



[1970 Brockwood](#)



[1970 Saanen](#)



[1970 San Diego  
State College](#)



[1971 Brockwood](#)



[1971 Madras](#)



[1972 Brockwood](#)



[1972 Madras](#)



[1972 Saanen](#)



[1973 Brockwood](#)



[1973 Madras](#)



[1973 Ojai](#)



[1973 Saanen](#)



[1973 San Francisco](#)



[1974 Brockwood](#)



[1974 Saanen](#)



[1975 Ojai](#)



[1975 Saanen](#)



[1975 San Francisco](#)



[1976 Brockwood](#)



[1976 Ojai](#)



[1976 Saanen](#)



[1977 Madras](#)



[1977 Ojai](#)



[1977 Saanen](#)



[1978 Bombay](#)



[1978 Brockwood 1](#)  
[Conversations With](#)  
[David Bohm, Mr.](#)  
[Narayan And 2](#)  
[Buddhist Scholars](#)



[1978 Brockwood 2](#)



[1978 Ojai](#)



[1978 Saanen](#)



[1979 Bombay](#)



[1979 Brockwood 1](#)  
[Conversations With](#)  
[Teachers And](#)  
[Buddhist Scholars](#)



[1979 Brockwood 2](#)



[1979 Madras 1](#)



[1979 Madras 2](#)



1979 Ojai



1979 Saanen



Lost And Found

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Dialogue With Young People](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[2nd Dialogue With Young People](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[6th Public Dialogue](#)

[7th Public Dialogue](#)

[8th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk - The Human Condition](#)

[4th Public Talk - What Is It We Are Seeking](#)



[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Discussion](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Discussion](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Discussion](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue \(With Young People\)](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[6th Public Dialogue](#)

[7th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)



[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[6th Public Dialogue](#)

[7th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[Dialogue On Education](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)



[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[What Is The Innermost Nature Of The Self](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)  
[Thinking Together Holistically](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Conversation](#)

[2nd Conversation](#)

[3rd Conversation](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Seminar Meeting](#)

[2nd Seminar Meeting](#)

[3rd Seminar Meeting](#)

[4th Seminar Meeting](#)

[5th Seminar Meeting](#)

[6th Seminar Meeting](#)



[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[Why Do You Live With Stress?](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Conversation With 5 Teachers](#)

[2nd Conversation With 5 Teachers](#)

[3rd Conversation With 5 Teachers](#)

[1st Conversation With Buddhist Scholars](#)  
[Truth](#)

[2nd Conversation With Buddhist Scholars](#)  
[Death](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[2nd Public Question And Answer Meeting](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Seminar Meeting](#)

[2nd Seminar Meeting](#)

[3rd Seminar Meeting](#)

[4th Seminar Meeting](#)

[5th Seminar Meeting](#)

[6th Seminar Meeting](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[1st Public Talk - The Art Of Learning](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Talk - What Is A Religious Mind](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Talk - The Seed Of A Million Years](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk - Sorrow, Death And Meditation](#)

[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue - On Transformation](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)



[1st Public Talk](#)

[2nd Public Talk](#)

[3rd Public Talk](#)

[4th Public Talk](#)

[5th Public Talk](#)

[6th Public Talk](#)

[7th Public Talk](#)

[1st Public Dialogue](#)

[2nd Public Dialogue](#)

[3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[4th Public Dialogue](#)

[5th Public Dialogue](#)

[1976 Brockood Park - Dialogue With Students And Staff](#)

[1974 Madras - 1st Public Talks](#)

[1971 Saanen - 3rd Public Dialogue](#)

[1971 Saanen - 6th Public Dialogue](#)

[1971 Rome - Public Talk](#)

[1973 Bombay - 9th Small Group Discussion  
Silence And Disorder](#)

[1970 Sydney - Interview With Mr. Saunders  
Is Belief Necessary?](#)

[1975 Brockwood Park - Film Interspersed With Music](#)

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 5TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

I am so glad it is such a nice morning. A beautiful sky and lovely countryside. But I am afraid this is not a weekend entertainment. What we shall talk about is quite serious, and perhaps after I have talked a little we can talk, discuss, or have a dialogue, or talk over together what we have talked about.

I don't know how you feel about what is happening in the world, in our environment, to our culture and society. It seems to me there is so much chaos, so much contradiction and so much strife and war, hatred and sorrow. And various leaders, both political and religious, try to find an answer either in some ideology, or in some belief, or in a cultivated faith. And none of these things seem to answer the problems. Our problems go on endlessly. And if we could in these four talks in this tent and the two discussions that are to take place, if we could be serious enough to go into this question of how to bring about, not only in ourselves but in society, a revolution, not physical revolution because that only leads to tyranny and the heightened control of bureaucracy, if we could very deeply find out for ourselves what to do, not depending on any authority, including that of the speaker, or on a book, on a philosophy, on any structural behavioral pattern, but actually find out irrevocably, if one can, what to do about all this confusion, this strife, this extraordinary, contradictory, hypocritical life one leads.

To me it seems to be fairly clear that to observe there must be freedom, not only the outward phenomenon, but also to observe what is going on within ourselves, to observe without any

prejudice, without taking any side, but to examine very closely, freely the whole process of our thinking and our activity, our pleasures, fears, and all the things that we have built around ourselves, not only outwardly but in ourselves as a form of resistance, compulsive demands, escapes and so on. If we could do that consistently, with full intention, to discover for ourselves a way of living that is not contradictory, then perhaps these talks will be worthwhile; otherwise it will be another lecture, another entertainment, pleasurable or rather absurd, logical or illogical and so on. So if we could completely give ourselves to the examination, to observe intimately what is going on, both outwardly and inwardly.

Now the difficulty in this lies, it seems to me, the capacity to observe, to see things as they are, not as we would like them to be, or what they should be, but actually what is going on. To so observe has its own discipline, not the discipline of imitation, or compulsion, or conformity but that very observation brings its own discipline, not imposed, not conforming to any particular pattern, which implies suppression, but to observe. After all when you do observe something very closely, or listen to somebody very fully, that very listening and seeing, in that is implied attention. And where there is attention there is discipline, without being disciplined.

If that is clear, the next point is, in observing there is always the observer. The observer who, with his prejudices, with his conditionings, with his fears and guilts and all the rest of it, he is the observer, the censor, and through his eyes he looks, and therefore he is really not looking at all, he is merely coming to

conclusions based upon his past experiences and knowledge. The past experiences, conclusions and knowledge prevent actually seeing. And when there is such an observer what he observes is something different, or something which he has to conquer, or change and so on; whereas if the observer is the observed - I think this is really a radical thing to understand, really the most important thing to understand if we are going to discuss anything seriously: that in us there is this division, this contradiction, the observer and the many fragments which he observes. The many fragments make up the 'me', the ego, the personality, whatever you like to call it, the many fragments. And one of the fragments becomes the observer or the censor, and that fragment looks over the various other fragments. Please do this as we are talking, not agreeing or disagreeing but observe this fact that is going on within oneself; it becomes terribly interesting and rather fun if you go at it very, very seriously.

We are made up of many fragments, each contradicting the other, both linguistically, factually and theoretically, contradictory desires, contradictory pursuits, ambitions that deny affection, love and so on - one is aware of these fragments. And who is the observer who decides what he should do, what he should think, what he should become? Surely one of the fragments. He becomes the analyzer, he assumes the authority. One fragment, among the many other fragments, becomes the censorship, and he becomes the actor, the doer, compelling other fragments to conform and therefore brings about contradiction. I don't know if we see this very clearly? Then what is one to do, knowing most of us are made up of these many fragments, which fragment is to act? Or are all

the fragments to act? You are following? Or action by any one of the fragments brings about contradiction, conflict and therefore confusion. Right? Are we communicating with each other? Communication being thinking together, not only verbally but understanding together, going together, creating together. One fragment believes in god, or doesn't believe in god, and another fragment wants a security, not only physical but psychological security. One fragment is afraid, another fragment tries to dominate that fear. Seeing this extraordinary contradiction in ourselves, what is one to do? The fragments cannot be integrated, which implies there is an integrator. Right? That is, the integrator becomes another fragment. So it is not integration, it is not one fragment which assumes superior position as the higher self, or the most intellectual thing and dominates the rest; or one fragment which feels greatly emotional and tries to function along emotional lines. So seeing this very clearly, what is the action that will be total, that will not be contradictory? And who is it that is seeing the whole fragments? Is it another fragment which says, 'I observe all the many other fragments'? Are we moving together? Or there is only observation without the observer. Can we go along? You understand my question?

Is there an observation, the seeing, without the 'me' as the observer seeing? And therefore creating a duality, a division. That is really our problem, isn't it, basically? We have divided the world, the geographical world, as the British, the French, the Indian, the American, Russian and so on, and inwardly we have divided psychologically the world, those who believe and those who do not believe, my country, your country, my god, your god

and all the rest of it. And this division has brought about wars; and a man who would live completely at peace, not only with himself but with the world, has to understand this division, this separation. And can thought bring about this complete total observation? I don't know if we are going together in this?

Who is responsible for this division? The Catholic, the Protestant, the Communist, the Socialist, the Muslim, the Hindu? You follow? This division that is going on within, outwardly and inwardly - who is responsible? The Pope? The Archbishop? The politicians? Who is it? Is it thought? The intellect? Can thought observe without division? Do you follow? We observe - or thought observes all the many factors of these divisions and is it not thought itself that has brought about this division, the intellect? And the intellect is one of the divisions, one of the fragmentation and that intellect has become extraordinarily important, which is thought. Right? For us thought is the most extraordinarily important thing, the intellect. And we hope to solve all the problems of our life through thought, don't we? By thinking over a problem, trying to suppress it or give free reign to it. Thought is the factor, is the instrument, which is always observing. Right?

Now that is, thought is one of the fragments. You don't live by thought, you have your feelings, your appetites, your pleasures. So if thought breeds contradiction, as yours and mine, as heaven and hell and all the rest of it, then how shall we observe, see, without the fragment which we call thought? I do not know if you have ever put this question to yourself. Thought is after all the response of the past, memories. Thought is never free, and with that thought, with that instrument, we are always looking at life, always

responding to every challenge with thought? Now can we observe with eyes, with a mind which is not shaped by thought? That is, can we observe without any conclusion, without any prejudice, without being committed to any particular theory or action? Which means to observe with eyes that have learnt about these many factors, fragments, which make up the 'me'. That is, as long as there is no self-knowing, as long as I do not know myself completely, entirely, I must function in fragments. And how to observe myself, how to learn about myself, without the censor intervening in observation. Are we getting together?

Look, I want to learn about myself because I see how extraordinarily important it is if I am at all to understand the world, action and a new way of living altogether. I have to understand myself, not according to some philosopher, psychologist however learned. I want to learn about myself as actually what I am, without any distortion, without suppressing anything, what I am both consciously as well as unconsciously. I want to know myself completely. Now how shall I learn? How shall I learn about what I am? To learn there must be a certain passion, a great deal of curiosity, without any assumption, taking things for granted, to look at myself without any formula - can one do that? Otherwise you can't learn about yourself obviously. If I say, I am jealous, the very verbalization of that fact, or of that feeling, has already conditioned it. Right? Therefore I cannot see anything further in it. So there must be a learning about the usage of words, not to be caught in words, and the realization that the word, the description, is not the described or the thing.

So to look, to learn about oneself there must be freedom from



all conclusion. I am ugly, I don't want to look at myself. I don't know what I shall find in myself. I am afraid to look at myself. You know all the things that we have come up with. So, can one observe without any sense of condemnation? Because if there is condemnation it is one of the fragments that has gathered, that has been conditioned by a particular society or culture in which it lives. If you are a Catholic you are conditioned - 2,000 years of propaganda has conditioned your mind, and with that mind you observe. And in that observation there is already condemnation, justification, therefore you don't learn. Right? The act of learning implies there must be freedom from the past. Obviously.

Now we are learning together here and is one free from the culture that has conditioned the mind? Being born as a Hindu or a Muslim, centuries of propaganda, don't do this, do this, believe in this, don't believe in that, has conditioned the mind, and such a mind says, I am going to learn about myself. It doesn't realize that it is conditioned, and a conditioned mind cannot possibly learn. Therefore it must be free of its conditioning. I don't know if you are following all this? Are you? You know what that implies when you say, 'Yes, we are'? Not to be an Englishman, or a Frenchman, not to belong to any religion, not to have any prejudice, not to come to any conclusion, which means freedom. And it is only such a mind that can learn about itself. Therefore one has to be aware of one's conditioning. Then the problem arises: who is to be aware of the conditioning? You follow? There is only conditioning, not, to be aware of the conditioning. I don't know if you see this? The moment I am aware of my conditioning there is a duality, isn't there? I, who am aware of my particular conditioning and hence

the one who is aware wants to change his conditioning, break it down, be free from it, therefore that creates conflict. Right? All division is bound to create conflict. Right? Sirs, look, the Catholic and the Protestant, you have got a very good example. Any division is bound to bring about contradiction, conflict and strife. If I say, I will be aware of my conditioning, there is immediately a contradiction, a separation. So to be aware of one's conditioning. You see? I am going to be aware of my conditioning, is one thing. And the other is, to be aware of it. Non-verbally, because the word is not the thing, and therefore the actual perception of it. Can you do this? Not that this is a group therapy, or analysis - for god's sake none of all that stuff - but actually is one aware of this conditioning? To be aware that I am a Hindu. Awareness implies looking, being aware, without any choice. The moment you have choice it is a fragmentation.

So can you observe yourself without any image of yourself? The image of yourself is the conditioning. Right? And to observe without any image, which means I don't know what I am, I am going to find out. In that there is no assumption, conclusion, therefore the mind is free to observe, to learn. Right? But in learning the moment there is an accumulation you have stopped learning. Look, sir, suppose I have observed myself and I see I am this, as a fact, and from that observation I have learnt something about myself. Having learnt about myself is the past. Right? With that past knowledge I am going to observe, therefore I cease to observe. It is only the past that is observing. Right? So can I, can the mind observe without accumulating? You understand the problem? Just look at the problem first, not what to do. When you

understand the problem very clearly action follows naturally. I observe myself and through that observation I have learnt something. After having learnt, I further observe. Having learnt more, I go on to observe, therefore the observer becomes the analyzer. Right? Right? Please do see this. Let's go along. The observer, the analyzer, is the result of many things he has learnt about himself, and with the eyes of the past, as the analyzer, as the person who has accumulated knowledge, he examines, he looks, he learns. So the past is always trying to learn of what is going on in the present. Is this clear?

So can there be a learning, that is, watching, observing, without any sense of accumulation, so that the mind is always fresh to learn? It is only such a mind that is a free mind. So can the mind be free of thought in observing, in learning? Because you see one wants to learn, naturally, seeing the transient nature of our life, the exhaustion of pleasure revived by thought, given continuity to pleasure by thought, seeing how everything comes to an end, one wants to find out if there is anything which is beyond, which is transcendental, which is something other than this daily routine, daily boredom, daily occupation, daily worry. After all that is what religions promise: seek god, love god. But to learn if there is anything that is beyond thought, beyond the intellect, beyond the routine, one must be free of all beliefs, mustn't one? Which doesn't mean you become an atheist. The atheists and the believers are both the same.

I want to find out seriously if there is something which is beyond 'what is', which means the mind must be totally free of any fear otherwise fear will project something that will give it a

comfort. So I must learn all about fear, the mind must be enquiring into this whole terrible problem of fear. If the mind wants to find out anything that is beyond the imagination, the myth, the symbol, man has projected as god, the mind must be free of all that to find out. And it cannot possibly find out if there is any form of fear. And we are frightened human beings. So can the mind learn the whole nature of fear, not only the conscious fears but the deep rooted fears of which most of us are unaware?

So from that arises the question: how are the unconscious fears to be revealed, to be exposed? Are you following all this? Is it to be exposed through analysis, which means the analyzer, which means a fragment who is going to analyze. Or through dreams discover all the fears, and that is a perilous road, to find out through dreams what we are because dreams are merely the continuation of what we are during the daily life, waking hours. No? Is all this too much in one morning?

Audience: No.

K: Good. So how is the mind, which has divided in itself as the conscious and the unconscious, which again is a division, therefore contradiction, how is the mind to be aware of this whole structure and nature of consciousness? You follow? Without division. And there are hidden parts in the mind, deep down in the darkest corners of our minds, all kinds of things going on - nothing extraordinary, it is as silly as the conscious mind, the things of the conscious mind. So how is all that to be exposed? Not through analysis obviously. Right? If you really see that, the impossibility, the danger, the falseness of analysis - I hope there aren't any analysts here, bad luck if there are! - if you really see that, your

mind then is free to observe without analysis. I don't know if you see that. Look sir, let's be very simple about this. Analysis implies time. Right? Analysis implies the analyzer who is different from the thing analyzed. And is the analyzer different from the thing he wants to analyze? Surely they are both the same only he, a fragment, has assumed the part, the knowledge, the assumption that he is different and he is going to analyze. And each analysis must be complete. Right? Otherwise you carry over the misunderstandings of your analysis to the next analysis. Time, division as the analyzer, each analysis must be complete, finished each time, which are all impossible. If you see the truth of that, the actual fact of it, then you are free of it, aren't you? Are you? If you are free of it then you have quite a different mind that is going to observe. You see the difference? If there is the freedom from the false, and analysis is the false, then my mind is free from the burden of that which has been false, therefore it is free to look.

Now can the mind look at the totality of consciousness without any division as the observer watching the whole structure of consciousness? I don't know if you see. Is this all becoming rather complex? If it is complex life is complex. And to learn about oneself you have to face this extraordinary complex entity called the 'me'. You have to learn about it, and that is what we are doing, we are getting educated about ourselves.

So, can the mind observe the totality of itself? Look, we are human beings - at least supposed to be - only we have divided ourselves into various nationalities, religious beliefs, and so on. When you observe, that is, when you go beyond all nationalities and religious beliefs, we are aggressive, brutal, violent, pleasure

seeking people, frightened and so on, and we have to learn all about that, which is ourselves. And to learn about ourselves we see analysis has no answer at all. On the contrary analysis prevents action, denies action. So can the mind observe the totality of itself, look at itself without any division? Then there is no need for analysis or for the hidden things to be exposed, you see the whole thing. Therefore in that observation you may discover fear. Fear and pleasure are the two principal things in us, driving forces, demanding more and more and more pleasure, and warding off fear. Right? Now what do you do with pleasure? You want more of it, surely - both physical, psychological pleasure. And in looking at pleasure very closely, one asks oneself: what is pleasure? Please sirs, do discuss with me. Come together. What is pleasure to you? Physical sensation, psychological factors.

Q: For me pleasure is an escape.

K: For me, the gentleman says, pleasure is an escape. Escape from what? Am I escaping through pleasure? Escaping from fear of not having pleasure? Do look at it. Please sirs do look at yourselves and you will find out simply this thing. Most of us are pursuing pleasure, aren't we? Why? Not that we should or should not. It would be absurd to say, 'Don't have pleasure', when you look at the sky and the trees and the lovely countryside there is a delight. But why this pursuit of pleasure?

Q: I feel that I sustain myself in pursuing pleasure.

K: Sustain yourself? Who is yourself? This is much more complex than that. Do go into it a little bit. First of all let's be very clear what we mean by pleasure. Pleasure is entirely different from joy, isn't it? No? When you are joyous, when you think about it, it

becomes pleasure doesn't it?

Q: Pleasure is a stimulus.

K: Obviously a stimulus. We know all how pleasure comes about. It is a stimulus. All right. Go into it please. Look at the pleasures you have. And also you have at rare moments great joy, don't you? Sudden burst of joy. Is there a difference between the two? Look, you have suddenly, as you are walking along you feel extraordinarily happy, and the moment you think about it, it has gone. No? No? At that moment of great joy there is no thinker. The thinker comes in and says, 'I wish I could have that extraordinary moment again'. So the thinker has made joy into pleasure by thinking about it. No? So there is a difference between joy and pleasure. I have had pleasure, somebody said something nice. I have had sexual pleasure. I have had pleasure in achievement, in success, in making a name for myself, and that pleasure is something entirely different from enjoyment, from joy. No?

Q: Joy is in the now.

K: Yes, joy is in the now, pleasure is something which happened yesterday and I want to repeat it today. I think about the thing which gave me pleasure yesterday and the very thinking about that pleasure sustains that thing which was called pleasurable yesterday. No? So thought sustains pleasure, doesn't it? And also thought sustains fear. No? You are uncertain about that? I might lose my job. I am not so nice looking as you, not so clever, I might die tomorrow. I am lonely, I want to be loved, I may not, be loved and so on. Thought does both, sustains both, fear as well as pleasure. No? So what are you going to do about it? Put an end to thought, knowing thought breeds and sustains and nourishes these two. And

to escape from this pattern we go off. Right? We turn to meditation, we turn to Zen, we turn to - you know, become Communist, Socialist, oh, a dozen things. To escape from this pattern we become terribly religious, or terribly worldly, or revolt against the established order, which is built on this pattern. And the person who revolts creates the same pattern, the same thing in a different pattern. He is still seeking pleasure, avoiding fear. Then what is one to do? You follow? Because the whole religious structure is based on escaping from this: believe in something marvellous, think about it all the time. But the other thing goes on all the time also. So there is contradiction in wanting to be free of it, and yet be in it. I don't know if you see all this. So they say, 'Suppress thought, control thought, kill the mind'. No? Who is it that is going to suppress thought? You see the danger? So that whole process of thinking has no meaning whatever. Right? I don't know if you see all this. All escapism has no meaning, whether that escape be in social work, watching football, or attending, going to churches where there is another form of entertainment. So unless you solve this basic problem, that is, to learn all about it, then only the mind can be free from it. Which means, can the mind observe the various forms of pleasures, the stimuli and so on, and also all the fears which thought has bred in its search for security. Right? That is, the brain demands that it be completely secure otherwise it can't function properly, efficiently, logically, sanely. Right? The brain, which is the storehouse of memory, experience, knowledge, and that brain with its thought is constantly seeking safety, security, permanency. And not finding permanency in any relationship - husband/wife, you know, relationship, then it tries to



escape in some form of belief, in some ideology, in some image, in nationalism, in god. You follow? Escape.

So can the mind, knowing all this, that is, learning about all this, which is being educated, educating itself, learning from itself, not from somebody else, because no book can give you all this, no teacher, only one has to learn about oneself completely, and then when one is not self-centred, then perhaps one is able to observe, or see, something which is beyond all this.

Now Sirs, shall we ask, discuss, ask questions?

Q: May I ask a question please? Could you tell me whether unselfishness is real or unreal?

K: Could you tell me whether unselfishness is real or unreal. I wonder what we mean by the word 'real'.

Q: Actual.

K: Actual. Yes. Need somebody tell me whether I am self-centred or not - the actual fact? What does that mean, selfishness, what does it mean to be self-centred, to be concerned about oneself. Right? Whether that oneself has been identified with the nation, with a belief, with a particular ideological, political system, or that self identified with the family, it is still the self. That is the actual. That is 'what is'. That is what we are doing all the time. My family. And in that too there is a division - me and my family. Me with my ambitions, with my greed, with my position. You follow? And the family pursuing also the same thing, isolating each other. Right? All this is a form of egocentricism, isn't it? That is the actual. That is what is going on in our life daily. I like those who flatter me, who give me comfort; I don't like those who say anything about my belief. You know it all becomes so absurdly

childish the whole thing.

Now the question is: can the mind be free of this egocentric activity? Right? That is really the question, not whether it is so or not. Which means can the mind stand alone, uninfluenced? Alone, being alone does not mean isolation. Sir, look: what one rejects completely all the absurdities of nationality, the absurdities of propaganda, of religious propaganda, rejects conclusions of any kind, actually, not theoretically, completely put aside, has understood very deeply the question of pleasure and fear, and division - the 'me' and 'not me' - is there any form of the self at all?

So one has to be free of all this to find out what it means to live a life in which there is no fear. But you see unfortunately for most of us we have neither the time nor the inclination to pursue this right to the end. Or rather, we have plenty of time but we don't want to do this because we are afraid what might happen. You see I have my responsibilities to my family, I can't become a monk. You follow? All the excuses that one churns out, which means that we do not want to find out how to live without sorrow. And to learn about it one has to become extraordinarily, choicelessly aware of oneself.

Q: May I ask a question? If one could ever, with this choiceless awareness that you speak of, really come to know all the fragments in oneself, would the conflict of seeing these fragments disappear?

K: Would conflict disappear in every form if one became aware? Do you know what it means to be aware? Don't let's make a tremendously complex thing of it - to be aware, see. See the sky, the trees, the green grass, to see the beauty of all that, and to see the colour of your sweater, which I don't like, to be aware of my

like and dislike. It is easy to be aware of things that don't affect me, like the tree, the ocean, the sea and the wind in the leaf, but to be aware of one's dislike, of one's prejudice, of one's vanity, arrogance - you try it, to be aware of it, without any choice, don't say, 'It is right' - or wrong - 'I must get rid of it', 'How absurd to be vain' - all those are rationalizations of a fact. To be aware of the fact. And in that, when you are so aware, the question arises: who is it that is aware? When you put that question you are not aware. Right? Do please see it. When you put that question, who is aware, you do not know the meaning or the significance of that word 'to be aware', because you are still thinking in terms of division - the one who is to be aware. Is that clear? Yes sir?

Q: I see the enormous need to be aware choicelessly, as you say, and yet as I observe myself this does not occur. In other words the thinker is always intruding, the thinker is always commenting, observing, evaluating. Am I just to stay with that? Otherwise I think I recognize the vital need for this not to always see through this past conditioning of the thinker, and yet the thinker continues to evaluate and judge. This does not occur, this choiceless awareness does not come into being.

K: You are saying: what is one to do with the observer, with the thinker. Right? Who is always interfering, projecting, deciding. Now what do you do? Tell me please. There is your problem. Right? You have all that problem, haven't you? What will you do with it? Don't please answer me. Look at it first. Look at the question. Be aware of this fact that one is always doing this. I want to see the world as new. I want to see every challenge as something new to which I can respond with freshness, but always the thought

is interfering. Right? The observer with his condition, with his past responses, with eyes that are spotted, always interfering. Now what are you going to do? If it is actually your problem, not a theoretical problem, a passionate problem, what will you do?

Q: Find out what causes it.

K: Now wait. What causes it? Wait. Wait. Go slow. See what is implied. To say, I am going to find out what causes it, is part of the analysis, which will take time. Right? I thought you had abandoned analysis. So what will you do? By finding the cause of it, you may instantly find the cause of it, but will the discovery of the cause free the mind from the censor? Right? Will it? I know why I am angry, but I am still angry. I know the absurdity of jealousy, but I am still jealous. I have gone into the question of ambition very carefully, and discovered how absurd it is, why I am ambitious because in myself I am really nobody, a rather footling little entity and I want to be somebody great. There is the cause. But yet the drive to achieve, to be successful, is still there. So the cause does not free the mind of the thing it wants to understand and be free of. So what are you going to do? Please proceed. You'll find out. Analysis will not help. Discovery of the cause will not free the mind.

Q: So we must live it and let it be.

K: Live it and let it be. Live what?

Q: What is.

K: What is. What is, is that thought is all the time, as the censor, interfering, judging, evaluating, condemning. That is a fact. Now you see that as poison. Now what will you do? Do you actually see it, or is it just a theory?

Q: Sometimes it is. In flashes you see it and at other times you can't see it.

K: Sometimes you see it and at other times you don't. Is that so? When you see something very dangerous, that pool - you don't see it sometimes and you don't see it other times. The danger is always there, isn't it?

Q: Sometimes you are aware of it and sometimes you forget.

K: Wait. I understand that. What does it mean? You are aware of sometimes, you are unaware of it other times. Right? What will you do? Proceed and you will find out. What will you do? That sometimes you are aware that the censor is operating and therefore preventing clarity, and other times you are unaware of the censor at all, you are just quickly responding. How will you bring about a total attention? Right? How? A system? A method? Right? Will it? You are doubtful about that, aren't you? A system implies practise doesn't it? Practise day after day of being aware. Right? Which means what? It becomes mechanical doesn't it, therefore it is no longer awareness. Therefore systems of any kind will not bring about attention. So, finished. Right? See what you have learnt. No analysis. Right? No searching out the cause. No system. Right? Now is your mind free of analysis, cause, systems, is it actually free?

Q: At the moment.

K: Ah, no, no. Not, at the moment. It means you don't see the truth of it, you only see partly what you like to see.

Q: Ignore it.

K: Ignore it! Withdraw? Ignore? Ignore it. How can I? You could ignore it? Ignore what? Ignore that I am thinking absurdly?

But that is my whole life. How can I ignore my life?

Q: Your past life.

K: Your past life. Do you know what it means to live in the present?

Q: I am suggesting that you ignore your past life.

K: Sir, do you know what it means to live in the present? To ignore the past. Can I ignore the past? All my life is the past. No? I am the past. No? The past. All thought is the past. No? Because thought is the response of memory. Memory is knowledge, experience, which is all the past. Can the mind ignore all that? Because the mind is the past. All the brain cells are the result of the past. And you say, 'Ignore it and live in the present'. Do you know what it means to live in the present? Which means to have no time at all, to be free of time. Not so that you will miss the bus - I don't mean that. If you forget time you won't be able to get home. We mean by freedom from time, it implies freedom from the whole structure of the 'me', which is time, which is the past. And one has to learn about all that. You can't just say, I'll be free, or ignore it.

Q: Krishnaji, may I ask your advice? I realize I must find the answer. In this process of observing fragments of oneself there seems to come a sense of guilt of one's shortcomings compared with an established standard of values, also a sense of possible disloyalty because one anticipates having to make a break from certain obligations to responsibilities that one has undertaken. Is this another form of fear? Should one disregard it? And then continue to look with joy and awareness?

K: Yes sir. When I observe myself, the questioner says, please correct me sir if I am not putting it rightly, the questioner says,

when I am aware of myself I feel very guilty, I feel various forms of fears, of being irresponsible and so on and so on. All these things arise when I observe myself. What am I to do? Disloyalty, guilt, wretchedness, feeling miserable, repentance, you know, the whole works that one goes through. Why shouldn't they all come up? Why shouldn't this feeling of guilt come up? It is there. You are following what I am saying? Let it come but the moment you say it is guilt, it is wrong, it is right, I should have done this, then begins the interference of the censor. I don't know if you are following all this. Sirs, please, be extraordinarily simple about all this. I observe myself and I find that I have done something ugly and the makes me feel guilty. I want to know why. Why am I guilty about something which I have done? I have done it.

Finished. Right? It has happened. I have told a lie. That's a fact. And no amount of my cunning deception is going to hide it. I am afraid you might find out that I lied. I don't mind. Find out. Be clear, honest about it. You follow what I am saying? I have lied and I feel guilty and I know I have done something ugly. I am going to look at it, I am not going to condemn it.

You know sir, to actually look at 'what is', without the censor, it doesn't mean that you become callous, indifferent, on the contrary, you become extraordinarily sensitive. And sensitivity is part of intelligence. But the moment you condemn it, condemn 'what is', then begins all the trouble. But just to look at it, that you have told a lie, that one has been angry, one has been afraid, just to observe. Look sir, you depend, don't you, on people psychologically. No? You depend. Why do you depend? Not that you should not, or should. Why? Because the other gives you comfort, or sustains you

psychologically. Inwardly one is poor and the other gives you a feeling of well-being. One is lonely, therefore you depend on another. You can't stand alone therefore you depend. So there it is. Just to be aware that you depend and not cultivate detachment. But to be aware that you are dependant because you are lonely. And find out what it means to be lonely. Is it an acknowledgement of isolation? You understand? Loneliness is a fact of isolation, isn't it? Completely isolated from everything and one is afraid of that loneliness. Therefore you escape and therefore you depend. If you see this thing, actually see it non-verbally, the fact, because the moment you depend you are afraid, you are jealous, you become aggressive, you lose all sense of affection, love. When you see this whole thing very clearly then the mind is free from all dependency.

Q: What is the dimension and the extent of the mind in relation to space?

K: What is the time sir? I think we had better stop and continue with this tomorrow, shall we? Right sirs.



## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 6TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

I wonder what you would like that we talk about this morning. I would like to talk about something that might be of interest. One can see very clearly that one must lay a new foundation for a different kind of living, a different way of looking at life as a whole, not fragmentarily, a way of thinking when it is absolutely necessary, most efficiently, logically, and sanely, but while the mind is not functioning in thought, for the mind to be completely quiet the rest of the time. A way of living where action is complete and not contradictory, so that one action doesn't deny or bring about corruption, or disintegration in other activities. A way of living that is of tremendous enjoyment, great delight, without the exhausting process of pleasure. And also a way of life that is completely and utterly peaceful. Now can all this be realized in our daily living? That's what I would like to talk about, if that is what you also want. Is that all right?

For this to come about easily, almost unconsciously as it were, one must understand this question of effort, conflict and this constant seeking out something. There must be effort as long as there is contradiction in our life: thinking one thing, saying another, doing something else, obviously that leads to a hypocritical - a life of great friction. Is it at all possible to live a life in which there is no effort of any kind? Because effort implies not only contradiction but various forms of suppression, various forms of escapes, imitation, conformity. And that effort brings about its own discipline, which is merely accepting a norm which is

comforting and imitating that pattern. All that is implied in effort. We are talking about psychological effort. Can one live without this constant struggle inwardly? Which implies, doesn't it, to see this whole pattern of conflict and struggle and contradiction as a whole, not in fragments. Is the mind capable of looking at the whole of life, with all the problems, with all the contradictions, struggles, searching, longing, fears, pleasures, searching for something immutable, escaping from our own petty narrow lives, our own shallow thinking. See the whole of that non-fragmentarily - is that at all possible? Because the moment something is possible you have plenty of energy. It's only when psychologically we think there is no possibility then we become slack, our energy fades away. But the moment there is a possibility of something then we have abundance of energy.

So we are asking a question, which is, can the mind, your mind, the mind, see this whole existence as one unitary movement, though in it there are contradictions? Because it seems to me in that lies the understanding of effort, struggle, seeking out something, something great, noble, transcendental, and the constant movement of going to one thing after the other, church, Catholicism, Protestantism, the Hinduism, Judaism, you know, follow one after the other, endlessly shop-lifting - I think that's the right word! Because one can see where there is contradiction and conflict there must be distortion. To see that as a fact, not as a theory, not as a formula, something to be achieved, but the actual perception of that truth, of that fact, that any form of struggle, conformity, imitation, in which there is contradiction, this tendency to conform and so on is a form of distortion, to see that. We don't see it because we are

caught in the trap of formulas, concepts.

Can the mind observe without formulas, without conceptual ideas, theories, but merely observe the fact that conflict distorts? And when the mind sees that very clearly, through negation you put away all the factors that bring about conflict. Are we communicating with each other? That is, sirs, negation is the most positive action. To see something false and totally deny it is the most positive response. So through negation the positive comes, not the pursuit of the positive. Say for instance, one perceives the falseness of nationalities, the falseness of organized belief, religions, rituals and a projection of what god is, which are all intellectual superficial fragmentary processes, to deny all that, not verbally but actually psychologically, in oneself, that brings freedom which is the most positive.

Are we meeting each other? Communication is really an extraordinary thing. Which means, both of us meet with the same intensity, at the same level, at the same time, and that is communication. It is really a form of communion. To see something together, that which is false, and see something real, together, both of our minds must be at the same time, with the same passion, with the same vitality, to observe, to see. And that is real communication, then words have very, very little significance. But unfortunately one has to use words, knowing the word is not the thing, the description is not the described.

You see we have lived so long in formulas, in concepts, and according to those we act, or not act, and these formulas, concepts, condition our thinking, our living. I won't use the word 'condition' our thinking, because thinking is already conditioned - our living.

So can the mind, your mind, be free of all formulas? Do investigate as we are talking, please. To be aware of one's formulas, that there is god, that there is no god, this is right, this is wrong, I am this, I am not that - you know what we mean by formulas: forms created by thought in order to be secure, in order to function according to a certain pattern, and so on. To be aware of these formulas that one has and to find out why they exist, just by observing. As we went into yesterday, trying to find out what the cause of these formulas are is a waste of time, because if you are aware of these formulas you see the cause instantly. Obviously the formulas, the concepts, the theories, the philosophies, the various ideologies exist simply because that way the mind, the brain, feels safe, feels secure. And to be aware of these formulas, and to put aside all formulas - you try it, do it as we are discussing, talking about it, you will see what happens to a mind. First to be aware of these formulas, concepts; then see actually what the implications are, and put them aside. The very seeing of that which is false is the denial of it. Because it is only a mind that is really free that come function easily, without any effort.

So: because we are talking not about theories but a way of living which has deep significance, not invented by the intellect, but significance in living itself. Unless we lay that foundation one cannot go any further. One can go imaginatively, theoretically, fancifully, deceitfully, hypocritically. Because after all our actual daily living is rather tiresome, ugly, violent, brutal, without much meaning, and in this futile existence we try to find a meaning, we try to find love, we try to find what we call god, or reality, or whatever you like to call it. And not finding it there, our mind still

caught in the trap of shallowness, in all its various forms of strife and struggle, we try to escape from all this through knowledge. Knowledge becomes extraordinarily important, not wisdom but knowledge. Which means books, teachers, following, forming separate groups and all the rest of it. So we think having more knowledge about ourselves we will be able to live a different kind of life. Do please see this. Knowledge implies accumulation; accumulation is the past. Obviously. And our life is directed, guided, shaped by the past, and we cling to that because that is the safest way of living, at least we think it is. And freedom from the known, which is knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Do go into it with me, you will see it.

The known is the 'me' - my conflicts, my struggles, my unhappiness, my sense of guilt, sorrow, despair, success, pleasure and so on. All that I know of myself is the past. My god is the invention of my thought. Because I want something totally secure, something immutable, permanent, because my life is very changeable, so I want something everlasting. The everlasting is the 'me' identified with a word called god. And that word has caused such mischief in the world. And to find out if there is something beyond all the measure of thought, beyond all the measure of one's fears and imaginations and fancies, the mind must be completely free from knowledge. I don't know if you follow all this.

Knowledge is necessary when you function, as a scientist, as a doctor, an engineer, a professional careerist, a bureaucrat, you must have plenty of knowledge otherwise you cannot function. And we think acquiring knowledge about oneself will not only enhance, get enlightenment through knowledge about ourselves, therefore

through the past, and so what happens. We divide life as the past, the present and the future. I don't know if you see. And all the time the past is shaping our life - the past being the known. And we are afraid to let go the known because that's all we have. The past is the only thing we have. And to let go completely, which means a mind that is capable of learning and not accumulating.

Because if you want to learn what truth is, learn about what truth is, first you must know 'what is'. Mustn't you? Because the 'what is' is the most living thing. But if we translate 'what is' in terms of the past then 'what is' becomes static. Right? Are we meeting each other? And when 'what is' becomes sterile then the mind cannot go beyond 'what is'. But to observe 'what is' without translating in terms of the past, then the mind can go beyond 'what is'.

Look, sir: I am greedy, that's a fact. One is greedy, envious, violent, those are facts. And we look at that fact, 'what is', with eyes that condemn, justify, give reason why we should be violent. And so we see the impossibility of going beyond. Whereas if we looked at the violence, which we have in us, the 'what is', without any condemnation, without any evaluation, then the possibility of going beyond it is there. I don't think we are meeting each other. I don't think so, sorry, I don't feel you are getting it.

Look, sir, I realize I am violent, I hate, I am greedy, competitive, aggressive, easily slipping into anger, I realize that, that's a fact. And looking at it I have already a formula, an idea that I must not be because I want to live a peaceful life - god knows why, but I want to. So I have a concept that a different kind of life is possible, an ideal of non-violence. So what has the mind done? It

has seen that it is violent and it has created a formula of non-violence so it brings within it a contradiction. And I fight with that contradiction. I move from violence to non-violence. Whereas if I had no formula at all but actually observed the fact of violence, I discover why I am violent. Again not seeking the cause of it, it is there. Because we love aggression, there is great pleasure in being aggressive, dominating. Our social structure, culture is based on competitiveness. All that is based on the principle of pleasure. Now if I see all that, and I can only see it if I have no conceptual idea about violence, then the mind can go beyond it, can be utterly free of violence. Have I made it clear? Clear in the sense not verbally or intellectually, but you actually see it, as you see the speaker sitting on the platform, as clearly as that: that one cannot go beyond 'what is' if you look at it with closed eyes, and the eyes are closed when you have the desire to get rid of it, to overcome it, to suppress it, to achieve a different state. Which are all the seeds of violence.

Right?

So one discovers for oneself, if you are at all serious and go into it very deeply, that one can live without a formula. After all love is without a formula, isn't it?

Q: Both aggression and love are unconscious things which rise up without a formula.

K: Oh, no, no, you have not understood what we have said. Both arise, love and aggression have no formulas. Really, that is not what we are talking about.

Look, sir, I see the necessity in myself of living a different kind of life. I am the result of the culture, the society in which I have been born. The society, the community, the culture is me, and I am

that society, I am the world and the world is me. This is not a theory but an actual fact. You are born in this country, you are brought up according to its culture and society, that's a fact. And being born in another country, with their beliefs, with their dogmas, they are conditioned by that culture. Now I want to find out a different way of living because I see the way I have lived is utterly meaningless - the struggle, this everlasting boredom, the routine, the exhaustion of pleasure, the fear of living and dying, the utter emptiness in oneself, the loneliness, the lack of love. I see all that. And I want to find a way of living which is none of this. And to find that out I must deny the whole of this in myself, not in you, not kill you, not throw bombs, and all the rest of it.

So I realize that change is only possible if the mind can become - the mind being the brain and the whole business - can be made new. The entity that can make the mind new is not thought, because thought is the response of memory, knowledge, experience. The mind cannot be made new through the intellect with all its formulas, with its endless futile enquiries and with its philosophies. So that goes. So what is the factor that will make the mind totally new? You understand my question? What is it?

Q: Feeling?

K: Feeling. Listen, sir, feeling is fragmentary. Like thinking is fragmentary, the intellect is fragmentary, to be sentimental, emotional is fragmentary. We are asking - please listen to the question first - seeing all this, seeing the confusion, the misery, the conflict, the inner utter poverty, what will make the mind, the brain, the whole structure totally new so that it will be creative - not in expression, not in writing a poem, or painting a picture,



that's not creative. When there is tension between two opposing desires, in that tension you can do things. So for a mind to be new, fresh, young...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh, my lady, you are just throwing words. Please find out, look at it, look at your life first. Your life, not how you think your life should be, but actually what it is - the frustrations, the misery, the quarrel in relationship, the images that you have about each other, the toil of going to the office, being insulted in the office by the boss. You follow, the whole of that, watch it in your life. And you see all that very clearly, the absurd beliefs based on fear, and so on, and you ask yourself, how can the mind which has produced all this, how can that mind be made totally new so that it can function differently.

Q: Possibly by understanding.

K: Possibly by understanding.

Q: And seeing 'what is' without condemnation.

K: This is not guess work! This is not a guessing game.

Q: I still say, feeling. I don't understand why feeling is not right.

K: You mean, sir, by feeling, do you, by love?

Q: No, just feeling, the instant without any thought process.

Living right now with no fear of any kind.

K: Wait sir, wait sir. Living right now without any fear.

Q: Just living right now.

K: Sir, you can't live right now with the burden of the past, can you?

Q: The past is the past, it has gone.

K: Is it so simple as all that? The past is the past, and it has

gone. You know what it means? The past is in the brain, in the brain cells are the memories of the past. You don't know. And you mean to say you can get rid of all that through just feeling at this moment?

Q: Why not?

K: Not, I don't know. Sir, find out without putting into words, or trying to answer, how you with your life, which you know very well, better than anybody else, both the secret and the open, when you are by yourself, or when you are with other people you know what your life is. And you see the importance of changing all that, bringing about a different kind of mind, not throwing away knowledge, because you must have knowledge otherwise you can't get home - how can this mind be changed completely? Do, sit quietly, find out, don't answer me. I am not asking you. Sir, do you know what this means? To find out you must give your life to it. It isn't just a weekend affair. It must be your vocation, therefore dreadfully serious. So what will bring about this radical change?

Q: We must wipe out our feelings.

K: We must wipe out our feelings.

Q: Can't we just let 'what is' be and watch it?

K: Watch 'what is'. Why don't you?

Q: That's what I am saying.

K: Why don't you? Are you doing it? Do you know what silence is? When you look at anything, at a tree, at a child, your wife, or your friend, or see anything, do you look at it through silence, or through noise? When you look at your husband, do you look at him or her through an image you have, or do you look only without any movement of thought.

You know what it means to be absolutely quiet, not cultivate quietness, but being quiet. A mind that is really quiet can observe 'what is' and go beyond it. But the mind is not quiet when it is chattering that it must be changed. That is, trying to suppress it, trying to understand it, trying to find out the cause of it and so on.

You know - may I go on with this a little bit? Meditation is this. To observe completely silently. In that silence there is no observer at all. The moment there is an observer silence is not. Not only physical quietness, the physical organism being completely still but also the brain, which means thought. Then out of that silence and space the mind is made new. Not you make the mind new, as the observer. And the silence is only possible when there is an awareness of all the conditioning, of your conditioning as this or that - Christian, Muslim, Hindu, you know, communist, socialist, you know, all the rest of it. When the mind is free, is aware of its conditioning and being aware there is complete attention. I do not know if you have noticed when there is complete attention there is no observer at all, no censor. Haven't you noticed it? No? When you attend, when you listen to something, when you listen to the song of a bird - there it is! - when you listen to it completely with full attention, in which there is no control, no sense of division, in that attentive state, movement, there is no observer at all. Then in that attention there is something new, the mind is made new.

Right?

But then you say, how can such attention be maintained. Right? Which is your greed. So all that one can do is to be aware that you are inattentive. That's all. Not, how can inattention become attention - it can't. Whereas if one is aware that one is inattentive,

that's sufficient. I don't know if you are meeting this.

I think that's enough this morning, so can we discuss, talk, question?

Q: Do you feel that your mind is quiet, your own personal particular mind, is it usually quiet?

K: Is your own particular mind, the speaker's mind, quiet.

Q: Do you feel that you have a quiet mind?

K: Do you feel personally that you have a quiet mind. I really don't know.

Q: What about...

K: Do listen, sir, do listen to what I am saying. If you knew that you had a quiet mind, it is not a quiet mind. If you are conscious that you are quiet, still, don't you know what it means. When you know that you are happy, is it happiness? Sir, you see, as I said, when there is complete attention, and therefore silence, in that there is no observer, the entity that is conscious that he is silent. Then there is a division between the observer and the thing he calls silence. And the struggle begins to achieve that silence. And you have the various systems, practices of achieving silence. Just think of the absurdity of that!

Q: Sir, what does the cessation of sorrow imply?

K: What do you mean by the cessation of sorrow. The ending of sorrow. We know what sorrow is, don't we. It's always with us, in different forms - death of somebody whom we think we love, the sorrow of not being something or other, the sorrow of self-pity mostly, the sorrow of realizing how shallow, empty, dull we are; and the sorrowness of the world as a whole, the poverty, the superstition, the fears of the world, not only your own sorrow but

the sorrow of the world. Now can all that sorrow end?

Q: Only when fragmentation ends.

K: Only when fragmentation ends. Look, that's just a theory, isn't it. I am in sorrow, I want to find out how to end it. Because I know what sorrow does, it brings about greater concentration of self-centred activity. In sorrow there is a great deal of self-pity. Watch it in yourself, sir, please. In sorrow there is isolation, cutting yourself off from others. In sorrow there is this constant weight, burden, the seeking and the ending of it, demanding to put an end to all that - either suicide, or escape, which are both the same. Now how can this sorrow end? And I see that it must end, it is imperative because otherwise the brain, the mind, my life has no meaning, just go on, round and round in this trap of sorrow. Now how is it to end? What do you say, sir? How is it to end? How is your sorrow, not mine, or the world's sorrow, how is your sorrow to end? Obviously not through escape. And we have such a network of escapes. Do you understand? How is to end? Do find out. Will you end it through time, gradually, working at it, chiselling it away, day after day? Or it can only end instantly? Can the mind see the whole pattern of sorrow, with its self-pity, with its neurotic pursuits? And the neurotic pursuits are escaping through pleasure, through entertainment, through knowledge, through religious formulas and beliefs.

Q: It can end when you know longer desire sorrow.

K: When we no longer desire then there is an end to sorrow. Can you put an end to desire?

Q: End desire.

K: Watch it, do listen sir. Can you put an end to desire? That's

what the Protestants, and the religious people, and Catholic priests have done: stamp out desire and concentrate on the saviour, on god, on your book. Have you suppressed - you see you are saying things. Can you get rid of desire, what is desire? Do look at it, sir, what is desire? I see you have got a nice shirt, and I'd like to have it. I see you have got a nice face, I wish it were mine also, and you have got a good brain, good capacity, clarity and I would like to have that. So there is perception - seeing first, visual, then contact, then sensation, then desire, and that desire is sustained by thought. No? And you mean to say you are going to suppress all that? Which means suppressing thought, therefore don't look at women, don't look at things that give pleasure, don't look at that shirt, shut your eyes. Or do you understand this whole process? The seeing, the contact, the sensation, and why can't the mind stop there, why should thought come in and say, 'I'd like to have that shirt', 'What a lovely car that is, I'd like to go in it'. You follow all this? To see that thought perpetuates pleasure as desire. To see a car, to see a good brain functioning, not say, 'I wish I could get it', to be aware when thought comes and turns it into pleasure. I don't know if you follow this. All that means watching, being aware, alert, and that requires energy.

Q: Are there any rules, none which I can see, on what is good and what is bad. Is that all created in the mind itself? Some people can think that some things are one hundred per cent good, and their next door neighbour feels exactly opposite. And I can't see that they both aren't right because they are both there. I mean to say that one has a good mind...

K: No, sir, good mind in the sense clear mind, thinking clearly.

You know, sir, a good mind, I don't have to go into it.

Q: Right. But I am saying to look into someone else's mind, you could never know if it was clear unless...

K: No, sir. I am talking - look you are asking, are you, what is good and what is bad - are there rules about it. Rules of good taste, the golden rule of proportion. Now, sir, look, there is after all good and bad, isn't there. There is - wait a minute - there is violence and there is gentleness, tenderness, care. Violence is destructive, kills. They are obvious, aren't they? Wait, look at it, don't say good and bad. Look at it first. The moment you say it is good and it is bad, you have put it into a formula and with that formula you are going to judge. That's the easiest way of living. You are Catholic, I won't have anything to do with you, communist or this or that. But to look, to observe, to understand is far more important than saying good and bad. Not that there is not violence and peace.

Q: There was a question under consideration of how the cessation of sorrow could be arrived at. We have detracted from that.

K: I am afraid so, sir. Yes, sir. How to end sorrow.

Q: Is it by accepting sorrow totally?

K: Is it by accepting sorrow totally and openly that it comes to an end. Who is it that is accepting it? You see, you are again functioning in formulas. Look, sir: you are in sorrow, aren't you. As a human being, most people are. And you see what danger it is, what a calamity it is. How will you end it? Surely by not escaping. Right. Not suppressing it, not identifying totally yourself with it. So how will you end it?

Q: By staying with that sorrow and not identifying it with

thought.

K: By staying with that sorrow and not identifying thought with it. When you say, stay with it, do you mean, don't run away from it, don't judge it, don't be identified, just watch it. Is that what you mean?

Q: Yes.

K: Can you do it?

Q: Yeah.

K: Wait, sir, don't say, yeah. Don't be, if I may most respectfully suggest, don't be so quick, it is quite a complex problem, because if it as simple as that we are all free of it. How do you look at sorrow? Do you look at it with the intention of getting rid of it? With suppressing it, with overcoming it? Please listen to all this. Justifying it, escaping from it? Then, who is the entity that is doing all this? The entity that wants to escape from it, the entity that wants to suppress it, the entity that is looking for the cause of sorrow, the entity that is full of self-pity. Who is that entity that is saying all this? Is that the observer?

Q: Sorrow.

K: Sorrow.

Q: Sorrow is the entity.

K: Sorrow is the entity, and that entity says, I must get rid of it. Which means what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. The entity has separated himself from sorrow, hasn't he, when he says, I must get rid of it. No? So as long as there is an observer who is different from the thing observed, this division, there must be sorrow. That is, as long as there is no self-knowledge



there must be sorrow. So the ending of sorrow comes about when there is total self-understanding. Don't make that into a formula. See how in sorrow there is such a great deal of self-pity: I have lost, I wish it were different, the complaint about it, the blaming somebody else. So in sorrow there is a great deal of self-pity. So the understanding of the self, the 'me', is the ending of sorrow.

Q: Don't you think there is one formula that can explain the futility of existence and non-existence?

K: Don't you think there is a formula for all existence.

Q: For non-existence.

K: Or how to control it, how to shape it, how to manage it.

Q: No, just how to see it, the way it is.

K: Is there a formula to see the totality of life, as it is, a formula. The very thing that we have been saying: you cannot see the whole of life through a formula. It's so clear isn't it.

Q: It's not clear to me.

K: Sir, I have a formula, let's say, suppose I have a formula that all life is bliss, that all life is sacred, that all life is one. That's a formula, isn't it.

Q: I know that. But I think, have the feeling that it is possible in the mind to have a formula to say, all life is such and such. I think there is truth in that. It think that can be expressed in terms of a formula.

K: Sir, look, you are saying, by having a formula quietly in the mind, and that formula having a certain vitality and feeling, that formula will solve our problems.

Q: No, no. I am not saying that. I am saying that it is one and the same thing. In the mind exists a formula that recognizing this, it

is possible.

K: Who creates that formula? Who sustains it? Why do you have a formula?

Q: Instinct.

K: Instinct.

Q: Does one want to show the formula to other people?

K: Look, sir, we wanted to say - we started by asking what sorrow is. We asked if it can ever come to an end, not in heaven, or at some future date, end. And we went into it. That is, as long as there is the self as separate and there is no understanding of the whole nature and the structure of that me, the self, the person, the ego, or whatever you like to call that centre, there must be the engulfing waves of sorrow. So can one understand oneself totally? And it is possible to understand oneself completely, not only the conscious self but the deep hidden self. And to understand that self there must be an awareness, a watchfulness without any sense of distortion. Then you will see if you go very deeply into it, not taking time, sorrow comes to an end.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **8TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

K: This is supposed to be a discussion, a dialogue or talking over together any of the things we would like to discuss. So what shall we start with?

Q: Could we discuss the application of these talks as a means of education, in other words, an active thing.

K: Discuss education. Application of these talks in education, could we discuss that. Do you want to discuss that or something else?

Q: Like the idea of a school for pre-adolescents.

Q: Don't you think that it is possible to have a school whereby these people would never be conditioned?

K: We will discuss that, sir, we will discuss what is conditioning, whether it is possible to bring up children without being conditioned. That's what he wants to discuss. Anything else?

Perhaps that could be discussed if we approach the question differently: how to bring about an education, or to educate a child, a student, and ourselves, not to imitate, not to conform. Could we discuss that? Would that be worthwhile? What do you say, would that be worthwhile to discuss: what are the implications of conforming and whether it is possible not to conform at all, but yet live in the society, in this world, not in a monastery, but here? Would that be worthwhile?

A: Yes.

K: If you don't want to discuss that please talk about something else that might be of interest to you. So shall we start with that?

A: Yes.

K: Right. Before we try to find out how to educate children not to conform, or to conform, shouldn't we find out for ourselves if we are conforming, the educator, which we are, the parent, the teachers, the educator, the human being, are we conforming? Are we imitating, following a certain pattern, accepting formulas and fitting life to that formula? All that implies surely, conformity, doesn't it: following, accepting authority, having a formula or a principle, or a belief according to which one lives, or rejecting the outer patterns of conformity imposed on us through culture, through education, through the impact of social influences. We may have our own patterns of conformity, inwardly, and accept those and conform to that - you see, both outwardly and inwardly. Is one aware that one is conforming?

Am I aware that I am conforming? Not that one should not, or should, but first let's begin to find out if one is conforming. What does it mean? I mean all the structure of language is a form of acceptance of a pattern of speech, of thought, conditioned by words and so on. That is, one can see one does conform there. And one does conform to outward social patterns: short hair, long hair, beard, no beard, trousers, short, mini skirts, and long skirts, and you know, all the rest of it. And inwardly is one conforming, following an image that one has built about oneself, image, a conclusion, a belief, a pattern of conduct, and following that pattern. Is one aware of all this? Not that one should or should not imitate, but is one conscious, know, aware, recognize that there is this outward and inward conformity all the time? Because if one is conforming obviously there is no freedom. And without freedom

there is no intelligence.

So in enquiring within oneself, looking at oneself, quite objectively, without any sentimentality, without saying this is right, this is wrong, just to observe and find out at what depth one is conforming. At a very superficial level, or does one conform right through one's being? When one is conforming - it is really quite a complex subject this - when we have been educated to divide life as the 'me' and the 'not me', as the observer, the censor, and the thing observed as something separate. Basically that is one of the patterns of conformity, that's the way we have been brought up. When I say, I am a Hindu, it is conforming to the pattern of the particular culture and society in which this particular mind has been cultured, brought up. Is one doing that?

Please, I don't want to talk about this by myself, I can talk by myself in my room. This is really quite extraordinarily interesting if one could go into this very, very deeply. And then we can discuss how to bring about in a student, in a child - a student, let's keep it to that, a child is too small.

Q: Why?

K: Wait, sir. Don't jump to the 'why' yet. We will come to that a little later. We say first let us see how you and I conform. And as we are the educators, whether we are parents, teachers, if we don't understand what it means to conform how can we help another to be free of conformity, or to say you must conform, that's natural. We must be clear in oneself. Don't let's put the horse before the cart - or the cart before the horse!

Because I really want to find out, I want to learn about it. You see, it is really very subtle, and it has great depth if you really go

into this question. Memory, the cultivation of memory, is what education is at the present, what facts and this and that technology. The path of knowledge, you follow, is to conform. I don't know if you see that. Following the past, accepting a tradition, calling oneself a German, a Russian, an Englishman, is conforming. And the revolt against that becomes another pattern of conformity. Therefore all reaction is a form of conformity. I don't know if you accept all this. I don't like the particular system, the capitalist, or the communist system, I revolt against it, because I want a different kind of system; and that different kind of system is the outcome of these two particular systems, and I prefer that and therefore I am conforming to that. I don't know if you see this.

Therefore in enquiring into this question, not how to bring up children, we will come to that very much later, one has to find out in oneself these patterns of conformity, imitation. Go on, sirs.

Q: Sir, if we do not follow these systems that exist in our society, how can we educate our children to go through examinations.

K: Yes, sir that's what we are saying. You see again, don't let's talk about the children for the moment. Let us talk about ourselves who are responsible for these poor unfortunate children, whether we are conforming. If we are, then whatever our relationship with the children be, we will always subtly or brutally bring about an educational system that will make the child or the grown-up or the adolescent conform. This is so simple. What's the difficulty? If I am blind I can't lead, I can't look, I can't help another. We are more or less blind if we don't know at what depths we are conforming.

Q: But isn't knowledge of these depths a continuous process,

doesn't it become more precise?

K: It does, sir, it does become very precise. If we could please give a little attention to this. Are you conforming? Obviously when I put on trousers I am conforming. When I go to India I put on different clothes, I am conforming. When I have my hair cut short, I am conforming. When I have my hair long, or an enormous beard, I am conforming.

Q: But is it not much more this matter of the condition of looking at the world as being oneself and the outer world as two separate things?

K: No, I said that. The division as the 'me' and not 'the me' the outer and the inner, this division, is another form of conformity. Sir, let's get at the principle of it, you follow what I mean, not at the peripheral conformities, but at the root. Why does the human mind conform? And does that human mind know it is conforming. Why, and conformity. You follow? In asking that question we will find out. But not enquiring about the peripheral conformity, the borders of conformity. That's a sheer waste of time. Once the central issue is understood then we can deal with the outer, with the peripheral conformities.

Q: Sir, I am very unsure if I don't follow a certain pattern.

K: He says, if I don't follow a certain pattern, established by a particular society and culture, communist, or Finnish, or German, this or that, Catholic, I shall be thrown out. Right? Imagine what would happen in Russia, under the Soviet tyranny, though they may call it democracy of the people, all that bilge, I shall be wiped out, I shall be sent to the mental hospital and given drugs to become normal. This is all - so before we say, what shall I do in a

particular culture where conformity is the pattern, before we even put that question we should find out for ourselves whether we are conforming and what it means. Why? You see you are always discussing what to do under a given structure of a society. That's not the question. The question is, is one aware, does one know that one is conforming? Is that conformity peripheral, that is very superficial, or is it very profound? Until you answer this question you won't be able to deal with the problem, whether to fit into a particular society that demands conformity.

Q: I act in a certain way, how do I know if I am conforming, or not?

K: We will have to find that out, sir, let's go into it. Let's take time and patience in finding out. And don't let us ask peripheral questions please. Is that clear? Peripheral questions, what to do.

Q: It seems possibly that like any other species we have a natural and instinctive desire to conform.

K: Yes. Why? We know this. This whole process of education, all our upbringing is to conform, why? Do look at it. The animal conforms.

Q: To preserve the species.

Q: To keep together.

Q: To preserve the group.

K: To preserve the group, to have security, to be safe. That's why we conform. Does that conformity lead to security? We say it does; does it? I mean, to call oneself an American, or an Indian, or a Japanese, or Indonesian, I am sorry to have to introduce all these words, but it doesn't matter, does seem to give a sense of security. Doesn't it? To identify oneself with a particular community appears



to give security. But does it? When you call yourself a German, and I call myself a Jew, or an Englishman, this very division is one of the major causes of war, which means no security. Where there is division which comes about through identification with a particular community, hoping that community will give security, it is the very beginning of destruction of security. This is so clear.

Q: Then you feel that the idea of any community is one that would detract from...

K: No, sir, no sir. No. We are saying - look, sir, please - we are saying the desire to conform, the urge, the instinct to conform, comes about through the hope of security, wanting to be secure, safe, certain, physically. Is that a fact? Historically - not that I am a historian - historically it has shown when you call yourself a Catholic and I myself a Protestant, we have murdered each other in the name of god and all the rest of it. So the mind seeking security through conformity, denies that very security. That's clear, isn't it. So please, when that's clear we have finished with identification with a community through which we hope to be secure. That thinking, looking at it that way is finished. You follow? Once you see the poisonous nature of this division between you and the community, and you identifying with the community in the hope of security, when you see that very clearly, the truth of it, you no longer want security through community. You follow? Through nationality, through identification with a particular group.

Q: Is there not another point, the point of feeling to belong to?

K: Yes, sir. I belong to a particular group, it gives me satisfaction, it makes me feel warm inside, it makes me feel safe. Which is the same thing.

Q: It much more than to be safe, it's the feeling, a nice feeling.

K: Yes, sir, which is what? A nice feeling - I belong to this community of Brockwood. It gives me a nice feeling. What does that mean? I belong. Which is, I want to belong to something. Right? Why? Sir, let us tear all this apart and look at it. Why do I want to feel comfortable with a blasted little community? Sorry!

Q: I feel insufficient in myself.

K: What does that mean? In myself I am insufficient, I am lonely, I am a poor, unhappy, haggard, miserable entity, and I say, my god, if I could identify myself with a large community I would lose myself in that. This is so simple.

Q: We want communion.

K: With whom?

Q: With other people.

K: How do you have communion with other people when you are seeking security through other people?

Q: It is not a matter of security.

K: Sir, look, sir. I feel comfortable, happy, with a small group of people, a particular community, why? Do answer. You have to answer this question. Why do I feel comfortable with a particular group of people?

Q: Because I am frightened of the others.

K: I am not only frightened of the others, right?

Q: No.

K: No, then what? I don't like the others. I don't like their looks, their smell, their clothes, their beards, their hair. I like this group. And that group gives me a great sense of warmth.

Q: We want extension.

K: Wait, expansion of what?

Q: Extension.

K: Expanding what? What am I expanding? My loneliness, my fear, my misery, my sense of lack of certainty? When I am clear, certain, you know, vital, I don't want to identify myself with anything. I don't know why we waste time on this thing. We ought to go much deeper than this, sirs, come on. Which is, any form of identification with a group, however comfortable it is, however satisfying it is, this identification implies not only psychological well-being, the psychological well-being in division, and therefore destruction, but also it brings about a conformity of the group as against another group. Right? So our question is: why do we conform, and do I know I am conforming? Please, do stick to those two things. Do you know you are conforming? When you call yourself an Englishman, or a Frenchman, aren't you conforming? When you call yourself a Catholic, Protestant, communist, the Panthers, and all the rest, aren't you conforming? And when you are aware that you are conforming, peripherally or superficially, the next question is, why. If you say, it is to be safe, secure, then you see the dangers of that security. There is no security when you identify yourself with a group, however satisfying it is. So isn't that clear? We can push it aside, finish with it. Any form of identification with a group, however satisfactory, however comforting, does not bring security. So I will never look for security in a group. Can't we finish with that?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait. Yes, but do it!

Q: It doesn't always seem that we are identifying when we are

doing it, but we are working together and then it slips over somehow.

K: Yes. The question is, we may think we are working together, not necessarily identifying together. Is co-operation imitation, conformity? Please go into it a little bit. Am I co-operating with you about something? Right? About a principle, about Utopia, about a series of ideations, or co-operating with you because you bring enlightenment, or bring an Utopian world, or have I the spirit of co-operation in which there is no conformity? I don't know if you see. If I am co-operating about something because I hope through that co-operation I will gain a personal profit, then it's not co-operation. But if I have the spirit of co-operation, the feeling...

Q: I go beyond the me.

K: Madam, that's just it. Do I have the spirit of co-operation, the feeling? So let's come back. I must come back to this thing, which is, do I know, does one know that one is conforming, why one is conforming, and what is the necessity to conform?

Q: It presents an image of sameness.

K: Yes, sir. No, look at it, sir. Are you conforming? I am sorry to push it. Are you conforming? When you take drugs - not you, I am talking generally, it's not my concern whether you take it or not, sir - isn't that conformity? When you take drinks, smoke, isn't that conformity?

Q: It seems that you can't talk about an action, saying it is a conforming action, you have to talk about the mind.

K: Sir, we did just now. Why does the mind conform?

Q: But you can say the mind conforms, but can you say that if such and such an action is conforming, that it is done by a

conforming mind?

K: Do you know - please listen, sir - do you know that you are conforming through the action of conformity? You understand my question? I am doing something, and the doing of it reveals that I am conforming. Or, without action I know one is conforming. You see the difference? Do you see the difference, sirs? Do I know that I am hungry because you tell me? Or I know for myself I am hungry? Do I know I am conforming because I see the action of conformity going on? You follow? I wonder if I am making myself clear? Do please go with me.

Do I know - please, sir, just listen to my question - do I know through action that I am conforming, or do I know I am conforming not through action? The two different kinds of knowledge, the discovery that I am conforming through action leads to the correction of action. Right? You are following this, sir? I discover I am conforming through a particular act, and then I say to myself, to change, to bring about a change in conformity I must act differently. So I lay emphasis on action, not on the movement that brings about action. This is clear. Please, sirs, come on. Have you travelled too far this morning, or tired out?

So I want to be clear before I talk about action, of the nature of conformity. So I have to find out whether I am conforming. Wait. The mind that wants to conform, the principle of conformity. You understand?

Q: Sir, I don't understand how you can observe the nature of conformity without the action to reveal it.

K: That's just it. I cannot find out the nature of conformity without being aware of the action that is the result of conformity.

Right?

Q: Conformity is connected with an objective.

K: Sir, how do you know that you are conforming? Please, how do you know that you are conforming?

Q: Through observation.

K: Through observation. Do be clear. Wait a minute. Through observation, you say. The observer watching action says, I am conforming. Right? And is not the very observer the result of centuries of conformity?

Q: Yes.

K: Therefore he is watching not action, but watching himself conforming.

Q: Yes.

K: No, no. He is the source of all conformity, not what he is doing. What he is doing is the result of the flow of conformity, as the observer, as the censor, as the Englishman, as the traditionalist, and so on and so on. So when I am asking, when we are asking the question, who is conforming, what is conformity, and why does one conform, I think the answer lies to all that in the observer. The observer is the censor. Right? Now the censor becomes aware of himself condemning or justifying. And that condemnation, or justification, is the result of his conformity to the pattern of a particular culture in which he has been brought up. There is the whole thing. I don't know if you get it.

Q: Surely this has only come about through being out of the problem, but somehow that stopping, in that stopping there is the seeing of it.

K: Sir, I don't know what you quite mean, stopping. I think I get

what you mean. But does that happen? Look, sir.

Q: Well it's the only time when one gets a glimpse of it.

K: Yes. You are asking me to be aware of the observer. Right? The observer is the very essence of conformity. Please, we have said a truth, once seen you will see the whole thing. The observer is the essence of imitation, conformity. Now can the observer become aware of himself as the principle of conformity? Now wait, go slow, go slow. How is this to happen? You are asking me to be aware - listen to this, sir - aware of the observer. Which is, can the observer become aware of himself as the source of conformity? You have challenged me. Right? Now what is the response of the observer to the challenge? I don't know if you follow what I am saying.

Q: Well...

K: No, please don't answer it yet, look at it, take a little time. You have challenged me, right sir? Which is, you said, look, can the observer who is the essence of conformity, can that observer become aware of itself? That's your challenge. And what is the response of the observer - listen carefully - what is the response of the observer?

Q: It goes back into memory to try and find out.

K: Which means what? His response will invariably be conforming. No, no, you are missing it, see the implications of it. You have challenged me, and the observer responds according to his conditioning which is conformity, therefore his answer is a conforming answer. Right?

Q: But...

K: Wait, sir, wait, sir, look, first look. Any response from the

observer is the response of conformity - full stop!

Q: But has the observer actually an instrument that isn't contaminated?

K: We are going to find out, we are going to find out. We are so near it, let's push. You'll find out.

Q: Isn't what you are saying that the process of conformity can only be discovered in action.

K: Ah, no. No. I am saying this, sir - look sir, we have come to the point when we say the observer is the very essence of conformity. How does the observer know he is the very essence of conformity? How is he aware of himself as the instrument of conformity, as the result of conformity? Wait, no, no. Whatever his answer is conforming.

Q: Yes.

K: Therefore what have I found? What have I found?

Q: There is also something beyond conformity.

K: No, what have I found - listen sir - what has the observer found when he responds to a challenge, as you put the challenge, and finds whatever his response, whatever, at whatever depth, at whatever peripheral response, is the response born of conformity. Right? He has discovered that. What does that mean?

Q: He is the total. He is not different, he is the total.

Q: He has discovered himself.

K: No, no, please let us stick - don't let us use the word 'total'.

Q: I think that the observer can only be a non-conformist when he has no answer.

K: You see, no sir. The observer is the very essence of conformity. Right? Do you see that, not because I say so.



Q: But I see that if he has an answer he must be a conformist.

K: No. Yes, sir. So what has happened to the observer?

Q: Separated.

K: No, madam.

Q: It seems...

K: Do pay a little attention, don't find an answer. I have found something. I have found through that challenge that whatever the response the observer gives is the response from the source of all conformity. And he realizes this. What happens then?

Q: He keeps quiet.

K: No. Sir, you are just playing with words. Do find out what happens to you when you have discovered for yourself the truth - the truth, not an idea - the truth that any form of response on the part of the observer, and all our responses are on the part of the observer, then what do you find?

Q: Sir, is not our realization of that itself the result of the observer in the sense that the observer separates himself.

K: That's what you are saying. Therefore you are still separating the observer from the observed. Which means another reaction of the observer which is born of another conformity. So whatever his reactions are he is always conforming. I have discovered that. Wait. Have you discovered it? He may separate himself into a hundred parts, and say, I remain. And this division indicates that any reaction on the part of the observer comes out of this enormous weight of conformity. I have discovered the truth of that. The observer has discovered it. He hasn't separated himself as a further observer, he has seen this. Now what has happened? What takes place when the observer sees this?

Q: How can the observer discover this?

Q: Does it break the conformity?

K: You are going to find out. Doesn't it break conformity. And your question is?

Q: How can the observer see that?

K: Wait sir, I'll answer that question, you'll see it in a minute.

Q: Sir, little things keep coming in all the time, it doesn't stop.

K: Madam, that gentleman is asking a question. He says, how can the observer become aware of himself without the reaction of the observer. Right? Have you understood my question, sir? Does the observer become aware of himself through the part or the division of himself? You understand my question, sir? You haven't understood? How does the observer become aware of himself? Through the part, the fragment, which he has brought about. Look, sir, the observer has brought about his conditioning through nationality. Right? Does the observer become aware of himself as the source of conformity through this division? So he does not become aware through any division. Let's be clear. Then how does he become aware? If you reject, see the falseness that the observer becomes aware of himself through a fragment of which he is, then how will he be aware of himself? Go on sirs.

Q: If there is no fragment by which he can become aware of himself, then he is not.

K: No, you see. If the observer does not become aware through any fragment of which he is part, then how will he know that he is the source of all conformity?

Q: The question is, then the fragment is aware of the total. One fragment.

K: Right, put it that way sir. Put your question that way, let's put it: can one fragment be aware of the total. Obviously not.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, speak in French.

Q: (In French)

K: No, madam, listen. I understand that. But we are not for the moment discussing that, madam.

Let's begin, sir, in a totally different way, shall we. Are you aware of the division in yourself? Right? Division when you call yourself a communist, a socialist, a Catholic. That very naming brings about a division, doesn't it? Are you aware of that? Not in any complex way, just be aware of it. Are you aware when you look at a plant or a tree, or the sky, or a cloud, that you are looking with a division, with eyes that are always looking at everything through division?

Q: It does not touch an awareness immediately, but one is out of that division.

K: No, sir. I want to begin right at the other end, so begin anew. Now do you look at anything with eyes that are not touched by division? Do you look at your wife or husband without the image and therefore look without division?

Q: The only way to do that is by the senses. When I look at you, you are what you are, I hear you but there is no division, there is only you and what looks at you.

K: So here it is fairly simple, isn't it. Because I don't interfere with your life, I don't tell you what to do, I don't nag you, I don't bully you, I don't patronize you, flatter you, insult you, so it is fairly easy for you to look at me. Me sitting on the platform, you

sitting there you can observe what is being said. But if I what I say touches you, hurts you, flatters you, then you look at me with different eyes, don't you.

Q: Only by my intellect.

K: Only intellect is good enough. You look at it with division. Right? Now, can you look at me who insults you without this division, without the image that you have created through my words of insult?

Q: Only if I can see you, the insult and the image at once.

K: Which means, no sir, you haven't asked. Look, sir, I have insulted you, or flattered you, and you have built an image about me. Next time we meet you look at me through that image. That's simple. Now can you look at me though I have insulted you, flattered you, without the image?

Q: Only again by the senses.

K: No, no, sir.

Q: It is complicated.

K: No, madam, you make it all so complicated. Keep it very simple. I have insulted you, or flattered you. You have an image of me. And the next time we meet, through that image you are looking at me. That's a simple fact.

Q: I don't know.

K: Wait madam, wait. That's a simple fact. If I am married - I am not, thank god - and if I am married and my wife bullies me and tells me this, dominates me, I have built an image about her, haven't I. And therefore our relationship is based on images. Right? It's simple. Now I want to look at you though you insult me, flatter me, nag me, without building an image. Right? Now is that

possible? No?

Q: No.

K: Wait. Then it's finished. If you say it is not possible then there is no further enquiry.

Q: For me, that which comes in the way is my own reaction to what I see, not so much what people say but what happens in me when this is said, and to see that.

K: Obviously, sir. Obviously.

Q: How can you...

K: I am going to show you in a minute, listen sir. You have insulted me, or said, what a marvellous chap you are. And I have built an image on those two. Right? And I am asking myself, can I look at you without any image though you have insulted me? And when I look at you without the image our relationship is entirely different, isn't it. Then it's much more vital, much more close, much more real. So the image is the factor that divides. Right? Now is it possible to be free of the mechanism of building images?

Q: You can look at the whole.

K: No, no, don't answer me please, I am going to tell you in a minute. But I want to find out. I am terribly interested to find out, learn, if I could live a life, a way of life in which there is no formation of images at all. Don't say, no, then you are blocked. If you say, that is impossible, it can't be done, then you have shut the door on it. But I refuse to shut the door on it, I want to find out. I am going to find out. That is, I want to - no - can the mind as it is being insulted and flattered, can that mind at that moment be intensely aware and not create an image? If it is attentive at that moment there is no image forming. Right? You have got it? Which

means, at the moment I insult you, or flatter you, watch it. Watch your responses, be aware of your responses. Then you have stopped image building. That's all. It's as simple as that.

Now the question is: I want - the mind wants to find out whether it can look at anything, the tree, the woman, the child, the politician, the priest, the whole world of human beings, without any image, without any formula. Not, 'Oh, have love', that means nothing. You follow? That's another escape, another series of words that have no meaning. But I want to look at the world without any image, is that possible? If I can't then I will be in battle with the world. Right? Me and my group, and you with your group, we and they. So I begin to enquire, test this out, by looking at a tree. Right? Non-subjective thing. Let's look at a tree. Can I look at a tree without the word, without the image which I have about trees? Have you ever tried it?

Q: It is not at the beginning a unitary process, but afterwards it is.

K: No, sir. This unitary process may come much later, but first I must test it out, find out. I can't imagine it is a unitary process, I want to find out, I want to learn, I want to test it. I don't want to deceive myself.

Q: If I look at you now I do not have any image, I do not have your name, I do not know you, though I just hear your voice. If I wish I can think about you.

K: Right, sir. But can you do the same with your intimate friends?

Q: Why not?

K: Not, 'why not'. Do you do it?

Q: I would answer, yes.

K: Then what happens?

Q: You are free.

K: No, sir.

Q: Because if...

K: You can, sir, if the fight doesn't injure you financially, no sir.

When your wife - not your wife - my wife runs away, looks at somebody else, when the wife doesn't get what she wants - oh, no, don't go into all this.

Look, sir, we will come back to this question of conformity but we are trying to find out whether the mind can look without division. And it's one of the most extraordinary things to find out, to learn, because then conflict comes to an end. And conflict can only come to an end when there is no machinery the forms that image, and the machinery is the observer. Right? The observer who calls himself black, white, purple, Catholic, communist, all that, or doesn't call himself anything but he is. He becomes all-important.

So this mind has discovered, has learnt that every form of division inwardly as well as outwardly must spring from the observer who must divide life. Right? Life with all its conflicts and jealousies and anxieties and all the rest of it. So in asking myself the question, at what level am I conforming, and why am I conforming, this mind has found it conforms where there is the demand for security, it conforms where one seeks certainty, either in a family, in a group, or in an idea, or in the ideation of a god, or non-god, all springing from this source as the 'me' and the 'not me'. So can this mind live in this world without any of this division? Don't say, it must be peaceful, it must be silent, it must be in a state

of tremendous joy, ecstasy, love, that's all nonsense. If you haven't found that you can't talk about it at all. Because that way lies deception.

So from that one discovers the observer becomes aware of himself not through the fragment of any action but the observer within himself lights the fire that dissolves the observer. Right?

Q: Is this a gradual process, like you can spend a life time it seems?

K: No, no. Don't spend time, a life time over it; you can see it instantly and it is finished. It is like seeing instantly the precipice, you don't take a life time to look at the precipice.

Q: Isn't there a lot of chaos.

K: There is a lot of chaos, not only outside but inside, a lot of confusion, disorder, vomit of other people.

Q: It seems that you should be - not, should be - but be doing something, going to be propagating...

K: Sir, what are we doing now? What are we doing now? You are listening. I am doing all the work - the speaker is doing all the work and you are listening. If you go away with having learnt the lesson, then you will propagate, do propaganda. When you do propaganda it becomes a lie because it is not yours. If it is yours, you are building, you are creating, you are living, you are vital.

Q: But doing this you want to be in contact.

K: You are in contact, sir. You see you are in the greatest contact with the world, not through words, not through magazines, books and lectures and philosophies and beliefs, you are directly in contact with this terrible world.

K: I think that's enough, isn't it, for this morning.



## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 10TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

K: What shall we talk over together? I am sorry it is such a rough morning.

Q: Sir, could you talk about the relationship between pleasure and pain? We regard them, I think, as opposites, you say they are the same.

K: I didn't say there were the same. Do you want to discuss the relationship between pleasure and fear?

Q: Excuse me, may I suggest something else? I have been told that you are going to speak next in Perugia to a group of writers and speakers who are very much concerned about the killing of this earth. I wonder if we can broach that subject.

K: I am going to speak in Perugia in Italy to a lot of professors and scientists and philosophers and all the long haired ones. And?

Q: I wondered if these people and others are concerned about the gradual killing of the earth.

K: Oh, I see the gradual pollution and the destruction of the earth and so on. Do you want to discuss that? Or shall we discuss, talk over together what is sanity? Shall we? I am not saying what you ask is insane, or anything of that kind, but it might be rather worthwhile to talk over together what is sanity. Shall we?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! I wonder what is sanity. To be sane, healthy, to think clearly. What do you mean by that word, what does that word mean to you? Please go on sirs, I can go into this, I don't know if you... Would not any exaggeration of fragmentation of the mind be

insanity? The exaggeration giving importance to, or putting all your thought and energy in one fragment, one fragment among many others fragments which make up the human mind, wouldn't you call that insanity, not balanced? And if you think that, are we sane in relation to that particular thing which we just now talked about, which is giving emphasis, putting all our energy in one direction, like sex, like earning money, like enjoyment, pleasure, or the pursuit of a fragment which is called god. Would you call any of that imbalance? What do you say, sirs?

Q: I think if it is putting so much tension in one fragment to the exclusion of other fragments...

K: Therefore?

Q: You become - the other parts will be unbalanced.

K: So you will consider if you give emphasis to one and not consider the rest it is obviously not a harmonious living, and therefore not sane. Now do we do this in our daily life? When one worships sex as the supreme thing in life, or taking drugs and thinking that is going to bring enlightenment, final illumination, or concentrate on earning a livelihood and the money, the prestige, the position - all those indicate a mind that is not harmonious, doesn't it. Or a mind that is concerned entirely with knowledge, or technique. What do you say? Are we in that sense balanced human beings? Obviously not. Should we be behind the bars, and an unbalanced humanity, as it is, must produce all kinds of catastrophes - wars, pollution, destruction of the earth, bringing about constant misery. If that is so, what then shall one do? I realize I am giving all my energies, thought and therefore action to - what, what would you suggest?

Q: To thought.

K: To thought. Right. That I worship thought as the supreme instrument of all culture, of all enlightenment, of all intelligence, of all action. Am I, or is one aware that one gives thought an extraordinarily important position, state, in life? And if one does realize that, what shall one do? Sir, please, this is supposed to be a discussion, not a talk by me, by the speaker. So what shall I do when I realize that my whole life is based on thought? Do I realize thought is only a fragment, a part of a whole? A segment among many other parts, do I realize that? Or do I think thought is the whole thing? What do you say, sir, please?

Q: I think one should differentiate between thought, a principle, and thought being my thought, an individual's thought.

K: He says thought as a principle and individual thought. Is there a difference between thought as a principle and individual thought? I am asking, I am not saying there is not, I am just asking if there is a difference between individual thinking and collective thinking, thinking which man has gathered through millennia, through centuries upon centuries as knowledge - scientific, technological, knowledge of nature and so on and on. Is there a difference between a particular thinking, or the peculiarity of a thinking of an individual and the collective accumulation of thought of mankind? What do you say, sirs?

Q: I don't think so. The individual is influenced by the collective.

K: Sir, you say thought is conditioned by the culture, the society, the environment in which he lives, therefore there is no division between the individual thinking and the collective

thinking.

Q: The collective thinking seems to be made up of personal experiences.

K: That's what we are saying, sir.

Q: And it seems to be in touch with your individual thought, your own thought, seems to be necessary if you are going to have any self-awareness.

K: Therefore you are separating individual thought from the collective thought. You think that there is individual thinking.

Q: I am not certain.

K: I am just asking. You say that there is an individual thinking apart from the collective. Is that so?

Q: I think that's why Jung...

K: Wait, sir, we'll come to that. Don't take a particular example. Is your thinking as an individual different from the collective thinking, or my thinking? Your thinking, is it different from my thinking as an individual, or the collective thinking? Or is all thinking more or less the same?

Q: The thought process, the source of all thought is the same, but the particular thought is different.

K: The source of thought is all the same, the questioner says, though there may be modifications or slight changes in the thought in an individual. Yes, sir?

Q: If the individual reacts to society, the individual's thoughts must be exactly the society's thoughts.

K: Obviously, sir. I don't quite see the difference, the basic difference between the collective thought and the individual thought, because the individual is part of the collective.

Q: He is at the same time greater, it seems to me. May be we misunderstand each other's words, but it seems to me that the reason for all these wars, and everything, is all the bad feelings that people have about themselves. It seems to be that they are thinking for themselves, and they find that what they think is relatively different from the collectivity thinks.

K: Look, sir, is your thinking different from mine coming from India, or from Russia, is your thinking different?

Q: The things that we think about.

K: Not the things, not what you think about, your thinking process.

Q: Oh, no, that's the same.

K: So the thinking process of human beings is more or less the same. Conditioned according to their background as Catholic, Protestant, Hindu and so on and so on. Right? And there may be modifications of that thought. I might as a German think differently from you who are American because I have been conditioned by the German culture in which I live. But the process of thinking is the same, isn't it, thought I call myself a German, and you an American, the process, the mechanism - the mechanism is memory, knowledge, experience. Otherwise if you had no knowledge, no experience, no knowledge, you couldn't speak. Right. So thought is the response of memory. That memory may be conditioned, it may be a little more free, a little less dogmatic, a little less assertive, a little less aggressive, but it is still the response of memory. And is your memory so very different from mine, as the German, as a human being? Please, sir, this is quite important, go slowly in this.

Q: It depends whether it is from the conscious or the unconscious. The problem arises when different people have a different awareness.

K: We will go into that madam, I am not at all sure - I am not saying that what you say is not true - but I am not at all sure that our thinking is not more or less the same. You, conditioned by the culture in which you live, and another conditioned by his particular culture, whether that culture is superficial or deep, whether it is conscious or unconscious, it is still part of the mechanism, or the process of thinking. Isn't it? We are learning. Please, wait a minute, sir. We are learning, aren't we? I am not being assertive, dogmatic. We are trying to learn about this whole process of thinking. Right? Whether it belongs to you as an individual whose thinking is completely different from another - you follow - we are going to learn about it. Therefore don't be assertive, dogmatic, let's enquire into it. Right, sir? There is somebody else, sir, before you.

Q: We have been discussing the question of the environment conditioning the thoughts of people, and groups of people, but some people follow different lines and gain inspiration from those lines, there are great musicians. Music, for example, of the great composers is not a conditioning of the environment because it is new, though it comes from somewhere.

K: Sir, look, don't take examples of the musicians or the artists or scientists, or a religious person; but we are asking ourselves whether the process of thinking is so very different from yours and mine - thinking. The machinery of thinking, sir, not what you think about, not how you express that thinking in music, in painting, in this or that.

Q: May we say that perhaps if the process is the same, there is difference in emphasis in different capacities?

K: But thinking is the same mechanism.

Q: Yes, indeed.

K: That's all that we want to establish first.

Q: Maybe the thinking, thought/energy, the original thought/energy appears to be different in different individuals if they have different conditionings, cultural conditioning. But some people may be different from his culture, his society, and even different from his own family. They all have their own conditioning.

K: Sir, please, do let's stick. Look, sir, we are talking about the machinery of thinking, not how you or I express that thought.

Q: No, what I am saying is that thought/energy, which is all the same.

K: Stay there. Stay there a minute. The energy of all thinking is the same. That's what you say. Which may express itself according to the capacity, to the gift, to a particular tendency and so on, that might vary, but the machinery of thinking is the same. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Quite right, sir. That's right. You are saying, like the computer. We have got computer-like minds. And some are well informed, more alive, but it is a computer mind that is functioning all the time.

Q: Yes, our brains are all made of the same kind of cells.

K: Stick to that a little bit. Therefore what does that mean? Is there then, the next question, freedom in thinking? Freedom.

Q: No, sir. It is playing the same record all the time.

K: It is playing the same old record all the time with varying

themes, depending on the circumstances. Therefore can thought, however capable, however efficient, however knowledgeable, can that bring freedom to man? Freedom in the sense, from fear, from anxiety, from guilt, from sorrow. You understand my question? Is sorrow different from my sorrow? Is your sense of guilt different from another? Is your sense of despair different from another, or your loneliness, your misery, your confusion? Please.

Q: Are you saying, sir, that ideally it is the same?

K: No, I am not saying that. Look, sir, the first part of the question was, can thought, which is the repetition of the computer knowledge, can that thought free the mind from all the reactions of fear and so on.

Q: It never has in the past.

K: It never has - until now?

Q: It never will.

K: It never will. How do you know?

Q: It is obvious, sir.

K: Why do you say that, sir? No, please sir, I am not saying you are right or wrong, I want to learn. Why do you say thought can never free jealousy, or anxiety?

Q: I disagree. I have found that if you understand a person's motive for doing something you can be much more tolerant, understanding, less jealous by using your understanding.

K: When you use the word 'understanding', what does that word mean?

Q: Well it has to start with thought. I have to pay attention to the fact that I am jealous. I have to think about the situation first. Then in that process you find you change your living, your



thinking, your attitude, as I become clear.

K: Through thought - I'll have to repeat it.

Q: I must use my mind.

K: Wait a minute, madam, I'll have to repeat your question, statement, otherwise they can't hear it. If I mis-state it, please correct it. The questioner says, I must use my mind. I see, I am aware, or another is aware - I am aware of another's jealousy or my own jealousy. By understanding it, which is exploring, enquiring, I become tolerant, and therefore understand more of jealousy not only in myself or understand the jealousy of another.

Q: The cause of it.

K: The cause, the reactions, all the implications of jealousy. That is, you are saying, through thought, the exercise of thought, there is an understanding of jealousy and therefore freedom from it. Right? Is that so? I am not saying it is not.

Q: It seems that one comes to a less intense form of jealousy.

K: Sir, let's enquire into this particular thing. We say, by exercising thought we learn more about jealousy and are therefore free from it. To put it quickly.

Q: No, I would say that thought is just exercising thought.

K: No, sir. Don't you see? What caused jealousy?

Q: Thought.

K: Thought.

Q: No, I disagree again. Very profoundly I disagree. Jealousy is an emotion, it is a sense of loss.

K: Which is part of thought.

Q: You are making it a childish, an infantile thing. It is not. If you understand what you have got, and if it even matters that you

have got it, you mature to the point that you understand it doesn't matter.

K: I understand that, madam, just go slowly. Don't say, I profoundly disagree with you, we are trying to learn about things. Thought, if you had feeling without thought would there be jealousy? Just feeling. Would you call it jealousy?

Q: I think I would feel jealous.

Q: People are usually jealous when they are unconscious. Not when they are conscious.

K: No. You are now moving away - conscious, now we will have to go into that. Conscious and unconscious jealousy. I become conscious of a feeling which I call jealousy, a feeling. The feeling of jealousy, the word of jealousy is remembered from the past jealousies. Which is, the response of memory to a particular feeling which has been recognized as jealousy. Right? Whether that response is the outcome of conscious memory or unconscious memory we will leave that for the moment. So the feeling is recognized as jealousy through a word which thought has given meaning to.

Q: The recognition is thought, the feeling comes first.

K: I am saying that. I have a feeling, then I recognize it as jealousy. How do I recognize it as jealousy? Because I have had it before. I associate the present feeling with a past feeling which I have called jealousy. So it is still within the field of thought.

Q: Thought must come from the experience.

K: Wait, I am saying that. Wait, madam. Listen, otherwise I couldn't recognize it as jealousy. I am angry, and I say, 'By Jove, I am angry, why?' Because I have had that feeling before, and

recognition implies a previous knowledge, which is thought, otherwise I wouldn't know that was anger.

Q: A baby can become angry, so can an animal.

K: But isn't there an operation of thought there also going on, in a dog?

Q: It doesn't know it.

K: Therefore let us babies and dogs alone. Let's talk about ourselves.

Q: We are babies. We are, I think you are very infantile.

K: I quite agree, I quite agree. But I want to find out if being infantile, whether that childishness is the result of thought.

Q: I think it is the result of lack of thought.

K: You say it is the result of the lack of thought. Wait. Madam, go slowly. Lack of thought. Therefore what is maturity?

Q: Ability to face truth in your conscious mind.

K: Wait. Ability to face truth consciously, which means able to face facts, able to face 'what is'. And not go round it, not escape from it, not cover it up, not condemn it, not judge it, not give various evaluations about it. To face 'what is'. Right? What prevents it?

Q: Fear.

K: What is fear? Go slowly. Without recognition, a new feeling, has it any significance? I am full of antagonism today, I feel this. Before, without giving a name to it, which is the response of memory, which is the response of recognition, this feeling has no meaning at all. I just feel something. It is only when I recognize it by using a word as aggression that it has significance; and the recognition is a process of thinking. Right? So without thinking

feeling has very little meaning. Go slowly.

Q: Can I say something? You started by talking about sanity. I work in a mental hospital. The psychotics do not seem to have the same thing, it is very hard to communicate with them.

K: Why?

Q: They do not have your sense of recognition, some are terrible.

K: Yes, madam, I understand all this, I know what it means - I am not psychotic, but I can see, but please stick to one thing at a time. And we will explore all this together.

I am saying to myself, asking myself, has feeling any significance apart from thought?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? Before you say, yes, let's find out. I feel a great sense of tenderness, a sense of love. Right? Can thought be related to it? Go slow, go slow. Then it becomes pleasure, doesn't it, then it must be translated in terms of recognition. Oh, my lord! Is love a product of thought?

Q: I don't think one can answer that.

K: Wait, we are going to answer it.

Q: People only seem to be able to achieve love, go beyond it, by using their minds to understand themselves.

K: Now, is that so? By understanding themselves they go beyond the travail of love? That is, love is not pleasure. Love is not desire.

Q: All of it, and pain.

K: Oh, so love is pleasure, desire, pain, sorrow, jealousy, hatred. Where do you draw the line?

Q: I think love goes beyond emotion. We get confused with our emotions and call them love and anti-love. But we have to use our minds.

K: We are using our minds now, as we are discussing. What is the thing we are trying to discuss? We are trying to find out...

Q: We are saying, can thought dissolve the problem of fear and pain.

K: Yes, can thought solve the problem of fear? And is not fear the creation of thought? No?

Q: A child on a dark night, it isn't thought, it's the feelings he has got.

Q: Unless thought sustains feeling, feeling evaporates very quickly, but thought gives it an object, gives it a drive in time, it sustains it.

K: Now sir, let's begin: you know what fear is, don't you. We all do: going in the dark, afraid of somebody and so on, death, everything. Right? We all know this fear. How does it come? How does it come about? I go out in the dark and suddenly I am afraid.

Q: Isn't it a physical reaction?

K: Which is, a physical reaction. Suddenly finding myself in the dark in a strange place, and the feeling of uncertainty, insecurity. The feeling of insecurity.

Q: That's fear by conditioning.

K: Wait, look at it slowly, sir. Please go into it slowly. I am not dogmatic, so please don't, we are trying to learn about it. There is sudden feeling of insecurity. What is that feeling of insecurity? What has brought about that feeling of insecurity?

Q: It is the thought that something might happen to one.

K: Isn't it? Something might happen to one, sudden danger, feeling of insecurity, feeling of being lost, where you might get attacked and all the rest of it. All that is the result of thinking, isn't it. It may be instant thinking. If there was no thought I wouldn't be afraid of the dark, I would walk through it. It's only the swiftness, the rapidity of thinking has brought this feeling of uncertainty. Otherwise I wouldn't be afraid of the dark.

Q: There must be a first time.

K: Wait, I am talking of a first, second, third, tenth time.

Q: I am sorry, I am stuck. The fact that the first time I was afraid I didn't know what it was.

K: Therefore what happens the second time?

Q: I wasn't thinking about being afraid.

K: No. But I said it was thought that was so rapid of which you are unaware. The next time it happens you say, well, I have had this fear, I won't be afraid so much; and the third, tenth time you have got used to it.

Q: But it takes my mind to get over it.

K: Wait. I am not talking how to get over it. The question of getting over it is quite a different matter. We are pointing out that thought has bred fear. Whether that thought is so rapid, of which one is not aware, or thought, not so rapidly thinks what is going to happen tomorrow: I might die, I have done something in the past, all that is a process of thinking whether it is instantaneous or gradual. It must be. Therefore fear is the product of thought. How to get over it is another matter. Like pleasure is the product of thought. No? I had the most extraordinary enjoyable evening yesterday in the wood, walking, looking at the sunlight, it was

marvellous. And that was a delight which I would like to have repeated tomorrow. And this demand for repetition is the machinery of thought, the process of thinking. It's so simple. It's obvious.

Q: Fear is not thinking.

K: The recognition of that experience, we have said that. I looked at that sunset, it was splendid. Finished. But thought comes in and says, 'I wish I could have it, it was so enjoyable, it was a marvellous feeling, I'd like to have it again.' Stick to that simple example and you will see how this operates. Fear, I realize, is the product of thought. And pleasure is the product or the continuity of thought. After all, all sexual pleasure is thinking about it, chewing over it, going into it, and saying, how marvellous, and on and on and on. And fear is saying, my god, what is going to happen tomorrow, I might die. No?

Q: If I do not recognize my feeling as jealousy, does not there remain sorrow?

K: If I do not recognize my feeling - what is the next thing?

Q: Jealousy or fear and so on, does there not remain sorrow?

K: Ah! If I do not recognize the fear or pleasure, or guilt and so on, it has no profound affect?

Q: Sorrow remains.

K: Ah, just sorrow remains. Is that it? Does it? Sir, please. You see, when we use this word 'sorrow', what do you mean by that word? What is the content of that word? There is a tremendous quantity of self-pity in sorrow. No?

Q: Is not the question when you have the feeling like jealousy, if you don't recognize it, is that feeling painful?

K: Is that feeling not painful. Have you ever tried this? You have a feeling, can you remain - can the mind remain with that feeling without naming it? Without recognition? Then what is it? Is it pain? Is it sorrow? Look, the moment you say, it is pain, there is the process of thinking involved in it.

Q: Is not sorrow the basis of all our life?

K: Is not the sorrow the basis of our life. Is it? That's why, sir, when you use the word 'sorrow' we must go into it. Sorrow. What does that mean? Sadness, grief, the feeling of insoluble problems of life, feeling the death of someone, feeling loneliness, feeling deeply frustrated, not being able to do anything in this world and so on and on and on. Right? All that is implied in the word 'sorrow', isn't it? Right, madam? Now who is feeling all this? Feeling the loneliness, the despair, the utter misery, confusion, aggression, violence, who is it that is feeling all these things?

Q: There is sorrow and fear.

K: Who is feeling it? Answer that one question: who feels all this?

Q: I think we are, as it were, in a big psychic self.

K: Which is that? You give it a big psychic self.

Q: Most of us have two frames of being, one is our thinking self and one is unthinking.

K: All right. You think there are two superficial us - different. One is superficial and the other more profound. How does this division arise? You must answer all these questions.

Q: There is a deep self.

K: What is this deep self? And what is the superficial self?

Q: There is the conscious and the unconscious.



K: Which is what? Please, madam, go into it. Conscious and unconscious. Why do you divide it?

Q: Because only a little bit is lit, what is lit by awareness is our conscious self, and what is unlit is our unconscious self.

K: Therefore you say there is no division really.

Q: No, not really.

K: Wait, wait. Let's stick to the reality, not the superficiality of the division. So there is only a state of mind in which there is division, as the thinker and the thought. Right? As the experiencer and the experienced, as the observer and the observed. Right? The observed we say is the superficial, the observer is profound. Right?

Q: Maybe.

K: No, no, don't say, maybe. Examine it, find out, we want to learn.

Q: I think the problem is lack of awareness.

K: No, no, wait. You see awareness - who is it that is aware? Don't throw up your hands. We must learn about it, we must find out. So we realize there is a division in life, in me, in you. The you and me are many fragments. Oneself is made up of many fragments. One of the fragments is the observer and the rest of the fragments are the observed. The observer becomes conscious of the fragments, but the observer is also one of the fragments; he is not different from the rest of the fragments. Right? Therefore you have to find out what is the observer, the experiencer, the thinker. What is he made up of, how does it come about this division between the observer and the observed? The observer, we say, is one of the fragments, why has he separated himself, assumed as the analyzer, the one who is aware, the one who can control, change, suppress

and all the rest of it. The observer is the censor. Right? The censor is the result of the social conditionings. Right? Social, environmental, religious, cultural conditioning. Which is, the division between culture has said, you are different from the thing you are observing. You are god and that is matter, you are the higher self and that is the lower self, you are the enlightened and that is unenlightened. Now what has given him this authority to call himself enlightened? Because he has become the censor? Right? And the censor says, this is right, this is wrong, this is good, this is bad, I must do this, I must not do that, which is, the result of his conditioning. The conditioning of the society, of the culture, of the religion, of the family, of all the race, and so on.

So the observer is the censor, conditioned according to his environment. And he has assumed the authority of the analyzer. Right? And the rest of the fragments are also assuming their authority; each fragment has its own authority, and so there is battle. Right? And so there is conflict between the observer and the observed. So to be free of this conflict one has to find out if you can look without the eyes of the censor. That is to be aware. Aware - to be aware that the eyes of the censor are the result of his conditioning. And can those eyes look with freedom, look innocently, freely? Otherwise this conflict will exist, and therefore neuroticism and all the rest of it follow from this conflict. So you have to solve this question, learn about this, whether the mind can look without any conditioning. Which means without the censor, without the observer. Because the observer is the source of all conformity. And when you are conforming there must be contradiction, and therefore conflict, which are all the result of

thinking.

So the thinker is not separate from thought. So the observer is not separate from the observed. And when this is an actual reality, fact, truth, 'what is', then conflict comes to an end. I won't go into all that.

Q: Sir, the concept you talked about, if you observe it and it was so divine, then at the moment when you are not doing it, you are still observing, then...

K: It comes back.

Q: Yes.

K: Which means what? Do listen to this, sir, this is quite extraordinary if you go into it. You saw that sunset yesterday. It was a great delight. It has left a memory.

Q: You see it.

K: It has left a memory, obviously, otherwise you couldn't see that sunset. It has left a memory, left a mark, and the response through thought, is, 'I wish I could have more of it'.

Q: No, you don't say that, but you can see it.

K: The seeing of it is the same, sir. So thought breeds fear and pleasure, sustains it, gives it a continuity. This is clear, isn't it? And if I can't have my pleasure I get upset, I get neurotic. And I want to avoid - the observer wants to avoid fear. Right? Wants pleasure and avoid fear. And the observer is the result of all thinking. Obviously. Look at the game he is playing with himself: with one hand he holds, with the other hand he rejects. But he is still the same observer. And if I can't have my pleasure I get angry, I suffer, I go into tantrums, and if I cannot resolve my fear I escape through amusements, through religions, through dogmas, through

nationalities, through all kinds of ugly escapes. And that's what we human beings are.

Q: Can there be thought without the observer?

K: Wait, first see what takes place, sir. Then the next inevitable question comes next. See that is the fact, whether it is conscious, or unconscious, this is the whole momentum of our conditioning.

Right, madam?

Now the next question is: can the mind be free of all this conditioning, and this conditioning is the observer, and not what he observes. Right? I am conditioned - this mind is conditioning by a culture which has existed for five, three thousand years in India, and when it meets a different culture, the Catholic, it says, my god - you follow. The observer rejects, and therefore conflict. So the inevitable next question is: can the mind, the brain cells themselves, be free of all conditioning as the observer, as an entity that is conforming, as an entity that is conditioned by the environment, culture, family, race - you follow - conditioned. If the mind is not free from conditioning it can never be free of conflict and therefore neuroticism. Therefore we are, unless you are completely free, we are unbalanced people. And out of our unbalance we do all kinds of mischief.

So maturity is not a frame but a freedom: freedom from conditioning. And that freedom is not obviously the result of the observer, which is the very source of all memory, of all thought. So can I look with eyes that have never been touched by the past? And that is sanity. Sorry! Can you look at the cloud, the tree, your wife, your husband, your friend, without an image? To be aware that you have an image is the first thing, isn't it. To be aware that you are

looking at life through a formula, through an image, through concepts, which are all distorting factors. So to be aware of it. And to be aware of it without any choice. And as long as the observer is aware of these then there is distortion. Therefore can you look - can the mind observe without the censor? Can you listen without any interpretation, without any comparison, judgement, evaluation, listen, to that breeze, to that wind, without any interference of the past?

Sorry, I have taken the show away!

Q: If I see the tree and am delighted, and thought slipping in says, 'That is an oak tree', it is just words. Can we see without the observer?

K: Yes, sir, that's right. You do it. Look at the tree - haven't you ever done all these things. Look at the tree, a tree without naming it, without the interference of the knowledge about trees, just to look. What takes place when you do so look?

Q: You become the tree.

K: You become the tree. Have you looked at a tree that way and then can you say you are the tree? Don't say this, you have never looked. No, madam, you can never say you are the tree. That is an identification with the tree. You are not the tree, are you. I hope not!

Q: The feeling, profound relationship.

K: Wait, look, madam, profound relationship implies a relationship in which there is no image. Obviously. If you have an image about me and I have an image about you, our relationship is between two images, which is built up by thought. Right? This we call profound relationship. Therefore there must be freedom from

the machinery of the image. Therefore can I look at a tree without the image of the tree? Which means, can I look without the observer, without the censor? Then what takes place? You are not the tree. That's a trick of the mind so say, I identify myself with the tree, with you, with god, with this, with that. When there is no movement of identification on the part of the observer, then what takes place? Who creates the space between the tree and you? There is actual space, you understand, there is a distance, it may be a foot, it may be ten feet. The physical distance. We are not talking about the physical distance, but the psychological distance between you and the tree, who has brought this about? The thinking, the observer, the censor. No? Now when that observer, that censor doesn't exist, but only look, what takes place?

Q: The mind becomes very still.

K: The mind becomes very still. Does it? When you observe that tree without the observer, we are asking, what happens.

Q: The distance between the tree and you is not there any more.

K: Are you saying the tree disappears?

Q: No, I am saying the distance between yourself and the tree.

K: That is what? The psychological distance between you and the tree has disappeared. Right? Are you guessing this, or have you actually done this thing? One of the factors of neurosis is obviously resistance, building a wall round oneself. One has built a wall as the observer, and when you look at a tree that wall separates you from the tree, psychologically, not in actual space. Now when there is no psychological space what happens?

Q: Then the tree is part of your being.

K: Oh, no. Your being is the observer. Do listen, sir. I said

when you look at a tree, or a human being, without the observer, without that censor, without that thinker who says, that is the tree, that is what I like, or don't like, I wish I had it in my garden - when you look at it without all that, what happens?

Q: There is communion.

K: There is communion between you and the tree.

Q: It doesn't seem like a question that has any answers.

K: You see you are all guessing.

Q: Is it acceptance?

K: Is it acceptance of the tree. It is there, why should I have to accept it?

Q: Yes, but you might not like it, you build your resisting wall.

K: No, madam, I am asking you - we have been through all that - I am asking, what takes place when the observer is not.

Q: There is only the object.

Q: What happens when you do it?

K: When I do it? Why do you want to know? Are you interested? Theoretically?

Q: No, actually.

K: Then you have to do it yourself, haven't you. Therefore what happens to me is totally irrelevant. No?

Q: Then that means that we are all different.

K: You asked a question: what happens to you when you look without the observer. I said what value has it to you? Are you asking it as an example to copy, to verify your own particular experience, and so on. So what is important in this, not what happens to the speaker when he looks at the tree, but what actually takes place when you look.

Q: With respect, there are several answers here, which I suspect came from their personal experience, but you don't accept it.

K: No. I am not sure they are not repeating. Look, madam, what happens when you, when one looks at another, husband, wife, or children, or the politician, without the image, what takes place?

Q: The mind turns on, lights up.

K: I give it up!

Q: When you say what takes place?

K: What happens to you when you have no image, when you look at somebody without an image?

Q: You have a...

K: If you say, I really don't know - right - then we can proceed; but when you say it is this, it is that, I am not sure if it is real.

When you say, really, I have never done it - that means tremendous discipline, not suppression, not all the rest of the nonsense with regard to discipline. This needs tremendous attention - not on the part of the observer. If the observer becomes attentive he is still separate.

So what takes place if you have really gone through this, not according to me, I am not the oracle, you will see it for yourself when the psychological space disappears there is a direct relationship. Isn't there? When you are married and you have a wife or between two people, there are images, each is building an image, and each is looking through those images at each other. Now if you have no image, what happens? Isn't that what is love? Which has nothing whatever to do with pleasure.

Q: When people are married they may carry each other's images.



K: They generally do, sir, they marry each other's images.

Q: Yes, but they may be able to...

K: Sir, you are guessing, this is all guess work please. Look, sir, either we talk very seriously to find out, to learn, not from me, to learn the nature of observing, the nature of looking, the nature of listening, so that when you do look, you look with eyes completely differently. Otherwise we play around with insanity.

And we started by asking what is sanity. There it is! A mind that is conditioned is not sane.

Q: When there is no psychological space between the tree and the observer, the experience must be the same for everyone.

K: Will the experience without the observer, will that experience be all the same or vary according to the individual.

Q: I have a feeling it will be the same.

K: Not, a feeling, you see. You have asked a question, sir, look at it, first look at the question. When you look without the observer, you are asking whether that observation, what takes place, will it vary according to the individual. If there is no observer at all, is there individuality?

Q: I see.

K: Individuality as we know it is fragmentation. Individual means indivisible. But we are divided human beings, broken up, fragmented, therefore we are not individuals.

What time is it, sir. This is the end of the discussion.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

What shall we talk about this morning? A rather wet and sloppy morning.

Q: Sir, could we speak about psychological space?

K: I should have thought one of the most important things to really explore and discover for oneself the possibility of completely unconditioning the mind. I should have thought that would be the most important thing, and may I go into it?

Now before we go into that please, if I may suggest, bear in mind that the words and the descriptions are not the thing, and the described. The words are necessary as a means of communication. And descriptions, explanations are merely an indication of 'what is'. But if one doesn't actually observe and discover for oneself then mere piling up of words has very little meaning. If one is at all serious and apparently you must be serious to have travelled all this distance in a damp climate like this, it's not the South of France, or Italy, or Spain, if you are at all serious this must be one of the most fundamental questions because man, as one observes in different parts of the world with different culture and social morality, is tremendously and very deeply conditioned to think along a certain line, to act, to work, to think. And his whole background is shaped by the past in relation to the present. And he has cultivated a great deal of knowledge, he has had millions of years of experience. And all this has conditioned him - education, culture, social morality, propaganda, religion, which is an extension of propaganda, and his own reactions to all this

conditioning, which is also a response to another form of conditioning.

So if we could go into this question this morning by talking over together, not that one, specially the speaker, has any authority to what one should do or not do, but in talking over together a very serious problem like this, one has to apply, one has to be sufficiently attentive to see the whole significance of this conditioning, how it divides people, not only geographically but nationally, religiously, socially, linguistically. And this division is in itself a tremendous barrier, it breeds conflict. And if one is to live completely at peace and creatively - we will go into the words 'peace' and creatively' presently - if one is to live that way one must understand this conditioning. This conditioning which is not only peripheral, superficial, but also very deep, and whether the whole structure of this conditioning can be revealed. And when one has discovered it what is one to do, how is one to go beyond it. So that is the problem.

One sees one is conditioned, superficially, and if one is attentive, enquiring, observing, one also begins to question whether this conditioning is right through one, or merely at a superficial level and a little deeper, that's all. So we have these two questions: first to be aware, know, conscious of our conditioning, whether that conditioning is superficial or profound. If it is profound how are the things that are hidden, the conditioning that is deep, to be revealed? And having observed, how is one to go beyond all this conditioning? Now can we go on from there?

One observes one is conditioned, and if one says, one can never possibly uncondition the mind the problem ends. If you start out

with a formula that it can never be unconditioned, then all enquiry ceases. You have already resisted it, you have already answered it, and the problem there ends. Then you can only further decorate the conditioning. But if one went into this fairly deeply, and one becomes aware of this whole business, what is one to do? How would you answer it? If this was a very, very serious challenge and not something that you just brush aside, something that is vital, tremendously important in one's life, how would you answer it? What would be your response? Please do give a little thought to this, find out how one would react to such a challenge. Because one can see what is happening in the world. It is this division, this separative conditioning, divisive, destructive, that is creating such havoc in the world - the Panthers, you know all the rest that is going on, the wars and so on. Now what is one to do?

The first question apparently that would arise, at least for me, is the manner of one's observation. How you have discovered this conditioning. Have you discovered it, found it out for yourself, or somebody told you about it? Please, this is really quite an important question to answer for oneself. If you have been told about it, and then you say, yes, I am conditioned, then you are responding to a particular pattern. You are responding to a suggestion, someone points it out to you, it isn't real, it's only a verbal, intellectual concept which you have accepted, with which you agree, which is totally different from the discovery of it for oneself. Then it becomes tremendously vital and you then have the passion to find the way out of it. I don't know if you see the difference between the two: someone telling you, and discovering it for yourself, are two entirely different things. So which is it? Is

one aware that one is conditioned because you have enquired, searched, asked, looked into. Then if you have, how have you discovered it? Who has discovered it? Please, who has discovered it? The observer? The examiner, the analyzer, who observing, examining, analyzing the whole mess and the madness that is going on in the world. And by observing he has discovered the structure of this conditioning and the result of it.

Then from that arises the question: who is the observer who has discovered that he is conditioned? You follow? Are we communicating with each other? By observing what is happening outwardly and inwardly, the conflicts, the wars, the misery, the confusion in oneself and outside of oneself - the outside is part of what one is - I have observed this very closely, all over the world, this happening. And I have discovered that I am conditioned, and I have found the consequence of this conditioning. So there is the observer who has discovered that he is conditioned. Right? The observer through analysis, through examination, through investigation, has observed that the structure in which he lives is conditioned. Right? Are we going together?

Then the question arises: is the observer different from the things which he has examined and discovered, something separate from himself? If it is separate from himself, then again there is a division, and therefore there is conflict - how to overcome this conditioning, how to free oneself from this conditioning, what to do about it. And one has to discover whether this division between the observer and the thing observed, or the analyzer and the thing analyzed, are two separate things, two separate movements. As we said, if they are separate there must be endless conflict between the

two. Endless struggle to overcome, to suppress, to control, to discipline, to hold, resist, all that is born from this division. Are they separate, or, the observer is the observed? This is tremendously important to find out for oneself because then the whole way we think completely undergoes a change. And this is the most radical discovery. Then the structure of morality, the continuation of knowledge has quite a different meaning. Please, let's talk this over together and find out if you have discovered this for yourself, or have been told, whether through description you have accepted the described as a fact, or you have discovered this for yourself without any outside agency telling you, it is so. Then you are discovering it. And it releases tremendous energy which has been wasted in this division between the observer and the observed. Are we moving together in this?

The wastage of energy is the continuation of knowledge in action. We will go into that. Knowledge which has been gathered by the observer and the observer uses that knowledge in action, so action is different from knowledge, the division; and hence conflict between action and knowledge. And the entity that holds this knowledge which is essentially the conditioning is the observer. So one must discover this basic principle for oneself - principle, not something fixed, a reality which can never be questioned again.

Then what takes place? What happens to a mind that has discovered this fact, this truth that all division outward or inward induces conflict and therefore effort, struggle, and it leads to every form of distortion? Has one discovered this, this simple fact that the observer is the observed, psychologically speaking. I observe the tree but I am not the tree. I can identify myself with the tree,

and that identification is part of the reaction of division. Then if I have discovered this, what takes place to the quality of the mind which has been conditioned by this division, as the higher self, the soul, the body, you know, the division, what takes place, what happens to the quality of the mind? The speaker is doing all the talking unfortunately, and asking all the questions. What happens to the mind that has been conditioned through tradition, propaganda, through education, culture and society, and the entity that is conditioned, the mind that is conditioned is part of that society, culture and so on? What takes place when this fact is unearthed and observed?

Then one asks, what is freedom. Because if this discovery doesn't lead to freedom, doesn't open the door to freedom, then it has no meaning. It is just another intellectual feat, leading nowhere. But if it is an actual discovery, an actual reality, then there must be freedom. Freedom not for what you like to do, freedom to fulfil, freedom to become, freedom to decide, freedom to think what you like and act as you wish, because all that is not freedom. Decision implies choice between this and that. And what is there need of any choice at all, does a free mind choose? Please sir, this is not a verbal statement, you have to go into it, you have to live it daily, and then you will find the beauty of it, the vigour of it, the passion, intensity of it. Choice implies decision, decision is the action of will. And who is the entity that exercises will to do this or that? Please follow this carefully. If the observer is the observed what need is there for decision at all? As we said, decision arises only when there is confusion between this and that. Whether it is politically or inwardly, outwardly or inwardly, when

there is any form of decision, depending on choice, it indicates a mind that is confused. A mind that sees very clearly has no choice, there is only action. And this lack of clarity comes into being when there is this division between the observer and the observed. Right? I don't know how much you see of all this.

Q: Factually there has to be this division, doesn't there.

K: I choose between brown and pink, between brown cloth and red cloth, of course. I am talking psychologically.

Q: It is difficult to separate them.

K: No, no. If one understands the effects of choice, effects of division, decision, then the choosing becomes a very small affair. Look, sir, I am confused in this world. I have been brought up in Catholicism, or Hinduism, or whatever it is, and I am fed up with it, it doesn't satisfy me. And I jumped into another religious organization and they have chosen. But if I examine the whole conditioning of a particular religious society, religious culture it's fairly simple. It's a series of propagandas, a series of acceptances of belief through fear, through the demand for security, psychologically, because inwardly one is lonely, insufficient, miserable, unhappy, uncertain, all the rest of that business, one hopes in something that can offer security, certainty. My particular religion to which I belong doesn't and I jump into another hoping to find it there, but it is the same thing, whether it is called X or Y. So I see this, the mind observes that without freedom, which means freedom from choice, when a mind that is very clear has no choice, has no need of choice, and therefore the whole response of action according to will completely comes to an end. Will implies resistance. Right? Obviously. And any form of resistance is



isolation. And a mind that is isolated is not a free mind, and a mind that is caught up in the acquisition of knowledge as a means to freedom doesn't come about with that freedom, it doesn't happen to it. So one has to go into this question of knowledge. I don't know if you are following all this?

Why has knowledge become such an extraordinarily important thing in life? Knowledge being accumulated experience, both outward experiences that thousands of people have discovered, both scientifically, psychologically and so on, and also the knowledge one has acquired for oneself through observation, through learning, through searching out. What place has knowledge in freedom? Does this interest all of you?

Audience: Yes.

K: No, no, don't be so quick in answering, yes. Because this is not a verbal exchange, intellectual play. Knowledge is always in the past. When you say, 'I know', that word implies you have known. Knowledge of every kind, scientific, personal, communal, or whatever it is, is always in the past. And as our mind lives in the past, is the result of the past, can such a mind be free at all?

Knowledge not only about facts and information and so on, but knowledge which is part of this image, the symbol. The image I have built about you, and you have built about me.

Q: What about self-knowledge?

K: What about self-knowledge. We will go into that. See first how the mind accumulates knowledge. Why it accumulates, where it is necessary, where it becomes an impediment to freedom. To do anything one must have knowledge: driving a car, speaking a language, doing a technological job, you must have abundance of

knowledge, the more efficient, the more objective, the more impersonal, the better. Knowledge is necessary. But a mind that is full of this information, as knowledge, can that mind ever be free? Or must it always carry this knowledge, which is always the past? And carrying this past, this knowledge, and meeting the present with that knowledge, and hence conflict. I met you yesterday, you flattered me or insulted me, I have the image of you, which is part of this knowledge. This knowledge which is the past, with that knowledge I meet you today, which is the image I have built about you today. And therefore there is conflict between you and me, as the observer and hence there is conflict between you and me. This is simple enough. Right?

So the observer is the reservoir of knowledge. No? Please, discover this, it's more fun. The observer therefore is the past, he is the censor, the entity that has accumulated knowledge, and from that knowledge he judges, he evaluates. And he is doing exactly the same with regard to himself. He has acquired knowledge about himself through psychologists, and he has learnt what he is, or he thinks he has learnt about himself, and with that knowledge he looks at himself. He doesn't look at himself with fresh eyes, he says, I know, I have seen myself, it's rather ugly, parts of it are extraordinarily nice but the other parts are rather terrible. He has already judged, and his judgement is based on the past, which is his knowledge about himself. Therefore he never discovers anything new about himself, because the observer is different from the thing observed which he calls himself. And that's what we are doing all the time, in all relationships - mechanical relationship or human relationship, relationship with the machine, or relationship with

another. It is all based on the desire to find out a place where he can be completely secure, certain, and he now has sought and found security in knowledge. And the keeper of this knowledge is the observer, the censor, the thinker, the experiencer. And the observer is always watching as being different from the thing observed. The observer analyses himself, or he is analyzed by the professional, who himself needs analyzing, and this game goes on being played.

So one asks, can one look at this whole movement of life without the burden of the past? And that's what we are all trying to do, aren't we. We want to find new expressions, if you are an artist, more objective, you know, you play with that game for ever and ever. You want to write new books, a new way of looking at life, a new way of living, revolt against the old, and fall into the trap of the new which is the reaction to the old.

So one sees that intelligence doesn't lie in the hands of the observer, and it is only when the mind is free, free to learn, and learning is not the accumulation of knowledge. On the contrary, learning is movement, and accumulation of knowledge is static, you may add to it but the core of it is static. And from this static state one functions, one lives, one paints, one writes, one does all the mischief in the world. And you call that freedom. So can the mind be free of the known? You know this is really quite an extraordinary question if you ask it, not merely intellectually but really very, very deeply, to find out whether the mind can ever be free from the known. Otherwise there is no creation - you follow - otherwise there is nothing new, there is nothing new under the sun then. It is always reformation of the reformed.

So one has to find out why this division between the observer and the observed exists, and whether the mind, the possibility of a mind going beyond this division, which means the possibility of being free from the known to function at a different dimension altogether, which is intelligence which will use knowledge when necessary and be free of knowledge. So intelligence implies freedom, not what one wants to do, which is so immature and childish. Freedom implies the cessation of all conflict, and that comes to an end only when the observer is the observed, because then there is no division. After all this exists when there is love, doesn't it. You know that word is so terribly loaded, like god, one hesitates to use that word because it is associated with pleasure, with sex, with fear, with jealousy, with dependency, with acquisitiveness and all the rest of it. A mind that is not free does not know what love means; it may know pleasure, and hence know what fear is. But fear and pleasure, fear and desire and pleasure are certainly not what is called love. And that can only come into being when there is real freedom from the past. And is that ever possible? You know man has sought this out in different ways, to be free from the transiency of knowledge. I don't know if you are following all this. And so he has always sought something beyond knowledge, beyond thought. Thought is the response of knowledge. And so he has created an image called god - all the absurdities that arise round that. But to find out if there is something that is beyond the image of thought there must be freedom from all fear.

Q: Could I ask if you are differentiating between the brain, the cells of the brain, as intellect and the mind which is something, an

awareness beyond the actual intellect?

K: Are you differentiating between the brain and the mind, the mind being something beyond the brain and the activities of thought. No, I think we are not dividing it. We are using mind as the total process of thought as memory, as knowledge, including the brain cells. Obviously. One can't separate the brain cells from the rest of the mind, can one.

Q: The brain builds up intellect.

K: What is the function of the brain, what is the brain? We are not talking professionally, I don't read books about all this business, but what is the brain?

Q: Well, it is a computer.

K: A computer.

Q: Yes.

K: A most extraordinary computer, built, put together for thousands of years, it is the result of time. Time is memory. Right? Memory is experience, accumulation of thousands of years of experience to survive, to be secure, to be safe. And one has, therefore, this knowledge. Both the outer, specially much more the outer, knowledge of everything that is happening in the outer world, how to go to the moon, you know, all the rest of the knowledge, but very little about oneself.

Q: Could creation depend on memory and therefore depend on the past?

K: Does it? Now, wait a minute, sir. Creation depends on memory.

Q: Creation of a right relationship between another person need not depend on memory, but on the feeling of the moment that you

have affection for that person.

Q: Surely no real creation depends on memory at all.

K: I don't know!

Q: What I was suggesting in fact was that you said earlier that there is nothing new under the sun.

K: That's what we think, sir, that there is nothing new under the sun. At least the Bible says so, Ecclesiastes says so. Now, aren't we confusing creation with expression. And does a creative person need expression? Do think it out, sir. I need expression to fulfil myself, it must be expressed, I have a feeling that I am an artist and I must put it down in paint, or a poem or whatever it is. Does creation need expression at all? And does expression indicate a mind that is free in creation? You understand? Because one writes a poem, or paints a picture, does that indicate a creative mind?

Q: Not necessarily.

K: Therefore what does creativeness mean? Not the repetition, a mechanical repetition of the past.

Q: I think creativeness does need expression.

K: Wait, we will go slowly. Creativeness does need expression. I am just asking. You say it does need it, then it is finished, there is no further enquiry. We are just learning. We are learning together please, do bear this in mind all the time, that we are learning together, that we are working together, sharing together and therefore if you say, it needs it, then it is finished, blocked the door, shut the door in my face.

Q: I didn't say it needed expression.

K: We are going to find out, madam, have patience, let's go into it slowly. What does creativeness mean? What is the feeling of it,

the mind that feels creative, do you know it?

Q: When the mind is inspired, then it creates something new.

K: When the mind sees something good and beautiful, that's a creative mind?

Q: Inspired.

K: Inspired. Does a creative mind need inspiration? No.

Q: It...

K: No, sir, you see you make statements. Do enquire, let's proceed slowly into it. I don't know what it means, we are going to find out. Not verbally, but actually, you know, find out a mind that is really extraordinarily creative, what it means.

Q: It means reality.

K: You say it is reality. Is your mind creative to know that it is reality? Look, sir, please, mustn't the mind be free to be creative, free. Otherwise it is repetitive; in that repetitiveness there may be new expressions but it is still repetitive, mechanical. A mind, a life that is mechanical, can it be creative? A mind, a human being that is in conflict, in tension, neurotic, can that mind, that human being be creative, though he may write marvellous poems, marvellous plays, he might write a marvellous play after having a hang-over. Hooked to something - those are all the new phrases.

Q: You must be in the 'now'.

K: Therefore, sir, what does that mean, to be in the now? It cannot be mechanical. It cannot be burdened with all the weight of knowledge, as tradition. It means a mind that is really profoundly free of fear. That's freedom, isn't it?

Q: Surely it must seek safety still, that's a function of the brain.

K: Therefore, sir, look, you are saying, there must be security.

Q: It is the function of the brain.

K: Of course, it is the function of the brain to be secure. It can function properly, efficiently, clearly, when it is secure. Right? But is it secure when it divides itself into nationalities, into religions, into saying, it's mine, it's yours and all the rest of it. Where there is any form of division there is destruction - the Jews, the Muslims, the Arabs, you follow?

Q: It seems to me that without opposition there is no growth.

K: Oh, without opposition there is no growth. Oh my lord!  
That's part of our conditioning, isn't it.

Q: No, it's part of reality.

K: Is it, is it? Let's find out, madam.

Q: Without a high there is no low.

K: Let's find out. We have lived that way, between the good and the bad, between hate and love, jealousy, between tenderness and brutality, between violence and gentleness, that's how we have lived, for millions of years, and we have accepted that because we are conditioned that it is something real. Is it, to live like this?

Q: How can one be free of this conditioning?

Q: Well I have a suggestion: to rise above these planes of good and evil into the plane of divine consciousness.

K: No, no, sir, no, sir. You see. Now we are discussing what is the mind, what is the quality of the mind that is creative. A quality of mind that wavers between hate and jealousy and love and pleasure and fear, can it know what love means? Can a mind that is always seeking expression, fulfilment, to become famous, to be recognized, to be somebody in a potty little town? And we all call that fulfilment, becoming, being, you know, all the rest of it, which



is all part of the social structure, part of our conditioning, and can such a mind be creative when it is caught in the word, or the verb, to be? To be - I will be, I have been. Always becoming something, can such a mind be creative? Because in becoming there is fear - you might not become, you might not be successful. In becoming there is the fear of death, fear of the unknown, so you cling to the known, which is knowledge. Can such a mind be ever creative? Or is creation the result of stress, opposition, strain?

Q: Creativeness is joy and attention, imagination.

K: Oh, creativeness is joy, imagination. You see we are all so - I don't know what we are. Do you know what joy means? Is joy pleasure?

Q: No.

K: You say, no, but that's what you are seeking, aren't you. You have a moment of great ecstasy, great joy, and you think about it. The thinking about it has reduced it to pleasure. So, sir, please, we are all so full of conclusions, and a mind that has a number of conclusions is not a free mind. And to find out whether one can live without any conclusion, without any conclusion, to live it daily, which means to live a life without comparison. You conclude because you compare. To live a life without comparison - you do it some time and you will find out what an extraordinary thing takes place.

Isn't it time, sir? It is twelve twenty, I think we had better stop, don't you.

Q: If just the experience, and the experience is fear or anger, what happens?

K: If one is only experience, the questioner asks, and the

experiencer is fear, but only lives in experience, without that experience being recorded and recognized in the future as an experience, what happens. Is that it? I think one has first to find out what we mean by that word 'experience'. Doesn't it mean to go through? Doesn't it imply recognition, otherwise you wouldn't know you had experience? Are we meeting each other? If I didn't recognize the experience, would it be experience?

Q: Can't there be just experience without the image?

K: Wouldn't you put it a little further, go a little further. Which is, why do you need experience at all? You understand my question? We all want experience. First we are bored with our life, we have made life into a mechanical affair and we are bored with it, we want wider, deeper experiences, transcendental experiences. Right? Now what does all this imply? Boredom, and the escape from this boredom, through meditation, through various forms of escapes into so-called divine, whatever that is, which are all various formulas, and experience implies a recognition. Recognition means you can only recognize if there is a memory of that thing which you have already experienced, otherwise there is no recognition. So the question is, why do we ask for experience at all? To waken us up because we are asleep? A new challenge is an experience. And we respond to that challenge according to our background, which is the known. So there is always conflict between the challenge and the response. Right?

So is it possible to live a life in which the mind is so clear, awake, a light to itself that it needs no experience? Don't say, yes. Find out! That means to live a life without conflict. That means a mind that is highly sensitive and therefore intelligent, which is a

light in itself therefore it doesn't need something to challenge it, or to awaken it. Right?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH SEPTEMBER 1970**

This is the last, whatever it is. I would like to, if I may, to talk about a great many things. First, as one observes what is going on right round the world, both economically and socially, and in the human being, there is really a great deal of confusion, mischief, and violence. These are obvious facts. And the politicians perhaps encourage it, and the religious people cannot do anything about it, the organized religions. They have tried in every way right throughout the world, depending on their particular religious idiosyncrasy and belief, to put an end to violence, and they haven't succeeded. They have talked a great deal about love, peace, goodness, being kind to each other and so on. And apparently this has never come about. And conquerors have tried to unite mankind, again through violence, through murder, war, torture. And again human beings, being what they are, cannot seem to unite, bring it about not only economically but socially, morally, feel for each other, whether they are brown, black, white, and pink and all the rest of it, bearded or not bearded.

So one sees the utter and complete importance of a human being living harmoniously with his environment, and also inwardly, both in relationship and as a human being, vitally alive, passionate and capable and efficient. And it seems to me that is one of the major problems, if not the problem (noise of baby) - I am afraid it is going to be a choice between the baby and the speaker! As there is no choice we will go on.

It is one of the most important questions to solve: to bring about

a complete unity, a feeling of a sense of, 'not me'. It is this self-centred activity, at whatever level it be, socially, economically or religiously, this self-centred activity is the factor of division. The 'me' and the 'not me', we and they. And is it ever possible to go beyond this self-centred concern, activity. If anything is possible then one has a great deal of energy. What wastes energy is seeing that it is not possible and just drifting, as most of us do, falling, going from one trap to another. How is this possible? How is a human being, recognizing what he is, a great deal of the animal in him, aggression, violence, a great deal of stupid mischievous activity, caught in various beliefs and dogmas and separative theories and formulas, revolting against one particular system, or establishment and falling into another establishment, which he himself recognizes and doesn't call that conformity. So seeing all that, what is one to do? This has been, I think historically, as well as in every human being who is sensitive, and alive, aware of the things that are happening around him, he must inevitably ask, not intellectually, not theoretically, not posit an hypothesis, but actually find out how to live, not at few odd rare moments but throughout the day and night and years until the end, a life that is completely harmonious, without conflict in himself, and therefore with the world. And this conflict, as one observes, arises from this self-centred concern, giving such tremendous importance to its appetites, whether it be sexual, economic, or what you will.

This has been, at least to all sensitive and people who are aware and serious, this has been always the question: how to go beyond his own petty little shoddy little self. Though he may call it god and soul and atman, you know all the rest of the words that one

invents, pleasant sounding words to cover up a corruption. How is one to go beyond it? And so not being capable we have invented an outside agency, which is environment. Change the environment, the social structure, the economic business and man will inevitably also change. That has proved utterly wrong and false and untrue. Though the communists insist on that theory. And the religious people have said, believe, accept, put yourself in the hands of something outside of yourself. And that too has lost its sting, its vitality, because it is not real, it is merely an intellectual invention, a verbal structure, which has no depth whatsoever. And then one has tried to identify oneself with a nation, with a larger group. That too has brought dreadful wars and misery and confusion, ever bringing about division.

Now seeing all this, what is one to do? Escape to some monastery? Run off and learn the Zen meditation? Or accept some philosophical theory and commit oneself to that? Or meditate as a means of escape and self-hypnosis? So when one sees all this, actually, not verbally or intellectually, and seeing all that as leading nowhere, doesn't one invariably throw aside all that, deny completely and totally all that, all the various forms of self-identification with something larger, expecting the environment to shape man, laws, tyranny. And also seeing the absurdity, the falseness, the superficiality of beliefs, noble or ignoble. Does one actually set aside all that? Or do we still play with all that? If one has, and that's quite a task, because that implies a mind that is completely capable of looking at things as they are, without any distortion, without any interpretation, according to one's like or dislike, seeing things actually as they are, both outwardly and

inwardly. Then what takes place with the quality of the mind? The mind being not only the nervous organism, but also the whole brain with all its memories, experiences, knowledge, based on security, because the brain can only function efficiently, healthily, sanely when it is completely secure.

Now seeing all this and acting, not seeing and action, they are the same, not a division between seeing and acting. That is, when you see something very dangerous, threatening, there is immediate action. In the same way, if you see all this, that man has invented, that human beings have constructed, as a means of escape from one's own tortures and agonies, loneliness, despairs, when one sees the danger of all that there is immediate action. After all that is intelligence. Intelligence is the seeing of the danger and acting. Therefore there is no division between seeing and acting.

Observing what is actually going on both outwardly and inwardly, and the very perception of that is action, and when one doesn't act then insanity begins, then imbalance takes place. Then we say, I cannot do that, it's too difficult, what shall I do.

I hope we are communicating with each other. That is, not only verbally but actually seeing things as they are. After all, the meaning of this kind of gathering is not merely to spend a sunny morning in a rather uncomfortable seat and in a tent, but rather to listen so that we find out what is true, not according to the speaker, or according to your own particular like or dislike, or idiosyncrasy, but in talking over together, discovering for ourselves what is truth, which means giving real attention. One cannot possibly understand anything unless you give your attention, unless you hear completely. But hearing is one thing and listening is another. If you

merely hear a lot of words and argue about it, and discuss intellectually, like and dislike, it has very little meaning, whereas if you listen really with your heart and mind, listen to find out, because it is a very serious thing we are involved in, this is not an entertainment. And as human beings caught in all this confusion, misery, and the appalling things that are going on in the world, for which we are responsible as human beings, we have to act, we have to do something, not in Jordan but where we are, as we are. And so one has to really understand what action is.

As we said, when there is a division in action as, idea and then action, the concept and then action follows, the formula and later on the action, in that division there must be conflict. I don't know if we see that. First we have an idea, don't we, what we should do, what we should think, a concept. And that concept comes about through our conditioning. And so there is a concept, a formula, an idea, and later on action. And therefore there is always conflict wherever there is division. I don't know if we are seeing this together. And this conflict between the idea and action is the most confusing factor in life. And is it possible to act - please do listen to this - is it possible to act without idea? The idea first and action later. Is it possible to act without the ideation taking place? Which is, the seeing and the acting together, which we do when there is great danger or a crisis, there is instant action. And is it possible to live like that? Which is, a way of life of sanity. That is, is it possible to see clearly the danger, let us take of nationalism, or the danger of religious beliefs, which separates man against man, the division between races, the Arab, the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim, you know, all that nonsense that goes on, seeing the danger of



division, the very seeing, not the believing that it is false - I don't know if I am - belief has nothing whatsoever to do with perception. On the contrary belief prevents perception. If you have a formula, or a tradition, or a prejudice that you are a Hindu, a Jew, an Arab, or a communist and so on - am I going too fast? It doesn't matter, it's up to you - that very division does breed antagonism, hate, violence. And when there is this division between the concept and action there must be conflict, and this very conflict is neurotic, insane. So can the mind see, and the very seeing is the doing? That demands attention. That requires an alertness, not only visual alertness but a quickness of the mind, a sensitivity.

One sees this, that you need to have a clear sharp, sensitive, intelligent awareness, and then one says, how am I to get it, to capture it. When you put that question there is already a division. But whereas when you see the actual fact of what is going on, and the very seeing of it is the action. I hope this is clear. Because after all, every form of conflict, inwardly or outwardly, there is no division as the outer and the inner, every form of conflict is distortion. I don't think we realize this sufficiently clearly. We are so accustomed to conflict, struggle, we feel when there is no conflict we are not growing, we are not developing, we are not creating, we are not functioning properly. We want resistance. And one doesn't see the implications of resistance, which is division. So can the mind act without resistance, without friction? Seeing that any form of friction, any form of resistance is division, and therefore action brings about a neurotic conflicting state.

So when there is perception, observation, or seeing and acting then the activity of the self-centre comes to an end. I don't know if

you see that. After all the self, the 'me', the 'I', the ego, you know whatever that is that is inside, the observer, the censor, the controller, the thinker, the experiencer and so on, he is the past. The self is the past. And the past is knowledge. The self, the 'me', is the centre of all knowledge, of psychological knowledge, not the scientific knowledge, or medicine and so on. So when there is any challenge the response from the centre as the 'me' is the response of the past, and therefore there is conflict. I don't know if you see all this. Whereas the seeing, the instant seeing and the instant acting, the self doesn't enter at all. Therefore there is no division. The centre as the observer is the Hindu, the Arab, the Jew, the Christian, the communist and all that business. When he responds it is the response of the past, the response of his conditioning is the result of thousands of years of propaganda - religious, social, or whatever it is. And that which is the past when it responds, must create division, inaction, and therefore conflict. Whereas when you see something very clearly and act there is no division. Is this clear?

You know, it is a great deal of fun to go into oneself and find out all this in oneself. You can't learn this from books - thank god! You can only learn through self-knowing, observing, then it is not secondhand but it is direct. And as most of us are secondhand human beings we find it awfully difficult to act without the 'me'.

So from this arises a further question, which is: can man, realizing the transiency of all things, find something that is not of time? You understand? Because the brain is the result of time, it has been put together through thousands of years, millennia. And thought is the response of memory, knowledge, experience, and

thought can never discover anything new because thought is always the old. Thought can never be free. So anything that thought builds or thinks about is within the field of time. It may invent a god, it may conceive a timeless state, but it is still within the field of time because it is the result of thought, of the intellect. You may invent a heaven, but it is still the product of thought, and therefore of time, therefore unreal. So man, if one observes, has everlastingly sought this thing, realizes the nature of time, not only the chronological time by the watch but also the psychological time in which thought has become so extraordinarily important. And man says, is there something beyond all this time structure. Are we with each other? Right, can we go on?

Man starts out to find this, then gets trapped in belief, through fear. Then fear invents marvellous gods and all the rest of that business. Or he sets out through meditation to find it. Meditation - one has to be terribly brief about all this because there is too much involved in it - any form of structural meditation based on any system or method is a repetitive affair, which makes the mind somewhat quiet but dull. You know you have heard the repetition of mantras, you have heard about that, haven't you. I am so sorry you have heard about it. It is the same as repeating Ave Maria a hundred million times. And if you repeat something endlessly, then what happens? Obviously the mind becomes extraordinarily mechanical, rather stupid, and flies off into some mystical, supernatural, transcendental something or other. That's not meditation at all. You might take a trip, psychedelic trip by taking drugs, but that is not meditation. Meditation implies a mind that is so astonishingly clear so that every form of self-deception comes to

an end. Because one can deceive oneself infinitely. And generally meditation is a form of self-hypnosis: seeing visions, all this is rather absurd, shall we have to go into all that. Because you have visions according to your conditioning. It's so simple. If you are a Christian you will see your Christ, if you are a Hindu you will see your Krishna, or whatever it is, the innumerable gods one has. But meditation is none of these things. Meditation is the absolute stillness of the mind, which means also the absolute quietness of the brain. You are all listening rather intently, aren't you? I am afraid by listening to what the speaker is going to say you are not going to achieve this. There is no achievement at all, no gaining. You have to lay the foundation for meditation in daily life - how you behave, what you think, what you do. You can't be violent and meditate, it has no meaning. If there is fear of any kind, psychologically, any kind of fear, obviously meditation is a nice escape. So the mind which is the result of time, as the brain, when that operates, functions, when it begins to look or conceive then thought, which is the past, and all its activities can be so deceptive.

So meditation is the stilling of the mind, complete quietness. And this requires an extraordinary discipline. Not the discipline of suppression, conformity, following some authority. But that discipline, that learning - discipline, that word means to learn - the learning which takes places throughout the day about everything, that is, you are thinking, watching, then the mind has that quality, that religious quality of unity. And from that there can be action which is not contradictory.

All this implies a serious person, a mind that is capable of clear, sane, observation, without any distortion. And it is possible to live

that way daily, not at the weekends, daily.

And also there is the question in all this: what part do dreams play? Are you interested in all this? Shall I go on? Are you having fun? Because you see, the mind is never still, there is incessant activity going on. What goes on during the day continues during the sleep - the worries, the travail, the confusion, the misery, the anxiety, the fears, the pleasures, goes on when one sleeps, only there it becomes more acute. And it is symbolized through dreams, scenes and so on. Can the mind be completely still during sleep? And it is possible only when the activities of the day are understood each minute as they are over. You follow? Not carried over. You try some time not to carry your worries, your anxieties, your ambitions, your petty little activities over. If you are insulted, or praised, finish with it as it happens so that the mind is constantly free from problems. And as you sleep, then a different kind of quality comes into being because the mind is completely at rest. You are not carrying over the business of the day, you end it with each day. I don't know if you have gone through all this, if you have ever done it.

Then you will see meditation has that quality of a mind that is completely at rest, that's completely free from all knowledge. But such a mind uses knowledge. I don't know if you see. Because it is free from knowledge, from the known, it can use the known. When it uses the known it is sane, it is objective, impersonal, not dogmatic. And so one discovers - not, 'one discovers' - it happens that the mind in this silence there is a quality which is timeless.

And as we said, the explanation, the description is not the described, or that which is explained. But most of us are satisfied

with explanations and descriptions, which are words. Therefore one must be free of the word, for the word is not the thing. And when one lives that way life has quite a different beauty. In that there is great love, which is not pleasure, not desire. For pleasure and desire are related to thought. And love is not the product of thought.

Well, sirs, that's enough. Perhaps you would like to ask some questions and we can talk things over together.

Q: When I observe myself I see a very rapid movement and feeling, and I am unable to watch one thought amidst this confusion.

K: Right, I understand, sir. May I repeat it? Please correct me if I repeat something wrong. When I watch myself there is such a rapid movement of thought I can never finish one thing, there is always a chain of events going on. Right, sir? What am I to do? I really don't know. Do you? Let's find out.

You watch yourself, and as you are watching various thoughts arise. And if you think or try to understand one thought and go to its very end, as you are doing it another thought arises. So there is this going on all the time, this movement. Right? What is one to do? What will you do? Are you waiting for somebody to tell you what to do? There is your problem, that as you are watching yourselves there is the multiplication of thought, multitude of thoughts, and you cannot finish one thought to the end. What is one to do? Go on, sirs.

Q: Does it matter?

K: Does it matter. Oh, probably nothing matters in that sense.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, we are trying to finish this question first. Would you put the question differently, which is, why does the mind endlessly chatter. Would you put it that way? Why is there this soliloquy going on? What happens if it doesn't go on? Is the chattering the result of wanting to be occupied? You understand my question? Something to be occupied with.

Q: Is it an escape?

K: Madam, that's not an answer. If it is an escape, why is the mind escaping, from what? Please, go slowly, we are going to find out, don't say, it is so. Ask the question, enquire. We chatter, why?

Q: Because we are not aware at the moment.

K: That settles it.

Q: Is it because we can't bear the void of no self?

K: We are going to find out, go slowly. You want to be occupied with something, don't you. If you are not occupied, what takes place? You understand? If you are not occupied with what you are used to, if you are a housewife you are occupied with all the business, if you are a businessman you are occupied.

Occupation becomes a mania, right? And why is the mind demanding occupation, which is chattering? You follow? Why? Watch your own mind, please. This is quite amusing, and entertaining, fun, to watch it, why it chatters. And what happens if it doesn't chatter, when it isn't occupied? Is there fear behind it? Fear of what? Please, go slowly. Fear of what?

Q: Of being nothing.

K: Fear of not being. Wait, look at what you are saying. Fear of not being.

Q: Fear of the past.

K: Fear of the past, whatever it is, fear. Fear about what? Fear exists in relation to something, fear doesn't exist by itself.

Q: Is it...

K: Find out, madam, don't ask me, find out. Fear of what? Of being empty, of being lonely, becoming aware of all this turmoil about you, in yourself, therefore be occupied with something. Like the monk, he is occupied with the book, with his ideas, with his gods, with his saviours, with his prayers, because the moment he stops he is just like anybody else: there is fear. So we want to be occupied. And this occupation implies a fear of finding out what we are. Right? Fear of our loneliness, of our ugliness, fear of whatever it is. Until you solve that problem of fear you will chatter. Right?

Q: As I watch myself the fear increases.

K: As I watch myself fear increases. Naturally. So the question is not, how to stop the increase of fear, but rather, can fear end. You follow? What is fear? Please, don't reply. Let's learn, find out. What is fear? You may not feel fear now, because you are sitting here, you don't feel fear now so you may not be able to take that and examine it and learn from it. But you can take immediately and immediately perceive that you depend, don't you. Right? Depend on your friend, on your book, on your ideas, on your husband, you know, psychological dependence, that is there constantly. Why do you depend? Because it gives you comfort, a sense of security, sense of well-being, companionship? And when that dependency is disturbed you become jealous, angry, and all the rest of it follows, or try to cultivate freedom from dependency, independent. Why does the mind do all this? Because in itself it is very empty, dull,



stupid, shallow, so through dependence it feels more.

Now, in the same way, fear. What is fear? That is, why does the mind endlessly chatter? It chatters because it has to be occupied with something or other. And this occupation you separate as the highest occupation of the religious man, or the lowest occupation of the soldier, and so on, this division. We are not talking about the various forms of noble, or ignoble occupations, but occupation. Because it is obviously frightened that if it wasn't occupied it might discover, it might - you follow - it might see something of which it is afraid, which it may not be able to solve. So one has to find out what this fear means. Learn about it, not how to end it, not how to suppress it, or escape from it, but learn about it. What is fear in relation to something? Something I have done in the past, or something that might happen in the future: the past incident, and the future accident; the past illness, and the future pain of it. Right? Now what creates this fear? Thinking about the past, and thinking about the future, doesn't it. So thought breeds fear. Right? Are we going together. Thought breeds fear, as thought sustains, nourishes, pleasure. No? I have had marvellous food last night, and I would like to have it again. I had an extraordinary experience, a vision, or whatever it is, I want it again. So thought breeds both fear and pleasure, sustains both fear and pleasure, gives it a continuity. Right?

Then can thought - please listen - can thought end, come to an end so that it doesn't sustain, give a continuity, nourishment to fear, or to pleasure? You see we want pleasure, we want pleasure to continue but fear, let's put it away. But we never see the two go together. And thought is responsible. The machinery of thinking.

So then one asks oneself, can this stop - the machinery which sustains, gives nourishment, continuity to pleasure or to fear. That when you see a sunset, the beauty of it, the colours, the extraordinary quality of that light, see it and end it, not say, I must have it. You follow? To see it, and end it is action. Whereas if you see it, and enjoy it and want its repetition, it's inaction. I don't know if you see that. And as most of us live in inaction therefore this inaction becomes chattering. I don't know if you follow all this.

What time is it, sir? It's quarter past twelve. Do you want to go on with this?

Audience: Yes.

K: I hope you are also working as much as the speaker.

Q: In fact when the chattering does go on, do you just observe it?

K: When the chattering goes on, do you just observe it. That is, become aware of this chattering, without choice. Which means don't try to suppress, it, don't say, it's wrong, right, it must be - as you watch chattering you discover why it is chattering. You discover all the thing which you have just now described. And when you learn about chattering it is finished, there is no resistance to chattering. That is, through negation you have the positive action.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 16TH JULY 1970

I see all the old familiar faces are here again.

Perhaps after I have talked a little while you may like to ask questions, and so if that is all right with you I will talk first and see how things go along.

In a world that is so utterly confused, violent, revolutionary, every form of revolt and a thousand explanations for these revolts, confusions and violence, in which it is hoped there will be social reformation, change of bureaucracy, different set of values, different realities and greater, wider freedom for man. This is asked in every country, under every clime, under the banner of peace there is violence, in the name of truth there is exploitation, misery; there are all the starving millions in the world, suppressed, under great tyrannies in the name of ideologies, whether those ideologies be religious or political, there is such social injustice, different races against one another, every form of revolt and revolution and hatred. And there is war, conscription and the evasion of conscription, draft and so on. There is really great confusion, terrible violence, hatred is justified and every form of escapism is accepted as the norm of life. When one is aware of all this, not only outwardly, but also in oneself, there is uncertainty, oneself is confused what to do, what to think, what part to play in all this variety of confusion and demands - what is one to do. Join the activists, or escape from all that into some kind of inward isolation, or go back to old religious ideas, or start a new sect and carry on with one's own prejudices, inclinations and tendencies.

Seeing all this, one naturally wants to know for oneself what to

do, what to think, how to live a different kind of life. And I think, if we can during these talks and discussions, find out for ourselves, amidst this clamour of action, this destruction of hatred and violence and brutality, if we can find out for ourselves, a light in ourselves, a way of living in which there is no violence whatsoever, a way of life which is utterly religious and therefore no fear, a life that is completely stable inwardly, which cannot possibly be touched by outward events, then I think it will be eminently worth while if we could, all of us, together, give complete and sensitive attention to what we are going to discuss, what we are going to talk over together, because we are working together, we are co-operating together to find out. It isn't that the speaker tells you what to do, what to think, he has no authority, he is not going to tell you what to think and what to do, he has no philosophy. But together we are going to find out for ourselves, not dependent on anyone, including the speaker, find out for ourselves how to live in this mad confusion, how to live peacefully, and that peace can only come about if there is a light in ourselves which can never be destroyed by another, by any environment, by any accident, by an experience. If we could do that - and we must - during these days that we come together here, if we could quietly, patiently, with real interest and seriousness, go into this, I am quite sure we will be able to find out for ourselves; only unfortunately the difficulty is that our brain functions in the old habits, like a gramophone record playing the same tune over and over and over again. And while that tune is going on, the noise of that music, of that habit, one is not capable of listening to anything new, because after all we have been conditioned, the brain has been conditioned

to think in a certain way, to act in a certain way, to respond according to our culture, to our background, to our tradition, to our education and that very same brain tries to listen to something new, to a new quality of meaning, to a new tone, and it is not capable of it, and that is where our difficulty is going to lie. You know if you talk on a tape you can wipe it out and begin again, but unfortunately the tape the brain has, which has been so long cultivated and conditioned, it is very difficult for that tape to be wiped out and begin again. And we repeat that same pattern, the same ideas, the same physical habits over and over again. And so we never catch anything fresh, new.

So, listen so that the brain puts aside the old tape, the old way of thinking, feeling, reacting, the innumerable habits that one has, to put all that aside - and one can do it, I assure you you can do it if you listen, if you give attention, if the thing you are listening to is deadly serious, tremendously important, then you are bound to listen, and that the very act of listening will wipe out the old. Do try it - or rather do do it, not try it. You are really deeply interested otherwise you wouldn't be here, you are taking life very seriously, otherwise you wouldn't take all the trouble to come and sit here with the fresh snow on the hills, uncomfortably, away from the things that you are used to. So one assumes that you are serious, because you have to be serious confronted with the extraordinary chaos in the world, uncertainty, war, destruction, every value has been thrown away, it is a completely permissive society, sexually, economically, in every way. There is no morality, no religion, everything is being thrown away and one has to be utterly, deeply serious; and that very seriousness, if you have that in your heart,

you will listen. And in that very act of listening the old memories, the hold habits, the accumulated tradition, all that will be wiped away. So it depends on you, not on the speaker, whether you are sufficiently serious to listen, to find out for yourself, so completely, a light that can never be put out, a way of living that doesn't depend on any idea, on any circumstance, a way of life that is always fresh, new, young, vital.

So if you are serious and not completely self-centred, just have that quality of mind that wants to find out at any price, then you and I, you and the speaker, can co-operate, can work together and discover, or come upon this strange thing that will solve all our problems - whether it be the problems of daily monotonous life or the problems of the highest quality.

Now how do we go about it? You know I feel there is only one way, that is, through negation to come to the positive, through understanding what it is not, to find out what it is. To see what one actually is and go beyond it, to start looking, not only at the world and all the event of the world, the things that are going on, and our relation to that, either separatively or without the separation between you and the world. You have understood I hope? One can look at the world's events as though it didn't concern you, you as an individual, looking at all that, trying to understand it, trying to shape it, trying to do something about it, you as an individual separate from that thing, from the thing called the world and the events that are taking place in the world, so there is a division between you and the world, you can look at it that way. You, the individual, with your experiences, with your knowledge, with your particular idiosyncrasies, your prejudices and so on, with those,

look at the world, and therefore separate yourself from the world. You as an Englishman, or a German, or whatever it is, you look at the world from your prejudice, from your particular little sectarian culture.

So one has to find out how you look, whether you are looking at all the things that are happening outside of you as well as inside of you, from a particular point of view and therefore from a particular prejudice, from a particular belief, a conclusion. Please do this as we are talking. And so when you look at it that way there is a separation between you and the world and the events of the world, and therefore when there is a division between you and the world then you try to do something about the world. And hence there is a conflict between you and the world. Right?

Or, you can look at this whole process of living, in which there is you and the world, as a unitary process, as a total movement, not a separate movement, you as the individual and the community, you and the nation, you and the Vietnamese war, and so on and so on, you as the Arab, or the Jew and so on. So it depends on how you look, whether you look at the world from a particular point of view, from a particular conclusion, from a particular culture, you taking a stand verbally, ideologically, or committed to a particular action and therefore isolate yourself from the rest, and then there is a contradiction and conflict. Either you look that way, or you look at this whole phenomenon, the whole phenomenon, as a living, moving process, a movement, a total movement of which you are a part and therefore no division. Because you are after all the society, what you are is the result of the culture, the society, the religion, the education, the climate, the food, the propaganda, that is what

you are - you are the world and the world is you. And to see the totality of this, not what to do about it, we will come to that later, to have this feeling of the whole of mankind, not as a Hebrew, or a Hindu or some - I won't use strong language. Can you do this, not identify yourself with the world because you are the world; the war is the result of you, the violence, the prejudices, the division, the appalling brutality that is going on, it is part of you.

So it depends then on how you look at this phenomenon that is going on both within and without, and how serious you are. If you are really serious then you will listen and the old momentum comes to an end, the old pattern, the repetition of the old pattern, the old habits, the ancient ways of thinking, living, acting.

So we come back to the question of whether you are really serious, not with a long face and without a smile and laughter, but inwardly really serious to find out, find out a way of life in which all this turmoil, this misery, the sorrow doesn't exist. So for most of us that is where the difficulty lies: to be free of the old, the old habits, not only physical habits but the habits of thought, the crudest form of it - I am something, I want to fulfil, I want to become, I believe, these are my opinions, this is the way, I belong to this particular sect, whether it is the Roman Catholic sect or the Protestant sect. So the moment you take a stand you have already separated yourself and are therefore incapable of looking at this total process. You see what is happening in the world, as well as in oneself, there is the scientist, the artist, the businessman, the philosopher, the Pope, the priest, the businessman - division, fragmentation of life, and each one of these people offer an explanation, each says, 'This is the way', the historian, the



Communist, the Socialist, have their particular way, they don't look at the whole fragmentation of man and one fragment is explaining away the other fragments. I hope you are listening to all this. And one fragment is trying to unify the rest of the fragments, which is what you are doing. One fragment in you says, 'I must control the rest of the fragments, I am the censor, I am the moralist, I know what is right'. So every fragment has its devotee, its teacher, its philosopher, its scientist, its businessman, and they are all at war with each other. That is so - you can look it objectively.

The other day on the television - need I go into all this? - a high dignitary of the Church of England was being interviewed and the interviewer asked him what about other religions - Buddhism, Hinduism, oh a dozen of them, what about them. 'Oh', he said, 'they have got truth in them, some of them, but we are unique because we have Jesus with us'. You know in this age, the 20th century, a man can say that: which means he is so conditioned by his own repetition, by the culture in which he has been brought up, that he can't see anything new, and yet he is the highest dignitary, and he tells people the beauty of god. And there are those philosophers, the intellectuals, trotting out their own particular ideologies, writing clever, marvellous books. So there is this fragmentation, this division in life, and as long as there is this fragmentation both outwardly and inwardly, there must be confusion and war. Do please see this with your heart. Look at the war that is going on in the Middle East, Near East. So you know all this; and there are volumes written explaining it all, and we are caught by the explanation. As though any explanation, it doesn't matter which explanation, written by the cleverest man, is ever going to solve

anything.

So the first thing is to realize not to be caught in explanations, it doesn't matter who gives it, but to see actually 'what is'. When you see 'what is' it does not demand explanations; it is only the man who doesn't see 'what is' is lost in explanations. Please do see this, understand this so fundamentally that one isn't caught by words.

In India it is the fashion there to take their sacred book called the Gita, and explain everything according to that book, and there are everlasting meetings about it, thousands upon thousands listen to it, the explanations, how you should live, what you should do, how god is this - you know - and they listen, enchanted, and carry on with their life. So explanations are deadly things, they blind you because they prevent you from seeing actually what is, and through explanations you can never see 'what is'.

So to look at 'what is', and how you look at it, is of the highest importance. That is the only thing that matters. Either you look at it from a particular point of view, with your particular vested interest, economically or ideologically, your vested interest in them, either you look at them from a particular conclusion, from a particular prejudice, from a particular experience, and so there is a division between you and the thing which is. Is this clear? And when there is a division there must be inevitably conflict. And the explanation of the conflict has no value. What has value is to see how you look, to be aware of your prejudice which is preventing you from looking. So if you listen to this really seriously, the old pattern is wiped away, you will never again look from a fragment, because we are concerned with the whole of life - the whole of life, the physical, the economic, the social relationship, enjoyment,

pleasure, the reality - if there is any reality - to find out something beyond all thought, all imagination, what is death, what is love, what is fear, and to see if the mind can go beyond all this. We are concerned with the whole movement of life, not one segment of it. And when there are revolutions, physical revolutions, they are only concerned with a part of it; and when there are revolutions you are bound to end up with dictatorship, with a tyranny, and battle again begins to be free of the tyranny.

So it is vitally, immensely important, to find out for yourself how you look at all this problem of existence - from a conclusion, from an explanation, from a particular point of view. Or do you look at it non-fragmentarily? Do find out. Spend an hour. Go out for a walk by yourself and find out, or in your room, put your heart in finding out how you look at all this phenomena. Then we can begin to talk together. Then we can begin to communicate together. The word 'communication' means that - to work together, to look together, to examine together, to create together. But if you don't take part in it but merely hear certain ideas, concerned with your particular little problem whether you are sexually satisfied or not, whether you are fulfilling or not, whether you are happy or not, we can deal with all that afterwards. Then we can work out all the details together, and we will go into the most infinite details to find out, to understand, but before we do that you must be very clear that you are free from fragmentation, that you are no longer an Englishman, an American, a Jew - you follow? - black, white, pink, purple - all that rubbish. Or you have your particular conditioning in a particular religion or a culture, which tethers you, holds you, and according to that you have your experiences, which only

strengthen your further conditioning.

So to be aware of all this, whether you are hurt because you don't get something that you want - you know - all the tricks that one plays upon oneself. To look at this whole movement of life as one thing, there is a great beauty in that, immense possibility, then action is extraordinarily complete, and it is only then there is freedom. And a mind must be free to find out what reality is, not invent a reality, not imagine what reality is. There must be this total freedom in which there is no fragmentation. And that can happen only if you are really completely serious, not according to somebody who says, 'this is to be serious' - throw them all away, don't listen to it. But find out for yourself if you are completely serious to find out. It doesn't matter whether you are old or young. Then you will listen, and that very act of listening will wipe out the old repetitious habits and conclusions, and all the absurdities that we have accumulated.

Now would you like to ask questions about what we have been talking about this morning? You know before you ask - just a minute sir - before you ask let us see why you are asking and whom are you asking the question. Why you ask and from whom do you expect the answer? And in asking, are you satisfied with the explanation which will be the answer? Or are you asking the question in order to expose, because that very questioning is a process of enquiry. So it is no good your asking a question and waiting for the speaker to answer it. Your questioning is taking part, sharing in the answer. Is that clear? So it is a thing together. If one asks a question, and one must ask always about everything, if one asks a question, you are asking it because in that very asking

you are beginning to enquire and therefore share together, move together, experience together, create together. It doesn't matter what question it is - if it is the most silly question, you will find out it's silly and in finding out it is silly we are both together sharing it. If the speaker answers that question he discovers how silly he is himself. So if that is more or less clear, and it doesn't mean the speaker is preventing you from asking questions, then let's go. Just a minute sir.

Q: In this world with wars and conflicts, if there is someone, say a madman, loose, and he is killing people, and it is within someone's power to stop him by killing him, what should one do?

K: If there is a madman in the world who is killing others, if you stop him and kill him, doesn't the problem end? That's right sir? That was your question wasn't it? I am just asking you to correct if the question that was repeated is what you asked. That's all.

So let us kill all the Presidents, all the rulers, all the tyrants, all the neighbours, and yourself. (Laughter) No, no, don't laugh. We are part of all this, we have contributed by our own violence the state the world is in. We don't see this clearly. We think by getting rid of a few people, by pushing aside the establishment, as it's called, revolt against the establishment, you are going to solve the whole problem. You know every revolution, physical revolution, has said this, historically, the French, the Russian, the communist and so on and they ended up in bureaucracy, in tyranny. So my friends, to bring about a different way of living, living not for others but for oneself, because the other is oneself, there is no 'we' and 'they', there is only ourselves. If you really see this, not

verbally, not intellectually, but with your heart, then you will see there can be a total action which would have a completely different kind of result, there will be a new social structure, not the throwing out of one establishment and creating another. That means one must have patience to enquire, and young people don't have patience, they want instant result - instant coffee, instant tea, instant meditation - which means they have never understood the whole process of living. If you understand the totality of the living there is an action which is instant, which is quite different from the instant action of impatience. Please do listen to all this, not because the speaker says so, it is so.

Look, sir, you see what is going on in America, the racial riots, the poverty, the ghettos, the black and the white, the utter meaninglessness of education as it is, look at the condition in Europe, the division, and how long it takes to bring about a Federated Europe, each politician driving his own particular little nail, and look at what is happening in India, Asia, in Russia, in China. And when you look at all that and the various divisions of religions, there is only one answer, one action, total action, not a partial action or a fragmentary action, and the total action is not to kill another but to see this division that has brought about this destruction of man. And when you really seriously, sensitively, see that you will have quite a different action.

Q: There are about 15 people here who have no place to sleep and no money, and I wonder whether together we can solve this problem immediately.

K: The gentleman asks: there are about 15 or 20 of us who have no money, no place to sleep. And he asks whether this can't be

solved together. I don't know sir, you had better find out.

Q: Excuse me, it is impossible to do anything together here because everyone makes references to you as the only source of authority.

K: Ah! Look, look. Let me repeat this, something very clearly. Whatever takes place in this tent, we are responsible. What you do outside we are not responsible. There is great difficulty here in this country. You know what Switzerland is, they don't want you to come here without money, they don't like hippies, there is trouble, they have written to us. And whatever happens outside, we are not responsible. And when we said tapes, please kindly refrain from taking your own particular recording, it isn't that we are preventing you, using our authority and all the rest of that nonsense, but people have written and said, 'for goodness sake, everyone putting out a microphone and listening, disturbs us, do stop it' - and that is why we are stopping.

Now with regard to this problem that few of us have no money and are here, no place to sleep, please talk it over and arrange it, it is not dependent on me.

Q: Excuse me, I am not asking the question of you, I am asking it of all of them.

K: Oh!

Q: We have a room for three.

K: Sir, you arrange it afterwards, sir, arranging it afterwards. Meet together and arrange it afterwards.

Yes, sir?

Q: For someone who has been born under total and complete tyranny so that he has total and complete suppression, so that he

has no other opportunity of doing anything himself, and I feel most people here cannot imagine it, we are treated just like animals.

Now he is born in this situation, his parents were born..

K: Yes, sir, I know.

Q: So living under those conditions, and supposing he takes to drugs and so forth and all kinds of things. Now what contribution has such a person...

K: I have got the question, sir. I have got the question. Born in a country, in a race, in a family, where you are completely suppressed, where there is no opportunity, economically, socially or in any other way, to express themselves, completely submerged, what is one to do? Can one bring about a change in the world or within oneself? Is that the question sir?

Q: A little like that but what contribution has such a person - what has he done to create this world?

K: I see. What has such a person done to create this monstrous world? The man - please listen carefully - the man who is born in a race that is completely suppressed by another race, this has happened in all the colonial places, it happens in Russia though they doesn't call it colonial, it happens in China, it happens in India, everywhere this is going on, this suppression. What has such a person who has been suppressed for so long, or a race, what has it done to contribute to this horror? Right?

Probably it has not done anything. What has that poor man living in the wilds of India, or in a small village, or in Africa, or in some happy little valley, not knowing anything that is happening in the rest of the world, what has he done, in what way has he contributed to this monstrous structure? Probably he has not done



anything, poor fellow. What can he do? You know, in India, as well as in other parts of the world, the so-called higher group who are more educated have kept the others down, and there is revolt - you know all this - going on all the time, boiling, boiling, boiling. And one particular race that has been suppressed, naturally give it an opportunity to flower it will probably do exactly what the other races have done, throttle other people. You know, this is the eternal game of history.

You were asking a question up there sir, weren't you?

Q: About seriousness.

K: What does it mean to be serious?

Q: I have the feeling that I am not serious.

K: What does it mean to be serious? I don't know. (Laughter)

What does it mean? Do find out. Let's find out together. What does it mean to be serious? Completely dedicated to something, to some vocation, that you want to go right to the end of it. Right?

Q: Dedication is experience.

K: Wait, sir, wait. Just a minute. I am going to enlarge it. I am going to go into a little bit. Let's go into it. We are going together. Now please I am not defining it and you accept this definition, or that definition, this word or that word - we'll change the definition, we will change the word, we'll change the whole context of it in a few minutes. But let's start.

I want to find out how to live quite a different kind of life. A life in which there is no violence, where there is freedom, complete and absolute and inward freedom, I want to find out, and I am going to spend my time, days, energy, thought, everything to find out. I would call such a person a serious person. He is not put off,

he may amuse himself - you follow - but his course is set, which doesn't mean he is dogmatic, which doesn't mean he is obstinate, which doesn't mean he doesn't adjust. He will listen to others, consider, examine, observe, listen. In his seriousness he may become self-centred and therefore that very self-centredness will prevent him from examination, therefore he has got to listen to others, he has got constantly to examine, question, which means highly sensitive, and to find out how he listens, whether he listens because he feels serious therefore the other is not serious and therefore he will not listen to him, but to listen whether to a person who is serious, not serious, who is flippant, listen. So he is all the time listening and yet pursuing, enquiring and that very act of listening is the enquiry. So a serious person is highly sensitive. You are discovering, not only physically but sensitive brain, sensitive mind, a sensitive heart - they are not four separate things, the totality, the sensitivity of all that.

So I would say, find out if the body is sensitive, aware of the gestures, of its peculiar habits. You can't be sensitive physically if you are stuffing yourself with a lot of food, or become sensitive through starvation or fasting. Sir this requires enormous intelligence and it is only when that intelligence is that you are sensitive, highly sensitive. Therefore one has to find out what you eat, what are the things to eat, and to watch yourself, your peculiar habits of scratching or whatever it is. Then to have a brain that is sensitive, that means a brain that is not functioning in a habit, pursuing its own particular little pleasures, sexual or otherwise. Therefore a mind that is so completely sensitive and therefore free, such a person is a serious person. And I hope you are.

Is that enough? What time is it? Is that enough for this morning?

Q: You have told us not to listen to explanations. What is the difference between your talks and explanations?

K: What is the difference between your talks and explanations? Let me think for a minute. Am I explaining? The question is: what is the difference between your talks and the innumerable explanations that are dished out? What do you think is the difference? Is there any difference?

Q: I think you are seeking the reality.

K: Wait, wait. Go into it sir, examine it. Is there any difference or it's the same verbiage going on repeating, explaining? Is there any difference? What do you think? What do you think? Come on sirs.

Q: Words are words.

K: The gentleman says, words are words. Whether you say it or somebody else says it. Now, wait a minute. We are asking explanations, to explain. You know what I mean, explain; the cause, the effect, the description of the cause, saying many has lived for so long, inherited, brutality from the animal, and so on, explaining, explaining, explaining. And the other points out and in the very pointing out you act, you cease to be violent. Now is there a difference between the two? You think it out sirs, it is not for me. Action is what is demanded. Will action come about through explanations, through words? Total action. Or does this total action come about when you are sensitive enough to observe the total movement of life, the whole of it? Here what are we trying to do? Give explanations of why and the cause of why? Or, are we

together trying to find out, live, so that our life is not based on words but actually on the discovery of 'what is', which is not dependent on words. So there is a vast difference between the two, even though I point it out. It is like a man who is hungry. You can explain to him the nature and the taste of good food, explain it, show him the menu, show him through the window the display of food, but what he wants is food and explanations don't give him food. That is the difference.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1970

There are a lot of people, aren't there? And I suppose you think it is worthwhile to come and listen. So may we continue with what we were talking about the last time we met here. There are several things to talk over, like fear, the desperate loneliness of life, and the boredom, the many gratifications, dependencies and pleasure, the pain and the sorrow, and also we should talk over together love and death, and what is meditation. There are these many things to talk over together, not only in generalities, but go into detail, not only verbally but also, if one can, go beyond the meaning of mere verbal statements and explanations. These are the many things we have to talk over, but before we go into all that, first, it seems to me, one has to very deeply consider what is freedom. Because without freedom, not only outwardly, but specially inwardly, without deeply and seriously understanding it, not verbally or intellectually, but actually feel it, whatever we talk about will have very little meaning unless this is first thoroughly and completely understood.

As we were saying the other day, what is important in all this is the quality of mind that is really serious. We considered what is seriousness, what is the nature of a mind that is completely and utterly serious. Because it is only the serious mind that lives, and enjoys life - not the mind that is seeking entertainment, not the mind that is merely seeking some kind of particular gratification in some form of fulfilment, because actually there is no such thing as fulfilment. So to understand what is freedom, and all these things that are connected with it, and all the things that we are going to

discuss together, talk over, one must obviously understand what it means to be free. You know first of all, freedom implies the total abnegation, the denial, negation of all authority. One has to understand this very, very carefully because the younger generation thinks freedom is to spit on the face of the policeman, to do whatever they want. The denial of outward authority does not necessarily mean the complete freedom from all inward authority, and when we understand the inward authority, and a mind and a heart that is wholly, completely, integrally free from authority, then we'll be able to understand the action of freedom outwardly.

The outward freedom of action depends entirely and wholly on the mind that is free from authority inwardly. And this requires a great deal of patience and enquiry and deliberation, to find out what it means to be free from inward authority. And if you do not mind that is what we are going to discuss this morning, because I feel that it is of primary importance, and then when we discuss various other things which are involved with regard to life, the daily living, then we will approach them with quite a different quality of mind. So if you don't mind we will go together, share together, work together to find out what it means to be free from all inward authority. Is that all right?

The word 'authority' according to the meaning of the dictionary, is the 'one who starts an original idea', 'the author of something', 'the author of an idea, of something entirely new'. Then he sets a pattern, a mode, a system, or an ideal, an ideation, and the rest seek, finding some gratification in it, or in them, follow it. So there is that way authority set out. First, the original human being who has discovered something new, something original, perhaps he puts

it into words, or into a picture, or a poem, or a religious life. That becomes the pattern, the mould, the system which others follow, whether it be Lenin, Mao, or others politically and economically, or religiously, then the rest blindly, or cleverly, intellectually follow. Please if I may suggest, do observe this in your own life, because that is what we are doing - you are not merely listening to a series of talks, or discussions, or explanations of certain facts, but you are actually by listening to the speaker listening to yourself, observing yourself. Otherwise what is said has no value whatsoever. Right? So there are pattern of ways of life, conduct, politically or psychologically. Outwardly, or inwardly, and the easiest thing for the mind, which is generally very lazy, indolent, is to follow what somebody else has said. The follower then accepting authority as a means to what he wants to achieve, or what is promised through that particular system of philosophy or ideation, or a particular system of thought, follows it, clings to it, depends on it, and thereby makes it into authority. Right? You are merely a follower then, a secondhand human being, and most people are completely secondhand. They may think they have some original ideal with regard to painting, writing poems, but essentially because they are conditioned to follow, to imitate, to conform, they become secondhand, absurd human beings. That's one quality of the destructive nature of authority.

Now do we listening - do we belong to that kind of category. Do you? Don't answer me please. Find out. Following somebody, or some belief, or some instruction according to some book or to a person who promises a reward, an enlightenment, a thing to be achieved at the end, through a particular means - and the means

and the giver of that means become the authority. As human beings do we do this? Do you do this? Follow somebody, psychologically? We are talking not of the outward following, the outward obedience, of following a law, denying a law and so on, we are not discussing that, - but inwardly, psychologically do you as a human being follow? If you do then you are essentially a secondhand, worthless human being. You may do good works, you may have a very good life, you may have a lovely house and all the rest of it, but it has very little meaning. Then there is another kind of authority, the authority of tradition. The meaning of that word 'tradition', means to hand over from the past to the present. The Christian tradition, the Catholic tradition, the family tradition, the racial tradition, and the tradition also implies not only that which had been handed down but also the tradition of memory. You understand - this becomes much more difficult. I hope we are going along together in this - are we? Yes?

Because if you follow tradition one can see at certain levels it has value, and at other levels it has no value at all. Good manners, politeness, consideration, thoughtfulness, the alertness of the mind that is watching, which can gradually become a tradition, and the pattern having been set the mind then just repeats it, gets up, opens the door, is punctual for meals, polite and all the rest of it. But it has become a tradition, it is not born out of consideration, alertness, sharpness and clearness.

Then there is the tradition of a mind which has cultivated memory, the functions like a computer, every action, repeating, over and over again, so that it can never receive anything new, it can never listen to anything totally different. As we said the other



day, our brains are like tape recorders, certain memories have been cultivated through centuries and we repeat that, over and over and over again. Through the noise of that repetition, we try to listen to something new. And therefore we don't listen at all. Then we say, what am I to do? How am I to get rid of the old machinery, the old tape and listen to the new tape? The new thing can be heard only when the old tape is silent. And the old tape becomes completely silent without any effort if you are serious to listen, to find out, to give your attention.

So then there is the authority of another, and the dependence on another; there is the authority of tradition, there is the authority of the past as memory, as experience, as knowledge. And there is the authority of an experience which is the immediate. Are you following all this? You have had an experience, and that becomes the authority. And that experience is based on your past, accumulated knowledge - otherwise if you don't recognise it as experience, as something new, it is not an experience. Are you following all this? Am I talking too much and too fast? You are following all this, which is following yourself, not me, not the speaker. Right? So there are these various categories of authority. And how can a mind, a brain which is so conditioned by authority, imitation, conformity, adjustment - how can such a mind and heart listen to anything completely new? How can it listen to the beauty of a day? - when the mind, and the heart and the brain are clouded by the past as the authority. So if you see that, not verbally, not intellectually but actually perceive the fact, the actual what is, - that is, a mind that is burdened by the past, conditioned by various forms of authority is not free and therefore cannot see completely,

if you actually see that then the past is set aside without effort.

Right?

So freedom implies the complete cessation of all authority inwardly. And from that quality of mind that is free, an outward freedom comes, takes place which is entirely different from the reaction of an opposing, or resisting factor. Are you following all this? Are you also working as hard as the speaker? Or are you merely just hearing! What we are saying is really quite simple and it is because of its very simplicity that you will miss it. Our minds, our brains are conditioned through the authority, through imitation and conformity - that is a fact. And therefore freedom cannot exist to such a mind. It can talk endlessly about freedom, and revolt against certain outward forms of restrictions, but is not a free mind. The mind that is actually free has no inward authority whatsoever, and we have explained very carefully what authority means. Have you, as a human being, any form of authority on which you depend. And if you do, you cannot have freedom. And it is only the free mind that knows what it means to love and meditate.

So in understanding freedom, one has to understand also what is discipline. This may be rather contrary to all that you think, because we generally think freedom means freedom from all discipline. So let us find out what it means, find out together - I am not laying down, I am not telling what you should do, or should not do. We are trying to find out - not trying - we are finding out what it means to discipline. What is the quality of mind that is highly disciplined. Because freedom cannot exist without discipline. Which doesn't mean that you must first be disciplined, and then you will have freedom. But freedom and discipline go together,

they are not two separate things. So what does discipline mean. According to the dictionary - I'm sorry to talk about dictionary and the meaning of the word so much, I have recently looked it up, at least not this morning - the Latin - the meaning of that word means to learn. Not the mind that confirms, not the mind that has been drilling itself into a certain pattern of action, please see this. Not the mind that confirms to a goal, according to an ideology, according to a belief, according to Marx, Engels, or Stalin, Lenin, Mao, this or that! A mind that is capable of learning, which is entirely different from a mind which is capable of conforming. A mind that confirms cannot possibly learn. It is only a mind that is learning, that is observing, that sees actually what is, and not interpret 'what is' according to its own desires, its own conditioning, its own particular pleasure. You understand?

Discipline means not suppression, not control - please listen to all this - not conformity, not control, not suppression, nor adjustment to a pattern or an ideology, but a mind that sees 'what is', and learns from 'what is'. Such a mind has to be extraordinarily alert, aware. So that's what it means to have discipline. You understand - in the ordinary sense of that work, to discipline oneself, implies there is the entity that is disciplining itself according to something. So there is a dualistic process. You are following this? I say to myself, I must get up early in the morning because I am lazy, or I must not be angry, or I should do this or that. In that there is a dualistic process involved, there is the observer and the thing observed. Right? There is the one who with his will controls what he should do, or denies what he should not do. Right? In that dualistic state there is conflict, isn't there? Right? So discipline as it is accepted is

a process of constant conflict. Right? The discipline laid down by the parents, but society, by religious organizations, by the church, by what the Buddha, the Jesus, and so on have said. (Band music in background - laughter.) There is a discipline there! For us discipline means conformity, and there is a revolt against conformity, the parents wanting you to do certain things, and you revolting against it, and so on and on and on. Now our life is based on obedience, conformity the opposite of it, to deny conformity, to do what one likes. A revolt against the pattern, and this is what is going on throughout the world.

So we are going to find out what is the quality of the mind that doesn't conform, doesn't imitate, doesn't follow, doesn't obey but has a quality in itself which is highly disciplined - discipline in the sense, a quality that is constantly learning, a quality of mind that is learning, not conforming. Conformity implies comparison, doesn't it? Comparing myself with another, comparing means measuring, measuring myself, what I am, or what I should be according to somebody else, the hero, the saint, the Mao, the Lenin, the Marx - or if you don't like them, Jesus, you know, the other side.

So where there is conformity there must be comparison. Please see this. And to find out whether you can live, not verbally but actually live daily without comparison, which means not conforming. You know you do compare yourselves, don't you? That is our conditioning from childhood - 'Oh, you must be like your brother', or your great aunt; you must be like the saint, or follow Mao, he's the latest, what he says. So we are always comparing, our education is that in schools, which means all this giving marks and passing examinations. Oh, you don't know what

it means to live without comparison, therefore without competition, and therefore non-aggressively, non-competitively, non-violently. The moment you compare yourself with another it is a form of aggression and therefore it is a form of violence. Violence isn't merely going and killing or hitting somebody, it is this comparative spirit - I must be like somebody else, or I must perfect myself; self-improvement is the antithesis of freedom and learning. Are you listening, are you doing all this? So can you find out for yourself, to live a life without comparing and you will see what an extraordinary thing happens to you if you really become aware, choicelessly, what it means to live without comparison, never using the word 'better', never using the word 'I will be'. Do listen to all this because we are slaves to the word 'to be', 'esse', which is I will be somebody sometime in the future.

So comparison, conformity, go together and that does only breeds a suppression, conflict and endless pain. To find a way of living - not a way - a daily living in which there is no comparison. Do it sometime and you will see what an extraordinary thing it is. It frees you from so many burdens. And to be aware of that, that very awareness brings about that quality of mind that is highly sensitive and therefore highly disciplined, because it is constantly learning, not what it wants to learn, or what is pleasurable to learn, what is gratifying to learn, but learning.

So can you become aware of the authority, the following, the obedience, the conformity to a pattern, to tradition, to propaganda, to what other people have said - it doesn't matter who it is - and the tradition, the accumulated experience of your own or of another, of the race or of the family. All that becomes the authority. And

where there is authority the mind can never be free to discover whatever there is to be discovered, something entirely timelessly new.

Then, the nature of a mind that is sensitive; a mind that is sensitive has no pattern, it is constantly moving, it is like a river, flowing, and that flow there is no suppression, no conformity, no desire to fulfil and all that rubbish. It is only the mind that is static that says, 'I must fulfil', 'I must become'. Right? Now if this is not clearly, deeply and seriously understood, the nature of a mind that is free and therefore truly religious, freedom from all dependency inwardly, because dependency on something, on a people, on a friend, or on a husband, wife or on some ideation, authority and so on, breeds fear, which we will discuss presently. But it is very important to understand this before we go into all the complicated things of life; that a mind must be completely free from all authority, inwardly, because there is the source of fear. If I depend on you for my comfort, if I depend upon you because you applaud me when I speak, if I depend on you as an escape from my own loneliness, ugliness, stupidity, my own shallowness, pettiness, shoddiness, then depending on you breeds fear, depending on any form of subjective imagination, fantasy, experience, knowledge, does destroy freedom.

Now, after saying all that, I want to find out, don't you, if ones does depend. Because a mind that depends on something is not alone, clean healthy, sane. If the mind depends on Mao on one side, Mao, Lenin and all the people you know on that side, if you depend on them, what kind of mind is yours? Only you have thrown away the old and taken on the new, but the quality of the

mind is the same. And on the other side, the opposite unfortunately, is all the religious leaders, from the infinite past to the present, and if you depend on them, look what you are doing to yourself, you are depending on somebody else's authority on what they think is true. And what they think is the truth is not the truth. So you are lost, you are confused. And so out of that confusion we do a great many things, we join this or that, we become activists or meditative, run away to Japan to sit in some Zen school, or India, or this or that.

So when you are aware of all this, please do it, when you are aware of all this, both the left and the right, and the centre, when you are aware of it you are learning, you see what it all implies, a dependency inwardly and therefore there is no freedom, therefore there is fear. And it is only a confused mind that depends, not a clear mind. So being confused you say, 'I must depend', and then you say, 'How am I to be free from dependency?' - which becomes another conflict. Whereas if you observed that a mind that depends must be confused, if you know the truth of that, a mind that depends inwardly on any authority, whether the authority is the word, a symbol, and ideology, a person, when you realize dependency creates confusion, not how to be free of confusion, when you see that very clearly, the truth of that, then you will cease to depend. So your mind becomes extraordinarily sensitive and therefore capable of learning. It is like a child that learns, he is very curious, he wants to find out. And that very sensitivity is the quality of a mind that is constantly learning, therefore disciplining itself without any form of compulsion, conformity. Right!

Is this all somewhat clear? Clarity means not verbally but

actually. I can imagine, or think I am very clear. I see very clearly but that clarity is very short living, that quality of clarity, clear perception, comes only when there is no dependency, and therefore there is no confusion, and confusion arises only when there is fear. Can you honestly, seriously, say to yourself, find out whether you are free from authority? That needs tremendous enquiry into yourself, great awareness - doesn't it? And from that clarity there is a totally different kind of action; action that is not fragmentary, that is not divided into political, religious, left or right or centre, Mao or whatever it is. It is a total action.

Well sirs, would you like to ask questions and discuss what we have talked about this morning?

Q: From what you said, it seems to me the same action at one point which can be thought a reaction to some kind of an outward authority; at another point or at the same time by another individual, that same action can be a total action.

K: Quite right sir. Look, sir, intellectually we can spin along, verbally we can beat each other, or explain each other, either way, but that doesn't mean a thing. What to you may be a complete action may appear to me as incomplete action. That is not the point. The point is whether your mind, as a human being, because a human being is the world - you understand? - is not an individual - again that word 'individual', do you know what it means?

'Individual' means indivisible. An individual is one who is undivided in himself, who is non-fragmentary, not broken up, he is whole - 'whole' means sanity, healthy and also 'whole' means holy, H O I Y. You are not that. When you talk about 'I am an individual', you are nothing of the kind.



So to live a life, sir, of no authority, of no comparison, do it and you will find out what an extraordinary thing it is. You are alive, you have tremendous energy, when you are not competing, not comparing, you are not suppressing, you are living and therefore you are sane, whole, and therefore sacred.

Yes sir?

Q: What you are saying is not very clear to me all the time. What can I do?

K: What you say is not very clear all the time. What can I do? I don't know. (Laughter) No, no, don't laugh. Either what is said is not very clear in itself, or you may not understand English properly, or you are not sustaining attention all the time. You know it is very difficult to sustain attention for an hour and ten minutes, sustained, not pick it up occasionally. There are those moments when you are not giving complete attention and then you say, 'By Jove, I haven't quite understood what you are talking about'. Or you don't know English properly. Or what is being said by the speaker is not clear. Now which is it? If you say what you are saying is not clear, we will go over it, we'll explain it ten different ways to make it clear - the speaker can do that. And on your side find out whether you are sustaining attention, maintaining attention all the time, watching, listening; or you go off wandering, you know, vagabonding. Which is it?

Q: Do you think it is possible to learn all the time?

K: Do you think it is possible to learn all the time? You understand the question? Do you understand the question? I want to learn, is it possible to learn all the time? Now when you ask that question you have already made it difficult for yourself. Right? So

can I learn all the time - it is impossible. You see by putting a question of that kind you are preventing yourself from learning - right sir, you see the point? Look, you have not understood. Look sir, I am not concerned whether I am going to learn all the time, Ill find out. What I am concerned with, is am I learning? Right? If I am learning I am not concerned with if it is all the time. I don't know if you see this. Then I don't make a problem of it. Then you say, 'My god how am I to give my whole attention all the time?' It is impossible. But if you say, 'Look, I am learning, I am not going to be concerned with whether I am going to learn all the time, all day and all night, but I am learning'. A mind that is learning never puts that question. I don't know if you see this? Then that question becomes irrelevant. If I am learning, I am learning all the time. You don't see it.

Q: You can learn from anything.

K: You can learn from anything. That is, if you are aware you are learning. Look sir, this is very complex, may I go into it a little bit? If you aren't tired, are you?

Can I learn all the time? - which is important here, learning, or all the time? Which is important do you think? Learning. Now, when I am learning I am not concerned with the rest of the time, the time interval, time period. Right? I am only concerned with what I am learning, what I am learning. Right? Now mind goes off, naturally, it gets tired, then it becomes inattentive. Right? Are you following all this? Being inattentive it does all kinds of stupid things. So it is not a question of how to make the mind which is inattentive, to make it become attentive. What is important is for the inattentive mind to become aware that it is inattentive. Have

you got it? You don't see it. You understand sir? Look, I am aware, watching everything, watching the movement of the tree, the water, the flow of a mountain, watching myself, watching not correcting, not saying this should be or this should not be, just watching.

Naturally the mind that is watching gets tired. When it gets tired it is inattentive, being inattentive it suddenly becomes aware that it is inattentive, therefore it tries to force itself to become attentive.

Right? Are you following all this? So there is a conflict between inattention and attention. Right? Right? I say, don't do that, but become aware that you are inattentive - that's all. You understand? No.

Q: Could you describe it, when you are aware that you are inattentive?

K: Sir, no, no, no. I am learning. Look, I am learning about myself. Right? I am learning not according to some psychologist or specialist, I am learning, I am watching, and I see something in myself, I don't condemn it, I don't judge it, I don't push it aside, I just watch it. I watch that I am proud - let's take that as an example. I don't say, 'I must put it aside, how ugly to be proud', but I just watch it. As I am watching I am learning. Watching means learning what pride involves, how it has come into being, how stupid it is, I watch it. I can't watch it more than say five or six minutes - if you can, that is a great deal - the next moment it becomes inattentive. Right? Now having been attentive and then knowing what inattention is you struggle to make inattention attentive. Right? Don't you? Don't you do all these things? I said don't do that but watch inattention, become aware that you are inattentive. That's all. Stop there. Don't say you must spend all you

time being attentive, but just watch when you are inattentive. Full stop. I don't want to go any further into this because it is really quite complex. Because there is a quality of mind that is all the time awake, all the time watching, and therefore merely watching there is nothing to learn. And that means sir a mind that is extraordinarily quiet. Extraordinarily silent. What has a silent clear mind to learn? I won't go into all that. Yes sir?

Q: Communicating through words, through ideas, couldn't that sometimes become a habit and add to confusion?

K: Couldn't communicating with words, ideas become a habit?

Q: A tradition?

K: A tradition, a repetition. They only become a habit, a tradition, only when words become terribly important. You know there is communion and communication. There must be communication verbally which is to share together whatever we are looking at together, like fear, there must be verbal communication, which means you and the speaker are both at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity observing, co-operating, sharing. That brings about a non-verbal communion, which is not habit. Is that good enough?

Q: How is it possible if you are a total individual to love another individual?

K: How is it possible if you are a total, whole, sane individual, not divided, fragmented, indivisible, how can such a whole human being love another? The other human being is fragmented, is broken up, how can a whole human being love a fragmented human being? Right sir?

Q: How can a whole individual love also a whole individual?

K: How can two whole human beings love each other?

(Laughter). You cannot be whole if you don't know what love is.

Then if you are whole, in the sense we are talking about, undivided in himself, then there is no question of loving another. Sir, have you ever watched a flower by the roadside? It exists, it lives there, it is in the sun, in the wind, in the beauty of light and colour, it doesn't say to you, 'Come and smell me, enjoy me, look at me' - it lives and its very action of living is love.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 21ST JULY 1970

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the other day when we met here? As we were saying it is really quite important to understand this whole business of living. From the moment we are born till we die, we are always in conflict, there is always a struggle, a battle, not only within ourselves, but outwardly, in all our relationships there is strain, there is a strife, there is constant division and a sense of separate individual existence in opposition to the community, in opposition to the most intimate relationships, each one is seeking his own pleasure, secretly or openly pursuing his own ambitions, fulfilment and thereby frustrations, this whole turmoil of what we call existence, living. In this turmoil we try to be creative, if you are gifted you write a book or a poem, compose a picture and so on. All within the pattern of strife, grief and despair, and this is what is considered creative living, going to the moon, if you must, or live under the sea, have wars, this constant bitter strife against man and man, this is what our life is.

It seems to me that we should understand very deeply this question of strife, this struggle, this contradiction, this conflict. I hope you are serious this morning, even though it is bad weather. We want to go into this matter very, very seriously, very deeply if we can, and feel our way into a quality of mind where there is no strife whatsoever, both at the conscious level and also below in the layers that lie under the conscious. After all beauty is not the result of conflict. When you see the beauty of a mountain, or the beauty of a face and the swift running water in that close immediate perception of great beauty, there is never a sense of striving. And

our lives are not very beautiful because it's a battle going and coming, and to find out this quality of mind that is essentially beautiful, clear, a mind that has never been touched by strife, seems to me is very important, because in the understanding of that, not verbally, not merely intellectually, but actually live it in our daily life, then perhaps we shall have some kind of peace in the world, and also within ourselves.

So if we could this morning hesitantly and with sensitive watchfulness, perhaps we shall be able to understand this battle and be free of it. What is the root cause of this conflict and contradiction? Please do ask this question of yourself? Don't try to put it into words, give it an explanation, but merely enquire non-verbally, if you can, what is this basis of this contradiction, this division, this strife, this conflict. Either you enquire analytically or you perceive immediately the root of it. Either analytically you unravel bit by bit and come upon the nature and the structure and the cause, and therefore the effect, of this strife between ourselves, between you and the state, between you and the community, between us and they. Either you analytically examine or you perceive the cause of it instantly. I don't know how you are going to discover the cause of it. Now we are going to examine both, the analytical process and the immediate perception. Right? Are we communicating with each other? Yes, may we go on? That is, we want to find out, not only verbally, but factually the root, the basis, the cause of all this contradiction, this conflict, this division. That is what we are going to enquire into. And either that enquiry is intellectual, which is analytical, or perceive the truth of it instantly. (I am glad that train is going by.)

Now let us find out what it means to analyse and thereby perhaps intellectually discover, which is verbally, what is the cause of this conflict? Because once you understand this whole analytical process and see the truth of it or the falseness of it, then you will completely be free of it, for ever, so that your eyes, your mind and your hearth can perceive immediately the truth of it. I don't know if you are following all this? Now, can I go on? We are used to being conditioned to the analytical process, not only in the recent philosophical, psychological research of various specialists and psychologists. The analytical process has become a habit and we are conditioned to live and try to understand this whole complex process of living analytically, intellectually, which doesn't mean we must become its opposite, sentimentally, emotionally, gushing and all the rest of it. But if one understands very clearly the nature and the structure of the analytical process and see the validity or the falseness of it, then we shall have quite a different outlook. Then we shall be able to give the energy which we have given to the analysis, that same energy can be directed in a totally different direction. Right? Are we meeting each other? Can we go on? I really don't know.

What does analysis mean? In that very verbal statement analysis implies a division. Right? There is the analyser and the thing to be analysed, whether you analyse it yourself or if it is done by a profession. In that very structure of analysis there is division, and therefore there is already the beginning of conflict. Please, you really must put your teeth into this? Because we can do tremendous things only when there is great passion. The inward revolution doesn't come about through analysis, the inward revolution



demands great passion, great energy, and it is only this passion that can create, bring about a totally different kind of life, in ourselves and in the world, and that is why it is very important to understand this analysis in which the human mind for centuries has been caught. Analysis implies a division between the analyser and the analysed, and in that division there is already the root of conflict. The thing that is to be analysed, which is a fragment of the many other fragments of which we are, one of those fragments assumes the authority of analysis, as the analyser. Right? Please will you do this as we go along? Not just merely listen. As we are explaining, please do it, see what is involved in analysis? As we are explaining, please do it, see what is involved in analysis? As we said, analysis implies division between the analyser and analysed. The analyser is one of the fragments of the many fragments which make up the whole structure of a human being. That analyser, who is a fragment of the many fragments, assumes the authority to analyse. He becomes the censor, he becomes the accumulated knowledge with which he evaluates the good and the bad, what is right and what is wrong, what should be suppressed or what should not be suppressed, and so on, he has assumed the authority of the censor. Right? Are we in touch with each other?

And the second thing is the analyser, when he analyses every analysis must be totally complete, otherwise his evaluation will be partial and therefore his conclusion will also be partial. Right? Then the analyser must examine every thought, every thing which he thinks should be analysed, and that will take time. Right? You may spend, as they do, a whole lifetime analysing, if you have the money, if you have the inclination, if you can find an analyst with

whom you are in love and all the rest of it. you can spend you days analysing. At the end of it you are where you were, more things to be analysed. So, in analysis there is the division between the analyser and the analysed. The analyser must analyse so accurately, so completely, otherwise his conclusion will impede the next analysis. Right? And the analytical process takes an infinite time, and during the interval of that time many other things happen. so, when you see the whole structure of analysis then you see it is an actual denial, negation of action. Analysis, the whole nature of analysing is the negation of action. Is there anybody here who is going to object to all this? Probably you will when we question.

Now when you see the whole structure of this analytical process, see what is involved in it, there is the negation of all action, complete action, isn't there? Are you doubting that?

Q: I don't understand what you mean by action?

K: Oh my Lord! All right sir, what does action mean? Action according to an idea, action according to an ideology, action according to one's experience, or knowledge. So there is a division between action and idea, action and ideology, action and knowledge, so action is always approximating itself to the ideal, to the prototype. You are following all this? So action is never complete. And analysis is the negation of action, total action. So if you see the truth or the falseness of this whole process of analysis you will never again analyse. Right? When the mind has seen the futility, the meaninglessness of analysis with all its problems involved, then you will never touch it, the mind will never seek to understand true analysis. Right? That is obvious isn't it? Oh Lord!

Just a minute sir, let me go on, you can ask questions afterwards. So what has happened to the mind that has looked into the process of analysis? It has become very sharp, hasn't it, alive, sensitive, because it has rejected that which we have considered as the way and means of understanding anything? Right?

You know what communication means, sharing together, investigating together - together, moving together, creating together. And are we doing that? Or, are you merely listening, hearing a few set of words, conclusions and agreeing or disagreeing? Which is it, that you are doing? If you very clearly see for yourself, not direct it, not forced, or compelled by argument, reason of another, but actually see for yourself the falseness or the truth of analysis, then your mind is free to look in another direction. Right? You have energy to look somewhere else. But if you are looking in the direction of analysis you will not be able to look in another direction - is that clear?

So what is the other direction? That is to perceive immediately and therefore the immediacy of perception is total action. Now we are going to examine that, we are going to go into that. As we said, analyser and the thing analysed, in that there is division. Right? And we said that any form of division at any level brings about a contradiction and therefore conflict. When I separate myself as a Hindu and you separate yourself as a Catholic, or a Buddhist or a Communist, or whatever it is, this very division breeds conflict. Right? So the division between the observer and thing observed is the root cause of conflict - right? No, sirs, come on. Let's go into it.

When you observe you are always observing from a centre, from a background, from experience, from knowledge. The 'me'

observing, the 'me', the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Communist, the educated, the specialist and so on, he is observing. So there is a division between himself and the thing observed. Right? You can see this, it doesn't require a great deal of understanding, it is an obvious fact. When you look at a tree there is this division, when you look at your husband, wife, your girl friend, boy friend, there is this division. There is this division between yourself and the community, between yourself and the society. So there is this observer and the thing observed. When there is that division there will inevitably be conflict. Right? That is the root of all conflict, of all strife, of all contradiction. Right?

Now, can you observe without division? If that is the root cause of conflict, then the next question is: can you observe without the censor, without the 'me', without all the experiences, the miseries, the conflicts, the brutalities, the vanities, the pride, the despair, which is the you, can you observe without all that? Are you following all this? Which means, can you observe without the past? The past memories, remembrances, conclusions, hopes, all the background, can you observe without that background, because that background divides - right? - as the observer and the observed. So the question then is: can you observe without the background? Have you ever done it? Do it now please. Play with it. To look at the tree, the mountain, outwardly, objectively, the outward things, the colours, listen to the noise of the river, look at the lines of the mountains, the beauty of it, the clarity of it. That is fairly easy to do without the past, without the 'me' observing. But can you look at yourself inwardly, without the observer? Do it please. Look at yourself, your conditioning, your education, your way of thinking,

your conclusions, your prejudices, to look at it, or to look at them without any kind of condemnation or explanation or justification, just to observe. When you so observe there is no observer and therefore no conflict.

That way of living is entirely, totally, different from the other. It is not the opposite of the other. It is not the reaction of the other, but entirely different. And in this there is tremendous freedom, and therefore there is an abundance of energy and passion. And this total observation, which is not partial, is complete action. You know it is like looking at a map, the total map, not where you want to go, but first observing the total movement of the map. And when you have completely understood the map, looked at it completely, then your action will always be clear.

So one finds out for oneself as a human being that it is completely possible to live without any kind of conflict. You know, sir, this implies an enormous revolution in oneself. And that is the only revolution. Every form of physical revolution, political, economic, social, outward revolution, always ends up on dictatorship, either the dictatorship of the bureaucrats or the dictatorships of the idealists, the Utopian people, or some conqueror. Whereas when you have this inward, complete, total revolution, which is the outcome of understanding all conflict, which is the understanding of division between the observer and the observed, then there is a totally different kind of living.

Now please let us go into it further, if you will, by asking questions about it.

Q: How can you divorce yourself from problems when you live in a world full of problems?

K: Wait, wait, How can you divorce yourself from the world which is full of conflict, how can you separate yourself from the world which is full of conflict? Is that it?

Q: Yes.

K: Let's find out. Are you different from the world? You are the world aren't you?

Q: I am a person who lives in the world.

K: I don't understand, sir.

Q: I am just a person who lives in the world.

K: Oh, just a person who lives in the world, disassociated, unrelated to all the events that are taking place in the world?

Q: No, I am part of that. The thing is how can I divorce myself from it?

K: You cannot. You cannot possibly divorce yourself from the world, you are the world. If you live in Christendom, you are conditioned by the culture, by the religion, by the education, by the industrialization, by all the conflicts of wars - you are that. You cannot possibly separate yourself from the world. They have tried to, withdraw from the world, the monks, enclose themselves in a monastery, but they are the result of the culture in which they live, and they want to escape from that culture by withdrawing from it, by devoting themselves to what they consider the truth, to the ideal of Jesus and so on and so on. How can you separate yourself from the world when you are the world, you have made the world?

Q: How can I observe these things with all these worries on my mind, because I've got other things on my mind, getting my house, making money on my mind - how can I look into myself. I have to do other things and how can I look into myself?

K: Sir, sir, look, you are talking with your head down. I can't possibly hear what you are saying, would you make it brief?

Q: How can I look into myself with all these worried on my mind, with making money, with other things on my mind?

K: How can i look into myself when I have to make money, when I have to have a house, when I have to have this and that. Is that it? How can I, living in this world, living in this world implies earning a livelihood, getting a house, a flat or living some place, married, children, job, all that - how can I with all that going on round me and in me look at myself? Is that right? Is that the question sir?

Q: Yes.

K: How do you look at your job, getting a job, how do you consider it?

Q: I consider it as a means to survive in the world.

K: Survival in the world. So you say at any price I must survive. Right?

Q: Not that. But I must have a job.

K: Wait sir, wait. I must have a job in order to survive. I must have a livelihood in order to survive. And the whole structure of society, whether here, or in Russia, etc., is based on this - survival at any price, doing something which society has set up. Right? Right, sir?

Q: Yes

K: So you are concerned with survival, and all of us are. Now how can one survive completely, safely, lastingly, when there is division between ourselves? When you are European and I am an Asiatic, when you are German - you understand - when there is

division between ourselves, each one competing to be secure, to survive and therefore battling with each other, not only individually but collectively, nationally, how can there be survival? There is a survival temporarily. Right? Oh, for god's sake, come on!

So our question is, not survival, but whether it is possible to live in this world without division, when there is no division we shall survive completely, without fear.. Sir, look! There have been religious wars. Right? The Catholic against the Protestant. And at that time, and there have been appalling wars between the two, they were saying 'We must survive'. They never said to themselves, 'Look, how absurd this division is between the Catholic and the Protestant' - which is a matter of conditioning, you believe this and I believe that. So if we could put our whole energy, our thinking, our feeling, our passion into finding out whether it is possible to live without this division, then we shall live completely, in complete security. But you are not interested in all that. You just want to survive. You don't - your survival is in spite of non-survival. Oh, sirs, this is so simple! Look, sir. Governments, sovereign governments are separate, each with its own army, navy, airforce, they have divided the world this way, and each at each other's throat, prestige and all the rest of it - economic survival.

Now computers, without the politicians, in the hands of good men, can alter this whole structure of the world, without the politicians, without the divisions. But we are not interested in all that. You are really not interested in the unity of mankind. And that's the only problem politically. And that can only be brought about when there is no politician at all, when there are no



sovereign governments at all, when there are no different, separate religious sects and you, who are listening to this, you are the people to do it.

Q: Does it not need conscious analysis to arrive at that conclusion?

K: Wait. Is it a conclusion? Is it an analysis? You have just observed this fact. You have just observed. Look at it, how the world is divided into coloured men, into sovereign governments, Hinduism, Buddhism, Catholics, communists - this division - is that analysis? You can see it.

Q: Don't you think that in order to change all that we also need an outward revolution?

K: Don't you see - or don't you realize to change all that, there must not only be inward revolution but also outward revolution. What do you say sirs?

Q: No.

K: Please, don't say no.

Q: Aren't they the same thing?

K: Wait, wait. Listen to the question. Inward revolution and at the same time outward revolution. At the same time. Not one first and then the other. That is inward revolution first and outward revolution afterwards; or outward revolution first and the inward revolution. Right? It must be simultaneous. It must be instant. Right? How can that take place? Both inward revolution and outward revolution, without emphasizing this or that, how can that take place? That can only take place instantly when you, who are listening, see the complete truth that the inward revolution is the outward revolution. That inward revolution is the outer, and the

outer is the result of the inner. They are not two separate. When you see that then it takes place and so - wait a minute sir - so do you see that? - Not see intellectually, verbally, ideally, but is there, in you, complete inward revolution? If there is not and you want outer revolution then you are going to bring chaos in the world, and there is chaos in the world. Yes sir, just a minute.

Q: You always speak of governments or churches and nationalism and all these people have what we consider as the power.

K: Sir, power. The politician wants power, the priest wants power, the commissar wants power.

Q: They have it.

K: The bureaucrats want power and they have it. And in their power lies education. Wait, sir, listen to all this. And each one of us wants power. Right? Don't you want power? Over your wife or your husband, your conclusion, you think this is right and you want - do you follow? - every human being wants some kind of power. So first don't attack the power that is invested in others but be free of the power in yourself and then you will act totally different. I know we want to attack the power outwardly, the outward power, tear that power away from the hands of those who have it and give it to somebody else. We don't say to ourselves, let us be free of all idea, feeling of dominance, possession - you follow? - you don't say that. If you did actually apply your whole mind to be free of every kind of power, which means position, prestige, function without status, then you will bring about quite a different society.

Yes sir?

Q: If you are hungry you can't even begin to deal with these

questions.

K: If you are hungry you cannot possibly deal with any of these questions.

Q: Because survival depends on....

K: I understand sir, we have been through that. If you are hungry you can't deal with these questions. If you are really hungry you wouldn't be here. (Laughter)

Q: We are very small...

K: Wait. Now wait a minute. We are not hungry and therefore we have time to listen, time to observe and you say we are a small group of people, what can we do, a small - like a drop in the bucket. Right? What can we do? Is that the right question? Is that the valid question when you are confronted with this enormous complex problem of the world in which we live. What can I, as a human being, one individual, one - you know - who have understood, what can I do? Is that the right question? Will you ever put that question if you are really confronted with the problem, the world and you, you are living entirely differently, would you put that question? Then you will not be concerned, you will be just working. You understand sir? It is only when you say: what can I do? There is already a note of despair in that.

Q: Not really, we are talking about solutions. Solutions, there are a lot of people hungry and if they are hungry they have got to take immediate means to survive.

K: Right. So a lot of people who are hungry, they have got to take immediate means to survive.

Q: What does all this mean to them?

K: What does it all mean to them? To them who are hungry.

Nothing. When I am hungry sir, I want food. Right? All this has very little meaning. Right? So what is your question?

Q: My question is: we are a minority here, a favoured minority.

K: Yes sir. We are the minority. A small group and the vast majority in India, in Asia, in every part of Europe, England, America, are really hungry. How can we, or what we are saying here, affect all these people. Right? It depends on you. No?

Q: That's right.

K: It depends on you, what you do. Even the small minority, a small minority have created an enormous revolution in the world because the minority in themselves have changed. You are concerned with the world and the misery of the world, the poverty, the degradation, the starvation that is going on in the world, and you say, what can I do? Either you will thoughtlessly join an outward revolution, try to break it all up and create a new kind of social structure and in the process of that you will again establish the same pattern in a different way, whereas what we are saying is, consider total revolution, total, not partial, not physical, a total revolution which is both the inward structure of the psyche, and which will act entirely different in relationship on which society is based. Right?

Q: You speak as though inward revolution happens suddenly, and it doesn't really take place that way at all?

K: You speak as though inward revolution happens suddenly, like instant coffee, and it doesn't really take place that way at all. That's the question. Do you think the inward revolution is a matter of time? Gradually change inwardly. Please sir, be careful, this is a very complex question. We have accepted and it is our

conditioning that through gradual revolution, inwardly there will be a change. And we are going to examine, does revolution inwardly take place gradually, step by step, which is analytical. You understand? Or does it take place instantly when you see the truth of this? So when you see a danger, instant danger, there is instant action isn't there? You don't say, is my action gradual, revolutionary, analytical, this or that, there is immediate action when there is danger. Now, we are pointing out all the dangers, the danger of analysis, the danger of time, the danger of postponement, the danger of division. Now when you see the real danger of it, not verbally, actually, physically, psychologically, see the danger of it as you would see the danger of meeting a wild animal, there is instant action, and we are talking about that instant revolution, when you see danger, and to see that danger you need a sensitive, alert, watchful mind. Then you will say, how am I to have a watchful mind, a sensitive mind, again you will be caught in the gradualness of it. But when you say, it is a necessity in front of danger, and society is danger, you are danger, all the things involved in you is dangerous. When you realize that, there is a total action.

Q: How can you solve any complex problems without analysis, I mean for instance, research in cancer?

K: Now wait sir, look. How can you solve any physical problem like cancer without analysis - you can't. They are spending millions and millions all over the world trying to find out what is the cause of cancer, and trying to find a means to stop it. Right? That needs time, examination, analysis, all kinds of brutalities towards animals and so on. Is that what we are talking about? We are talking about

a mind that perceives danger instantly, because we have this habit this conclusion, this tradition of analysis which is postponement of action, inwardly.

Q: Isn't it possible to analyse without approving or condemning?

K: Is it not possible to analyse without condemning or justifying.

Q: Just looking.

K: If you don't condemn or justify or analyse but just look, you have done it.

Q: Is it possible to achieve a state of oneness knowing that there is starvation and cruelty in the world?

K: We have gone back to the same question, haven't we sir? Oneness is not something to be achieved, when you say achieve it implies time. Right? Look at it sir - achievement implies time. I am going to achieve that, I am going to achieve unity, which involves time doesn't it? The very idea of achievement involves time, and we say the very danger of that, see the danger of that, and therefore there is no sense of achievement, but seeing the facts, seeing 'what is', and when you see 'what is' then you have the energy, the passion to change, to bring about a different world.

Is that enough?

Q: In order to live you have to eat and as long as you are aware of this involvement you are going to eat, you are dividing yourself from others, you are thinking of yourself.

K: That's right.

Q: How can you cope with this division?

K: How can you cope with this division in yourself when you

are looking at others from a particular point of view, we explained this madam just now. Will you do something which is very simple but requires considerable attention and sensitivity, to look at something, a tree, your friend, without this division, just to observe, which means care, which means affection, which means love? Do it.

Q: We can't observe all the time.

K: I said observe, I said observe without the observer. We are always observing, but our observation is based on our conclusion, on our memories, on our censorship, judgement and we are saying be alive to the danger of this censorship. To be alive to the danger is not a matter of time.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD JULY 1970

Aren't you all very hot? I suppose we cannot have the side open?  
All right. If we may we will go on with what we were talking about last Tuesday when we met here? We are inclined when we face all the many innumerable problems to solve each problem, or at least try to, by itself. If it is a sexual problem treat it as though it were something totally unrelated to all other problem. Or when there is the problem of starvation right throughout the world we try politically or economically or socially to solve that problem of starvation, or a problem of violence by itself. I wonder why we do this, why we try to solve each problem by itself? There is violence and this violence is spreading throughout the world, in various forms and the powers that be, the politician, the priest, the established order, try to solve, or individually, that problem by itself, as though violence was something apart from the rest of life. We do not consider the problem as a whole, every problem is related to other problems, it is not isolated. Violence as one can see in oneself, is part of that animal inheritance in all of us, we are animals, a great deal of us, part of us, and without understanding the whole structure of the human being, to merely try to solve violence by itself only leads to further violence. I think this must be clearly understood by each of us that no problem, and there are thousands of problems, at least appear to be all separate different problems, and we never seem to see that they are all interrelated, you cannot possibly solve one problem in isolation by itself. When you go into the question of violence, to try to end violence, through will, through war, through various forms of compulsion, you breed



other forms of aggression. And we have to deal with life which has so many inter - related problems, not separate, not isolated, but a continuous movement of many, many, many problems, many crises, small or big. Right?

Please let us go into this very carefully, because unless we understand this, when we are going to discuss and talk over together the question fear, love, death, meditation and reality and all that, unless you understand how all this is interrelated, death, love, reality, the beauty of life, the ecstasy, the thing that is immeasurable, so extraordinarily vast, that is not separate from our daily problems. So if you say, I am only concerned with meditation, and with truth, you will never find it, but if you understand how each problem is interrelated and that each problem cannot possibly be solved by itself, like starvation, it cannot be stopped by itself, it is a problem, political, economic, social, religious, psychological, the division between man and man, nationality against nationality, and so on, when that is all understood there will be no problem of starvation. So if we could go into this very, very carefully why human minds, that is our minds, your mind, tries to solve each problem by itself. I am sure you have many problems, economic, social, personal relationship, problem of suffering, not only physical, but psychological, problems of intense sorrow, not only personal sorrow but the sorrow of the world, the misery the confusion, and if you try to resolve each problem and try to find an answer to a particular problem, then you are only bringing about further division, further conflict, further misery.

Now why do we do this? Why does the mind try to solve each problem as though it was unrelated to other problems? The other

day somebody asked, what about starvation, as though by itself, it is the result of human relationship, of human condition, of human education, of this constant division between people, both economic, social, personal. So to understand this very, very deeply and so completely, we must ask, why do we do this? I do not know if you have asked that question, ever. And if you do, if you are at all serious you must have asked it, if you are mature, not in age, maturity does not mean age, you can be mature when you are twenty both psychologically, inwardly, so any person who is serious and mature, must have asked this question: why the human mind, the brain always divides, me and mine, you and yours, we and they, on one side, god, religion and politics, on the other side, and so on, this constant division, and trying to solve each problem by itself, isolated why? No don't answer me please, because I don't want to break it up, you can ask at the end of the talk if have the patience, and if you don't mind allowing me to talk for twenty or thirty or forty minutes, first, I hope you don't mind.

In asking that question we have to also find out, what is the function of thought? What is the meaning, substance, structure of thought, because it may be thought that divides, and to find an answer through thought, through reason, obviously must separate each problem and try to find an answer for itself. We are asking why the human brain and mind, the totality of one's being why we are always inclined to solve our issues separately, as though it was unrelated. They want a physical revolution to upset the social order in order to bring about a better order and they forget all the implications of physical revolution. Dictatorship, either of a group or bureaucracy and so on and they forget the whole psychological

nature of man. So one has to ask this question, why? And in asking the question, what is the response? Is it the response of thought or is it the response of understanding the totality of this immense, vast, structure of human life? Am I making my question clear, if not I will go into it?

I want to find out why this division exists. We went into it the other day as the observer and the observed, let us forget that, put that aside and approach it differently. Does thought create this division, and if we find thought does, and thought tries to find an answer to a particular problem, it is still a problem separated from other problems. Are we going together? No, don't please agree with me, it is not a question of agreement, it is a question of seeing for yourself the truth of it, or the falseness of it, not accepting - and if I may add here under no circumstances accept what the speaker says at any time, with regard to what we are talking about, not with regard to you doing something or other outside the tent. There is no authority, at least when we are talking together about these matters, with me, neither you have the authority nor the speaker, we are both of us investigating, observing, looking, learning, therefore there is no question of agreement or disagreement.

One has to find out, if thought by its very nature and structure does not divide life into many, many, many problems, and if we try to find an answer through thought it is still an isolated answer, and therefore breeding further confusion, further misery. So first of all, one has to find out for oneself, freely without any bias, without any conclusion, if thought operates this way. Because you see, most of us try to find an answer intellectually or emotionally, or try to say intuitively. When one used the word 'intuition' one must be terribly

careful of that word, because in that word lies great deception, because one can have intuition dictated by one's own hopes, fears, bitterness, longing, wishes, therefore one has to beware of that word, and never use it. So we try to find an answer intellectually or emotionally, as though the intellect was something separate from the emotion and the emotion something separate from the physical response and so on. And as our whole education and culture is based on this intellectual approach to life, all our philosophies are based on the intellectual concepts, which is rubbish. All our social structure is based on this division and our morality is too, so if thought divides, how does it divide? You are following all this, please do it as we are talking and not just play with me. Actually observe it in yourself, it is much more fun, and you will see that an extraordinary thing you will discover for yourself. You will be a light to yourself, you will be an integrated human being, not looking to somebody else to tell you what to do, what to think, and how to think.

So, does thought divide? And what is thought? Thought can be extraordinarily reasonable, reason consecutively, and it must logically, objectively, sanely, because it must function perfectly, like a computer ticking over without any hindrance, without any conflict. Reason is necessary, sanity is part of that reasoning, capacity. And what is this thinking, what is thought?

Can thought be ever new, fresh, because every problem is new, fresh, because every problem is new, fresh? Every human problem, not the mechanical, scientific, every human problem is always new. And the life being new, thought tries to understand it, tries to alter it, tries to translate it, tries to do something about it. So one

must find out for oneself, what is thought? And why does thought divide? If we really deeply felt, loved each other, not verbally but really, and that can only take place where there is no conditioning, when there is no centre as the 'me' and the 'you', then all this division comes to an end. But thought apparently, which is the activity of the intellect, the brain, cannot possibly love. It can reason, logically, objectively, efficiently. To go the moon thought must have operated in the most extraordinary way, but whether going to the moon is worthwhile or not, that is a different point, whether it is insanity, or logical conclusion of technology. So thought has to be understood. And we asked whether thought can see anything new, or is there new thought, or is thought always old? And when it faces a problem of life which is always new, and it cannot see the newness of it, because thought observes it first, and therefore tries to translate the thing which it has observed in terms of its own conditioning. Are we getting along together? Are we? Right sir? May I go on?

So thought is necessary, it must function, logically, sanely, healthily, objectively, non-emotionally, non-personally, and yet that very thought divides as the 'me' and not the 'me', and tries to solve the problem of violence by itself, as though unrelated to all other problems of existence. So thought, which is the past - thought is always the past, if we had no tape recorder as the brain, which has accumulated all kinds of information, experience, personal collective and so on, if you hadn't that brain you would not be able to think, you would not be able to respond, and so thought is the past. Right? Do we see that, not verbally but actually? So the past meeting the new, the new issue must translate in terms of the past,

and therefore division. You are following? Have you got it?

You are asking why thought divides, why thought interprets? If thought is the result of the past, and thought is the result of yesterday, with all the information, knowledge, experience, memory and so on, thought operates on a problem, and divides that problem as though it was something separate from the rest of the other problems. Right? You are not quite sure. I am going to make you quite sure, not because I want to assert myself, which is silly, or my argument is better than yours, which is equally silly, but we are trying to find out the truth of it, actually 'what is'. Now leave everything aside for the moment and observe your thinking. Thought is the response of the past. Right? If you had no past, there would be no thought, there would be a state of amnesia. Right? The past is the thought and therefore the past will inevitably divide life as the present and the future. Right? As long as there is the past as thought that very past must divide life into time as the past and present and the future. Right?

Q: (In Italian).

K: Just follow this, I am going to go into it step by step, don't jump ahead of me. You are not pursuing it you are going ahead of your problem. I have a problem of violence, I want to understand it completely, totally, so that the mind is entirely free from violence altogether, completely, and it can only understand it by understanding what is the structure of thought. It is thought that is breeding violence, my house, my property, my wife, my husband, my country, my god, my belief, which is utter nonsense. Who is doing this? This everlasting me opposed to the rest. Right? Who is doing it? Education, society, the establishment, the church? Wait,

wait, don't say no, they are all doing it, because I am part of all that. Right? You see, you don't proceed, you don't see this. And thought which is matter, thought which is the result of memory, memory is in the very structure and the very cell of the brain, which is the past, which is of time, and so when the brain operates, whether psychologically, socially, economically or religiously, it must invariably operate in terms of time, the past according to its conditioning. Right? You are following all this? Please do.

So I am asking myself, thought is essential, it must function absolutely logically, completely objectively, impersonally, and yet I see how thought divides. Right? Psychologically as well as in time. Right? I am not urging you, pushing you to agree, do you see this? So thought must inevitably divide. Look what has happened. Thought says nationalism is pretty rotten, it has led to all kinds of war and mischief, let us have brotherhood, let us all be united, thought. Right? Thought finds a league of nations or united nations or this or that, thought is still operating, separating, but maintaining the separation in total: you who are an Italian, you keep your Italian, Sovereignty and so on and so on. Right? Talks about brotherhood and yet keeps separate, which is hypocrisy, that is the function of thought itself to play double games with itself. Are you following all this?

So thought is not the way out, which doesn't mean kill the mind. Right? So, then what is it that sees every problem as it arises as a total problem. Right? You are meeting me? If one has a sexual problem it is a total problem, related to culture, to character, to various other forms of issues of life, not by itself. Now what is the mind that sees each problem as a whole problem, not a fragment of

a total problem? Are you getting all this, my question? Am I making myself clear? It's very hot isn't it?

The churches, the various religions have tried it, they say, 'Seek god and everything will be solved'. As though god, according to them, is separate from life. So there has been this constant division, and I say to myself, observing this, I don't read books or anything but if you just observe life and you will learn more than from any book, both outwardly and inwardly, if you know how to look - then what is it that looks at life as a whole? Right? You have got it? Are we proceeding? Right sir? What is it? Knowing the breadth, the efficiency, the vastness of thought, and knowing, observing that thought does inevitably divide as the 'me' and the 'not me', and the brain, which is the result of time, and therefore the past, and when all that structure of thought is in operation it cannot possibly see the whole, so what is it that sees life as a whole, not broken up into fragments? You have got my question clear?

Q: (In Italian) There still remains a question.

K: We have understood but there remains a question - still there is a question. Right? Now who is putting the question? Thought? Inevitably. You are caught sir. Please sir let me finish and you can ask all the questions you want, afterwards. When you say - please listen to this - I have understood but yet there remains a question, is that possible? When you have understood what thought does, completely, at every level, at the highest level, at the lowest level, when you see what thought does and you say, 'I have understood that very well', then what is it when you say there is a question more, then who is it that is asking that question? There is only one question, which is: this brain, the whole nervous system, the mind



which covers all of that, it says, 'I have understood the nature of thought'. The next step is not a question - the next step is: can this mind look at life, with all its vastness, complexity, with its apparently unending sorrow, can the mind see this thing as an entire whole? That is the only question. And thought is not putting that question, mind is putting that question because it has observed the whole structure of thought, and knows the relative value of thought and therefore is able to say: can the mind look with an eye that is never spotted by the past?

Now we are going to go into that. Can the mind, the brain, which is the result of time, experience, a thousand forms of influence, accumulated knowledge, all that has been collected through time as the past, can that mind, that brain be completely still to observe life which may have problems? You understand now my question? Are you all tired in this heat? Please don't go to sleep, this is really a very serious question we are asking, this is not just an amusement, an entertainment. One must give one's energy, capacity, vitality, passion, life to this, to find out, not just sit there and ask me questions. You have to give your life to this to find out, because this is the only response, the only way out of this terrible brutality, violence, sorrow, degradation, everything that is corrupt. Can the mind, the brain, which is itself corrupt through time, can all that be quiet so that it can see life as a whole and therefore no problem? Right? When you see something as a whole, how can there be a problem? A problem only arises when you see life fragmentarily. Do see the beauty of that. When you see life as a whole then there is no problem whatsoever. It is only a mind and a heart and a brain that are broken up as fragments, they create the

problems. The centre of this fragment is the 'me', the 'me' is brought about through thought, which has no reality by itself. The 'me', 'my' house, 'my' furniture, 'my' bitterness, 'my' disappointment, 'my' desire to become somebody, the 'me' is the product of thought - 'my' sexual appetites, 'my' bitterness 'my' anxiety, 'my' guilt - the 'me', which is the product of thought, divides. And can the mind look without the 'me'? Right? You are following this? Not being able to do this, to look at life without the 'me', that very 'me' says: 'I will dedicate myself to Jesus' - to Buddha, to this, to that - you understand? I will become the communist who will be concerned with the whole of the world. The 'me' identifying itself with what it considers to be the greater is still part of the 'me'. Right?

So the question arises: can the mind, the brain, the heart and whole being observe without the 'me'. The 'me' which is the result of thought, the 'me' is the past, there is no 'me' in the present. The present is not of time. So can the mind be free of the 'me' to look at the whole vastness of life? It can, completely and utterly. Only it can when you have really, fundamentally, with your heart, with all your being, have understood the nature of thinking. If you haven't given your mind, your attention, everything you have, to find out what is thought, the way of thinking, you will never be able to find out, you will never be able to observe without the 'me'. And therefore if you cannot observe without the 'me' the problems will go on. One problem opposing another problem. Look what they are doing in the world. If you let loose a madman, a neurotic, he couldn't make things as bad as they are now. And these politicians, these religious groups, these economists and all the rest of them,

they are creating this madness: the west against the east, you know what is happening. And all these problems will come to an end, I assure you, when man lives a different life altogether, when the mind can look at the world as a total movement.

Now sir, let's proceed. Take a minute, take a minute. There is time, patience! You must have a minute and I must also have a minute. Right? Right sir?

Q: You were asking in the beginning of the talk what made us try to solve problems separately and isn't urgency one of the reasons which make us try to solve problems separately. For instance, if the house burns I have to get out of the house. If in the world things are so urgent...

K: We want to solve the problems right away, urgently. As the house burns we act immediately. As we said, if you see the danger you act. In that action there is no impatience, there is not a question of urgency, you act. Please watch it sir! The urgency and the demand for action immediately can take place only when you see the danger, the danger of the 'me' as thought, dividing the world into this mess. When you see the total danger of it, and the seeing is the urgency and the action. Look sir, if you really saw starvation - we have been brought up in starvation, not you people, we in India, we know what it means, having very little food to eat - and see how the starvation has been brought about - callousness of people, governments, the inefficiency of the politicians, they must always be inefficient because they are concerned with their party, with which they identify their own petty little arrogance. And this is happening all over the world. And you see the nature of it, and when you see the nature of it, what do you do? Tackle one

starvation by itself? Or, do you say, look this whole thing is a psychological issue, which is centred in the 'me', brought about by thought? Unless that is completely, totally understood, starvation in different forms, not only physical starvation but the human starvation of having no love, not seeking love, you will then find the right action. The very urgency of change is change, not the change that will come about through urgency. I don't know if you see that.

Q: You seem to say that thought has to function and then you say at the same time it can't.

K: You seem to say thought must function logically, non-personally and yet thought must be quiet. How can these two take place? Is that the question?

Sir, do you actually see or understand the nature of thinking? Not according to me or to a specialist, but do you yourself see how thought works? Look sir, when you are asked a question which is utterly familiar to you, your response is immediate, isn't it? Your name, and you reply quickly, because you are quite familiar with that. Ask a little more complicated question and you take a little more time. Right? Please, do it - don't you? Naturally. Ask a question to which the brain has not found an answer, after having searched all the memories and the books and all the rest of it, it says, 'I don't know'. Right? It has used thought to say 'I don't know'. I don't know if you are following all this? You are following this? Have you got the answer? Oh, no! When you say, 'I don't know', your mind is not seeking, not waiting, not expecting, I don't know. That is entirely different from the mind which operates with knowledge. I wonder if you are following all this. So can the mind

remain completely free of the known, and yet operate functionally in the field of the known? Do you understand what I am saying? The two are not divided. Oh, Lord, you have never done these things. Sir, look, when you want to discover something new, as the man who wanted to discover the jet propulsion, he had tremendous technological knowledge of the piston. Right? - internal combustion machinery, tremendous acquaintance with it. He had to put that knowledge aside to find something entirely new. If he carried on with the old memories he couldn't have found the new. So seeing the new can take place only when there is freedom from the known, and that freedom can be maintained constantly, from the known. You have never done these things therefore you are just open mouthed and listening! Just a minute, sir. Which means sir, for the mind to live in complete silence and in nothingness, and that complete nothingness and silence is so vast, and out of that silence it can use knowledge, technically work things out, and so also it can observe the whole of life out of that silence, without the 'me'.

Q: You were kind of admitting in the beginning of the talk that to want to change things from the outside would kind of lead us to a dictatorship, a group, or person. Don't you think we are now living under the dictatorship of money, industry?

K: Sure, understood. When you implied that if there is a change, a physical revolution - (noise of trains) thank the Lord for the trains! - you implied if there is physical revolution we will end up in a dictatorship, either in a group, or a person, or a bureaucracy, but aren't we now living in the dictatorship of businessmen, the politicians, the priests and so on? Of course. Where there is

authority, there is dictatorship. And to bring about a social, religious, a human change, there must be first understanding of this whole structure of thought as the 'me' which is seeking power, whether it is me or the other who is seeking power. Can the mind live without seeking power? Go on, answer this sir.

Q: Isn't it natural to seek power?

K: Is it natural to seek power? Of course it is so-called natural, so is the dog seeking power over other dogs. It is all right there, poor thing it probably doesn't know any better. But we are supposed to be cultured, educated, intelligent. And we apparently, after these millennia, have not learnt to live without power.

Q: I wonder whether the mind can put a question to itself that it doesn't already know.

K: Can the mind put a question to itself, and the answer does it not know already? Of course. When the mind, as the 'me', or as the separate thought, puts a question about itself, not about the moon and technological things, already it has found the answer because it is talking about itself; it is ringing the same bell with a different hammer, a wooden hammer or a steel hammer, but it is the same bell.

Is that enough for today?

Q: Can we act without a 'me', or do we then live in contemplation?

K: Can we act without a 'me' and does that mean living in contemplation? Can you live in contemplation? Who is going to give you your food? Who is going to give you your clothes? Who is going to nourish you? Can you live in isolation, in contemplation? You know, the monks and the various tricksters of

religions have done all this. There are people in India who say, 'I live in contemplation, feed me, clothe me, bathe me, I am so disconnected'. That's all so utterly immature. You cannot possibly isolate yourself. You are always in relationship with the past, or with the things around you. And to live in isolation, calling, it contemplation, is mere escape, self-deception. Right sirs, that's enough.

## **SAANEN 1ST DIALOGUE WITH YOUNG PEOPLE 21ST JULY 1970**

This is supposed to be a young people's meeting. And they are supposed to sit in front and the older people, like us, sit back!

So what shall we - I am asking the younger people, not of my age, but less, what they would like to talk about this morning, to talk over together.

Q: Does complete awareness imply a total indifference to all the things about us, except to that with which we are immediately confronted?

K: Does complete awareness imply total indifference to all the things about us.

Q: No, to all the things with which we are not confronted immediately.

K: Does total awareness mean a complete indifference to all other things except to that with which we are immediately confronted? Is that what you want to talk about? It doesn't matter, let's ask half a dozen questions and then we will see what comes out of it.

Q: I think that a lot of us are concerned with social problems, not only the problem of starvation but there are lots of problems which are urgent, like people accumulating bombs to destroy the other ones, like the attitude of man towards business and industry. And all these problems need, I think, urgent solutions. Can we really wait until everybody has passed his personal revolution to make another kind of revolution?

K: There needs to be a great many social changes. People



accumulating bombs to destroy others, the business world which is so corrupt and so on, social injustice, and the various problems of society, must they wait until the individual, you, are free himself from his own limitations, miseries, suffering. Any other questions?

Q: Well, do totally different individuals, that is completely integrated individuals, perceive the same fact in the same way, or are they different?

K: If each individual freed himself, would each individual be different from the other, or in his actions, different. Any other?

Q: There is a problem which several of us are concerned with: what to do with our lives.

K: Several of us are concerned with what to do with our lives. We are young, just beginning to be aware of all the difficulties, the corruption, the various struggles that are going on in the world. What is one to do? Yes sir?

Q: You talk about closing the gap between us and the world so that we no longer have the distinction of the observer and the observed, or thought which by its nature divides. And you have always talked in terms of vision, which I find to be the most distancing of the senses. You are much closer to something if you can touch it, or smell it, or taste it, than if you see it. And I am wondering if you can also close the gap, except in action when you are really working in the world rather than draw back in a way to look at it - to look always draws you back.

K: Correct me if I repeat your question wrong wrongly. Please correct it. To close the gap between the observer and the observed, does it not mean a certain amount of withdrawal from the world. And it is much easier, more acute, definite when there is action

which brings us face to face with this division. And one can observe, visually it is more difficult, but would it not be easier to bridge this gap between the observer and the observed when there is direct contact, direct touch, direct action. That's right, sir, isn't it. Any other question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I didn't quite catch it sir.

Q: Isn't there a danger of the cessation of thought, etc., could you discuss it from the point of view of the biological functioning?

K: Could you discuss the cessation of thought, and the activities of thought and so on in relation to the biological functioning, the actual physical existence. Right?

Q: Sometimes when I feel I have got awareness I find social relationships almost meaningless. (Inaudible)

K: I haven't understood that question, sir. Sorry.

Q: I'll simplify it.

K: Make it simple.

Q: Sometimes when I find myself being aware I find all social interreactions and relationships rather meaningless.

K: Now, when I am aware, he is saying all his social interactions, social relationships rather meaningless. Now is that enough?

Q: The question of bliss - what is it? I want to know in this world of complete brutality, if it is possible for a person to live in that state of consciousness all the time?

K: Can a person live in this world with all its brutality, violence, contradiction, social upheaval and so on, in complete bliss. Right?

Now may we begin with that question first, and then bring all

the other things into it. What are we going to do with our life. May we begin with that and gradually bring all the other questions into it, which I will try to do as we go along.

Q: Can we also talk about relationship?

K: Ah, he wants to talk about relationship, between human beings, between nature and himself. Let's begin.

What am I going to do if I am young with my life. Seeing what the world is, I have to earn a livelihood, I can't go around begging - perhaps in India you could, if you put on a sannyasi, a monk robe, it is the tradition in India you can go from village to village to village and they will feed you, clothe you and look after you.

Q: Why can't you go round begging?

K: Why can't you go round begging. All right, if you like it! There's nothing to prohibit you, or prevent you from begging. Except perhaps in certain countries law, vagrancy and so on, will not allow it. But that's up to you. There is neither right or wrong: in India it is the common tradition to go from house to house begging. And nobody thinks the worst, quite the contrary. That's partly religious tradition there.

Q: What about here?

K: Ah, talking about it here in this country, in Switzerland, try it!

Q: I have been living for four years begging.

K: All right. Perfect!

Q: Why don't you do it?

K: Wait a minute. The question is, why don't I do it. Why don't I go round begging. How do you know I don't? (Laughter) One moment. Look sir, don't make it a laughing matter. It is quite

funny. I have no money of my own, people give it to me, clothes or whatever it is. And I have lived like that for forty five years, or more - what are we talking about, sixty years. So that's that. Now let's get going.

What am I to do, being young, alive, fairly active physically, and half intelligent, what am I to do in this world? You know this question is being asked right through the world: shall I become a businessman, a lawyer, a doctor, take some kind of profession, and that profession depending on the demands of society. Society demands so many engineers, so many doctors, so many businessman, so many politicians, so many crooks, so many this and that. Society demands it. So shall I fit into any of these categories? So that's the question. What am I to do with my life? Right? Right, sir? Now you know what vocation means? A call, Latin, vocare, to call out, like when a man says, 'I have had a divine call to join the church', that's a vocation. Not that you should join the church. The urge to do something with your life right to the end of it, to do something that is true, that is completely worthwhile, that is completely meaningful, that will never bring about bitterness, frustration, anxiety, something that you will do, your vocation. That will be your whole life. Right.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, I understand, sir. Do please follow this carefully because in answering this question you will answer all the rest of the questions that have been put this morning. You will see in a minute how it is all related. One need not have a definite vocation, it doesn't mean necessarily drifting, but doing something from moment to moment, some occupation; be a gardener one year, next

year something or other, and so on, get little money but keep going. Now which is it you think is important: a life of vocation - you understand the meaning of that word, a call, not necessarily the call of a church, or a business, but the feeling that one has to do this with one's life, and nothing else matters. When one feels that way there is no question of frustration, there is no question of tomorrow, you are doing the thing that is complete, that is what you want to do, that is your call. Do you understand? One's call. Probably you have not thought about it that way. Probably you haven't gone into this question of what to do in life. And it is very important to put that question and find an answer, otherwise one wastes one's life. As you observe, there is such wastage of human life, not only on the battlefield but in the daily living. So one has to find out, at least it seems to me, what is your vocation, what is your - there is a marvellous Sanskrit word, which I daren't use because it has been so misused, the word called dharma, to do something which is true, which is your vocation, your life, you know, job. And therefore being your duty, your responsibility, your vocation, from that you never deviate. You may do something but it is always in that direction. If you are an artist, in the sense paint pictures and so on, if you are an artist, that's your vocation, a true artist is not concerned if he is going to get a lot of money out of it and so on. It is his, you know, his life, nothing will distract him from that. And therefore there is no frustration, there is no bitterness, there is no cynicism, there is no failure. I think this is very important to understand.

So what is your vocation? Are you going to become engineers, beggars, a religious person, not belonging to any church, any

group, any sect, in the sense a really religious person, and spend the rest of your life teaching others, not battling with others? So in answering that question you will find what is your relationship with other human beings. So I am answering your question, relationship. What is your relationship - please listen to this - when you are following your vocation, which is not dependent on the demands of society, when you are following your vocation, what is your relationship with other human beings when you are following that? Go on answer it, sirs, answer it.

Q: How can you speak of a vocation which is not thrust upon you by society.

K: How can you speak of a vocation which is not thrust upon you by society.

Q: How do you know it is your vocation?

K: Look, how do you know this is your calling, this is your vocation. How do you know it? It may be imposed unconsciously by society and you think that it is your vocation, your calling. Or you may deceive yourself, saying this is my line, my direction, my vocation, and I am going to follow it to the end, and you may be deceiving yourself. At the end of ten years you say, 'My god, what a mistake I have made. I ought to have been a butcher. I ought to have been a soldier, I ought to have joined the church.' So look, look, please investigate that question. He says, how do I know that I am following my vocation, which is true, which is not imposed by society, or responding to my unconscious conditioning? So you have to be alive, sensitive enough, free enough, to investigate, search your own structure, and find out if what you call your vocation may be thrust upon you by the society, or your own

personal inclination which you call vocation. So you have to investigate. And you say, 'I have no time'. On the contrary you have plenty of time. You can investigate, search out, if you are really serious and honest, to find out what your line is in a day if you give your whole mind to it. Observe all your conditioning, all the influences that have been imposed upon you, your own desires, your own inclinations. Observe all that. It's only the serious person can find out his vocation, not just the man who drifts about and says, 'Well, I'll do this and that'.

Q: I wonder if it is a real serious problem because I am not a butcher, or an artist, or a politician, I am a man. All these things are just restrictions.

K: No, wait. You are a man - you are not a butcher, you are not this or that. You are a man. But you have to do something in life.

Q: Why?

K: Why? Wait a minute, sir. Why should you do anything in life? Just live? Wait. What does that mean? Live according to the edicts of society, live according to your own inclination, according to your own pleasure, according to your own changing moods, fancies, imaginations, and suppositions and formulations?

Q: Why not?

K: Why not. Wait. Why not. What are you at the end of it? Just a driftwood, aren't you?

Q: How do you know?

K: How do I know? I'll show it to you. I am not trying to convince you. Let's be clear on that point. I am not trying to persuade you to accept what I say. A man who says, 'I don't care what happens, I'll live a life from day to day, casually.' What's

going to happen to me? It may be all right when he is very young, go on, have a good time. When he gets a little bit older it will begin to tell. Doesn't it? His teeth begin to fall out. Go into it, sir. Look, most people are living this way, drifting - they get caught in a job and when that job doesn't suit them they change to something else. Most people are drifting in life.

Q: Are you drifting?

K: I say so sir. The gentleman asks, are you drifting.

Q: I mean it seriously: are you drifting?

K: Why do you ask that question, sir?

Q: Perhaps there is no difference.

K: Between what?

Q: Between me or any other person.

K: I don't know anything about you, sir. We are talking of a person, human beings who are drifting. Their life is very shallow. Right? They are unhappy people, divorce, remarry and divorce, and remarry, children, responsibility, alimony, god knows what else. And that's most people are doing, and they are thoroughly frustrated, unhappy, bitter human beings.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir, look at it. Then what will I do, what will you do?

Q: Can we decide such a thing now?

K: Can you decide such a thing now. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Not decide. There is no decision. You see.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Not at all sir. Not at all sir.

Q: All right. Is there a vocation apart from the human life?



K: I don't think you have listened to what I have been saying, sir. Forgive me for saying so.

Q: You don't take my question.

K: I get your question, but it has already been answered.

Q: What I said was that perhaps all people are drifting, and what you are doing is introducing some sort of discipline, like, if I do not drift, then I have to impose a discipline upon myself.

K: Not at all. I think you have completely misunderstood what I have been saying. Sir, it is no good keep on repeating this over and over again. We have explained very carefully the whole nature of discipline, the other day. What is involved in it. We are not going to go back into it now.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, but sir we must go ahead, we can't go back to something that we have discussed ten times. Now let's go back.

What is one to do? What will you do? You say, I am too young, must I decide now. It's not that you must decide, one must be aware of what is going on in the world, and your role in the world, your responsibility in the world. You must be aware of you and your relationship to the world, your relationship to other people. Right? Now what is your relationship with other people? Actually what is it? Has one a relationship with others? And if you have, what does that word 'relationship' mean? Go into it, sir, please. You are related to your wife, you are related to your girl, or boy friend, or whatever it is. What does that mean to you, actually, not theoretically, but actually what does that relationship mean between you and another? Is it based on pleasure? Is it based on your feeling of loneliness? And therefore a demand for

companionship. A feeling of frustration, and therefore you depend on another for fulfilment? You may have a conclusion, and act according to that conclusion in relationship. Or you may have an image about yourself and the other, and act, feel through that image. All that is involved in relationship, isn't it? Right? Now which is it? Relationship means to be related, to be in contact, to be not only blood relationship, but physical, intimate, in contact, minds working together, feeling together, creating together, working together. Which means a constant communication between each other, not one person isolated and in his isolation trying to establish a relationship with another.

So one has to find out for oneself when you ask, what is relationship, whether you are isolating yourself in your activities. Do you follow? If you are ambitious to reach a certain goal, position, prestige, your relationship is really non-existent, because your whole purpose is to get in one direction. A person who is ambitious, competitive, cannot possibly have relationships, he may get married, have children, all the rest of it, but that is merely a social convention.

So when you talk about relationship all this is involved. This seeking for love, because you yourself have no love, seeking companionship because you cannot stand alone, finding a fulfilment in another, because in yourself you do not know how to live completely, wholly. So all these things are implied when you talk about relationship. So are you related to the world, or to another? Bearing in mind relationship means no barrier, intellectual, emotional, no barrier, no wall, no separation, no division: you with your problems, and ambitions and worries, and

despairs, and she, or he with hers. Then only you have a relationship. You see how difficult it is, sir. Therefore that being very difficult we are satisfied with superficial relationship which leads to a great deal of misery. Yes sir?

Q: In an occupation, a vocation, we seem to be caught in a kind of conflict, and one part says, first liberate yourself and then do what you want to do, and the other part says, do what you will do and in that way you will liberate yourself.

K: There are two parts in me, one says liberate yourself first and then do, and the other part says, the very doing is the way of liberation. Now listen to the question. First liberate yourself from all the chaos, mess, confusion within yourself; and the other, in the very understanding of the confusion, misery, strife, struggle, despair, in the very understanding of it is liberation. The very understanding of that is liberation. Why do you divide the two?

Q: The understanding is the action.

K: I have understood that. Look, why do you divide it? Is this action, which is, first liberate yourself, is there any action in that at all? Because you are only concerned about yourself.

Q: But action is not only understanding.

K: Which means what? I can only understand in relationship, not in isolation. I can't go to the mountain top, sit cross-legged, and understand myself. I understand myself in action, in relationship, in movement, I then observe my reactions. Right? I observe the way I think, feel, act. So isolation, or saying to myself, first I must liberate myself, is out because that way leads to isolation, and therefore exclusion. And in isolation, exclusion you cannot possibly understand relationship, or understand yourself. You

understand yourself by watching your reactions. Your reactions produce certain actions, and you watch those actions. So it is a constant watching of the movement of the brain and the mind, which is thought. Watching your feelings, and in that way, that is the only way to free the mind from its own conditioning. That is liberation. Right.

Now what is your relationship? Please, sir this is very important, because in putting this question you become aware. You follow? You become aware of what you are doing, what your state is, what your mind is playing with.

Q: About this problem of relationship, I think it is of all time. There was the structure of the family, there was the structure of the village, there was the structure the tribe, but nowadays society gets anonymous, the cities are too big. And that's a pity also, we lose a certain quality of relationship. We should find a new society and recreate this.

K: Sir, we'll go back. There was a time when the family was important, the tribe, the nation, the group. Then - what was it sir?

Q: The cities got big.

K: Then the cities get bigger and the individual becomes anonymous, he is squashed out. And so one has to find a way of living which is not tribal, which is not anonymous, which is not suppressed by society, anonymous, one has to find a way of living which is neither.

Q: A new society.

K: First, you see you are more concerned with the new society. The new society only comes when you have found right relationship with another. Society is relationship. Now it is based

on isolation, contradiction, each one's despair, purposes, the ambitions, strife and so on. Therefore the society which exists now is corrupt. And to create a new society you must find out for yourself the right relationship between you and another, and out of that comes a new society. Right? Which is not bureaucratic, and all the rest of it.

So in asking this question, look at what it is leading up to, first you asked the question, what am I to do. I suggested what is your vocation, find out, not drift, enquire into it, spend time, give your thought, your energy, your vitality, your passion to find out, which doesn't mean you discipline yourself - you become something else. Uncover, awaken. Now from that you realize one has to be aware of one's relationship, therefore you become aware. So you are finding out what it means to be aware, not only in your relationships but aware the way you behave, the way you think, the way you are escaping, and so on. You are beginning to understand yourself in relationship and through relationship. Right? So awareness is not a matter of practice, following a particular system in order to be aware, but aware in what you are doing: when you cut bread, when you are looking at yourself in the mirror, to be aware during the day, watch your face, your gestures, your movement of thought, just watch it, not correct it, so that this awareness becomes extraordinarily potent. Right?

Now the next question from that: can one live in this world with this awareness? That was one of the questions asked. Which is, can one have this strange sense of bliss - one has to go into the whole question of pleasure and bliss.

Q: Just go away from bliss.

K: Can one live with this quality of awareness in this world. Now who will tell you whether you can or cannot? Now who will tell you? I say one can. I say that it is perhaps possible for another to live this way, but won't you have to find out for yourself?

Q: Yes, but not trying to see if you can do it, at the same time not desensitising yourself from all others. Like, supposing you say you are completely different, and that's why you are trying to see something you are not.

K: Then what shall I do, sir? Look, what shall I do with the war that is going on in the Middle East, in Vietnam and other wars, what shall I do, as a human being, who is aware, who is sensitive, who has watched this phenomena of butchery, of the last two dreadful wars, what shall I do? Tell me!

Q: What have you done during the last war?

K: What did you do during the last great war, daddy! I will tell you, sir - if that interests you. As usual we were travelling all over the world, going from place to place. And the war came and we were in California. And being a foreigner I was called up before the Board, or what is it, who were investigating people who were worthwhile to fight, and they saw I was a poor unfortunate heathen, who couldn't even lift a gun, didn't know what it all meant to kill another. They said, please go home. And so I - does all that interest you?

Audience: Yes.

K: I milked a cow, two cows, looked after chickens, did gardening, and all the rest of it, until I could get away from California, and then started the journey all over again. Washed dishes, washed floors.

Now sir, just a minute. You see where we have landed ourselves. We are asking what is it to be aware. And with this quality of awareness, with this quality of attention, which in itself is a great bliss, because it means freedom, and can such a human being free, aware, he may make a mistake, but corrects it, there's no regret, then say, 'My god, I have done terrible things, what am I to do?' You move. You follow? The mistakes are wiped out, corrected, if you can, but you keep on. So we are asking with this awareness, with this attention, with this quality of bliss, can one live in this world. Yes, sir, I tell you, you can. But that's not an answer for you. What's the good of a man, another man saying, you can have food when you are hungry. You need food. It is no good taking you to a restaurant and showing you the food, when you have no - you follow. It is your vocation - there we are - it is your vocation to find out how to live in this world with this alert awareness.

Q: That is very encouraging.

K: The gentleman says that is very encouraging. Don't be encouraged by another. Because then another can also disappoint you. But if you see what is possible then it releases tremendous energy. You understand, sir. Possible.

So from this quality of awareness, which is not following a method, a system, a discipline, but watching - watching how you sit, watching the restlessness of your body, becoming aware of the fidgeting of your fingers. Right? There is the biological enquiry, watching the body - you understand sir - watching it, not directing it, not saying it should or should not, but watching it, when you watch so alertly the body you will see the body becomes very

quiet.

Q: But sir, it is only possible, mainly, if you live among a religious group.

K: It is only possible if you live among a religious group.

Q: Not only, but mainly, it is very difficult if you have to live in society.

K: It is very difficult if you have to live in society, so corrupt, so irreligious, to do this. Sir, everything is difficult.

Q: No, sir, I have practised it many a time.

K: Sir, I am telling you sir, don't practise it, sir, I beg of you, don't practise anything. No, do listen to what I am saying. Don't practise anything. If you practise your mind becomes mechanical.

Q: I am just using a word, I don't mean it like that. Words are very limiting.

K: I know that sir.

Q: If you are confused by the very structure of society, you go on and try.

K: Sir, look, I know, we all know the tremendous weight of society. The society is your father, your mother, your neighbour, your politician, the society. I know the dangers of that, we are all well aware of it, the criminality of it all. And I say to myself what am I to do in this society? Run away from it? Join some religious group? Escape into some fantasy, or become a communist, a socialist, you know all the rest of it? So I have explained all this.

Q: Why do you identify changing society with becoming a communist?

K: I don't sir. I don't identify the change of society with the communists, or with the Catholics, or with the Labour party, or



with this or that. When you identify yourself with a group you cannot change society. Full stop. If you belong to a religious group you cannot change society. The other day somebody came to see me - I don't know why - and he said, 'At last I am free. And being free I have joined the Catholic church.' Yes, sir! Because to them freedom means freedom of choice. Follow this. Go into it sir. Freedom of choice. Right? When do you choose? When you are confused, when you are uncertain, you say, 'I'll choose this'. Right? But when you see very clearly there is no choice. It's only when the mind is confused it chooses, when the mind is very clear there is no choice. Now go into it.

So you are asking, can one live in this world so clearly, without any choice, with that full awareness. Right? Do it sir, do it. And you will see the immense possibility. And it's only when you think you have to change according to a certain pattern, according to a certain goal, according to a certain principle, then you are lost. But if you watch yourself, you know, play with it, when you are talking, when you are driving, how you drive, with your mouth open, you know, watch it. When you are talking, whether you are gossiping. You know that is one of the favourite means of wasting one's time by gossiping about somebody or other. Watch it, so that your mind becomes astonishingly sensitive. It is that sensitive intelligence that is going to act. Yes sir?

Q: Are thinking and being aware compatible?

K: Thinking and being aware, are they compatible. Are you aware that you are thinking? Please put this question. I am putting you this question. Are you aware when you are thinking? No, don't answer me, enquire, this is really quite an interesting question, go

into it. (I am so sorry. Take her out please, she is bored sitting here.

Q: She doesn't want to go out either.

K: She doesn't want to go out either! Ask her to come and sit here, I'll hold her hand.)

The question was: are thinking and awareness compatible. Now my question is: are you aware that you are thinking? Awareness being watching without any distortion, without any effort, without any correction, justification, just watching.

Q: For a moment.

K: Don't, not one moment or the next. Look at it sir. Are you aware that you are thinking? Or is thinking immediate, you know, you think? I ask you something and there is immediate response. Now if you go into it a little bit you will see something very interesting. The old brain, which is full of memories, knowledge, experience, the old brain responds instantly to any challenge. Right? I say, you are ugly, you say, no. You follow? The response is instant, the response which is of the old brain. Right? Now if you are aware there is a hiatus, there is a gap between the response of the old and because there is a gap perhaps a new response will take place. You are following what I am saying? You are following all this? No. All right.

Look sir, you can watch all this in yourself, if you watch yourself, it is better than any book ever written by any man, including the Bible or the Gita, or any other book. If you watch yourself you will see that there is a quality in the brain which is always the old, the old tradition, the old conditioning, and any challenge which is always new, it must be otherwise it is not a challenge, the old brain responds quickly. Right? I am a Christian -

battle. You follow? I am a communist, this or that, according to its old conditioning it responds. Now if you are aware you will see that the old brain need not necessarily respond immediately. There is a gap, an interval. In that interval the new mind will respond. You try it out, do it, and you will see. You understand what I am saying? Are you all getting too tired? This is really quite important if you go into it. It's marvellous. Because our old brain, which is at the back, and so on, I am not conversant with all that, the old brain responds all the time according to pleasure, according to pain, and so on and so on. As that is responding all the time there is no new response. Right? The new response can only take place when the old brain is sufficiently quiet. Right? For this quietness to be there must be an awareness in which there is no justification, condemnation, identification. You follow? An awareness. In that awareness the old brain becomes a little more dormant, and therefore the new brain can act. You go into it.

And that's why the whole question of sleep and dream and all that is part of this. Perhaps we shall go into it another time, not now.

Q: I was wondering if you could paint a verbal picture of what the world would be like if everyone was a total individual.

K: He would like to have a verbal design of what the world would be like if all the human beings were totally individual. I am afraid I am not the person to give you a verbal picture because that is a waste of time. What will be is not important, 'what is' is important.

Q: As soon as I become aware of myself, I try to escape. As soon as I become aware of my thinking, whatever, I change it. As

soon as I become aware of it, I change it.

K: The moment I become aware I want to change, whether it is my facial expression or a particular way of thinking, the moment I become aware there is an instant response of change - or the demand for change. That's what I am saying. The instant response for change is part of the old brain because it says, this isn't right, this should be that way. To quieten the old brain is to be aware without any choice. To be aware of the trees, sirs. Look, you are aware of those mountains, can you do anything about it? Can you? There they are, the line, the height, the beauty, the valleys, you are just aware of it. In the same way, to be aware of yourself, not wanting to change it. Then the response of the new brain brings about quite a different quality of change, something totally new.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madame, the moment there is a division between the old brain and the new brain - oh, lord, I can't go into all this. Please, just look at it, sir. There is a division between you and another, between you and the tree, between you and the mountain, between you and your husband, wife, children, and all the rest of it, there is this division. This division exists because there is always the censor - the censor, you know, who says, this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be, that is part of our conditioning, is part of our structure, is part of our society, our culture, to judge immediately. Right? Now to be aware of this judgement, if you are aware of it without any choice, in that awareness there is no division at all.

Q: The very speculation of this...

K: There is no speculation, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We said that too, sir. If you are intellectually approaching this whole problem then it becomes a nightmare. But if you also approach it emotionally it is also another form of nightmare. But if you approach it, sir, if you approach it as it is. Look, if you approach it as it is, which means you have been conditioned by the culture in which you live. Right? That is a fact, isn't it.

Q: When I experience freedom it comes about not in watching, it doesn't come about if I urge it, if I force myself. (Inaudible)

K: Ah, that's just...

Q: Well, it is happening to most of the people all the time.

K: Sir, I don't know what is happening to most of the people all the time. But I am saying as one human being we are so conditioned in the pattern of achievement, whether in business, in religion, in any way, we are conditioned to achieve. Now in becoming aware of this conditioning, then you will find in that awareness if you are choosing, if you are saying, 'I must not try to achieve', then you are blocking yourself, then greater conflict arises.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know sir. If one is aware of that very definite process, that very awareness changes the pattern. I can't tell you any more. Repeat the old thing over and over again. It's now ten to twelve.

Q: Could you say something on the cessation of time, and the flame of discontent at the same time?

K: Look, it is now quarter to twelve. Wait a minute. Do we have another meeting for young people? Do you want it?

Audience: Yes.

K: You know how much I am working?

Q: Do you feel like it?

K: Do I feel like it? If you want it, and you are asking me, you want it, and you are asking me if I feel like it. Right? I feel like it if you are really serious.

Q: Are we serious?

K: That's up to you! If you are really serious, if you want to really deeply go into all this, I will spend all my day at it. You understand sir? So we will have next Friday at ten thirty.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 26TH JULY 1970

We were talking the last time we met here about the whole structure of thought and its activities, how thought does divide, and thereby bring about a great deal of conflict in human relationship. I think this morning we should consider, not intellectually or verbally, what is the nature of pleasure, fear and sorrow. Whether it is at all possible to be totally free of sorrow. And in enquiring into that, again non-verbally, non-intellectually, one has to consider going into, examine very carefully the whole question of time.

You know it is one of the most difficult things to convey something which not only demands the accuracy of words, but also the accuracy of perception that lies beyond the word, a feeling, a sense of intimate contact with a reality. And if you, listening to the speaker, merely interpret the word according to your personal like and dislike, without being aware of your own tendencies for interpretation, then the word becomes a terrible nuisance, then the word becomes a prison, in which most of are unfortunately caught. But if one is aware of the meaning of the word and what lies behind the word, then communication becomes extraordinarily interesting. Communication implies, as we were saying the other day, not only a verbal comprehension, understanding the meaning of words, but also going together, examining together, sharing together, creating together. And this is very important specially when we are talking about sorrow, time, the nature of pleasure and fear. This is a very complex question, and every human problem is quite complex. It needs a certain austerity, simplicity of perception. When we use the word 'austere', we don't mean the harshness that

is involved in the meaning of that word, a sense of dryness, a sense of discipline, control, following a particular dry course; we are using that word 'austere' stripped of all the meaning of harshness, but there must be the austere simplicity in the examination, in the understanding of what we are going to talk about. One's mind must be very sensitive because sensitivity implies intelligence, and intelligence is beyond the interpretation of the intellect, or emotional enthusiastic action. And in examining, in looking, in listening, in learning, about time, pleasure, fear and sorrow one has to have this quality of sensitivity of perception, of immediate seeing something as true; which is not possible if, as we explained the other day, intellect with its activity of thought divides, interprets. I don't know if you were all here the last time we talked about thought, and the nature of thought and how it divides human relationship, though thought is necessary as reason, sanity, clarity, objective clear thinking is absolutely necessary, but thought also becomes a dangerous implement when one is not analysing but looking. I hope we understood when we talked about the nature and the structure of thought.

So we are going to find out this morning whether the mind can totally be free of fear. And this is a very important question to understand, again non-verbally. Because for most of us fear is a constant companion, conscious or unconscious, whether you are aware of it or you are not, it is there, hidden in some dark recesses of one's own mind. Please, as we said, we are sharing this together, so you have to be aware of your own fear, and not try to escape from it, because in looking into this question of fear we are asking whether it is at all possible for the mind to be completely and



totally free of this burden. You are asking this question. Perhaps the speaker may suggest it, but it is your problem, your question, therefore you have to be sufficiently persistent, sufficiently simple, to see what it is, and to pursue it to the very end, so that the mind, when you leave this tent this morning, is literally free of fear.

Perhaps that's asking a great deal, but it can be done. For a mind that has been conditioned in the culture of fear, with all the neurotic complicated sequences in action, for such a mind to even put the question, the possibility, of being completely, entirely, absolutely, free of fear, is itself a problem, not fear, but the question itself. Do you understand? To put to oneself the question, whether it is at all possible, itself becomes a problem. A problem exists only when it is not soluble, when you cannot go through with it, when it keeps on recurring, you think you have solved this question of fear, but it keeps on repeating in different forms.

So first one has to see very clearly the possibility of it, and not say it is impossible. Do you understand? By saying that it is not possible, you have already blocked yourself. So one has to be very careful not to block oneself, not to prevent oneself from this question of fear and its complete resolution. Right? Because when there is any sense of fear it does all kinds of mischievous activity, not only psychologically, neurotically, but outwardly this whole problem of security comes into being - not only physical security, but psychological security. Please do follow all this because we are going to go into something that requires your attention, not your agreement, not your interpretation but your perception, your seeing the thing as it is.

You know you don't need any interpreters, no one need interpret

anything for you. Volumes are being written by people who want to interpret what we are talking about - don't. Don't allow yourself to be interpreted to. Examine for yourself, find out for yourself.

So we are asking for the mind to examine itself and perceive the sequence of fear, its activities, its dangers. So we are going to examine not only physical fears, but also the very, very complex fears that lie deeply below the conscious mind. Most of us have had physical fears, either fear of past illness, with all its pain and anxiety and the boredom of pain, physical; or you have faced physical danger. And is facing a danger and its immediate action - you understand? - when you face danger of any kind, physically, is there fear? Please enquire, don't say, yes, there is fear - find out. When you meet, as it often happens when you are walking, perhaps not in these civilized countries, but when you are walking perhaps in India, or in Africa, and wild parts of America, you come across a bear, or a snake, or a tiger - as it has happened to us, several times. There is immediate action. Right? Isn't there? When you meet a snake there is immediate action, it is not conscious, deliberate action, there is instinctual action. Are you following all this? Now is that fear? Or is that intelligence? Because we are trying to find out action which is intelligence and action which is born of fear. When you meet a snake there is a physical response, instantly. You run away, you sweat, you try to do something about it. That response is a conditioned response because you have been told for generations, be careful of snakes, be careful of wild animals. It is a conditioned response, so the brain, the nerves respond instinctually to protect itself. Protecting itself is a natural, intelligent response. You are following all this. Right? To protect the physical organism

is necessary and a snake is a danger, and to respond to it in the sense of protection is an intelligent action. Right?

Now look at the other, which is, a physical pain. You have had pain last year, or yesterday, and you are afraid that it might return. The fear there is caused by thought. Thinking about something which has happened a year ago, or yesterday, and might happen again tomorrow is fear brought about by thought. Right? Isn't that so? Go into, please, we are sharing it together. Which means you are watching your own responses, what your own activities have been. There fear is the product of conscious, or unconscious thought - thought being time. Right? Time, not chronological time by the watch, but time as thought thinking about the thing that happened yesterday, or some time ago, and the fear of it happening again. So thought is time. Right? So thought produces fear: I might die tomorrow, and I am all a quiver. I might be exposed about something I have done in the past, thinking about that thought breeds fear. Right? Now, are you doing it? You understand? You have had pain, you have done something in the past which you don't want to be exposed, or you want to fulfil, or do something in the future and you may not be able to, which is all the product of thought and time. Are you doing this? Right? Most people are doing this, including yourself.

Now, can this movement of thought which breeds fear in time, and as time, can that come to an end? You are following? You have understood my question? Yes? There is the intelligent action of protection, self-preservation, physical necessity to survive, which is a natural intelligent response. The other, thought thinking about something, and projecting the possibility of it not happening,

or it might occur again, breeds fear. Right? So the question is: whether thought, this movement of thought, so instinctual, so immediate, so insistent, so persuasive, can that movement naturally come to an end, not through opposition. If you oppose it, it is still the product of thought, if you exercise your will to stop it, it is still the product of thought - you say, I will not allow myself to think that way, who is the entity that says, 'I will not' - it is still thought because by stopping that movement it hopes to achieve something else, which is still the product of thought. Therefore thought may project it and therefore may not be able to achieve it, and therefore there is fear involved in it. I don't know if you are following all this.

So we are asking whether thought which has produced this psychological fear, not just one fear but many, many fears, whether that whole activity can naturally, easily without any effort, come to an end. Because if you make an effort it is still thought and therefore productive of fear, therefore it is still caught within the field of time. Right? So one has to find a way or understand, or learn about a way that it will naturally come to an end, thought will not create fear. You have got it? Are we communicating with each other, please, are we? I don't know! When we are talking about communication, not verbally, perhaps you have seen the idea clearly, the division clearly, that's not it. We are talking not merely verbally but being involved in it, it's your fear, it's your daily life, and that's what we are talking about, your life, not the description of your life. Because that which is described, that which is being described is not the described; the description is not the described, the explanation is not the explained. Right? The word is not the

thing. So it's your life, your fear, which is not exposed by the speaker; by listening you have learnt to expose what is fear, how thought creates the fear. Right?

So we are asking whether thought, the activity thought, which engenders, which breeds, which sustains, which nourishes fear, can naturally, happily, easily, come to an end, without any determination, without any resistance, without any activity of the will.

Now before we can complete that question by discovering the true answer, we also have to enquire into the pursuit, conscious or unconscious, the pursuit of pleasure, because it is thought again that sustains pleasure. You have had a lovely moment when you have looked at the sunset yesterday; you said, what a marvellous sunset, you took a great delight in it. Then thought steps in and says, 'How nice it was, I would like to have that experience repeated again tomorrow'. Whether it is a sunset, or whether it is somebody who flatters you, or whether it is sexual experience, or you have achieved something which you must maintain which gives you pleasure - pleasure isn't merely just sexual pleasure, there is a pleasure which you derive through achievement, through being somebody, the pleasure of success, the pleasure of fulfilment, the pleasure of what you are going to do tomorrow, the pleasure of something which you have experienced, sexually or artistically, or in different ways, wanting that repeated. All that is pleasure. And our social morality is based on pleasure. No? You are rather silent about that. Social morality is based on pleasure, and therefore it is no morality at all, it is immoral. The social morality is immorality. You are going to find that out, which

doesn't mean by revolting against the social morality you are going to become very moral, doing what you like, sleeping with whom you like. Play with all this, you will find out.

So one has to understand, if you are going to understand and be free of fear, one must also understand pleasure because they are both interrelated. Which doesn't mean you must give up pleasure. We are going to go into it. You know all religions, organized religions, and they have been the bane of civilization, all organized religions have said, you must have no pleasure. Right? No sex, god won't allow you, you must approach god a tortured human being. Right? So you mustn't look at a woman, you mustn't look at a tree, you mustn't look at the beauty of the sky, you mustn't look at the lovely lines of a hill, which might remind you of sex and women and all the rest of it. So you must not have pleasure, which means you must not have desire. Right? So pick up your bible when the desire arises, lose yourself in that - or the Gita, or repeat some words, all that nonsense.

So to understand fear one must also examine the nature of pleasure. Right? If you don't have pleasure tomorrow you are going to be afraid. Right? You are going to be frustrated. You have had pleasure yesterday, sexually or otherwise, and if you cannot have it tomorrow you get angry, you get upset, your nerves - you become hysterical, which is a form of fear. So fear and pleasure are the two sides of a coin; you cannot be free of one and not be free of the other also. Right? I know this is rather - you want to have pleasure all your life and be free of fear, that's all you are concerned about. But you don't see that if you have no pleasure tomorrow you feel frustrated. Right? You feel unfulfilled, you feel angry, anxious,

guilty and all the psychological miseries arise. So you have got to look at both.

And in understanding pleasure you have also to understand what is joy. Is pleasure joy? Is pleasure enjoyment? Is pleasure something totally different from the full delight of existence? We are going to find out all this. First we are asking whether thought with all its activities, which breeds fear and sustains fear, conscious or unconscious, whether that can come naturally to an end, without effort. Right? There are conscious fears as well as unconscious fears of which you are not aware. The fears of which one is not aware play much greater part in one's life than the fears that you are aware of. Now how are you going to uncover the unconscious fears? You are following? How are you going to expose them to the light of whatever it is - how? By analysis? Who is then to analyse? You are following all this? If you say, through analysis I will expose them - we have gone into the question of analysis the other day, but we will briefly go into it now. If you say, I will analyse my fears, who is the analyser? Part of the fragment of fear. Therefore analysis of his own fears has no value at all. Right? I don't know if you see this. Or if you go to an analyst to have your fears analysed the analyst is also like you, conditioned by the specialist, by Freud, Jung and Adler and X Y Z. He analyses according to his conditioning. Right? Therefore it doesn't help you to be free of fear. As we said, all analysis is a negation of action. We have been through that, I won't go into all that.

So how are you going to uncover the unconscious fears, knowing analysis has no value? Right? You are rather uncertain about it. I can't go into it now, I have explained it before. If you say

I will look into my dreams, I will examine my dreams. Again the same problem arises: who is the entity who is going to examine the dreams? One of the fragments of the many fragments. Right? So you ask a question, quite differently, which is, why do you dream at all? You are following all this? Dreams are merely the continuation of your daily activity. I do not know if you have not noticed in your dreams there is always action going on of some kind or another - jumping over the cliff, or hitting somebody, or a dozen forms of daily activity repeated while you are asleep. Now can that activity be understood and come to an end? That is, can the mind during the day time be so alertly watching all its motivations, all its urges, all its complexities, its pride, its ambitions, you know the things that are going on during the day, the frustrations, the demand to fulfilment, the urge to be somebody. You know. The movement of thought during the day, can those be watched without the observer? You are following all this? Because if there is the observer who is watching, the observer then is part of thought which has separated itself from the rest of the thoughts and has assumed the authority to observe.

So can you observe during the day the whole movement of your activities, thoughts, feelings without interpretation, watching? Then you will see dreams have very little meaning, you will hardly ever dream. Therefore during the day time if you are awake, not half asleep, if you are not caught by your beliefs, by your prejudices, by your absurd little vanities, and pride, your petty little knowledge, but merely observe the whole movement of your conscious mind and unconscious mind in action during the day, you will see there will not only be the end to dreams but also



thought begins to subside, no longer seeking or sustaining pleasure or avoiding fear. Right? I wonder if you have caught all this.

Then thought is also producing pleasure, continuing, nourishing that which has been pleasurable. Right? You have had some experience, physical or psychological or otherwise, and you want that repeated. The demand for the repetition of that pleasure, that experience is the product of thought. Right? So thought not only sustains, gives birth to pleasure but also to fear. Right?

So being caught in fear and in pleasure, which produce sorrow, how can all this come to an end? You follow? How can all this movement of pleasure and fear, which is the product of thought, how can that machinery of thought naturally come to an end? Now that's your problem, isn't it. Right? Is that your problem? Now what will you do with it? Give it up? Go on as you have been living, caught in pleasure and pain? Which is the very nature of the bourgeois, though you may have long hair, sleep on the bridge, do all kinds of silly things, revolt, throw bombs, avoid one war and have your favourite war, do what you will, the very nature of the bourgeois mind is this, a mind that is caught in fear and pleasure. Face it!

Now if it is your problem, what are you going to do with it? How will you resolve it? And you must resolve it if you want a totally different kind of society, a different kind of morality, a different kind of life, you must solve this problem. If you are young you may say, 'Well, it is not important, I will have instant pleasure, instant fear, but that doesn't matter'. But it builds up and then you will find yourself caught in it. So it's your problem. And no authority can solve this. Right? You have had authorities - the

priest authority, the Jungian psychological authorities, and they have not been able to solve it. Right? They have given you escapes, like drugs, beliefs, rituals, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, they have offer all this, but the basic question of fear and pleasure you have never solved. And you have got to solve it. How? What are you going to do? Please, sir, put your mind to this. Knowing nobody is going to solve it for you; the realization that nobody is going to solve it for you is already the beginning to be free of the bourgeois world. Right? Neither your governments, nor your Mao's, nobody. Then what will you do, sirs? Unless you solve this sorrow is inevitable. Right? Not only your personal sorrows but the sorrow of the world. Do you know what the sorrow of the world is? You know what is happening in the world, not outwardly, all the wars, all the mischief of the politicians, and all that, but inwardly the enormous loneliness of man, the deep frustrations of man, the ache of loneliness, the utter lack of love, this vast uncompassionate callous world.

So unless you resolve this problem sorrow is inevitable, and time will not solve it. Right? You can say, well, I will think about it tomorrow, I'll have my instant pleasure and if fear comes out of it I will put up with it - time will not solve this problem. Right? So what will you do? Who is going to answer you? After raising this question, seeing all the complexities of it, seeing that nobody on earth, or some divine force - we have relied on all that before - is going to resolve this essential problem. What are you going to do, how do you respond to it? No answer? What do you say, sirs? All right, if you have no answer, I mean, not say, 'You will tell us', but really you have no answer, have you, if you are really honest, not

playing the hypocrite, or trying to avoid it, not trying to side step it, when you are faced with this problem, which is the crucial problem because we have translated love as pleasure, which we will go into another time.

So how are you going to find out naturally for it to come to an end? No method, obviously. Right? Method implies time. Somebody gives you the method, the system, you practise that method, that system, it will make your mind more and more mechanical, conflict with 'what is' and the system. Right? You are following all this? The system promises you one thing but the fact is you are afraid. And by practising the system you are further and further moving away from 'what is', and so conflict increases, consciously or unconsciously. Right? So what will you do?

Now what has happened to the mind - please listen carefully, follow this - what has happened to the mind, to the brain, that has listened to all this - listened, not merely heard a few words, but actually listened, shared, communicated, learnt, what has happened to that mind? You have listened to my question? What has happened to your mind that has listened, not verbally, superficially, but actually with tremendous attention, awareness of your own fears, that has listened to the explanation, listened to the problem, listened to the complexity of it, seen how thought breeds fear as well as pleasure, and sustains it, what has happened to the quality of the mind that has so listened, that is to your mind, to your heart?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't answer, it sir. We will answer this question afterwards, question it. But now what has happened to your mind? Examine it, find out. Is it different entirely from the moment when we began

this morning and now, or is it the same repetitive mind caught in pleasure and fear? Is there a new quality, or a mind that is learning? You follow? Not saying it must put an end to fear or to pleasure but a mind that by observing has learnt, is learning, and therefore what has happened to such a mind? Please.

Q: It becomes totally silent.

K: It becomes totally silent. Wait, sir, look what you have said. It has become totally silent, which is what? Shocked? Shocked by all this? No, sir, look what has happened to your mind and heart that has observed all this, this morning by listening, discussing, enquiring, learning, being curious, see how thought breeds fear and pleasure and all the consequences of its activities, what has happened to your mind?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Hasn't your mind become a little more sensitive? Hasn't it? Before you just walked, carrying this burden of fear and pleasure. By learning the weight of the burden, haven't you slightly put it aside, haven't you dropped it, and therefore walking very carefully? One moment, let me finish, because I have not finished with this. So your mind, if you have really followed this, listened to it, shared it together, learnt together, your mind by observing, not through determination, not through effort, but merely observing it has become sensitive and therefore very intelligent. Right? Don't, please, don't agree, if it is not sensitive it is not sensitive - don't play the game.

So next time fear arises, as it will, intelligence will respond to it, not in terms of pleasure, in terms of suppressing or escaping. You follow? This intelligent, sensitive mind, which has come about by

putting aside, and by examining, learning, looking at this burden, it has put it aside and therefore it has become astonishingly alive, sensitive. Then it can ask quite a different question, which is: if pleasure is not the way of life, as it has been for most people, for most of us, then is life barren? Do you understand? Is life dry? Or what is the difference between pleasure and joy? Does it mean I can never enjoy life? Please don't agree, find out. You enjoyed life before in terms of pleasure and fear. The instant pleasure, sex, drink, killing an animal, eating food, stuffing yourself with dead animals, and all the rest of it. The instant pleasure. And that's been your way of life. And you suddenly discover by examining, looking that pleasure isn't the way at all, because it leads to fear, to frustration, to misery, to sorrow, to other great sociological as well as personal disturbances and so on. So you ask quite a different question now. You say, what is joy.

Is there joy which is untouched by thought and pleasure? Because if it is touched by thought it again becomes pleasure, and therefore fear. Right? So is there a way of living daily, having understood pleasure and fear, a way of life which is joyous, which is enjoyment, not the carrying over of pleasure from day to day, and the fear? You have understood my question? Are you all getting tired?

Look, sir: you know what enjoyment is? To look at those mountains, with the beauty of the valley, the light on the hills, and the trees, and the flowing river, to enjoy it. And when do you enjoy it? When you say, how marvellous it is - when the mind, when thought is not using that as a means of pleasure. Right? You are following? Look: you can look at that mountain, or the face of a

woman or a man, the lines of a valley, the movement of a tree, and take tremendous delight in it. When you have done that it is finished; but if you carry it over then pain and pleasure begins. Are you understanding all this? Can you look and finish with it? Be careful of this, be very watchful of this. That is, can you look at that mountain, and not be absorbed by the beauty of the mountain, like a child with a toy being absorbed by the toy, and return to your mischief again, but to look at that beauty and the very look is enough, the delight in it, but not to carry it over, wishing for it tomorrow. Which means - see the danger - that is, the instant pleasure, sexual or otherwise, you can also play that trick, can't you. Oh, Lord, no? You see it, do you? You can have some great pleasure and say, it is over. But is it over? Is not the mind consciously or unconsciously building, chewing over it, thinking about it, wishing it to happen again soon? Thought has nothing whatsoever to do with joy. Please, all this is tremendous discovery for yourself, not being told, not write about it, interpret it for somebody to read.

So there is a vast difference between delight, enjoyment, joy, bliss and pleasure. I do not know if you have not noticed, all the religious pictures in the western world avoid any kind of sensuous pleasure taking place. Have you noticed it? I won't go into all that, sorry.

Q: Why not?

K: Because it is so obvious. If you saw early pictures, before all the pictures, you will notice, there is no scenery at all. Right? Only the human body, tortured, or the Virgin Mary and so on and so on. There is no landscape because that distracted you, that was

pleasure, therefore be concerned with the figure, the symbol of that figure, what it implied - all that stuff. Only much later this thing came on, the introduction of the scenery, whereas in China and India it was part of life. You are understanding all this? This is not a school, please. I am not a professor.

So you can observe all this and find out the beauty of living, and there is, in which there is no effort but living with great ecstasy in which pleasure and thought and fear doesn't enter at all. Right, sir.

Now you can ask me questions. Just a minute, sir, let me take a breath, and you also take a breath.

Q: About dreams: I understood that the daily activities and so forth in dreams come to an end, but what about a dream like I dreamt that I see you coming to this meeting, leaving that coat there, at that same place - they all come true.

K: That is, you are saying - I have understood your question, sir, let me take a breather. You are saying, when I am asleep I see something that is happening in the future which is accurate. Is that it? You saw in your sleep the speaker come on the platform, put the brown coat there, and the microphone, this, very definitely in your dream what was going to happen in the future, the next morning. Are you all waiting for me to answer this! Oh, Lord, look at all your faces, you ought to see them. I wish you would pay as much attention to what was being said before rather than listen to this question so attentively and waiting for an answer. You have understood the question, sir? The questioner says, he saw last night in his sleep what actually took place when the speaker came into the tent, put the brown coat - it was a brown coat - and exactly

what clothes he had on and so on and so on. How do you account for that? How do you account for it?

First of all, why do you give such tremendous importance to what is going to happen in the future, and seeing the reality of the future, why do you give such colossal importance to it? You know, astrologers, the fortune tellers, the palmists, you know, tell you what marvellous things are going to happen to you, why are you so concerned? Why aren't you concerned - I am going to answer your question - why aren't you concerned with the actual daily living, which contains all the treasures? Oh, you don't see it. Wait, sir, I haven't answered this question, please. You know when the mind becomes somewhat sensitive, and because you have been listening here, it has become somewhat sensitive, I don't say completely sensitive, but somewhat sensitive, naturally it observes more, whether tomorrow or today. It's like going up on an aeroplane and looking down, two boats coming from the opposite direction on the same river and they are going to meet at a certain point, and that's the future. Right? Right? The mind being a bit more sensitive becomes aware of certain things which may happen tomorrow, and also which is happening now. And most of us give much more importance to what is going to happen tomorrow, and not what is actually happening now. And you will find, if you go into this very, very deeply, nothing happens at all. Any happening is part of the experience of living, of life, why do you want experience at all? A mind that is sensitive, alive, full of clarity, what does it need to have experience at all? You answer that question yourself. Yes, sir?

Q: You suggest that we should observe the actions in our daily



life, but what is the entity that decides what to observe and when?

K: What is the entity that observes and when to observe during all the activities of life, daily life. Right? Is that the question, sir? What is the entity that observes?

Q: Does the entity take a decision to go and observe? Does one decide if one should?

K: Ah! Who decides that you should observe. Is there any decision involved in this? Do you decide to observe? Or do you observe merely? Please find out, sir. Do you decide to observe, do you decide and say, 'I am going to observe and learn'? Then there is the question, who is the decider. Is it will that says, 'I must', and when it doesn't it chastises itself further and says, 'I must, must, must', therefore when you decide to observe, in that there is conflict, and therefore in that state of mind which has decided to observe there is no observation at all. Sir, look, you are walking down the road, somebody passes you by, you observe, and you say, 'How ugly he is, how he smells, I wish he wouldn't do this', which is, you are aware of your responses to that passer-by, you are aware that you are judging, condemning, or justifying, you are aware, observing. You don't say, 'I must not judge, I must not justify', which means be aware why you are justifying, why you are condemning, just be aware of your responses. Right, sir? In that there is no decision at all. You are following this? You see somebody who has insulted you yesterday, immediately all your cockles are beginning to get nervous, or anxious, or you begin to dislike. Be aware of your dislike, why, be aware of all that. Don't decide to be aware. Somebody passes by who has flattered you, says, what a marvellous bird you are - and you will feel delighted.

Watch that sense, watch it.

So you will see in that observation there is no observer, only observation taking place. The observer exists only when through observation you accumulate - when you say, 'He is my friend because he flattered me, and he is not my friend because he said something ugly, or something true which I don't like.' Which is accumulating through observation, that accumulation is the observer. But when you observe without accumulation then there is no judgement, you observe. And you can do this all the time. And in this observation there are certain definite decisions made, naturally. You follow? But those decisions are a natural result, not decisions made by the observer who has accumulated. Clear? Do you see something of this? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand the question. The questioner asks - I must stop after this, it's twelve o'clock. We have talked for an hour and a half, isn't that enough? This is the last question. And the questioner asks, you said at the beginning the instinctual response of self-protection against a wild animal is intelligence and not fear. And thought which breeds fear is entirely different from the other. Right? Aren't they different? Aren't they different, don't you observe the difference? Thought which breeds and sustains fear, and intelligence which says, be careful - isn't there a difference there? But thought - see the intricacies of this - thought has created say, for example, nationalism, racial prejudice, the acceptance of certain moral values, has accepted it, but thought doesn't see the danger of it, doesn't see the danger of nationalism. Right? If it saw it then it would be the response of not fear but of intelligence,

which would be the same as meeting the snake. I don't know if you are meeting this? Meeting the snake is a natural self-protective, intelligent response. Meeting nationalism, which is the product of thought, which divides people, breeds war, thought doesn't see the danger of it. If it saw the danger for the human self-protection, they would both be the same. Do you understand this?

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 28TH JULY 1970

There is a lovely story of a teacher who used to give a sermon every morning to his disciples, and one day he was just getting on to the rostrum and about to begin when a bird came on the window-sill and sat there singing, and the teacher became quiet, and when the bird flew off he said, 'Now the sermon is over'. I wish we could do the same!

Q: Why can't you?

K: We are doing it! This is our song. So you can listen.

We were talking the other day of the importance and the total unimportance of thought, where thought has a great deal of action, and within its own field a limited freedom, and a state of mind that is totally unconditioned. So if we can this morning go into this question of conditioning, not only the superficial cultural conditioning but also why conditioning takes place, and what is the quality of mind that is not conditioned, that has gone beyond it, because we have to go into this matter fairly deeply to find out what love is. And in understanding what love is perhaps we shall be able to comprehend the full significance of death.

So first we will, if you will also go with the speaker, take a voyage together into this question of conditioning and find out for oneself whether the mind can ever be totally and completely free of this conditioning. One can see, and it is fairly obvious, how superficially we are conditioned by the culture, the society, the propaganda around us. The conditioning of nationality, the conditioning of a particular religion or sect, the conditioning through education, through environmental influence, one can

observe that fairly clearly and be aware of it. I think that is fairly clear and fairly simple, how most human beings in whatever country or race they belong to, or any particular culture or religious propaganda, they are conditioned, shaped, moulded, held within that particular pattern. One can see that in oneself. And one can fairly easily put those conditionings aside.

There are deeper conditionings, such as this aggressive attitude towards life. Aggression implies also a sense of dominance, seeking power, position, prestige, and that's much more difficult, and one has to go into it very, very deeply to be completely free of it because it is very subtle, it takes different forms. One may think one is not aggressive, but when one has a conclusion, an opinion, an evaluation, verbally and non-verbally, there is a sense of assertion which gradually becomes aggressive and violent. One can see this in oneself.

May I here say, please don't take notes. Not only it disturbs others round you, but also while you are taking notes you cannot possibly listen and observe yourself. It isn't a thing that you are going to think over when you go back to your room, what we are doing is observing as we go along now, at this minute. So as one cannot possibly compel you to do that, we request you kindly not to take notes because it disturbs, and for your own sake. And also please don't take recordings, putting out a microphone, it also disturbs other.

To be aware of this conditioning of aggression: the very word that one uses, you may say it very gently but there is a kick behind it, there is an assertive, dominant, compulsive action, which becomes very crude when it becomes violent. Now that is our

conditioning. That conditioning of aggression, whether one has derived it from the animal or one has, in one's own self assertive pleasure, become aggressive. That one has to discover because that is part of our conditioning. Is one aggressive in that total sense of that word? Aggressive, that word means stepping forth.

And one of our conditionings is comparison, comparing, not only with what you think is noble, or a hero, or a memory, comparing secretly within yourself with what you would like to be, and what you are. The comparative, assertive pursuit is also our conditioning. And again this is extraordinarily subtle. I compare myself to somebody who is a little more bright, a little more intelligent, a little more physically beautiful, regular features and all the rest of it - secretly or openly. This constant comparative enquiry, soliloquy, talking to oneself. Because where there is comparison - please observe this in yourself - where there is comparison there is not only assertion, a form of aggression but also the feeling of achievement, and therefore in that there is a frustration. When you can't achieve there is a sense of frustration, and a feeling of inferiority. I hope you are doing this as we go along. There is not only the aggressive conditioning, but also from childhood all our education, all our educational system is based on this: compare, getting more marks, examinations, comparing yourself with somebody who is much clever, the battle goes on. And in that comparison there is envy, jealousy, and all the conflict involved in that.

Comparison implies measurement: I am measuring myself with what I think I am, with something that I think is better, or bigger, or nobler. Right? Please let us work at this thing together, not you

listen and I talk, let us, both of us, move together, flow together in the comprehension of this. Because you will see our conditioning is so extraordinarily deep, and so very subtle. And one asks, can the mind be ever free of this conditioning? Then there is the conditioning of society, the culture, always measuring. As long as the mind has a measure it must compare, whether the measurement, the rule, the tape with which you measure is self created or given to you by the society, the culture that is around you. Do please go into this with me, you will see how extraordinary, fascinating this is.

Then there is the conditioning, not only of fear, but of pleasure. On that reward and punishment, on that the whole moral and religious structure is based, and by that we are conditioned, and so on. Now why is it that we are conditioned? You see we see outwardly the various influences that have conditioned us, and the inward voluntary demand to be conditioned - the acceptance of conditioning. Why? Why does the mind have to be conditioned, why has it allowed itself to be conditioned? What is the factor behind these conditionings? You are following all this? Why? Why am I born in a certain country and culture, calling myself a Hindu, with all the superstition, tradition, and all the rest of it, which is fairly obvious, imposed by the family, by the society, by the ritual, by the constant repetition of a particular Brahmin class which says, do this, don't do that - repetition, constantly drilled in, which also takes place in the west, even though now a permissive society - a permissive society has its own conditioning - long hair, short hair, this kind of dress, that kind of dress, square, not square, the bourgeois, you follow? Now one asks, why does the mind and the

heart, the whole activity of this, why does it accept conditioning? Not only outward influence, but also the inward demand to be shaped? What is the urge that lies behind this? You are understanding? What do you think it is? Please don't answer me, we will discuss it a little later. What do you think is the factor that is constantly demanding and acquiescing, yielding and resisting, this conditioning? The obvious reason is, one can see, one wants to be safe, secure, in a community which is doing certain things, which is following a certain pattern. If you don't follow that pattern you may lose your job, you may not have money, you might be regarded as a respectable human being, and all the rest of it. So there is a revolt against that, and that revolt forms its own conditioning - which all the young people are going through now. So what is the urge - please do listen to this, and go together into this - why are we doing this? What is the factor? You must find this out. Unless you discover it for yourself you will always be conditioned one way or the other, positively or negatively.

From childhood, from the moment we are born until we die, this process goes on. You may revolt against it, you might try to escape into another conditioning, withdrawing yourself into a monastery, or joining the activists, or the people who devote their life to contemplation, to philosophy, you follow, it is the same movement, right through life - why? What is the machinery that is in constant movement to adjust itself to various forms of conditioning? Right?

May I go on now, you have got the question clear? Have I made the question quite clear? Thought must always be conditioned, though in the field of thought there might be a certain freedom. Thought is always everlastingly conditioned because thought is the



response of the past, thought is the response of memory. And so where thought is functioning, adjusting, active, thought becomes mechanical, thought is always mechanical, and conditioning is always mechanical. Because it is very easy to fall into a pattern, into a groove, and then you think you are living, being tremendously active running around that groove - whether it is the communist groove, the activists groove, the groove of the Catholic, this, or that, because it is the easiest thing, the most mechanical thing to do. And we think we are living. Though thought has a certain amount in its field, a limited freedom, everything it does is mechanical. After all to go to the moon is quite mechanical; you have all the accumulated knowledge of centuries, and thinking about it you can pursue it, make it more and more and more, technical, mechanical, and you end up in the moon, or under the sea, and so on. The mind wants to follow a groove, wants to be mechanical, and that way there is safety, security, there is no disturbance: I have decided to do this, and I pursue that; I think this is right, and I pursue that; this is what I feel, and again. So the mind and the brain demand a mechanical functioning, a repetitive activity, in that there is safety. Right? Look at yourself, how many habits we have, both physical and psychological and intellectual habits, emotional habits we have. And it's one of the most difficult things to break away from, because to live mechanically is not only encouraged by society but also by each one of us, because that is the easiest way to live.

So thought being mechanical, repetitive, pursues and accepts any form of conditioning, which guarantees it a mechanical activity. A philosopher comes along, invents a new theory,

economic, or social, or mathematical, or this or that, and we poor silly human beings accept that groove and follow it. Our society, our culture, our religious promptings, everything is to function, is the encouragement of a mind that wants to function mechanically. In that mechanism there is a certain sense of stimulation. When you go to the Mass there is a certain elan, a certain excitement, emotionalism. And that becomes the pattern of life. I don't know if you have ever tried - do it once and you will see the fun of it - take a piece of stick, or a stone, any old piece, with a little shape to it, put it on the mantelpiece and give it every morning a flower. Put a flower beside it every morning, and within a month you will say that it has become the habit, that has become the religious symbol, you have identified yourself with that, with that piece of stick, with that piece of stone, with that piece of statue, or some other symbol.

So thought - please see the beauty of this and you will see what takes place when you see this - thought is always conditioned and therefore thought is always mechanical. Thought being the response of memory, response of the past, and that response is within certain variations, is mechanical. One has been taught engineering as a profession and you keep on adding, taking away a little bit, but you are set on that line-if you are a doctor, and so on and so on. So thought - please see this - thought within a certain field is still somewhat free, it can invent, but it is still within the field of the mechanics, technology. So when you see that, not only verbally, intellectually, but actually feel it - you understand what I mean. Look, when you hear that train, your whole body is aware of it, you are listening to it with your ears, with your mind, with your brain, with everything you are listening to it - or resisting it. And

from childhood we have been conditioned, and thought follows that conditioning, it is so easy, so mechanical.

Now can the mind free itself from its conditioning? Not only the habits it has cultivated, certain intellectual, emotional, opinions, judgements, you follow, the attitudes, the values, can the mind free itself of all this conditioning? Which means, can the mind be completely free of thought? Go easy, don't jump on me. Because if this is not completely understood the next thing which I am going to talk about will have no meaning. The understanding of this leads to the next question, which is inevitable, if you go into it.

If thought is mechanical, if thought will inevitably make the mind conform, and therefore be conditioned, then what is love? You are following? Is love the product of thought? Is love conditioned by the society, the culture, the religion in which one is born, the state? You are following all this? That is the inevitable question after asking oneself if thought is actually conditioned, is mechanical, is the factor of conditioning. Then as we are investigating, enquiring, looking into this question of what is love - is love thought? Is love nurtured by thought, cultivated by thought, dependent on thought? Right?

Now what is love? Bearing in mind, the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. Can the mind be free of the mechanical activity of thought so as to find out what is love? For most of us love is associated or equated with sex. That's one form of conditioning. When you are enquiring into this really very complex and intricate and extraordinarily beautiful thing, one must find out how that word has conditioned the mind. Right? We won't kill, go to Vietnam, or some other place, to kill, but we don't mind

killing animals, we don't mind saying brutal things about another, gossip, ugly, about another, and yet we talk about love. You know, if you had to kill the animal which you eat, go out yourself to the farm, kill it, or see the ugliness of it, would you eat that food, that animal? I doubt it very much. But you don't mind the butcher killing and eating it, and in that there is a great deal of hypocrisy.

So one asks, not only what love is, what is compassion. In the whole Christian culture the animals have no soul, they are put on earth by god for you to eat them; and you go to some parts of India where to kill is wrong, whether the fly, the animal, or anything, so you kill the least thing, and they go to the other extreme exaggeration of it. Again part of this conditioning. You see people who are anti-vivisection and yet wear marvellous furs. You know the double, the hypocrisy that goes on. Now to find out what is compassion, to be compassionate, not only find out verbally, but actually with passion be compassionate, what does it mean? Is compassion a matter of habit, a matter of thought, a matter of mechanical repetition of being kind, polite, gentle, tender? You follow? So what is compassion? Can the mind - listen to this please-can the mind which is caught in the activity of thought with its conditioning, and mechanical repetition, measurement, can such a mind be compassionate at all? It can talk about it, it can do social reform, social activities, be kind to the poor heathen down there and so on - is that compassion? When thought dictates, when thought is active, can there be any place for compassion? - compassion being action without motive, without self-interest, without any sense of fear, without any sense of pleasure. So one asks: is love pleasure? Go on, sirs, answer it.

Q: Yes.

K: You see! You say, yes. Yes, sir, sex is pleasure, of course.

Q: Not sex, love.

K: Wait sir, wait, sir.

Q: Don't talk about sex all the time.

K: I don't talk about sex all the time.

Q: All the time you talk about sex, sex, sex.

K: Sir, sir, wait, wait.

Q: Love is a whore. That's what you think all the time, a whore, sex. You talk against killing animals, aren't those leather shoes you are wearing?

K: Sir, we went into that. Please sir, just a minute sir.

Q: Ah, you talk all the time, you never let me talk.

K: Of course not.

Q: Shut up. These are discussions, right, let me talk.

K: We take pleasure in violence, we take pleasure in achievement, we take pleasure in assertion, we take pleasure in aggression, in every form of violence. And also we take pleasure in being somebody. All the product of thought, the product of measurement - I was that, and I will be that. Thought thinking about something, which has given it pleasure, wants it repeated. Now all that, is it love? Is pleasure, in that sense which we are talking about, the repetition of an experience, the repetition and the pursuit of achievement, the aggressive attitude, assertion, and its opposite which is fear, is all that love? Then how is a mind, which is caught in certain habits, with its associations, measurement, comparison, which produces all our conditioning, how can such a mind know what love is? Right? I may - one may say, love is this,

that, that, which are all the product, the result of thought. And that's our life. A life of constant battle, and aggression, killing for satisfaction and for duty and for pleasure, that's what we call living, with its fear, punishment, pain, sorrow, all that is living. And we cling to that, and in that field circumscribed by thought we try to escape or find another field which is more productive, more creative, and so on, again created by thought. Please see what we are doing, not that we are imposing anything on each other, but observe what is actually going on.

Then from that question, from that observation, arises a question: what is death. What does it mean to die? It must be a most marvellous experience. We are not saying this for sadistic reasons, or because one wants instinctively to commit suicide, but it must be something that has completely come to an end. You understand? A movement that has been set going, a movement of strife, struggle, turmoil, sorrow, and all the anxious despairs, frustrations, which you call living, suddenly coming to an end. The man who is trying to become famous, assertive, violent, brutal, you know, cut off. I do not know if you have noticed, anything that continues psychologically becomes mechanical, repetitive, it's only when that which psychologically has a continuance comes to an end there is something totally new. You can see this in oneself. Creation is not the continuation of 'what is', or what was, but the ending of that. You have understood? If I, if a human being repeats he is a Brahmin, he is a Christian, he is a Buddhist, he is a communist, he is a socialist, you know, various forms of absurdities, he can never find anything new. It's only when all that momentum has come to an end there is something new.

So psychologically, can one die? You understand my question? Die to the known, die to what has been, not in order to become what you will be - the ending, the freedom from the known. After all that is what is death: the physical organism will die, naturally, poor thing, it has been abused, kicked around, vaccinated, frustrated, eaten all kinds of things, depending on the taste, drunk, you know, how you live, and you go on that way until you die. And the body through accident, through old age, through some disease, through the strain of this constant emotional battle within and without, makes the body twisted, ugly, die. And there is not only self-pity in this dying - please observe it - and also there is self-pity when somebody else dies, the thing that we call sorrow when somebody dies whom you consider you love, isn't there in that sorrow a great deal of fear, because you are left alone, you are exposed to yourself, you have nobody to rely on, nobody that can give you comfort, so there is in that there is a great deal of self-pity, not only for the person that has died but for yourself.

So our sorrow is tinged with this self-pity, and with fear. And naturally when there is this fear, self-pity, uncertainty, one accepts strangely every form of belief. You know the whole of Asia believes in reincarnation. You know what that means? Being reborn next life. Now when you enquire into that, what is it that is going to be reborn next life, you come against difficulties. What is it? Yourself? What are you? A lot of words, a lot of opinions, attachments to your furniture, to your shoes, to your opinions, to your conditioning, all that is going to be born next life, which you call the soul. And incarnation implies also that what you are today you will be again next life, therefore behave. You understand?

Behave, not tomorrow but today, because what you are today you are going to pay for it next life. Incarnate today, afresh, not next life. And those people who believe in this thing don't bother about behaviour at all, it is just a matter of belief, which has no value, because what you do today, what you are today, your activity, your conditioning, what you actually are, not what you think you should be - if you believe in that you will be, modified. So if that is going to be the next life, change it now, completely change, change with great passion, let the mind strip itself of everything, of every conditioning, every knowledge, everything we think is right, empty it. Then you will know what dying means.

So only when you understand means then you will know what love is. So love is not something of the past, of thought, of culture, it is not a pleasure. Therefore a mind that has understood the whole movement of thought becomes extraordinarily quiet, absolutely silent. This silence is the beginning of the new.

Right sir. Just a minute, you take a breath, and I'll take a breath.

Q: Can love have an object?

K: Can love have an object. Can I love you, you the object? Has love an object? Now please just listen to this. Who is asking the question? Thought?

Q: Love.

K: Love. Love is not asking this question. When you love, you love, you don't say, object, or no object, personal or impersonal. Oh, you don't know what it means, the beauty of it, sirs. Look at it. Our love as it is, is such a trial. Our love in our relationship with each other, is such a conflict. Our love is based on your image of me, and my image of you. The relationship of these two images -



look at it very carefully - the relationship between these two isolated images call or say to each other, we love. The images are the product of the past, of our memories, memories of what you said to me and I said to you. And this relationship between the two images must inevitably be an isolating process. And that's what we call relationship. To be related means to be in contact, not merely physically but to be in contact, which is not possible when there is an image, or when there is a self-isolating process of thought, which is the 'me' and the 'you'. Then we say, has love an object, is not love divine, or is love profane. You follow? Sir, when you love you are not giving or receiving.

Q: What goes behind or beyond the word love, and also the beauty in the feeling of the sunset, is there actually a difference between beauty and that which has been named as love?

K: When you go behind the words beauty and love, do not all these divisions disappear. Right, that's the question, sir? You know, sir, have you ever sat very quietly, not day-dreaming, sat very quietly, completely aware, in that awareness there is no verbalization, no choice, no restraint, or direction, when the body is completely relaxed, have you noticed, have you ever done it, and be - not 'be' - when that silence comes into being, have you? We will talk about that the day after tomorrow when we meet, because that requires a great deal of exploration, a great deal of, you know, investigation. Because you see our minds are never still, they are endlessly chattering, and therefore dividing, therefore make life into fragments, the living into fragments - the doctor, the pacifist, and so on, divide, divide, divide. And so we divide beauty and love, art, the artist and the businessman. Can all this fragmentation

come to an end? And knowing thought has divided this, thought is responsible for this division, because thought in its very nature is the past. Thought is time, thought divides the 'you' and the 'me', the fear and pleasure, escape from fear, pursue pleasure. So can thought be completely silent, and respond when it is necessary, without violence, objectively, sanely, rationally respond, and let this silence pervade? That's the only way to find out for oneself this quality of the mind that has no fragments, that is not broken up as the 'you' and the 'me'.

Q: Is killing a fly the same as killing a human being and an animal?

K: Is killing a fly the same as killing a human being and an animal. You know, where will you begin the comprehension of killing? Please listen to my question. With the fly, with the shoe, or with the mind, the heart, that has accepted killing? Where will you begin? You won't go to war, kill a human being - you may, I don't know whether you will or will not, it's up to you - but you don't mind taking sides - your group and my group. You don't mind believing in one thing, and standing by what you believe. You don't mind killing people with a word, with a gesture, and you'd be awfully careful not to kill a fly. You know, once I was, some years ago - the speaker was in a country where Buddhism is the accepted religion. In Buddhism it is one of the accepted actions of behaviour not to kill, if you are a practising Buddhist. So a couple came to see the speaker and he said, 'We have a problem. We don't want to kill, so we change the butcher every week.' Listen, listen, don't laugh, just listen. 'And that's not our problem.' They were ardent Buddhists who had been brought up not to kill. 'But our problem is

we like eggs, and we don't want to kill life, the fertile egg, so what are we do?' You understand the question? Unless inwardly you are very clear, both verbally and actually, what killing implies, not only through a gun, by a word, by a gesture, by division, by saying, my country, your country, my god, your god, my belief, and your belief - as long as there is this division there will inevitably be killing in some form. And don't make a lot of ado about killing a fly and going and killing your neighbour with a word.

Look, sirs, the speaker has never eaten meat in his life, he doesn't know what it tastes like even. And yet he puts on shoes. And one has to live - I don't know why - one has to live, and so because in your heart you don't want to kill anything, hurt anybody, really you mean it - you understand, not to hurt anybody - then you have to kill the vegetable you eat, the tomatoes you eat. And if you don't eat vegetables, and you don't eat anything then I am afraid you will come very quickly to an end. So one has to find out for oneself very clearly, without any choice, without any prejudice, which means to be so highly sensitive and intelligent, then let that intelligence act, not you say, 'Well, I won't kill flies, but I will say something brutal about my husband.'

Yes sir?

Q: What is the difference between the mind and the brain?

K: Ah, what is the difference between the mind and the brain.

Q: Have they any function?

K: Please sir, we will go into it. Do you want to go into it now? What is the difference between the mind and the brain, and what are their functions? Do you want to go into it now? Haven't you had enough for this morning?

Q: Yes.

K: Thank you. We will meet again so we will talk about it.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH JULY 1970

This is the last talk, but there will be discussions beginning on Sunday morning. And I hope you can stand this heat, at least for an hour and twenty minutes or so.

We have been talking, communicating with each other about many things concerning our daily existence. And I think this morning we should talk over together the problem of religion. I know most people don't like that word, they think it is rather old fashioned and has very little meaning in the modern world. There are the weekend religions, turn up on a Sunday morning, well dressed, and do all the mischief you can during the week, and so on. When we use the word 'religion' we are not in any way concerned with organized propagandist religions, churches, dogmatism, rituals and the authority of the saviours and representatives of god, and all the rest of that stuff. We are talking about something quite different. I am sure most human beings, both in the past and in the present, have always asked if there is something more, much more transcendental, real, than the everyday existence with all its tiresome routine, with its violence and despairs and sorrows, if there is something more. And not being able to find it, they have begun to invent, imagine, worship a stone, a tree, or an image, giving to that symbol a great significance. And it was all, it appears and seems, based on fear and thought.

Now to find out if there is anything really true, sacred - I am using that word rather hesitantly - something that is not put together by one's own desires and hopes and fears and longings,

something that is not dependent on environment, culture, on education, but something that thought has never touched, something that is totally incomprehensibly new. And to find that out perhaps this morning we could spend an hour or so in enquiring into that, trying to find out whether there is a vastness, an ecstasy, a light that is unquenchable. Because without finding that life, however virtuous one is, however orderly, however non-violent one is, in itself has very little meaning. And the meaning of religion in the sense we are using, in which there is no kind of fear or belief, is the quality that makes for a life in which there is no fragmentation whatsoever. And if we are going to enquire into that, one must not only be free of all beliefs, but also one must be very clear of the distorting factor of all effort, direction and purpose.

Please do see the importance of this, because we are talking over together, sharing together, understanding together. And if you are at all serious in this matter it is very important to understand how any form of effort does distort a direct perception. Any form of suppression obviously distorts. Or any form of direction, direction born of choice, established purpose, an end, created by one's own desire, will, does make the mind not only distorted, utterly incapable of seeing things as they are. So we are enquiring into this question of what is truth, if there is such a thing as enlightenment, if there is such a thing as something that is not of time at all, if there is a reality that is not dependent on one's own demands.

Now in trying to find that out there must not only be freedom but also a certain quality of order. We generally associate order with discipline - discipline being conformity, imitation, adjustment,

suppression and so on, drilling the mind to follow a certain course, a certain pattern, what it considers to be moral. That is generally understood as discipline. And that is diametrically opposite to order. Order has nothing whatsoever to do with discipline. Please do follow this a little while, give your attention, we are sharing together, so I don't have to repeat, 'Please do pay attention to this'.

As we were saying, order is not discipline. Order comes about naturally and inevitably when we understand all the disturbing factors, when we understand the disorders, the conflicts, the battles that are going on within ourselves, and outwardly, when we are aware of all this - the disorder, the mischief, the hate, the violence, the ambitions, the comparative pursuit and so on, which all creates not only social disorder but inward disorder, when we understand this disorder, look at it, become aware of it, then out of that awareness comes order, which is nothing whatsoever to do with discipline. But you must have order, because after all order is virtue. Yes, sir, you may not like that word 'virtue', after all virtue is not something to be cultivated. If it is a thing of thought, will, suppression, it is no longer virtue. But if one understands the disorder of our life, the confusion in which one lives, the utter meaningless of our existence, when we see all that very clearly, not only intellectually and verbally, but actually see the utter futility of all that, not condemning it, not running away from it, but observing it in our life, then out of that awareness and observation comes naturally order, which is virtue. This virtue is entirely different from the virtue of society with its respectability, the sanctions of society, of churches and religions with their hypocrisy, it is entirely different from one's own self imposed discipline. But this order in

our enquiry must exist, otherwise you cannot proceed - proceed to find out if there is, or if there is not, without any assumption, a reality that is not of time, that is incorruptible, that doesn't depend on anything.

Now to find that out, if you are at all serious, really serious in the sense that it is a part of life, it is as important as earning a livelihood, as important as eating, seeking pleasure, you know, it is a vital tremendously important thing to find out. And this can only be found out through meditation. That word 'meditation' implies, the dictionary meaning of that word, is to ponder over, to think over, to enquire, to have a mind that is capable of looking, a mind that is intelligent, a mind that is sane, not perverted, not neurotic, not wishing something, for something. That is the generally understood meaning of meditation if you look into the etymology of that word, and so on.

Now we are going to together enquire into this: what is meditation, and if there is any method, any system, any path which you can pursue and come to the understanding, or perception of reality. You are following all this? You know unfortunately people come from the east with their bag of tricks. Their bag of tricks consists of systems, authorities, they say, do this, and don't do that and you will find enlightenment; practise Zen. Some of you have done all these tricks? Or go to India, or Japan, and spend your years studying, disciplining yourself, trying to become aware of your toe, your nose and your eyes and all the rest of it, day after day, practise endlessly. Or repeat certain words, the Sanskrit word for that is mantra, repeat certain words and you will calm the mind and in that calmness there will be perception of something beyond



thought. You know all those tricks can be practised by a very stupid mind. A stupid mind, a dull mind - I am using the word 'stupid' as stupefied, the word 'stupid' means a mind that is made dull, stupefied. A mind that is stupefied - you may not like stupid, so I will be more polite by calling it a stupefied mind - a stupefied mind can practise any of these things, study Zen, practise it, repeat words, and specially if they are Sanskrit they have a certain tonality, and do all these tricks of control, suppression, imitation, follow a certain authority. A dull mind can do this, and it will remain dull. Naturally. Because when you do all these things, practise, the mind becomes more and more mechanical. Please, you may not be interested in all this but you have to find out. Because after you have listened very carefully you may go out in the world and teach people, that may be your vocation - and I hope it is - and so if you are going to point out these things you have to know the whole substance, the meaning, the fullness, the beauty, the ecstasy of all this.

So a dull mind, a mind that has been stupefied by practice cannot possibly under any circumstances whatsoever understand what is reality. So one must be completely, totally, everlastingly free of all this. Because you need a mind that is not distorted, that is very clear, that is not blunted, that is no longer pursuing a direction, a purpose, then only is it possible for such a mind to see 'what is'. In this state of mind there is no experiencing at all. Experience implies there is an entity who is experiencing, isn't there. An entity that is going through a certain experience, and therefore there is a duality - the experiencer and the thing to be experienced. Right? There is the observer and the thing to be

observed. That is, most of us want some kind of deep abiding marvellous mystical experience, because our own daily experiences are so trivial, so banal, so superficial, we want something mysterious, something that is electrifying. Now in that desire for a marvellous experience there is this duality of the experiencer and the experience. Right? As long as this duality exists there must always be a distortion because the experiencer is the accumulated past, with all his experiences, his knowledge, his memory. Being dissatisfied with all that he wants something much greater, and therefore he either projects it, or finds it, but in that still there is a duality, therefore there is a distortion. Are you following all this? Truth is not something to be experienced. Truth is not something that you can seek out and find it. That which is beyond time, thought cannot possibly enquire, search it out and grasp it.

So one must understand very deeply this question of experience and wanting experience. So please understand this. Do please see this tremendously important thing. Any form of effort, wanting, direction, seeking out truth, and the demand for experience, in that there is a duality, the observer wanting something transcendental, and therefore making effort, and therefore making the mind not clear, not pristine or non-mechanical. And a mind that is seeking an experience, however marvellous, mysterious, in that very search there is a duality, the 'me' that is seeking it. The 'me' is the past, with all the frustrations, miseries, hopes, disgusts, you know, all that is seeking, therefore in that there is a distortion.

Then there is the whole business of the brain. After all the brain, you can observe this in yourself, I haven't read books, so we are

not discussing from any special point of view - you can observe yourself, for yourself, how the brain operates. The brain is the result of the past, of time, of experience, it is the storehouse of memory. And memory is the past. And this memory responds, all the time responding, of like and dislike, justifying, condemning and so on, responding all the time, according to its conditioning, according to the culture, religion, education it is brought up with. That storehouse of memory, from which thought arises guides most of our life. Right? You are following all this? Are we going together? Don't look so worried, please. If you don't quite understand it now we will go into it a little later, afterwards, so relax and take it easy, because this is really quite an immense thing if you can grasp it.

And that brain, which is the storehouse of the past, is directed, is shaping our life, every day, and every minute, conscious or unconscious. And that's one of the distorting factors, which is thought, which is the response of the past - the past being knowledge, experience, and so on, the 'me', which is the very essence of the word and thought. Now can that old brain be completely quiet, only awoken when it is necessary to operate, to function, to speak, to do, act? But the rest of the time completely still. Have you ever tried to do this? No, you haven't. You all smoke very easily, you do things without deep thought, it doesn't matter, that's your affair.

Meditation implies, not the orthodox meditation, not the Zen meditation, not the meditation through repetition, all that is stupefied, mechanical, has no meaning. The real meditation is to find out whether the brain with all its activities, with all its

experiences, can be absolutely quiet, not forced, because the moment you force it there is again duality. The entity that says, 'By Jove, I'd like to have a marvellous experience, therefore I must force my brain to be quiet, will it' - you will never do it. But if you begin to enquire, watch, observe, listen to all the movements of thought, its conditioning, its pursuits, its fears, its pleasures, how the brain operates, then you will see the brain becomes extraordinarily quiet. And the quietness is not dormancy, sleep, but tremendously active and therefore quiet. You understand? A machine, a big dynamo that is working perfectly, ticking over, well oiled, hardly makes any sound, it is only when there is friction, there is noise. So the brain and therefore the body, must be completely quiet.

So one has to find out whether your body can completely sit still, or lie still, without any movement - again, not force it. Because the body, the brain are interrelated, psychosomatically they function, not separately. Shall we go on, we are meeting each other? We are communication with each other?

There are various practices to make the body still. Again these practices imply suppression: the body wants to get up and go away, walk, and it says, 'No, I must sit quietly', and the battle begins, wanting to go out and wanting to sit still. And in this there is this whole thing called yoga - you have heard about it? You are rather - I suppose you know the whole world is upside down, when one is concerned only with social activities, social reform, revolution, all the other things escape, or are put aside. But if you want to understand the whole business of life, you have to understand everything that is contained in it, human life, psychologically. The

word 'yoga', you will find dozens of books all over the world, written by all the specialists, means to join together. The very words 'join together' is wrong, which implies duality. You understand? Therefore it has quite a different meaning, which we won't go into now. Probably it was invented, this particular series of exercises and breathing many thousands of years ago. It is to keep the glands and the nerves and the whole system functioning very healthily, without medicine, and keep it highly sensitive. And the body needs to be sensitive otherwise you can't have a very clear brain. You know, if you stuff yourself with wine, meat and all the rest of it, how can your brain function clearly? Your smoking, drugs and all the rest of it, becomes such superficial immediate satisfactions without any understanding of what is beyond it.

Now yoga is a certain kind of practice, exercise, not something mysterious through exercise, one has to do it to keep the body supple. You understand? The brain has to have all the blood it needs, and therefore right breathing. You understand all these things? If I may be a little personal, we do it every day for two hours, regularly. Not the regularity of machinery - I won't go into all that, it doesn't matter.

So one has to have very good healthy, sane body, and therefore a brain that is capable of thinking rationally, healthily, objectively, non-personally, therefore efficiently, and a brain that is absolutely quiet - not mechanically made quiet. Now you can see the truth of it, can't you, the simple fact of it, that one needs to have a very good healthy, sensitive, alert body, a brain that functions very clearly, non-emotionally, non-personally, and such a brain to be absolutely quiet. You can see the fact of that, the simple logical

fact of it. Now how is this to be brought about? You understand what I mean? How can the brain, which is so tremendously active, not only during the day time but when you have gone to sleep, how can this brain be so completely relaxed, or completely quiet? You understand my question? No method will do it, obviously. Please follow all this. No method. Right? Do you see that? Because method implies mechanical repetition, which stupefies the brain, and therefore makes the brain dull, and in that dullness you think you have a marvellous experience. So how is this brain, which is so tremendously active, which is never still, because it is always chattering, to itself or with others, judging, evaluating, liking, disliking, you know, turning over all the time, how can that brain be completely still? Do you understand the importance of a brain being still, the importance, not what the speaker says is important, for yourself do you see the real importance, the extraordinary importance that this brain should be completely quiet? Because the moment it acts it can only act in response of the past. It can only act in terms of thought, and therefore again the operation of the past. And it's only such a brain that is completely still that can observe. Right?

One can observe a cloud, a tree, a flowing river, with a fairly quiet brain. Right? You can see those mountains, the extraordinary light on those mountains, and the brain can be completely still. You have noticed this, haven't you. Now how has that happened? How does the mind, facing something of extraordinary magnitude, like a very, very, very, complex machinery, like a marvellous computer, or a magnificent sunset or a mountain, how does it become completely quiet, for even a split second? Have you

noticed when you give a child a good toy, how the toy absorbs the child? Then the child is concerned with it, is playing with it, and doesn't - you know - he is absorbed by the toy. In the same way the mountain, the beauty of a tree, the flowing waters, absorb the mind and makes the mind by its greatness still. Right? That is, the brain is made still by something. Now can the brain be quiet without an outside factor entering into it? You are following all this? And because they haven't found a way, therefore they say, grace of god, prayers - right - faith, absorption in Jesus, in this or in that. And we see all that, this absorption by something outside, a dull, a stupefied mind can do this.

We are trying to find out, can this happen, this quiet, free brain that is completely quiet, without any interference. Right? You have understood the question? If it is not quiet one of the factors is dreams. You are following all this? Is this too much? Tant pis, if you don't understand, it's up to you. The brain is active all day, endlessly, the moment it wakes up till it goes to sleep it is on the move. And when you go to bed and go to sleep, the activity of the brain is still going on. Right? The activity of the brain are dreams. Right? The same movement of the day is carried on during sleep. And therefore the brain has never a rest, never a moment to say, 'I've finished, it's over', because it is carrying on the problems which it has accumulated into sleep, and when you wake up those problems go on. It is a vicious circle. So a brain that is to be quiet must have no dreams at all. Because when the mind is quiet during the sleep - the brain quiet during sleep there is a totally different quality entering into the brain, into the mind. We will go into that a little later, if you are interested.

So we are asking how does it happen that the brain, which is so tremendously, eagerly and enthusiastically active, can naturally, easily, without any effort or suppression, be quiet? I'll show it to you. As we said, during the day it is active endlessly, the moment you wake up, you look out of the window and say, 'Oh, awful rain', or, 'It's a marvellous, lovely morning, but too hot'. You have started. At that moment when you look out of the window not to say a word, not suppressing words, to realize that by saying, what a lovely morning, what horrible rain, this or that, the brain has started. But if you watch out of the window and not say a word, which doesn't mean you suppress the word, just to observe without all the memory of the past, just to observe. Right? So there you have the clue, there you have the key. To observe without the old brain responding. Therefore when the old brain doesn't respond there is a quality of the new brain coming into being. Are you getting all this?

You can observe the hills, the mountains, the river, the valleys, the shadows, the lovely trees, and the marvellous cloud full of light and glory beyond the mountains, to look at it without a word, without comparing. But it becomes much more difficult when you look at your neighbour, at your wife, your husband, another person. There you have already got the images established and it becomes much more difficult to observe your wife, your husband, your neighbour, your politician, your priest, or whatever it is, absolutely without an image. Just to observe, and you will see when you so observe, so clearly see, the action becomes extraordinary vital, therefore it becomes a complete action which is not carried over the next minute. You are meeting this? You understand? One has



problems, not sleeping well, quarrelling with the wife, you know, problems, deeply, superficially, and we carry these problems from day to day - dreams are the repetition of these problems, the repetition of fear, pleasure, problems, over and over and over again. That obviously stupefies the mind, makes the mind dull, the brain too. Now is it possible to end the problem as it arises? You understand? Not carry it over. I have a problem, somebody has insulted me - I am taking the most silly problem. At that moment the old brain responds instantly. Right? Saying, you are also. Now before the old brain responds, to be aware of what the man or woman has said, something which is unpleasant, to have an interval between what he has said and the response of the old brain, to have a gap. You understand this? So that the old brain is responding slowly, doesn't immediately jump into the battle. So if you watch during the day the movement of thought in action - thought is action, and if you watch that and you realize that it is breeding problems, and problems are something which are incomplete, which have to be carried over - but if you watch that with a brain that is fairly quiet, then you will see action becomes instantaneous, so there is no carrying over of a problem. You have got this? No carrying over the insult or the praise, or something, you know, problems, carrying over to the next minute, it is finished.

So when you go to bed, when there is sleep, the brain is no longer carrying on the old activities of the day, it has complete rest. Right? And therefore the brain then being quiet in sleep, there takes place not only the rejuvenation of the whole structure in itself but a quality of innocency comes into being. Because only the

innocent mind can see what is true. Right? Not the complicated mind, not the philosopher, not the priest, not the brain that is constantly repetitive, mechanical. The innocent mind is the brain as well as the body, the mind, the whole entity, the whole being - not even the being, it is the whole thing in which the body, the heart, the brain, the whole of that, if there is this alertness, watchfulness during the day, and when there is sleep there is a certain quality of innocency that happens. And it is only this innocent mind which has never been touched by thought, it is only such an innocent mind that can see what is truth, what is reality, if there is something beyond measure. That is meditation, not all the phoney stuff.

Therefore to come upon this extraordinary beauty of truth with its ecstasy, you must lay the foundation. The foundation is the understanding of thought which breeds fear and sustains pleasure. The understanding of order and therefore virtue, and therefore the freedom from all conflict and aggression and brutality, violence. That is the foundation, without that you can play tricks. And what you will have are the tricks of the conjurer. If one has laid this foundation on freedom, then there is this sensitivity which is supreme intelligence, and from that the whole life one leads becomes entirely different.

Would you would like to ask any questions about all this? Yes sir?

Q: Sir, during you talk you started to make a personal reference and then stopped. I think understanding you is very important to our understanding of what you said. I was surprised to hear what you said about yoga and how you practise it regularly for two

hours every day. To me this sounds like a strong form of discipline. More than that though, it is the general question, you were speaking of innocence of mind, I am interested in the innocence of your mind.

K: The questioner says, it may be a personal thing but I would like to ask you, is your practice of yoga, doing two hours a day, regularly, a form of discipline, driving the body to do two hours a day, whether it likes it or not regularly. And also the questioner says, perhaps in answering this question I would like to see the innocency of your mind. To see the innocency of a mind, whether it is yours or mine, you must first be innocent. I am not turning the tables onto you, sir. And to see the innocency of this mind you need to be free, you need to have no fear, and a quality of brain that is functioning without any effort. And if you do yoga regularly every day, two hours, is that not a form of discipline. You know the body tells you when it is tired, the body tells you, don't do it this morning. So when we have abused the body, driving it to do all kinds of things, spoiling it, spoiling its own intelligence, which it has, by particular food you like, smoke, drink, and all the rest of it, the body becomes insensitive, then thought says, I must drive it, I must force it. Then such driving the body, or forcing it, compelling it, becomes a discipline. Whereas when you do these things regularly, easily, without any effort - yoga means skill in action, it isn't just doing certain things - the skill in action implies no effort. When you do the exercises any form of effort involved, that is not yoga. Therefore you do it easily, and the regularity of it depends on the sensitivity of the body. You do it one day, and the next day the body may be tired and you say, all right, I won't do it.

It is not a mechanical regularity. Right sir?

All this requires a great deal of intelligence, not only the intelligence of the body, but the mind, the whole thing called mind in which is the brain, and all that, when that is intelligent it will tell you, it will react, tell you what to do, what not to do. Yes sir?

Q: You want our minds to be quiet, but we have sometimes to take decisions. It is awfully difficult to know if we are going to take this or this decision, and this is what carries on problems.

K: Right. I understand sir. A mind that is quiet must decide sometimes. If it cannot decide clearly then problems arise, even the very decision is a problem. Isn't it? That is the question, isn't it, sir? Decision. When do you decide? You understand the question? When do you decide - decision between this and that? Right? To do this, or to do that, which means choice. Right? When there is choice and out of that choice decision, then there is conflict, then from that arises problems. But when you see very clearly there is no choice, and therefore there is no decision. You are meeting this? I know the way very well from here to where one happens to live. There is no choice, you follow the road, because it is very clear. Watch it, watch it, go slowly. Because you have been on that road a hundred times, there is no question, you may find a short cut, and if there is a short cut you take it next time. That becomes mechanical, in that there is no problem. The brain wants the same thing to happen, to function automatically, mechanically, so it doesn't create a problem. Right? Do you see that? The brain demands that. Which is, please let me operate mechanically, therefore it says, I will discipline myself to function mechanically. I must have a belief, a purpose, a direction, so that I can set a path

to it and follow it, which all becomes mechanical. It follows in a groove. Right? Therefore what happens? Life won't allow that because there are all kinds of things happening. And so thought resists, builds a wall of belief, it resists. And this very resistance creates problems. So when you have to decide, and you decide between this and that, that means there is confusion between this and that, otherwise there is no decision. Right sir? Should I, or should I not do this? Right? That question I put to myself only when I am confused, when I don't see clearly what is to be done. Please see this. Out of confusion we choose, not out of clarity. The moment you are clear your action is complete.

Q: But it cannot be always clear.

K: Wait. He says it cannot always be that way. Why not?

Q: If it's a complex choice then you cannot reach a decision quickly, you have to look at it, it takes time to look at it.

K: Yes, sir, take time, patience, to look at it.

Q: You have to compare.

K: Wait, sir. Look at it sir. You have to compare, compare what with what? Compare two stuffs, blue and white, compare it. Right? Whether you like this colour or that colour, whether you go up this hill or that hill, and you decide I prefer to go to that hill today and tomorrow I will go there - there is no choice, because you are going up there the next day. The problem arises when it is dealing with the psyche, what to do within oneself, this or that. Now I say - we say, watch it. First watch what decision implies, to decide to do this or that, what is that decision based on? On choice, obviously. Should I do this, or should I do that. And I realize when there is choice there is confusion, because I have to choose. So confusion

must exist when there is choice. No?

Q: I pass.

K: Wait, wait. First, I see the truth of this, the truth, the fact, the 'what is', which is where there is choice there must be confusion. Now why am I confused? Go step by step. Why am I confused? Because I don't know, or I know but I prefer that, as opposed to this. That's more pleasant, it may produce greater results, greater fortune, or whatever it is, so I choose that. But in following that I realize also there are frustrations, which is, pain. Right? So I am caught again between fear and pleasure. No? So I say, now, I am caught in this, can I act without choice? That means I have to be aware of all the implications of confusion, all the implications - listen to this carefully, please - all the implications of confusion, all the implications of decision, the decider and the thing decided upon, which is duality, and therefore conflict, and therefore perpetuation of confusion, to be aware of all this - all that will take time, you say. You follow? It will take time, won't it - to be aware of my confusion, to know I am confused, what is involved in this confusion, to be aware out of that confusion I choose, and in choice there is decision, which means duality, which means conflict. Now to be aware of all the intricacies of this movement will naturally take time. Right? Now will it take time? Or can you see it instantly? And therefore instant action. You see the difference? Oh, come on sirs.

Look: I have to decide between this and that, and in that decision there is conflict. And if I pursue one decision, the thing which I choose, there is a duality, and that inevitably breeds conflict. So I am back again with the problem. So I am asking

myself, all this enquiry, observation, apparently, generally takes time, that's what you said just now, there. It takes time, patience, enquiry. I say, does it?

Q: Otherwise you will dream of it.

K: No, no. Do watch it, sir. It only takes time when I am not aware of it. That is, my brain being conditioned in the old, says, I must decide, look what the brain does, because that is its habit, I must decide what is right and what is wrong, what is beauty, what is responsibility, what is love - right? - decide, decide, decide according to the past, which is the old brain. So the decision of the old brain breeds more conflict, which is what the politicians throughout the world are doing. Right? The Israelites against the Arabs, and the English, you know. Now can that brain, the old brain be quiet so that it sees the problem of confusion instantly and acts because it is clear? Therefore there is no decision at all. If you saw that once, you will see what happens.

Q: Sir, if I perceive something my brain instantly becomes worse. It is natural, yes.

K: I explained that sir. I explained just now, we explained just now. Because our brain, as we said, is all the time active, responding. And we are saying this response of the old brain must inevitably lead to confusion, to decision, to operate and act according to the old pattern. But when you see the fact - please see this - when you see the fact that any decision must be born out of confusion and therefore increased problems, then your concern is not decision but whether the mind can be free of confusion.

Q: How?

K: I am showing it to you. The mind is in confusion, the brain is

in confusion because it is responding all the time according to the old pattern. Be aware, see the truth that it is acting according to the old pattern. See the truth of it, not your intellectual seeing, see the fact of it. The seeing of that fact is the liberating factor. Like when I see danger there is instant action, there is no choice. Wait. In the same way when I see the danger of decision born out of confusion, see the danger of it, then that very danger frees the mind from the old, and therefore there is an action which is complete which is not based on decision.

Q: Can we learn from experience?

K: Can we learn from experience. I don't think so.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, wait, let me finish. Can you learn from experience - certainly not. Learning implies - learning, curiosity, enquiry, freedom. Are you following all this? When you are learning something, a new language, when a child learns something it is free, he is curious, he wants to know, he is learning, it is a momentum - not a momentum of having acquired and moving from that acquisition. We have experiences, innumerable, we have had five thousand years of war, we haven't learnt a thing from it, except to invent more deadly machinery, to kill each other. We have had many experiences with our friends, with our wives, with our husbands, with nationality - we haven't learnt. Learning can only take place when there is freedom from experience. Sir, when you discover something new your mind must be free of the old. Obviously. That's why meditation is the emptying of the mind of the known, because truth is not something that you invent, it is something totally new. Not in terms of the old and new, its



newness is not the opposite of the old, it is something incredibly new. And therefore a mind that comes to it with experience cannot see what truth is.

Q: To operate in the world of thought, are you saying that the paradox of thought is thinking of no thought, something like that?

K: No, not something like that at all. We operate daily with thought, and that's why there is so much mischief in the world, the 'me' and the not 'me', my country, your country, my god, my race, my belief, you know, thought. To operate entirely differently, not the opposite of it, is to find out the whole nature and the structure of thought, which is the past. And to find out whether that past which is necessary when I have to operate mechanically, when the mind has to operate technologically, it has to have all that knowledge, but to meet this whole extraordinary problem of living the mind must be new, fresh, innocent. No? If it meets always with the past pattern it creates more and more problems, and therefore more and more confusion. So to see the truth of this, not analyse it, dissect it, agree with it, but see the truth of this simple fact. If you really see it you are out of it.

We meet tomorrow, don't we, there's a young people's meeting tomorrow at ten thirty.

## SAANEN 2ND DIALOGUE WITH YOUNG PEOPLE 31ST JULY 1970

K: What shall we talk over together this morning? This is supposed to be the younger generation who are going to ask questions, and perhaps as the speaker belongs to the older generation they will forgive me for being up here. So what shall we talk over together? You know it would be very interesting and worthwhile if we could take one subject that is of vital importance to all of us and explore it together, uncovering every detail, if we can, not coming to any conclusion because that would be terrible. But expose everything contained in that one issue so that we will see for ourselves all the implications involved in it. And when we see the whole thing, all the intricacies, all the issues, then there is no question of choice or decision, it is there. You either do it, or don't do it, there is not, saying to oneself, shall I, or shall I not, that brings about a decision. Whereas if you see the thing very clearly you can say to yourself, I am not going to do it, it doesn't interest me. But if it is of vital meaning to you then you can't help doing it, it is part of one's life. It's like saying I won't use my right arm.

So what shall we talk over together this evening - this morning that would not only expose the intricacies of the problem but also in understanding the problem expose ourselves to it. An issue can be something outside, verbally, which has very little meaning, but if we could get involved in it, be part of it, and thereby expose ourselves, not to another but to ourselves. Then I think it might be worthwhile if we could easily and happily enquire into a problem that might be of general and vital interest.

Q: We communicate by words and symbols, and also by clothes and our way of being. And these symbols, and even the way we communicate with our clothes, stands in the way of true communication. Can we go into communication?

K: The questioner says, can we talk over communication. We use words, gestures, symbols and often periods of quietness, but somehow it doesn't seem quite appropriate or significant or give the full meaning of what one wants to say. Is that right, sir?

Q: Right. And the actual symbols, we are conditioned by our symbols, we have conditioned ourselves to symbols.

K: We are conditioned by our symbols, and we have conditioned those symbols according to our conditioning. We know all that. Now, do you want to discuss that? Yes sir?

Q: We said yesterday that we had difficulties to take decisions, which shows we are in confusion. So I would like to know how did we get into that confusion, and how can we get out of it?

K: Yesterday you said that decision means a choice, choice implies confusion, how did we get into this confusion originally.

Q: And how can we get out of it?

K: And how can we get out of it. Yes sir?

Q: Can freedom, non-dualism, and bliss be sustained by human beings, or are we meant to oscillate up and down?

K: Freedom, bliss and non-duality, can we remain at that level all the time, or must we oscillate up and down.

Q: You said yesterday the brain must be quiet. I would like to know can the brain be quiet when it has to work?

K: You said yesterday the brain must be quiet, can it be quiet when it has to work, when it has to think. Yes sir?

Q: Could we discuss our demand for security?

K: Can we talk over together our demand for security.

Q: Can we discuss the tyranny of the mind?

K: The tyranny of the mind.

Q: From the question of communication, you said - I am now asking a question - of how one can get a person who is living in all kinds of ways that has made this person completely insensitive, so that the yoga you talk about is completely down, how can you get to this person?

K: How can you communicate with somebody who is completely down, who is insensitive, who is not interested in what you are talking about, how can you communicate with such a person. You can't!

Now just a minute, sir. What shall we do? There are now so many questions. Now which of those - please find out for yourself - which of those shall we take and go right through to the end of it so that you are very clear, so that you have no problems about it, so that you don't have to ask afterwards, 'I would like to ask another question about it'? Right? Now can we take one of these which will be really worthwhile and significant and go to the very end of it?

Q: The tyranny of the mind.

K: The tyranny of the mind?

Q: This question of confusion, it seems to go on from yesterday. Everything seems to relate to this question.

K: So shall we discuss confusion?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! Now please, sir, we are talking as two friends. I am sorry I have to sit on a platform, which gives one a certain

authority, but I have no authority, it is just for convenience I am sitting up here. I must just as well be sitting on the ground and talking over together. That's what we do in India. It is only sitting on a platform, as I do when there are 8,000 people, one has to because otherwise... So, please, we are talking over together as two friends really concerned with this problem, not partially concerned, or just go off and you are not interest in it, you are involved in it, you live it. You want to find out how this confusion arises, and whether it is at all possible to be free of it. Right.

When we talk about confusion, what do we mean by that word? What do you mean by that word? Not only according to the dictionary meaning, but to yourself, non-verbally - you understand? Bearing in the mind the word is not the thing, the description is not the described, the explanation is not the explained, how do you consider, or how do you feel for yourself that you are confused?

Q: Not knowing what to do, what you are.

K: Not knowing what to do, what you are, what your relationship to society is, what commitment you should undertake. When there is so much confusion, misery, injustice, neuroticism in the world, among the politicians, the priests and your friends around you, what is one to do? Right? Now what does this word 'confusion' - how do you know you are confused?

Q: Possibly because you are unable to take decisions.

K: No, no. Don't - no, my question is something entirely different. We will come to that, first begin slowly. How do you know you are confused? Is it in relation to something, because you want to do something, and you say, 'I don't know', and therefore

you discover you are confused. Please go very, very slowly over this, it is very important to understand this. You want to do something and you discover you are confused. So you know your confusion in relation to something. Wait! If the thing you are related to is happy, you knew what to do, would there be confusion? You are understanding my question? I am happy, I have money, I have everything I want, and I go about, do everything as I like. I say, 'What are you talking about confusion, I am not confused'. But such a person is confused. Now see the difference. It is not in relation to something. We will come to that presently. But how do you know you are confused without action taking place, asking, what should one do. You see the difference? I wonder if you do.

Q: Isn't it that we always see we are confused in action?

K: No, sir. Go slowly, first. Go into this so deeply, and to go into it very, very deeply you must go millimetre by millimetre, or centimetre by centimetre, you can't jump to any conclusion. Now how do I know I am confused? How do I know I am hungry? Wait, wait, listen carefully a minute. How do you know you are hungry? Not because of the food I am going to have which stimulates hunger, but there is hunger. Then I want certain kind of food. Then I say, shall I eat this, that, or the other. First there is the feeling of hunger. Right? In the same way, do you know you are confused? Or you only know in relation to something? Like a man who has everything he wants - position, prestige, etc. - he says, what are you talking about confusion, I am not confused at all. But below that strata, layer, he is terribly confused. Now to such a person confusion is non-existent, to you who want to do something and

find yourself confused, you say, I am confused. See the difference? And there is another thing: do you know you are confused, per se, for itself? Do you see the difference of these three categories?

Q: I would say you know it, to a certain extent, but you really touch it when you have to act, because then you have to choose.

K: You only know that you are really confused when you have to act, then you have to choose. Right? And according to your action, what to do reveals your confusion. Right? But if the action is very satisfactory what will you do? You will say, it's all right, I am not confused. I don't know if you see this? Do we see this, please, let's go further in this.

Do you only know that you are confused because you don't know what to do? Or - let me put it this way - or you see what is happening in the world - the political confusion, the nationalistic confusion, the economic confusion, the social injustice, the prejudices of black, white, pink, at each other, and the corruption that exists in society in the individual, in the human being, this constant turmoil, war - all that indicates confusion, doesn't it? Wait, all that indicates confusion, doesn't it? So do you realize in your relationship to that general vast confusion that you are also confused, not action, not what to do about that? I don't know if you see this.

Q: Whether to adjust myself to confusion, or not.

K: No, no my darling sir, just listen. I am sorry. Look, there is confusion in the world, and in observing the general confusion I am aware I am also confused. It's not a question of action yet. Right? I am confused because the world is confused, but the moment I say, I have to do something about that, and realize I am

confused, then my confusion is a result of wanting to find out what to do. You see the difference? I wonder if you do.

Sir, look, you are hungry, nobody needs to tell you that you are hungry, you don't have to watch the world, see the restaurants, or the menus and so on, you are hungry. Now in the same way do you know you are confused?

Q: Sometimes I do.

K: Then you will see that if it is confusion unrelated to the general problem, then your action is entirely different. Look, sir, let's go slowly. I am confused - the world is confused, as a human being, living in this world, I find I am confused. I don't say, 'What am I to do about the confusion that exists in the world', but I say, 'I am also confused' - not in relation to any action, I am just confused. Your question is: I only know confusion when I have to do something, which is entirely different from knowing that you are confused. I wonder, have I explained this enough? Don't get bored with this.

Q: I also want to know how did I get in this confusion.

K: I am coming to that.

Q: I mean, psychoanalysts, am I confused because I have got countless...

K: No, no, forget the analysts.

Q: How did I get into confusion?

K: Be patient, we are going to find out how we got into this, but first see the difference, please see the actual verbal, intellectual and otherwise, a difference between the confusion with regard to action, and confusion for itself, per se. Right? Do you see the difference between that? Then I say to myself, not, what I am



going to do about society, but how did this confusion arise in me, as a human being. That is the question, not what to do about society. If there is no confusion in me I will act, and therefore affect rightly the social structure. Right? No, no, but see the difference. If you see the difference, then how have I got into this confusion?

Q: We are dealing with the confusion of years, so is our present problem...

K: Wait, sir, I am coming to that. How did I, a human being, get into this terrible confusion? That's what you are asking. How does it happen that I am confused?

Q: Is it not a complex...

K: Wait. I don't accept - we will go into that presently, whether it is the complex, or the Jungian complex, or Adlerian, or Freudian complex or the latest analyst complex, we will come to that a little later. I realize I am confused. I realize it not in relationship to any action. Therefore my question is: how have I, a human being living in this world, got into this state? Is it the fault of the society? Is it the fault of education? The economic structure? The religious beliefs, fears and all that? Is it the inherited, accumulated confusion of man from the beginning? Follow all these questions, you can't just brush all this aside. So when I say, is it the result of society - right? I am taking that first - is it the result of society, society being education, religion, the general culture, the general absurdities, superstitions, inequalities, social injustice, the prejudices, the nationalities, the false education, all that we can put in one word - society. Right? Don't bring up another. So is it that society has produced this in me? - which means I am different from society: I

am an innocent, or a malleable entity, soft, and society has shaped me, and in the very shaping of me it has brought confusion. Which means I am different from society. So I cannot blame society.

Right? See, you cannot blame the environment, you cannot blame the food I eat. You follow? So I am asking if it is not the fault of society, because I am society, I created it and I am caught in it - didn't I create it? Wait, let's be clear about it.

Q: No.

K: You say, no. Didn't you create it through ambition?

Q: It was there.

K: It was there. You say, it was there, created by other human beings - arriere. My great-great-great-grandfathers, they created that society for which I am not responsible - listen very carefully - for which I am not responsible. And I being very clear - right? - I am very clear therefore I am not confused. If my great-grandfathers, the past generations, have brought about this awful mess, and it is their fault, and therefore I have nothing whatsoever to do with it, then I am not confused. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: But I am confused!

Q: Because I have been marked.

K: Wait! Therefore - we are coming to that - therefore you say, I have been marked, I have been shaped by society. I have been marked, I have been shaped, I have been pushed into a corner by society. Right? Are you? Are you?

Q: Not put in a corner, but marked, yes.

K: Marked. Therefore what does it mean? You are marked, you are caught, you are shaped. So whom are you going to blame? Can

you blame anybody?

Q: No.

K: Right. That's all. You have allowed yourself to be marked. Before you knew anything about it, as a child, as a boy, as a girl, as you grew up, the imprint of society - so you can't blame society. Right?

Q: Right.

K: You blame nothing. Right? You don't blame your grandfather, your grandmother, your parents. Please see the importance of this. So it is no good revolting against your parents!

Q: Can we continue?

K: Wait, I am going to. So you say, there is nobody against whom I can revolt, there is nobody, no society, which I can blame. I am marked. I am confused. Right? Not, what has produced confusion. The fact is I am confused. You can give explanations for this confusion by saying it is my grandfather, the present society - those are all explanations, but the fact is you are confused. Can we proceed now? Nobody to blame, no good saying, how has it come about, not the complexes, it is there. Right? Our position now is entirely different. Right? Before I blamed people.

Q: I don't blame them but I can revolt.

K: You can revolt, which is a form of blaming.

Q: No.

K: When you revolt you reject that.

Q: I don't want it.

K: You don't want it. Just let's go slowly, sir. But when you don't want it, and you act, you are acting out of your confusion, therefore you are increasing your confusion. We are now

concerned not with action for the moment but the realization that you are confused and no one is to be blamed. Right? It happens. I happen to be born in India, I can't blame all the Indians for being born there because I am not the fashionable colour, a little brighter colour, but it's no good my blaming anybody, it's a fact. Now let's proceed from there. Right?

Now I realize that I am confused, and it is not the fault or the result of any outward confusion. It is a fact. Now what am I to do? Right? Now see how we have progressed, how we have gone into this: what am I to do. I know I am confused, what am I to do?

Q: We have to see we won't try to get out of it.

K: We are going into it, sir, slowly, sir, go with me. What am I to do? Now I say to myself, who is putting this question? Right? I am confused and I say I must do something about it - who is putting this question? Is this question being put by somebody who is not confused? Please answer this question, find out. Is this question being put by a fragment outside this confusion? Right? Then who is putting the question?

Q: Confusion itself.

K: Yourself?

Q: No, confusion itself.

K: Now if you say it is the confusion itself - see what you are saying - it is the confusion itself. How can it put such a question? How am I to get out, what am I to do about it? See the importance, go into this, see the importance of this. I realize I am confused. If there is one part of me that says, I must get out, I must clear this confusion - what is that part? Is it still a part of confusion, or something unrelated to confusion? Some outside agency, higher,

lower, an outside agency, or am I - no, listen carefully, sir - or, is there part of me which is confused which says, for god's sake, let's get out of this to a better level?

Q: The same part.

K: Right. So it is confusion asking this question. No? No, sirs? I am confused, I realize that very clearly. Then the question arises: I must be free of this confusion. I say to myself, who is putting that question? Is it part of the confusion, or is it some entity outside the confusion - god, whatever it is? And if it is a part of the confusion that is putting this question then that question is irrelevant, it has no value. Wait. Right? Please follow this carefully. If it is an entity which is putting the question, then there is an outside factor or an agency that is driving you to put this question.

Q: Couldn't we say it is a healthy part of ourselves which is putting the question?

K: Therefore, whether you call it healthy - therefore you are suggesting that there is a part of us that is not confused. Right?

Q: The same part.

K: There is part of us that is not confused and therefore that part is putting the question. Now wait a minute, look what you are saying. A part of us that is not confused, and that's what all the religions have said. You are caught in this. All the religions have said, god, an outside agency, the higher self, the atman.

Q: Not outside.

K: Which is in us.

Q: Yes.

K: Which is the same thing. It is in us but it is not touched by confusion. You see, the clever trick we play upon ourselves. You

realize, sir, that we have played a trick upon ourselves by saying, there is a part of us which is untouched, and that part is putting the question. And I say, by Jove, look what I have done. That's what all the religions have maintained, which means a duality, which means a conflict between the part that is untouched and the rest of the confusion. So I say that's nonsense.

Q: But...

K: Wait, wait. That's nonsense. I drop that. I won't put a question at all.

Q: So I can't get out?

K: Wait, wait. I am going to show it to you, sir, go slowly. You are all too impatient.

Q: Interruptions are confusing.

K: No, there should be interruptions, there should be questions, but follow it step by step and you will put the right questions. Go easy, sir. Look: I am confused, I don't blame anybody. Right? I am marked, and this mark is not the imprint of anybody, of any society, of any culture. And the next thing is: how am I to get out? And I say to myself, who is putting this question? Is it an outside agency, or a part of me which is not outside agency, part of me which is not confused? Is there a part of me which is not confused? If there is a part of you which is not confused then that part will act, and therefore you have no choice to make. And if there is a part of you which is not confused then there is duality. That means one part against the other part; the higher self against the lower self, god against - you are back again, the devil and you know. So I say that approach, that questioning is totally wrong. It leads to a wrong conclusion, a wrong end, so I won't put a question. I am

confused.

Now what do you do when you are confused in a wood, when you have lost your way? And there is nobody to ask where is the right road. What do you do, what is the first thing you do?

Q: Stop.

K: Stop, don't you? Wait, look, go slowly. Now I am confused, I have put every question, I have said this, I have said that, I have taken this path, that path, the other path - you follow - and I see before I do anything there must be stopping of action with regard to confusion. Right? You are following all this? The mind says, I won't go this way or that way, I must first stop. Are you doing this? You are confused and there is no way out - right? - and you have thought of many ways out, and you say, how absurd because in myself I am confused, therefore every act I do is confusion, therefore I won't act, I won't do anything - stop. Have you stopped?

Q: Part of me has.

K: No, not part of you has. You see, you have actually tried the road going north, you have tried north-east, south, west, east, you have done all these paths. Wait, sir. Out of your confusion you have done all these. And you say, by Jove, I am still where I am, I am still confused. So you say, the first thing I must stop going in any direction.

Q: Stop is outside action.

K: No. Have you stopped?

Q: Most of us wait, there is no more fuel.

K: No, sir. Do see this, there is plenty of fuel. Do please see this. When you are lost in a wood, in a forest, and you have tried every other way, every way to get out of it, and come back to the

point where you started, you say, for god's sake, let me stop first and see what happens. Right? You stop. Have you? Have you stopped searching a way to clear up the confusion?

Q: When you stop there is no confusion.

K: Stop, sir. You are going to discover something else. I wish you would actually do it. Which means the mind, being confused, realizes that whatever it does leads to further confusion, the mind sees the truth of that and stops. The mind doesn't wander out, or wander in. It says, any movement from me, any movement of the mind to seek a way out is to increase confusion, sees the fact of it. Right? As I see the fact that the sun rises every day, I see the fact of it, and therefore it stops. Have you done it? Stopping without any conflict, because, you follow, you see that road doesn't lead anywhere, you stop. My lord, what are you all hesitating about?

Q: Do you mean stopping to act, or stopping to search a road out of confusion?

K: Both: act, a way out. Because to act out of confusion is to increase more confusion, seeking a way out of confusion implies an entity which is not confused and therefore duality, and so on. So all the movement stops.

Q: Sir, I have a question: you, Krishnamurti, you are confused, now are you going to hold a private soliloquy as you are doing now with yourself, or are you just going to recognize the fact that you are going to stop and change direction, look at 'what is' and just go on?

K: I am not confused. I see very simply and very clearly that a human being who is confused has first to stop.

Q: Is stopping not another action?



K: No. You see you are all verbalizing, you are not doing it.

Q: Isn't it an act for you?

K: No, no action at all. Look sir, I have been wandering around, trying this way and that way, and I see the futility of it, therefore I stop.

Q: To self-understand eliminates confusion.

K: No, no, you don't have to self-understand, we are doing that now as we go along, this is self-understanding, this is self-knowledge, how the mind plays a trick upon itself, by saying, I am confused, I must get out of it and so on. Sir, a blind man seeking a way out, he has tried several ways, hurt himself against this furniture and that furniture, so he realizes I won't move. First let me take my bearings, stop and then I will feel my way around, not rush into things. Right? We are blind, we are confused. I say, look, stop a minute and feel around. You understand sir? Don't say, I must do this, I must not do that, I must revolt.

Q: But some people stop their whole lives.

K: That's equally stupifying. Some people say, I don't know what to do and just stop and they are dead. But a man who says, look, there must be a way out, I am going to find it, I don't know what it is, I am going to find it, I have tried this, this, this, it doesn't work, therefore before I do anything I won't move. Are you like that? If you are not like that, the next question or next enquiry has no meaning.

Q: How does a confused mind know there is a way out?

K: I am showing you sir. How does a confused mind know its way out.

Q: No, know there is a way out.

K: Therefore first stop. You'll find out! Lordy, you don't do it.

Q: I still feel there is an separate entity that is not confused.

K: You can't get away from this feeling that there is a separate entity that is not confused. That means separate entity which is clear, which is unpolluted, which is untouched, unmarked. Now, listen to this, please listen to this, once you understand this you will never again put that question. Now when you have a feeling that there is a separate entity, how do you know that there is a separate entity? Is it a feeling? Is it the result of your thought, your wish, your desire that there must be some way out and therefore thought invents a separate entity who is not marked? If you know a way out you wouldn't have a separate entity. Right? Right? Because we don't know a way out we invent a separate entity. Come on, sirs! I am sorry you are bored and yawning.

Q: I'm not.

Q: Would you say that the trials of many attempts before coming to a stop was a necessary prerequisite?

K: I understand. Was it necessary to go through all these various attempts to come to the point that you must stop. Must one go through all this? Now just a minute, listen. Must you go and get drunk to know sobriety? Must you go and take drugs to know the uselessness of it? Or you know it, you see it?

Q: I think that is a little more obvious. But the case of a person joining a society, or a church, or this sect and so on, was that a necessary prerequisite?

K: Look sir, I have said that, the human being tries these things, he doesn't stick to one of them, he tries it, and he realizes one try is good enough, one part is similar to the rest of the parts, so he says,

out.

Q: You said firstly to stop - and afterwards?

K: I have asked the question sir, have you stopped?

Q: Sometimes, yes.

K: Have you stopped asking the question, or seeking the way out of this confusion? Now this next question is really very important if you have done it. If you don't do it then you are playing with words. I have stopped because I have sought different ways and I see the futility of going to one thing after another, so I have stopped. Now the next step: how do you know you have stopped? How are you aware - please listen carefully, sirs, this is a really important question - who is aware that he has stopped?

Q: Because you are watching the senses become quiet since you stopped.

K: Yes, sir. I am asking, sir. I understand sir. Look, how do you know you have stopped?

Q: You only know you haven't stopped, if you see yourself in relationship then you know you haven't stopped.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: The mind becomes quiet.

K: Yes, sir. Look, listen carefully, find out, don't be so quick in saying, the mind becomes quiet. There is a great deal involved in this question.

Q: I can say, I don't mind being confused all the time

K: Well you can say, I don't mind being confused all the time - all right, sir, there is no problem. Like the man who says, what are you talking about confusion when I have everything I want. You are a similar person who says, I am confused all the time, I don't

mind - you have no problem.

Q: Sir, you are talking about confusion, going step by step. Is there a pattern in your mind that you are trying to give to us which we should follow?

K: No.

Q: Because it seems so long and so abstract.

K: It is not long, it is not abstract, it's like going up the hill - I have to go step by step, I can't suddenly find myself at the top of the hill. I must put foot after foot. It may sound, or it may appear long, but it is not, because you have come to a point when you have put away all the things which man has invented in order to escape from confusion - his gods, his societies, his culture, his analysis, everything you have put away. That's a tremendous thing. Then you say, how do I know - please listen - how do I know I have stopped? Is the stoppage right through my being? You understand? Right through, or only superficial? Because the stopping superficially is an intellectual conclusion, and therefore you are back again. But if it is both at the conscious level, at all the deeper layers, there is complete cessation of any movement, both neurologically, emotionally, verbally, in thought, there is a complete cessation of any movement that is born out of confusion.

Q: By stopping I don't believe you can relieve the state of confusion.

K: You are going to find out.

Q: That argues from the fact there is a choice, one way or the other.

K: No, sir, we went through that. We said confusion - when there is choice you are confused. Sir, if I don't know which road to

take, I am confused. But if I know which road to take I am not confused. Let me finish with that. You are going back to the old thing, which is: choice exists, and decision exists as long as there is confusion. Full stop. We have been through that yesterday, you might not have been here yesterday.

Q: Stopping all movement within myself, does it mean also stopping action?

K: Find out!

Q: It seems illogical to say that I control myself and stop...

K: Wait, sir. No, you have realized that any movement out of confusion leads to more confusion. Right? And therefore you say, let me stop, because I can't go way, there is no way out, I have tried that way, that way, that way, there is no way out.

Q: Probably I don't recognize it as stopping.

K: I am going to go into it, sir.

Q: How is one to stop? One sees this body has been deformed since childhood, and one finds it difficult to breathe, and all types of psychosomatic...

K: Then I am afraid sir. The question is, how can one who is psychosomatically damaged stop from being confused. Wait. Has the psychosomatic activity produced this confusion? I can be ill and yet realize the confusion is not the result of my illness. That is fairly simple, isn't it? I can have violent, deep pain and yet realize that my confusion is going on. So illness, disease, any form of psychosomatic warping can be disassociated from confusion. This is fairly clear.

So let's proceed: I realize I am confused, and out of that confusion any choice is furthering that confusion. So there is no

decision. I am confused therefore I have tried this, this, this, and I realize the futility of it. The realization of the futility of any movement of confusion, that very fact makes the whole movement stop. Now has it stopped with you? Has it stopped with you? No? Why not? Wait. Somebody says to you, this is a microphone - you say, I don't see it, I think that is a tree. Right? In the same way, we have spent nearly an hour seeing the whole implication of confusion, that it is not the fault of anybody, it happens to be there, and we are concerned whether the mind can be free of it. In its attempt to be free of it - do it, watch yourself, sir, - attempt to be free of it, it has tried this, this, this, and it says, by Jove, it's no good, and stops. If you have not stopped I mean I can't go on repeating it ten times. That means you are not associated, you are not involved in the thing that is being said, you are just looking from outside.

Now has the mind realized that it has stopped right through, not superficially? Not verbally, not experimentally - I will try this and see what happens, but the realization that any movement out of confusion only breeds more confusion, therefore seeing the fact itself brings an end to the movement. Right? Have you done this, right through? Right? If you have done it, are you confused? You understand this? It is only when you are moving in various directions out of confusion you know you are confused. But when you see the fact, the futility of this movement, that very fact frees the mind from any movement, and therefore the mind is not confused. Oh, you don't see it.

Q: We come back to sensitivity.

K: No, it is not confused. Not comes back. You have discovered

something, sir. It's not, I am discovering it for you, you are discovering it for yourself, it's your food. You are free then. And from that non-confused mind you act. If there is a mistake, you alter it. Wait, sir. Right? You think you are perfectly clear, out of that clarity you act. That action is not fragmentary action, it is a total action - please listen - it is a total action, therefore not under the pressure of any culture, any society, any belief, or your personal wish, it's a total action, therefore it is complete, non-fragmentary, non-contradictory action. Right? And therefore there is freedom. But you may make a mistake because it is something new you have discovered, and you have done it. But that mistake is altered instantly because you see it as a mistake. You follow? There is constant watchfulness. You understand? Constant watchfulness, if there is a mistake it is altered, you don't carry it over into a problem. So there is an action when a mind has completely stopped because it has realized any movement out of confusion is more confused, therefore in that very stopping there is clarity. And therefore such action is totally complete, and therefore action doesn't produce more confusion. Look, sir, what is happening in the world, they are trying to bring the Arabs and the Israelis together, the Russians have their own vested interest in Egypt, and the Egyptians, and the Israelis have their own interests. So it is a frightful mess that is going on, they are going to breed more confusion. Obviously. You see that, but you don't see in yourself that you are doing exactly the same thing. Wait, sir. You are trying to oppose this confusion by another entity that says, stop it, let's clear out of this. It is the same thing that they are doing in the Middle East.

So you realize any action out of this confusion is furthering confusion. Therefore you ask quite a different question, which is: life is action. Life, not life and action. Living is action. In that living there is confusion, and out of that living action brings confusion. So you ask the question now: can there be an action which is always complete, which is not contradictory, which doesn't breed more problems. We say, there is, only when you realize that any action out of confusion is more confused, therefore the mind completely totally realizes. And out of that tremendous realization of this simple fact there is a total action. Yes, sir, wait a minute.

Q: Does not fear play a part in this?

K: Of course. Fear, does not fear play a part in confusion. Fear is confusion. Right? It doesn't play a part, fear has produced confusion: I am afraid what you might say, you might say I am a damn fool, and I think I am a great man, I don't want to be contradicted, therefore I am afraid, therefore I am producing confusion in myself and also in you. Right, sir? So fear, confusion all go together, it is not that fear is something different from confusion, confusion different from pleasure, confusion - you follow, it is all interrelated.

Q: I think I have understood, I see what you have said for myself, but you just spoke of people fighting against each other, I mean this is something we really have to stop.

K: Of course.

Q: It is dangerous.

K: Of course. They are trying to stop it. But, sir, look: we are, students and young people are impatient, they want quick results,



and so they say by throwing a bomb we will upset, and therefore violence produces more violence, violence produces repression, which is taking place - the police are getting stronger to subjugate the others. And this battle is going on. And also there is a strange battle, a strange thing happening in America, which is, a group of people who are called 'Jesus freaks' - you have understood? Freaks who are dedicated to Jesus, which is the opposite of the Hippies - see what is happening - who don't grow long hair, who are not promiscuous, who don't drink, who don't take drugs, who don't smoke, and opposite to the Hippies, and trying to convert the Hippies to them and so on. You follow?

Q: But aren't we in an emergency situation?

K: Of course we are. Wait, wait. Aren't we in emergency always? Of course, sir. Aren't we? Only we are awake when the emergency is observable, when the bomb hits the house, or your bank, then you say, my god! But the bombs are exploding all the time around us, of which you are not aware. The church is a bomb! The organized religions are bombs. Nationalities are bombs because they divide people, prejudice against this or that is a bomb. You don't realize these things, you only realize when an actual bomb is thrown. Therefore one has to be aware - I won't go into all this.

Q: Sir, what is the roots of our emotions and feelings in our every day life?

K: Wait, sir. Have we finished with this? No.

Q: Who will see the confusion?

K: Sir, the question is: who will see the confusion. Nobody. Wait, sir, go slowly, this is quite an important question, look at it.

Before you said, I am confused, I, different from confusion, I want to do something about confusion, I want to get rid of it, I want to go beyond it, I am satisfied as I am with the confusion, and I have everything I want I am not confused. It's the same thing. So when you say, I am confused, in that there is a duality. Wait. That very duality, that very division is confusion. No, you are missing it. That very division is a product of confusion. The mind realizes that division is poisonous, is a bomb.

Q: What is the mind?

K: What is the mind? What is the brain? Sir, the brain has said, I am confused, thought. And thought says, I must do something about it. Therefore there is a division. Right? That division is a tremendous atomic bomb. Right? That division is the most dangerous division. Realize that, see that. How do you see it? Verbally, intellectually, or do you see it as I see this microphone, touch it, be in contact with it, smell it? You follow? You don't do all this, therefore you say, my god - you bring up the same question - who is there to realize I am confused.

What time is it?

Q: Twenty past.

K: We had better stop. There are going to be discussions from Sunday, next Sunday there are going to be dialogues. Now for how many days is it? Will somebody kindly tell me?

Q: Nine days.

K: Nine? No, no. Now you see, watch it, that's confusion! Either you don't know, or you do know. If you know there is no confusion. Which is it?

Q: Sunday to Sunday.

K: Sunday to Sunday? That means eight discussions, dialogues. Now would you like during those dialogues of eight days, one or two completely for the young? What do you say sirs?

Q: Yes, yes.

K: Good!

# SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 2ND AUGUST 1970

So many people have asked to have interviews with me. I am afraid it is not possible to give all the interviews everybody wants. I am awfully sorry there isn't time and also one has to do a great many other things than talk here, but those who have already got appointments, those will be continued.

We are going to have seven discussions, or dialogues, here - or is it eight?

Audience: Eight.

K: Oh, my Lord! (Laughter) Eight discussions, that is dialogues, conversations, where each one of us shares what we are talking about. It is not merely hearing a few words from each other, holding on to our opinions and judgements, but rather, in discussing, in talking over together, we will begin to find out for ourselves how we think, from what point of view we look at life, how formulas, conclusions, sway or control our minds. And if we could, during these eight talks, eight discussions, go into this, into the many problems, taking one morning, or each morning a particular subject, and going into it as completely and as thoroughly as possible so that both of us understand it entirely, not only verbally, intellectually which is of course not understanding, but go beyond it. So this morning what shall we take?

Q: How about the roots and origin of thought?

K: About the roots and origin of thought. Yes sir?

Q: The difference between the mind and the brain.

K: The difference between the mind, the brain. Just a minute sir.

That gentleman.

Q: The system of meditation - is it in oneself or is it?

K: He would like to discuss - if I understood it rightly - the system of meditation in oneself or following a particular method or a system outwardly. Is that it?

Q: Can one make a system out of anything?

K: Can one make any system out of anything? What were you going to say sir?

Q: Do we make the right use of our personal faculty, capacities? Do we use them in the right way?

K: How to use our personal capacities?

Q: And faculties.

K: And faculties. Any other questions? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How do we get out of the love in which we are caught?

Q: Could we discuss the letting go and giving up of all the conditioning?

K: Could we discuss letting go or putting aside all the burdens and conditioning one has. What sir?

Q: What is enlightenment?

K: What is enlightenment? Can one get into it. How that is enough. Yes sir?

Q: Why is it so difficult for us to attain a state of beauty?

K: Why is it so difficult for us to remain in a state of beauty, naturally, easily and freely - is that it?

Q: And to attain it.

K: And obtain it.

Q: Why is it difficult for us to do that?

K: Why is it difficult for us to do that? Now can we put all these questions together? And I think if we could discuss or talk over together what is self-knowledge - wouldn't all these questions be answered? Which is: what is meditation, is it a system outwardly or inwardly, what is the difference between the mind and the brain; why is it so difficult to arrive or understand what is enlightenment; why is it that most of us have to, in various forms, struggle and so on. Could we take self-knowing in which all this would be included? Would that be all right? You are quite sure. I am not imposing this on you. That is you are trying to find out how to understand oneself, because if I understand myself completely, as much as possible, then perhaps all these questions will be answered. Would you agree to that? Yes sir? Which means (sound of band) - Oh, Lord! (Laughter). I am afraid there is too much competition. ( Laughter) (Sound of band continues). I hope it is a reveille! Well, let's get on.

Would that be worth while to discuss? Is there a method by which one can know oneself? Is there a system? Is there a way of finding out for oneself all the human questions that we have put this morning, for oneself, not ask anybody? And that is possible only if I know for myself the mechanism of thought, how the brain works for myself, how the mind, the brain is caught in a conditioning, how it is attached, how it wants to free itself, the constant struggle within oneself and therefore outwardly, and is it possible to meditate and so on. So to answer all the questions that one puts to oneself, and also the problems that exist outwardly, is it not important to understand oneself? Right? Could we discuss this? Yes? You have asked the questions. I am asking you. I am not

trying to impose it on you. May we go into this?

Q: Yes.

Now first of all how I examine, observe, myself? That is what is involved first. Do I look at myself according to what the authorities, specialists, psychologies have said, which obviously has conditioned my mind? I may not like Freud, Jung, Adler and all the recent psychologists and analysts but because of their very statements that have penetrated into my mind, and I am looking at myself with that, with those eyes. Right? And can I look at myself objectively, without any emotional reaction, just to see what I am? And to see what I am is analysis necessary? All these questions are involved when I ask myself that I must know myself, because without knowing myself completely I have no basis for any action. Because if I don't know myself and therefore am confused, whatever action I take must lead to further confusion. So I must know myself. I must profoundly find out the structure of my nature. I have to see the scaffolds of my activities, the patterns in which I function, the line which I follow, the directions which I have established for myself, or the society. And understand this drive, which makes me do things, contradictory or consistent, or occasionally contradictorily. I hope you understand. Right? Too understand all these problems whether there is god, whether there is truth, what is meditation, what is the meditator, is much more important than meditation, I must know completely myself. Right? You see the importance of it? The importance that you know for yourself what you are. Because without knowing yourself whatever you do will be done in ignorance, therefore in illusion, therefore in contradiction, therefore confusion, sorrow and all the rest of it. Is

that clear? One must know oneself, not only at the conscious level but at the deep layers of oneself. Right? Is this clear? Not what I say, that you must know yourself.

Now, how shall I know myself? What is the procedure? Shall I follow the authorities, the specialist, who apparently have investigated, who apparently have come to certain conclusions, which they may alter, which later analysts, psychologists, philosophers, may alter, may strengthen - shall I follow the authorities, the specialists? Wait, wait, don't say 'No'. If I don't how shall I understand myself? Because whatever they have said, not only in the recent years but in the past - the philosophers, the analysts have existed before all the specialists in the western world, the Indian mind has gone into this at extraordinary great depth, and all the investigations of the past philosophers, teachers, and the moderns, is imprinted on my mind, consciously or unconsciously. You follow? I certainly have not read Freud but people talk about it, about their conditioning, their sex - you know all the rest of the Freudian jargon - and one is familiar with all that. So shall I follow, because they have gone ahead of me, because I am just beginning, shall I follow what they have said and go further than what they have said - you are following all this? - or I won't follow anybody but look at myself. Because if I can look at myself as 'what is', I am looking at myself who is the result of all these philosophers, sayings, teachers, saviours, all the rest of it. You are following this? Therefore I don't have to follow anybody. Is this clear? Do see this please. Do see this, please, don't come back to this later. My mind is the result of all the philosophers, consciously or unconsciously accepted what they have said, not only accepted,



it has flowed, come in, like on a wave all these things come in, not only in the present but also the great many teachers of the past. I am the result of all that. And also all the latest philosophers, teachers, saviours and all that. So I say as I am the result of all that, consciously or unconsciously, there is no need to follow them. All that I have to do is to observe myself. Right? Is to read myself, read the book which is myself.

Now, how am I to read, how am I to observe, how am I to observe so clearly that there is no impediment? I may have coloured glasses. I may have certain prejudices, certain conclusions which will prevent me from looking at myself. Right? See all what is implied in looking at myself. So what shall I do? I cannot look at myself freely, that is, I cannot, as I am conditioned, look at myself in complete freedom. Right? Therefore I must be aware of my conditioning. Are you following all this? So I have to ask: what is it to be aware?

Right, now let's proceed. You understand my question? As I cannot look at myself wholly in freedom, because I am not free, my mind isn't free, I have a dozen opinions, so many conclusions, infinite number of experiences, the education which I have been through, all that is my conditioning and therefore I must be aware of these conditioning, which is part of me. Are you following all this? So first I must know, I must understand what it means to be aware. Right? What does it mean to be aware? I am not talking alone, please share together. What does it mean to you too to be aware? The other day the speaker said 'Don't take notes please' - you heard that and you went on taking notes - several people did: now is that to be aware? Please sir, let us stick to one thing. What

does it mean to be aware?

Q: I know already that I can be only for two minutes, for a very short moment and then it becomes disorder.

K: Wait sir, we will come to that. We will come to whether this awareness can be extended. Or is it just for a very, very short period. But before we answer that question let's find out what it means to be aware.

Am I aware of the noise of that stream? Am I aware of all the different colours men and women have in this tent? Am I aware of the structure of the tent? The shape of it? How it sits on the ground? Am I aware of the tent - please follow this - and the space round it, the hills, the trees - you follow - the clouds, the heat, am I aware objectively, outwardly, of all these things? Are you aware? Now wait a minute. How are you aware?

Q: We are aware inwardly and outwardly at the same time.

K: No, madam. Look: we are not talking of inward awareness. Please go step by step. We'll come to all this. Are you aware of this tent, of the various colours within the tent of the people's dresses, are you aware of the hills, the trees, the meadows, the sound of the stream, the clouds, are you aware - wait - aware in the sense, are you conscious of it? You are, aren't you?

Q: When I put my attention on it I am aware of it.

K: Wait. When you put your attention of it you are aware, therefore you are not aware when you are inattentive. Right? You are following this? So only when you pay attention, then you are aware. Please follow this closely.

Q: When I pay attention to one thing, all the other things around me, I can't pay attention to them, then I become absorbed.

K: You become absorbed in one particular thing and the rest rather fade away. Are you aware when you are looking at the tent, the trees, the mountains, are you aware that when you look attentively even that you are shaping into words what you see? You say, 'That's a tree, that's a cloud, that's a tent, I like that colour, I don't like that colour'. Right? Please take a little trouble over this. Don't get bored. Because if you go into this very, very deeply when you leave the tent you will see something for yourself. So when you are aware, when you watch, aware, are you aware of your reactions?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking something and you reply to something else. I am aware. Look I am aware of that dress. My reaction says, 'How nice', or 'How ugly'. I am asking are you aware when you look at that red, your reactions?

Q: Sometimes.

Q: You have got to be aware to meditate at all.

K: Sir, go slowly into what I am asking. Are you aware when you see that red dress, of your reactions, not of a dozen reactions, but that particular reaction when you see a red colour? Why not? Isn't that part of awareness?

Q: When you put a name on a thing you are not aware.

K: I am going to find out sir, what it means. Look, may I talk a little? You don't bite into this.

I want to be aware and I know I am not aware. Occasionally I am attentive, but most of the time I am half asleep, half inattentive, I am thinking about something else while I am looking at a tree, or that colour. So, as I have said, I want to know myself completely

because I see if I don't know myself I have no *raison d'être* to do anything. So I must know myself. Now, how do I know myself? How do I become - how do I observe myself? In observing I shall learn. Right? So learning is part of awareness. Right? No? Am I going to learn about myself according to anybody, according to the philosophers, the teachers, the saviours, the priests? Then it is not learning, is it? I give it up. If I learn according to what others have said, or follow what others have said I have stopped learning about myself, haven't I? So the first thing is I have to learn about myself. Now what does this learning about myself mean? Investigate it sir. Go into it, find out, what does it mean to learn about myself?

Q: To observe myself.

K: No, madam, I don't mean that - too learn - what does that mean - to learn?

Q: (In Italian)

K: Are you really interested in all this?

A: Yes.

K: Wait sir. The questioner in Italian says, we see the reason for knowing ourselves, we are desperate to find ourselves but we want out of this desperation a system, a method because we don't know what to do with ourselves. So we want a method, somebody to tell us, 'Do these things and you will know yourself' - more or less. Now sir, please, do listen to me. Here I am. I am the result of the society, the culture in which I live, the religions, the business world, the economic world, the climate, the food, I am all that, the result of all that, of the infinite past and the present. Right? I want to know myself, that is I want to learn about myself - learn - right? Now what does that word mean, to learn. See the difficulty in this.

Please see the difficulty. I don't know German, which means I have to learn it - learn the meanings of words, memorize the verbs, the irregular verbs. You follow? And all the syntax and I have to learn. That is, I have to accumulate knowledge of words, how to put the words together and all the rest of it, I have to accumulate knowledge. And then I may be able to speak German. I accumulate and then act, verbally or in any other way. There learning meant accumulation. Right? Are you following? Accumulation. Now what happens if I learn about myself, I see something about myself and I say I have learnt that. I have seen that, that is so, I have learnt about it. Now that has left a residue of knowledge - hasn't it? Now with that knowledge I examine the next incident. Right? And that becomes again further accumulation. So the more I observe myself and learn about myself, the more I am accumulating knowledge about myself. Right? Right? It is simple sir. Wait.

Q: I am changing.

K: I am accumulating knowledge and in the process I am changing, but I am accumulating knowledge, experience by observing. Now what happens? With that knowledge I look at myself. So the knowledge is preventing me, is preventing observation, fresh observation. I don't know if you see this?

Q: (In Italian)

K: He says: there is a next step to that, which is, write down your thoughts, put down on a piece of paper what you are thinking, what you have accumulated, and having put that on the paper you are forced to look. You are not following, this is really quite complex. Do go slowly.

Look sir. You have hurt me, you have said something to hurt

me. That is my knowledge. Next time I meet you that knowledge of hurt comes forward to meet you. The past comes to meet the present. So knowledge is the past and with the eyes of the past I am looking at the present - you have got it? Now to learn about myself there must be freedom from the past, from the knowledge, to look at myself, which is the learning about myself must be constantly fresh. You see the difficulty?

Q: I'd say there are constants in life and if they are constant they don't change.

K: We'll come to change sir, later. We are not discussing change. We are watching, I want to learn about myself. I can only learn about myself - myself is movement, myself isn't just static, it's living, active, going in different direction. So if I learn about myself with the mind and the brain that is the past, that prevents me from learning about myself. If you see that once then the next question is: how is the mind to free itself from the past so as to learn about itself, which is constantly new. You have understood this? See the beauty of it, please sirs. The excitement of it! I want to learn about myself and myself is a living thing, it is not a dead thing. I think this one day, I think the next the other day, I want something - you know, this is a constant living, moving thing. And to learn about it, the mind, to observe, to learn about it, must also be free to observe, therefore it cannot observe if it is burdened with the past. Right? So what is it to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, yes, sir, that is what we mean: being an effect of the past. That is what we mean. Now, what shall i do? I see this, this happens. Right? I see that red and I say 'I don't like it'. Right?

Which is, the past responds, the past acts immediately, therefore stops learning. So what is one to do? Go on sirs, it is your problem.

(Various inaudible comments)

K: How to think?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What do you say madame?

Q: Not to have thought.

K: Not to have thoughts. You see you are not even following what I am saying. You have come to a conclusion when you say, not to have thoughts. You are not really learning.

Q: We have to empty ourselves.

K: We have to empty ourselves. That is another conclusion. Then how do you empty yourself? Who is the entity that is going to empty the mind?

Q: You have to empty that too. Everything you empty.

K: Who? Who is going to empty it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You see sir, you are not listening to what is being said - if you will forgive my saying so. I said I want to learn about myself. I cannot learn about myself if the past interferes. Learning implies the active present of the word to learn - learning means acting in the present. And that is not possible when the mind, the brain, is burdened with all the past. Right? Now tell me what to do, tell me what to do.

Q: Attention.

K: You see! How am I to be attentive?

Q: Live in the present.

K: How am I to live in the present when my whole past is

burdening me?

Q: Be aware of the process that is taking place.

K: Be aware of the present.

Q: Be aware of the process that is taking place.

K: Be aware of the process that is taking place. All right. Which means what? Aware that the past is interfering and therefore preventing the brain to learn. Right? Be aware of this movement: the past interfering and stopping learning. Right? Be aware of this. Go slowly sir. Be aware of this movement. Are you aware of it as we are talking? Then if you are aware of this movement as we are talking, what takes place? Don't guess! Don't say 'should be', 'should not be' - that has no meaning. What is actually taking place when you are aware of this movement, which is the past interfering with the present and therefore preventing learning in the sense we are using that word, when you are aware of this whole process going on what takes place then?

Q: You see yourself as the effect of the past.

K: You see yourself as the effect of the past. We see that, that is a fact. We have said what is the outcome, what happens when you are aware that you are the effect of the past and that effect is preventing you from learning in the present? Now when you are aware of this movement, what takes place? What actually takes place? Don't guess. What takes place in you, when you are of this process?

Q: The movement stops.

Q: There is no more thought.

K: There is no more thought. Yes sir?

Q: There is fear.



K: There is fear. One says there is no more thought, one says there is silence, another says there is fear. Just a minute sir. Yes sir?

Q: There seems to be nothing by the present.

K: You see there is nothing but the present. Now which of these statements is true? Now wait. Which of these statements is true? Silence, cessation of thought, one lives in the present - what is the truth of it?

Q: We are confused.

K: That's right sir. We are confused. Now look. What madam?

Q: I am afraid.

K: You are afraid.

Q: You are aware.

Q: You learn.

K: You learn. I give it up!

Q: I feel that there is a contradiction which has to be destroyed by direct action.

K: I feel there is a contradiction which has to be destroyed by direct action. Look sirs, don't come to any conclusion, I beg of you, because conclusions will prevent you from learning. And if you say direct action must happen, that is a conclusion. We are learning. So, look! I see that I am the result, I am the effect of the past, the past may be yesterday or the past second. That has left a mark as knowledge, that knowledge which is the past is preventing learning in the present - it is a momentum, it is happening all the time. Now when I am aware of it, this movement, aware of it, what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, no. What takes place sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You see you are not doing it. You are just guessing. And hoping some one statement will be right. I don't want to think that way, I want to find out, I don't want your conclusions. If I accept your conclusions you will be the new philosopher. I don't want any new philosophers! I want to learn, therefore I have to see what actually takes place, actually, when the brain is aware of this movement. Can the brain be aware of this movement? You are following? Or is it frightened to be aware of something new?

Q: The movement stops.

K: The movement stops. Then what? Have I learnt? Is there a learning?

Q: If I am quiet enough I think I can see what I perceive and what comes out from my own.

K: Yes sir. Look, please do observe this. I want to learn about this movement - learn - and I say now to learn I must have curiosity. Then if my curiosity is merely to come to a conclusion my curiosity stops. So there must be curiosity - right? - to learn. There must be passion to learn - right - and there must be energy to learn. Without this I can't learn. Right? If I have fear I have no passion. So I have to leave that alone and say, 'Why am I frightened?'. Why am I frightened to learn something about something that may be new? Why am I frightened? So I have to investigate fear. You are following? Now I have left this momentum of the past and I have now to learn about fear. Right? Are you following all this? Now why am I frightened?

Q: We are afraid to loose the image of ourselves.

K: We are afraid to loose the image of ourselves - the image which I have built about myself as being full of knowledge, a dead entity. No, sir.

I am frightened. Don't give me the explanation. I realize I am frightened - why? Is it because I see that I am dead? Because I am living in the past and I don't know what it means to observe and learn in the present, therefore it is something totally new. Right? And I am frightened to do anything new. Which means what? That my brain and my mind have followed the old pattern, the old method, the old way of thinking, living, working. So anything I am frightened. Right? And to learn, the mind must be free from the past - we have established that as the truth. Now, look what has happened. I have established the fact as truth, that there is no learning if the past interferes - that is a fact. And also I realize I am frightened. So there is the contradiction between the realization of the fact that to learn the mind must be free of the past, and at the same time I am frightened. So there is a duality in this: I see and I am afraid to see. Right?

Q: Are we always afraid to see new things?

K: Are we afraid to see new things? Aren't we? Aren't we afraid to change?

Q: The new thing is the unknown. We are afraid of the unknown.

K: The new thing is the unknown and so we cling to the old. And clinging to the old will inevitably breed fear because life is changing, there is social upheaval, there is rioting going on, there are wars. So fear is there. Now how am I to learn about fear? You understand? We have moved away from learning about the other

movement. We want to learn about the movement of fear. Right?

Now, what is the movement of fear? Are you aware that you are afraid? Are you aware that you have fears?

Q: Not always.

K: Now, not always. Do you know now, are you aware now of your fears?

You can resuscitate them, bring them out and say, 'Well I am afraid of what people might say about me' - or something or other. So are you aware that you are frightened? That you have fear? Are you? About death, about losing money, about losing your wife, or god knows what! Are you aware of those fears? Physical fears that you might have pain tomorrow and so on. If you are aware of it what is the movement in it? You follow? What takes place? What takes place when you are aware that you are afraid? You are aware when you become aware that you are frightened, you try to get rid of it. Now watch it. When you try to get rid of it, what takes place?

Q: You repress it.

K: Either you repress it, or escape from it, or - not or - and there is a conflict between wanting to get rid of it and fear - isn't there? So there is either repression, escape and in trying to get rid of it there is conflict, which only increases fear. Right?

(Noise of band playing). I wonder why bands were invented - don't you? You say - (noise of dog barking - laughter). Let no other dog bark!

You say the brain itself is so frightened to let go, and the brain itself is the cause of fear. Are you trying to say that? Now you see, look sir, I want to find out, I want to learn about fear, learn. That means I must be curious, I must be passionate. I must be curious

first and I cannot be curious if I have a conclusion. Right? So I have to learn - wait, wait madam - have to learn. I have to learn about fear. I am going to learn - watch it, sir, please do listen, I am going to learn, which means I mustn't be distracted by running away from it. I mustn't - there mustn't be a movement of repression, which means again a distraction from fear. There mustn't be the feeling I must get rid of it. Right? If I have these feelings I cannot learn. Now, have I these feelings? Escape, trying to get rid of it, trying to suppress it and so on - have I these feelings when I see there is fear? I am learning, I am not saying you shouldn't have these feelings, they are there. Am I aware of these feelings? If I am aware of these feelings what shall I do? I want to escape. My fear is so strong that I want to run away from it. And the very movement away from it breeds more fear. You are following all this? Do I see the truth and the fact that moving away from the fear increases fear? Therefore there is no movement away from it. Right? Yes sir?

Q: I don't understand it, because I feel that if I have a fear and I move away from it, I move towards something that is going to end that fear.

K: No.

Q Towards something that will see me through it.

K: I don't understand, the questioner says, that when I move away from fear, in that movement there is a desire to escape from it, suppress it, avoid it and therefore increases fear. I don't understand that at all - he says. But that is a fact, isn't it? I am afraid - what? - I am afraid - I don't know what, I am not afraid, but what am I afraid of - what are you afraid of?

Q: Money

K: You are afraid off losing money, losing money, not money. The more the merrier! But you are afraid of losing it. Right? Now there is a fear of it, therefore what do you do? You make quite sure that your money is well placed. Right? But the fear continues. It may not be in the changing world, they might be throwing bombs, the bank will go up and so on and so on. So there is fear even though you have plenty of money there is always this fear. Right? Now running away from that fear doesn't solve it. Right sir? Suppressing, saying I won't think about it. But the moment you say 'I will not think about it' the next second is thinking about it. Right? So running away from it, suppressing it, avoiding it, doing anything about it, continues fear. Right? That is a fact. Now we have established two facts. That to learn there must be curiosity, to learn there must be no pressure of the past. And to learn about fear there must be no running away from fear. That is a fact. That is the truth. Therefore don't run away. Right? Now when I don't run away from it what takes place?

Q: I stop being identified with it.

K: I stop being identified with fear. Is that what is learning? You have stopped.

Q: I don't know what you mean.

K: Therefore you have to learn. Stopping is not learning. Because you have a desire you mustn't have fear, you want to escape from it. Just see the subtlety of it. I am afraid and I want to learn about it. I don't know what is going to happen. You follow? I want to learn the movement of fear. So what takes place? I am not running away, I am not suppressing, I am not avoiding it and I

want to learn about it.

Q: I think about how to get rid of it.

K: Ah, you want to get rid of it! If you want to get rid of it - I have just explained - who is the person who is going to get rid of it, and if you want to get rid of it, which means you resist it, and therefore fear increases. If you don't see the fact of that I am sorry I can't help you.

Q: Accept fear.

K: I don't accept fear - who is the entity who is accepting fear?

Q: I accept there is no fear.

K: I have just said sir, you don't listen. To escape from it, to avoid it, to pick up a novel and read what other people are doing, look at the television, go to the temple, church, is still avoidance of fear, and any avoidance of fear only increases and strengthens fear. That is a fact. Now after establishing that fact I won't run away. I won't suppress - therefore what takes place when there is an awareness of fear? I am learning. You follow? Now what takes place? Not running away.

Q: Understanding of the process of fear.

K: We are doing it. I am understanding the process, I am watching it, I am learning it. What takes place? I am afraid and I am not running away from it - what takes place?

Q: You are face to face with fear.

K: You are face to face with fear. What takes place then?

(Several inaudible comments)

K: Don't you ask this question? Please just listen to me for two minutes. I am not running away. I am not suppressing, I am not avoiding, I am not resisting. There it is. Now, I am watching it.

Right? The natural question out of that is: who is watching it? Isn't it? Who is watching this fear? Look, don't guess, please don't guess. When you say, I am watching fear, learning about fear, who is the entity who is watching it?

Q: Fear itself.

K: Is fear itself watching itself? Please don't guess. Don't come to any conclusion. Find out. The mind isn't escaping from fear, not building a wall against fear through courage - you know, all the rest of it. What takes place when I watch? I ask myself naturally, who is watching? Right? Who is watching the thing called fear? Don't answer me please. I have raised the question, not you. Who is watching? Another fragment of me? Listen sir, find out who is watching this fear.

Q: Watching cannot be the result of the past, it must be fresh.

K: Sir, I am not talking about whether the watching is the past or this, you are watching. I am aware of fear. I am aware that I am frightened of losing money, of becoming ill, of my wife leaving me and god knows what else - I am frightened, and I want to learn about it, therefore I am watching and my natural question is: who is watching this fear?

Q: Myself.

K: I give it up! You don't really look at it, learn, you are just making a statement. Learn. Who is watching? Wait. When you say who is watching - just a minute sir, I will ask you - when I ask the question: who is watching, what takes place - in the very word itself? There is a division, isn't there? The very question, who is watching it, implies a division. Right? Madam, for the love of Pete listen to me! It means a division.



Q: It's impossible.

K: Wait. It means that, the moment I ask that question: who is watching? That very question implies a division - wait - that's a fact. When I say: who is watching, it means the thing is there and I am watching, therefore there is a division. Now why is there a division? You answer me this. Sir, a moment, don't guess, don't repeat what somebody else said, including myself. Find out why this division exists when the moment you ask the question: who is watching - it implies a division. Right? Why is there division? Find out.

Q: There is a desire on my part to watch.

K: There is a desire on my part to watch. Listen to that question: there is a desire on my part to watch. Which means the desire says watch in order to escape. You follow? Before you have said I have understood, I mustn't escape, and now you find that desire is making you escape subtly, therefore you are still watching fear as an outsider. See the importance of this. You are watching with an intention to get rid of fear. And we said, a few minutes ago, to get rid of fear means censoring fear. So your watching implies that trying to get rid of fear, therefore there is a division, which only strengthens fear. Right? So I am again asking the question: who is watching fear?

Q: Sir, isn't there also another point, who is asking the question who is watching fear?

K: I am asking that question sir.

Q: But who is asking the question?

K: The same thing, sir. Same thing, only you push it further back, it is the same thing. Now please, this is the most practical

way of going at it. You will see if you follow this very carefully, the mind will be free of fear. But you are not doing it. I am frightened of losing money - thank god I haven't got any money to be frightened of! I am frightened of losing money and therefore what do I do? I escape from it. I avoid it, I avoid to think about it. So I realize how silly of me to avoid it because the moment I resist it, more fear. Then there arises I am watching it, I say, who is watching it? Is it the desire that wants to get rid of it or go beyond it, to be free of it, does that watch it? It is. And I know desire, watching it that way, only divides and therefore strengthens fear. So I see the truth of that, therefore desire has gone. You follow? Desire to get rid of it has gone. It's like seeing a poisonous snake and the desire to touch it is finished. Right? The desire to take a drug, when I see the real danger of it, is finished, I won't touch it. As long as I don't see the danger of it I'll go on. In the same way, as long as I don't see that running away from fear is the strengthening of fear, I'll go on running away, doing every kind of thing. The moment I see it I won't run. Then what happens?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am telling you sir. I am pointing out to you. The moment you are scared of looking at fear, then you won't learn about fear, and if you won't learn about fear, scared, full stop. It is as simple as that. If I don't know how to swim I won't plunge into the river. If I know that fear cannot possibly be ended, if I am afraid to look, and if I really want to look, I say 'I don't care, I'll look'.

Q: Sir, he says it is his desire to get away from fear that constantly breeds more fear. But when I am afraid I do want to get away from it so what I have to do, is what I always do, is to let fear

well up in me so that I can identify with it, so that I can unify myself.

K: You see that! It is all these tricks that we are playing on ourselves. Do listen sir. Who is saying all this? You make an effort to identify yourself with fear.

Q: I am that fear.

K: Ah! Wait. Wait, wait, wait. If you are that fear, as you say you are, then what happens?

Q: When I come to terms with it, it begins to...

K: Ah, no, no, not, terms. When you say that you are fear, fear is not something separate from you, just a minute sir, what takes place? Sir, I am brown. I am afraid to be brown because it is not - you know all the rest of it. But I say yes, I am brown and that's the end of it, isn't it? I am not running away from it. What takes place then?

Q: Accept.

K: Accept? On the contrary, I forget about it. I forget that I am brown. You don't even know all this. You are just guessing. Sir, look, it's time to stop, I'll stop. We'll continue with this tomorrow. I want to learn about myself. I must know myself completely, passionately because this is the foundation of all action, without that I'll lead a life of utter confusion. So I must learn about myself. To learn about myself I cannot follow anybody. If I follow anybody I am not learning. Learning implies the past doesn't interfere because myself is something so extraordinarily vital, moving, dynamic, so I must look at it afresh with a new mind. There is no new mind if there is the past that is always operating. That's a fact. I see that. Then in seeing that I realize I am

frightened. I don't know what will happen. So fear - I want to learn about fear - you follow. I am moving all the time in the movement of learning. I want to know about myself and I realize something, a profound truth, and also in learning about fear I am going to learn, which means I mustn't run away from it at any price. I mustn't have a subtle form of desire to run away from it.

So what happens to a mind that is capable of looking at it without division? The division being, getting rid of it, subtle form of escape, suppression and so on - what happens to the mind when it is confronted with fear and there is no question of running away from it? Please I have to stop. We will go on from where we leave off today, tomorrow. Please in the meantime find out, give your mind to it.

## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD AUGUST 1970**

Shall we go on from where we left off yesterday? We were talking about fear and the necessity of knowing oneself. I don't know if one sees the utter importance of understanding the nature and the structure of oneself. As we said, if there is no comprehension, not intellectual or verbal, but actually understanding what one is, and the possibility of going beyond it, we must inevitably bring about confusion, contradiction in ourselves, activities that will lead to a great deal of mischief and sorrow. So it behoves and it is absolutely essential that one should understand, not only the superficial layers of oneself, but the total entity, all the hidden parts. And I hope in communicating with each other, that is, in understanding together this whole problem we shall be able actually, not theoretically, see if through self-knowledge the mind can go beyond its own conditioning, its own habits, its own prejudices and so on.

And we were talking yesterday about learning, learning about oneself; learning implies a non-accumulative movement. There is no movement if it is accumulation. If the river is flowing and it ends up in a lake there is no movement. There is a movement only when there is a constant movement, a constant flow, a strong current. And learning implies that. Learning not only about outward things, scientific facts, but also learning about oneself, because oneself is a constant, changing dynamic, volatile being. And to learn about it the past experiences in no way help, on the contrary the past impedes learning, puts an end to learning and

therefore to a complete action. I hope when we discussed this point yesterday we saw this very clearly; that we are dealing with a constant living movement of life, the movement which is the 'me'. And to understand that 'me', to learn about that 'me', which is so very subtle, there needs to be an intense curiosity, a persistent awareness, a sense of non-accumulative comprehension. I hope we were able to communicate this with each other yesterday, this whole question of learning. And that is where our trouble is going to be, because our mind likes to function in grooves, in patterns, from a fixed conclusion, or prejudice, or knowledge. It is tethered to a particular belief and from there it tries to understand this extraordinary movement of the 'me'. And therefore there is a contradiction between the 'me' and the observer.

And we were talking yesterday about fear, which is part of this movement, part of this total movement of the 'me', the 'me' which breaks up life as a movement, the 'me' that separates as the 'you' and the 'me'. And we said, what is fear? And we are going to learn non-accumulatively about fear. The very word fear prevents coming into contact with that feeling of danger which we call fear.

Look sirs, maturity implies a total, natural development of a human being; a total, natural development of a human being - natural in the sense non-contradictory, harmonious, which has nothing to do with age. And the factor of fear prevents this natural, total development of the mind. I'll go on a little and then we will discuss about all this.

When one is afraid, not only of physical things, but also of psychological factors, then in that fear what takes place? You understand? There is fear: I am afraid, not only of physically

falling ill, dying - you know physical fears that one has - darkness, you know the innumerable fears one has both biologically as well as psychologically. Now what does that fear do to the mind, the mind which has created these fears? You understand my question? Please, don't immediately answer me yet, let's look at ourselves - I have fear. What is the effect of that on the mind, on one's whole life, living? Or we are so used to fear, we have accustomed ourselves to fear which has become a habit, we are unaware of its effect. If I am accustomed to the dogma, to the beliefs, to the national feeling of the Hindu, I am totally unaware, enclosed in this conditioning, of what the effects of it are. I only see what that nationalism, that calling myself a Hindu, that feeling that arouses in me and I am satisfied with that. I identify myself with the country, with the belief and so on and so on, and all the rest of it. But we don't see the effect of such a conditioning all around. In the same way, we don't see what fear does, both psychologically as well as biologically, physically, psychosomatically. What does it do?

Sirs, this is a discussion. This is a discussion. You have to take part in it.

Q: I become involved in trying to stop this happening.

K: It stops or immobilizes action. Or is one aware of that? No sir, are you? Don't generalize. We are discussing this morning and all these discussions, in order to see what is actually happening within us because otherwise these dialogues, talking over together, has no meaning. In talking over what fear does and becoming conscious of it, aware of it, it might be possible to go beyond it. So I must, if I am at all serious, see the effects of fear. And do I know

the effects of it? Or do I know it verbally? Or do I know it as something which has happened - please listen to this - something which has happened in the past, which remains as a memory, and that memory says, these are the effects of it, and therefore the memory sees the effects of it, but the mind doesn't see the actual effect of it. I don't know if you see that? Do you see the importance of this? I have said something which is really quite - eh?

Q: Could you say it again?

K: Could I say it again? (Laughter) Wait a minute sir. What did I say? (Laughter).

Q: You said the mind saw the effects of fear - the memory saw it but the mind didn't.

K: When I say, I know the effects off fear, what does that mean? Either I know it verbally, that is, intellectually, or I know it as a memory, as something that has happened in the past and I say, yes this did happen. From the past I see the effects. Right? So the past tells me what the effects are. Don't disturb me please. But I don't actually, actually, at the moment see the effects of it. The past tells me the effects of it therefore it is something remembered and something of the past and therefore not real. Whereas knowing implies non-accumulative recognition or seeing - not recognition - seeing the fact. Have I conveyed this?

Look, how do I, when I say I am hungry, is it a remembrance of a hunger of yesterday which tells me I am hungry, the remembrance, or the actual fact of hunger now? The two are entirely different. Right? The actual awareness that I am hungry is entirely different from the response of a memory which has told me I have been hungry, therefore you are hungry now. So which is



it? Is the past telling you the effects of fear, or are you aware of the actual fact, actual happening of the effects of fear? I have got it. You see the difference? Which is it? The action of the two are entirely different - aren't they? The one, of being completely aware of the effect of fear, and that acts instantly. Right? But if the effects of fear of the past and that memory tells me, yes the effects are these, then that action is entirely different. Right? Have I made myself clear? Right, now which is it?

Q: Can you distinguish between the feeling about a particular fear and actually being aware of the effects of fear as such, as apart from remembering the effects of fear? I think that was the distinction that was made.

K: That's what I was trying to explain, wasn't it? Wasn't I? Have I misunderstood your question sir?

Q: I thought when you made that remark, you wouldn't remember, it was distinguishing the remembering the effects of a particular fear and seeing what fear does to one.

K: All right, I've got it. Yes. The questioner says - must I repeat all this? Can't somebody repeat what the questioner says. I want to go on!

Q: Go on. Go on!

K: The action of the two are entirely different - do we see that? Please, be careful, if you don't see it don't say yes, don't let's play games with each other, it is very important to understand this. Is the past telling, saying the effects of fear, or there is a direct perception or awareness of the effects of fear now? If the past is saying the effects of fear the action is incomplete, therefore contradictory, therefore it brings conflict. But whereas if one is

aware completely of the fear, the effects of fear now, the action is total.

Q: As one is sitting here I have no fear because I am listening to what you are saying.

K: Yes. As I am sitting in the tent now I have no fear because I am listening to what you are talking about, naturally I am not afraid. But this fear may come up as I leave the tent. But can't you sitting here in this rather hot tent see your fear, which you may have had yesterday, see it, invoke it, invite it.

Q: It may be right fear.

K: Wait. Whatever the fear be - daily life of fear, losing money, afraid of your husband, wife, afraid of losing your job, afraid of darkness, afraid of people - afraid - afraid of death, afraid of not becoming famous, fulfilling, wanting to be recognized - you know, fears. Need you go back and say, 'Well, I have no fear now, but when I go outside I'll have them' - it is there.

Q: You can invoke it, as you say. You can remember it. But at this point you bring memory, the thought of what is should be.

K: Sir, I am asking sir - do find out sir. Need I wait until I leave the tent to find out what my fears are, or sitting here be aware of them?

Q: If the unawareness of fear itself...

K: Sir, look. I am not afraid at this moment what my brother might say to me. But when I meet the man he is going to say things that will frighten me. Right? Can't I see the actual fact of that now? No?

Q: Well if you do that you do a practise already.

K: No, it is not a practice. You are so afraid of doing anything

which might become a practice. I am not saying - sir, aren't you afraid of losing your job? Aren't you afraid of death? Aren't you afraid of not being able to fulfil? Aren't you afraid of not being able to fulfil? Aren't you afraid of being lonely? Aren't you afraid of not being loved? Aren't you? Some form of fear? What your son, your husband - something aren't you?

Q: Only if there is a challenge.

K: No, but I am challenging you. Not 'if there is a challenge'. I can't understand this mentality.

Q: If there is an impulse you act, you have to do something.

K: No. You see you are making it so complicated. It is as natural as hearing that train roar by. Either you can remember the noise of that train, or listen actually to that noise. Don't complicate it, please.

Q: Aren't you in a way complicating it by talking about invoking fear? I don't have to invoke any of my fears - just by being here I can see my reactions.

K: That's all. That's all. That's all I am saying.

Q: In order to live we must know the difference between the brain and the mind?

K: Oh, I've been through that sir. I have been through that. We have discussed that before. We are now discussing, trying to find out - I'll go on - we are now trying to find out what fear is, to learn about it. Is the mind free to learn about fear - learn? Learning being watching the movement of fear, watching it. And you can only watch it, the movement of fear, when you are not remembering the past fears and those memories watching. You see the difference? I can watch, I can learn. I can watch the movement of fear with a

background of memories of previous fears, or I can watch the movement, the responses of fear, without the past. Now which is it that you are doing? Don't complicate it, it is so very simple. Which is it you are doing? Watching it with a memory of the past? Are you watching it without that memory, watching, learning about what is actually taking place when there is fear?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am watching. I am boiling with fear all the time. I don't seem to be able to get rid of it.

Q: Unfortunately we have no actual fears at this moment.

K: All right sir. You may not have fear now but you have had fears, haven't you? Yes? What happened when you had those fears? What was the effect of those fears around you and in you? You have understood my question? When you have had fears in the past and when you are aware of those fears in the past, what effect those fears had on you and your environment - what happened? Weren't you cut off from others? Weren't the effect of those fears isolating you?

Q: It crippled me.

K: It crippled you, isolated you, cut off. It made you feel desperate, you didn't know what to do. Right? Now, when there was this isolation what happened to action?

Q: It is fragmentary.

K: Which is fragmentary, isn't it? Do listen to this carefully please. I have had fears in the past, about something or other, that's irrelevant, and the effects of those fears was to isolate me, was to separate me, to cripple me, to make me feel anxious, desperate, a feeling of running away, seeking comfort from something or other

- all that we'll call for the moment isolating myself from all relationships. Right? The effect of that isolation in action is to bring about fragmentation. Right?

Q: Sir.

K: Wait, wait, wait. One moment sir. Do get this point. Didn't this happen to you? When you are frightened, you didn't know what to do, you ran away from it, or tried to suppress it? Reason it away? And when you had to act you were acting from a fear which in itself is isolating? No? So action born out of that fear must be fragmentary. Right? Fragmentary being contradictory, therefore in that there was a great deal of struggle, pain, anxiety - no?

Q: Sir, as a crippled person walks on crutches, so a person who is humbled, crippled by fear uses various kinds of crutches.

K: Right sir. That's what we are saying. That's right. That's exactly - he says that a person on crutches can't walk fully and so on.

Now, you are very clear what that action of effects of past fears does. Right? It produces fragmentary actions. Now what is the difference between that and the action of fear without the response of memory? You have got my question? Look sir, when you meet danger, physical danger what takes place?

Q: Spontaneous action.

K: Spontaneous action it is called. Is it spontaneous? No, please do enquire, we are trying to find out something. You go along in the woods by yourself, perhaps not in Switzerland, but you go in wild parts of India, or certain parts of America, and you go along and suddenly round the corner you come upon a bear with cubs - what happens then? Knowing the bear is a dangerous animal, with

cubs especially - what happens to you?

Q: There is a chemical change in you, the adrenaline rises.

K: Yes sir adrenaline and all the rest of it. Now what is the action that takes place?

(Various responses - inaudible)

K: No, sirs, what happens to you - of course if you are afraid you transmit it to the bear and the bear gets more frightened and attacks you. (Laughter) This is all very simple - do please - you are missing the whole point. Please sirs.

Q: What happens in that situation if you are fear?

K: Have you ever faced a bear in the woods? No?

Q: There is someone here who has.

K: I have. We have. That gentlemen and I happen to have many of these happenings during certain years but that is irrelevant.

What takes place? Don't imagine. There is a bear in front of you, a few feet away from you, all the bodily reactions, the adrenaline and so on and so on and so on, there is instant stopping, isn't there, and you turn away and run, leave. What has happened there? What was the response? A conditioned response, wasn't it? People have told you generation after generation 'Be careful of wild animals' If you get frightened you will transmit that fear to the animal and then he will attack you. The whole thing is through instantly. Now is that fear functioning or intelligence? Don't answer me, please listen to this. You understand sir. Which is operating, fear or intelligence? Fear of what - the fear that has been aroused by the repetition - 'Be careful of the wild animals' - that has been your conditioning from childhood - be careful - is that operating? Or is intelligence operating? You have never faced wild animals have you? No. So

see the difference: the conditioned response to that animal and the action of that conditioned response is one thing, and the operation of intelligence and the action of intelligence is entirely different, the two are entirely different. Are you meeting this thing? The bus is rushing by, a bus, you don't throw yourself in front of it, your intelligence says, don't do it. It is not fear, unless you are slightly neurotic or have taken a series of drugs. Your intelligence says, don't be - you know, intelligence prevents you. It is not fear.

Q: Sir, when you meet a wild animal don't you have to have intelligence and conditioned response?

K: No sir. See it. The moment it is a conditioned response there is fear involved in it and that is transmitted to the animal; but if it is intelligence - must I go into it, personally it's not important. I have faced a tiger - well never mind - leave all that alone. So you find out for yourself what is operating. If it is fear then its action is incomplete and therefore there is a danger from the animal, but the action of intelligence is entirely different. There is no fear at all.

Q: (In Italian)

K: If I watch that bear then will I be killed - if I watch that bear intelligently, will I be intelligently killed? (laughter)

Q: Without fear.

K: Oh, yes, without fear.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh Lord! Oh Lord! You are all talking with such complications. It is so simple this. Now leave the animals, poor things, alone. Let us start with ourselves, who are part animals too.

The action of fear and the effects of fear and its action, based on past memories, such actions are destructive, contradictory,

paralysing. Right? Do we see that? Not verbally but actually see that? That when you are afraid you are completely isolated and any action that took place from that isolation must be fragmentary and therefore contradictory, therefore there was struggle, pain and all the rest of it? Now an action of awareness of fear without all the responses of memory is a complete action. You try it! Do it.

Become aware, as you are walking along, going home, your old fears will come up. Then watch, watch, be aware, whether those fears are actually fears or projected by thought as memory. You see that? If those fears are the projection of thought as the response of memory, then your action will be incomplete and therefore painful. Right? But as you walk along and a fear arises watch it, whether you are watching from the response of thought or merely watching. Right, is that clear? If it isn't clear go and jump in that lake!

(Laughter). Don't do it though!

So, what we are talking is action, because life is action, not saying one part of life is action only, the whole of living is action. And that action is broken up, and this breaking up of action is this process of memory with its thoughts and isolation. Right? Is that clear?

Q: You mean the idea is totally experienced, every split second, without memory entering?

K: Sir, when you put a question like that, you have to investigate the question of memory. You have to have memory, the more clear, the more definite the better, if you are to function technologically, or if you want to go home, you have to have memory. Right? You can't say, 'Well I have no memory' - you have to have memory. But thought, as response of memory and



projecting fear out of that memory, such action is entirely different.

Now what is fear? What is fear? How does it happen that there is fear? You have had it. You have had yesterday certain fears. How does it happen? How do these fears take place? Would you tell me please? We are talking over together. Can't you say?

Q: In me it is the attachment to the past.

K: In me it is the attachment to the past. Now let's take that, one thing. Attachment to the past. What do you mean by that word 'attachment'?

Q: My mind is holding on to something.

K: That is, he says, the mind is holding on to some memory. When I was young, how lovely - you know. Or holding on to something that might happen, for which I have definitely cultivated a belief which will protect me - attachment. I am attached to a memory. I am attached to a piece of furniture. I am attached to what I am writing because through writing I become very famous. I am attached, attached to a name, to a family, to a house, to a belief, to various memories and so on and so on - attached, bound, identified myself with that. Now why does this attachment take place?

Q: I think because fear is the very basis of our civilization?

K: No sir, don't - why are you attached? What does that word attachment signify? Depending on - right sir?

Q: Security.

K: Now please you are all too quick. I am depending upon something. I am depending on you all attending so that I can talk to you. I am depending on you, and therefore I am attached to you, because through that attachment I feel I gain certain energy, certain

elan, and all the rest of that rubbish. So I am attached, which means what? I am dependent on you. I am dependent on the furniture, in being attached to the furniture, to the belief, to the book, to the family, to the wife. I am depending. Right? To give me comfort, to give me prestige, to give me social position, to give me this and that. So dependence is a form of attachment. Right? Now why do I depend on you, on the furniture, on my books - you follow? - why, why do I depend? Don't answer me, look at it in yourself. You depend on something, don't you? On your country, on your gods, on your beliefs, on the drugs you take, drink, good Lord!

Q: It is part of social conditioning.

K: Is it social conditioning that makes you depend? Which means you are part of society, society is not independent of you. You have made society, the society which is corrupt, you have put together; and in that cage you are caught, you are part of it. So don't blame society. Do you see the implications of dependency? What is involved? Why are you depending?

Q: So as not to feel lonely.

K: Wait, wait. Look, listen quietly. Somebody says, 'I depend on something because I am lonely'. I depend on something because that something fills my emptiness. I depend on knowledge, books, because that covers my emptiness, my shallowness, my stupidity - so knowledge becomes extraordinarily important. I talk about pictures and the beauty of pictures because in myself I depend on that. So dependence indicates my emptiness, my loneliness, my insufficiency and that makes me depend on you. Right? That is a fact isn't it? Don't theorize, don't argue. It is so. If I am not empty, if I am not insufficient, I wouldn't care what you said, do. I

wouldn't depend on anything. Because I am empty, lonely, I don't know what to do with my life. I write a stupid book and that fills my vanity. I go back and write about ancient Sanskrit rot, and I say 'By Jove'. So I depend, which means I am afraid of being lonely. Right? I am afraid of my emptiness. Therefore I fill it with cloth, or with ideas, or with persons. Now wait - aren't you afraid of uncovering your loneliness? Right? Have you uncovered your loneliness, your insufficiency, your emptiness? And that is taking place now isn't it? Right? Therefore you are afraid now. Right? You are afraid of that emptiness now. Now what are you going to do? What is taking place? Before you were attached to people, to ideas, to all kinds of stuff and you see you are depending and that dependence is covering your emptiness, your shallowness, your petty little shoddy little minds, though you may write clever books. And when you see that you are free - aren't you? Aren't you? No? Now what is the response? Is that fear the response of memory? Or is that fear actual, you see it?

Gosh, I work hard for you don't I? You know there was a cartoon yesterday morning - you have heard of Peanuts? A little boy says to the other boy, he says, 'When I grow up I am going to be a great prophet', and he says - the next drawing is - 'I am going to speak of profound truths but nobody will listen' (Laughter!) Wait, wait, wait. And the other little boy says, 'Then why do you talk if nobody is going to listen?' 'Ah' he said 'Us prophets are very obstinate' (Laughter).

So now sir, you have uncovered your fear now, uncovered through attachment, which is dependency, under dependency, when you look into it you see your emptiness, your shallowness,

your pettiness - you know all, the rest of it - and you are frightened of it. Right? Which means what takes place then? Proceed, sirs.

What takes place?

Q: Try to escape.

K: You try to escape, which is trying to escape through attachment, through dependency. Therefore you are back again in the old pattern. But if you see the truth, the fact that attachment, dependency, emptiness, if you see that fact, you won't escape will you? IF you don't see the fact of that you are bound to run away, you will do all kinds of things. You try to fill that emptiness in other ways, before you filled it with drugs, now you will fill it with sex or you will fill it with something else. So when you see the fact of that what has happened? Proceed sirs, go on with it. I have been attached to the house, to the wife, to the books, to my writing and becoming famous - you know the people who want to be famous ought to be kicked in the pants - so I see fear arises because I don't know what to do with my emptiness. You understand? Therefore I depend, therefore I am attached, on that which I depend on. Now what do I do when I get this feeling of great emptiness in me?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: It is fear - you follow? I discover I am frightened, therefore I am attached. Please go slowly. Now is that fear the response of memory, or is that fear of actual discovery? You see the difference between the two? Discovery is something entirely different from the response of the past. Right? Now which is it with you? Is it the actual discovery? Or the response of the past? Don't answer me. Find out, sir, dig into yourself.

Q: Sir, in that emptiness surely there is loneliness.

K: No, no. I am asking something different. Please I don't have to repeat the question again. I am asking something entirely different. The fear of attachment, the fear which emptiness, loneliness and all that insufficiency, which you haven't been able to understand sufficiently to go through with it and finish it, has brought about fear. Now is it your discovery now, now, being here in the tent, is it your discovery? Or is it the recognition of the past? I don't have to repeat it again, have I? Which is it? Have you discovered that you are attached because you depend, and you depend because of fear of emptiness. Are you aware of your emptiness and the process of what that emptiness does? Are you aware of it? Right? Which means becoming aware of that emptiness is there fear involved in it? Or you are you merely empty? Merely see the fact that you are lonely.

Q: If you can see that you are not alone any more.

K: Just a minute sir. We'll go step by step sir, if you don't mind. Do you see that? Or are you going back to the old stuff? Dependency, attachment - you follow? The regular pattern being repeated over and over and over again. Which is it - what is going to take place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, unfortunately we are not dogs.

Q: Pardon?

K: Unfortunately we are not dogs, not animals. We are partly animals. I wish we were entirely animals and it would be quite a different problem. We are partly animals. So please sir I am asking something which you don't answer. Have you discovered for

yourself the fear that takes place when you discover for yourself your emptiness, your shallowness, your isolation? Or discovering, you are going to run away, get attached to microphones?

So then what takes place, if you don't run away through dependency and attachment, then what takes place when there is this emptiness?

Q: Freedom.

K: You see sir, do look at it. It's quite a complex problem, don't say

it is freedom. Before I was attached and I covered up my fear. Now by asking that question I discover it was an escape, this attachment, escape from fear which came into being when I was aware for a split second of my emptiness. Now I won't run away any more because I have finished with running away - then what takes place?

Q: There is no time. We are nothing.

K: What takes place madame? Be simple, don't say 'no time'.

Q: Can it be passion?

K: No sir. Just listen for two minutes. Just listen. Just a minute. What were you going to say?

Q: I was going to say that after that split second there is another escape.

K: After that split second there is another escape, which means you don't see the futility of escapes. Right? Therefore, don't see it, keep on escaping. But if you do see, are aware of your emptiness, what takes place? If you are watching very careful, what generally takes place is, who is aware of this emptiness. Right? No? Who is aware of this emptiness?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I have stopped escaping. I no longer depend or attach, that is finished. Then I am empty. Who is aware of this emptiness?

Q: The mind.

K: Go slowly, please sir, please. Please don't jump into it. Go step by step. Who is aware of it? The mind? Who is aware of it? A part of the mind - please listen - a part of the mind aware of another part which is lonely? You see my question? I am lonely - I have suddenly become aware that I am lonely. And who is aware of this loneliness? One part, a fragment of my mind, which says I am lonely? In that there is a division. Right? Therefore as long as there is a division there is an escape. You don't see this.

Q: What happens when you experience the emptiness then? Experience this loneliness - you are no longer aware of it.

K: Sir, look sir. You need here a persistent, sustained observation, not a conclusion - please listen to it for two minutes. You need here a persistent observation, not an observation from any conclusion, or from anything that you think should be, but observation, that is, I am aware of my emptiness, before I have covered it up, not it has been stripped and I am aware. Who is aware of this emptiness? A part of my mind? A separate segment of my mind? If it is, then there is a division between emptiness and the thing that is aware that it is empty, then what takes place in that emptiness - in that division? I can't do anything about it. I want to do something about it. Right? And I say I must bring it together, I must experience this emptiness, I must act. So as long as there is a division between the observer and the observed there is a contradiction and therefore there is a conflict. Is that what you are

doing? A separate segment of the mind watching an emptiness which is not part of itself? Which is it? Please sirs you have to answer this, I can't answer for it. Then if it is a part that is watching what is that part?

Q: Is it the intelligence of energy?

K: I don't understand it sir. Is it the intelligence of energy? What does that mean, I don't quite understand?

Q: Born out of energy.

K: Born out of energy. Sir I didn't talk about energy. Don't complicate it sir, it is complex enough. Don't bring in other words.

Q: It is universal.

K: Look sir, my question is very simple. I asked, when you are aware of this emptiness, from which you have escaped through attachment and you are no longer running away from it, when you say you are aware of the emptiness, who is aware? It is for you to find out. Who is aware?

Q: It is another escape, this awareness, and you see you are nothing else but all these things put together.

K: When you say, 'I am aware of my emptiness' it is another form of escape. And we are caught in a network of escapes. And that's our life. Let me finish. So if you realize that it is an escape, as attachment is an escape, then you drop that escape. Right? Are you going - please listen - are you going from one escape after another? Or do you see one factor of escape and therefore you have understood all the factors of escape?

Isn't it time? I think I had better stop as it is ten to twelve. Look sirs, you cannot possibly sustain a continuous watchfulness for more than ten minutes and we have talked for an hour and forty



minutes, and hour and fifty minutes. So we had better stop. We will continue the same thing tomorrow, until it becomes real to you, not because I say so, real to you, it's your life.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 4TH AUGUST 1970

May we go on with what we were talking about yesterday morning? We were talking about dependency, its attachments and the fear of loss. I think this may be rather an important subject, rather an important issue in our life, that we should really go into it rather deeply. After all, one can see that freedom cannot possibly exist when there is any form of dependency. There is physiological dependency and psychological, the dependency biologically on food, clothes and shelter which is a natural dependency. But the attachment that arises through the biological necessity, as having a house to which one is psychologically attached, or attached to certain form of food, or compulsive eating, because the other factors of fear which have not been discovered, and so on. So there are physical dependencies of which one can be fairly aware of, like wanting to, depending on smoke, on smoking, on drugs, on various forms of drink, various forms of physical stimulation, on which psychologically one depends.

Then there is the psychological dependencies - really one has to watch this very, very carefully, because they flow into each other, they are interrelated. The dependency on a person or a belief, on a continuous established relationship, on psychological habits of thought. I think one can be aware of all this fairly easily. And because, as we said yesterday, there is a dependency on something, and the attachment to that something, both physical or psychological, and that dependency and the fear of losing that to which one is attached, brings about or affects or breeds fear. I think

that is where we went yesterday. I wonder if you have thought any more about it, gone into it yourself, since we last talked, on how deeply one depends - we are talking psychologically. One may depend on belief or an experience or on a conclusion, attached to a particular form of prejudice.

And how deeply does this attachment go. I do not know if you have observed it in yourself. We were watching it yesterday, all throughout the day, to find out if there is any form of attachment - coming here regularly, living in a particular chalet, following or going to one country after another, talking, addressing people, being looked up to, criticized, exposed. If you have watched throughout the day, one discovers naturally how deeply one is attached to something or another or not at all. If there is any form of attachment, it doesn't matter what it is, to a book, to a particular diet, to a particular pattern of thought, activity, committed to certain social responsibility - such attachment invariably breeds fear. And a mind that is frightened, though it may not know it because it is attached, obviously is not free and therefore must live in a constant state of conflict.

One may have a particular gift, capacity, like a musician, tremendously attached to his instrument or to the cultivation of his voice. And when the instrument or the voice fails, he is completely lost, his days are ended, he may insure his hands or his fiddle, or become a conductor, but he knows, through attachment, the inevitable darkness of fear is waiting.

I wonder if each one of us, if we are at all serious, have gone into this question, because freedom means freedom from all attachment, and therefore all dependency. A mind that is attached

is not objective, is not clear, cannot think sanely, observe directly.

And there are the superficial, psychological attachments and there are deep layers in which there may be some form of attachment. How do you discover those? Please, this is not a talk by me - we are communicating with each other, sharing with each other the examination, which is not an analysis.

So how does the mind, which may consciously observe its many attachments, and realize the nature of those attachment and see the truth and the implications of that truth, but yet it may have other forms of hidden attachments. How are you going to uncover those concealed, secret attachments, bearing in mind, a mind that is attached goes through the conflict of detachment, realizing it must be detached, otherwise it has pain, and then gets attached to something else, and so on. This is our life. I find I am attached to my wife - fortunately I am not married - I am attached to my wife. And I may see all the consequences of it. And being attached to her I realize there must be inevitably fear involved in it. Therefore there is the conflict of detachment, and the trial in relationship, the conflict in relationship.

That is fairly easy to observe and expose to oneself, very clearly. Our question is, how deeply, in the hidden recesses of one's mind, is one attached to some form of tradition, modern or ancient, short hair, long hair, whatever it is. The tradition of a particular culture - please follow all this, because you will see freedom implies complete freedom from all this. Otherwise there must be fear. And a mind that is burdened with fear is incapable, do what it will, of understanding, seeing things as they are and going beyond them.

How does one observe the hidden attachments. I may be stubborn, thinking I am not attached, I am not depending on anything - I may have come to that conclusion, and the conclusion makes for stubbornness. But if one is learning, seeking, watching, then in that act of learning there is no conclusion.

And most of us are attached to some form of conclusion. And according to that conclusion we function. And can the mind be free all the time, not occasionally, all the time from forming conclusions, and therefore being attached to those conclusions. That is one problem, which is, can the mind not form any conclusion at all. I like and I don't like - I like long hair, I don't like long hair, I like this, I don't like that, I believe - conclusions, intellectually or through some experience you have come to a way of thinking, whether it is the bourgeois way of thinking or the non-bourgeois, whatever it is. Can the mind act without conclusion? That is one point.

Second - I am going to stop because you are going to, we are all going to discuss presently. Second, can the mind reveal to itself the hidden attachments, patterns and dependencies. And three, can the mind, seeing the nature and structure of attachment, can the mind be completely, or sustain move within, move with a way of life which is not isolating but highly active and yet no fixation at any point. I don't know if you are following all this. We will go into it.

First of all, are we aware that we are psychologically attached, first of all, biologically, physically attached. Are you aware of it? We are going to discuss, please. I'm not going to make a long speech - you and I are going to share this thing together. Are you aware that you are attached physically to things? And being aware

of that, are you aware also of the implications of those attachments. If you are attached to smoking, see how extraordinarily difficult it is to give it up. The battles that one goes through, because I've watched people - personally I've never smoked, I don't know what it means - once I tried it and I was sick and I put it aside. But the people who smoke, it has become a habit, find it incredibly difficult, not only acts as stimulation and all the rest of it, social habit and all that, but the attachment to it - the attachment to drink, to drugs, to various forms of stimuli - is one aware of all this? If you are, can you drop it instantly.

Come on, sirs, please. I am aware that I am attached to whisky. I am not, but suppose I am. And it has become a tremendous habit, the body demands it. See what is involved in this. The body has got used to it, it can't do without it. And you have come to the conclusion that you mustn't drink, it is bad for you, it gives you various forms of physical disturbances, the doctors have said, don't, cut it down. But the body, the mind, have fallen into the habit of it. I am only taking that as an instance. Can the mind, watching this habit, can it completely, immediately drop it. See what is involved in it - the body demands it, because it has got into a habit, it acts as a stimulus or whatever it is, and the mind has said, oh, I must give it up. So there is a battle between the body, the bodily demands and the decision of the mind. Right?

Now what are you going to do. Instead of whisky, put your own habits which you have - perhaps you don't drink whisky and it is not particularly a habit, but you have other physiological habits, frowning, watching with your mouth open, fiddling with your fingers - what will you do? Please, sirs, let's discuss this, don't let

me - the body's attached to drink and the mind says, I must be free of it.

And also you realize, conflict between the body and the mind is not very good, doesn't help, it becomes a problem, a struggle. What will you do? Please, sirs, come on. You must be extraordinarily free of all habits, if you can't discuss this.

Q: Either you stop it or you go on drinking.

K: You either stop it or go on drinking. What do you do, actually? Please don't play with this, because if you once understand this, which we are going to go into, you will see how extraordinarily vital it becomes or how important it becomes to act, to be without any form of effort, which means without any distortion. Which we'll go into, presently. Yes, sir?

Q: I realize that I am my habit.

K: Yes. Then what will you do - I realize I am my habit, my habit is me.

Q: Must we not go to the roots of these habits?

K: Must we not go into the roots of these habits?

Q: Begin by stopping resistance to it.

K: Stop, begin by stopping resistance to the habits. Sir, may I say something - don't let theorize, don't let's speculate. Just a minute, sir. Don't tell me what to do but let's find out or let us learn how to look, let us learn not only how to look but from that very looking action takes place. Seeing is acting, that is what we are concerned with. I have a particular habit of scratching my head, fiddling with my fingers, watching things with my mouth open, a very physical thing. Now how do I bring it to an end without the least effort, because we are discussing habits to which we are

attached, conscious or unconscious. I am taking the most trivial habit. You understand my question? I've got a habit, scratching my head or pulling my ears or fiddling with my fingers. How do, how does, the mind stop it without any kind of effort, knowing that effort implies duality, implies a resistance, implies a condemnation, implies a desire to go beyond it, and therefore either suppress or escape, verbally or non-verbally. So bearing all that in mind, understanding those facts, how do I stop a physical habit, without effort.

Q: Observer it in its entirety.

K: You observe it in its entirety. Wait, sir - let's answer, that statement may answer all our questions. You observe in its entirety - what does that mean. The entire habit, the entire, not just one habit, as scratch, fiddling with your fingers, but the whole mechanism of habits - the whole of it, not a fragment of it. Now, how does the mind watch the whole of the habit in which it lives? Please sir, you made a statement.

Q: Passive awareness or passive observation.

K: You are quoting the speaker. I'm afraid that won't do. Don't quote anybody, sir, including Peanuts - Charlie Brown!

Q: Is the mind part of the...

K: Do look, sir, watch - that question is really quite important, if you go into it. Can the mind watch, not only the particular little habit, which is, a particular little habit, but be aware of this whole mechanism of forming habits. Please don't say yes - we are trying to learn about it, don't come to any conclusions. Look what is implied in this question, they are not only a very small habit, like fiddling with ones fingers, keeping ones mouth open, but also other



habits, sexual habits, habits, patterns of thought, activities, I think this, I conclude this, and that has become a habit, I have lived with it, you follow - I live in habits, my whole life is a form of, a structure of habits.

Now how am I, how is the mind to be aware of the entire habit mechanism?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The questioner says, I find myself wandering away from actually what is taking place, escaping, day-dreaming, moving away, thinking about - I never watch 'what is', the thing that is most important right in front of me, I never come directly in contact with it, I move away. Wait, that is not for the moment the question. Look, one has thousand and one habits, the way you brush your teeth, comb your hair, the way you read, the way you walk, the way you - you follow? Dozens and dozens of habits. One of the habits is wanting to become famous, wanting to become important. Now, how is the mind to become aware of all these habits? Is it to be aware - listen please - aware of one habit after another. Do you know how long that would take? I could spend the rest of my days watching each habit and yet not solving it.

So I am asking, is it possible for the mind - I'm going to learn about it, I'm going to find out, I'm not going to leave it - for the mind to see the whole network of habits - how is it to do it? Don't guess, don't come to a conclusion, don't offer an explanation, I'm not interested, it doesn't mean a thing to say, go and do something, it doesn't mean a thing. But I want to learn about it, now. What do I do, what does the mind do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Can one be aware of the wastefulness of energy in pursuing a particular pattern of habit or many patterns.

Q: And thereby liberating oneself from habits.

K: Thereby liberating oneself from habit. That is, one habit after another, liberating from one habit after another. Please - I've come to you, all of you, and say, please help me, help me to find this out, I'm hungry, don't give me a menu but give me food, I am asking, what will you do.

Q: If you can see one habit, totally, possibly one could discard all habits.

K: See one habit totally, and then you will see all other habits. Now how do I, watch it, how do I watch one habit which is twiddling my fingers, and see all the other habits? Is that possible, with such a small affair, this. I know why I do it - I do it because out of tension, I couldn't get on with my wife, probably, and say, well, develop this peculiar habit or I do it because I am nervous, shy or this or that. And there it is. But I want to learn about the whole network of habits - am I to do it bit by bit, or - listen, please listen - or is there a way of looking at this whole network, instantly?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes. Does this network of habits through one out from being aware of the one thing you are concerned. Obviously. Please answer me. How am I, how is the mind to look at this totality of habit.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Habit consists of two parts, the habit that exists and the observer who is concerned with those habits. And the observer is

also a habit. So both are habits. You understand? I fiddle with my fingers and I observe the observation also is from an entity which is the result of habits. Obviously. So it is all habits. Please, sir, listen to me for two minutes. How will you help me, teach me, help me to learn about it?

Q: Me and my habits, my whole life is habit, my mind is a habit.

K: Yes, sir - what am I to do?

Q: It is a state of my mind.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: I must change my structure.

K: Wait - I must change the structure of my mind. Who is the I that is going to change, the I is also a habit, the I is a series of words, and memories and knowledge, which is the past, which is a habit.

Q: As we are all caught in habits, we all obviously don't know.

K: Therefore why don't you say, I don't know, instead of throwing in a lot of words. If you don't know, if you don't know, then let's learn together. Right?

Q: We didn't understand.

K: If you don't know, then let us both of us learn together. But first be clear that you don't know - don't quote anybody. Are we in that position, saying, I really don't know?

Q: But why do we have to have it?

K: Why? It's fairly simple - habit, to have habits of many kinds doesn't need much thinking. If I have a dozen habits - get up every morning at eight o'clock, go to the office every morning, be there at nine o'clock, come back home at six o'clock - you follow - take

drink, I don't have to think very much, be alive very much.

Therefore mind likes to function in grooves, in habits. I am a Hindu - that finishes it. I am a Communist according to Lenin, and you are Communist according to Trotsky - you've finished - or a Catholic or this or that. So the mind likes to function and the brain likes to function because it is safe, secure, to function in habits - that's simple, that doesn't need a great deal of explanation. Now how is the mind to observe this whole network of habits?

Q: May be can pay attention every moment, as far as our energies allow.

K: Maybe we can pay attention every moment as far as our energy allows. You see, that is just an idea - I am not interested, please sir.

Q: I have a habit, I see some kind of attachment always connected to habit, and I think it must be because the brain functions in habits.

K: No, sir, my question is this - please, you made a statement, I am following that statement, which is, can the mind see the whole structure and nature and the mechanism of habit. And when it sees the totality, there may be a different action. That's what we are enquiring into. Now may I go into it now? Since you don't know - not that I am Delphic Oracle, we are going to find out together. How is the mind, including the brain, to see something totally? Not only habit - to see anything totally. (Noise of plane) To see anything totally there - don't you like the sound, the deep sound of that aeroplane? We see things fragmentarily, don't we, don't we? We see things in fragments - business, family, community, individual, my opinion and your opinion, my god, your god, your

social act - we see everything in fragments. Isn't that a fact? Are you aware that you see things in fragments? If the seeing is fragmentary, then you cannot see the totality. If I see life in fragments, because my mind is conditioned as this or that, then obviously it cannot see the totality of the human being. If I separate myself through my ambition, through my particular prejudices, I cannot see the whole. Now am I aware that I am looking at life partially, in fragments - 'me' and the 'not-me', we and they. Do I look at life that way? If I do then obviously I can't see anything totally.

Then arises my question then, how is the mind, which is so caught up in this habit of fragmentary outlook, fragmentary activity, how is such a mind to see the whole? Obviously it can't. If I am concerned with my particular fulfilment, ambition, competition and my desire to achieve, I can't see the whole of mankind. So what am I to do? That is a habit, wanting to fulfil, wanting to be somebody, wanting to achieve something - that is a habit, a social habit as well as a habit that gives me great pleasure, to say, well, as I go down the street people look at me, say, there he goes. That gives me great pleasure.

Now as long as that mind is operating in that field of fragmentation obviously it can't see the whole. Now my question is, how is the mind, which functions in fragments - please listen to this - realizing that it cannot possibly see the whole, what is it to do? Is it to break down every fragment, understand every fragment - again, that would take a long time. Or what is it to do? Are you waiting for an answer from me, from the speaker?

Q: Silence.

K: Oh my Lord - he is quoting somebody.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand, madam. Actually, right now, I feel happy?

Q: Habits, our actions are not in the future, habits, if we can see our habits now actually at this very moment.

K: I am doing that, aren't we? I am actually caught in a habit. Oh Lord, you don't go any further, you go back over and over again. I am caught in a habit, now, I fiddle with my fingers, I listen to what is being said with my mouth open, and I see that it is a habit, and my question is, can I understand this whole machinery habit now. You don't pay attention. Look, sir - a mind that is in fragments cannot possibly see the whole, full stop. And I take one habit and through learning about that one habit, a serious habit, by observing that one habit I see the whole mechanism of all habits. I take one habit - what shall I take?

Q: Smoking.

K: Please take the habit of smoking. All right, sir. Now wait a minute, I am not analysing, you understand the difference between analysis and observation. Do you? How am I to do it? All right, I'll explain. There is a difference between analysis and observation, seeing. Analysis implies the one who analyses and the thing to be analysed. The thing to be analysed is smoking and to analyse that there must be an analyser. And the difference between that, which is analysis, and observation is this: observation is seeking directly without analysis. Seeing without the observer, seeing the dress, red, pink, black as it is without saying, I don't like, like, it is so - you follow. Seeing things as they are, without analysing - listen, two minutes, I am going to explain. Seeing, in seeing there is no

observer. I see the colour red, visually, the vibrations and all the rest of it, are translated in the brain as red. And there is no like or dislike, there is observation. Analysis implies I don't like red because my mother who quarrelled with my father - you know, go back to my stupid childhood and say, my mother - my god, must I go through all that. So analysis implies an analyser - please realize that - a division between the analyser and the thing analysed. In observation there is no division. I observe, there is observation without the censor, without saying, I like, I don't like, this is beautiful, this is not beautiful, this is mine, this is not mine - just observe without any division. You have to do this, not just theorize about it, you have to do it and then you'll find out.

As I said, we are not analysing we are merely observing the habit of smoking.

Now, in observing, what does it reveal? What does it reveal, not your interpretation of what it shows - you see the difference? There is no interpretation, there is no translation, no justification, no condemnation. What does the habit of smoking reveal?

Q: It reveals that you are putting into your lungs a lot of nasty smoke.

K: It reveals that you are drawing into your lung - I won't use the word 'nasty' - a lot of smoke. One fact. Second, what does it reveal, not you, what it tells, what it tells you, not what you are telling it - please listen, sir. It is going to tell you the history of smoking, if you don't interpret, if you don't - you follow. The picture is going to tell you all it wants, if you can listen to that picture, if you can watch smoking, you have understood that. So don't say it is nasty, it is pleasant - it is going to tell you.

Now what does it tell you, that you are drawing a lot of smoke into your lung. What else?

Q: That you are dependent.

K: It shows that you are dependent on a weed.

Q: That inside...

K: That is your translation. What does it tell you?

Q: I see that it is a very mechanical thing, I don't think about it - I just do it.

K: It tells you that you are doing something mechanically, it tells you that when you first smoked it made you sick. It was not pleasant, but other people did it round you, so you did it. Now it has become a habit.

Q: Does it tell you that it tranquillises you to a certain extent?

K: It tells you that it puts you to sleep, helps to drug you, you know, quieten your nerves, cuts your appetite, you don't get fat.

Q: It tells you, you are bored with life.

K: It tells you, you are bored with life. It tells you that you, because when you meet others and you feel nervous by taking a cigarette it makes you kind of, you know - it has told you a lot.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is your translating, that you are inattentive - it is not telling you that you are inattentive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, it helps you, I understand - it is telling you all this. Right. And why are you doing it? Just listen, sir - don't quickly answer me, please. Why are we doing this - it has revealed to you, and why are you accepting all that? Television tells you what to do, what kind of soap to buy and all the rest of it - you've seen all



that, commercial. It is telling you all the time - why do you accept it. It tells you, the sacred books, what you should do, what you should not - why do you accept it? Do watch it.

Q: It's easier.

K: Do watch it. Please. Why do you accept the propaganda of churches, religious, priests, the politicians, why, why?

Q: Because it is easier to follow a system.

K: You say it is easy to follow a system. I don't believe it but I follow it.

Q: No, I don't follow that, but I said it is easier.

K: We explained this - why do you follow it, is it because, for the sake of security, to feel companionship with others, not to be out of the run, to be like the rest of the people? Which means, you are frightened not to be like the rest of the people. You want to be like everybody else, because in that there is perfect safety. In a Catholic country, if you are non-Catholic you find it pretty difficult. If you are in a Communist country, if you don't follow all the line, you'll find it difficult. And so on and on and on.

Now look what it has revealed to me. What the picture of that weed has revealed and why I am caught in the habit. It is interrelationship between the cigarette and me. And this is the habit, this is the way my whole mind is working. I do something because it is safe. I get into a habit, small, trivial or great habit, because I don't have to think about it any more.

So my mind feels that it is safe to function in habits, cigarette or Church, believe in god or non-believe in god. So I see the whole mechanism of this habit formation. Are we getting together? No? Through one habit of smoking a cigarette, of smoking, I have

discovered all the pattern, I've discovered all the way, I have discovered the machinery that is producing habits. No?

Q: Yes.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Though we are living in habits, both physically and psychologically, accepting those habits, can we live fully, freely, happily, ecstatically.

Q: Yes.

K: Yes?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, we've been - I did not say that. I never said good habits and bad habits. We are examining the machinery of habits. We are not condemning it. The lady asked, having all these habits, can one live happily. One can live happily blind, if you call blind living happy, it's up to you.

Now through one habit you can discover, if you listen to the whole habit - listen to the whole habit, you can find out the machinery that breeds habits.

Q: I didn't understand perfectly how you can see through one habit, the whole mechanism of habit.

K: I've shown it to you, sir. Habit implies functioning mechanically, through smoking - you follow, we took that - and we see how it has become mechanical. And from that observation of mechanical habit of smoking, I see how the mind functions in habits.

Q: But are all habits mechanical?

K: Wait. Must be - moment you use the word habit, it must be mechanical.

Q: Aren't there more deep dependencies as just mechanical habits.

K: The moment we use the word 'habit', it implies mechanical, repetition, establishing a good habit, which means doing the same thing over and over again. The doing over and over again is called good, because one is caught in the doing of the bad thing, so there is no good habit and bad habit, only habit, we are concerned.

Q: If I have a habit of power or the habit of comfort, for instance, or the habit of property, it isn't something more deep, it is just mechanical.

K: Wait - I am going into it, I did it just now. The habit of power, the demand for power, position, domination, aggression, violence - all that is implied in the desire for power. To do what one wants to do, like a child or like a grown up man. That has become a habit.

Q: Or security also.

K: I said that, it gives you security, safety and so on. In examining that one habit I've traced all the other habits are based on that. Look at it. Habits being mechanical, repetitive, and once they may have been the freedom, to say, I would like to be a great man, then I become caught in that habit because in that habit I find security and so on. And I pursue that. Deep down all habits - we are not discussion the good or the bad habits, only habit - deep down all habits are mechanical.

Q: Are they really?

K: Look at it, sir - don't say, are they really, really - look at it. Anything that I do repetitively, which is doing something from yesterday to today, to tomorrow, must be mechanical. They may be

in that mechanical, repetitive action, little more polished, function a little more smoothly, but it is still habit, still repetitive - that's obvious.

Q: Would you say that certain creative efforts are habits?

K: Would you say that certain creative efforts are habits?

Would you? Let's answer that question, sir. Would you say creativeness is a habit?

Q: Creativity implies freshness.

K: Creativity implies newness, freshness.

Q: You don't make an effort to be creative.

K: If I make effort I can't be creative. Are you saying all this because you are creative or are you just guessing at it. Therefore one has to ask what you mean by creativeness. Please, sir, this is a tremendous question - you brush it aside. You paint a picture, either you do it because you love painting, or it brings you money, or you want to find some original way of painting and so on. So what do you mean by creativeness, what does it mean to be creative? A man who writes a poem because he can't get on with his wife or with society, is he creative? The man who is attached to his violin and makes a lot of money out of it, is he creative? And the man who is in great tension, in himself, and out of that tension he produces a play, which the world say, how marvellous. Would you call that creative? The man who drinks, soaked, and out of that writes a marvellous rhythmic, you know, full of rhythm - is he creative?

Q: How can you judge?

K: I am not judging.

Q: But that is the question you pose. If I say someone is or isn't

creative, I am judging.

K: I am not judging, sir, I am asking, I am learning, I look at all this in front of me, the people who write books, the people who write poems, who write plays, who fiddle, the Church - I see this in front of me, I don't say this is right, this is wrong, this is good, this is bad - I say, what is creativeness. The moment I say this is right, I am finished, then I can't learn. And I want to learn, I want to find out what it means to be creative.

Q: Perhaps it is to have an innocent universality.

K: Again, I don't know, perhaps - I want to find out, I want to learn. I go to a museum and see all those pictures, admire them, compare them - one, or this modern, non-objective and, you know, all the rest of it - watch them. And I say, what marvellously creative people they are. So I want to find out, learn what it is to be creative. Must I write a poem, paint a picture, write a play, to be creative? Which means, does creativeness demand expression? Please listen carefully. The woman who bakes a bread in a hot kitchen, is she creative?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: All these activities, we generally call them creative, I know. I'm questioning it. I don't say they are not, I don't know, I am questioning it, I want to learn.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are saying, the man who is creative doesn't know he is creative.

Q: Yes.

Q: He can feel he is creative.

K: He can feel he is creative - you see, sir, look. Are you

creative?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you, sir, what is creativeness.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. What is it from observing what man has called creativeness, all these things, I ask myself, what is creativeness, what is it to be creative. Must it have an expression, which is baking a bread, painting a picture, play, making money - being creative, does it demand expression. Please, sir, this is one of the most colossally important things, don't say...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The lady says, at this moment you are creative, you are creating - that is not my point. My point is, whether you are creative, or merely listening to somebody who points out all this.

Q: I think you create when you observe uncritically.

K: Not 'I think' - you see, sir. I want, I'm passionate, I want to find out I want to learn.

Q: The moment you see you and act is the very moment of creation.

K: The very moment you see that you see and act, that is the moment of creation. Therefore you are saying, seeing is acting and at that moment is creation. That is a definition. Wait, wait.

Q: Is not creativity one's harmony with nature?

K: Is not creativity one's harmony with nature - are you? I want to learn - you miss the point - I want to find out, I am hungry, I have observed all the great painters, I have seen all the great, listened to all the great plays and so on - I say, what is creation, what is it to be creative? No definition, I want to, you understand.

Q: Doing something new.

K: To discover something new? Doing something new? Wait a minute, listen quietly. To discover something new, doing something new - what does that mean - new, fresh, not a decision, something totally new, that means, the past must end. Has it ended with you? Or are we just talking about creation as you talk about a book, gossip about a book. Are we doing that? If you are, I don't want to play a part in it. I want to learn, I am passionate, I want to shed tears over it, because one can, one may live creatively, without doing any of these things, neither baking a brick, bread, painting a picture, writing a poem - that means, you can only do that when the mind is non-fragmentary, when there is no fear, when the mind is free of all the implications of the past, when the mind is free of the known.

Q: For me, creativity isn't a thing.

K: Not for you, sir, or for me - you are all making it personal - it is not an opinion. You go to a writer, he says, this is my creativity, it is mine - I am not interested in yours or his or Michelangelo or somebody else, I am interested to find out, I am hungry and you feed me with a lot of words. Which means, you are not hungry. You know, sir, yesterday, after talking about attachment, I was watching it, the mind was watching it all day, whether it was attached to anything, to sitting on a platform, talking, wanting to tell people, writing something or other, attached, person, ideas, chair - one has to find out. And in finding out one discovers enormous things, the beauty of freedom and the love that comes out of that freedom. And we were talking of creation, it is that, a mind that has no aggression. So too find out, sirs, the machinery of

habit, the network of habit, one has to be aware, go into it, let it flow through you, you follow, like the river, moving, moving, moving. Let this enquiry, the learning, carry you all day, and you will discover enormous things.

That's enough for today, isn't it.



## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 5TH AUGUST 1970

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday morning? We were talking, if I remember rightly, about attachment, detachment which inevitably leads - attachment leads to fear. And the various forms of fear, both the conscious and the unconscious fears that one has. And whether one can see the whole network of fears and escapes without analysis but observe, in which there is no analytical process at all. That is what we were discussing, more or less, weren't we? And I think we ought to go into this matter very deeply because a mind that is really not free from fear and the escape from that fear, in different forms, will inevitably cripple the mind, make the mind unintelligent. It may do all kinds of meditations and all the rest of it, follow various systems of meditation and all that, which is so utterly childish and immature, as long as there is not complete freedom from fear, obviously.

So could we go into it much more deeply and find out and learn whether the mind, not only the superficial layers but also the deep, hidden layers of the mind in which there are fears. Could we go into this. And we said, as most people are attached to something or another, that attachment indicates an escape from one's own loneliness, one's own frustrations, emptiness, shallowness and so on. Now when one is aware of this whole movement of fear, which is a movement away from the fact of emptiness, can one see this total process as a whole and not partially? That is what we were talking about.

To see something whole, the fragmentary process must come to an end. The fragmentary process of the mind that seeks success - I do not know if you follow. I want to be free from fear in order to achieve something else. I will follow certain systems of meditation in order to arrive at enlightenment. I will discipline, control, shape myself in order to see something most extraordinary. Such ways of thinking, living and acting is fragmentary. I don't know if we shall see all that clearly.

Can we look at the network of fear and the various escapes and the various escape from which our whole being runs away, can we see this complicated, very subtle form of escape which is the very nature of fear. Can we see that? Can we see that to act from any form of conclusion is fragmentary, because it stops further learning - you may have started to learn but the moment there is a conclusion from that learning, it becomes fragmentary.

Now what makes for fragmentation. We have discussed fear, when we find ourselves being attached to something, and the cultivation of detachment from that attachment, in order to overcome fear, that is fragmentary thinking. Now what is it that makes for fragmentation in our life? We are going to discuss this. Now, please sirs, would you kindly listen - don't draw any conclusions from what you hear - would you kindly listen. I really want to communicate with you to tell you that one can be completely, totally and utterly free of fear, not only the biological fears, physical fears, but deep, psychological fears. And fear is a form of fragmentation, attachment is a form of fragmentation. And seeing attachment, the attempt to be detached is a movement in fragmentation. I am first attached to my family, then I discover that

family causes pain or pleasure, if it is painful I want to detach myself from it, and fight attachment. So it is fragmentation, a movement in fragmentation, and therefore there is no resolution in that fragmentation. Right? Is that clear?

Now what is the basis, the mechanism of this fragmentation in life, not only inwardly but outwardly - the German, the Dutch, the French, the English - you follow - this breaking up - your religion, my religion, Catholic, Protestant, the Zen Buddhism, the Zen Meditation, the practice of Indian meditation, the practice of certain mantras - all fragmentation. Through one of these fragmentations one hopes to arrive at a synthesis, at a completeness, enlightenment, what you like. Is that possible. That is through a fragmentation you hope to achieve a non-fragmentary mind. And is that possible? Though all the yogis, rishis, you know, promise all these things.

So one has to find out why fragmentation comes into being, what is the mechanism, not conclude in words or intellectually, the mechanical process of it, but actually see the non-analytically the whole mechanism of it. I don't know if I am conveying this to you. If I am not, please stop and let's discuss that.

Q: Sir, but aren't these rishis enlightened men. These wise men, these rishis as you call them, aren't they enlightened men?

K: The maharishis and the rishis and the yogis and people, are they enlightened? What do you think? You are asking my opinion? Are you, sir? Only the fools give opinions. Now, how do you know, you, know who is enlightened? You never ask that. I may sit up on the platform and say, I am the most wise, most enlightened, most divine human being - how do you know. Don't laugh. This is

what is happening in the world - a man comes and asserts these things - do these things, you will have enlightenment, I've got it, I'll give it to you. How do you know he is enlightened, why do you bother about it, why do you bother who is enlightened or who is not enlightened?

Q: You can experience yourself, if you observe. You have a method too in a way, I think.

K: No, sir, there is no method, if you have observed, listened, we are not showing you a method at all, we are learning - learning is not a method, you can learn through a method, but learning through a method is only conditioning the mind to that particular system. But if you are learning you observe. If you observe that one system conditions the mind, makes the mind mechanical, then all systems are the same - that is, you learn. You learn what a system does - through a system you have most extraordinary experiences but it is still very limited experience. This is so obvious, I don't know why we keep on.

Q: If you have this system, wouldn't it be that, I don't know if you are enlightened, I don't know if anybody is, you might be up there some place, I might be down there. Now couldn't it be that to start of with you could use the system, just to get an idea of the fragmentary state, and then from there to get the whole and watch oneself and all that.

K: Wouldn't it be helpful to have a system to begin with, and then after a little while throw it off. Begin with the crutches and later on throw it off - hang on to your mother's strings or the guru's strings, or the rishi's strings, and then let go later on. Our question is, why do you hold on to any string when you can observe, learn,

from watching yourself, the whole phenomenon of existence and go beyond it. Sir, you want to be helped and that is the first thing, if I may point out most respectfully, that is the greatest impediment. That is, you have the idea somebody can teach you, therefore you begin right off with a fragmentation of this division - this division is a fragmentation - you and the teacher, you and the enlightened being. Obviously there is a division.

Q: But aren't you teaching?

K: But aren't you teaching - am I? He says, look, from the beginning he has said there is no teacher and no disciple. From, probably the first time, or first few years, he has been, you have heard this. He has been saying this for 45 years, not out of foolishness or reaction but one has perceived the truth that nobody can teach enlightenment to another, through no system, through no meditation, through no discipline, one sees that, one saw that 45 years ago. And you ask whether you are a teacher or not - I've shown it to you. Teacher implies one who has accumulated knowledge and transmits to another, who is a professor, professor and a student. We are not in that relationship here at all. We are learning together, we have made that very, very clear - all communication means learning together, creating together, watching together, learning together. If that is understood then our communication is entirely different. But if you have a feeling that because he sits on the platform he knows better, he is the enlightened one, I say, please don't attribute things to the person who is sitting here - you know nothing about enlightenment. Right? If you knew it or if you understood it, lived it, you wouldn't be here. And it is one of the most extraordinary things to find out,

to find out, to learn about it, not to be taught - you don't pay 100 dollars or 100 francs to be taught this. My god, to think of it - pay money to learn truth? What are you all doing?

So, sirs, we are trying to find out, learn, what is implied in fragmentation. The teacher and the disciple - that is fragmentation. The higher self and the lower self, the soul and the body, this constant division, this constant fragmentation.

Q: Thought is only capable of giving attention to one thing.

K: Thought is only capable of giving attention to one thing at a time. Then are you saying that thought is the cause of fragmentation? If I can only give - thought can only give attention to that, and discard all the rest, then thought must breed fragmentation, must, the very process of thinking is fragmentation. We are going to learn about it - please don't draw a conclusion. I am asking why we live in fragmentation. How does it happen, and what is behind the demand for this fragmentation? Let's take a very simple fact. You are the teacher and the disciple. Now, why is there this division between you and me - you the teacher and I the disciple - why? I want to learn. Do I want to learn or do I want to follow? I want to follow the authority which you represent, which you have invested in yourself. You say you know, you say you are enlightened. And I, I want to find, I want to have that, I'm greedy, I'm greedy, I want something that will give me happiness, that will give me something or other. So I follow you. You the teacher, I the disciple, fragmentation exists when I follow you. I have never asked why I follow you, what is the reason, what is the basis of accepting you as my authority. You may be a cuckoo, a neurotic, you may have one or two little experiences which you have blown

up, as a tremendous thing, and I look at you and I am incapable of judging because you fascinate me by your beard or eyes or whatever it is, and I just follow. Whereas I want to learn, I won't accept you as authority, because the moment you become the authority, you already brought about fragmentation.

Please do see that. It doesn't matter, if it is the spiritual authority or the political authority, or the authority of the military, or the authority of the priest - moment there is the assumption of authority, the assumption that you know and I don't know, there is fragmentation. And that will inevitably lead to conflict between you the teacher and me. Right? Is this clear, please? So that means, I will never follow anybody.

Q: If he does good to you, sir. If you do something and you experience yourself, and it is good for you, why shouldn't you do it? I mean, it's still fragmentary but isn't it better to have something fragmentary than nothing?

K: The teacher tells me something and I do it and in the doing of it I have great delight, great pleasure, great, I have understood. What is implied in that? My craving for experience, my craving to understand - not myself but what that bird is saying, what the guru is saying, not understand myself. If the guru said, look, understand yourself, that is far more important than anything else, don't try to understand me, but understand yourself, then you are stuck, you'd rather follow than understand yourself.

So why is there is fragmentation - please let's go on.

Q: Because we are made from fragmentary processes.

K: We have fragmentary faculties, we have faculties and in themselves they are fragmentary.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You have a faculty for engineering or I don't know what else - faculty. Why should from that faculty arise fragmentation? I have a faculty, playing the piano - why should that bring about fragmentation. Aren't you putting the cart before the horse, or the horse, whatever it is. Is it the faculty that is bringing about fragmentation or the mind is broken up and using one of the fragments, one of the faculties, and therefore further strengthening the division. You understand what I am saying? I want to learn about this fragmentation, if I could once solve that, I will have a difference action altogether, a non-fragmentary action, so I must find out. I must learn about fragmentation, why it comes into being. I am not going to come to any conclusion or start with any conclusion.

There is fragmentation - the teacher and the disciple, the authority, the follower, the man who says he's enlightened, the man who say's, I don't know, teach me - the Communist, the Socialist, you follow - fragmentation. Why? How does it happen? If I could really understand it, learn all about it, I've finished with it. Then my relationship with another will be entirely different, then my activities will not be fragmentary, it will be total each time. I don't know if you follow all this. So I must learn about it. Please, sir, go with me.

Now I am asking, why does it happen. What do you say, sirs?

Q: Is there an expectation?

K: We live in expectation and that very expectation is a form of fragmentation. We expect. What are you expecting, is that the real reason, real truth for fragmentation, expectation? That is one of the



effects of fragmentation, like wanting success, that wanting success is the effect of my fragmentation - me, that is tremendously important, I want success - through painting, writing, this or that. So what is the basis of this fragmentation?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, I've understood.

Q: My view is limited.

K: My view is the one direction, I have not eyes behind my head - if I had eyes behind my head I would see the whole thing. Is that what we are discussing, having eyes behind the head? And saying my view is limited? Of course my physical view is limited, I can't see the whole alpine range - perhaps I could if I went on top, in an aeroplane. But surely that is not what we are discussing, are we?

Q: Our senses are fragmentary.

K: Our senses are also fragmentary, the taste, the smell, the seeing, the listening, all the rest of it, it is all fragmentary. Is that what we are discussing? That is part of it - that is part of this fragmentation, we are discussing why the mind, the brain, divides.

Q: It is not possible to think about the whole at once.

K: It is not possible to think of all the world at once. So you are saying, fragmentation exists as long as thought, which cannot think about the whole thing at once, that is the cause of fragmentation - are you?

Q: Yes, communication to other people is also fragmentary, now we are thinking about self-knowledge and not about mountain climbing. You can't put everything together.

K: Now let's be clear, what we are talking about, not climbing

the mountain, as you point out, sir, or having eyes behind the head. But we are talking of a mind, of our ways of thinking, looking, listening, coming to conclusions. Why is there this process which inevitably brings about fragmentation - that is what we are discussing.

Q: But discussing only this already prevents you.

K: So discussing this very issue is a fragmentation. But we are asking, we are asking why this fragmentation exists, why can't I communicate with you completely. And you convey to me completely. So let's find out, let's go into this slowly - what is the process, the mechanism, the cause of this fragmentation.

Q: Because we cling to the idea of ourselves.

K: Yes, we cling to a conclusion, we cling to a conclusion and that is the reason of fragmentation. Why do we cling, to a fragmentation?

Q: I still think it is a communication, for instance, at school, you have lessons in English, in French and geography, it is fragmentary from the beginning.

K: You are saying, our education, Geography, History, Mathematics, Science, is all fragmentary, and therefore our mind is already, from childhood, is conditioned by this fragmentation.

Q: The very process of thinking, is to form conclusions, you can't think without forming a conclusion.

K: We cannot think without forming, without bringing about fragmentation. So you are all saying, in more or less different words, that thought is the source of all fragmentation.

Q: We are saying it is the process of thought.

K: Yes, thought, which is thinking, is fragmentary. Is a

fragment of ourselves.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right, sir, you are saying, all the results of our thinking, which is a fragment of ourselves, must result in further cleavages, further breaking up. So you are saying to me, who am learning, as you are learning, that thought is the source of all fragmentation. No? Find out, don't say no. Thought is the result or the response of memory. And memory is the past. And that memory of the past, which is memory, the past is always divided. Obviously, the past, the today and the tomorrow - the past experience, the present experience and the future. The past that says, I haven't learnt, I don't know, and I am going to learn from you. Isn't that the major cause of fragmentation? What do you say, sirs? Isn't that the major cause of fragmentation?

Q: Sir, you have already said so. I would think talking about time, because time is, the awareness of time is taking our attention away from the present.

K: Time divides - what is time? What is time?

Q: Thought.

K: What is time? Find out, sir - thought he says. There is chronological time, by the watch - I have to go to the station, to catch a train, it goes by a certain time, and there is time as achievement, as success, as you know, I don't know, I'm going to learn. All that involves psychological time. Which is, thought says, I don't know but you know, and I am going to learn, step by step. There are seven steps or four steps or ten steps and I'm going to gradually climb them and eventually come to that marvellous state. Which is, thought that says, I don't know but you know and you

tell me that I will know if I do follow these steps and so there is a division created by thought, which wants success. The success being not money this time - enlightenment or faith. Are you saying that thought is the mechanism that brings about this fragmentation, the thought that has said, you are a Hindu, the thought that said, you are a Catholic, the thought that said, you are brown and you are black, you are white, you are pink - thought has conditioned the values of a particular society and culture and that says, everybody who does not belong to that culture is a barbarian. This is all clear, isn't it?

If thought is responsible for this fragmentation, what are you going to do about it? What do you say? I have to earn a livelihood - I don't know why but I have to, to live. I have to do something, I have a family, I have a job - a doctor, professor, mathematician, whatever it is - and I have a family, my son, my wife, my daughter. And also there is me, with my problems, with my ambitions, with my successes. So there is livelihood, there is the family, there is the function and the desire to derive a status from that functioning, and the me - all fragmentary. Now what am I to do - and I see, thought is responsible for all this. Is that so or not? We are learning - if the speaker is wrong, tell him, find out.

Q: But we are thinking all the time. We are thinking at this very moment.

K: Wait, we are going to find out - that is the whole point. We are thinking and we say, I have to earn a livelihood, a family enjoyment, success, wanting to find out enlightenment, the guru, authority, all that. And there is me, muddling through all this. And also you tell me, after discussion, I am learning, that thought is

responsible for this - thought which has brought about a certain culture and that culture has conditioned me, saying, you are a Brahman, you are a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, this or that. So thought has done this, and thought also has to earn a livelihood - thought says you have to go out and earn a livelihood. You must earn money for your family, for your children. So thought is responsible for it. Are you sure you are right - don't afterwards say, look, it is not like that - be quite sure, learn.

Q: One has the feeling that there is something even behind thought.

K: We'll come to that. First see what we are dealing with, not what is behind it yet. We will come to that. But you can't come to that without understanding the whole machinery of thought, otherwise you'll be merely escaping from thought. Now if you are absolutely, if that is the truth, not your truth or my truth, it is not my personal opinion or your opinion, it is the truth, it is the fact, that thought divides - thought divides the living, now, and the dying, tomorrow. I will die tomorrow. But thought says you'll die, I'll get frightened. Thought says, that was a marvellous pleasure, I must have more of it. And thought says, that I have done, I am frightened of that thing. Thought says, you have done something which wasn't right a few years ago, be careful, don't let it occur again, don't let it be discovered. So thought is breeding fear, pain, pleasure.

So thought is dividing. That is the truth, whether you see it or not, it is so. Now then what are you to do with it. I have to earn a livelihood, I have to leave this tent to go home, which is all activity of thought. I have to tell my friends where I have been, and that is

the activity of thought and so on. Knowing thought brings about fragmentation, conclusions, and therefore sustains division, fragmentation - what are you going to do?

Q: Is it the thought itself that divides?

K: Is it thought itself that divides or is it the way we use thought that divides - who is the we? Who is the 'I' that uses thought which divides.

Q: The action of the thought.

K: That makes three - the 'I', the thought and action of that thought. So you've got more complicated. See, sir, first listen to it, listen. Don't come to any conclusion, first listen to what the speaker is saying. I have to earn a livelihood, a livelihood has to be earned, therefore thought must be employed there. I come back home and thought says, my family, my responsibility. You follow. Thought says, I have great pleasure in sex, great pain, my wife - thought is in operation all the time, all the time breeding fragmentation, breaking up - the guru, the teacher, the disciple, the success. What are you going to do? And knowing that thought brings about fragmentation and fragmentation means fear, fragmentation means conflict, fragmentation means that there will be no peace whatsoever. You may talk about peace, join the organizations that promise peace, wave flags that promise peace, but there will be no peace as long as there is fragmentation by thought. So faced with that fact, what is going to happen?

Q: Identify myself with the thought.

K: Identify myself with the thought. Who is the 'I' who identifies itself with thought. Has not thought created the 'I'? The 'I' being, my experiences, my knowledge, my success, which is all the

product of thought. And if you say, no, it is the higher self, god, it is still thought, that has thought about god. So what will you do - please, sir.

Q: Thought must end.

K: Thought must end - how is it to end - but listen, sir. Thought must operate when you go and do something mechanical, even to drive - you follow? When you say, thought must end, then thought must end altogether. Then you can't earn a livelihood, you can't go home, you won't be able to speak. Sir, watch yourself, find out. Learn about this. There must be the usage of thought and also thought sees that it does breed fragmentation. So what is thought to do?

Q: It seems that we come to this point in almost every discussion - my question is, is that a question that can be answered.

K: We come to this point in almost every discussion - can this ever be answered. We're going to find out.

Q: I become afraid because I see a deadlock.

K: I'll become afraid - I am afraid because I see a deadlock, an impasse, I don't know what to do. Now will you, knowing that you don't know what to do, will you learn? Will you learn, sir?

Q: If it is possible.

K: Why do you say, if it is possible. No, my question is not whether it is possible or not, but I said, will you learn about this. Wait.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait. To learn, what does it imply. Curiosity, doesn't it. No? Wait. Are you curious to learn? Don't be so casual. Are you eager to learn, passionate to learn about this? Because this may solve all

our problems, therefore you must be intense, curious, passionate to find out. Are you, or are you going to say, I am going to wait, I will, so far I have functioned with conclusions, I'll form another conclusion and act from that.

So if you want to learn, these three things are absolutely necessary - curiosity, eagerness, you must have energy, and that energy gives you passion to find out, learn. Have you these things, or you just want to learn, casually talk about this.

Q: Is it one pointedness?

K: Is it one pointedness. Learning is not one-pointed learning. Learning means learning, you know, sir, the mind that wants to learn, that wants to find out is like a child that says, I want to know what the mountain is made of, whether the moon is cheese or what is it - I want to find out.

Q: I need to be detached to learn.

K: Detached to learn - sir, why do you translate into your own words what one has said. I said one must have great deal of energy, one must be curious to find out, and to find out you must be persistent, not just one minute full of curiosity, next say, please, sorry, I'm too tired, I'm bored, I want to go out and smoke. Then you can't learn.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Gentlemen says, does learning guarantee me certainty. Listen to that question - I will learn if it guarantees me complete certainty for the rest of my life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Si signor, perhaps you could talk a little bit in Spanish, sir, slowly, I can understand it - slowly.



Q: (In Spanish)

K: This fragmentation gives me a sense of security and I cling to that security. And you come along and say, look what you are doing, you are disturbing my security, I am therefore frightened, I don't want to learn. This is what you are all doing. I have found great delight in my writing a book and I know I function from fragmentation but that book gives me fame, money, position and for god's sake keep out. Don't talk to me, don't disturb me. The house is burning but don't disturb me.

Let's proceed from this otherwise we are going only four more days, you understand, I want to get on with this thing.

If thought is the source of all fragmentation and yet thought has to be used, what is to take place, how is thought not to function and yet to function? You follow the question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is the feeling of insecurity, as that gentleman pointed out, that we get frightened about it.

Q: We get frightened.

K: I know, I answered that question - that gentleman didn't hear - you hear what you want to hear and you don't listen to other people. That question has been answered, sir - that gentleman asked in Spanish, I cling to one of the fragmentations of activities because I feel secure, and you come along and disturbed that security, therefore guarantee me security at the end of learning. Give me a certificate that I've learned and through which I'll get a job. Please, sir, let's go.

If thought is responsible for this fragmentation and all conclusions are fragmentations - please see that - all conclusions: I

must be secure, I am frightened of uncertainty. But there may be a way of living which will give you physical security, which is what you want, but freedom psychologically. And that freedom will bring about complete physical security. But you don't see this, so we are going to learn.

If thought is responsible for this fragmentation and yet thought must function to survive, then what is one to do? Then what is thought to do? You understand my question? If you don't understand it, please let's go into this question itself. I must go from here to where I live - I must use thought. To earn, to go tomorrow to my job and function there properly, I must use thought. And yet thought sees itself that it is the cause of fragmentation and therefore conflict. Thought sees it must function, and thought sees itself bringing about fragmentation.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, we said, sir, it is not a linkage, you cannot put fragments together and make it whole. Many spokes of the wheel doesn't make the wheel - it's how you put the spokes that makes the wheel.

Q: As we have to use thought, we don't want to come to fragmentation, can we just become conscious of the tendency of thought to produce this fragmentation - if you are conscious of that it doesn't...

K: Now, who is it, if you are conscious, if you are conscious that thought fragments and brings about fragmentation, and yet thought must function - that very consciousness of this whole process brings about a different quality altogether. Is that what you are saying? Now is that what is happening to you? Be careful, sir, go very slowly into this. Thought must be exercised, thought must

exercise, and thoughts also realizes that it breeds fragmentation and therefore conflict and therefore fear and all the misery in the world. And yet thought itself, you are suggesting, must be conscious of this whole process. Now see what happens. We said, thought is the basis of fragmentation, therefore when thought becomes conscious of itself and how it breeds fragmentation, how it must, therefore, thought itself divides itself into this, into that, into that.

Q: Just to be conscious of something which is happening.

K: Therefore what do you mean by being conscious. Go into this slowly - what do you mean by that word, conscious.

Q: To see.

K: To see. Go slowly, now what do you mean by seeing? Do you see this process mechanically, because you've heard the words, you have intellectually understood, and you see with the intention to apply these words and the intellectual conclusion to seeing? Be careful, don't say, no. Are you seeing with a conclusion or are you merely seeing.

Q: At the point where you were asking this question, were you yourself actually asking the question, because it seems to me that if there is a question at this point, it is again fragmentary.

K: No, I am not asking. The lady suggests, if you are asking the question, then you are dealing again fragmentation.

Q: And if so, what has this whole investigation been, what validity has it had?

K: What has this whole investigation been, what is the point of all this investigation, if thought is asking that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I'll explain to you, you come to this point and ask the

question. And the lady says, who is asking this question, is it thought that is asking the question? If it is, then it is again - I am asking it because you are not learning.

Q: But then...

K: Wait. I am not asking this question.

Q: At this point I don't mind, it is presumptuous to say so, but may be you would not, but I do ask this question, at whatever point along the line...

K: Yes, I am going to point out. Go a little bit slowly with me. I have this picture, the mind sees this match. How thought has fragmented, thought must function and sees this. If you really see this, completely, there is no more question. Wait. You can only see this if there is no conclusion here, no desire to solve it, to go beyond it; only when you see this whole mechanism of thought, how it operates, how it functions, what is behind, etc., when you see this completely the problem is solved. Then you are functioning all the time non-fragmentarily, even though you go to the office, it is non-fragmentary action - if you see the whole of it. If you don't then you divide the office, the family, the you, the me. Now do you see the whole of it?

Q: Sir, are you suggesting it is possible to carry on a non-dualistic life and still function in society?

K: I am showing it to you, sir. If you see this whole mechanism of thought, not just one part of it, the whole of it, the whole nature and the structure and the movement of this.

Q: How can you learn it quicker?

K: How can you learn it quicker - by listening now. (Laughter)  
You see, aga in the desire to achieve. That means you are not

listening at all, your eyes, your ears, are fixed on getting somewhere. So, sir, my question then is, as a friend, asking, do you see this whole thing. And the friend says, for god's sake, you must see it, otherwise you're going to live a terrible, miserable existence, you'll have wars, you'll have such misery and sorrow, for god's sake see this. And why don't you? What is preventing you - your ambition, your laziness, your innumerable conclusion that you have? Now, who is going to answer it?

Q: Why answer it?

K: Why answer it? He says, why answer this?

Q: Just do it.

K: Just do it.

Q: (In Spanish)

K: I know I have conclusions, I know it, I have them, but I can't get rid of them, they go on.

Q: (In Spanish)

K: It is the same old question - tell me how to secure, that is the everlasting question of man.

Q: May be it is better to become a little more aware that we are living now and not yesterday or last year.

K: It may be better to be aware that we are living now than live in the past or in the future.

Q: Because a lot of our attention, I don't know how much percentage is taken away, when we live in the past or dreaming of the future.

K: Can you live in the present? Which means living a life that has no time.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you, sir, can one live in the present - to live in the present there must be no time, no past, no future, no success, no ambition. Can you do it?

Q: Just a bit. (laughter) The very process to build something, let's say a house, supposes a programme.

K: Of course, sir - look at it. To build a house you must have an architect. And architect makes a design, a plan and according to that plan the contractor builds. In the same way, we want a plan. You are the architect, give me the plan and I will function according to that plan.

Q: I wasn't saying this, we want to build a house which is concrete thing, we must plan certain things.

K: So you use thought.

Q: So we cannot live only in the present.

K: I never said that, sir. When you look at this question really, carefully, you will never ask the question, how am I to live in the present, to build a plan, if you see this very clearly, you will find that, if this is very clear, the nature and the structure of thought, then you will find that you can function from a state of mind that is always free from all thought and yet use thought. That is real meditation, sir, not all the phoney stuff. That is, the mind that is so crowded now with the known, which is the product of thought, the mind which is filled with the past, knowledge, experience, memory, which is part of the brain, the whole of that is filled with the known. I may translate the known in terms of the future or in terms of the present but it is always from the known. It is this known that divides: knowing the past, I don't know, I shall know. This past, with all its reservoir of memory says, do this, don't do

that, this will give you certainty, that will give you uncertainty.

So when this whole mind, including the brain, is empty of the known, then you will use the known when it is necessary, but functioning always from the unknown, from the mind that is free of the known. Sir, this happens, sir, its not so difficult as it sounds. You have a problem, you think about it for a day or two, you go over it, you mull, you chew over it and get tired if it, you don't know what to do, you go to sleep. The next morning if you are sensitive you have found the answer. See, that is, you have tried to answer this problem in terms of the known, in terms of what is beneficial, what is successful, what will bring you certainty, what will keep you going - in terms of the known, which is thought. And when after using all the exercising thought, thought says, for god's sake, I'm tired. And next morning you've found the answer. That is you have exercised the mind, thought to its fullest extent, and dropped it. Then you see something totally new. But if you keep on exercising thought all the time, conclusion after conclusion, which is the known, then obviously you never see anything new.

And this demands a tremendous inward awareness, inward sense of order, not disorder, order. If you haven't got that you can whistle all day long.

Q: Is it not a method of procedure?

K: Is it not a matter of procedure, is it not a method of procedure? Look sir, - I get up, walk few steps, take a few steps and go down the steps, is that a method of procedure? I just get up and do it naturally, I don't invent first a method and follow it, I see it. Oh Lord, you can't reduce everything into method.

Q: Can you ever empty the storehouse of impressions which

you have had?

K: Can you ever empty the mind of all the known, which is the past. You've put a wrong question, it is a wrong question, because you say, can you ever - who is the 'you' and what do you mean by 'ever'? Which means, is it possible. Sirs, look, we never put the impossible question - we are always putting the question, what is possible. If you put an impossible question your mind then has to find the answer in terms of the impossible, not what is possible. All the great discoveries, scientific discoveries, are based on this, the impossible. It was impossible to go to the moon. Or if you say, it is possible, then you drop it. Because it was impossible, therefore they put their mind to it and 300,000 people worked at it, co-operating, working night and day, competing with each other, Russia-they put their mind to it, and went to the moon. But we never put the impossible question - the impossible question is this, can the mind empty itself of the known - itself, not you empty the mind. That is an impossible question. If you put it with tremendous earnestness, seriousness, with passion, you'll find out. But if you say, oh, it is possible then you are stuck.



## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH AUGUST 1970

Do you think a special meeting, or gathering like this, is necessary for the young people?

Audience: Yes.

K: I said fortunately, or unfortunately, that we would have a couple of discussions in which the young people could take the greater share. Aren't they now taking the greater share in the discussions than the older generation like us? So do you think you need a special one? A special one - you know what that means? Younger people sitting in front and the older ones behind, that's all. Let's see how things go along and then we will decide. We have got Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, four more discussions and we'll see.

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday? Or shall we approach this whole problem again from a totally different angle?

Could we talk over together, I know you may not like the word 'discipline', but order, substitute the word order instead of discipline, could we discuss this? Do you think it would be worthwhile? I know the young people don't like discipline, neither do I. But I think we should be able to discuss that and see where it will lead us. Shall we?

A: Yes

Q: Is discipline constraint?

K: Yes we are going to go into all that. First, do we want to discuss that, talk over together?

Q: Didn't you say somewhere, you once mentioned in one of the lectures, that we are doing two hours of exercises or something like that - is that for the body or for the awareness?

K: Wait. We are going into all that sir. First let us see, do you want to go into this question of order?

Q: Aren't there more important things?

K: Aren't there more important things? Such as what? Social activity?

Q: For instance.

K: For instance what? Social activity?

Q: Death.

K: Death. All right, you have your way. Death, social activity and what else?

Q: Boredom.

K: Boredom.

Q: What about responsibility?

K: Responsibility.

Q: Education.

K: Education. What do you think we have been doing during the last ten talks, but education? Now which do you want to take up - boredom, social service?

Q: Discipline.

K: Discipline, order. What sir?

Q: Prayer.

K: Prayer.

Q: Consciousness.

K: Consciousness.

Q: Death

K: Death

Q: Loneliness.

K: Loneliness. Now what shall we take among all those things that you have suggested that you think will be sufficiently important and will cover all the rest? Right? Social activity - shall we take that?

Q: No.

K: Oh!

Q: Boredom.

K: Because I tell you, if you take up one thing, like social service, social action, and somebody said responsibility, and if we go into it sufficiently thoroughly I think we will cover everything, every problem is interrelated with other problems. You cannot separate one problem and say, 'Let's discuss that'. They are all interrelated, aren't they? One is not more important than the other. It may appear to some social service, a revolution, a social activity, activists and so on, this or that, may seem important to one or two, but they look at it, I am afraid, as though it were an isolated problem by itself, not interrelated with every other problem. So please listen, there is not important problem first, every problem is important.

Q: I have the impression that we are always talking about the inward revolution, and we think a lot about that, and it seems to me awfully difficult to do any inward revolution, if you still remain in the same society.

K: Let's talk over that. If you remain in the same society, inward revolution seems terribly difficult, or practically impossible. Shall we discuss that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Right.

I think most of us want to change society, the structure, I think most intelligent people are aware of this fact. Right? We all agree to that, young and old and deaf and dumb and all the rest? All of us see the importance of a social revolution - a social - we may not use that word revolution, it may be too drastic, therefore we will use the word social change. Now how is this to be brought about? By physical revolution? Upsetting society as it is and creating a new society? Let us talk it over. See what is involved in it.

Q: I have the impression it is property and it is already violent. So changing society, even if it implies some violence will never be so violent as private property.

K: Private property, to the questioner, seems the very essence of violence. Without changing that, any form of change must be another revolution. He is saying physical property is the cause, is the real change, the changing of physical possessive property, real estate, earth, if you can change that then everything will be solved. All right sir, then how do you propose to do it? Give it all into the hands off the government? Let governments own it? Who will own it? A few people? Or many people? Or socialise it? Everybody owns it? All these experiments throughout history have been tried. Even in India there was a period, I was told, when everybody owned the land. How do you propose when you have property, a house, a piece of land, and I have mine, how do you propose to change it? I like to own my land.

Q: You should have the right to use it but not to possess it and sell it.

K: You should have the right to use it, not possess it and sell it.  
How are you going to prevent this?

Q: Detachment.

K: Sir do consider it. I feel, having a house, a piece of land, my own, I feel safe, I identify myself with that - to me that is very important. To me that is life and death, it is something to own - wait sir, go slowly. I am not for or against. We are trying to find out what to do given certain things, what to do. How will you take it away from me? By law? By revolution? And if you do, we all of us land owners will get together and fight you. This has been going on for a million years - you follow sir?

Q: Yes sir. For instance in Russia they have a tremendous bureaucracy and it doesn't mean that no system could be invented, no natural system exists, it just means that this isn't that experience.

K: Yes sir.

Q: I'd like to quote someone, it's my father. And I think this is really a propos. He has always said that as long as there are group of people in the world there is always going to be the crafty people and the slow people. To him and it appears that way to me, that the crafty people are always going to want to take from the slow people.

K: How will you change this sir?

Q: There will obviously have to be a change in the people themselves.

Q: How will an inner revolution change this?

K: How will inner revolution change the outer structure of society? How will the inner revolution change the structure of outward structure? What do you think? To me owning property, or

not owning property, is of very little importance. The riches are not in the house or in the land but somewhere else. I don't care. I am a beggar. I don't mind. What will you do if you are not a beggar, if you are attached to property, what will you do? You see we are discussing theoretically all this. No? What madame?

Q: I may be speaking for myself, but I can't help it, I resent this young man and the way he keeps leading us back to the social revolution. I feel you have something to tell us if only we would allow you to do it.

K: It is not a question of somebody interfering in what you want to hear from the speaker, but we are talking about this. Look - I see the world as it is, property, possessiveness, domination, power, bureaucracy reaching a state where they want to control everything, as is being done in Russia, and so on and so on. I see wars, I see everything around me, the division of people through religion, politics, through nationalism and so on and so on and so on. What shall I do? I see the necessity of a change. Right? There must be. I see this. I see that it is tremendously importance that human beings should change. Now where shall I begin, there or here? Or is it a combination of both? Not there first, or here first, but a movement that answers both questions, both the outer and the inner, so there is no division as the inner revolution and the outer revolution. It is a movement of constant change. Right? Of constantly freeing the mind from its own conditioning, from its own possessive demands, from its own self-centred activities, from its own pursuit of pleasure and pain and division and so on. Right? Now where shall I begin, inner or outer?

Q: Inner.

K: Now wait. Don't you see? When you say 'inner', you feel that the inner is disassociated from the outer. The inner is the result of the outer and the outer is the result of the inner. We have created this society. We have created through our ambition, through our greed, through our competitiveness, through our comparing, and so on and so on, demanding for power, position, prestige - we have created this society.

Q: We had established in another talk that we had been conditioned by the society, marked in our childhood. Isn't this necessary to make it so that other ones are not conditioned because otherwise...

K: Right. That means you have to begin helping the child, to educate the child in such a way that he is not conditioned from the very beginning, which means special schools.

Q: If he was still in the society, which means violence, he will be conditioned.

K: How will you change the society? Yes sir?

Q: Is it not possible to set up a commune?

K: Is it not possible to set up a commune - where a lot of people get together, pool their money, pool their children and educate them unconditionally? Is that it?

Q: Too fragmentary.

K: You see! You object to that.

Q: How can any kind of education not be conditioning?

K: How can education not be conditioning? Sir, look. Do you know what it means to be conditioned, what are the factors that go into being conditioned?

Q: You don't think any more of yourself if you are free of your

conditioning.

Q: We are robots.

K: We are robots. We are so conditioned we think according to some authority and so on. Please sirs, do listen to this for two minutes before coming to any conclusion. Any intelligent man sees what is happening in the world, and he says to himself, what am I to do, I am a responsible human being, serious, what am I to do? Am I to join the outward revolutionists, the physical revolutionists - I am not talking about the Communists because they are driven by an idea, by bureaucracy, by a theory and all the rest of it, like the church people, the same thing repeated in a different pattern - what shall I do? Shall I join a revolutionary society, or shall I withdraw from the world, withdraw completely, and bring about a revolution in myself and thereby perhaps affect the outer? Right? Now what shall I do? There are these two alternatives: one to join in, and the other to withdraw. And perhaps in withdrawing I shall be able to understand more myself and help others to understand themselves and thereby perhaps bring about a physical revolution eventually. Now what shall I do? Is it so clear cut as that? Begin there, or being here? Or is it a total movement with which we are concerned. That and this moving together. You understand? Both the outer and inner moving together. Right sir. So there is no division as the inner and outer. Right? Because we have seen when you emphasize the outer it becomes bureaucratic, it becomes mechanical, it becomes inhuman, it becomes entirely materialistic. If you emphasize the other, which is the inner, then you withdraw completely.

Q: Also we must be very careful because for instance preferring



the inward revolution could be also because we are very attached to the past and we like to keep our private property.

K: That's right. The inward revolution may imply that you are sticking on to your property, to your bank account, etc., etc., but talking about inward revolution. That's a cheap trick.

So let's begin. Let's start with this. Will you begin there or there. Or you see the effects of both and so you see that life is a unitary process, not a thing to be divided - the commissar and the yogi. It is a question of bringing the two together. Now can I do this? Can a human being do this? You and I, can we do this? - not emphasizing on that or this but moving, as the river does, taking all life together - all life being the outer and the inner? Now - right? Is that our problem?

Q: Yes

K: Now, don't say yes. If that is our problem, that we are trying - not trying - actively concerned in bringing about a harmonious action in which the outer and the inner is involved, in which the outer and the inner are completely together, not separate, so I will never talk about the inner and the outer, it is a movement. Right? Now, to do that, to live a harmonious life in which the two are operative together. Right sirs? Now can I, a human being, conditioned to property, conditioned to patriotism, conditioned to self-centred activity, so what shall I do? You answer me sirs, answer. Let's talk it over together. What shall I do? I am conditioned, in a culture, in a society which I and my great, great, great grandfathers created - what shall I do? Knowing that I am conditioned by the society, the culture, the religion in which I live, which we all together have created it, therefore society is me and

me is society. Right? Right? Do you dispute that? I am the society - my great grandfather and all the rest of it created this and it has caught me, I am trapped in it, I am trapped in it as it has trapped me. So I am both that and this. So I can't separate myself from society and say 'I must change society' - I don't know if you see?

Q: Sir, say a man who is communist, he is living in a capitalist society, can he say also, 'I am the society'?

K: He can't. He can't

Q: In which case it is not true that he is the society.

K: No but sir, how will he change? Our concern is not that a man who is a communist living in a capitalist society, he cannot identify himself with the capitalist society, but look what has happened. He has identified himself with the communist society - wait sir, right? - and therefore he is acting in fragmentation - no?

Q: I would suggest if it is possible, not using the word 'Communist' because it's putting something in a category like saying black, or red.

K: Quite right sir. Let's leave all that. Let's leave the words communism, socialism - put it all out. Here is a simple fact that society is me and me is the society, there is not a division between me and society. After all if you are born in India you would all be thinking in a certain way, you would all be worshipping Krishna or some other bird and here you worship somebody else because you have been conditioned that way, that's all. So we are the result of the society in which we live, and that society has been brought about by us. Right? No?

Q: Not completely. It was there before we came.

K: You have been through this before. You have been through -

now watch it sir. The society existed before I was born, my great etc., etc., created that society, I was born in it - I don't know why but I was born in it, instead of being born in this culture I was born in that culture - and what happens? I was educated in that culture, I accepted the conditioning of that culture knowingly or not knowingly. As I grew up I said 'How stupid every culture is, to be shaped by any culture', so you reject the whole thing. Do you?

Q: Yes

K: No, no. Don't so easily say, yes, madam. It sounds so silly.

Q: Sir to reject your own culture you make your own little culture.

K: No. No. You see you don't understand me. I see the human mind is shaped by the environment in which it lives - the Eskimo, the Pacific Islander, the Christian and so on, each one is conditioned by the environment in which he lives, the environment is all the rest of it - you know Catholic and all that. So a child being born in this culture is conditioned and he says, 'I am not responsible for this, I am conditioned by the culture in which I have lived'. His responsibility is to free himself from the culture in which he has been brought up.

Q: That has just been created by man, so change man.

K: Obviously. If I am born in a culture called the Hindu, and I see very definitely as I grow up, an educator, or uneducated as it happens with the person speaking, sees how he is conditioned by the various cultures and so on. He sees this whole structure of thinking, living, is conditioned and seeing how it is conditioned he puts it aside. So he is free of conditioning. Right?

Q: He has to be evolve.

K: No, no. You see you are bringing something in. He has to evolve. Evolve. He has to evolve. What does that mean? Take time?

Q: No, no.

K: Then?

Q: Free himself from certain beliefs which are not true.

K: Which means? Oh, be careful what you are saying. Free yourself from certain beliefs which are not true. We are talking about being free from all beliefs, not just true and false beliefs. No. You see you have not gone into this. You just make that statements, please listen.

Being born, educated for which one is not responsible, but you become responsible the moment you become aware that you are conditioned, and becoming aware that you are conditioned you finish it. Which means you are never conditioned.

Q: But you are free.

K: But you are free from all conditioning, you are awake. That is quite a different matter.

Q: There is still the past.

K: No sir. Now look. You are being brought up in a certain culture, and you observe the various other cultures throughout the world, each divided. Now you become aware of your conditioning - have you? And becoming aware of your conditioning it is your complete responsibility to see that you are free of it, otherwise you can't help society, otherwise you can't bring about a change. Are you doing that? Are you aware that you are conditioned, by the church, by wealth, by poverty, by the climate, by the food, by the clothes - you follow - you are conditioned. And you are aware and

you become utterly responsible, which means that you have got to free yourself from it, otherwise you are not a human being, you are a fragment of this whole structure.

Q: I see my conditioning now, and I make a statement about that, I speak out about it. And then other people...

K: Wait sir. Look at it sir. First, are you aware, please watch it, this is really important, related to the question, what am I to do given all these facts - all the facts, not just your fact and my fact, all the facts that are observed - what am I to do? I have been conditioned as a child, I can't help it, by the parent, by the society, by the grandmother - you know, conditioned. And I don't know that I am conditioned, I grow up and I realize, watching all this around me, that I am conditioned; and my feeling is that I must change society. I can only change both the outer and the inner when I become utterly responsible for my conditioning and be free of it. Are you? Unless you are you cannot possibly help society - full stop. Don't let us talk about helping society.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How can you bring about a revolution?

Q: How can you free them if they don't want to be freed?

K: I am not talking about the people who don't want to be free, who want to change society in a particular way, or change society in a communist way, or socialist or capitalist - I am not talking of such people at all. I am talking of those people who are here in this tent after ten days. I say to you, look if you really deeply fundamentally are earnest about bringing about a change in society you can only do it if you are aware that you are conditioned and you are free of that conditioning, otherwise don't talk about altering

society. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, wait. I explained that sir. It is not your society - we are back.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do listen sir. I can't possibly change Mr Who.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No sir, it is not a slow process. Not a process of evolution.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look sir, I am not talking quickly, slowly at all. I am talking about something. I see this world as it is, and I am born in that society, and as I grow up I realize I am conditioned, and my responsibility is to completely free the mind from conditioning, and then only can I do something about society. Till that takes place I won't discuss, talk about changing society, it is meaningless.

So wait sir. I want to do this - you follow? I realize I am conditioned and I must change it completely, alter it, free the mind from it, the mind must free itself from it. Now the first question is - please follow it if you will - will it take time? That is slow, evolutionary process.

Q: The idea of time is part of my conditioning.

K: No sir. That's what I am pointing out to you. Part of your conditioning is to say it will take time.

Q: How can we determine that it is going to take time or not if we don't know what it is going to be?

K: I am going to show it too you sir. I ask myself, will it take time, I am conditioned, the mind must be free, the mind says it is

conditioned, it must free itself - will it take time? Or, saying that it will take long, it will gradually be done, is part of my conditioning. Right? So I have to find out the truth of this matter, whether it is a matter of slow, gradual process or instant process.

Q: How can we know?

K: I am going to find out, I am going to learn. I am going to learn, sir, I don't know. Right?

Q: Is it possible to know if it is...

K: I am going to find out. You see you don't even look sir. I want to find out whether this conditioning of the mind, the mind having been conditioned, to free itself from that conditioning, will it take time, I want to learn, I want to find the truth of it. Right? Now what does that mean? Am I approaching this problem of freedom with a mind that is conditioned to time? Are you answering my question? Is your mind conditioned by time, that is, gradually I will do it? If it is conditioned to time, then become aware of it, aware of that conditioning and put it aside for the moment and find it. That is, listen sir, the mind is conditioned to time, that is, it is conditioned now and eventually, there, it will be unconditioned. The time, the interval between now and then is time. Right? No? Oh Lord, don't go to sleep, please sirs. This is not complicated. To reach from this seat to go to the other end takes time. Right? Many steps and so on. Now I am conditioned, the mind is conditioned, and to be free of that conditioning, will it take time? Time being freedom is over there and conditioned mind is here. Right? And it must do certain things in order to arrive there. Right? Now what happens? It is conditioned and it will be unconditioned then. What happens between the interval, between

now and then? What takes place?

Q: Further conditioning.

K: Right. Further conditioning, further factors entering in, which distorts it, pulls you in that direction and then you are pulled back and go on. And so on. There is a constant movement, which is pushing you in different directions. This is so obvious. So that is involved. If you admit time that is involved. Right sir? Are you following all this? And if you admit time, which means division between now and then, who has created this division? I must find this out. Who has created this division?

Q: It's what you call the input and output.

K: No. No madam.

Q: The spirit against the matter.

K: There is not such thing as spirit and matter, both are one.

Q: For me there is.

K: Oh well that finishes it.

Q: It is the entity which wants the unconditioned state.

K: Of course sir. Psychosomatic, that is the interrelationship between the mind and the body is so well established, it is not good saying matter and spirit - we won't go into that. So the moment mind admits time, time becomes a danger - no? In that there is laziness, postponement, in that there is a division between here and there, and all that implies an entity which wants to reject this and get that. No? Right sir? So as long as this division in thought exists time must exist.

Q: But aren't we getting away from our original question?

K: Oh no, no. I haven't moved away from it at all. I am saying, I realize I am conditioned and my responsibility first is to



unconditioned, because if I cannot uncondition, but act according to my conditioning, I make society more horrible than it is - which the politicians all over the world are doing. So I say my responsibility as a human being is to free the mind from conditioning. Now will it take time? I have not moved away from it. Will it take time? Or is it possible to change it instantly?

Q: Can you demonstrate what you do not understand?

K: I don't know what you mean.

Q: It needs time.

K: Sorry. Is this the first time you are listening to this madam? Is this the first time you are here?

Q: Yes.

K: I am so sorry. You see we are both of us using different language. so - we have spent ten days or more, or perhaps five years learning about each other, so please if you don't mind, most respectfully and politely, listen first and get into it and you may understand it.

Q: Sir until this morning I thought it must take time but now at the moment I think it can be done instantly and as a result of that I think your relationships change immediately with all those around you instantly, and then the world changes from a nucleus.

K: That's right. We must find out the truth of this matter - you follow? Whether time is necessary, or time is a danger. Or time is an impediment. We are conditioned by the society which says time is necessary. Right? Gradually old boy, not quickly! Right? And I say that may be wrong altogether, that may be my conditioning, therefore I must investigate, learn about it. And I see the moment time is allowed the enormous danger that exists in the interval

between now and then, so seeing that I reject time - not reject, it has no meaning. So freedom may be there only I don't know how to look at it. I am going to find out how to look, I am going to learn. And I can only learn if I am not concerned with time - I don't know if you see this? If I don't say from here to there, which means this must be changed to that and therefore division, therefore time, therefore conflict. I have been through all that. You see sir unless you really understand the interrelationship of all this you will be lost.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, do you mean to say the generals, the admirals, politicians all over the world, are going to change by listening to you and me? Certainly not. What we are talking about is, if you are serious, if there is the real deep understanding that society must change, not according to any pattern, break away from the Judaism, the Christianity, calling yourself a Jew or Hindu, wiping away all that and therefore we are concerned with the unity of man. The unity of man is not through organizations - that may help later to organize - but in understanding how this conditioning divides people. There we are. Can you change, you, brought up in a particular culture, change your conditioning? Unless you change, please don't talk about changing society. It is a blasphemy. They all talk about changing society according to their pattern and therefore divide, divide, divide. That is what is happening - according to Marx, according to Jesus, according to somebody else. What we are concerned is to see that man, you and I who have been brought up in a conditioning, to be free of it, is this to be done instantly, or will it take time? For me, for this person speaking on this platform,

change implies - look at the subtlety of it - change implies - a change comes about only when there is no motive. The moment you have a motive you are conditioned. If you can understand that! The moment you have a motive - make somebody happy, change society, bring about enlightenment, or seek enlightenment - the moment you have a motive, that very motive is the conditioning factor.

Q: Is it a motive to be responsible?

K: Is there a motive in responsibility? Are you saying that? Is there a motive in responsibility? If I feel I am responsible to you because I feel you should change, change according to my pattern, my philosophy, my understanding. Which is, I feel responsible then I have a motive.

Q: When I see I am conditioned you say I am responsible.

K: No. Responsible to be free of your conditioning. Not for somebody else's freedom. So I have to find out if I have a motive. Go on sirs, work with me and don't let me work by myself. Have I a motive in wanting to change society, in wanting to change myself? Obviously I have a motive, because I want to be free, I want to achieve enlightenment, I want to be - I want to impress others. God knows, a thousand reasons.

Q: Sir, because I can't be separated it is a very important problem because it is the only problem which is not fragmentary.

K: That's what I am showing to you.

Q: When you say you want to be free that implies a motive.

K: No I only use that - when I want to be free - as a way of talking - 'I want to be free' means again time. I am not talking - oh Lord, don't pick up a few words and throw it at me please. We are

talking about the whole business of freedom and conditioning. It is not - I give it up!

Sirs, can we go on from there? That is, have you got a motive which is the factor of your conditioning? I have a motive and that motive says, change. And that motive is going to dictate what kind of change it must be, obviously. Look sir, I am ambitious and I have tried this, that, the other, hoping through that to achieve my ambition. And I have got on to one line and I say I am going to fulfil that, that's my motive. And according to that motive and that line I change, and I think I am being freed from my conditioning. I am not. Oh Lord, isn't that clear?

Q: Is there not a motive in unconditioning?

K: No sir. Is there not a motive in unconditioning? Is there? Look sir. Just let me answer that. You observe the sorrow, the misery of the world, what is going on - right? - not observe intellectually, verbally but actually see it. There is starvation, there are wars, the division between spirit and matter, you see all these divisions. Right? See it, feel it, you are involved in it. Right? And you realize that there must be a change, naturally. When I have got a tooth ache I can't keep on, I must go to the doctor to remove it, do something about it. There is a motive in that in an obvious sense, but I am talking of a deeper motive.

Q: Are you and I without motive in being here? Are we talking about motive and just being here?

K: Are we here without motive. I don't know, I can't tell you. Right madam?

Q: Can you start out thinking about a motive and as you think the motive becomes obvious or disappears?

K: Can you start out thinking about a motive.

Q: No, thinking about this question of motive.

K: Thinking about this question of motive, as you observe the motive becomes obvious or disappears. Sir, look, we are talking about not some other motive, but have you got a motive that says, change society. Right? Have you got a motive?

Q: Obviously.

K: Wait. Find out sir what that motive is.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You have a motive. All right. What is the motive?

Q: Is there any way of living at all by certain rules - why don't you change?

Q: It is obvious.

K: Are you acting according to the dictates of a motive? Sir, do go into this question a little bit. Are you acting according to the dictates of your motive? Or are you free from motive?

Q: I see the rules are wrong and I want to change them.

K: You see the rules are wrong. You want to change them. You, who are conditioned and therefore your changing those rules will bring about another set of rules according to your conditioning.

Q: I don't think it is so obvious. For instance, let's say there is traffic in the town and it isn't satisfactory, then the rules are wrong, so let's change them.

K: They are changing them sir.

Q: That's a practical problem.

K: Yes, that is a totally different problem. Aren't we going round and round in circles? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course not sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please sir, could we stick to one thing and work it out together. Please just stick to one thing, which is this: you see the world as it is, you are part of the world, this chaos in the world has been brought about by human beings. Right sirs? And you are part of that human society. You realize this misery and confusion has been brought about by you as well as by another. Right? By your conditioning. Now how am I to change that conditioning? With that only we are discussing, nothing else. Now is it possible to change it instantly? Or will it take time? Now, just a minute, just a minute. Look at it this way. If you see the danger of any danger you act instantly, don't you - no? Don't you act instantly when you see some danger? Now do you see the danger, please listen, the danger of being conditioned? Do you really see the danger of being conditioned? If you see the danger as dangerous as meeting a wild animal, you will change instantly. But you refuse to see the danger.

Q: Excuse me for going back one step. But are there not some kind of social environments that make unconditioning more possible than others?

K: May be. But a future society may come into being which you are trying to help now, which will help your grandchildren to be less conditioned, but we are taking things as they are now, not a society in the future. Look sir. If you see your conditioning is a danger, a real danger not philosophical danger, a theoretical danger, intellectual danger, but a positive, direct danger to human

well being, you are bound to change instantly. Now you don't see that. Why don't you? Right? Why don't you see the danger as you see the danger of an animal, wild animal, or house on fire, and equally see the danger of being conditioned?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, why don't you see? Don't explain. I'll tell you why you don't see it, why you don't see the danger, I'll give you ten explanations.

Q: If you saw it you wouldn't be conditioned.

K: Why don't you see it?

Q: I am afraid of something new.

K: No. Sir, are you afraid of something new when you meet a tiger? You act.

Q: The condition of conditioning is that it is unconscious.

K: Therefore find out. Are you conditioned, consciously, superficially conditioned or conditioned right through? You don't even enquire. Or you merely want to change society, the rules, this and that, you go back. Sir, please, go together.

Q: I am blind to the danger of conditioning.

K: You are blind to the danger of conditioning. Are you blind? Are you blind when your house is on fire?

Q: She means blindness to the conditioning is part of the conditioning.

K: Blindness is part of this conditioning. Blindness is part of this conditioning. Then what are you going to do? You can't have everything. You want to change society and you say I am blind to my conditioning, I don't know what to do and so you keep on repeating. It is just a theory.

Q: It is what is happening.

K: That's exactly my point. You talk about change of society, which you really don't mean at all. If you really mean change in society you have to go very deeply into this question of conditioning. Whether it is superficial conditioning or deep, conscious or hidden conditioning, you have to enquire, you have to learn, you don't apply, you don't pursue, what am I to do?

Q: Isn't the desire to change society an escape from ourselves?

K: Is not this desire to change society an escape from ourselves? How can it be an escape when you are part of the society? When you separate yourself from the society then you can say, 'I am escaping'. But if you realize you are part of it then there is no escape. Sir, look: one is conditioned. I want to find out if it is a superficial conditioning or a deep conditioning because as long as the mind is conditioned any enquiry into change has no meaning whatsoever. If we agree on that, see the truth of that, then we can proceed. Which is, I want to find out whether it's superficial conditioning or deep conditioning. Now what is the instrument - please listen quietly - what is the instrument which you are going to use to enquire? You understand? If it is the old instrument of analysis it has no value. Right? We have been through that. So are you enquiring through the old instrument of analysis? Are you? Or, are you looking without analysis? Which is it you are doing? Are you looking with analytical eyes, or are you looking, merely observing? You must find this out because part of our conditioning is the analytical process, and if you proceed with the analytical process your enquiry will be conditioned enquiry. If it is not then you are merely observing without the analyser therefore it is totally



different perception.

Q: Sir, as soon as I ask myself a question that implies analysis, doesn't it?

K: No, no, sir. Move from there. Analysis - we explained what analysis means. There is an analyser and the thing to be analysed.

Q: As soon as I ask a question there is a division between...

K: No, no I ask a question. Sir, I ask a question not from an intellectual point of view, not from a verbal point of view, the mind says it is wanting to find out the truth of something, it is not an intellectual enquiry, it is not an analytical thing. I hope you are as hot as I am!

Q: But there is a division, isn't there?

K; No. Sir, I ask. That is why I said to you, what is the motive in your asking. If there is a motive in your asking then that motive is going to dictate your observation, analytically or non-analytically.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I am not - one is not responsible for anything except one's conditioning. As long as you are not aware of your conditioning and try to be responsible for another then it becomes a monstrous fight, a conflict, a possessive demand, a dominance and all the rest of it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So you are saying, you don't see the danger of conditioning because it is not immediate. Is that it sir? You are saying you don't see the danger of conditioning because it is not immediate, it is not active, it is not something that really disturbs you.

Q: It is not right here.

K: Yes, that's what we are saying. Why isn't it?

Q: Sir, isn't also that people want to change their conditioning because they have notions of security.

K: Yes sir, therefore I have to find out what security means. Is there security for a man who is conditioned? Find out sir. Look, I am conditioned as a Jew, is there security for me?

Q: You mean whether he is privileged or not?

K: No, no. Born as a Hindu, live in that cage, think traditionally, I say 'I must have security' therefore I fight the Muslim.

So as long as I am conditioned in nationalism, or any other division, fragmentation, security is not possible. Look you have had two wars.

Q: Yes, sir, that's true. But it's not the problem because people feel secure in nationality, feel secure in their private property, feel secure in their...

K: Do you, who have been listening here, sitting here, hour after hour for ten days, feel secure in nationality?

Q: I don't say we do.

K: Do you? I am asking you. Secure in your belief, in your conclusion, in your hope, in your aggression? Do you? Don't talk about others. You started out this morning wanting to help society, change society, and you see you really don't mean it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. It repeats itself because we are conditioned by a new conditioning. Before it was Capitalism, then later on Marx, Lenin and so on, we are conditioned by this or that, and we are talking about all conditioning.

Q: It is not possible.

K: Look, if you say it is not possible for a human mind to be free from conditioning, then we can deal with that in a different manner; but the moment you admit the possibility of it, which means a tremendous thing, then you are altogether thinking differently. If you say it is not possible then let us decorate the cages we live in - right? - hang up pictures of this or that, make lovely things of our cages, our traps. If that is all you want I am afraid I won't play that game with you.

Q: I am puzzled by your approach to motive. Is motive and attachment the same thing?

K: Yes sir.

Q: Sir, you asked the question: why don't you see the danger as really as a physical danger. What makes one really ask such a question?

K: I am asking it. I am asking. Apparently you don't face it. Apparently it is not a danger to you. It is not a danger to the young or to the old.

Q: But if we see there is no security in nationalism, people think there is security there...

K: But sir, nationality is such superficial rubbish. You can put that aside very quickly but there are much depending conditioning like conformity. Go into it sir. Find out how you conform. Therefore find out whether you are conforming and you will find out only when conformity becomes a tremendous danger. And that makes you conform to the society in which you live, or change that society in order to conform to another pattern of society. Therefore the enquiry into conditioning implies not only superficial conditioning as nationalism, but the most fundamental conditioning

like acquisitiveness, like competitiveness, comparison, conformity, find out. Put your teeth into it and find out. If you have that - conforming, acquisitive, wanting to dominate, changing this society, to something else, has no meaning.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You may say what you like sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are asking: are you aware of your conditioning? - Not somebody else's. Don't give me explanations, theories. Are you aware that you are conditioned? Are you aware that you are conditioned as a Dutchman? As a Jew? As a Hindu? And if you do something as a Hindu your action will be conditioned, therefore destructive. If you do something as a Dutchman, it will be equally destructive, or a Jew. You may write about all the goodness of the world but if you are at heart a Jew, conditioned, your action will be destructive and bringing misery.

Q: But if you just have god and nothing else, no creed, and nothing else, just god, you take away god and what do you give for that?

K: If you take away god what do you put in its place? Freedom from fear.

Q: What do you give back in return?

K: I am telling you madam. Freedom from fear needs no belief. We have our gods as yours and the Hindus, the Muslims and the communists, have their gods because they are all frightened.

Q: Don't you believe in spiritual powers?

K: Don't you believe in spiritual powers. Sirs this becomes... Sirs, life - please do listen - the mysteries that we invent are

rather silly but there are tremendous mysteries if we can free the mind from its conditioning. You will find out the greatest mystery, and the beauty of that mystery.

Q: Can one be aware of conditioning as long as they are subconscious?

K: Right, right. How can one be aware of the unconscious conditioning? Do you really want to go into this?

Q: Yes.

K: Now sir, just a minute. Do you really want to go into this so deeply that it means that you will completely expose all your unconscious beliefs, dogmas, traditions, dreams, hopes. Right?

Q: Yes.

Q: It is better to ask why we can't see the danger.

K: All right I am going to go into it. What is the time? We had better stop. Shall we pick it up tomorrow?

(Various comments from the audience)

K: I will do it tomorrow, sir.

## **SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 7TH AUGUST 1970**

We are going to talk over together this morning what lies below the conscious. I do not know if you have thought about it at all, or enquired into it, or have merely accepted what the analysts and the psychologists have said, but if you have gone into it fairly deeply, and I hope we shall this morning, one or two major fundamental questions have to be asked, not according to what others have said, but for oneself. One has to discover, explore, learn for oneself, the whole content of consciousness. Why one divides the unconscious and the conscious at all. Why there is this division. Is it an artificial division brought about by the analysts, the psychologists, the philosophers, or is there a division at all? And if one is to enquire into the whole structure and the nature of consciousness, who is it that is going to enquire? A fragment of the many fragments? Or is there an entity, an agency, that is beyond all this consciousness which looks into consciousness? And can the conscious mind, the daily operative mind, can that mind observe into the contents of the unconscious, or deeper layers? And what are the frontiers of consciousness? What are the limits? I hope you'll remember these questions - I have forgotten them already! Please do remember it and tell me afterwards as we go along.

You know this is a very, very serious subject. In the understanding of which I think most human problems will be resolved. It isn't a thing that you pick up, take as a hobby, spend a few hours or a couple of weeks and just study superficially and drop it and go on with your daily whatever life that is. If one is to

go into this very deeply, it is a way of life, it is not that you understand that and leave it there. You can only understand the whole content of consciousness and the limits of consciousness if it is a daily concern. It isn't a thing you kind of play with. It must be your whole life, your whole calling, your vocation, because we are enquiring into the very depths of the human mind, not according to your opinion, or the speaker's opinion, but learning the fullness of it and see what lies beyond it, not just scratch on the surface and think you have understood it. It isn't a thing that you learn from a book, or from another. Please do let us realize this: it isn't a thing that you acquire as knowledge from books and then apply it. Then if you do, it will have no value, it will be secondhand. And if you merely treat it as a form of entertainment, intellectual, spiritual, emotional, it will equally have no effect at all in your life. And we are concerned with the fundamental revolution of the mind, of the whole structure of oneself, the freeing - for the mind to free itself of all its conditioning, so that we are mature human beings, not educated, sophisticated human beings but real human, mature, deep human beings.

So, we are going to learn together this morning if we can, what is below the conscious, the layers, and seeing the many layers or one layer, or many layers, then to discover for oneself the content of consciousness, whether that content makes up the conscious or the conscious with its frontier contains 'what is'. You are understanding this? Does the content of the consciousness make up consciousness - the content? You follow? Or, in the content all these things exist? See the difference? I am just investigating, you follow? I am moving slowly so please let us travel together. Don't

ask me afterwards 'please repeat what you said' - I can't. So first: why is there this division between the conscious and the so-called unconscious or the deeper layers, why is there this division? Are you aware of this division? Or does this division exist because we have got so many divisions in our life? Which is it? Is it a separate movement, conscious movement and the deeper layers with their own movement? Or this whole thing a movement, undivided? Please sirs this is very important for us to find out because we have trained the conscious mind, we have drilled it, educated it, forced it, shaped it, according to the demands of society, or according to our own impulses, our own aggression and so on. And are the deeper layers uneducated? You follow? We have educated the superficial layers and are we educating the deeper layer? Are you following all this? Or the deeper layers are utterly untouched and only we have cultivated the superficial layer? What do you say? Please this is not a talk by me. What do you say? Because in the deeper layers may be the source of finding out new things, because the superficial layers have become mechanical, are conditioned, repetitive, imitative and there you can't - it is so mechanical there is nothing. It is not free to find out, to move, to fly - you follow? Take to the wing. And the deeper not being educated, unsophisticated, therefore extraordinarily primitive, primitive, not savage, primitive, there may be the source of all new things. Please is this all too difficult?

I do not know what you feel, what you have discovered. Is the superficial mind so heavily conditioned that it has become mechanical? If I am a Hindu I function as a Hindu, or a Jew, or a Christian, whatever it is, the superficial is so heavily laden - I



function on that line, And below that layer which education hasn't touched, or has it touched, and therefore the whole content of consciousness is mechanical - you are following? Conditioned, heavily burdened by all the past, by all the etc., etc. Now sir, I'll keep quiet and you proceed.

Q: Sir, how can we know about our unconscious?

K: How can we know about the unconscious? All right sir, let's begin.

When we use the word 'know', what do we mean by that? No please I am not being merely verbal or superficial - you follow? We must move into this very, very carefully. What do you mean when you say 'I want to know'?

Q: I haven't any experience.

K: Keep to that one word, go into it, don't introduce other words. What do you mean by that word 'know'? When you use that word 'I know', what does that mean, 'I know'? 'I know something that has happened yesterday'. All knowledge is the past - isn't it? Don't agree please, just see. I know you because I met you yesterday. I didn't meet the whole of you, I only met you when you said something, therefore knowing implies a time, time - in the period of time. Right? So knowledge implies always the past, when I say 'I know that is an aeroplane flying' - you follow? - though the flying is at the moment the knowledge that it is an aeroplane is the past. So how can I not know - how can this mind, the superficial mind, learn about the deeper layer. Right? Are we moving together? Now how can you know? How can that superficial mind learn about the other?

Q: Keep the superficial mind still then it can learn about the

deeper levels.

K: When the superficial mind is still then only you learn, there is a learning of the deeper layers. And what is there to learn in the deeper layers? You assume there is something to learn - wait, wait. Please go slowly. Sir, are you actually aware of the operations of the conscious mind? Are you? How it is ticking over? What are its responses? Please do listen to all this. Do you - is there an awareness of the conscious mind? Find out how extraordinarily difficult this is, not difficult, you have to watch this thing so very closely, the mind has to watch this entire movement very, very closely. Why you say there is the unconscious and there are many things in it. Right? That's what all the professionals say, the specialists - are there? The moment you divide the conscious and the deeper layers then the question arises: how is this superficial mind to enquire into the other? Right? Are you following this? And if there is no division at all it is a total movement, a total movement of which one is only aware of a fragmentary movement. And this fragmentary movement asks: what are the contents of the unconsciousness? You are following all this? If it is a total movement you won't ask this question. Is the speaker making this clear? Be quite sure. Not verbally but actually. The moment you divide consciousness into fragments, one fragment says, what is the rest of the fragment, what are the rest of the fragments. But if it is a total movement then there is no fragmentation, therefore the question doesn't arise. This is really important to find out, then you go beyond all the specialists.

Now do you see consciousness as a whole, or do you see with one fragment examining the other fragments? This requires - you

follow sir? What do you do? Do you see it partially or wholly, as a total movement, like a river that is moving? You can dig a ditch on the bank and call it the river, it isn't, it is a whole movement, the river. Right. Then what is this movement? How is one to observe this movement without a fragmentation?

Q: May I say something please? You speak about an unconsciousness mind, but please you cannot speak about something which is not, but how can you speak about something which is not conscious. We can speak about the conscious. Please define unconscious and conscious.

K: Look sir.

Q: The question is: are do we know the unconscious?

K: We asked this question earlier: are we aware of the frontiers of consciousness? Or, are we aware of the many fragments that compose the conscious? One fragment becoming aware of the many other fragments? Or are you aware of the total movement of consciousness without any division?

Q: Both ways are conscious. Intellectually I answer, why divide them?

K: What sir? What sir?

Q: Intellectually.

K: Please, we are not analysing. We have gone into that very carefully. We are not analysing. When there is analysis there is the analyser and the thing analysed. One fragment assuming the authority of analysis and examining the other parts. And in this division arises the conscious and the unconscious, then we put the question: can the conscious mind examine the unconscious? - which implies that the conscious mind is separate from the rest.

And we say from that false question you can answer this through dreams, through various forms of intimation, hints - all arising from a false assumption that the superficial mind is separate from the other, which means we have never seen or felt or learnt about the whole movement of consciousness as a whole. If you do, this question doesn't arise at all. I don't know if you see this?

Q: Obviously some people are suffering from neurosis without knowing the origin of their neurosis - isn't that the unconscious?

K: Some people suffer from neurosis, isn't that the outcome from the unconscious? Do you suffer from any neurosis? Do you? Does it mean that you are all free from all neurosis? Please this is not a silly question. Are you aware that you are neurotic in some form or another?

Q: Who is deciding if one is neurotic?

K: Who is to decide if one is neurotic? Don't you know when you are neurotic? Has somebody to tell you that you are neurotic? Do please listen to this. When there is any exaggeration of any fragment, of any fragment, then neurosis takes place. Right? When you are highly intellectual, that is a form of neurosis, though the highly intellectual is highly regarded. The person who holds on to certain beliefs - Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Communist, this or that, any attachment to any belief is a form of neurosis. Wait sir, look at it, look at it. Go slowly. Wait, hold on to your question. Any fear is a form of neurosis, any conformity is a form of neurosis - you follow? And any form of comparing yourself with something else is neurosis. Aren't you doing all this?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes sir. Therefore you are neurotic. (Laughter) No, no,

please sir, this is very serious.

So, any fragment - please we have learned something from this - any exaggeration of any fragment of which the whole consciousness as we see it, which contains many fragments, any emphasis on any fragment is a form of neurosis. Wait sir, get it into your hearts, feel it. Move, take time, apply it sir, get involved in it, apply it to yourself and you will see for yourself the next question. As we are, as we have accepted, we have divided consciousness. In this division there are many, many fragmentations, the intellectual, psycho-neurotics - you follow? - many, many divisions and any division, an emphasis on that division is neurotic, which means that a mind emphasizing a fragment cannot see clearly. Therefore the emphasis of a fragment brings about confusion. Get all this sir. Please sir, one moment, please just a minute sir. I am going to ask you, please go with this. See yourself whether in you there is not a fragmentation, and that fragmentation laying emphasis on one, on its issue, on its problem, and disregarding the rest of the other fragments, leads not only to conflict, but to great confusion because each demands an expression, each demands an emphasis and when you emphasize the one the others are clamouring. And this clamour is confusion and out of that confusion every form of desire to fulfil, to become, to achieve, all are neurotic impulses.

Yes sir?

Q: But also, for instance, neurosis can also be to suffer from something and you don't know really what you are suffering from. For instance, somebody doesn't dare to go through a Square and it is obviously not the Square that he is frightened of but something in the unconscious.

K: Sir, I understand. I don't know what this lady is troubled about - what are you troubled about madam?

Q: It was forbidden to take photographs.

K: I don't know. For god's sake! Listen!

Look this is terribly serious stuff. One is aware that one is neurotic. You are afraid to cross the Square, you are afraid to let go your past, you are afraid to be non-Hindu, non-Jew, non-Christian, this or that, and how are you to know that you are neurotic? Is that the question sir?

Q: Not really.

K: Then what is the question sir?

Q: Sometimes you suffer from something, obviously the thing you suffer from is not the real reason. For instance, you don't dare to go through a Square or you don't dare to be alone, it is not the fact itself but it is something, they say, in the unconscious itself which gives you the fear.

K: Yes. Now wait a minute. The neurosis is only a symptom, the cause is in the unconscious.

Q: Could be.

K: Could be. Obviously could be and probably is. Then what is the question?

Q: It's neurosis.

K: Sir you are not following the whole. Then when we have understood this whole structure then we can go to the particular, but to start with the particular we'll end nowhere. Please see that sir. Do you see that any emphasis on the fragment is a form of neurosis? - intellectual, emotional, devotional, physical, psychosomatic, you follow? And as most of us have laid stress on

one aspect of the many fragments, naturally out of that exaggeration, out of that disharmony, other factors of disharmony arise, which is: 'I can't cross a street, or a Square in the dark, I am frightened', and the explanation of that is my childhood, my past, my mother didn't treat me properly. Now our question is, not why I can't cross the Square - which I will answer without going to the analyst. If I understand the fragmentation of consciousness, the moment I have understood that then the problem of crossing the Square doesn't exist at all. Right? Are we meeting each other? When we see the totality, the immensity, the greater, the lesser disappears. But if we keep on emphasizing the little, then the little brings about its own little problem. Right?

Q: But when you talk about seeing the totality of consciousness, what does the 'see' mean because I am thinking sometimes I know something and I know how I resent this, when you know something you don't know how you know it.

K: No sir, just look. Do you listen to that movement of that river totally? Just do it sir. Don't speculate. Listen to that river, stream, and find out if you are listening completely, without any movement in any direction, only there. Then what do you say, when having listened, what do you say?

Q: I...

K: You see you are all too ready with the answers.

Q: Recognition plays no part in it.

K: That's right sir. Recognition plays no part in it, you don't say, 'That is the stream to which I am listening' or you as an entity listening to the stream, there is only the listening to the sound. You don't say, 'I know it is a river'.

So let's go back. I want to go into this so much, please let's move together.

Q: Isn't the emphasis on fragmentation the essence of neurosis, or is it the symptoms of neurosis?

K: No it is the very essence and the symptoms.

Q: Being intellectual is the essence as well as the symptom?

K: Isn't it? Look sir. I emphasize my intellectual capacity. Right? I think it is marvellous, I can beat everybody at argument, I have read so much, I can correlate all that I have read, and write marvellously clever, intellectual books - isn't that the very cause and the symptom of my neurosis?

Q: It seems to be a symptom of our...

K: Wait. Is it? Or is it, you are saying that is a symptom not the cause, I say, let's look. Is the mind, the whole stuff, undivided and therefore the cause and the effect are the same?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no sir. Don't translate yet sir. See it. Look sir. Cause and effect: what was the cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause of the next movement, there is no definite demarcation or line between cause and effect, what was cause yesterday has become the effect, the effect of today becomes the cause of tomorrow. It is a movement, it is a chain.

Q: But isn't it essential to see this whole process rather than just...

K: That's what we are doing and that is not possible if you emphasize the intellectual, the emotional, the physical, the psychosomatic, the spiritual, god, no-god and so on and so on. Right?



So my question is, which was the first question: why is it that we have divided? Is it artificial, necessary, or just the invention of the specialist, to which we have become a slave, which we have accepted, as we accept most things so easily, we say, 'All right, great people say this and I swallow it and I repeat it'. But when we see the fragmentation and the emphasis on the fragmentation and we see out of that arises the whole casual/effect chain, and that is a form of neurosis, when we see all that then the mind sees the totality of the movement without division. Well sir, do you see it? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, if you identify yourself - the questioner says no identification - if you identify yourself with any one of the fragments obviously it is the same process, which is the process of being identified with the one and disregarding the rest, is a form of neurosis, contradiction. Can you - no, put the next question sir. Can you identify yourself with the rest of the fragments? You, another fragment, identify with the many other fragments. You see the trick we are playing, this question of identification? You understand what I am talking about?

Q: No.

K: Oh my Lord!

Q: You can only say that identification with one fragment because you feel that you are incomplete so that...

K: That's right. You feel you are incomplete therefore you try to identify yourself with many other fragments. Now who is the entity that is trying to identify itself with the many? It is one of the fragments, therefore it is a trick - you follow? And we are doing

this. I must identify myself.

Q: Isn't it better to identify yourself with more fragments than with one.

K: Not better. No, not better. Look sir. Look, first let me explain again once. There are many fragments - right? - of which I am. One of the fragments says, it brings about confusion when I identify myself with one fragment therefore I'll identify myself with the many other fragments. Right? And it makes a tremendous effort in identifying itself with the many fragments, with the Christians, with the Hindu, with the Buddhist, with the Communist, you follow? Who is this entity that tries to identify itself with the other fragments? It is also a fragment isn't it? Therefore it is a game it is playing by itself. It is simple.

Now let's proceed, there is so much in this, you are just remaining on the very surface of all this.

Now we see there is not actual division at all. Right? Non-verbally, see it, feel it, that the observer is a fragment which separates itself from the rest of the fragments and is observing. In that observation as the observer and observed there is a division, there is conflict, there is confusion. Now if when the mind realizes this fragmentation and the futility of its separating, then it sees the movement as a whole. Now do you do this? If you cannot do this you cannot possibly put the next question, which is: what is beyond the conscious? What is below, above, side, it doesn't matter. So we have to find out, if you are serious, what is consciousness and when are you aware that you are conscious. When are you aware that you are conscious? You understand my question? We are asking - I am doing all the work, too bad! Sir look, you have to

learn about all this and when you learn you help others to learn - you follow? So learn now for god's sake - you follow? That is your vocation.

So we are looking into the unconscious, we are asking what is this thing called consciousness? And when am I, when is the mind aware that it is conscious - you follow? When do you say, 'I am conscious'?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Come nearer.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What do you mean, let's come closer? Begin nearer. You begin too far away from me.

Q: In meditation.

K: Sir, just listen. When are you at all aware that you are conscious? Wait sir. What? Is this so difficult as all that?

Q: When there is pain.

K: The lady suggests you are conscious when there is pain, when there is conflict, when you have a problem. Right? When you are resisting, otherwise if you are flowing smoothly, evenly, harmoniously living without any contradiction, are you conscious at all? Are you conscious sir when you are supremely happy?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes?

Q: What does that word mean, being conscious?

K: Wait, you'll find out. You don't have to ask me you'll find out. The moment you are conscious that you are happy, is happiness there? The moment you say, 'My god how joyous I am' - can you ever say that? If you say it, it has already moved away

from you.

Q: Well you are then conscious of that.

K: Which is the past. So you are only conscious of something that has happened, or actually conscious when there is some conflict, pain, when there is actually awareness that you are confused. Right? So any disturbance in this movement is to be conscious. And all our life is a disturbance against which we are resisting.

Q: Sir when there is a feeling of loneliness and when the mind does not interfere, isn't the mind whole in that state?

K: No, no madame, no please do listen to what I am saying. Do please listen, don't take a particular example just now. We are talking over together what it means to be conscious, to be aware, to be apprehensive in the sense, I apprehend, I see. If there is no discord at all in life would you say, 'I am conscious'? When you are walking - you follow sir? - moving, living without any friction, without any resistance, without any battle, there is no - you are not saying 'I am'. Right? It is only when you are saying, 'I will become' or 'I am being', then you are conscious.

Q: Well the being never comes.

K: No, no. Do take a little time sir, you are too quick. Move into this very slowly, you will find out something extraordinary, you go into it.

Q: Isn't this state that you are talking about still a process of identification, say, of the tree, of the...

K: No, no, no. You see you are - I explained sir, identification. Of course when I see a tree, I see a tree I don't mistake it for a woman, or for the church, it is a tree, which doesn't mean

identification. Look sir, we have discovered something, we have learned something, there is consciousness only when there is becoming, or trying to be. Becoming implies conflict, 'I will be', which means conflict exists as long as the mind is caught in the verb 'to be' - please see that. And our whole culture is based on that word 'to be'. 'I will be a success', 'I am a failure', 'I must achieve', 'This book is mine, it is going to change the world'. You follow? So as long as there is a movement of becoming, in that there is conflict and that conflict makes the mind aware that it is conscious. Or the mind that says, 'I must be', be good, not I will be good, be good. Then also it is a form of resistance, being good being and becoming are the same. My golly!

Q: Can one be conscious of conflict?

K: Of course sir, otherwise you wouldn't be conscious.

Q: Can't you be so caught up in conflict that you don't see that you are in conflict?

K: Of course, it is a form of neurosis.

Q: Well I can't see how...

K: Sir, look. Have you ever been to a mental hospital, any of you? I wasn't there as a patient, I was there, taken by an analyst, and every patient from the top floor down to the lowest, the top floor where they are the most violent, caged in, down to the lowest where they are more or less peaceful, are all in conflict, all of them are in conflict, which was exaggerated conflict - you understand? One person was thinking that he was something or other, fighting everybody, only they are inside the building and we are outside. That's all. (Laughter)

Q: I don't see how we can...

K: No, no. You don't listen, you hold on to your particular question and don't listen to the whole. Let go yours sir, come. We'll answer. What is your question sir?

Q: I am trying to distinguish between consciousness and awareness.

K: Both the same. Being aware implies aware of division, to be aware without division and choice is to be not caught in the movement of becoming or being - got it?

I don't know what I said, don't ask me to repeat it. Have you got it? Sir, Look! The whole movement of consciousness is becoming and being. Right? Right? No, don't say you don't understand. The whole movement of consciousness is either to become, or to be. Becoming famous, becoming a social worker, helping the world - you know - becoming, or to be. That is, after looking at this whole fragmentation, after looking at this movement as a whole as consciousness, you find that this whole movement is based on that, too become, or to be. Right? You have learned it sir, not agreeing with me. Then you ask a totally different question, which is: what is beyond this movement of becoming and to be? You are not asking the question, I am asking unfortunately. You understand my question sir? I have realized in looking at all this business of consciousness both from the analytical point of view, from the analyst and psychologist and philosopher, and from the point of view of the religious man with his god and non-god, the believer and the non-believer, the atheist and the believer, looking at all this fragmentation of life, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the black, the white, the pink and the whatever - follow? - division, division, division - that division has been created through becoming, or to be. Right? I

want to be a Hindu because it promises me not only physical success but spiritual achievements. If I reject that I say to myself, I must be, - I must be, I don't know what! but I am going to be, myself, identify myself with myself - again the same process. Right? So I see, observe, this total movement of consciousness is this movement to be, or to become, or not to be, or not to become. Right? Now how do I see this? Do I see it as something outside myself, or do I see it without the centre as the 'me' that is observing the becoming and the not becoming? You have understood my question? No I don't think so.

I realize, I am using the word 'I', realize that all consciousness is this movement. Right? I realize it. When I say 'I realize it' am I realizing it as something I have seen outside of me, looking at a picture outside of me hanging on the wall, spread out before me, or do I see this movement as part of me? Is the very essence of me? Do I see this movement from a centre - you are following all this? - or do I see it without the centre? If I see it as the centre, from a centre, that centre is the self, is the 'me', who is the very essence of fragmentation, and therefore when there is an observation from the centre I am only observing this movement as a fragment, as something outside of me, which I must understand, which I must try to grasp, which I must struggle with and all the rest. But if there is no centre, which means there is no me but merely observing this whole movement, then that observation will lead to the next question. So which is it you are doing?

Please this is not a group therapy, this is not a weekend entertainment, this isn't a thing you go to, to learn from somebody how to become sensitive, how to learn creative living - put all that

bilge aside. This is hard work, this requires deep enquiry, learning. Now how are you observing? Because if you don't understand this, life becomes a torture, a battlefield. In that battlefield you want to improve the cannons, you want to bring about brotherhood and keep your isolation to yourself - we have played this game for so long, therefore you have to answer this question if you are really profoundly serious. Are you watching this whole movement of consciousness, as we have seen it, as an outsider watching, unrelated to that which he is watching, or, there is not centre at all from which you are watching? And when you do watch that way what takes place?

May we side step a little? I don't know what time it is. What time is it sir?

Q: Twenty to twelve.

K: Gosh how time goes! You see, all of you dream a great deal, don't you? Have you ever asked why? Not what dreams tell you, how to interpret dreams, that is a irrelevant question which we'll answer presently. But have you ever asked a relevant question, which is: why you dream at all?

Q: Because we are in conflict?

K: No, sir. Don't be so quick. Look at it. Why do you dream? The next question is: is there a sleep without any dream at all? Don't say 'Yes' sir. First of all you all dream, what are those dreams, why do you dream? Dreams as we said the other day, are the continuing movement of the daily activity, symbolized, put it into various categories, and it is the same movement. Isn't that so? Don't agree or disagree. Find out. Obviously, it is so obvious. Now, what happens then, if dreams are a continuous movement of the



daily action, then what happens to the brain, if there is constant movement, constant activity, constant chattering, what happens to the brain that is constantly...

Q: It never rests.

K: What happens to it?

Q: It is exhausted.

K: Exhausted - which means what?

Q: It wears out.

K: It wears itself out, there is not rest, there is nothing new, there is nothing new seen. The brain doesn't make itself young because of its movement - you follow? All these things are implied when there is a continuous movement of daily activity which goes on in the brain when it sleeps. Right? You may foretell what may happen in the future, in that daily activity because while you sleep there is a little more sensitivity, more perception and so on, but it is the same movement. Oh my Lord!

Now, can this movement during the day, end with the day? Not carry it over when you sleep - you have understood my question? Can this movement, which goes on during the day, end with the day? That is, when you go to bed the whole thing is ended? Wait, don't answer my question yet. We are going to go into it for you. Doesn't it happen to you when you go to bed, that you take stock of what you have done during the day - don't you take stock? Or you just flop into bed and go to sleep? Don't you review the day? Say, look this, this, this should have been done, this should not have been done - you know, you are taking stock? And which means what? - follow this very carefully - which means what? You are bringing order. Right? Right? And the brain demands order

because otherwise it can't function. If you dream, if the movement of the daily activity goes on in your sleep there is no order. And the brain demands order, therefore the brain instinctively while you are asleep brings about order. You wake up a little more fresh because you have a little more order. The brain demands order otherwise it cannot function efficiently. It cannot function efficiently if there is any form of conflict, any form of disorder.

Q: Aren't there other kinds of dreams in which...

K: I am going sir, I am going. Listen. First listen to this. Get order. This movement of the daily life continues through sleep because in this daily movement through sleep there is contradiction, there is disorder, disharmony. And the brain during sleep, through dreams, through various forms of non-dreams, tries to bring order in itself, in its own chaos. And if you put order during the day, the brain does not necessarily need, when it sleeps, to put things in order. See the importance of this. Therefore the brain becomes rested, quiet, alive, fresh. I do not know if you have not noticed if you have a problem and you go on thinking it out during the day, during the night it is still going on, worrying about it and you wake up the next morning weary of the problem and you still during the day worry about that problem, like a dog biting a bone, at it all day, and when you go to bed again until the brain is exhausted, then perhaps in that exhaustion you see something fresh. Now what we are saying is something entirely different. Which is: to end the problem as it arises, not carry it over during the day or the next minute, end it. Somebody has insulted you, hurt you, end it. Somebody has deceived you, somebody has said unkind things about you, look at it, don't carry it over, don't bear it

as burden, end it. End it as it is being said, not after.

So the mind demanding order, disorder is a neurotic state of the brain and ends up in a mental case. So order implies the ending the problem as it arises, and therefore the movement of the daytime through the night ends and therefore no dreams, the body may move and all the rest of it, no dreams, because you have solved everything as you are moving. I don't know if you see the importance of this. Then you can ask the question, which is: what is beyond all this? We will deal with it tomorrow.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 8TH AUGUST 1970

We'll go on, I think, don't you, where we left off yesterday. We were considering the nature and the structure of what consciousness is. Because one can see that if there is to be a radical change in the human mind, and therefore in society, we have to consider this question, we have to delve deeply into it to find out whether there is a possibility of this consciousness undergoing a metamorphosis, a complete change in itself. Because one can see, all our actions, superficial or profound, serious or flippant, are the outcome, or born out of this consciousness. And we were saying yesterday, within this consciousness are many fragments, each fragment assuming dominance at one time or another. And without understanding these many fragments - it's all right, sir, somebody's fainted, it's all right, madam, sit down, somebody's fainted. You can't all get up and look, he has just fainted. (pause)

Would you consider it rather rude on my part if I suggest that those who want to leave, leave now, not in the middle, because it disturbs many people. Either you sit quietly and go to the very end, the bitter end of this, or, just leave quietly when you must. Because several people have complained that when everybody's moving about, it is rather difficult to pay complete attention. So would you please, if you want to leave, leave quietly. Because we are discussing, talking over together rather a difficult problem, and you need all your attention.

As we were saying, that without understanding the content of consciousness, and perhaps going beyond it, any action, however

significant it may be, without understanding the fragmentary nature of our consciousness, whatever our action, however significant it may be, must produce confusion. I think this must be very clear. It's like giving a great deal of attention to one fragment, like the intellect, or the body, and so on, or belief.

And these fragmentations, which compose our consciousness, from which all action takes place, must inevitably bring about contradiction, confusion and misery. Is this, verbally at least, clear? And to say to oneself, all these fragments must be put together or integrated has no meaning, because then the problem arises, who is to integrate it. And the effort of integration. So there must be a way of looking at this whole fragmentation with a mind that is not fragmented. And that is what we are going to discuss a little bit this morning.

I realize that my mind, my consciousness, including the brain, all the physiological nervous responses, the whole of that, consciousness, is fragmentary, is broken up, conditioned by the culture in which one lives. That culture has been created by the past generation and the coming generation. And any action, any action, or the emphasis of one fragment over the others, will inevitably bring about immense confusion. Do we see this? Giving emphasis to social activity, giving emphasis to a religious belief or intellectual concept or Utopia, must inevitably contradict and therefore bring about confusion. Do we see this together?

So one asks the question, which is, is there an action which is not fragmentary and which does not contradict another action which is going to take place next minute.

And we see in this consciousness, thought plays an

extraordinary part, thought being, not only the response of the past, but all our feelings, all our neurological responses, the future hopes, fears, pleasures, despairs, sorrow - all are in this. So does the content of consciousness make for the structure of consciousness, or is consciousness free from its content? Are you following all this?

If the content of consciousness, which is, my despair, my anxiety, fears, pleasures, the innumerable hopes, guilts, and the vast experience of the past, if that makes up the consciousness, that is consciousness, then any action springing from that consciousness can never free the consciousness from its limitation. Got it? No, please don't agree with this, it isn't just schoolboy stuff. I have been brought up in a particular culture - we are communicating, do share it with me - which means work, observe in yourself and then we can proceed further - I'm just talking as an introduction. My consciousness is the result of the culture in which I have lived. That culture has encouraged and discouraged various forms of activities, various forms of pursuits of pleasure, fears, hopes and beliefs. That consciousness is the 'me'.

Now, any action springing from that consciousness, which is conditioned, must inevitably be fragmentary and therefore contradictory, confusing. Are we communicating with each other, are we sharing together this? If you are born in a Communist or a Socialist or a Catholic world, or Protestant and so on, the culture in which that particular mind, brain, is born, is conditioned by this culture, by the society, by the standards, the values, the aspirations of that society. And any action born from this consciousness must inevitably be fragmentary. Is that clear? No? Lord, don't tell me

not. Watch it, sir, don't ask a question, just watch yourself. If I may suggest, first listen to what the speaker has to say, don't bring in your question, or your thought, but first listen, listen first to what he has to say. Then after having listened very quietly, then you can begin to put questions. Then you can say, you are wrong, you are right, this is so, why is this, and so on. If that is going on in your mind, the questioning, then you are not listening. And therefore our communication comes to an end. We are not sharing together. And as this is a very complex, subtle problem, the thing into which we are enquiring, you have first to listen.

You see we are trying to find out what is consciousness. Is it made up of the many things that it contains, or is it something free of its content? You must find this out, you must learn about it. If it is free of its content then the action of that freedom is not dictated by the content. If it is not free then the content dictates all action. Right? That is simple. Now we are going to find out. You see I realize, watching in myself, that I am the result of all this, the past, the present, the future hope, the whole throbbing quality of consciousness is this, with all its fragmentations. And any action born of this content must inevitably be not only fragmentary but through that there is no freedom whatsoever.

So can this consciousness empty itself and find out if there is a consciousness which is free from which a totally different kind of action take place. Are you getting what I'm talking about? Somebody tell me, yes or no. What I am talking about, what I am trying to explain, not what you think about it - am I conveying it to you, am I explaining it to you?

All the content of consciousness is like a muddy little pool, very

shallow and a little frog is making an awful noise in it. And that little frog says, 'I'm going to find out'. And that little frog is trying to go beyond itself. But it is till a frog, it is still in the muddy pool. So can this muddy pool, however shallow, deep, empty the content of all itself, of all itself. My little muddy pool is the culture in which I have lived. And the little me, the frog, is battling against the culture, and saying it must get out. But even if it gets out, it is a little frog. And whatever it gets out into is still the muddy pool which it will create.

So what is one then to do? Please don't answer it. The mind realizes all the activity it indulges in or is forced to do, all its activity is the movement within the consciousness with its content. And realizing this, what is the mind to do? Can it ever go beyond this limited consciousness?

Now that is one point. Second point is, this little pool with the little frog - it is a good simile - may extend, expand and widen the pool. The space it creates is still within the borders of a certain dimension. Does this all interest you? I'm asking this - that little frog can accumulate, or a little monkey, better monkey - that little monkey in the little pool can acquire great deal of knowledge, information and all the rest of it, experience. And this knowledge and experience may give it a certain space to expand. And that space has always in it the little monkey at its centre. Right? Are you following this?

So the space in consciousness is always limited by the centre. If you have a centre, the circumference of consciousness, or the frontiers of consciousness is always limited, however it may expand. That little monkey may meditate, may follow many



systems, rejecting one, taking on another. And that little monkey will always remain. And therefore the space round it and the space it will create for itself is always limited and shallow. Right? So that is the second question.

The third is, what is space without centre. We're going to find this out. What was the first question?

Q: The limitations of the consciousness and can the mind go beyond consciousness.

K: Let the rain have a chance! (pause)

Can this consciousness with its limitations, at whose centre is this everlasting mischievous monkey, can it go beyond itself? (pause) Can the monkey - if you don't mind, I'll stick to that word - can that monkey, with all its intentions, with its aspirations, with its vitality, free itself from its conditioning and so go beyond the frontiers of consciousness which it has created?

To put it differently, can this monkey, which is the 'me' - can the 'me', which is the monkey, by doing all kinds of things - meditating, suppressing, conforming or not conforming, being everlastingly active, to be or not to be, can its movement take it beyond itself? Which is, does the content of consciousness make the 'me', the monkey, and therefore the attempt on the part of the monkey, the 'me', to free itself, is still within the limitation of the pool. So my question is, can the monkey be completely quiet, to see its own frontiers, to be aware of the extent of its frontiers, and whether it is at all possible to go beyond it. Am I conveying it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh Lord - sir, do you notice for yourselves, that you are always acting from a centre? Do you notice this? No? The centre

may be a motive, the centre may be fear, the centre may be ambition - you are always acting from a centre, aren't you? I love you - I hate you - I want to be powerful - all action as far as we know now, is from a centre, whether that centre identifies with the community or with a philosophy, it is still the centre which has identified and therefore the identified thing with becomes the centre. Get it? Are you aware of this action going on, always? No? Or are there moments when the centre is not active? It happens, suddenly you are looking, living, feeling without a centre. And that is a totally different dimension. And thought begins to say, what a marvellous thing that was and I'd like to continue with it. Then that becomes the centre. The remembrance of something which happened a few seconds ago becomes the centre through thought. Are we aware of this? And are we aware of the space that centre creates round itself, isolation, resistance, escape - space? As long as there is a centre there is the space which the centre has created round itself.

And this space we want to expand because we feel the expansion of space is necessary to live extensively. But in that expansive consciousness there is always the centre, therefore the space is always limited, however expanded. Observe it in yourself, sir, don't listen to me, watch it in yourself, you will discover these things very simply. And the battle in relationship is this, between two centres, each centre wanting to expand, assert, dominate - the monkeys at work.

And so I want to learn, the mind says, I see that very clearly, I've learnt that. And I am learning, mind is learning how that centre comes into being - is it the result of this society, the culture, or is it

a divine centre - I'm using that word, forgive me for using that word 'divine' - is it a divine centre which has always been covered up. Covered up by the society, by the culture - outwardly, its been covered up. The Hindus and others call it the Atman, the Great Thing inside which is always being smothered. And therefore you have to free the mind from the smothering, so that the real thing can come out, the real monkey can come out.

Obviously the centre is created by the culture one lives in. And one's own conditioned memories, experiences, the fragmentation of oneself. So it is not only the society that creates the centre but also the centre itself is propelling itself. Right? So, can this centre go beyond the frontiers which it has created for itself - that is one question. Can it? By silencing itself, by controlling itself, by meditating, by - you know" following - can that centre explode and go beyond. Obviously it can't the more it conforms to the pattern, the stronger it gets, though it imagines that it is becoming free.

Enlightenment, surely is that state of mind that quality of mind in which the monkey is never operating. So how is that monkey to end its activities, not through imitation, not through conformity, not through saying, somebody has attained enlightenment, I'll go and learn from him - all those are monkey tricks.

Now does the monkey see this, does the monkey see the tricks it is playing upon itself, and saying, I've got it, I'm ready to help society, alter society, I am completely concerned with the social values and righteous behaviour and social justice. I'm - you follow? Or is it a trick that is being played upon itself. You answer this, sir. No? You don't think it is a trick that is being played upon itself? It is so clear, there is no question about it. You are not sure? If you're

not sure, sir, please let's discuss, let's talk it over.

Q: You say sometimes to help society, to do social service, as if helping society or doing social service was doing something for somebody else. But I have the feeling that I'm not different from society, so working is a social thing, it is working in myself, it's all the same thing - I don't make a distinction.

K: But if you don't make the distinction - I'm not being personal, sir - I'm asking, we're asking, does the centre remain.

Q: It should not.

K: Not 'should not'. Then we enter into quite a different field - should, should not, must, must not - then it becomes theoretical. The actual fact is, though I recognise the 'me' and society are one, etc., etc., is there the centre still operating, the 'me' still operating, the 'me', the monkey that says, I'm - you follow? My question is, I see as long as there is any movement on the part of the monkey, that movement must lead to some kind of fragmentation, illusion and chaos. Put it round, much more, very simply - that centre is the self, is the selfishness that is always operating, whether I am godly, whether I am concerned completely with society and say, I am society - that centre, is it operating. If it is, then it is meaningless.

Then the next question is, how is that centre to fade away. Through determination, through will, through practice, through various forms of compulsive neurosis, compulsive - you know - dedication, identification? And all such movement is still part of the monkey. Right? Therefore consciousness is within the reach of the monkey. And the space within that consciousness is still within the arm's length of the monkey. And therefore no freedom.

So the mind says, I see this very clearly, seeing in the sense,

either as a perception, like seeing the microphone, without any condemnation, it just sees it. then what takes place. To see, to listen, to anything, there must be complete attention, mustn't there. If I want to understand what you are saying, I must give all my attention to it. In that attention, is the monkey operative, operating? Please find out. I want to listen to you. You are saying something important or unimportant - I want to find out. And to find out what you are saying, I must give my attention, which means my mind, my heart, my body, nerves, everything must be in harmony to attend. The mind not separate from the body, the heart not separate from the mind and so on - it must be a complete harmonious whole that is attentive, that is attention. Do I attend so - does the mind attend so completely with complete attention to the activity of the monkey, watching it, not condemning it, not saying it's right or wrong, this or that, just watching the monkey, tricks of the monkey.

And in this watching there is no analysis. This is really important, sirs, go into it, sirs, put your teeth into it. The moment it analyses one of the fragments of the monkey is in operation. So does the mind watch with such complete attention to all the movements of the monkey - we won't say all the movements - then you'll say, can it - to the movements of the monkey, and what takes place when there is such complete attention. You get the point? Are you doing it?

You know what it means to attend - when you are listening to that rain, completely, there is no resistance to the rain - you don't say, I wish it would go away, I want to find out, I want to learn - there is no impatience, there is no resistance against it, there is no -

you are completely listening. Now when you are so listening, is there a centre which the monkey is operating? You find out sir, don't wait for me to tell you - find out. It's raining now - all right. Are you listening to the speaker? Listening, which means complete attention. Are you? Which means you are not interpreting what he is saying, you are not agreeing or disagreeing, you are not comparing or translating what he is saying to suit your own particular mind. When all such activity takes place there is no attention. To completely attend means a mind that is completely still to listen. Are you doing that? Are you listening to the speaker now, just now, with that attention. If you are, is there a centre there?

Q: I feel passive.

K: I don't care whether you are passive, active - I said, sir, look don't - look, are you listening, listening being attentive. And in that attention is the monkey working. Don't say yes or no - find, learn about it. Is there? And what is the quality of that attention in which there is no centre, in which the monkey isn't playing tricks, the quality of it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't know, sir, don't put into words thoughtless, empty - find out, learn, which means, sustained attention, not a fleeting attention, a sustained attention to find out the quality of the mind that is so completely attentive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir - when you say it is not there to tell me, to communicate through words, then the mind, the memory is there. But I am asking, when you are so completely attentive, is there a

centre. Surely this is simple. Sir, when you are watching something that really is quite amusing, makes you laugh, is there a centre - something that interest you, you know, watching, not taking sides - when you are watching football, if you do, and if you are not taking the side of this or that, just watching - in that watching is there a centre which is the monkey? I can't answer any more. If there is no centre, then the question is, can this attention flow, move, not one moment, you follow, and then inattention. Can this attention flow, naturally, easily, without effort - effort implies the monkey comes into being. You are following all this?

The monkey has to come in if it has to do some functional work. But that operation on the part of the monkey, does it spring from attention, comes out of attention, or is that monkey separate from attention. I go - one goes to the office - going to the office and working in the office, is it a movement of attention or it is the movement of the monkey, which has taken over. The monkey that says, I must be better than - you know, I must get more money, I must work harder, I must compete, I must become the manager, foreman, whatever it is. I'll become the archbishop or the commissar - which is it in our life. Go into it, sir, which is it in your life, a movement of attention, and therefore much more efficient, much more alive; or is it the monkey that is taking over? Answer it, sir for yourself. And if the monkey takes over and makes some kind of mischief, you know, and monkeys do make a mischief - and can that mischief be wiped away and not leave a mark. Go on, sirs, you don't see all the beauty of all this.

Somebody said something to me yesterday - listen to this, follow it little bit - which was not true. Did the monkey come into

operation and want so say, look you're a liar? Or the movement of that attention in which the monkey is not operating and listens to something which is not true, that statement which is not true doesn't leave a mark. Get this, sir, for god's sake. When the monkey response then it leaves a mark.

So I am asking, can this attention flow, not how can I have continuous attention, because then it's the monkey that is asking. But is there a movement of attention all the time, I just follow it, the mind just moves with it. No, you must answer this really extraordinarily important question. We only know the movement of the monkey. And we only have occasionally this attention in which the monkey doesn't appear at all. Then the monkey says, I want that attention. Then it goes through - goes to Japan to meditate or India to sit some ugly feet and so on.

So we are asking, does this movement of attention, is it totally unrelated to consciousness, as we know it? Obviously it is - can you hear me? (noise of rain) All right, I'll wait.

We are asking whether this attention, as a movement, can flow, as all movements must flow. And when the monkey becomes active, can the monkey itself become aware that it is active and so not interfere with the flow of attention. Somebody insulted, yesterday. And the monkey was awake, to reply, and because it has become aware of itself and all the implications of the monkey tricks, it subsides and lets the attention flow. Not how to maintain the flow - this is really important. The moment you say, I must maintain it, it is the activity of the monkey. So the monkey know when it is active and the sensitivity of its awareness immediately makes it quiet.



Q: (Inaudible)

K: I haven't understood it, sir, I can't hear.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, attention means energy, the height of energy, isn't it? In attention all energy is there, non-fragmented. The moment it is fragmented and action takes place, then the monkey is at work. And when the monkey - and the monkey is also learning - has become sensitive, has become aware, and it realizes the waste of energy and therefore, naturally. It is not the monkey and attention. It is not division between the monkey and attention. If there is a division the attention then becomes the higher self, the, you know, all the tricks the monkeys have invented. But it is a total movement, attention. And unfortunately the monkey also has its own life, wakes up, its a total action not opposed to attention. I wonder if you get all this. Well, it's up to you, sir.

Now when there is no centre, when there is the complete apogee of attention, you know, the height of attention. In that height of attention there is - will you tell me what there is, what has happened to the mind that is so highly attentive, all the energy there, not a breath of it wasted. What takes place, what has happened? Oh, come on sirs, I am talking all the time.

Q: There is silence.

K: Oh no.

Q: There is no self-identification.

K: No, monkey tricks. What has happened, not only to the intellect, to the brain, but to the body? I have to talk - you don't learn. If the speaker doesn't come any more, dies, anything happens, what is going to happen, how are you going to learn.

Learn from another yogi? No, sir, therefore, learn now - learn.

What has happened to a mind that has become so highly attentive, in which all energy - what has happened to the quality of the intellect?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, you don't know - please don't guess.

Q: It becomes quieter.

K: Look sir - the brain which has been operating, working, which has invented the monkey - the brain. Please don't guess. Doesn't the brain become extraordinarily sensitive? And does your body - sir, when you have got such tremendous energy, unspoilt, unwasted, what has happened to the whole organism, what has happened to the brain, to the whole structure of the human being - that is what I am asking.

Q: It wakes up and it becomes alive. It learns.

K: No. Sir, it has become alive to learn, otherwise you can't learn. If you're asleep and say, well, I believe in this, my prejudice, I like my prejudice, it is marvellous, my conditioning - then you're asleep, you are not awake. But the moment you question, begin to learn you are alive, you are beginning to be alive. That is not my question. What has happened to the body, to the brain.

Q: Complete interaction.

K: I think I'll go home. (laughter)

Sir, have you noticed a very simple fact, that if you are not wasting energy, fiddling, if you are not wasting energy, what has happened? What has happened to the machinery of the brain, which is a purely mechanical thing, the brain - what has happened to that machinery?

Q: It's alive.

K: Tomorrow, sir! Please, do watch yourself, pay attention to something so completely, with your heart, with your body, with your mind, everything in you, every particle, every cell - attend to something, see what takes place.

Q: The centre is gone.

K: Yes, sir, but what has happened to the brain, I agree the centre doesn't exist but the body is there, the brain is there - what has happened to the brain?

Q: It rests.

K: Look, what is the function of the brain.

Q: Order.

K: No. Don't repeat after me, for god's sake. What is the brain - it has evolved in time, it is the storehouse of memory, it is matter, it is highly active, recognising, protecting, resisting, thinking, not thinking, frightened, seeking security and yet being uncertain - it is that brain with all its memories, not just yesterday's memories, centuries of memories, the racial memories, family memory, the tradition - all that, that is the content is there. Now what has happened to that brain when there is this extraordinary attention?

Q: It is new.

K; I don't want to be rude, but is your brain new? Or is it just a word you are saying.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, what has happened to this brain that has become so mechanical - don't say it's become not mechanical, that is mechanical, the brain is purely mechanical, responding to conditioning, responding according to its conditioning,

background, fears, etc., pleasure and so on, this mechanical brain, what has happened to it when there is no waste of energy at all?

Q: It is getting creative.

K: We'll leave it till tomorrow.

## **SAANEN 8TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 9TH AUGUST 1970**

This is the last discussion and if we may, shall we go on with where we left off yesterday. During the last four weeks that we have met here, four, five weeks, I forgot what, we have been discussing, talking over together the many problems that touch our lives, the many problems that we create for ourselves, and the society that creates for us.

And we also saw that the society and us are not two different entities - they are interrelated movement. And any person seriously concerned with the change of society, its patterns, its values, its morality, if he is not aware of his own conditioning, then if he is anxious, desirous, actively involved in social change, then this conditioning makes for fragmentation in action and therefore more conflict, more misery, more confusion. We went into that pretty thoroughly.

And we were discussing also what is fear and whether the mind can ever be free of this burden, completely and utterly, both superficially and deeply; and the nature of pleasure, which is entirely and wholly different from joy, from great delight. And also we went into the question of these many fragmentations which make up our structure, our being. And we saw in our discussion or learnt about it, not from me, not from the speaker, learnt in observing ourselves - that these fragmentations divide and keep separate all human relationship, and that one fragment assumes the authority and becomes the analyser, the censor over other fragments.

And yesterday we were talking over together the nature of consciousness. And in talking about it, we went into the question of attention, what is attention. And we said, this quality of attention is a state of mind in which all energy is there, highly concentrated, and in that attention there is no observer, there is not centre as the 'me' who is aware, attentive. We went into that.

Now we are going to, this morning, find out, learn together, what happens to a mind and to the brain - the brain, the mind, the whole being, that is the psychosomatic, both the body, the brain, the heart, the mind, the whole thing - what takes place when a mind is tremendously attentive. Now to understand that very clearly or find out, learn about it for oneself, one must first see that the description is not the described. One can describe the tent, this tent, with all the holes and everything involved, the tent. But the description is not the tent, the word is not the thing, and of that we must be absolutely clear from the beginning, that the explanation is not the explained, and to caught in description, in explanation, is the most childish form of living, which I'm afraid most of us do - we are satisfied with the description, with explanation, with saying, that is the cause and just float along. But whereas what we are going to do this morning is to find out for ourselves the quality of a mind, or what has happened to the mind - mind being the brain as well as the whole psychosomatic structure - what happens to the mind when there is this extraordinary attention, when there is no centre as this observer or as the censor.

To understand that, to really learn about it, not merely satisfied with the speaker's explanation of it, one has to find out, one has to begin with the understanding of 'what is', 'what is', not 'what should

be' or 'what has been', but 'what is'. Please go with me - let's travel together - it is great fun if we move together, in learning. Because obviously there must be tremendous changes in the world and in ourselves. Obviously the ways of our thought and our action have become so utterly immature, so contradictory, so diabolical, if one can say so. You invent a machine to kill and then there is an anti-machine to kill that machine - anti, anti, anti - that's what they are doing in the world, not only socially but also mechanically.

And a mind that is really concerned, involved in the seriousness of psychological as well as outward change, must go into this problem of the human being with his consciousness, with his despair, with his appalling fears, with his ambitions, with his anxieties, with his desire to fulfil in some form or another. So to understand all this, and we cannot go back to begin all over again, because we have been through it, we must begin with seeing 'what is'. 'What is', is not only what is in front of you but what is beyond. To see what is in front of you, you must have a very clear perception, uncontaminated, not prejudiced, not involved in the desire to go beyond it, but just to observe it, not only to observe 'what is' but 'what has been', which is also 'what is'. The 'what is', is the past, is the present and is the future. Do see that thing. So the 'what is' is not static, it's a movement. And to keep with that movement, with the movement of 'what is', you need to have a very clear mind, you need to have unprejudiced, not distorted mind.

That means, there is distortion the moment there is an effort. I can't see 'what is' and go beyond it, the mind can't see it, if the mind is in any way concerned with the change of 'what is', or trying to go beyond it, or trying to suppress it.

And to observe 'what is' you need energy. To observe attentively to anything you need energy. To listen to what you are saying, I need energy - that is, I need energy when I really, desperately want to understand what you are saying. But if I am not interested but casually listen, you know - that is a very slight energy that soon dissipates. So to understand 'what is' you need energy. Now, these fragmentations of which we are, are the division of these energies. I and the not I, anger and the not anger, violence and the not violence, they are all fragmentations of energy. And when one fragment assumes the authority over the other fragments, it is an energy that functions in fragments. Are we meeting each other - are we communicating? That means, communication means, learning together, working together, creating together, seeing together, understanding together, not just, I speak and you listen, and say, well, intellectually I grasp it, that is not understanding. The whole thing is a movement in learning, and therefore in action.

So the mind sees that all fragmentations, as nation, not nation, my god, your god, my belief and your belief, is fragmentation of energy - there is only energy and fragmentation. This energy is fragmented by thought. And thought is the way of conditioning, which we have gone into and won't go into now, because we must move further.

So consciousness is the totality of these fragmentations of energy. And we said, this fragmentation of energy, one of that fragmentations is the observer, is the 'me', is the monkey, that is incessantly active. Bearing in mind, the description is not the described, that you are watching yourself, watching yourself



through the words of the speaker. But the words are not the thing. Therefore the speaker becomes of very little importance. What becomes important is your observation of yourself, how this energy has been fragmented - jealousy, non jealousy, hate - you know.

Now to see that, which is 'what is', can you see that without the, without the fragment, as the observer? Can the mind see these many fragmentations which make up the whole of consciousness, and these fragmentations are the fragmentations of energy - energy - can the mind see this without an observer who is part of the many fragments. Because this is important to understand this: when we are talking of attention, if the mind cannot see the many fragments without, or through the eyes of another fragment, then you will never understand what is attention. Are we meeting each other? Do say please, are we meeting each other?

I see, the mind sees what fragmentation does, outwardly and inwardly: outwardly, sovereign governments, with arms and all the rest of it; outwardly the division of nationalities, beliefs, religious dogmas, division, my god, your god, my belief - outwardly. In social action, division, political action, division, the Labour Party, the Conservative, the Communist, non Communist, Socialist, the Capitalist - all created with the desire of thought which says, I must be secure. Thought thinks it will be secure through fragmentation, and so creates more fragmentations. Do you see this, not verbally, not actually, as a fact - the young the old, the rich - this constant division, death and living - do you see this movement of fragmentation by thought which is caught in the conditioning of these fragmentations - does the mind see this whole movement of fragmentation, without a centre which says, I see them? Because

the moment you have a centre, that centre becomes the factor of division. Me and not me, which is you - please. And thought has put together this me. Through the desire or through the impulse to find security, safety. And in its desire to find safety it has divided energy as the 'me' and the not 'me'. And therefore bringing to itself insecurity.

Now can the mind see this as a whole? And it cannot see it as a whole if there is a fragmentation which observes. We are asking, what is the quality of the mind that is highly attentive, in which there is no fragmentation. That is what we left off yesterday, where we left off. What is the quality of the mind. I don't know if you have gone through it, enquired, or learned from yesterday, and the speaker is not a professor teaching you or giving you information. But to find that out, there must be no fragmentation, obviously, which means no effort - effort means distortion, and a mind, as most of our minds are distorted, you cannot possibly understand what it is to be completely attentive and find out what has happened to a mind that is so utterly aware, utterly attentive.

There is a difference between security and stability. It is the monkey, which we said yesterday, which is the everlasting me with its thoughts, with its problems, with its anxieties, fears and so on, this restless thought, monkey, is always seeking security, because it is afraid to be uncertain, uncertain in its activity, in its thoughts, in its relationship - it wants everything mechanical, which is, security. So it translates security in terms of mechanical certainty. I don't know if you follow all this.

Now, is stability different, not opposite, entirely different, different dimension from security? We have to understand this. A

mind that is restless, and seeking in that restlessness security, can never find stability, to be stable. Firm - firm is not the word - to be, you know, unshakeable, immovable, and yet it has the quality of great mobility. And the mind that is seeking security cannot be, cannot be stable in the sense, mobile, swift and yet immensely immovable. You see the difference? Now which is it you are doing, you, not the speaker - which is it you are doing in your life, in your everyday life - is thought the monkey, seeking in its restlessness, security and not finding it in one direction, it goes off in another direction, which is the movement of restlessness. And in this restlessness, it wants to find security. You see the point of this? Therefore it can never find it. It can say, well, there is god which is still the invention of thought, the image of thought, the image brought about through centuries of conditioning, of propaganda as thought, conditioned, in the Communist world says, there is not such thing, don't be absurd. Which is equally conditioning.

So what is it that you are doing? Seeking security in your restlessness? You know, security is one of the most curious things, the desire to be secure. And that security must be recognized by the world. You understand - I don't know if you see this. I write a book and I find in the book my security. But that book must be recognized by the world, otherwise there is no security. So look what I've done. My security lies in the opinion of the world. Oh, my books sell by the thousand. And I have created the value of the world. I am really, in seeking security through a book, through whatever it is, depending on the world, the world which I have created, which means I am deceiving myself constantly. Right? Oh, if you saw this.

Q: Yes.

K: So the desire for thought to be secure is the way of uncertainty, is the way of insecurity. Now, when the mind is completely attentive, in which there is no centre, what has happened to the mind that is so intensely aware - is there in it security? You understand my question? In it, is there any sense of restlessness - no, don't please agree - this is a tremendous thing to find out, because we want to go beyond this. You see, sir, most of us are seeking a solution for the misery of the world, a solution for the social morality, which is immoral, we are trying to find out a way of organizing society in which there will be no social injustice, where man has sought god, truth, whatever it is, through centuries, and never coming upon it, but believing in it - and when you believe in it you naturally have experiences of your belief, which are false. I don't know if you are following all this.

So man in his restlessness, in his desire for safety, security, to feel at ease, has all these imaginary securities, invented, projected by thought. Now when you become aware of all this fragmentation of energy, therefore no fragmentation at all of energy, what has taken place in the mind that has sought security, because it was restless, it was moving from one fear to another? You have understood my question? Please, have I made the question clear? No?

Q: Yes.

K: Is it verbally clear even, intellectually? Then what do you do, what is your answer?

Q: It is no longer isolated, there is no fear.

K: The gentleman says, it is not isolated, there is no fear - sir,

look, we've been through all this - sir, your question, unless it is so with you, don't say anything, because it has no meaning. You can invent, you can say, I feel this - but if you are really serious, you want to learn about it, then you have to go into it, it is your vocation, it is your life - not just this morning. You know, as we were coming down, going through the village, all the people were going to the church - weekend religion. And this is not a weekend religion. This is a way of life, a way of living, a way of living in which this energy is not broken up - if you once understood this thing, you'll have an extraordinary sense of action.

Now let's go on.

Q: Sir, do you say, what do you do with the monkey within us.

K: No, sir, I did not say that - I said, where are you.

Q: Right. If you want to solve the question...

K: No, I am only putting the question, sir, don't pick me up over words - I am only putting that question to see where you are.

Q; (Inaudible)

K: Yes. So there is one of the fragments, that is actually 'what is', one of the fragments of this broken up energy, knowing, being aware - no, I won't use the word aware or knowing - one of these fragments, restlessly seeking security - that is what we are all doing. And that restlessness and this constant search, constant enquiry, constant putting this away, taking that up, going joining this society, then taking that society, you know, the monkey goes on endlessly, all that indicates a mind that is pursuing a way of life in which it is only concerned with security.

Now when that is seen very clearly, then what is the mind - what has happened to the mind that is no longer concerned with

security? I'm putting the question differently. What has happened to it? Obviously it has no fear - that's a very trivial matter - it becomes very trivial when you see how thought has fragmented the energy, or fragmented itself, and because of this fragmentation there is fear. And when you see the activity of thought in its fragmentation, then fear, you meet it, you act. So we are asking, what has happened to the mind that has become extraordinarily attentive. Is there any movement of search at all. Please, find out.

Q: Mechanical activity stops completely.

K: Mechanical activity stops completely. You understand what I'm saying, my question? When you are so attentive, is the mind still seeking? Seeking experience, seeking to understand itself, seeking to go beyond itself, seeking to find out right action, wrong action, seeking a permanency on which it can depend, permanency in relationship, or in belief or in some conclusion, is that still going on when you are so completely aware?

Q: The mind does not seek anything any longer.

K: The mind does not seek anything any longer. You know what that means, when you make a statement of that kind, so easily - do listen to this. Not seeking anything, which means what?

Q: It is ready to receive something new.

K: It is ready to receive something new.

Q: That it cannot imagine.

K: That it cannot imagine. No, madam, you have not understood. No, no, my question is this - you don't know what you are all saying - my question is: the mind has seen the activity of the monkey in its restlessness. This activity, which is still energy, thought has broken it up, in its desire to find a permanency,

security, a certainty, a safety. And so it has divided the world, as the 'me' and the not 'me', 'we' and 'they', seeking truth as a way of security. And the mind, one has observed all this and is the mind any more seeking anything at all? You understand, seeking implies restlessness - I haven't found it here and I go there and I haven't found it there and I go there.

Q: The mind without a centre is not concerned with searching.

K: A mind which is without a centre is not concerned with search. But is it taking place, with you.

Q: At the moment you are attentive, it is taking place.

K: No, sir.

Q: What happens to the mind when it stops striving?

K: Have you ever known, walking or sitting quietly, what it means to be completely empty, not isolated, not withdraw, not building a wall around yourself and finding yourself, have no relationship with anything - I don't mean that. When the mind is completely empty, not that it has no memory, the memories are there, because you are walking to your house, or going to your office - memory. But the emptiness of a mind that has finished with all the movement of search.

Q: All is and I am.

K: All is and I am. What is 'I am'? Who is 'I am'? Who is this I that says 'am'?

Q: Monkey.

K: Monkey? That somebody suggest. What is the I - do look at it - what am I? Don't repeat what the propagandists have said, what the religions have said, what the psychologists have said - what am I? What are you? Who says, I am - the Italian, the French, the

Russian, the beliefs, the dogma, the fears, the past, the seeker, and the one who seeks, finds, identified with the house, with the husband, with the money, with the name, the family, which is all what? Words. No? No, you don't see this. But sir, if you see this, that you are a bundle of memories and words, the restless monkey comes to an end.

Q: Why, if your mind is completely empty when you are walking to the office, are you walking to the office?

K: No, sir.

Q: Well, why are you still doing this?

K: You have to earn a livelihood, you have to go to your home, you're going out of this tent.

Q: Forget about going to your office, maybe.

K: You may give it up, I'm not - don't bring in the office.

Q: Surely the question is, how can I be empty if the memory is there operating - this is the question.

K: Sir...

Q: It is split, part of the mind is empty and another part not.

K: No, not at all.

Q: The mind becomes energy.

K: I give it up - I'll go home if you're not careful.

Q: No, no, stay here.

K: Now look, sir, because I want to convey something to you, I want to communicate something to you, about something, and you are throwing words at me - I want to tell you a very simple thing: there is no such thing as security, this restless demand for security is the part of the observer, the centre, the monkey. And this restless monkey, which is thought, has broken up this world and has made



a frightful mess of this world, it has brought such misery, such agony. And, thought cannot solve this, however intelligent, however, clever, however erudite, however capable of efficient thinking, it cannot, thought cannot possibly bring order out of this chaos. There must be a way out of it, which is not thought" that's what I want to convey to you, which is, in that state of attention, in that movement of attention, all sense of security has gone because there is stability. That stability has nothing whatsoever to do with security - when thought seeks security it makes it into something permanent, immovable, and therefore it becomes mechanical. Thought seeks security in relationship, in relationship. Thought creates in that relationship an image. And that image becomes the permanent. And that image breaks up relationship, you have your image and I have mine. In that image thought has established identified itself as the permanent thing.

And outwardly this is what we have done. Your country, my country - god - all that silly stuff. Now when the mind has left all that, left it in the sense it has seen it, has seen the utter futility, the mischief, use any word, it has finished with it. Then what takes place in the mind which is so completely finished with the whole concept of security, what happens to that mind which is so attentive? I'm pointing out to you, description is not the described - that it is completely stable.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What madame?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The others have disappeared? What are you saying, madame, I can't understand?

Q: (In French)

K: It is finished, madame, there is nothing more to say. I am asking you - if you say that is so, then that there is nothing more to be said. I am asking myself, and therefore you are asking yourself, when the mind, when thought is no longer seeking security in any form, and sees that there is no such thing as the permanent, the mind - see the importance of this, sir - the brain evolving, growing, remembering, with the idea of being completely secure. All right? You are following this? The mind, the brain wants security, otherwise it can't function, it will function illogically, neurotically, inefficiently, therefore the brain is always wanting order. And it has translated having order in terms of security. And if that brain is still functioning, it is still seeking order through security. So when there is attention, is the brain still seeking security. Don't answer me.

Q: Sir, there is only the present.

K: He says, there is only the present. Sir, I am trying to convey something to you. I may be totally wrong. I may be talking complete nonsense but you have to find out for yourself if I am talking nonsense.

Q: I get the sensation that at the moment I am attentive, I am not seeking. But attention may cease, then I am seeking again.

K: Never - that's the whole point. If thought sees that there is no such thing as permanency, sees it, thought will never seek it again. Which is, the brain, with its memories of security, with its cultivation in society, depending on security, all its ideas based on security, its morality based on security, that brain, has it become so completely empty of all movements towards security. Don't answer

me.

K: Sir, have you ever gone into this question of meditation, any of you? Meditation is not concerned with meditation but with the meditator - you see the difference. Most of you are concerned about meditation, what to do about meditation, how to meditate, step by step and all the rest of it - that is not the question at all. Meditator is the meditation. To understand the meditator is meditation.

Now if you have gone into this question of meditation, the meditator must come to an end, obviously, by understanding, not by suppressing, not by killing the thought - by understanding, which is, understanding himself is to understand the movement of thought, thought being the movement of the brain, with all its memories. And the movement of thought seeking security and all the rest of it.

Now the meditator is asking, can this brain become completely quiet, which is thought be completely still, and yet out of this stillness thought operates and not as an end in itself. Probably it's all too terribly complicated to you - it's really quite simple.

So, the mind that is highly attentive, has no fragmentation of energy - please see that, there is no fragmentation of energy, it is complete energy. And that energy operates when you go to the office without fragmentation. Right?

Q: May be a real understanding could be realized without the help of the word, it's a kind of direct contact with the thing you are trying to understand.

K: You can understand without the word by getting directly into contact.

Q: And consequently there is no need for words which are an escape.

K: That's it. Can you communicate without words.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait. (laughter) Without words because words hinder. Look sir, can I communicate with you without the word, of the quality of the mind that is so extraordinarily attentive and yet function in the world without breaking the energy into fragments? You've understood my question?

Q: Yes.

K: Now, can I communicate that to you without the word? Can I?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? I can? How do you know I can? What are you all talking about?

Q: I think you can.

K: Look, I have talked for nearly three weeks, explained everything, gone into it in detail, poured one's heart into it - have you understood it? Verbally, even. And you want to understand something non-verbally. Which means - it can be done, if your mind is in contact with the speaker with the same intensity, with the same passion, at the same time, at the same level, you will communicate. Are you? Now listen to that train, listen to it. Now without the word, communication has been established, because we are both of us listening to the rattle of that train, at the same moment, with the same intensity, with the same passion.

Now, only then there is direct communion. Right? Are you intense about this, at the same time as the speaker, you know, all

the rest of it - are you? Of course not. Sir, when you hold a hand of another, you can hold it out of habit or of custom. Or you can hold it and communication can take place without a word, because both are at the given moment intense, communication has taken place, without a word. But we are not intense, passionate, concerned.

Q: Not all the time.

K: Not all the time - don't say that, even for a minute.

Q: How do you know?

K: I don't know. If you are, then you will know what it means to be aware, attentive, and therefore no longer seeking security, therefore no longer acting or thinking in terms of fragmentation. So, sir, look what has happened to a mind that has gone through all the things we have been talking about, all the discussions, exchange of words, what has happened to the mind that has really listened to this?

First of all, it has become sensitive, not only mentally but physically - given up smoking, drinking, drugs, down that drain that goes by, which is called a river. And when we have discussed, talked over this question of attention, you will see that the mind is no longer seeking anything at all, or asserting anything. And such a mind is completely mobile and yet wholly stable.

Now out of that stability and sensitivity it can act, without creating, without breaking up life into fragments, or energy into fragments. Now, such a mind - what does it find, apart from action, apart from stability and all the rest, what is there? You understand? Man has always sought what he considered god, truth, always striven after it, out of fear out of his hopelessness, out of his despair, disaster, death, he has sought it. And thought he found it.

And the discovery of that he began to organize. And, you remember that famous story - the devil and his friend were walking one day down the street and they saw a man in front of them pick up something very shiny. And the man looked at it in great delight, ecstasy. And the friend of the devil asked, what was that, what did he pick up. Oh, he said, the devil said, oh, it is part of the truth. And the friend says, then it's a very bad business for you, if a man has found truth on a pavement, it's very bad business, you will have no place. He said, not at all my friend, I'm going to help him to organize it. Right?

So sir, that which is stable, highly mobile, sensitive, is not asking, it sees something which has never been found, which means, time for such a mind doesn't exist at all - which doesn't mean he's going to miss the train. Therefore there is a state which is timeless and therefore incredibly vast.

Now, sir, I can go into it, which is something really most marvellous if you come upon it, but the description is not the described. It's for you to learn all this by looking at yourself - no book, no teacher can teach you about all this - don't depend on anyone, don't join anything, spiritual organizations, you understand, not physical organizations.

So one has to learn all this out of oneself. And in there the mind will discover things that are incredible. But for that there must be no fragmentation, and therefore immense stability, swiftness, mobility. And to that mind there is no time and therefore this whole concept of death and living have quite a different meaning.

Q: Would it be of any use for such a mind to make an attempt to communicate? It's impossible, even for a minute.

K: Finished, we have finished talking. It is time - what is the time, sir?

Q: Quarter to one.

K: I hope you'll have a nice journey.

Q: Thank you.

**SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, CALIFORNIA  
1ST PUBLIC TALK 5TH APRIL, 1970 'THE  
HUMAN CONDITION'**

May I also take my coat off - thank you so much. I would like to talk about so many things, because wherever one goes, Europe, India, Australia or America, one finds more or less the same human problems. Most human beings in the world are so confused and living a contradictory life; they are thoroughly unhappy, utterly miserable and in a great deal of sorrow. And one's life seems to be a battlefield, from the moment you're born till you die. One finds, right through the world, division, nationalistic, linguistic, religious differences, one sect opposed to another, one way against another, each saying its way is the best and the only one and so on. There is division, conflict and war. There is division as the business world, the spiritual world, the religious world, the scientific world, or the professorial, college world.

Seeing all this division, this utter chaos, and a great deal of misery, one wonders - and I'm sure you do too - what is one to do, what course of action to be followed, the left, the centre or the right. Or is it a course of action dictated by some ideology, some belief, some authoritarian dictum; or must one follow a course of action that doesn't depend on any authority whatsoever, neither the left, the centre, nor the right, nor any guru, any teacher, any priest, or for any organized religion, Catholic, Protestant, what you will, but follow one's own inclination, tendency; or follow one's own experience and knowledge, self-reliant, confident and purposeful.

There is so much contradiction, not only outwardly but also



inwardly. And what is one to do? I'm sure you must have asked this question many times - the more serious one is the more earnest, not seeking entertainment, one must really deeply ask this question, confront it, by a world that is so chaotic, contradictory, divided, knowing very well that one has lost faith, having no trust in anybody, no teacher, no professor, no priest or authoritarian Utopia.

If you are at all serious, and I hope you are at least for this afternoon, you must have not only asked such a question of yourself, but also have found a responding answer to the challenge: what is one to do, not having faith in another, not be dependent on some saviour, some teacher, some authority, then where are you to look for light, for an understanding? And if one's action, and life is inevitably a continuous movement of action, the very living, what is one to do?

This meeting, and the subsequent ones are not a philosophical entertainment, nor a religious amusement, and in no way a philosophical examination of life. We're not here - at least I am not - to be entertained by you or by my own particular ideas. What we are trying to do is to find out for ourselves, confronted with this extraordinary problem of living, with all its contradictions and complexities, what is the course of action which will not be contradictory, which will be whole, complete, which will not produce more agonies, more mischief, more confusion.

And to find that out is our problem - and I think that is the only problem in life: an action that is not broken up, that is not contradictory, that is continuous, whole, complete and total, so that it doesn't bring more sorrow, more confusion. And if you will, we

will go together into this question, bearing in mind that the speaker has no authority whatsoever, because both of us are going to examine, observe, this phenomenon called life, living. And find out the truth of the matter, if there is an action, a way of living, not at odd moments or in a great crisis but every day, every minute, a way of living in which there is joy, there is no violence, no brutality, no contradiction, and obviously no imitation and dependency.

Unless we find such a way of living, not an abstract idea, a philosophical concept, a theory, but rather an actual way of living, whether there can be an action so complete, so whole, so completely non-contradictory. And I feel to live that way is the only religious way, none other. We are using the word religious not in the accepted sense of that word, which is to believe in something, believe in God or no God, or believe in some conceptual ideation - we are using that word as a way of life in which every action is whole, complete and full of ecstasy. We're going to go into that.

First of all, to understand all this, we must establish right relationship between us, between you and the speaker. He is not teaching you, in the ordinary sense of that word, telling you what to do. The word teach is to give information, to make one understand, to point out, to inform. And one can teach mathematics, give you some scientific information. But here there is no teacher, and we really mean it, because each one of us has to be his own teacher and his own disciple. And this is a very serious matter. So that you are listening with quite a different attitude, you're listening to the speaker, to the words he is using, and

understanding those words, watching through those words all your own reactions and responses and conditioning, so that you yourself, through your own observation, learn, so the speaker becomes a mirror in which you are observing yourself.

So our relationship, between you and the speaker, is of a basic communication, communication being sharing together, understanding together, working together - that is what the word 'communication' means, to commune. Please do bear that in mind right through the talks or whatever the thing is called that's going to take place the next four days here, that we are sharing together, which means you are working as much as the speaker, you're observing, listening. And to observe and to listen needs no agreement or disagreement, because we are not dealing with theories and ideas, but listening to discover, to understand ourselves. For we are the world, whether you live in this marvellous country, lovely sunshine, hills and the beauty of the land, prosperous, brutal, violent, belonging to this group or that group. with one teacher or a dozen teachers, so-called spiritual teachers, you are like anybody else in Europe or America, or in India, we are human beings, not labels. The problems that they have in India, where there is an explosion of population which is quite incredible, poverty is something unimaginable, the decay, the violence, the brutality, the beauty of the land, the light - the people there are the same as here with the same agonizing problems, with the sorrows that seem to have no end.

So we are dealing, not with an Asiatic philosophy or exotic religion, or inventing some significance, giving a meaning to life, we can leave all that to the intellectuals - they can invent all the

significance and meaning to life because they themselves see the utter meaninglessness of this living. So, seeing all that, not as a theory, not something that is extraneous to you, but actually, that is your life, your daily contradiction, your daily battle, your daily irritations, anger, hatred, brutality.

And to see if all that can end, so that we can live quite a different kind of life, a life that is free, a life that doesn't bring through action, misery, a life that is really, completely, totally peaceful. So one asks, observing all this, what is one to do, knowing that you are the society, and the society is you - you are the world and the world is you, which is not just an idea but a fact. You have created this world, by your greed, anger, ambition, competition, violence, inwardly you are that; and outwardly your wars, all these divisions, the black and the white and the pink and the blue and all the rest of it - prejudice, antagonism, brutality. We know this. Either you know it as an idea or you know it actually. You know it through a magazine, through a newspaper, or somebody has told you. Or you have observed it in yourself, you have seen it in yourself, completely, and therefore there is no need for another to tell you what the world is like, you don't have to read a single newspaper, a magazine or listen to any talk, if you know for yourself what you are.

Realizing what you are, then the question is entirely different, the question what to do, because one realizes what one is - one is confused, as the world is, one lives in contradiction, in division, as the world is. And without understanding oneself, not only at the conscious level but also very deeply, very profoundly, unless there is this understanding, not according to some analyst, Freud, Jung,

or your own particular pet analyst, but to understand yourself as you are. And in the understanding of that the question of what you are to do becomes entirely different, because now you are putting the question in relation to the world as though it were something outside of you: to what political party you should join, to what group, the pacifist and so on, to what group, what section.

So you are putting the world as something outside of you. But when one realizes, not verbally, not as an idea, but actually - when one realizes that one is the world, and one's responsibility to the world is the responsibility of understanding yourself so completely. And then your question what to do has quite a different meaning. So the question is, how to observe, how to observe oneself, oneself being the total human being. You are not an American, though you may have the label as the American. And a man coming from India may call himself an Indian, with his particular label, with his particular superstitions and beliefs. But when you scratch or push aside all that, these are ordinary human beings like you and me, like dozens of others.

So the question is, how do you observe yourself, because without knowing yourself, who is the world, not an individual - the word 'individual' means a total entity, indivisible. And individual means a human being in whom there is no contradiction, no division, no separation, is a total unit, harmonious unit. That is, that word the individual means that, indivisible. So you are not individuals, you are all broken up, contradictory in yourself.

So, how are you to look at yourself - please do listen to this, it is quite absorbing. It demands a great deal of intelligence, it is great fun, much more fun than any book, than any religious

entertainment, than any philosophy. As we are broken up human beings in ourselves, contradictory desires, feeling inferior or superior, being afraid, having no love, feeling lonely, fragmented, not only superficially but deeply - how are you to observe? One fragment observes the rest of the fragments? One becoming the censor, the examiner, the observer, watching over the rest of the fragments? And what gives him the authority over the other fragments? I hope the speaker is making himself clear; unless you understand this really, what we are going to discuss during the rest of the talks you won't be able to follow at all.

So the question is, who is the observer and who is the censor that says, this I will do, this I won't do, this is right and this is wrong, this path I will take and I won't tread that path, I'll be a pacifist with regard to this war but I've other favourite wars, I will follow this leader and not that leader, I believe in this and not in that, I will hold this prejudice and reject that, knowing, if you have observed yourself, that you are a fragmented human being? And therefore, being fragmented, contradictory, living in constant conflict, and knowing this conflict, one fragment of this many, many fragments, takes charge, becomes the authority, the censor, and his observation must inevitably be contradictory. I hope you're following all this. If one fragment, one part of you assumes the authority of the analyser over the other fragments, why has he assumed that authority, and can he, one fragment, analyse the rest of the other fragments? You are following all this?

See how dreadfully complex it has all become. Whether you are analysed by a professional or you analyse yourself, it is still the same pattern. So it is very important to find out how to observe,

how to observe all these many contradictions which make up our life, how to observe the whole of those fragments without another fragment taking place. Is this question clear? Do please find out. Perhaps at the end of this afternoon's talk, you can ask questions. But this is very important to find out, because as long as there is contradiction, division, in oneself, there must be conflict, there must be violence, which expresses itself in the world outside, in society. And as long as this fragmentation exists within one, there can be no peace. And a man who really, deeply wants to understand and live a peaceful life, a life of love, must understand this question completely. Therefore it is a very serious matter, not just an afternoon's listening to a few words - we are dealing with the whole problem of existence. And it is only the mind that can give serious attention to this, that is able to resolve it. So it is very important, imperative that one understands this question.

How do you observe? Do you observe yourself as an outsider, as a censor, saying, this is right, this is wrong, justifying, condemning, approving, storing up? And if you do, there is contradiction and therefore conflict and therefore violence.

So how do you observe? How do you observe, not only yourself but the world about you? How do you observe the birds, the trees, the animals, the flowers - how do you look at them? Are you, the observer, separate from the thing you observe? Do please go into this with the speaker, take a little time, give some attention, because you will see if we can communicate together, which is share together, understand together, then you will see, at the end of these talks, that your whole outlook on life will be entirely different, if you understand this one fundamental question.

How do you observe? Do you observe through an image? When you observe a tree, do you observe with knowledge of that tree, the knowledge that separates you from that tree, divides you, brings about a space between you and the tree? How do you observe? How do you observe your wife and your husband or your girl or boy, how do you observe them? Watch yourself, sir, please do it as we are talking, don't make notes, don't fiddle around with a tape-recorder, but watch it. How do you look at another? Don't you look at another through the image you have built about the other, the image that you have been building for many years or perhaps two days? And the image becomes the observer. So the image, or through the image you look. So the censor, the observer, is one of the fragments and that censor has an image of what is right and what is wrong, what should be done and what should not be done, because he is still functioning as a fragment.

So the question from this arises, whether one can observe without any fragment, to see you, see oneself, see the world, without fragmentation at all. And what brings about fragmentation? Not only in oneself but also in the world of which one is - what brings it about, why is one fragmented, why are there contradictory desires? Right?

Now, why is one violent, which is part of contradiction? There may be causes why human beings are violent - lack of physical space; human beings were evolved from the animal and the animals are very aggressive; and people love being aggressive - feeling inferior and they want to be superior and so on. There are many causes. And most of us spend our time discussing the causes, explaining the causes; each professor, each specialist, each writer,



according to his conditioning, explains the causes - volumes are written why human beings are violent. But at the end of the volumes human beings still remain violent.

So the description is not the described, and therefore is of very little value. You know why you are violent very well, you haven't got to spend years trying to find out the cause of your violence, which is such a waste of time. But to observe violence as it is, without the censor, who then separates himself from the fact that he is violent. Are we meeting each other? Are we communicating with each other? I am not sure.

Look, sirs, this is very, very important to understand. So let's go into it a little more. Let's suppose I am violent - anger, jealousy, brutality, driving ambition that brings about competition. And I'm always measuring myself against somebody else. And this comparison makes me feel I'm inferior to you who are superior. So there is a battle, violence, and all that. Then I say to myself, I must get rid of this, I want to live at peace, though I've lived for thousands and thousands of years as a human being, there must be a change, there must be change in society, however rotten it is, and it is. So I'll plunge into social work and therefore forget myself. And the social work and the society is me. So I am escaping from myself. And realizing all the tricks the mind plays upon itself, now, I look at myself, I am violent.

And how do I look at that violence? As a censor who condemns violence? Or justifies violence? Or one who is not capable of dealing with that violence, therefore escapes from it? How do I look at myself, how do I look at that violence? Please do it. Are you looking at it as an observer who is different from violence?

The observer who is separate, who condemns, justifies and says, this is right, and so on. The observer looks at the violence, separates himself from violence and condemns it. Or is the observer the observed? You are following? The observer recognizes violence and separates himself in order to do something about it. But the separation is one of the tricks of thought. So the observer is the observed, is the violence. So long as there is a division between the observer and the observed there must be violence. Right?

So when I realize that, not verbally, realize with my heart, with my mind, with my whole being, then what takes place? You understand my question? You know, when you observe anything, there is always not only physical separation, distance, space, there is also the desire to identify yourself with that which is beautiful, noble, and not identify yourself with that which is not. So identification is part of the trick of a mind that has separated itself as the censor, and is now trying to identify. But whereas when the observer becomes aware that he is part of the observed, and he is, and therefore no image between the observer and the observed, then you will find that conflict completely comes to an end.

This is real meditation, this is not just a trick. Therefore it is very important, imperative, that one understands oneself, deeply, understands all the responses, the conditioning, the various temperaments, characteristics, tendencies - just to watch, without the observer. We are meeting now? To observe without the observer. And that is the act of learning. And so that is the act, that is the action.

Now there is a difficulty in this. One is observing oneself. One

wants to learn about oneself - the more you discover, the more you understand, the greater the freedom. I am using the word 'more' purposely for the moment - 'the more' is a comparative evaluation. I want to understand myself, learn about myself. In observing myself - please do this as the speaker is going into it, do it actually, don't take it home and think about it, do it now. This is not a group therapy or a confessional or all that nonsense, but watch yourself as we are working together.

I want to learn about myself. And myself is a living movement - each desire contradicts the other, they are living, moving, they're vital. And I observe and through that observation I've learnt. With what I have learnt I am going to look next minute. Right? You follow this? I am going to look, observe with the knowledge which I have gathered through previous observation. Am I learning, is there learning then? Because when the mind observes with an accumulated knowledge of its examination from its examination, that knowledge is preventing perception, that knowledge is preventing the freedom to look. See the difficulty.

So can the mind observe without accumulation? And the accumulation is the observer, is the censor, is the conditioned entity. Therefore, to look without accumulation, that is, sir, look: someone flatters you, says how nice you are, how beautiful you are, how very intelligent. or how stupid you are. Now can you listen to what he is saying, that you are stupid or very clever or very this or very that, can you listen without accumulation? That is, without accumulating the insult or the flattery, because if you listen with accumulation then he becomes your enemy, or your friend, therefore that listening and how you listen creates the image. And

that image separates, and that image is the cause of conflict - the image that you have about the Communist and the bourgeois, the image you have about the Catholic, if you are a Protestant. And a Catholic has the image about the Protestant. The image you have about your husband or your wife or your boy, whatever it is. You believe, another does not believe, so there is contradiction.

So can you observe without separation? Can you observe at the moment of violence, at the moment of your anger, without the censor? See how difficult it becomes if you are not aware at that moment. If you are not aware at that moment you already created the image.

So to observe the clouds, the beauty of it, the light of it, to observe the lovely hills in this country, to observe the light on the water - just to observe without naming it, because that, the naming, the knowledge, the experience prevents you, prevents the mind from observing totally. So when the mind can look without the observer, all fragments come to an end in oneself. And this is really very important to grasp, to understand. And this cannot be taught by another, it comes through your observation of yourself, watching all the time. You know, it's great fun if you don't condemn or justify but watch 'what is', not only what is politically - all the chicanery of the politician - what is of all the religious dogmas, structure and the superstitions, just watch it, in yourself and outside of yourself. Such a mind that watches it becomes extraordinarily sensitive, alive, because it is not breeding conflict.

Then we can go into the question of fear - fear, what love is, what death is. But without understanding this fundamental thing, mere enquiry, exploration of fear remains unsolved.

So I will stop. Perhaps now you will ask, if you are willing questions on what we have talked about. And one of the things about questioning is that you must ask the right question. And to ask the right question is quite difficult. But we must ask, not only of ourselves but of everybody who can think, ask. But we must have doubt, be sceptical. And also know when we should not be sceptical. It is like a dog on a leash, you must know when to let it go and also when to hold it. But most of us are even afraid to ask questions of ourselves primarily, and of another, because in that very asking the question, we expose ourselves to ourselves. And we would rather not be exposed to ourselves. So that is one of the causes of fear.

All this doesn't indicate that the speaker is preventing you from asking questions.

Q: When the observed becomes the observer, how do you remove the contradiction or the conflict?

K: The question is, when the observer becomes the observed - please listen to the question - when the observer becomes the observed, how does contradiction disappear? We never said that the observer becomes the observed. The observer observing the tree doesn't become the tree - God forbid! But when the observer understands the structure and nature of himself, then he observes without division, then there is observation without the observer. Is that clear?

Sir, look, the moment I try to identify with something, there is division already, otherwise I wouldn't identify myself with something. Because there is division, because there is space, because there is contradiction, and quarrels, hatred, I try to

overcome that by identifying. Which means, I have already admitted division and try to overcome that division, through identification. Whereas what we are saying is, the observer is the cause of division, the observer is the division. Look, sir, there is violence right through the world, increasing more and more every day. And as a human being one is violent. And realizing that, one has cultivated an ideal called non-violence, an ideal. Please follow this a little bit, if you care to. So there is the fact, the 'what is', which is violence, the actual violence of life. And there is the idea of non-violence - the 'what is' and 'what should be'. Right? So there is contradiction. The man who is violent has the ideal of non-violence and so he is all the time pretending to be non-violent, pretending, hypocritical. But the actual fact is, he is violent, he hopes through the ideal to remove violence. And look: there is space and time between 'what is' and 'what should be'. Please follow this. See the absurdity of it. And he is trying to always become that. So he is spending energy, vitality in becoming something which he is not, which is, but what actually is, is.

Now when the mind is free from the ideal altogether, and all ideals are idiotic anyhow, then you face, then the mind can face 'what is', which is violence. Then how do you observe violence? Do you observe it with an image you have, which is that you must not be violent, or does the mind observe without the observer, which means, not identifying yourself, mind identify itself with violence, but be free to look? And therefore end conflict between the observer and the observed. And the ending of conflict is the ending of violence.

Q: Are you saying we should observe without the observer?

K: I know. The lady asks, are you saying to observe without the observer. Try it, do it. Can you observe a flower, a bird, the waters, the beauty of the land, your wife, your husband, without the observer, which means without the image you have about your wife. Do it, sir, and you will find how extraordinarily attentive you have to be, not only now but when the image is being built, so that your mind is free to look. Have you ever looked at anybody? Not at a stranger because that is not important, have you looked at anybody whom you so-called like? Or love? Have you? You have looked at the person through the image you have about her or about him. And the relationship is between these two images. And that's why there is so much antagonism. And that is why there is no relationship at all. Which brings about a question, what is love? Perhaps this is not the moment to talk about it but we will. But when one says "I love you", what is it you are loving? Do look at it - when you say to another "I love you", what is it your are loving? The image that you have about her or him, which thought has put together? And is love the cultivation of thought? When you say "I love music", what is the thing you love? Your pleasure?

So relationship becomes extraordinarily important to understand, because all life is relationship, living is relationship. And we have made of this relationship such a horror. And that horror we call love, because in that there is occasional tenderness perhaps when you're sexual or when you see something pitiful. So one has to find out what is relationship, not from the dictionary, not from the professor, not from the analyst, not from the religious organizations, small or big, but find out in yourself, find out for yourself in yourself. Then you will see in yourself the whole world

is, you don't have to read a thing, because you are the whole of humanity. Until one understands that deeply, love doesn't exist - pleasure exists.

Q: How does one go about freeing oneself from this accumulated knowledge so that one can observe?

K: How does one set about freeing oneself from the accumulated knowledge? Look: if you had no accumulated knowledge you wouldn't be able to go home. You wouldn't be able to recognize your wife or your friend or your husband. Please see the difficulty of this. You need to have accumulated knowledge to function in your job. You must have it; you must have it in order to speak, English, Italian, whatever it is; to go home. But also see that in relationship how knowledge destroys relationship, knowledge being the image you have built about the other through years of living together, or even for a day - the nagging, the hurt, the brutality, the irritations, the pleasures, the companionship, the comfort. That image, which is knowledge, is preventing the right relationship. So you need knowledge to function in your office, in the laboratory, in mathematics and so on. But also be aware of the danger of that very knowledge, the accumulating and the building of the image, in relationship. And to be aware of this, where knowledge is essential and the danger, is to have a very good, intelligent mind. One has to be extraordinarily alert.

Q: In trying to observe very intelligently, look at things very clearly, I find it to be very painful and the pain is very distracting, it destroys the observation.

K: I don't quite understand why it should be painful. One observes - look, sir, I observe myself and see that I am stupid. Why



should it be painful? Because I am comparing myself with somebody who is very intelligent and therefore that comparison gives me pain, because I find myself inferior?

Q: This may be true, but it is painful.

K: I'm going to go into it, sir - just see it. Is it painful because I have compared myself with somebody else, comparison? Why do I compare at all, with 'what is', or with 'what should be'. Why do I compare? In comparison I find I am inferior and that gives me pain. And therefore I say, I won't examine, I won't look, I'll just go on. I'll escape. So the question is, why do I compare at all? Now I have said to myself "I am dull". How do I know I am dull if I don't compare? Are you following? I only know I am dull because I have compared myself with you who are clever. So comparison brings me pain and the conflict and all the rest of it. So is there dullness if I don't compare at all? And can I live without comparison?

Comparison, psychologically, I have to compare between two colours, between many things, but inwardly, psychologically, what is the need of comparison between 'what is' and 'what should be'? Why should there be comparison? Is not comparison one of the distractions from 'what is' and therefore preventing understanding of 'what is'?

So to live - do it, sir, you'll find out - to live without comparison, which doesn't mean smugness, satisfaction - on the contrary. And your whole mind is watching everything. We think we understand only through comparison. Do you understand anything through comparison? Do you understand your second son because you compare him with the first son? When you do compare A with B, don't you destroy A? Don't you want him to

conform to B? And that is the whole structure of our education, be like somebody else - the hero, even though you destroy, negate the hero, you imitate somebody, which is always comparing. Do experiment. That is, experiment means, the word, is to try, to test, to test it out in life. To live without any comparison, psychologically, see what happens to you.

Q: In an authoritarian society, how can you do that?

K: In an authoritarian society, how can you do that. We said, the society is you, you have created the society. You worship authority. So again one has to go into this question of authority; the authority of the law, which is to keep to the left side of the road, pay tax and so on, and the freedom from psychological authority on which you depend. You know, we are strange human beings. We deny outward authority, politically, or unfortunately in this country you spit on someone's face called a policeman, which is terrible to spit on anybody's face - and yet you cling to your own particular authority inwardly. Again there is a contradiction. Why do we always begin by spitting on the outer authority - why don't you begin spitting on your own inward authority - if you must spit! Why don't we begin there, because probably here, inwardly, you don't have to join any group, you have to be alone, there is nobody to demonstrate with you, walk down the street - you have to be alone. And probably to live in this kind of deep, inward beauty of aloneness, you are frightened. Therefore you begin by eschewing authority and the outer. We always do this, we all want to live a simple life and we begin at that end - one meal a day and so on - show, exhibitionism, circus. But to live a very simple life inwardly, that is very difficult. And it is only a deep, simple life, in the sense

of no fear, no ambition, it is only such a mind that is very simple,  
that can observe and love.

## **SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, CALIFORNIA 4TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL, 1970 'WHAT IS IT WE ARE SEEKING?'**

We were going to talk over together this evening - what is meditation? But before we go into that, which is really quite a complex and intricate problem, we ought to be, it seems to me, very clear what it is we are after. We are always seeking something, especially those who are religiously minded, and even the scientist, seeking has become quite an issue - seeking. What are we seeking? I think this must be very clearly and definitely understood before we go into this, into what is meditation and why one should meditate at all. And what is the use of meditation, where does it get you?

Before we go into that, we must be clear what it is that we are seeking, each one of us. And the word search, seek, run after, search out, implies, doesn't it, that we already know more or less what we are after. When we say we are seeking truth or we are seeking God, if we are religiously minded, or we are seeking a perfect life and so on, we must already have in our mind a pattern or an image or an idea of what it is. And to find it after seeking it we must already know its contours, its colour, its substance.

So in seeking, is there not implied in that word, that we have lost something and we are going to find it. And when we find it we shall be able to recognize it, which means you've already known it - all that you have to do is to go after, search out. And so, the first thing to realize is not to seek, because what you seek is predetermined, what you wish; if you are unhappy, lonely, in

despair, you'll search out, hope, companionship, something to sustain you, and you'll find it, inevitably.

So in meditation, every form of search must come to an end. And, as we said when we last met here, that one must lay the foundation, the foundation of order, which is righteousness, not respectability, the social morality is no morality at all. But morality, order, virtue that comes out of understanding what is disorder, is quite a different thing. And we said, disorder must exist as long as there is conflict, both outwardly and inwardly.

And to bring about order is to understand disorder. And therefore, order is not according to a blueprint, according to some authority, or your own particular experience. And how this order comes about must obviously be without effort, because effort distorts.

Are we communicating with each other? Because we are talking about something very, very difficult, how to bring about order without control. And that order can only exist when we say we understand disorder - the origin, how this disorder comes into being, which is conflict, which is in ourselves, to understand it, not to overcome it, not to throttle it, not to suppress it, but to observe it. And to observe without any distortion, without any choice, without any compulsive, directive impulse, is quite an arduous task.

Therefore order, which is virtue, comes about without any effort when there is the understanding of disorder. And control implies either suppression or rejection, exclusion, and a division between a controller and the thing to be controlled, and therefore conflict. So if one understands this whole business, control and choice come totally to an end. As we explained, control implies division, by the

one who controls and the thing that is to be controlled. And in this division there is conflict, there is distortion. And when you really understand this, that the controller is the controlled, then conflict and control in every form comes to an end, which is the ending of division and therefore comprehension, understanding. When there is understanding of 'what is', then there is no need for control.

So there are these two essential things that must be completely understood if we are to go into the question of what is meditation - order, with the understanding of what is disorder, and control, with all its implications, of its duality, contradictory, contradiction, and, as we explained, the other day, the observer is the observed, the one who is angry and tries to get rid of anger, is anger itself. And when he divides himself from anger or from jealousy or from despair or from the desire to fulfil there must be contradiction and therefore conflict and therefore distortion. Right?

This is the foundation. And without this really you cannot possibly know what meditation is. Don't fool yourself by all the books they write about meditation, all the people that come to tell you how to meditate, or the groups that are formed in order to meditate. Because you see, if there is no virtue, which is order, there must be distortion, the mind must live in contradiction, in effort. And how can such a mind know or be aware of the whole implication of what meditation is.

And, as we said the day before yesterday, we must also, not intellectually, with one's whole being, come upon this strange thing called love, and therefore no fear. Without love - you know what we mean by love - love that is not touched by pleasure, by desire, by jealousy, love that knows no competition, that does not divide

my love and your love. There must be that. All this is necessary because then the mind, including the brain, the emotions are in complete harmony, must be, otherwise meditation becomes self-hypnosis. Right?

You know, sirs - don't go to sleep over this. Because as we said, we are communicating with each other, which means we are sharing together, we are journeying together, you are not left behind for someone else to go ahead, either we are going together or not at all, which means you must have worked during this week, very hard, to find out your own activities of the mind, how it functions, your self-centred activities, the 'me' and the 'not me', you must have been quite familiar with yourself and all the tricks that the mind plays upon itself, the illusions and the delusions, the image, and the imagination that one has. And the romantic ideas, with a mind that is capable of sentimentality is incapable of love, because sentiment breeds cruelty, brutality, violence, not love.

So if you have, and I hope for your own sake, not because of me, of the speaker, you have more or less deeply established this in yourself. Which is quite an arduous, demanding, tremendous inward discipline, discipline being learning, not learning from another, but learning by observing what is going on in yourself. And that observation is not possible if there is any form of prejudice, conclusion, a formula according to which you are observing. If you are observing according to some psychologist, you really are not observing yourself, you are observing what the psychologist has said to you, and through that you are observing. Therefore there is no self-knowing.

And this implies an awareness. You know, there are many

schools in Asia and I believe they are creeping into this country too, where you are being taught how to be aware, or how to be attentive. The first thing is, if I may point out, don't join anything, don't join any group, any organization - I hope there is nobody here who is the head of organizations, or group leaders. Don't, because you need a mind that is capable of standing completely alone, not be burdened by the propaganda of others or the experiences of others. Enlightenment doesn't come through a leader, through a teacher, it comes through understanding of 'what is', which is in yourself, not running away from yourself. So don't, if I may most respectfully, suggest, don't join anything, especially the religious kind where they promise you Nirvana or God for five dollars, or give you some kind of talisman in the shape of words - we'll go into that presently; because the mind has to understand actually what is going on in the psychological field, in its own field, and therefore it must be aware of what is going on, aware without any distortion, without any choice, without any resentment, bitterness, explanation or justification, just to observe.

Now if this is laid happily, easily, with great joy, not compulsively but with ease, with felicity, without any hope of reaching anything, because if you have hope you are moving away from despair, therefore one has to understand despair, not search out hope - despair comes only when there is no understanding of 'what is' - out of despair you have bitterness. In the understanding of 'what is' there is neither despair nor hope.

All this is asking too much of the human mind, isn't it? Unless you ask the impossible you fall into the trap of: what is possible. And that trap is very easy, one has to ask the utmost of the mind,



the mind has to ask and the heart, the greatest demand, otherwise we will slip into the easiest, the possible, the convenient, the comfortable.

Now we are all together still? Verbally probably you are but the word is not the thing. What we have done is to describe, the description is not the described. So if you are taking a journey with the speaker you are taking the journey actually, not theoretically, not as an idea, but something that you yourself are actually observing, and therefore not experiencing. There is a difference between observation and exploration and experience. May I go on into all this? I don't know how you stand all this. (Laughter) Because you see this is the life of the speaker - therefore he can go on, endlessly, because there is the everlasting fountain. But you, the other, the listener, unless you also have travelled deeply inwardly, it will have very little meaning.

So we are asking, what is meditation? And why we should meditate at all, why all this fuss about this word? Probably for some of you or many of you, this is the first time you hear that word. Or you already have a concept of it or already have been told by some wandering monk from India that you should meditate and gives you a formula. And you, unfortunately out of your greed and it is greed and nothing else, follow it. Here we are not offering you a thing - please understand that, because any formula, any method, any system, soon becomes repetitive and mechanical, it doesn't matter who gives that formula or that system, if you practise it you become what the method offers, and what the method offers is not truth, because truth is a living thing, method is mechanical. And if you practise it, in the practice, watching yourself, there is the one

who practises and the thing to be practiced, therefore division, therefore conflict, therefore distortion, therefore disorder. Is that clear? Therefore don't accept any system from anybody.

Yes, sirs, which means you have to observe without any support, without any encouragement. Observation is entirely different from exploration in which is involved analysis. In analysis there is always the analyser and the thing to be analysed. Exploring - there must be an entity who explores, so that is, exploration is different from observation. Observation is a continuous learning, not continuous accumulation. I hope you see the difference. Learning is different from learning in order to accumulate and from that accumulation, act, or think. Whereas in exploration you are accumulating, there the mind is acquiring; and from that acquisition, adds things and so on.

So enquiry may be logical, must be logical, sane, rational but observation is entirely different - to observe without the observer. We went into it so I won't go into it now, there won't be time. Then the whole question of experience. I wonder why we want experience? Have you ever thought about it? We have thousands of experience all the time, of which you are cognizant or ignorant. Experiences are happening. But we want deeper, wider experiences - why? Don't you all want marvellous experiences? Mystical, mysterious, profound, transcendental, godly, spiritual - you want them, don't you? Why? Isn't it because one's own life is so shoddy, so miserable, so small, so petty. No? And therefore you want to forget those and move into another dimension altogether. How can a petty little mind, worried, fearful, occupied with the furniture, with the cook, with the 'what is', you know, problem after problem,

how can such a mind experience anything other than its own projection and activity?

And to demand greater experience is to escape from 'what is'. And it is only through 'what is', is the most mysterious thing in life. So: and in experience also is involved the whole process of recognition, otherwise you wouldn't know you had an experience, you must recognize it as pleasant or transcendental or noble or beautiful, happy, this or that. Otherwise you won't know it is an experience.

So when you recognize it means you have already known. So your experiences generally, vastly, is out of the past, therefore there is nothing new in it. So there is a difference between observation, seeing, exploring, critically, rationally, sanely, and this craving for experience.

Now if that is clear, clear not verbally or intellectually but clear in the sense that you have put all that aside completely, including the method, purpose, search. You know, all this is extraordinarily subtle, demands great attention inwardly; then we can go and ask, what is meditation, what is all this noise they make about meditation? Volumes have been written, there are great - I don't know if they are great - yogis who come and teach you how to meditate. Now the first thing is, you really don't know anything about it, do you, actually, unless you are told? Do let's be a little bit honest. But the whole of Asia talks about meditation, that's one of their habits, as one of their habits to believe in God or something else. They sit for ten minutes a day in a quiet room and meditate, concentrate, fix their mind on an image - that image is created by themselves or somebody else has offered through propaganda that

image. And during those ten minutes they try to control their mind and battle with the control, where the mind wants to go off, and battle, pull it back and forth you know, that game they play everlastingly. And that is what they call meditation. Right?

Then what is meditation? First of all, the mind, this mind that chatters, that projects ideas, that has contradiction, that lives in constant conflict and comparison, that mind must obviously be very quiet, mustn't it? To observe that mind must be extraordinarily quiet. If I am to listen to what you are saying I must give attention to what you are saying, I can't be chattering, I can't be thinking about something else. I mustn't compare what you are saying with what I already know, I must actually, completely listen to you. That means, the mind must be attentive, must be silent, must be quiet, mustn't it? Therefore, seeing the necessity that to observe clearly the mind must be quiet. To see clearly the mind must be quiet.

And because it is imperative to see clearly the whole structure of violence, and therefore to look at it, the mind must be completely still. Therefore you have a still mind. I don't know if you follow this. You don't have to cultivate a still mind. Right sir? Because to cultivate a still mind implies the one who cultivates in the field of time, that which he hopes to achieve. See what I have just now said, see the difficulty. Because all the people who try to teach meditation, they say, control your mind, your mind must be absolutely quiet. And you try to control it, and so everlastingly battle with it and spend forty years controlling it, which is completely silly, because any schoolboy can concentrate, control. We are not saying that at all, we are saying, on the contrary, the

mind that observes - please do listen to this, that observes - doesn't analyse, is not seeking experience, merely observes, must be free from all noise. And therefore the mind becomes completely quiet. If I am to listen to you I must listen to you, not translate what you are saying or interpret what you are saying to suit myself, or condemn you or to judge it, must listen.

So that very act of listening is attention, which means, not to practise at all. If you practise it you have already become inattentive. Are you following all this?

So when you are attentive and your mind wanders off, which indicates it is inattentive, let it wander off and know that it is inattentive, and the very awareness of that inattention is attention. Don't battle with inattention, don't try and say, I must be attentive - it's childish. Know that you are inattentive, be aware, choicelessly, that you are inattentive. What of it? But the moment in that inattention there is action, be aware of that action?

Silence of the mind is the beauty in itself. To listen to the bird, to the voice of a human being, to the politician, to the priest, to all the noise of propaganda that goes on, to listen completely silently. And then you will hear much more, you will see much more.

Now, that silence is not possible if your body, the organism, is not also completely still. Do you understand? If your body, the organ, with all its nervous responses, all the fidgeting, the ceaseless movement of fingers, the eyes, you know, the restlessness of the body - that must be completely still. Have you ever tried sitting completely still, without a single movement of the body, including the eyes? Do it some time and you'll see. You may do it for five minutes or two minutes, that's good enough - don't say, how am I

to keep it for ten minutes, for an hour - don't, that's greed! Do it for two minutes is enough. In that two minutes the whole of the thing is revealed, if you know how to look.

So the body must be still, because then the flow of the blood to the head becomes more. If you sit crouched, sloppy, then it is more difficult for the blood to go to the head. Which means, the body has its own intelligence, which the mind has spoiled, thought has destroyed. Thought seeks pleasure, therefore tasty foods, you follow, overeating, indulging, sexually, all the ways, compelling the body to do certain things - if it's lazy, force it not to be lazy, or take a pill to keep awake. That way we are destroying the innate intelligence of the organism. And when you do that, the organism becomes insensitive. And so you need great sensitivity, therefore one has to watch what one eats - I won't go into all that business, it's up to you. Because if you overeat, you know what happens, you know all the ugliness of all that. So we need a body that is highly sensitive, greatly intelligent. And therefore love, which doesn't become pleasure, love then is enjoyment, it is joy, pleasure has always a motive, joy has none, it is timeless. You can't say, I am joyous, the moment you've said it, it's gone. Or if you seek the cause of that joy you want it repeated and therefore it is no longer joy.

So there are these three things essential: the intelligence of the body, the capacity, the fullness of love, without the distortions of pleasure, which doesn't mean there are no pleasures, but which doesn't distort the mind. Look, you know, most of us have pain, physical pain in some form or another. And that pain generally distorts the mind, doesn't it? I wish I hadn't it, I wish I were better -

you know, spends years, days, thinking about it. So when the body has pain, to watch it, to observe it and not let it interfere with the mind. You are following all this? Do it, sirs.

So the body, the mind including the brain, and the heart, which is supposed to be love, all that must be in total harmony. Now what is the point of all this, what is the point of this kind of life, this kind of harmony, what good is it in this world, where everybody is suffering and one or two people have this ecstatic life - what is the point of it? I wonder who is asking this question? If you are asking this question, what is the point of it, it has none whatsoever. But if you have this extraordinary thing going in your life, then it is everything, then you'll become the teacher, the disciple, the neighbour, the beauty of the cloud, you are all that. And that is love.

Then comes another point in meditation - do you want to go into all this? You know, the waking mind, the mind that is awake during the day, functioning along the lines in which it has been trained, the conscious mind, with all its daily activities, continues during sleep, the same activities - have you noticed it? In most of the dreams there is action going on, some kind or other, some happening, which is the same as the daily living. So your sleep is a continuation of the waking hours. Are you following all this?

Are you getting tired at the end of the talk? I'm surprised you are not tired - you must have had a hard day and this is not an entertainment, this is real work, work that you have never done before, therefore it must be exhausting.

So sleep is a continuation of the waking hours. And we give a lot of mysterious hocus-pocus to dreams. And then these dreams

need to be interpreted and you have all the professionals interpreting the dreams for you, which you can yourself observe very simply if you watch your own life, your own life during the daytime. So the question is, why should there be dreams at all, though the psychologists say, from what they have told us, that you must have dreams, otherwise you'll go insane. But when you have observed very closely your waking hours and all your activities, the self-centred, the fearful, the anxious, the guilty, you know, watching it, attentive all day, then you will see that when you go to sleep, you sleep, you have no dreams, because during the day you have watched every movement of thought, the mind has been watching, attentive to every word. You work it out you will see the beauty of it, not the boredom of watching, but the beauty of watching.

So when the mind is attentive during the day, then there is attention in sleep. It doesn't matter whether you understand or not, I'll go on, because somebody, some day, will understand this. And it is important to understand it because, you see, conscious mind, the mind that is daily attentive, watching itself, cannot possibly touch something entirely different. So in sleep it is attentive and that is why meditation, the thing that we have talked about during this hour, becomes extraordinary important and worthwhile, full of dignity and grace and beauty, when you understand attention, not only during waking hours but also during sleep, Then the whole of the mind is totally awake. And beyond that every form of description is not the described, therefore don't talk about it. All that one can do is point to the door. And if you are willing to go, take a journey to that door, it's for you to walk - beyond that,



nobody can describe the thing that is not nameable, whether that nameable is nothing or everything, doesn't matter. Anybody who describes it doesn't know. And one who says he knows, does not know.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 5TH SEPTEMBER 1971**

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying yesterday that thought with its extraordinary capacity has created a world objectively and subjectively, a world of confusion, strife, constant battle both within and without, a wonderful world of technology; and at the same time thought has divided people into nationalities, religious beliefs, dogmas, rituals, and thought also in relationship with one another has emphasized the particular against the many and so on. And we said thought, though it has a very important place, is also an instrument of danger. Thought builds a great many images, both inwardly and outwardly, in all our relationships and hence there is a division in relationship which invariably brings about conflict and separation. Now that is more or less what we talked about yesterday, though I'm afraid I can't repeat all that was said, so if we may go on from there.

We said thought is image, measurable, and thought as image becomes the authority. I have an image about myself and I act according to that image, and there is a difference between that image and action. We are discussing this together, I am not giving a series of talks, I don't like that kind of thing, I rather we discussed it, shared it together and went into this very, very deeply, because if we could, this morning, go into the question of this whole structure of image, images that we have about ourselves and about others, and how it arises, whether it has importance or not importance, whether it is relevant or irrelevant, and where there is

freedom and the interference of images as authority in freedom.

Right?

Life is action, living is action, whether you sit quietly attempting to meditate - I don't know whatever that may mean to you, that is an action. Everything is action - living is action and in that action there is contradiction. In that action there is incomplete and complete action. When the action is complete there is no regret, there is no looking back, or suffering - it is over, finished. But most of our actions are not, in our relationships, and this inaction in relationship is it not caused by the authority of the image which we have about ourselves or about another? Please investigate it together so that we understand something of this because I want to go deeply if we can this morning, into the question of freedom and fear.

And whether these images that one has - you know what I mean by images - you have images about yourself, haven't you, dozens of them? And these images become the authority in action. Right? And when we have say, for instance, communes, they are being formed all over the world, little groups, for those communes to function easily, efficiently, without any conflict between each other in the commune, if I belong to that commune, a particular commune, have any image what that commune should be, that image becomes the authority. Though I reject authority of the establishment - I am glad you are following. So I'm still slave to authority, though outwardly I reject the authority of the older generation and their whole set of ideas, beliefs, dogmas, their way of life, I am still conforming to the pattern of an authority. And that authority exerts itself when another image comes into conflict with

it and we soon find a commune is broken up, as in society, as in every established order. So is it possible to act without the image as the authority? Because otherwise our relationship in co-operation, in living together becomes a contradiction, becomes a conflict - one authority imposing on another authority. I come here expecting the people to behave in a certain way, the people who live here - that's my authority and I assert that authority over others and then there is conflict between me and the people who are here. Right.

So I am asking myself, and you too I hope, whether we can have a relationship and therefore co-operation without any authority of the image? Because more and more as one observes in the world, whether in Europe, in America, in Asia, or in India, this problem is becoming more and more important: how to live together without any conflict. How to work together, co-operate together, bring about a decent society in which every form of conflict, inwardly, when extended becomes war, can we live together without this conflict? Which means can I live in this world with many or with few without any sense of authority as the image which I have established for myself as the pattern of behaviour. Go on sirs, let's work together at this.

Q: When people share an experience there seems to be an image created when people try to relate to each other about the experience they have shared. Those that haven't had the experience can't share in the image.

K: So experience then becomes the image which becomes the authority. I know, and you don't know, I have experienced Nirvana, god, whatever it is, and you haven't, you are a poor unfortunate

heathen and I'm not. The whole thing becomes absurd. So please this is really a very serious question. It isn't just a thing you casually answer or assert but it requires a great deal of examination and exploration: whether the human mind which has built for its own security, in its relationship with other human beings, a series of images as knowledge, and if these images remain then there must be separation and therefore conflict in relationship. And these images are built by thought, and can there be a relationship based on thought without the image, and if there is no image is that love? Please follow? So can there be an action without any sense of authority?

Q: Yes.

K: No, don't say 'yes', or 'no', please. Please enquire into it.

In my life, in my daily life, in contact with so many people, much more intelligent, more clever, more beautiful, sensitive, can I live with them without any form of friction, without any image, and yet be in relationship in which co-operation is possible? So I have to find out why these images exist and whether these images can be dissolved - how to dissolve them after having built them - then I can perhaps have a decent relationship with another - which means never building images - you see the problem.

Q: How can you order millions of people without having images of how they should be ordered?

K: How can you have order over a million people without creating an image? But I don't want to order a million people. I don't want to assert any authority over anybody. Because I don't place myself as a guru, as a teacher, as an authority of any kind. No, no. Sir, let's take oneself, begin with oneself and then extend it.

Then we may be able to find a way of dealing with others in a totally different way.

Q: Sir...

K: Sir, first just listen to what I have to say - not that I am preventing you from asking questions. First let us see the extraordinary complexity of the problem. And because it is complex one has to approach it very simply.

Q: By saying you have to dissolve images, doesn't that mean that you are putting a separation between the image and yourself?

K: No sir, is not the image that you have about yourself part of yourself? Can you divide yourself from the image - you are the images, the many images that you have about yourself - you are that. You are the furniture because you have identified yourself with the furniture. You are the house, the wife, the husband, the girl, the boy, the various experiences, knowledge, hopes, fears, angers, jealousies, you are all that - all those are the images you have.

Q: If you cultivated universal love you could cure that, you could dissolve all that conflict.

K: If you could cultivate universal love all these images would come to an end - that's the question. Can you cultivate love? Like you cultivate a tomato? No, I am not being sarcastic, please - can I cultivate humility, can I cultivate love? And if it is cultivated, is it love? Is it not the product of thought?

Q: You must see the point of view of another as well as your own point of view, and then you relate to each other.

K: You are making it all so complex. I'd rather be very simple about this.

First I realize, as most of us do, that we have a great many images about others and about ourselves. These images are put together by thought - thought being knowledge. I have lived with you, and in that relationship I have built various forms of images, because you and I have quarrelled, you and I have been angry - do you follow - the whole thing, sex, image after image. And these images with their knowledge, become my authority. That's simple enough.

So the next thing is: how am I, with all these images, conscious as well as deeply unconscious, how am I to be free of them, how is the mind not to create more and to dissolve what has already been created? Do you follow? Now how will you set about it? First of all let us deal with the unconscious images that one has, of which one may not be aware. Right? Let's begin not with the superficial things but the very, very deep-rooted images. How am I consciously to examine all the images which lie hidden in the cave, in the depth, in the hidden recesses of my mind? Would you do it through analysis, which is the fashion. You follow? The fashion is not only now but it has been always, throughout all cultures, analysis. Would analysis expose the images in the recesses of one's mind? Please let's examine together.

Q: How can one analyse if one is changing all the time?

K: How can one analyse if one is changing all the time. Is analysis possible if one is changing all the time? Is one changing all the time, or changing the images all the time? The images about myself changing, I don't like that image, I like that image and so there is constant movement from one image to another. That's not change. Change implies a total cessation of image-forming.

So please let's stick to one thing.

Q: What is the basis of the image?

K: What is the basis of image? That's what we are going to find out. You will see it in a minute, we'll go into it. All right, let's examine, what is the basis of images? You say something to me - you call me a fool - and I react to that - I react to it because I have an image about myself as not being a fool. And I react according to the image I have about myself, obviously. Because I have established this this image, now what is the basis of that image? Why do I have an image about myself at all? Is it not part of our education? Which is comparative. You must be as clever as that boy or girl. Right? Does it begin in education that way, giving me marks, giving examinations, the whole process of education is comparative. And there is the beginning of the basis of image-building. That's one. Then there is the image-building through propaganda - my country, your country, my god, your god. The division between the scientist, the artist, the businessman, the woman in the kitchen - you follow - the division. The more sensitive one is, the greater the burden of images.

Now, how am I or you to examine the unconscious, deeply hidden images that one has? Is it possible through analysis? Analysis implies the analyser. The analyser has his image. Right? And with his image he is analysing. His image is his knowledge - I don't know if you are following all this - and in the process of analysing with an image the other images, is there not an assertion of authority of one image over others? Right? And analysis implies a duration, a time, a length of time. And every analysis must be complete, otherwise the next analysis is carried over by the



misunderstandings of what you have examined or analysed. Right? So for me analysis is totally false. I won't touch analysis. To me, that prevents action, because I keep on analysing till I die, and I don't act. A very clever way of avoiding any kind of complete commitment and action.

Q: What do you mean by analysing?

K: Examining, finding the cause and going further behind the cause, you know step by step, analysing, examining.

Q: Isn't that thought?

K: That is thought, obviously.

Q: There is the image.

K: Therefore I say to myself, through analysis the image will continue in different forms. There is no ending to the image through analysis. Right? So I must find a different way of understanding and dissolving the images, and preventing the images from coming into being - so I see analysis doesn't resolve, doesn't end the image formation. Then there are these images in me, in you, deeply? How is the mind to dissolve them? Because analysis is finished. I don't know if you see it. It is false.

Q: I was thinking that although every image is itself the same person, distorted, perhaps one image can be less distorted than another, if somebody is in real trouble analysis may remove the severely distorted images, necessarily replacing them by other images less distorted...

K: Less distorted.

Q: ...which will place him in a position to begin to remove all images.

K: I understand. Therefore the less distorted image replaced by

a little less distorted image and so on and so on and on. I've no time for that, life is much too short. I want to find out a way of ending all images, not the less distorted and so on. I don't know if you follow, if I am making myself clear?

My question is: how am I, how is the mind to explore and expose the hidden images? And I see analysis replacing one image by another image has no value, to me it is utterly futile, irrelevant. Therefore I must find a different way, because logically I see the truth and the falseness of analysis. I don't know if you do because that's one of our conditionings - introspection, analysis, trying to become better - the whole thing. So I am asking, is there a way of exposing all the images both conscious as well as the hidden?

Now have dreams any significance in this examination? Most of us have innumerable dreams, and some of them are relevant and others are irrelevant. And some can be understood as the dreaming is going on and the explanation is going on - have you noticed it? Can I go on with this? Are we meeting each other? I hope so. So what are dreams, why should I dream at all? I know some of the people - professionals - who have said you must dream otherwise you will go crazy. It is part of your life to dream. And I question it: I don't want to dream. I want to find out why I dream. Because sleep may have a totally different significance than merely carrying on with dreams endlessly. What are dreams? Why does the mind dream at all? Are dreams an attempt to bring order in life? You understand? If I have an orderly life - we'll go into what is order - if I have an orderly life, would I dream at all? I do not know if you have noticed that before you go to sleep, don't you go over the day's happenings? Don't you? Recall everything that's happened,

say, I should not have done this, I should have done that, this was better done, and that was better said, I wish I hadn't - you follow - don't you do this - why?

Q: Yes.

K: Why do you do it? Isn't it to put order - no? Come on.

Q: Yes.

K: Obviously. To try to bring about order, and if you don't do it, the brain does it while you are asleep, because the brain can only function in order, efficiently, when it has complete order - no? The neurotic person cannot function orderly. It is only the mind, the brain, that has established order within itself that can function logically, healthily, sanely. No?

So the brain is always attempting to establish order within itself, and dreams may be the expression of trying to bring order. So if I can during the day - please follow this - during the day, the waking hours, bring order, complete order, then there'll be no necessity for dreams at all, then something totally different takes place - which we will go into if we understand what order is. May we go on now?

Q: That depends on your image of what order should be.

K: I am coming to that sir. I have no image.

Q: There are times when you say we have bad dreams, are they trying to bring order or disorder?

K: Obviously, it is disorder. Bad dreams - you may have overeaten, god knows what and then there are nightmares and all that. But sir, look at it, look at it very simply do, this is a very complex problem therefore we must approach it very simply. One realizes without reading books and all that - personally I don't read

any of these books - one realizes the brain can only function in order and in security properly. It will find security in disorder and then that becomes neurosis. It will find security in a belief and think that is order - that becomes another form of neurosis. It finds security in nationalism - you follow - see all the complications, and that security in nationalism brings disorder because it separates whole nations.

So the brain trying to find order at the same time creates disorder. Am I working or are you also working?

Q: Well, if the mind is in a state of disorder, what can it do?

K: We are going to find out. So I say to myself, dreams may be an expression or a way of bringing about order while I am asleep, while the body is asleep. And why can't I, during the waking hours, establish order? So I have to find out what order is. Right? Is that order based on my image of what order should be? Then it is not order. So I have to find out what is disorder, not order. Right? Because through disorder I shall find out what is order; it will naturally happen, through negation come to the positive, not assertion of the positive. I don't know if you follow? Can we move along together?

So what is disorder in my life - in your life - what it is, not what you think is disorder. Because the moment thought says, this is disorder, then thought has a pattern of order. You see - you follow? And therefore it imposes what thought thinks is order on disorder, in which there is contradiction and a discipline, a suppression - you follow - all that follows. All right? So I must find out what is disorder, what causes disorder, what is the nature of disorder. What do you think is disorder?

Q: Thought.

K: Thought is disorder, he says.

Q: When you are not permanently absorbed in what you are doing there is disorder.

K: When you are not absorbed totally in what you are doing, then there is disorder. Look at the varieties of opinions we are going to have. Listen to it, listen, when you have varieties of opinions, that is the very nature of disorder: so opinion is disorder. No?

Q: But that is an opinion.

K: Wait, wait, no, it is not an opinion, it is not another opinion. I see you have an opinion and another has an opinion and so on - why should I have an opinion about anything? Either it is, or it is not - why should I have an opinion? Then you don't see.

Q: Once one uses language the very words bring disorder.

K: I have to use language - and we use language and say, look, I am using a word hesitatingly - look, don't attach too much importance to that word - let's change the word if it isn't representative of the meaning I want to give to that word and so on. That's all settled and established but I want to go much deeper. Which is, I see factually the moment there are opinions, that is one of the causes of disorder. Why should I have an opinion about that microphone? Or about how you behave - why should I have it? Or you have an opinion of how I should behave. Why?

Q: Interesting.

K: Opinion is interesting, is it? No, please.

Q: Would you say that disorder is that which opposes the flow of evolution?

K: No, no, I don't want to enlarge it. Would you say opposing evolution is disorder? Now what is evolution?

Q: A process of becoming.

K: What is becoming, who is becoming?

Q: Everyone.

K: Please, please look at it - who is becoming? The 'me' that is becoming?

Q: Either one is, or one is becoming.

K: That's right. Now look, I see that I am dull, that is a fact. Now how do I know I'm dull? Because I've compared myself with you who are not dull. So I have in comparing myself with you, in measuring myself with you, I have made myself dull. No? Am I dull if I don't compare? Please look at it. So any form of comparison is disorder. You follow, we are collecting what makes for disorder - opinion, comparison. Right? And when there is a contradiction in myself - I want this and I don't want that, I must fulfil, I must be great - do you follow - contradiction in myself, fragmentation in myself. So fragmentation, comparison, opinion are some of the causes of disorder. Right? And identifying myself with a particular image and rejecting other images is one of the factors of disorder; whereas order is the rejection totally of all images, living a life without comparison. Are you following?

So I see there is disorder where there is this constant indulgence in opinions, so I say to myself, have I opinions? Why should I have opinions? It is such an irrelevant waste of time, isn't it? It is a form of gossip - it is so stupid, it has no meaning. And am I living a life of comparison, always comparing myself with you or with somebody who is more clever, more intelligent, more bright, nicer

looking - oh, this battle that goes on. And is there in me any form of image imposing one image over the other, you know? Or do I see that any form of image in myself brings disorder? So I have discovered many sources of disorder. And when these sources dry up there is naturally order. Then there will be no dreaming at night. Do you follow? Because I have established during the day complete order and that means the mind must be completely aware all the time - no, I won't use 'all the time' - the mind must be aware during the waking hours so that when you go to sleep the mind is quiet.

Q: Surely the only way to establish perfect order is for either you yourself or the group of people in their life is to live completely by themselves and to relate to nobody else. That is the only way you can make a perfect plan for fitting in everything that you need for your particular way of life.

K: I understand sir, I understand. No, I will put the question differently. Can you live with any group, with any individual, with any community, having order in yourself? Obviously if you have order in yourself you can live with anybody, with the most neurotic person.

Q: That is what I meant by becoming, the fact a neurotic person must have some means to establish that order in himself.

K: He has to...

Q: How does the ordinary man become aware in his sleep all the time?

K: I am going to show you. Not the ordinary man who is not here. We are the ordinary people and if we lived differently we'd be extraordinary people.

So I see, it is observable, you can experiment with this if you are serious enough, that a mind which has order during the day - we said order is the understanding of the processes of disorder, not imposing what it thinks is order on disorder, but seeing what is disorder actually in daily life, as opinion, comparison, image and so on, then during the waking hours you are aware of all the disorders and therefore bringing order in your life, the brain then when it sleeps, is quiet because it has order. Now what happens when the brain is totally quiet, except it is recording but it is recording superficially, very, very little, you understand? I don't know whether you have done this experiment with your sleep a little bit - oh Lord, am I talking Greek? Because you see, sir, this is part of meditation, of which you don't know.

Q: What will a group of people with such a mind create?

K: Sir, what such a mind, a group of such people will create is irrelevant. First what is relevant, have you such a mind? Are you working for such a mind so that such a mind will make a better world. Do you follow? Not, is that mind an anarchistic mind. That is just a theory. What we are concerned with here is, you sitting there and we sitting together to find out what it is to have an orderly mind, which means a mind that is orderly can live in any society, with any group, create a new kind of society.

So we see the unconscious images can be dissolved totally if there is an awareness of your activities and motives and movements of thought during the waking hours. Are we meeting each other? So that I don't have to examine my unconscious because the unconscious is as stupid and as trivial as the conscious. Because consciousness is the content, without the content what is



consciousness? We won't go into that for the moment as that leads somewhere else.

So now the question from that arises: how am I to prevent image-forming? I know how to dissolve them. You understand? By becoming tremendously aware, as I pointed out, during the day, attentive to what you are doing, how you move your arm as you walk, your speech - you follow - the movement of your eyes - and that is why in meditation they say, "Keep your eyes closed" - we won't go into all that for the moment, into meditation. So if one is aware of all that during the day, attentive, you can dissolve the images that one has. Now how is one to prevent image-forming? You understand my next question? Are you interested in all this?

A: Yes.

K: Ah, of course!

What is an image? Obviously it is put together by thought - thought being the response of various accumulations of memories. Right? If I had no memories there is no thinking. Right? Very simply, I ask you where you live and your response is immediate. I ask you your name and your response is immediate - because you don't have to think about it - you have thought about it, repeated it, it is instant response. If a more complicated question arises you have a time interval between the question and the answer. In that process you are thinking, thinking according to your memories, experiences, knowledge. Right? And if you are asked a question about something about which you know nothing, your memory can't operate because you know nothing. But if you say, "Well, do you believe in God" - you say, 'Yes' because - you follow - or not, according to your conditioning, which is your knowledge, the

result of 2,000 years of propaganda, or 10,000 years of propaganda.

So thought is the response of memory, knowledge, which is the past. Now I am asking myself, I know thought puts together the images - you call me a fool and I have already built an image about you and about myself. You insult me, you praise me - image - you follow? Any incident, happening, image immediately is formed. I am asking myself and you, whether such images need be formed at all. And I see the danger of images, the absurdity, the irrelevancy of images, and I see the necessity of putting an end to them. How is this to happen? Go on sirs.

Q: Don't you begin to end them when you see that they are images?

K: Yes, but how do you prevent it? You call me a fool, how am I to prevent myself from forming an image about you, which says, she is absurd, she is my enemy, I don't like her?

Q: What is wrong with not liking somebody?

K: No, no, you are missing my point.

Q: Has questioning got anything to do with this?

K: Sir, I am asking you - we see images are formed, how quickly, consciously or unconsciously, they are formed all the time - now how is the mind to prevent that?

Q: Not only if you call me a fool, if you call me anything.

K: Yes, sir. You follow, if I flatter you, I say what a lovely man you are, you will purr like a cat. It is so obvious. So how is this image-making to stop? Please enquire into it.

Q: By not identifying with the body.

K: That means who is it who is going to make the attempt not to

identify?

Q: If I wanted to stop making an image of you - why want to stop?

K: No, I see the danger of images. Right? I have been brought up from the age of eight or nine or less in India with a tremendous conditioning - I won't go into all that. And there I was conditioned. And I meet a Catholic later and say, how absurd he is with his dogma, his belief and his saviours, his images and all the rest of it - which is my image against another image. And I see this division invariably brings about conflict. And I want to live in peace. You follow? Peace, not just an idea of peace, be peaceful, completely, so that there is not a flutter of violence in me. And that can only end when the image-forming comes to an end.

Q: What do you do when you meet evil?

K: Now wait a minute, what do you call evil?

Q: Cruelty.

K: Cruelty. Now wait a minute - cruelty, cruelty to animals?

Q: Children.

K: Now wait, wait, wait a minute, we'll go slowly. Cruelty to animals - I'm sure the majority of you are meat eaters. Face it, sirs. Cruelty - you see you accept cruelty in one direction and not in another. You don't want to be cruel to children and yet you are cruel to animals. And if you say, I must not be cruel to children, aren't you cruel to children when you compare one child with another? Please sir, killing another human being by a word, by a gesture or with a gun, it is the same - and we indulge in that, don't we? Oh, he is a stupid man - finished. Or he doesn't belong to that class - you know?

So please let's get back. How do you prevent image-forming so that the mind has never an image, whatever you do? No, please, sir, just look at it first, look at the problem first. Whatever you do - run away with my wife, do anything you like, cheat me, everything you like, and yet no formation of any kind.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are too quick in answering these things.

Q: Can't we all stop thinking long enough to listen to Krishnamurti, which is why apparently we have all come here. Couldn't we please just listen to the man and then go away and think.

K: Sir, don't go away and then think, but do it now, because it is now you are here; when you go away you will dissipate it. While you are here work at it. Which is, I am asking: how am I, how are you, to prevent any kind of formation of image, whatever another does? You know it is one of the most difficult things, you understand? You run away with my wife, you know what happens - hate, jealousy, anxiety, fear. You cheat me, you do all kinds of things, say things against me. So can the mind never create an image? I will show you how it is done. If you do it, if you are serious about it, if you play with it you won't do it.

As we said, if during the day you are aware - aware, attentive of everything that is happening inside you - and you can pay complete attention to what you do, your gestures, your words, your ideas, your motives, just, you know - attentive, not correcting, just watching - in the same way if when you are called a fool you are completely attentive, then there is no formation of image. It is only when the mind is inattentive, not attentive, the image is formed.

When I listen to you completely, with real attention - we'll go into what is attention - real attention, there is no me to get hurt. I don't know if you have been so completely attentive so that there is no centre, only attention. In that attention the observer is the entity that creates and reacts to images. When there is no observer in that attention there is no image-forming at all. So what is attention? Now, attention means listening, seeing, without any distortion, doesn't it? Which means no opinion, no comparison, you follow, all that. No disorder, so when the mind listens completely, attends at the moment when you call me a fool, completely attends, there is no image, there is no time or energy to create images because all your energy is taken in complete attention. I don't know if you feel all this?

Q: How would you deal with personal sorrow?

K: We will deal with that next Tuesday or when we are going to discuss - perhaps next Saturday. But take just this one thing for the moment: that is, when the mind is completely attentive, and it cannot be completely attentive if - attention means harmony, doesn't it, harmony between the body, the mind and the heart, complete harmony, not established by an idea of what harmony should be, then it is thought imposing an image of what harmony is upon the disorder of the body, mind and heart, which is just like continuing or strengthening or perpetuating disorder - so when the body, the heart and the mind are completely attentive, which means the whole being is attentive, then there is no image-making at all. Right? Do it, not tomorrow, now as you are listening. I think we had better stop, don't you?

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **7TH SEPTEMBER 1971**

K: What shall we talk over together?

Q: The difference between analysis and immediate examination of one's reactions? Why in spite of such examinations the responses continue?

Q: Can I change my fears, my continuous anxiety, uncertainty and is it possible to change radically?

Q: Sir, if you give full attention to 'what is' I need abundant energy. How am I to have this energy if I have to do a repetitive job every day of the week?

Q: There is a increasing sense of mental illness, imbalance, what should one do about it?

K: Now which of these shall we discuss?

Q: The first one.

Q: Any of them.

Q: One that will answer all of them.

K: Could we take one that would cover all the others?

Q: The last one.

K: The last one and the first. The first one was: what is the difference between analysis and examination of one's reactions, one's immediate reactions, and yet in spite of that examination these reactions continue? And the other is: I am full of fears, deep rooted uncertainties, how am I to be completely free of them? Right, shall we discuss these two? Really? All right? It's a lovely morning, I don't know why we are doing this, but it doesn't matter.

You know there are a great many theories - and I was listening

to one of them on the television last night for a few minutes - about human behaviour, and how to change it. There are hundreds of explanations for the cause of this human behaviour, the misery and all the rest of it, and various theories what to do about them.

Analysis implies, doesn't it, a division between the observer and the thing to be analysed. Right? Let's be clear on that point. When I analyse myself and my reactions, or observe my behaviour, there is the act and the actor. Isn't there? There is a division between the two generally. And this division not only creates conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', which is introduced by the observer. Please, this is not a talk by me, we are discussing. I am angry, or jealous, or frightened and I want to get rid of that fear, that jealousy, I want to overcome it, so when I observe this whole phenomenon I see there is fear and the entity who is separate from that fear who says, "I must get rid of that fear". Right? Then he begins to analyse that fear, tries to find out the cause of that fear, tries to control it, discipline it, you know the whole conflict that goes on. Is there this separation at all? Please, we must discuss this before we answer your question, sir, we are answering your question.

Is there this division between the observer and the thing he calls anxiety, fear, guilt and so on?

Q: I would say there is at that point of awareness.

K: No, just observe it in oneself, sir. Is there such division? There is, isn't there?

Q: If there is a division there must also be a unity.

K: No. Let us actually see what takes place. I am angry, or jealous, or frightened, and I want to get rid of it. No? Let's be

simple about this.

Q: When I am afraid the fear seems to be me.

K: Wait. At the moment of actual fear there is no division. Hold on to that. Watch it. At the moment of actual reaction there is no division, a few minutes later, or a second later, the division takes place, doesn't it? We are talking of that division, not at the moment of actual reaction of fear, or jealousy, whatever it is. Is there such a division?

Q: No.

K: No, this is very important, because you can't just say there isn't. If there is no division between 'what is' and 'what should be', the observer and the observed, then what will you do? Come on sirs.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madame, let's examine it for the moment, please. I experience at this moment - what? - fear. At the moment, at this actual moment there is no observer or division between fear and myself, there is only fear.

Q: As soon as you become aware of it.

K: Then begins a moving away from that actual moment of fear, then the division takes place. Why does this division take place?

Q: Because if you are only aware...

K: Don't say, 'if'.

Q: Well, once you are aware...

K: No, not - please stick to what actually goes on. Who is it - we don't like it?

Q: The observer, the I.

K: Therefore you must go into this a little more slowly please.



At the moment of actual experiencing of any human reactions, at that moment there is no division. That is a fact. A second, or a minute later, the division takes place. First of all why?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Why does the mind do it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just observe it in yourself, sir, before you answer it. I am angry, at the moment of anger there is no division. A second or so later there is division. Why does this division take place?

Q: It is part of the ego, which is me.

Q: The observer establishes 'what should be'.

K: Why does this go on? You understand? At the moment I see a sunset, very beautiful, there is no sense of remembering. A moment later I want to remember it, store it up, and tomorrow I want to repeat it, I want to have the same experience. Why does this take place?

Q: Because the experience leaves a mark on the brain as experience and therefore there is memory of it, and this memory divides.

K: Sir, how do you find out the truth of the matter, not your opinion, my opinion, or the expert's opinion, how do you find the truth of this thing? I want to find the truth of it, not my opinion, or your opinion, or somebody else's conclusion, I want to know the actual truth of it. How do I do that?

Q: The experience of one is the same as the experience of another.

K: We are not discussing that, sir, please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, obviously not.

Q: Is it the memory of fear that divides?

K: Therefore fear itself is different from the memory of that fear. Does the division take place because of memory? Now wait, watch it. Somebody says something and there are ten different opinions, conclusions, expressions. Now what is one to do? Which is the right thing - your opinion, my opinion, your experience or my experience, how do we find out the truth of any matter?

Q: We desire to experience again the old experience.

K: You're not meeting my point. Now look, sir, at the moment of fear there is no division. That's clear. At the moment of actually experiencing anything there is no division. A second later division takes place. I want to find out why. Now how do I find out?

Q: What you were saying.

K: Which means what? I want to find out the truth which is irrevocable, which will be truth, how do I find that out, about why this division takes place? How do I find out?

Q: I don't see how you can do anything to find out.

K: I'll show it to you in a minute, sir. You see you are all so full of opinions, conclusions, judgements, you haven't time even to say, let's look.

Q: You have to be a realized man.

K: I don't know anything about realized man, but I want to be quite clear why this division exists. The question was, at the beginning: analysis is one thing, and immediate perception of one's reactions is another. Analysis does not necessarily dissolve the pain, the anxiety, and immediate perception appears, for the moment at least, to dissolve it. But it again recurs. Right? That was

the question we are discussing.

We are saying, what do we mean by analysis? Let's go back to it. What do we mean by analysis? Analysis implies examination, doesn't it, investigation. In that investigation there is the examiner and the examined. No? And I say why does this division take place? Or is it because our usual habit is to divide everything?

Is it my conditioning that brings about this division, because all my life I have been trained that I must conquer, control, suppress, discipline, I am different from the body, the body is different from the spirit, the spirit is different - you know, divide, divide, fragmented, is that one of the reasons why there is this division?

Q: Where does the conditioning come from?

K: My grandmothers did it, my great-great-great grandmothers, the past generations have done this, and I have been brought up in that culture. And they have said, control.

Q: When did it start? Why did it start?

K: Because that is the only way they could think of, there is no other way.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are examining this thing, please. Is it my conditioning that brings about this division? I divide the whole of my life - the artist, the scientist, the bureaucrat, the professional, the politician, the bank, you follow, my whole life is fragmented. No?

Q: I don't call that conditioning.

K: Sir, let's leave the word conditioning. My whole life is fragmented. Right?

Q: The whole world is fragmented.

K: Wait, the world is me, I am the world. So there is this fragmentation. Right? And that's one of the reasons why I have divided myself from my reaction. No?

Q: It might happen the other way round.

K: Which is the other way round?

Q: The egg or the chicken?

K: Then we are lost.

Q: We are.

Q: Well is it not that there is fragmentation of one's life.

K: Wait, just go slowly, see what takes place. We must go slowly. Your life and one's life is fragmented. That's a fact. And at the moment of experience all fragmentation ceases. Right? At the moment you call me a fool there is no fragmentation, a second later it begins. Right? So my question is, how am I - how is the mind to observe the whole phenomenon of existence without fragmentation?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I said that. Therefore, sir, what will you do?

Q: How am I to live at that moment and continue every experience without fragmentation?

Q: Why is it so bad?

K: I don't say it is bad or good. The fact is one is fragmented. Right? And how is one to be non-fragmented? That is the real question, isn't it?

Q: You must think from the whole.

K: Sir, how am I to think from the whole? What does the whole mean?

Q: You are experiencing all the time.

K: Sir, we are not talking about experiencing all the time. We are asking...

Q: We are doing now with you exactly what we do with ourselves, we try to analyse thought and we are utterly fragmented. I try to see the irony of it - a thousand and one points of view about experience.

K: Sir, look, I see in the world - and the world is myself, and myself is the world, that's a fact - I see fragmentation everywhere, nationalities, the Muslim, the Hindu, the Christian, the Buddhist, fragmented - the artist, the writer, the thinker, the philosopher, the scientist, you know, division after division, fragmentation. And my life is fragmented and I look at everything from that point of view. I look at fear, not at the moment I experience it, but later, and I must get rid of it, I must conquer it, I must develop courage, which is another fragmentation. Right? No?

Q: But surely we are only fearful when somebody wants to...

K: Yes, yes, we said that. But there are other forms of fear.

Q: Are we not fragmented inside?

K: Yes, sir, that's the whole problem.

Q: You say we are acting in unity when we have some critical experience, but I don't seem to have any of these things inside. My brain is limited and any fragmentation, as you used that word, is between my state of mind now and the next second and the next second.

K: That's right. I know this. All that is implied in fragmentation.

Q: At any one time.

K: Yes, sir, I understand that. So I am asking how is it possible to look at life non-fragmentarily?

Q: Is not the practical problem - and we all have the same - how to join our many mental concepts from the moment of birth to the moment now into an harmonious whole.

K: That's all I am saying, exactly the same thing, sir. How am I to live harmoniously - and harmony means non-division between the mind, the heart and the body, if you can for the moment put it that way - a complete sense of harmony in which there is no division, no breaking up, no fragmentation, no conflict. How is that possible?

Q: I need a lot of luck, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are not answering my question at all.

Q: Sir, it seems people don't care because everybody is quite happy with this fragmentation.

K: All right, be that.

Q: Unless one sees the necessity of change one can talk about endlessly.

K: I agree, sir. I quite agree.

Q: And you need energy to see there is a desperate urgency to change.

K: Look sir, there is a war going on between Israel and the Arabs, that is the result of fragmentation, isn't it? And if I want to live in a world that is so destructive peacefully, how are you to do it? You must be non-fragmented mustn't you. You must be neither an Israelite or an Arab, a Hindu or a Muslim. Right? Are you?

Q: No.

K: Why not? When you see the importance of living peacefully, why do you accept fragmentation like that, which leads to war?

Q: Why should one be fragmented?

K: But you are. Oh, you don't even listen.

Q: Because we still separate ourselves from the other person.

K: That's right sir. I agree sir, these are all the various reasons.

But I want to find out how to live a life in which there is no fragmentation, and therefore no conflict, and therefore live a life that is completely harmonious and peaceful. How an I to do it?

Q: You need a lot of experience and help.

K: You are really not interested in it, are you?

Q: I am, I am.

Q: He can't tell us how to do it, can he?

K: Wait a minute, sir, you see you have opinions already.

Q: Sir, it seems easy to see outwardly what fragmentation does in

K: I am coming to that, sir. Outwardly we see the fragmentations and what they do in the world, and there is also inward fragmentation. We are broken up inside. How is all this to end?

Q: By not having images.

K: Are you telling me theoretically? Have you no images? You have no images?

Q: Yes I have.

K: Therefore why talk about it? Get rid of it and then you can tell me what to do.

Q: Experience it.

K: My lord!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, do listen for a few minutes, would you. There is outward

fragmentation, as nationality, scientist, housekeeper, you know, fragmentation outwardly, and there is fragmentation when one is divided in oneself. Inwardly and outwardly. And inwardly there is the thinker and the thought, the experience and the future experiencer, there is a division all the time. And I see such a division both outwardly and inwardly creates great disharmony. Right? And that disharmony prevents one from seeing things very clearly, living a very clear, simple, direct life. Now how am I to be free of all these fragments, outwardly and inwardly? Is it at all possible, and if it is not possible then let's give it up. If it is possible let's find out.

Q: Is there something else possible because when I have an experience which I accept, and don't resist, the accepted one doesn't seem to be so divided as the one that I resist.

K: Why should you accept any experience, or reject any?

Q: Because it is there.

K: No. Acceptance means holding, and the other means resistance. So you are resisting anything which you don't like and keeping those which you like - which means a division.

Q: If you don't hold on to anything then you are reborn every minute.

K: That's a supposition. If you don't hold on to anything then you are reborn every minute. But I do hold on to my.... please do give a little attention to what is being said. Don't carry on with your own thoughts, with your own ideas, with your own conclusions, you are here to listen to somebody, aren't you? Not only to me, to each other. But you don't, you are carrying on with your own ideas.

There is fragmentation both outwardly and inwardly, this



division. Division invariably creates conflict, and I want to live a life that is completely without conflict, which is to live a life of non-violence. Now how am to do this?

Q: Conflict is essential to the world.

K: Then fight.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, please, I am talking of conflict inwardly, not on the roof. Wait a minute - the wars, not the shadow on the canvas, wars, the hatred between people, the quarrels between husband and wife, the brutality. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: You are talking about your conflict. Why don't you listen?

K: I want to find out how to live a life of harmony. How do you do this? Please tell me how to set about to live a life of harmony, in which the division as the 'me' and the 'not me', we and they come to an end.

Q: First of all we have got to accept that there is such a thing as harmony.

K: Why should I accept that there is such a thing as harmony. All that I know is that we are in discord. I want to find out a way of ending that discord.

Q: You have to examine discord.

K: All right, I have examined it. I am brought up as a Hindu for the last fifty years and you are brought up as a Muslim - or if you are a Hindu I'll be a Muslim - I have been brought up as a Muslim for fifty years and you have been brought up as a Hindu for fifty years - and the cause is my conditioning.

Q: Why are they two things?

K: My darling sir!

Q: What causes it?

K: A group of people believed that Mohammed was the only prophet, and the people round him made a propaganda and converted others with swords, war and all the rest of it. And the others, in the beginning there was a group of Hindus who said we are all Hindus, different. There it is. Need we go into all these obvious reasons?

You see we have nearly spent twenty, thirty minutes, discussing the most obvious things.

Q: Is it possible to record and not do something about it?

K: Now how do you, sir, that's the whole point.

Q: We don't know how to do it.

K: If you say, I really don't know what to do, then we can discuss. But if you say, yes, what is the reason we are divided, let's go into what is the cause - you follow? If you really say, I really don't know how to live a life totally harmonious, then we have a point of contact.

Q: Would it be useful if you investigated the fragmentation more and more deeply, would that bring about non-fragmentation?

Q: Surely we must concentrate only on fragmentation of the mind. We are born of different colours and in different parts of the world, that is obvious. So let's concentrate on the fragmentation of the mind.

K: Sir, that's what we are doing.

Q: Even if we get rid of Hindus and...

K: ...communists, Catholics and Irish and non-Irish... yes, sir, yes sir.

Q: We still have disagreements on those subjects, we are still going to have Africans and Europeans.

K: Sir, that is not what we are talking about.

Look, I have a problem: my problem is I come to you all and say, look, I want to live really a life of deep harmony in which I have no conflict, but I have good relationship with people, in which there are no quarrels, battles, and anxiety. I want to live a completely harmonious life. Now wait a minute, don't answer me. I come to you because I am very serious. I want to live that way. I'll give up everything to live that way, including my house, my property, my gods, I want to live that way. I come to you. What is your answer?

Q: I don't know.

K: Right, you don't know, do you. Therefore let's find out how to do it. You don't know and I don't know. Right? Then let's find out how - starting from not knowing let's find out, shall we? Not knowing, and you mean not knowing, don't invent afterwards this, that, you follow? You really don't know. If you knew it you would live it wouldn't you? So since you don't know it, let us start from not knowing. Right? Now if you don't know you are living harmoniously. Do please pay attention to what I am saying, for god's sake. If you say, "I really don't know what to do", then what will you do? Oh, do listen sir, please listen. If you really don't know then you will assert nothing, will you? You won't say, I will accept, I won't accept, I will resist, I won't resist, what is the cause of it - you follow? You say, "I really don't know". So your mind then is in a state of non-fragmentation, isn't it. No? When you actually say, "I don't know". Can you ever say, "I don't know"?

Q: I don't see why you cannot say it.

K: That's all I am saying, sir.

Q: We are frightened of not knowing.

K: So you are frightened of not knowing. Right? You want to live an harmonious life and you may not. I want to live an harmonious life and I never say to myself, I don't know how to do it. I say, I must live an harmonious life, this is what I must do, this is what I must not - you follow? I come to answer it through my conclusions, therefore that's not an answer. Right? Please. So can I honestly say to myself, I really don't know how to live an harmonious life?

Then from not knowing I am going to find out. You follow? I am going to find out, not come with a conclusion to find out. Can we move from there? At least with some of you who say, "I really don't know. I am dreadfully serious, honest, when I say, I really don't know" - which means I have no conclusions, no images, no concepts, I really don't know. Can some of you say that? If you do then let's begin, at last.

Now I don't know. You know when I say, I don't know - please go slowly with me, have patience with me - what do I mean when I say, I don't know? Is that state of mind, when I say, I don't know, is it waiting to be informed? Please listen to this carefully. Is it waiting to be informed, is it waiting to be told, or is it waiting to find knowledge which will then bring about an harmonious life? You follow? I must answer that question when I say, I don't know. Am I waiting for an answer when I say, I don't know?

Q: Surely is one accepts receptivity...

K: I don't know, we are talking about not knowing.

Q: You can never know.

K: Please stick to one word, otherwise receptivity means who is receiving. Just stick to what we generally have agreed to, which is, I don't know, you don't know. Now what does that mean, not knowing? Does it mean that the mind is waiting to be told, expecting an answer, looking to somebody to say, "This is right", or nobody can say it, "This is right, this is wrong". It doesn't know. Which is your mind?

Q: If you really don't know and somebody tells me then I still won't know.

K: That's the whole point. Now when you say, I don't know, what takes place? Go slowly. What takes place within the mind?

Q: The mind is quiet, still.

K: What takes place when I say I am not looking for an answer. I am not expecting a thing, what goes on in the mind, sir? Watch it.

Q: You discard everything.

K: You have discarded whatever you have when you say, "I don't know".

Q: Sir, when I say, I don't know, I find ideas.

K: Which means what?

Q: It seems to be the habit of conditioning for ideas to come, so I still don't know.

K: So your mind can never say, I don't know, because you are all full of ideas. Right?

Q: I don't know, but perhaps I do know a little bit.

K: Yes. You are all playing games.

You know it is one of the most difficult things to say, I don't know. If you are really a great scientist you examine everything for

the first time as though you didn't know, therefore you begin to discover. You follow? But if you come saying, I know a little bit, I don't know, you follow, then you discover nothing. Can you say, I really don't know how to live a life that is harmonious? That means that you become extraordinarily humble, don't you - no? Therefore a mind that does not know is enquiring into what is harmony. Right? So what takes place in the mind that is completely not knowing?

Q: Go on.

K: I can go on, by myself, I can go on in my room, with all these questions and find out, but with you we don't travel together; how am I to help you to travel together? Because you are full of ideas, aren't you?

Q: When I say, I don't know, I wonder.

K: Why should you wonder? What is there to wonder?

Q: Nothing.

K: That's just it. Can you stay, stay, and say, I really don't know and stay there?

Q: I do not know in the sense that...

K: No, sir, don't translate it into something else. Keep to one series of words. We said, what does it mean to know. First of all, what does it mean to know? I know you. Wait, sir, listen. How impatient you people are. I say, I know you, what does that word 'to know' mean? I know you because I met you yesterday. There is the recollection of meeting you, and your name, your face, that is recorded. I know. I know my wife. What does that mean, know? Can I know anybody? So I can never say, I know somebody. But we do: I know my wife.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, no, do listen to what I am saying. When I see the danger of that word, "I know", can I know my wife, I have slept with her, I have had children, sex, irritation, all the rest of it, and the image of her remains. And I say, "I know her", I mean by that that I know the image about her, which I have, I don't know her. Right? So see what takes place - how dangerous that word is, to know. The word, "I know". In the meantime she might have changed but I have this image of her that remains static, fixed. So when I say, I know, it is the past. Right? So can my mind, when it says, "I don't know" be free of the past?

Q: Sir, to come to that point where I realize that, and yet thought...

K: Wait, wait, first see the dangers, see what it means, sir. When I say, I know, knowledge is the past, and I must have knowledge - to go from here to the house, to talk, there must be knowledge; and yet I see the danger of knowledge. Right? Knowledge is the past, and with that I say, "Can my mind ever be free of the past?" - which means the past image, past impressions, past memories, past hurts, conclusions, ideas, the whole of that. It is only then I can say, I don't know.

Q: I don't know you, I don't know other people.

K: What do you mean you don't know other people?

Q: I don't even know me. So I have to say again that I don't know.

K: When you say, I don't know, does it mean that you are free from knowing as the past? So sir, look, our difficulty is that we live in the past, all our activities spring from the past, and we project

that past into the future into the present. No? This is so obvious. Now, that is part of our fragmentation. So can I ever say that I don't know? And to say it honestly is to find the beauty of not knowing. You understand? Do you know what love is?

Q: I don't know.

K: Wait, wait. Do you know what love is? Do you know what love is? Why are you silent?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. Don't you say to your friend, or to your husband, wife, girl, or boy, I love you? Don't you? No? Oh, you are all so quiet.

Q: It seems that when I am in a state of not knowing...

K: Madam, I am asking you a question.

Q: Then I'll answer it when I don't know.

K: When you don't know, but do you know what it means not to know?

Q: I think so, but I don't know if I know.

K: Do you believe in god? How silent, you see. When you touch the real things you become quiet because you are frightened. So I want to find out, the mind says, what is love, they talk about it so much - love god, love humanity, I love my wife, I love my country - what does it mean, I want to find out. Don't you? To find out I must have energy, mustn't I? So how do I have that energy? By not asserting, or introducing something which I am familiar with - they say love is god, love is sex, love is happiness, love is beauty, you follow, all those are distractions, wastage of energy, aren't they? Can I put all that aside?

I want to find out if there is such a thing as god. I don't know.



Millions of people, the propagandists, the priests, the books, the everyday politician, everybody talks about god, except perhaps the communists but they have their own gods. I want to find out, how do I find out? I am burning with it, not just sitting there and I want to find out - you understand? I want to find out if there is something real, and for that I must have tremendous energy. So I must first gather this energy, so I must find out how I waste energy. You follow? I obviously waste energy when I believe in god. Right? Or when I don't believe in god it is a wastage of energy. Right? To believe or not to believe, or to say, yes, there is god, look at nature without god - you follow, all that tommy rot. I want to find out - to find out there must be freedom of energy, and that's why I say, I don't know. And when I say, I don't know, that gives you tremendous energy. I don't know what god is. I am not an atheist, I don't believe or disbelieve, I don't know. That means is my mind free of fear? You follow? Because when I say, I don't know, there is a tremendous sense of uncertainty, nothing you can rely on. God was a marvellous refuge in which I took shelter. When I say, I don't know, I refuse that shelter. You are following? Do you? So I have no saviour, no guru, no teacher, I must find out.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, we are not talking about that, sorry. We have been through that. I consciously see the falseness of taking refuge in an idea, in an image. I see that, I am sane, rational, not neurotic, I have no mental shocks, electric shocks, nothing. I see this. Therefore I am quite balanced. And when I say, I want to find out, I must put aside all man's inventions about god. Right? Will you do it? That means you must be in a state where you have no sense of

security. Physically, yes, we must have it, you understand?

Q: Nobody..

K: We must have it. To have it we must get rid of nationalities, divisions, wars.

Q: Sir, if I get rid of this in myself then I begin to question my very existence in a society which is as it is, I don't have that security. I can't be in that society.

K: Why do you say that? The moment you reject security, you do something. You don't say, I must leave the society, I must form a different kind of commune and so on and so on. You will do something.

Q: I don't know what to do because everybody seems to be...

K: So what happens, sir. Look, sir: I want to find out what god is - I am taking god the same as love, or beauty. If you are interested in beauty. I want to find out what beauty is. Not in the building, not in an architectural expression, not in some imaginative idea of space, or in a painting, or in a statue, or in a woman, or a man, I want to find out what beauty is. To find out what beauty is there must be passion, mustn't there. I must be passionate to find out, mustn't I?

Q: Isn't that the answer to physical security, that passion to find out.

K: Obviously. Somehow you know - to talk about myself - I never sought security, and I am here still.

Q: In order to find out I must want to terribly.

K: Of course, sir. Otherwise what kind of life does one lead? A shoddy bourgeois life?

Q: I really can't understand how you want to find out about

beauty, or what love is.

K: Don't you want to find out, or you just live like a leaf driven and accepting what the propagandists say? Don't you really want to find out how to end fear?

Q: Is not the life of the leaf fearless?

K: Sir, that was only a simile. I understand, sir, of course sir, it is.

Q: When the end of a leaf comes and it gets burnt or some other fate, it has not looked ahead to the event, so it does not have any fear about it.

K: No, but we have thought, we have minds. I don't want to die, I want to live. My living is, I must have security, physical, psychological, environmental, you know, I must have security. That is one of my deep demands that I must have security in order to live. I see the security physically is essential - I must have two meals a day, or one meal a day, I must have shelter, and not only I but everybody in the world. And that is not possible if you are an Englishman and I am a blasted Indian. When we divide the world that is not possible.

Q: But we know we need have no fear and stay alive, we all know we are going to die.

K: Therefore that's a different question. How to understand what death is, that's a different question. And if you say, now I want to find out what it means to die, you must have passion to find out.

Q: But we all know already about it.

K: Do you?

Q: Well we know enough in our daily life.

K: You are frightened by it. Therefore to find out about god, love, if there is such a thing as security, total security, to find out what death is, I must have energy. You follow, sir? I must have passion, I must have immense intensity. I can't just say, well I will sit back and say, well, I'll find out and go on with my smoking and drinking and enjoying my poor shoddy little life.

Q: But most people do just that. The only people I know who are not afraid of death - or shall we say if there is any friend that I have met, it is that young people are more afraid of death and older people tend to be less afraid.

K: They are a little bit older, that's all. No, sir, please.

Q: They may have more understanding.

K: Or they are bored with life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the word 'seek' implies what? When you find it how do you know you have found it? I have lost you, and I have lost you and I can find you, and I look for you, and then I recognize you because I have met you before. In my search for truth, for god, for beauty, for love and for the understanding of death, in my search for it how do I know that I shall find it? And when I do find it, is it the truth? No, sir, this is too... So I have to begin by saying, do I really want to find out? Or is it just a game I am playing with myself because I am bored with life, with my wife, my children, going to the office, you know, I am bored, therefore I would like to have some other thing?

So my question is: I want to end fear, every form of fear, physical fear, as well as psychological fears. I want to end them because I see freedom can never exist where there is fear. That's

obvious. So I have to investigate, find out, give my life to find out, not just a couple of hours, find out if I can live without fear, fear physically as well as psychologically. Physically I know what to do. Right? I have had pain, I have had disease, I have had various forms of ailments - I haven't had, but you know - and I am afraid, what is that fear? I have had pain a month ago, and that has left a mark on my mind, memory, and the memory says, for god's sake be careful, don't have that pain again. Right? No? So fear begins when it says, I mustn't have it again. Right? So thought creates the future fear. No? So I say, my concern then is not fear at all but thought, to understand the whole structure of thinking. Why does thought sustain the pain which happened a month ago now, why does it carry on? Is it possible when I had the pain a month ago to say, finished, I won't even think about it, finished. Because thinking about it is going to create fear of tomorrow. No? Do it, sir. The same thing with pleasure, which is much more difficult.

So I have to go into this question of thought. Can thought see that when there is pain it does the right thing - go to the doctor, or drugs, whatever it is, not drugs, not LSD and marijuana and all the rest of that business, but heal itself - fasting, dieting, you know a dozen things you can do. And thought sees to it that it does things properly and end it there, and not carry it over to the next day. So can the mind, physically understand, be free of fear of tomorrow, of the past, of death? To find out there must be freedom, freedom means passion, fire, intensity, urgency, and that's why analysis destroys urgency. Right? Urgency means revolution - not physical revolution, throwing a bomb, that's too stupid. But when you have urgency then there is immediate action.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **9TH SEPTEMBER 1971**

K: What shall we talk about this morning? If we do choose a subject let us go to the very end of it, deeply and very honestly so that we really do understand something at the end of it. So what shall we discuss?

Q: Decision.

Q: What's the difference between superficial awareness and total awareness?

Q: Does responsibility necessarily kill the sense of enquiry?

Q: Is there such a thing as decision or we let things happen?

K: Now which of these shall we discuss, talk over together. The first one, which one, please.

Q: Decision.

Q: Awareness.

K: I think in talking over together this question of decision, perhaps we can also go into the question of awareness.

What is involved in decision? Choice, isn't it? Let us go into this completely, and not your opinion against my opinion or your judgement against mine, but let us enquire into this completely and go into thoroughly, shall we, so that we shall find out at the end, whether there is such a thing as decision at all, and so on. Let's go into it.

When we decide, we decide between two things, which implies choice, doesn't it? Right? Why do we choose at all? The choice between two houses, two motor cars, two materials, apart from that, what is the necessity for choice?

Q: When there is a desire, afterwards there's choice.

Q: The process begins when desire arises.

K: We're asking aren't we, why do I have to choose, and therefore a decision has to be made? Because I have conflicting desires, opposing desires, contradictory desires, therefore there is choice, is that it?

Q: Because of a lack of clear vision.

K: Lack of clear vision. You choose, don't you? Do you choose - what to do, what to think. You do choose between two different roads, one is longer, one is shorter; one aeroplane journey's quicker than the other and so on, there is that kind of choice, inevitably, and decision. You understand? Is there any other kind of decision, and if there is decision, decision implies choice. Right? Now why does choice exist at all? Look at it, sir, let's take time.

Q: Because I am divided.

K: Because you are divided, that is, you have different desires, different objectives, different passions, different interests, therefore you choose between this and that, discriminate between this, what you call right, and that, what you call wrong, the essential and the unessential, so there's always this choice between the two. I am asking myself before I choose, or decide, or make a decision, which implies will, why do I have to choose at all, what does choice imply? If I see something very clearly, there's no choice, is there? If I know the road from here to some place and I have investigated one or two ways and have found the shortest, there's no question of choice, it is there.

Q: Not if we don't see clearly.

K: Therefore when we don't see clearly, then the conflict of

choice arises. Is that it? Right? Let us go together with this. I don't see clearly what I should do. I have various roads or choices to make, because I don't see clearly, that I should do this, that or the other - I am confused, and out of that confusion I have to make a choice - or because I am confused, I choose.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't know whether I should be an engineer or a biologist, or an artist - I am not very clear, I'm still very young, I don't know what to do. Society wants me to do that, my parents want me to do something else, and I want to do some other thing. Right? And I say, I am limited, I can't choose, I'm too young or I'm too old or too gaga, or whatever it is, so what is one to do? Let us discuss it.

I want to find out why I choose at all, why there is such a thing as choice. Does choice exist when I see something very clearly? It is only when there is uncertainty, no clarity, no perception, then I am forced to choose. But if I see something very, very clearly it is finished, there's no choice. I have to go to London and I want to do something here, there's no choice. And I want to be an engineer but somebody else wants me to be an artist.

Q: I may want both things.

K: I want to be an artist as well as a businessman - what is the decision there? Go on sirs, please. Is that your problem? Is this your problem? That you want to be an engineer, a businessman or an artist, better - and somebody tells you, you must be a businessman. Are you faced with that problem - any of you? Or is it just a theoretical problem?

Q: I don't know what I really want to do.

K: How will you find out?



Q: I have an image of myself as an artist and I have to go out and earn money.

K: So what will you do? I have any image of myself as an artist and I have to go out and earn money because my mother is ill - so what am I to do? Do you do all these things, actually go through all this or you just yield to circumstances? It is so impossible to discuss.

So let's go back. What does decision imply? I decide - what does that imply, decision? I decide not to be a drunk, I decide not to smoke any more because last night the doctor found that it is dangerous to the heart and brain and all the rest of it. So I decide not to smoke - which means what? No, please, you smoke, some of you smoke - I don't smoke, but suppose I smoke and I say, "I must stop". I decide from today not to smoke any more. I decide. What is involved in that decision?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I'm just asking one question, sir. What is involved in decision?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Not only that, but also what? Resist smoking. I'm in the habit of smoking - I've decided not to smoke and I resist the desire to smoke. I've made up my mind to resist smoking. So, there's a battle going on. Right? Between the decision and the habit - the habit of the body which is used to this smoke and it demands more and more, it has to have it. And so intellectually, listen to the doctors, fear. From that I have decided not to smoke. So there is not only resistance, fear is involved in it and I'm in a constant battle - wanting to smoke and resisting it all the time - action of will over a

long habit. I've taken a decision, so what happens? I create a new problem, don't I? Before I smoked, now I've decided not to smoke, and then that decision brings another problem - and so I keep problems going all the time. Is there a way of completely dropping without decision - decision being resistance, fear - all that's involved in decision when I say I must not smoke - is there a way of stopping smoking without any of that?

Q: Well, there is...

K: Wait, wait. Look what I've said. I smoke or I take various forms of drugs. I am an alcoholic or god knows what else, and I decide to give up. I take a vow, you know, chastity, poverty and all the rest of it. I take a vow. What happens? I am always in a battle, am I not?

Q: There is a certain negation.

K: Now is there a way of understanding which is not based on decision, will or resistance, and yet not smoke - you follow - break a habit without resistance, and so no choice whatsoever. So how do I end a habit without resistance, without saying "I must not - I must control - I must resist?"

Q: (In French - mostly inaudible)

K: If you don't understand French - bad luck. I am not going to translate it.

Look, I am asking something very - please let's stick to one thing. I know the way of resisting - I drink or smoke or am attached to something, and I know the way, the traditional way of resisting, deciding not to do. And I see in that a great deal of conflict is involved, not only physical conflict but intellectual, emotional conflict, the whole problem of resistance arises. I want

to find a way in which all that doesn't exist, and yet drop smoking, drink, or whatever it is, a long established habit. Come on, sirs.

Q: When...

K: No, please listen to my question first before you - don't jump into it yet. Because I know the old way which has been practised.

Q: You have to change yourself.

K: What am I to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You have habits haven't you, no? Scratching your head, or twiddling your fingers or you know, walking in a certain way, the habit of chattering, gossiping, a dozen habits. Now, how will you end one of those habits without any resistance? Wait, wait, sir. Please do listen? Because resistance implies choice - and choice implies conflict, wanting, not wanting. And therefore choice invariably arises when there is uncertainty, no clarity, confusion. So what am I to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, I am taking one thing. I am taking the habit of drink, or smoking, or - take one habit that you have, actually - don't invent a habit - actually you have a habit - scratching your nose or picking your nose or sitting in a peculiar way, insisting on a particular chair, whatever you have - habit.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. I understand that. But take one habit now, and see if it can end without any form of the old traditional approach to a particular formed habit. Please, sir, I have stated it, now you discuss.

Q: One must...

K: Don't say must, then you are lost. I want to end a habit without any resistance - I explained resistance implies decision, conflict, choosing. Decision implies between this and that, should and should not, all that is implied. I don't want to enter into that chaotic activity. I want to end it, and I want to end it without any conflict. Now you sit with it for a minute and work it out.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No - let us put it differently. Habit must be ended, or that habit must disappear - I don't know how to put it.

Q: You must have total attention.

K: Oh no, sir. Don't tell me, I don't know what you mean by total attention. I don't know what you mean by total attention. You heard the man talk about total attention and you repeat it. I have got a problem, don't tell me I must be totally attentive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: All right. Is it possible to see the whole mechanism of habit? What is habit - repetition? Doing the same thing over and over and over again. Right? Habit. Do you want to go into this? Conscious habits.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's just it. Take one thing and go right through it. Don't substitute one word for another word, for then we get lost. I have habits. I have been brought up in a communist world and I have that peculiar habit of thinking on those lines. I have been brought up in a world of Islam, and I do that. So, habit is established, very deeply, from childhood - habit of thinking that I must do this or I must not do that. Right? Consciously I know; and unconsciously there are all the racial habits. Right? No? Am I talking to myself?

Unconsciously there is the whole habit of a culture. So my whole consciousness may be the result of habits. No?

Q: Yes.

K: You're saying 'yes'? Now I am aware - there is an awareness of this - the mechanical habits of thinking as an Englishman, Frenchman and so on, as a communist, socialist, labour, believing in god, not believing in god, I'm a Catholic, you are a Protestant, I am this - you follow. It is all habit, habit, habit, propaganda. Now, I am aware of it, aware this thing exists as a cloud in which my whole mind is caught - not only the habit of getting up regularly in the morning at six o'clock. If I don't get up at six o'clock I feel upset. You know, all that business. I'm aware of all that - the mechanical process of habits. Now, how is the mind to break from that and not fall into another habit?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't know anything about it, sir, tell me what to do - I'm caught in this.

Q: You cannot think about it.

K: You are saying you cannot think about it. So thought may be a habit.

Q: You have an awakening.

K: An awakening - how am I to be awakened.

Q: When you say 'I', do you mean mind?

K: My mind, sir, quick to get on.

Q: Is the mind anything else?

K: I realize that the mind, the body, all our feelings are caught in habits - and my habit is to drink - I somehow got into the habit of drinking - slightly getting tipsy all the time. What am I to do?

How am I to end it without any form of resistance.

Q: Sir, I had never smoked, but after the war we got lots of cigarettes in Geneva, and I suddenly felt my hand go in my pocket. But when I saw it, without any resistance...

K: You dropped it?

Q: Yes.

K: But that was a very short habit. (Laughter) Oh, lordy, come on sirs. I've a long habit of drinking. I used to know a friend in California, he had to drive home every night, always a little stoned, and he didn't know quite which side of the white line he was driving on, and he survived. But I wouldn't. So, I'm in that position - I drink an awful lot, quietly in my room or so on. What am I to do?

Q: I had been smoking for sixteen years, and three years ago I dropped it, but I don't know how.

K: The gentleman says he doesn't know how he stopped - he'd been smoking for sixteen years, three years ago he dropped it, he has now stopped. That doesn't solve my problem. I want to know, how to end my drinking without any resistance. Work at it, sir, you just answer. Please, it's my problem, help me. Don't throw words at me.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, have you a problem of habit? Have any of you a problem of habit? All right, take it up, look at it, and see how you will be able to resolve it totally.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam, take a habit that you have, which you feel is not pleasant and you want to end it. And you want to end it so that

your mind doesn't go through tortures, so that you come out of it clean, healthily, happily. Drop it. Now, will you investigate the cause of that habit? You can trace it, can't you?

Q: It will take time.

K: It doesn't matter - it may take time. Don't quote me, please, look at it? You can trace it. At school as a boy it was the habit to smoke, and gradually fall into it, it tasted filthy but I keep it. Now, I know the cause. And I see merely investigation and trying to find the cause of it doesn't end it. Right? And mere decision - I must not - makes for more conflict. My hand goes to my pocket - all the things I go through - I torture myself. And I say I don't want to - and yet I want to be free of this terrible thing - this thing which is my habit. How am I to do it?

Q: (Inaudible).

K: That's right, sir - not ending it totally. Now, I'll show you something. Shall we go ahead together. Right? I want to end it - 'I' means, you know it must be ended, don't quibble over 'I' for the moment. I want to end it. And I want to end it so that at the end of it I have much more vitality, much more energy. You understand? And I won't lose that energy or that vitality in fighting a habit. So at the end when I have dropped it, it is like a new - you follow - not just a dissipated old man who has wasted his energy fighting. So I said I must approach it differently. Now what is the approach? I must begin not with the problem, but somewhere else. Right? I am going to go into it. Because the more I pay attention to the problem the stronger the problem becomes. Are you following this? I am in the habit of smoking, or drinking, whatever it is, the more I give attention to it, say, "I must", "must not", I am giving all my energy

to something that is very trivial. Right? It may be a tremendous problem to me but it is a trivial problem. Are we meeting each other?

So I must begin somewhere else in which the little problem is absorbed, devoured. I don't know if you... Are we meeting? I must find energy which will not be dissipated by the little problem which I have. If I give attention to that little problem I am wasting energy. So I must find a greater energy which will in its action dissolve the little problem. Have we understood that, intellectually even, please are we meeting each other?

So where am I to begin? Where I have energy, and when I come to the little problem, the little problem with its triviality is dissolved instantly. I must begin somewhere else. Am I making myself clear? Now where shall I begin? You understand? They used to say, the older generation, "Begin with God". You follow? You understand? "Put your faith in God, put your faith in something higher". Again that is useless. So I must find a way of never wasting energy because resistance is a wastage of energy, conflict is a wastage of energy, decision is a wastage of energy. I don't know if you are following this? So I must find a way of awakening this total energy.

Now, shall we go into that, if you have understood my problem, if I have made the problem clear. I am going to begin by being aware, not practising awareness. The moment I decide to practise awareness it is a wastage of energy. I don't know if you see that. Right? So there must be an awareness without my deciding I must be aware. Right? There must be an awareness without my deciding that I must be aware. See the importance of just that fact. Shall we



move from there?

An awareness at the core, at the centre, not at the periphery - not at my habit, what I am doing, my gestures, the way I sit, but an awareness at the very core, the very centre of my being. Don't say, what is the your being. At the very heart of my existence. But I have been accustomed to be aware of everything happening around me - watching the trees, watching the people, of watching what they are saying, watching my bodily movement, my twitching, my opening my mouth, putting my tongue out, all kinds of awareness outwardly, at the peripheral awareness. And I say that doesn't solve, that doesn't enter into the core of it. You understand? So I must begin at the very core of it. Are you doing this with me? Now what does that mean? I move the whole emphasis from the outer, and not to the inner, but to a different dimension. I don't know if you follow this. Am I making myself clear? No, you are as clear as mud!

Q: Could you give an example?

K: No, I can't do it. Just take this first. Look, sir, I'll say it, just look at it, listen to it. I said, one begins to be aware on the periphery. Right? Periphery means watching the trees, the birds, the people's dresses, one's own habit. A very superficial awareness. And then one turns to an awareness inwardly. From there I shall be aware. Right? Now I am saying, don't do either but have an awareness at an altogether different level. Is that making any sense? No, please it must be logical, otherwise it has no meaning. Because if I am aware of outward things, then from the outer I move to the inner, then there is a division between the outer and the inner, and a time interval between the outer and the inner, a

space between the outer and the inner, and from the inner I move to somewhere else again, which again involves time, space. I don't know if you are following this?

Do I see this, see this? Intellectually, do I see this first. Begin intellectually, that is verbally, that is with my thought using logic, using capacity to think very clearly. Do I see what is involved from moving from the outer to the inner and then trying to go somewhere else?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: In all this there is division, you follow, and therefore conflict, and therefore resistance, therefore division.

So there is an awareness in a different dimension. Now with that I approach my habit. You understand what I am saying? You get what I am saying? Am I making myself clear?

Q: No.

K: No, no, don't say no, don't say yes or no, do it! I see in decision there is fear involved in it, a motive, saying, "By Jove, if I smoke I will get lung cancer, it is terrible for the heart, doctors have said it, it is appalling, and other people say, smoke old boy, it doesn't matter, after all if you have ten more years or five more years less, have a good time in the meantime", and so on. And I don't want to enter into all that, it is a waste of time and a wastage of energy. And also I see any form of division implies resistance. This is all part of an awareness of the outer as well as the inner. I am giving you an example, sir. Are you following all this? Am I moving too fast?

Q: Yes.

K: I am sorry I can't, I'll go on. I see in decision, in giving up

smoking, giving up a particular habit, however good, however bad - bad and good, they are just terms - I see what is involved in it, logically, I see it very clearly. Which is the awareness of the outer as well as the inner. Right? Which is the outer habit of smoking, and the inner habit of fear, resistance, saying. "I must get rid of it, I must fight it, I must..." and I get caught in that. So I see the outer as well as the inner movement of resistance and habit. Right? And I see that doesn't solve it. So there must be an action in which there is neither resistance, nor decision, nor fear, nor a motive. Is this giving you a headache?

A: No.

K: I hope it is!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, do look at it, do look at which I have said. The outer and the inner, the awareness of the outer is the awareness of my habit, just the smoking, drinking, and the inner action of that habit is to fight it, resist it, decide not to, force myself, control myself, find a substitute for smoking or for drinking - chewing, or whatever it is. I see - there is a motive behind that, and trying to conform to that motive, therefore failing in that motive, saying, "I can't do it; I must", fighting - all that, saying, "I have no strength, I am a weak man" - all that nonsense that goes on. Right, are you following all this?

I see very clearly all that is involved in it - the outer awareness and the inner movement of it, and I don't want to touch it at all because that has no meaning. So when I see the thing very clearly I have already entered into a different dimension. I don't know if you follow this.

Q: I...

K: Not 'I', please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't quite understand, madam.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Ah, no, no, no. Do you see clearly what is involved in habit and the decision to get rid of it, do you see that very clearly, what is totally involved in it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, don't give me examples.

Q: If you want to stop smoking...

K: No, no. I am not interested in stopping smoking. I am much more interested in something else. And when that operates smoking may have lost its meaning.

Q: I don't want to give it up.

K: If you don't want to give it up, don't give it up. For the love of Pete, let's get on with this. If you want to smoke, smoke. That's much better than fighting it. Get to the grave as quickly as possible. Enjoy it. I am talking about a man who says, "Look, I have got this habit, drinking, smoking, you know a great many habits which are most destructive, whether they are good or bad. And do I after listening to you, do I see this thing completely, see it, understand it, intellectually, verbally, with my heart, with my mind, do I see this thing clearly as I see the microphone, clearly?" And see the futility of it, what is involved, conflict, you know the pain, the agony that one goes through in giving up something.

Q: How does one get into the other dimension?

K: Madam, I don't know what the other dimension is, you can't

get into it. It will only happen if I have understood the whole complex intricate problem of habit, resistance, fear, motive, all that is involved in it, decision. When I have seen that very, very clearly with my heart and my mind, then the other - then I have finished with it.

You see sirs, the man who has got a belief, very strong, deep rooted belief, he is attached to it, consciously or unconsciously, he can't give it up, it is part of him. And so that belief divides people, divides him, his family, his wife - you follow, divides. And he says, "I begin to see the importance, or the danger of such a habit", and he begins to see the whole pattern of it, the whole nature and structure of belief - fear, the desire to find security in an idea. He has physical security perhaps, but he demands psychological security which is much more urgent, much deeper. And so he is attached to it, he can't break away. And as he begins to explore, enquire, he sees the whole structure, the nature of it, the division between you and me as believing in this, and you believing in that. So he sees that very, very clearly. When he sees very clearly there is no choice in it. He doesn't say, "I have to give it up". I don't know if you are following. When he sees clearly the habit of belief is gone, he will never be caught in it again.

So do we see very clearly, see, not visually, of course you can't see this visually, perceive, understand, this whole structure of habit, resistance, motive, fear, decision, choice?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, do you see it?

Q: Yes.

K: Ah! What is it?

Q: What is important is awareness. Is awareness a simple act of perception? And if awareness is there the whole pattern is revealed.

K: Is awareness, the simple act of perception, and if awareness is there this whole pattern is revealed? Is that what you are asking?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: In awareness there is, the gentleman says, the decision to be aware, and also in awareness there is the act of perception. Right?

Q: There is that which is perceived.

K: Yes, perception, the perceiver and the perceived.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, just a minute, would you please listen. Do you know what listening means? When I listen to you I have no other thought. I listen to you. I have not my conclusions, my opinions, my understanding, is this right, is that wrong, should it be this way or that way, I listen to you. Right? And listening to that man sitting on the platform, and he says, are you aware of this whole - you are listening - he is asking, are you listening to what I am saying. Which is, are you aware that you have got a habit, and because you have a habit and because you are aware of it, in that awareness there is the movement of decision, resistance, fear, achievement, all the rest of it - are you are listening to what is being said, he tells you. Am I listening? Or am I saying, no I can't, I understand a little bit, I don't quite understand all of it, does he mean this, does he mean that. You follow? An act of listening is to listen from the beginning to the end, not just take one sentence, or one verb and say, does he mean - listening from the beginning, going through the whole of it to the end. Have you such capacity to listen? Capacity in the sense, are you listening that way? Or are you

saying, "I began with him there, and I lost him there, now I will pick him up a little later, and I have learnt now the conclusion". Or is it one continuous movement?

I listen to that man sitting on the platform, and I have listened to him from the beginning of the word until the end, I haven't projected any of my opinions, any of my conclusions, I understand, I have listened. I am going to listen to him. He says, decision - from the beginning, he put that question, he said what is involved in decision, why do we decided - decision implies choice, choice implies between the two, and we do choose between that car and that car, between that material and so on, but we don't choose when we say, "I love that woman" - do you? You don't. It doesn't matter. And he says, resistance implies not only division but conflict. I decide to give up smoking. It is a partial act, not a total act, the decision - listen carefully to what the man is saying - the decision is partial because it is an intellectual conclusion that I must give up smoking because it is bad for you, the doctors says it will hurt your heart, your life will be in danger, therefore there is fear, therefore I have decided to give it up. That decision is partial, not total, and therefore there is conflict between an intellectual decision and the fact that I must give it up. Right? And in that decision there is conflict because there is a motive involved in it, because there is an end towards which I am working to give up.

So I say, that we know very well, that is our traditional, everyday, cultural habit, to say that is the only way to achieve something. And the man says I want to be a revolutionary, not just a traditionalist, and I want to wipe the whole thing out, look at it totally differently. So he says, be aware of this whole thing - aware

of your habit. In that there is no choice because the moment you choose you have decided. Just be aware of the outward habit, and then see what is involved in that habit - the fear, the motive, the decisions, the urgency, the saying, "I must", "I must not", putting the body through torture, all that is a wastage of energy, which does not solve the problem. It will still go on, there is still the hankering for whisky, or whatever you drink, or to smoke.

So have you listened from the beginning to the end? Listening means seeing this whole thing very, very clearly. And when you see the thing absolutely, not relatively, absolutely clearly then there is a different state of energy with which you can then come back and say, "Now, what shall I do with this particular problem?", and you will know how to deal with it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, I explained it. I have just explained it, madam.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's your affair, sir, I said, listen.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Call it what you like, the total tent, or anything you like. The whole means the whole, I said that. You know the word 'whole' means also holy.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You see you are still... I give it up! Sir, you go to a museum, and you see a picture. And first you say, who painted it, if it is Rembrandt, if it is Picasso, if it is Botticelli, then you say, 'By Jove', and you look at it. And then you compare it with this, Michelangelo painted it but he was a homosexual therefore he put all those men naked and therefore and so on and so on and so on.



So you begin to compare. And what are you doing? You are not looking at the picture. You are thinking about Michelangelo and all his peculiarities - Leonardo and his peculiarities. You are comparing, judging, evaluating, you are never looking. And the painter has his peculiarities and he wants you to look at his name first too. So you never look. And that's what we are doing here. This man sitting on a platform, unfortunately he has to sit on a platform, I don't know why, for convenience, he sits there and describes the whole picture in detail, and you say...

And you want to know about god, don't you, whether god created the universe, and all this stuff, but to find out, you have to work, haven't you, not just accept what the Hindus, the ancient Hindus, or the Hebrews, or the Arabs, or the Christian mythologists said, you want to find out. And to find out you have to have a free mind and a free heart.

So, sir, where are we now? What time is it? When did I begin? Now where are we? In the future, tomorrow, am I going to make a decision about anything? Apart from clothes, house, cars, you know between this brush and that brush, and this toothpaste, apart from that am I going to decide, am I going to take a decision? Am I going to, when I have seen what is involved in it in this tent, am I now going outside again saying, "By Jove, I must..." - you follow? Are you going to do it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, that's what we do sir. I am not creating it, I have finished, in my life I have never decided.

Q: Not even about toothpaste?

K: Toothpaste, yes. About any other thing I have never decided.

That's the beauty of it. Like I have never controlled. That's a different matter.

So in listening here this morning, you might say, well I have really understood it, perhaps verbally, intellectually, I see the whole logic, and the reason and the practicality of it. But when you go outside, are you going to fall into the trap of the old tradition? If you do, then you haven't listened at all.

So there is an action in which decision is not involved at all. See the beauty of it, sir. And one's life has been built on choice and decision, and therefore continuous battles. I think that is enough, isn't it?

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 11TH SEPTEMBER 1971**

K: What shall we talk about this morning? Have you any suggestions?

Q: Meditation.

Q: Love.

K: Do you want to discuss love and death and meditation.

Q: New schools.

Q: Loneliness.

Q: Consciousness of other human existences.

K: Now what shall we do? May I talk for a little while, then we can ask questions afterwards? There are several problems we really should talk over together, one of them is meditation, love, death - one of them - and also what it is that each human being is seeking. There is so much discontent in the world, so much hypocrisy, lies, and there are all the various tricks of propaganda, both religious, economic, political, social and so on. Amidst this vast confusion, contradiction, dishonesty, from the highest to the lowest kind of human existence, what is it that we, as human beings gathered together under this tent, what is it we are trying to find out?

Each one of us has many problems, or perhaps one major problem, and without bringing about order in our life we want to escape from that disorderliness and mess and chaos and all the misery of it, into something fantastic, something mysterious. I wonder what it is if you are asked directly and if one can answer it simply and honestly, what is it that each one of us is wanting to find out, what it is each one of us longs for, is seeking or striving

hard, honestly to find out? And can we ever bring a kind of order in our lives, order in our relationships, order environmentally, order in the chaos of our thinking? I mean by order not just a blue print, a pursuit of a direction, and forcing everything to conform to a particular pattern invented by each one of us or imposed on us by others, but order that comes out of the investigation of the whole disorder of our life, and therefore order becomes something real, alive, and not conforming and conflicting.

So when we talk about love, death, consciousness, meditation, is that what we really want to find out honestly? Meditate, what meditation means, what love means, what death means, is that really do we want to find that out, or is it an escape because we are so tortured, uncertain, life is such an awful mess, and not being able to resolve this we run away from it. So where shall we begin? Because if we begin with meditation and not knowing exactly what it is, except what others have told us and all the racket that goes with those who have groups of meditation, and gurus that teach you mantras - you know all the business of it. I don't see how you can meditate without bringing about a really honest, simple, direct life. So shall we go into the question of wanting to find out, and giving our attention, passion and deep interest, find out what love is, shall we discuss that?

You know, to find out anything humanly, one must begin with a certain quality of freedom, mustn't one, because if you are to investigate such a complex problem as love, one must come to that investigation with a freedom from all our particular prejudices, idiosyncrasies and tendencies, our wishes of what love should be, either Victorian or modern. We should put aside all that, if we can,

in order to investigate. Otherwise we'll be distracted, we'll waste our energy in affirming or contradicting according to our particular little conditioning. So can we, in discussing, in talking over together this question of what love is, see the importance that to really find out the full significance and the meaning and the depth of what that word conveys, or doesn't convey, shouldn't we first see if we could free the mind from the various conclusions that it has about that word? And is it possible to liberate the mind, to free the mind, from the deep-rooted prejudices, biases, conclusions?

Because when we are going to talk over together this question of what love is, it seems to me that before one can plunge into that, one has to have a mind that is very perceptive, and one cannot have such a good, clear mind if one has opinions, judgements, and say this is what love should be or, should not be. Can we start with that, or is that too difficult a thing to ask? To start to investigate, to examine the mind, our whole enquiry must begin with the sense of freedom, not freedom from something, but the quality of freedom that is capable of looking, observing, seeing what truth is.

So let us begin. Taking it for granted, I'm afraid granted is rather impossible really - whether this freedom can be sustained in enquiry - you can go back to your prejudices, your particular vanities and all the rest of the conclusions later, but this morning, sitting here, could we put aside all that for the moment and go into this? First of all there are several things involved in it, aren't there - sex, jealousy, loneliness, the sense of attachment, companionship, a great deal of pleasure, and thereby also fear - all that is involved, isn't it, in that one word, isn't that so?

So we should, if we could, begin with this question of pleasure,

because that plays an important part in love and most religions have denied - call it original sin or what you like - altogether sex, because they said, man who is caught in sensory pleasures cannot possibly understand what truth is, what God is, what love is, what the supreme, immeasurable thing is. So in Christianity they had this extraordinary, fantastic idea of the Virgin Mary, son of God without man or woman relation sexually; and also that exists in India and also in Buddhism and so on: this is a prevalent religious conditioning. Right? And we, when we are going to look into this question of what love is, we have to be aware of our traditional, inherited conditioning which brings about various forms of suppression, Victorian and modern, or permissive enjoyment of sex. So pleasure plays an extraordinary part in our life, and if you have talked to any of the so-called highly disciplined, intellectual, religious people - I wouldn't call them religious, but they are called religious - this is one of their immense problems, chastity. You may think all this is totally irrelevant, chastity has no place in the modern world, and brush it aside. I think that would be a pity because that is one of the problems: what is chastity? So one has to in going into this question of what love is, one has to have a wide, deep mind to find out, not just a verbal assertion.

So - I don't know where to begin - why does pleasure play such an important part in our lives? I'm not saying it is right or wrong - please - do you understand? We are now enquiring - there is no assertion - sex should be, should not be, pleasure should be, should not be and all that - we are just enquiring. Why does pleasure in every way, in every activity of our life, play such an immense role? And therefore why sex has such an important part in our life,

though it is one of our primary urges, why has it assumed, I don't know, such fantastic magnitude, not only in the Western world where it is so blatant - you don't mind me using that word - where it is so vulgar, but also in the East and in Asia, it is one of our major problems - why? And the religions, so-called religion, the priests have decried it. If you would seek god, they said, you must take a vow of celibacy, you know all the rest of it. I know a monk in India, a very, very serious man, scholarly, intellectual - at the age of fifteen or sixteen he gave up the world and took a vow of celibacy. And as he grew older - I met him when he was about forty - he gave up those vows and married and he had a hell of a time - sorry to use that word. Because Indian culture says it is appalling for a man who has taken a vow to go back. He was ostracized, he went through really a very bad time. And that is our mentality, most people's mentality. And I am asking why it has assumed - sex - such fantastic importance?

And there is this whole problem of pornography, allowing every freedom, complete freedom to read, to print, show anything you like, therefore emphasizing or giving freedom from suppression. You know all that business going on in the world - and what has love to do with it? And what does it mean, all this - love, sex, pleasure and chastity? Because please don't forget that word or the meaning of that word for which man has given such great importance - to lead a life of chastity. So there it is. Let's find out why man throughout the ages has given sex such a prominent place in life? And all the resistance against it also. Right? I don't know how you are going to answer it.

Is it not one of the factors that in that, sexual activity, in that

there is total freedom? No? Please, let me talk it over first.

Intellectually we are imitative, intellectually we are not creative, intellectually we are secondhand or third-hand, we repeat, repeat what others have said, our little thoughts, you know. There we are not active, creative, alive, free. And emotionally we have no passion, we have no deep interests. We may be enthusiastic, but that soon fades, there isn't a sustained passion, and our life is more or less mechanical - the office, the daily routine. So a mechanical life, intellectually, technologically, and more or less emotionally repetitive reactions, which are all mechanical, which is our life, and therefore this one activity which becomes extraordinarily important - naturally. No? And if there were freedom intellectually and deeply one had passion, fire, then sex has its own place and becomes quite - you know - unimportant - one doesn't give such tremendous meaning to it, trying to find through sex Nirvana, thinking through sex you are going to have complete unity with mankind - you know all the things that we hope to find through something.

So can our mind find freedom? Can our mind be tremendously alive and clear, perceptive - not the perception which we have gathered from others, from the philosophers, psychologists and the so-called spiritual teachers, who are not spiritual at all? So when there is that quality of deep, passionate freedom, then sex has its own place. Then what is chastity, has chastity any place in our life at all? What is the meaning of that word, not the dictionary meaning only, 'chaste' but the deep meaning of it, what does it mean to have a mind that is completely chaste? I think we ought to enquire into that. Perhaps that is much more important.



If you have observed your mind, not as an observer and the thing observed - do you understand what I mean - in which there is no division as the observer watching the mind and therefore bringing about a conflict between the observer and the observed - if one is aware of the whole activity of the mind, doesn't one see in that the constant shaping of images, and remembrances of various pleasures, misfortunes and accidents, insults, and all the various impressions and influences, and pressures. And these crowd our mind. If there was a sexual act, thought thinks about it - pictures, imagines, sustains evocative emotions, gets excited. Such a mind is not a chaste mind. It is a mind that has no picture at all, no image, that is a chaste mind. Then the mind is always innocent. The word 'innocency' means a mind that does not hurt or receives hurts, is incapable of hurting and also incapable of being hurt, but yet is totally vulnerable. Such a mind is a chaste mind. But those people who have taken vows of chastity, they are not chaste at all, they are battling with themselves everlastingly. I know various monks, both here in the West and in the East, what tortures they have gone through, all to find god. Their minds are twisted, tortured.

So one has to enquire into what is pleasure, because all this is involved in pleasure, with pleasure. Where is pleasure in relationship with love - what is the relationship between the pursuit of pleasure and love? And apparently both seem to go together. Our virtues are based on pleasure, our morality is based on pleasure. You may come to it through sacrifice which gives you pleasure, resistance which might give you pleasure in order to achieve.

So where is the line, if there is such a thing, as between pleasure

and love? Can the two go together, interwoven? Or are they always separate? Because man has said, "Love god, and that love has nothing whatsoever to do with the other profane love". You know this has been not just for centuries, historically, right from the beginning of time, this has been a problem. So where is the line that divides the two, or is there no line at all? One is not the other, and if we are pursuing pleasure, as most of us are in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of social reform, everything, then what place has love in this pursuit? So one has to go into the question: what is pleasure and what is enjoyment and what is joy? Is bliss related to pleasure? Don't please say, no or yes, let us find out. Look at a beautiful tree, a cloud, a light on the water or the beautiful face of a man or a woman or a child, the delight of seeing something really beautiful; in that there is great enjoyment, a real sense of appreciation of something extraordinary, noble, clear, lovely. When you see a sunset, a vast immense sky, and when you deny pleasure, you deny the whole perception of beauty. And religions have denied it. Because it is only quite recently, I've been told, that landscape painting came into religious paintings in the Western world, though in China and the East, painting of the landscape and the tree was considered noble and religious.

So, why does the mind pursue pleasure, not is it right or wrong - why? And what is the mechanism of this pleasure principle? Please find out, you understand, not repeat what the speaker is saying, but find out in discussing, that's what we're doing. Because if you say, I agree with you, or disagree with you because I prefer some philosopher, or some other teacher, then we are lost, but if we

actually together find out, as we are sitting here now, what is the principle, the mechanism of this whole movement of pleasure, then perhaps we shall understand what is real enjoyment, then what is joy and bliss, in which is involved ecstasy. Is ecstasy related to pleasure and can joy ever become pleasure?

So what is the mechanism of pleasure, why does the mind pursue it so constantly? You cannot prevent perception, seeing visually a beautiful house, the lovely green lawn and the sunshine on it, or the vast desert without a single blade of grass, and the expanse of the sky. You can't prevent seeing it, and the very seeing is pleasure, isn't it, is a delight. When you see a lovely face, not just a symmetrical face but depth in it, beauty, quality behind it, intelligence, vitally - to see such a face is a marvel and in that perception there is a delight. Now when does that delight become pleasure, do you follow? You see a lovely statue by Michelangelo, and you look at it, it is the most extraordinary thing - not the subject, I don't know about that, but the quality of that. And in the perception of it, there is great pleasure, great delight. You go away and the mind thinks about it, thought begins. You say, what a lovely thing that was. In seeing there was great feeling, a quality of perception, of something marvellous, then thought recollects it, remembers it, and the remembering and the pursuing of that pleasure that you had when you saw that statue. Thought then creates that pleasure, it gives vitality, continuity to that event which took place when you saw that statue. Right? So thought is responsible for the pursuing of pleasure. Right? Please, it is not my invention, you can watch it. You see a lovely sunset and you say, "I wish I could go back there and see it again". At the moment of

seeing that sunset there was no pleasure, you saw something extraordinary, full of light and colour and depth. When you go away and go back to your shoddy little life, or active life, whatever it is, your mind says what a marvellous thing that was, I wish that I could have it repeated again. So thought perpetuates that thing as pleasure. Is that the mechanism? Then what takes place? You never again see the sunset, never, because the remembrance of that original sunset remains, and you always compare with that, and therefore you never again see something totally new.

So one asks: can you see that sunset, or the beautiful face, or your sexual experience, or whatever it be, see it and finish it, not carry it over, whether that thing was great beauty or great sorrow or great pain, physical, psychological, whatever it be. To see the beauty of it and finished, completely finished, not take it over for the next day, the next month, or the future, store it up. If you do store it up, then thought plays with it. Thought is the storing up of that incident or that pain or that suffering or that thing that gave delight. So how is one to - not prevent - to be aware of this whole process and not let thought come into operation at all? Have you understood my question, am I making myself clear, or am I just going on by myself?

I want to see the sunset, I want to look at the trees, full of the beauty of the earth. It is not my earth or your earth, it is ours - not the Englishman's earth or the Russian or the Indian, it is our earth to live on - without all the frontiers, without all the ugly, beastly wars, and mischief of man. I want to look at all this, the palm trees on a solitary hill - have you ever seen it, what a marvellous thing it is? Or a single tree in a field? I want to look at it, I want to enjoy it,

but I don't want to reduce it into an ugly little pleasure, and thought will reduce it. So how can thought function when necessary and not function at all in other directions? You follow my question? And it is possible only when there is real awareness, awareness of the whole mechanism - mechanism of thought, the structure and the nature of thought, where it must function absolutely logically, healthily, not neurotically or personally, and where it has no place at all. So what is beauty and thought? Can the intellect ever perceive beauty? It may describe, it may imitate, it may copy, it may do all kinds of things but the description is not the described. We could go on and on into this infinitely.

So when one understands this nature of pleasure and the principle of pleasure, then what is love? Is love jealousy, is love possessiveness, is love domination, attachment - you know what one does in life - the woman dominates the man or the man dominates the woman, you know all that business that goes on. The man does something because he wants to do it, pursues it. He is ambitious, greedy, envious, he wants a position, prestige, and the wife says, "For god's sake stop all that tommy-rot, lead a different kind of life," and so there is a division between the two. They may sleep together. So can there be love when there is ambition, when each one is pursuing his own particular private pleasures.

So what is love? Obviously it can only happen, when there are no longer all the things that are not love, like ambition, competition, wanting to be somebody, becoming somebody and that - you follow - that is our life; we want to be somebody famous, fulfil, you know, become, a writer, artist, bigger - all that is what we want. And can such a man or woman know what love is?

Which means can there be love for a man who is working for himself, not only in a little way but in identifying himself with the State, with God, with social activity, with the country, with a series of beliefs? Obviously not. And yet that is the trap in which we are caught. And can we be aware of that trap, really aware, not because somebody describes it, be aware of the trap in which we are caught and break the trap? And that's where the revolution is, the real revolution, not the folly of revolution of bombs and social changes - though the social changes are necessary, not the bombs.

So one discovers or one comes upon unknowingly, without inviting it, this thing called love when the other thing is not. When we have really understood the nature of pleasure, how thought destroys the thing that was a great joy, because joy cannot possibly be made into pleasure, joy comes naturally, it happens, like happiness, it comes. But the moment you are aware, "Oh I am very happy", you are no longer happy.

Then what is love in human relationship? Do you understand all these questions? What is the place of such love in human relationship? Has it any place at all? And yet we have to live together, we have to co-operate together, we have to have children together, and the man who loves, can his son be sent to war? It is your problem, sirs - you have children, and your education is preparing the children for war, to kill. You find out. So what is that love, and what is its relationship in our human existence? I think that question can only be answered, not verbally or intellectually, it can only have the true answer when the whole principle of pleasure, and thought, and this becoming, is understood, then you will find it a totally different kind of relationship.

Now what has love to do with living, the daily living, and what has that to do with death? Right? We are introducing a lot of things - is that all right? And what is meditation in all this? You know yoga has become a fashion in the West, everybody is doing it and it is the thing to do because one says, through yoga we'll have a quiet mind, and through right pranayama - that is breathing - you'll make the mind very still. Any stupid ass can do that, make his mind very still. Right? By breathing, sitting very quietly but having a shoddy little mind, the size of a peanut, and in that and through that you hope to find god. Right? Do you know what that word 'yoga' means, the meaning of that word. I am not saying it is wrong - yoga - I do it every day for two hours. I have been doing it for forty years or more. Therefore, please don't do it! Do you know what the word 'yoga' means? The real meaning of that word is unitive perception - unitive, to see totally, to comprehend life as a whole, not just stand on your head for a couple of hours. And the history of yoga, I was told by a man who seemed to know a great deal about it, is that three thousand years ago in ancient India, the kings and the rulers and the prime ministers chewed a certain leaf from the Himalayas which kept their brain very alive, very active, clear, some kind of marijuana of those days - probably it wasn't marijuana but some kind of stuff. And that plant died, and so they had to invent a series of exercises which would keep the glands of the human system active, alive and functioning properly; and the various exercises in yoga used to keep the glands functioning healthily, that is all, to keep the body healthy, not to bring all kinds of racket. So I brought that in because meditation has nothing whatsoever to do with yoga, the yoga which is practised. We will

go into, perhaps tomorrow, what meditation is.

So what is death and love and living? They must be interrelated, all of them - living, love and death. We can't separate them as we do, push death far away, hide it under lock and key, never think about it - something unfortunate, something one is afraid of, something to be avoided at any price, don't talk about it. So what is our living, the living of our daily life, what is it? As we know it actually, not pretending, our life is a struggle, a misery, a conflict, a sorrow, with flashes of joy, appreciation of great beauty and occasional sense of love which is not pleasure. Our life is a process, a series of events, interspersed with pain, sorrow, anxiety, guilt, agony, loneliness and the seeking of some reality which becomes such a fantastic myth and illusion. That is our life. No? A routine sexually - our virtues are a mere matter of practising, imposing, controlling, suppressing - that is our life which we try to cover up through drink, through drugs, through marijuana, - you know all the rest of it.

And we want to find through this chaotic, sorrowful life, god, truth. We can't find it, obviously, because to find something one must have a life that is completely orderly, a life that must be not mechanical virtue, but really virtuous, a life that has in the very living meaning, not give meaning to living, and that life we are afraid to let go. This life which is really quite intricately miserable and confusing and shoddy, this we are afraid to let go - let go all the things with which we have been identified - the house, the furniture, the books, the experiences, the quarrels, the images - you know, all that we are afraid to let go because that means death. No? So the brain says I can't change this living, therefore there must be



a future life, in different forms, reincarnation, or incarnate in a different way, you know, dozens of ways of escaping from this inevitable thing called living which you can't solve apparently. So we are afraid of living, and we are afraid of dying because we have divided the whole thing - living, love, god, death. You follow?

So can living the life we do, can there be a radical revolution in that? Not a verbal revolution, not the revolution of some philosopher, or psychologist, or some bearded guru, but a revolution psychologically so that our human mind is totally different, so that there is no control - we went into all that - no decision, but a living in which there is no pain at all. There is, if one goes into it very, very deeply; which is to be totally attentive of all the content of consciousness. May I be a little bit difficult here? May I go into it a little bit?

The content of consciousness is consciousness. Without the content is there consciousness? This is not an intellectual, or philosophical or rhetorical question, but a genuine, a valid question. The content of consciousness, of me, is my furniture, my goods, my behaviour, my thoughts, my anxieties, my pursuits of sexual delights. You know? The content of my consciousness are all the things collected in it - verbal, non-verbal, ancient-tradition, the result of the race, the family - do you follow - the whole of that is my consciousness. I am not different from my consciousness because my consciousness, the 'me', is the content. Remove the content - there is no me. Remove my knowledge, the name, the thought, all the remembrances of the hurts, the anxiety, the sorrows of death and pleasure - empty all that, what is consciousness then? Is there me in that emptiness? No, please don't agree or disagree,

you don't know what it means. Is there a 'me' which is my vanity, my jealousies, my extraordinary sense of loneliness, bitterness, cynicism, vanity, that is my consciousness, that is my life, living, my gods, my shoddy little beliefs and opinions; take away all that - and death means that, physically, you understand, death, the organism dies because it is used and misused, you know, driven and tortured - old age, disease, eating too much, you know how you eat - have you watched yourself? All that is me, that is the content of me. I am a Catholic, I am a Hindu, I'm a Buddhist, I'm a Communist, I am an atheist, I don't believe in anything - all that is mine, the consciousness. The content is consciousness.

Now that is my life, my daily life of going to the office, being insulted, trying to be superior, all that. And the ending of that is death and I am frightened. I who have worked for so many years, I want to finish that book, that painting, that experiment, that research, I have a responsibility for my children to send them to war, to educate them, to condition them, to destroy them by comparing them with somebody else. All that is me and I don't like to think that me is so small, so I invent a super-me, the higher me, the soul, the Atman - you know, the game that one plays. All that is still within the field of consciousness, and that is the content of consciousness. So when I realize that, do you follow, when the mind realizes that, not just verbally, not accept a description, which is silly, or the explanation of the description, but sees that, the whole of it, non-fragmentarily but it is totally attentive of all that, then in that attention the mind is empty of all that and that is death. Therefore there is something totally new, of totally different dimension. But you can't come to it through prayer, through

following some shoddy guru - you can't ever come to that. One can only come when you yourself are actively attentive totally, totally perceive the unitary movement of life, the living, the love, death, all the agonies, miseries that one goes through as a whole movement, unitive perception. Then the mind empties itself of all its content. It is not afraid to be anything or to be nothing, then it hasn't got to invent a future life, then it is incarnating each minute. Is that enough for this morning? You want to discuss any more? Right? We have finished.

## MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 6TH JANUARY 1971

With so many people I wonder what we can talk about. First of all I would like to say how important it is to find out for oneself what learning is. Because apparently all of you have come here to learn, or to find out, what somebody else has to say. And to find out one must obviously listen. And it is one of the most difficult things to listen, it is quite an art, because most of us have our own opinions, conclusions, points of view, dogmatic beliefs and assertions, our own peculiar little experiences, our knowledge, which will prevent, obviously, from listening actually to another, because all these will crowd in, all the information, opinions, judgements will hinder the act of listening. And can one listen without any conclusions, without any comparison and judgement, just to listen as you would listen to music, to something which you really feel that you love. Then you not only listen with your mind, with your intellect, but also you listen with your heart, not sentimentally, which is rather terrible, or emotionally, but listen with care, objectively, sanely, listen with attention to find out. You know what you think, you have your own experiences, your own conclusions, your own knowledge. For the moment at least put them aside, and that's going to be rather difficult because we live on formulas, on words, on speculative assumptions, and when we are trying to find out, enquire really very seriously into this whole problem of existence one has obviously to prevent or put aside any projection of our own particular little idiosyncrasies, temperaments, conclusions and formulas, otherwise you can't obviously investigate, obviously

learn together.

And we are going to learn together, because after all the word `communication' means to have something in common with which we can co-operate, think over together, share together, create together, understand together. That's what really communication means, to have something in common over which we can think together, understand it together: together, not the speaker explains and you merely listen, but rather together understand this whole question of what is truth, what is living, this complex problem of daily activity. All that we are going to go into.

And to really investigate, learn together implies that there is no authority, the speaker because he is sitting on a platform has no authority, he is sitting on a platform merely for convenience, but that doesn't give him any authority whatsoever. Please let's understand this very clearly, that we are examining together, learning together. And the implication of together is surely that we both must be serious, we must both be at the same level, with the same intensity, with the same passion, otherwise we will not meet each other. If you are deeply interested in a problem, and if another is not, there is no communication at all. There is a verbal understanding and verbal explanation is never the thing. So the description is never the described.

And as we are going to together to find out, one must be serious because this is not an entertainment, it is not something over which you can discuss, argue, opposing one opinion against another. Opinions have no value, what has value, what has significance is to observe actually `what is', not only `what is' outwardly but inwardly. To see exactly what is actually taking place, together and

therefore no interpretation, no conclusion, but to merely observe. And that's what we are going to do. To observe what is actually going on both outwardly in the world and also inwardly. When one perceives `what is' actually then you can do something about it, but if you observe `what is' with a series of conclusions, a series of opinions, judgements, formulas, one will never understand `what is'. That's clear, isn't it. If you observe the world as a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Christian, or any of that nonsense, then obviously you cannot possibly see clearly. And we have to see together very, very clearly, objectively, sanely.

So if one can observe very clearly, which in itself is a form of discipline. We are using that word `discipline' not in the orthodox sense of that word but the very meaning of that word is to learn. The meaning of that word, the root of that word means to learn, not to conform, not to control, not to suppress but to learn. And to see very clearly what is happening inwardly and what is happening outwardly, and to see that this is a unitary movement, not a separate movement. To see it as a whole, not divide it. Right?

What is actually happening outwardly, not only in this country but all over the world, what actually is taking place? Not the interpretation or the explanation or the causation of what is taking place, but what is actually happening. If a madman were to arrange the affairs of the world he couldn't do better. Right? That is a simple, obvious fact. Sociologically, economically, culturally there is disintegration. Politicians have not been able to solve any problem, on the contrary, they are increasing them. Countries are divided, the affluent society and the undeveloped, so-called undeveloped countries, poverty, wars, conflicts of every kind, no

social morality, because what is social morality is immorality, therefore that's gone too. There is no morality, all the religious organizations with their beliefs, with their rituals, with their dogmas, are really separating people, which you can see obviously. If you are a Hindu and I am a Muslim, we must be against each other; we may tolerate each other for a few days but basically, inwardly we are against each other. So where there is division there must be conflict. Right? Not only outwardly but inwardly. You can see exactly what is going on in this unfortunate world, the extraordinary development of technology, social changes, permissiveness, all that is going on. And inwardly we are a mass of contradictions.

Please, as I said, do observe yourself, watch yourself, not what the speaker is saying, listen to what the speaker is saying as a way of observing yourself. Look at yourself as though you are looking at yourself in a mirror. Observe what actually is going on, not what you would like it to be, actually, and you will see that there is great confusion, contradiction, conflict, great amount of sorrow and the pursuit of pleasure, ideologically as well as sensuously. There is sorrow, confusion, conflict and an occasional flash of joy and so on, that is actually what is taking place.

So our problem is: can all this be radically changed? Can there be an inward and therefore outward psychological revolution? Because we cannot possibly go on with our old habits, with our old traditions, with our old capacities of thinking, our very structure of thought must change, our very brains cells themselves must undergo transformation to bring about order, not only within ourselves but outwardly. Now that we, you and the speaker, are

going to share together, learn together to find out if a mind that has been put together through time - please do listen to this - the brain cells which have evolved through millennia, centuries upon centuries, put together, which have acquired tremendous knowledge, experience, which have collected a great deal of scientific objective knowledge, can these brain cells which are the result of time, which have produced this monstrous world, this world of war, injustice, poverty, wars, the appalling misery that is going on in the world, the division of people, racially, culturally, religiously. And all this has been produced by the intellect, by thought. And any reconstruction by thought is still within the same field. I don't know if you see that.

First of all thought has produced this division among people, for economic, social, cultural reasons, both linguistically and ideologically. Right? Do follow this. This is not very complex, this is very simple. Because of its very simplicity you will discard it. But if you observe you will see for yourself very clearly that the intellect with all its cunning reason, both objective and non-objective, this thought has brought about this condition, this state both inwardly and outwardly. Right? Do we see this together? Your thought, the way you think, the way another thinks, the way you think as a Hindu, as a Buddhist, as a Christian, as a Muslim and communist, god knows what else, you are conditioned by the past, and you think along those lines, and that very same thought tries to find a way out of this confusion. Right? And that confusion has been created by thought. Is this clear? It is not what I say, what the speaker says, it is what you have discovered for yourself, which is together. Right? Are you going to sleep? Or are you listening



with passion to find out? Because we have got to change, we can't go on as we are, lazily, satisfied with little things, accepting certain doctrines as truth, believing in something about which you know absolutely nothing, following somebody hoping that it will lead you to enlightenment, the various gurus with their concentration camps. Don't laugh, do listen to this. This is so dreadfully serious.

And all this has been produced by thought. And thought is the response of memory. Right? Otherwise if you had no memory you couldn't think. Memory is knowledge, gathered experience, and thought is the response of the past. Obviously. And we are trying to solve an immense complex problem of human relationship in terms of the past, which is thought. Right? Do you get this? Are we moving together, or are you still a Hindu? Or god knows what else. All that childishness.

So our question is, if you are at all serious because it is only the serious person that lives, it is only the serious person that can understand totally this whole significance, not the man who just casually takes interest for a few days and drops it. We are concerned with changing your daily life, not substituting one belief by another belief. We must negate everything that thought has put together, otherwise you cannot possibly find a new dimension. Are we going together, are we? Please, don't agree, it is not a matter of agreement or disagreement, it is a matter of perception, seeing actually what is going on.

So the question is: thought which has brought about this culture, whether the Hindu, Christian, communist, what you will, and that thought which is the response of memory, which is knowledge, and that thought which has created such confusion, misery, sorrow in

the world, how can those very brain cells themselves which contain the memory undergo radical mutation? You have understood my question?

Look sir, knowledge is necessary - just listen quietly, first listen - knowledge is necessary, otherwise you can't go home, otherwise you couldn't write a letter, we couldn't speak in English together, understand each other. Scientific knowledge, technological knowledge is absolutely necessary to function. We see that, that is, if you want to communicate in Italian you must learn Italian, gather, study the meaning of words, the verbs, how to put the sentences together and so on, accumulate knowledge in Italian in order to communicate in Italian. You must have knowledge. Which is again the product of thought. Right? Which is, cultivating memory in the language of Italian and then speaking that language. Which is, having knowledge of the Italian words. Right? One must have knowledge, which is the accumulation and the product of thought. Are you following all this? God, knows, I don't.

And one sees also thought has created division between people through their religious absurdities, through their nationalism, linguistically, culturally, you know, all the division between you and another, between you and your wife, between you and your children. Thought has divided and yet thought has produced extraordinary technological knowledge which you must have. You are seeing the problem? Are we meeting each other over the question? Please. Thought has brought about great confusion, misery, wars, and thought also has produced extraordinary knowledge, accumulated technological knowledge, which you must have. So there is a contradiction in the very functioning of

thought. Right? On one side it divides, separates, psychologically as well as outwardly, and thought has gathered extraordinary knowledge, created knowledge, and thought uses that knowledge to sustain the separateness of people.

Now, so the question is - what is the question? You see the speaker is putting the question, you are not. The question is, can thought, though it must function within the field of knowledge, can that very thought cease to create separation? You follow? You have understood my question? Because really that is the problem, basically, fundamentally that's the problem. Thought is old because memory is of yesterday, so thought is never free because it can only function within the field of knowledge. And this thought which is the response of memory, and that memory is within the very structure of the brain cells, and is there - not a way, a system, a method, those are all mechanical and absurd, they lead nowhere - is there a perception, that's right, is there a perception which the very seeing is the acting? You have understood my question? Am I battling with you? Are we going together? Please, do say, yes or no. Don't so quickly agree because that's too childish. I don't want your encouragement. Please. You see you are not used to investigating, you are not used to observing yourself; you are accustomed to read what other people say and repeat, whether it be Sankara, Buddha, or whoever it is. You know it would be marvellous if you never said a word that is not your own discovery, never say anything that you yourself don't know. Which means you will put away all your gurus, your books, sacred books, religious books, theories, what the philosophers have said. But of course you will have to keep your scientific, technological books, that's all.

But to never say anything that you do not understand, that you have not discovered yourself. And you will see then your whole activity of the mind undergoes a tremendous change. Because now we are second-hand human beings, or thirteen-hand human beings. We are trying to find out a way of living which is really timeless. You understand? Because thought is time. Right? Because time is putting things together, a process, a process implies time. Right? To get from here to there requires time because you have to cover space. Thought thinks in term of time. Right? Thinks of life as a process, getting from here to there. Now we are asking, a way of living in which time doesn't exist at all, except chronologically, in numbers. Right, you have understood my question? Because what we are concerned with is change, a revolution, a total mutation of the very structure of the brain cells. You understand? Otherwise you cannot produce a new culture, a new way of living, live at a different dimension altogether. Right? So we are asking, how is - the word `how' is not right - is there a way - oh, lord, not, a way - is there an action of perception - that's it - is there an action of perception in which thought doesn't enter except technologically? You have understood my question now? Are we meeting each other? Look, sir, put it very simply: one has lived in the same old pattern, in a corner of this vast field of life, in a small corner, and in that corner there is extraordinary division, that very corner creates division. Right? And we are living in that state. One observes this, not through books, not through newspapers, not through what somebody else says, one actually observes this fact. And one asks, can this be radically changed? We think change in terms of time. Right? I will be different tomorrow. Right? We are

caught in the verb, to be. Right? I have been, I am, I shall be. That is, caught in the trap of that verb, to be. The verb, to be, is time. Right? Oh, for god's sake! And one asks, if one is serious, meditative, deeply enquiring, time doesn't seem to bring about radical change. I will be tomorrow what I have been. Right? Modified, slightly different but it is the same movement of what has been, and that is the process in time. And in that there is no mutation, there is no transformation. Right?

And how is this mutation to take place from which there will be a different way of living, a different culture, a different creation altogether? That is the question, you understand? To perceive and act, not perception and later on act, which is the function of thought. Oh, lord! Please, this isn't intellectual, this isn't verbal, this is really simple. Look, let's begin again.

I see in myself, which is yourself, I see in myself a great deal of suffering, a great deal of confusion, ambition, anger, brutality, violence, all the things that man has put together is in me, is in you. Right? The sexual pleasures, the ideological pleasures, the fears, the agonies, the competitive drive, aggression, violence, you know all that. That's what you are, what we are. Can that be changed instantly? We know, or we think there is a way of bringing about a radical change in that through time; gradually I will evolve, gradually I will get rid of my anger, you know, all the rest of it. That means time. Right? And one sees time doesn't change at all. Right? You may modify but radically it doesn't change because you perceive yourself as you are and you say, I will be that, I should be that - in that interval between what you are, 'what is' and 'what should be' is space, is time. Right? And when you are

moving from 'what is' to what you should be there are other factors coming in. And therefore you never come to 'what should be'.

Right?

Look: I am violent and I say to myself, I must not be violent. The 'must not be violent' implies time, doesn't it? Please, doesn't it? I will be not violent in a week's time - therefore that involves time. And between now and next week I am sowing the seeds of violence therefore I haven't stopped being violent. Right, do you follow this? Therefore I ask myself: is there a way - I am using 'way', it doesn't matter - is there a perception which is freed from time and therefore instant action? You have understood my question now? Is there perception of violence which will end that violence not in a week's time but instantly? You have understood my question? Isn't that clear? Right? Are you listening? For god's sake. Are we communicating with each other? That is, I want to see if violence can end instantly and not gradually, because when you say, gradually, it will never end. Right? Do you see that? Therefore is it possible to perceive and that very perception is action? Shall I go on from there? Shall we go on from there?

Now what prevents this perception? You understand my question? To perceive perception is action, as when you see a snake you act instantly, there is no saying 'Well, I will act next week', there is immediate response because there is danger. Now what prevents the mind, and therefore the brain, from this instant action of perception? You understand what I am talking about? You have got my question? Right? What do you think prevents it? Let's talk about it a little. What do you think prevents it? Why don't you see that time is a barrier, time doesn't bring freedom because

time is thought? Right? Time is putting things horizontally or vertically together. And time will not bring about a different perception of life on a different dimension. Right? So what is it that prevents perception? Right? You understand my question? What do you think prevents perception? Why don't you see things clearly and act instantly? Why don't you see that division, psychological division, as you a Parsi, a Hindu, a communist, a socialist, a Muslim, a Buddhist, that division creates tremendous conflict. You see that, don't you? How do you see it? Verbally? Or as an actual fact of danger? Do you understand? Do you see that as long as I am a Hindu, a communist, that very fact must bring about division and division is conflict? Intellectually I recognize that. Right? Intellectually say, 'Yes, that is so'. There I stop. But action doesn't come from it, I don't completely cease to be a Hindu, which means all the tradition, all the conditioning, the culture, you follow, that doesn't cease because I am intellectually hearing the words without relating to perception as danger. Right?

Why is there no perception as when there is danger you perceive and act instantly? You understand? Why don't you? Because you see, you know what is happening in the world, the black against the white, the communist against the capitalist, the labour against somebody, and so on, division, division, the Catholic against the Protestant though they both worship what they call Jesus Christ, and all the rest of it. Here too there is division, linguistic, national, cultural, you know, this country is ridden with division. Right? You have your guru and I have my blasted little guru. I have my guru's system to nirvana, to heaven, and you have yours. Right? So there is division, there is conflict, and out of this

conflict there is war both inwardly and outwardly. And a man who is really serious wants to find a way of living where there is no conflict at all, at the very root of his being, no conflict, he has to find out, not merely intellectually, not verbally, but actually find out for himself if there is an action which is not of time. Right? Now I will go into it.

When the speaker is going into it, don't follow him because then you become his stupid disciple. We are enquiring together therefore you are sharing the thing together. When the speaker is going into it, explaining, don't be caught by the words, by explanations because the explanation is not the explained. You may be very hungry, and if I tell you what lovely food there is, that won't satisfy you. You have to share it, eat it.

Now we'll begin at the very objective level. Whether you can see anything without an image. Just listen to it, please, just listen to it. To see a tree without the image, without the knowledge, without thought coming in between the observer and the observed and saying, that is a mango tree. Just to observe. Have you ever done it? You have always observed, haven't you, through an image? Right? Haven't you? Because that is, you see without the verbalization, the verbalization is the process of thinking. Now can you observe a tree, your neighbour, your wife or your boy or girl friend without the image? Can you? You can't, can you? Can you observe your wife, which is a little more difficult than observing a tree, can you observe your wife - how easily you laugh, don't you, you want to be entertained, too bad - you can observe a tree fairly easily without the image, without the word, without thought, just to observe. When you observe the tree without the whole mechanism



of thought coming into operation - just listen - then the space between you and the tree, which is time, disappears, which doesn't mean you become the tree, or you identify yourself with the tree. You see the tree completely, not partially, then there is only the tree without the observer. Right? You understand this? You have never done it, do it. Not, try to do it, do it! That is, to observe a flower, a cloud, the bird, the light on the water, the movement of the breeze among the leaves, just to watch it without any image, then you will see there is a relationship which has never existed before between that which is observed and the observer, because then the observer comes totally to an end. We will go into that, let's leave that for the moment.

Now observe, observe, do it, your wife or your friend without the image. You know how difficult it is? You have the image of your wife, haven't you, or the husband, or somebody. That image has been built through time. Right? You have lived with her, sexually, lived with her for comfort, you know, she has nagged you, you have bullied her and all the things that happen in this terrible family life - which we will go into later - there you have built up through years an image about her, and she about you. And you look at each other through these images, don't you? Right? Don't you? Oh, do be honest for a change. You are so frightened to be honest. You have an image. Now that image separates people. Right? The image as you as a Hindu, and the Muslim as a Muslim, which is an image, that image divides. Right? And if I have an image about my wife, that image, which she has and I have, obviously must divide. Right? Now how is this image to come to an end? The image as a Hindu, as a Muslim, as a communist, as a

socialist, you follow, the image that one has built about oneself and the image that one has built about another, how is that to come to an end? Right? If that image disappears then there is a totally different kind of relationship. You understand? Because the image is the past, the image is the memory, the memory is the various markings on the brain cells which have taken place through a number of years. You are following? Which is the conditioning of the brain cells as a Hindu, and that image remains.

Now the question is: can that image come to an end? Right? Not through time, not gradually but instantly. You have followed my question? Now to answer that question one has to go into what is the machinery that builds image? Right? Are you also working? Are we together or are you merely learning from the speaker? Don't learn from the speaker, because the speaker has nothing to teach you. You understand? He has absolutely nothing to teach you because he doesn't accept the position as a teacher and disciple, because that breeds authority. And where there is authority there is division, the one who knows and the one who does not know. And the man who says he knows, he does not know. So you are not learning from me, from the speaker; you are learning by observing yourself. Right? By observing, by watching, therefore you are free to learn. Therefore freedom is absolutely necessary to learn. And if you are merely following, accepting authority, whether of somebody or that of the speaker, specially of the speaker, then you are lost, as you are lost now.

So learn from observing. And you are observing yourself, you are observing that you have your own image about another, that you have an image of yourself as a Hindu, as a Buddhist,

communist, Christian, Protestant, as a hippie and so on and on and on. You see that image in yourself. Now you ask yourself, I know how that image has come into being because I have been brought up as a Christian, as a Hindu, as a Muslim, I was born into that and conditioned, and that image remains, and that image divides people. Where there is division there must be conflict, outwardly and inwardly. Then you are learning from your own observation. You are asking yourself, can this image come to an end. When you ask that question you are also asking the question, what is the machinery that builds this image. Right? And we are learning together to find out what this machinery is, therefore you are not learning from the speaker, it's yours.

It's twenty to seven, shall I go on? Yes? You aren't tired? Why not? Can you still go on with this? You are asking yourself, not me asking you. You are asking yourself, can this image come to an end, not through time because the image has been put together through time. Time is thought, thought has bred this image: I have been insulted, I have been nagged, I must dominate, you follow, thought has bred this image. Now what is the machinery, you are asking, that puts together this image? Right? What is the machinery? Just observe it, just observe it, don't try to translate it and act upon it, just observe what the speaker is saying, listen to it and observe its action, the action of observation, perception on yourself. Just observe it. You tell me I am a fool. The word with its associations is seated in the memory, in the brain cells, the word `fool' has its association which is the memory. Right? Which is the old brain. The old brain says, `You are another'. Right? You call me a fool, I call you another. Right? So the response is the

response of the old memory. Right? You see this? Now the machinery is, as you observe, when the wife or the husband nags, at the moment of nagging there is no attention; when there is attention at the moment of nagging there is no operation of the machine. Do you see it? Do you see this? You call me an idiot, if I am completely aware at that moment then the machinery has no fuel to act. Right? Do you see this? Oh, no. Is this difficult? Have you got this, please? Can I go on?

At the moment of inattention, when there is no attention then the machinery is in operation. Right? At the moment of attention you can say what you like, the machinery doesn't function. Right? You can see this for yourself. When you call yourself a Hindu, and do all the tricks of Hinduism, at that moment when you are completely aware when you call yourself a Hindu, you see all the significance, all the meaning of it, division, conflict, battle, separation, when you see all that, which is to see, and that perception takes place only when you are completely attentive, at that moment the machinery of the Hinduism which is the conditioning comes to an end. You have got it? Have you got it, please? Have you learnt it by observing yourself?

Then the next question arises: how can this mind keep so attentive all the time? Right? Is that the question you are asking? Because you see when at a moment of attention all the conditioning disappears, all the image building comes to an end, it's only when you are not attentive then the whole thing begins, you are a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, you know, communist and all the absurdities. And then the next question is: can this attention be sustained? Which means this attention continue. You follow?

Please follow this carefully. Can this attention continue all the time? Right? Which means can this attention endure, which involves time, doesn't it? See that. Therefore you are putting a wrong question - right? - when you say, can this attention endure, can I keep this attention all the time, tell me how to keep this attention going all the time, what is the method, what is the system to sustain this attention. The moment you say, 'how is it to continue', you are inviting time, therefore time is inattention. Got it? Oh, you don't see it. Time is inattention. When you are completely attentive there is no time.

And when there is this attention and you have perceived and acted, forget it, it is over. Don't say, 'I must carry it with me'. You understand? You follow this? That is, at that moment of attention, you have seen and acted. Right? Perception, action. But thought says, how extraordinary, I wish I could continue that attention all the time because I see a way of acting without all this conflict. And so thought wants to cultivate attention. Any form of cultivation implies time. Right? So attention cannot be cultivated through time. Therefore perceive, action, and end there, forget it, begin again. You follow? So that the mind, the brain cells are fresh each time, not burdened with yesterday's perception. You have got it?

So the mind then is always fresh and young and innocent, not carrying all the burdens of yesterday. And the word 'innocence' means a mind that can never be hurt. You understand? A mind that has no markings of ever being hurt. That is real innocence. And most of us are hurt from childhood, we are beaten, we are crippled, we are tortured, we have scars on the brain. And we are struggling through the scars to find some state of mind in which there is no

hurt. And an innocent mind is a mind that has never been hurt.

That means a mind that never carries the hurt over to the next day.

So there is no forgiveness or remembrance.

# MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC DISCUSSION 12TH JANUARY 1971

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Questioner: Can we dispense with memory altogether in our human relationships?

K: Can we - I'll repeat the question - can we dispense altogether with memory in our human relationship? Shall we talk that over together? Is that what you want to discuss?

Q: What is creation?

Q: Why should we hold on to scientific memories?

Q: You said the other day that we must die to the past, unless we die every moment of our life we can't live anew, how is this to be done?

K: You said the other day that we must die every day to live anew, to have a clear perceptive mind, and how is this to be done. Anything else you would like to discuss?

Q: What is wisdom?

Q: Concentration?

K: Just throw in any old word, you know, see what comes out of it. Yes, sir?

Q: Can you speak about your experiences of ...

K: I don't quite follow the question, sir.

Q: I mean we are trying to bring people by their own understanding of what they can do. Now I feel it is possible, I don't know what percentage, but I assure you that not all the people here are capable of living life at the moment and ...

K: The questioner says, if I understood rightly, please correct

me if I am repeating it wrongly: only a few of us can understand what you are talking about, what about the rest, and if you personally went into your own experience perhaps that might help. Is that it?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Now which of these shall we discuss, talk over, or shall we put them all together? I think we can put them all together. What is the place of memory; and what is the place of knowledge in our daily life; and is it possible to live without the burden of the past and so live anew every day; and such a way of life can only be understood by the few, what about the rest? I think that more or less covers all our questions, doesn't it?

What is the place of knowledge in life? We'll begin very slowly and step by step go into this. Both the scientific knowledge and the accumulated racial knowledge as tradition, and one's own particular experiences, memories, knowledge, what place has all that in our daily life? Are we aware of all this? Is one aware, are you aware of the immense racial, cultural memories which are traditions, how your mind, one's mind functions in that particular pattern, is one aware, are you aware of it? Sir, this is a talking over together, this is not a talk by me, so we are supposed to talk things over together. Are you aware of this? You know, this is rather a complex problem because there is not only the conscious technological memories acquired recently but also the deep inherited memories - racial, religious, cultural, sociological, sociological, environmental - they are deeply rooted. One may be conscious or aware of the superficial memories. Now what place - the question is: what place have these superficial memories in life,



in relationship, and what is the relationship of the deep hidden memories that affect our daily relationship? Right?

Look: one has collected recently a great deal of technological knowledge, a great deal of memories with regard to science, law, you know, all that one reads, the education that one has had, the linguistic, the superficial accretions of the culture in which we live - the technological, the tradition and so on. Is one aware of it? Aware in the sense, does one know how one uses memory? I happen to speak French and Italian and Spanish because I have accumulated knowledge about those languages. Those are recent acquisitions. And I use them when I travel and all the rest of it. And also one has a great many other memories, memories of hurt, memories of insults, memories of various kinds of experiences - you follow? - one is not aware of them, one is using them. And there are all the hidden memories, hidden knowledge, deep in the dark corners of one's own mind. All memory, isn't it, is in the past.

I don't know how to discuss with you, you don't seem to take a share in this. You just listen, nod your head or agree. All memory, all knowledge, is in the past, isn't it?

Q: What do you mean by the past?

K: He asked, what do you mean by the past. It's in your mind, it's in the brain cells, the very structure of the brain cells holds all the memories. An experience you pass through and that leaves a mark; the mark, the knowledge, the information is there in the brain cells but it is already over. Isn't it? It is finished. I have experienced an insult yesterday, that has been registered in the mind, in the brain cells, that has left a memory and that memory was of yesterday's insult. That's what I mean, the past. And most of

our memories are in the past in that sense.

Yes, sir? (Noise of aeroplane) Just a minute, sir, let the aeroplane have its voice! Yes, sir?

Q: Is every memory in the past?

K: Is every memory in the past. Are there memories that are actually taking place now? Is that what you mean, sir? Can there be?

Q: Yes.

K: There cannot be.

Q: Some of the memories are.

K: I am exploring. I am asking. And these memories, modified in the present, project `what should be` in the future. So the movement of memory from the past, through the present to the future, but the whole movement has its source in the past. Right? Please, don't agree with me, just observe it in yourself. So what is that relationship, what is the relationship of this movement to the present? Right?

Q: It is creative.

K: Sir, don't jump to creative - you don't even know what it is, let's go step by step into it, sir.

What is the relationship of this movement, what is the action of this movement with the movement of life, the living? Sir, what is memory? You can see if you learn a language you accumulate all the verbs, the words and how to put the words together and so on and so on, that is a linguistic memory, memory composed of many, many words, verbs, irregular verbs and the usage of that. That's one type of memory. Then there are the whole scientific, technological memories. Right? Which we acquired through so-called education,

the cultivation of memory through technological information.

There are all the psychological memories, the memories that come about through human relationship. Right? My wife, my neighbour, my children, my husband, psychological relationship. Then there are all the racial memories, the racial memories being the memories of the culture in which I have lived. Right? Then there are all the ideological memories. I don't know if you see. So my mind is full of these memories: linguistic, technological, scientific, engineering and all the rest of it, psychological memories which I have accumulated during the last twenty years, or thirty years, or fifty years, or eight years, and there are all the racial memories, and so on. My mind, this mind is composed of all this. Right? The consciousness is the content of all this memory.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh, good lord, we are talking about memory, sir. We haven't even finished it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just let us go into this, it is fairly complicated, sir. I won't go into consciousness because that leads to all kinds of things.

So the brain cells contain all this, all in contradiction. Right? Please, see this, observe it in yourself. All in contradiction: the scientific knowledge and the racial knowledge, the personal knowledge, they are all opposing each other, all moving in different directions from each other. And the content of the brain cells is this vast collective memories, and from that memory, consciously or unconsciously we act. So knowledge as memory, as experience, is always in the past - always in the past, it must be - and respond to the present from the past, so there is a contradiction.

Right?

Q: What do you mean by the past?

K: I'll show it to you. Sir, they agree immediately, they shake their heads.

Q: I don't.

K: Not you, sir, just a minute. I didn't say you, sir.

Q: I acquire more.

K: Yes, you acquire - that's what I am saying - accumulate, accumulate.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, sir, but it's all there. Now I was saying that the past with all the memories is in contradiction with the present. You say, what do you mean by that. And some say, I don't agree with you. Now what do we mean, what do I mean by that - the past is in contradiction with the present? Right, sir? What do I mean by that? I have been insulted yesterday, you insulted me, or flattered me. That has left a mark on my mind, an image of you who have insulted or flattered, and I meet you the next day. That image, that memory projects, interferes in the observation of you now. You might have changed, you might have - are bound to - had a tremendous lot of changes, and I come with a past memory and meet you with that image of that insult, so there is a contradiction. If I can meet you without that insult with its memories I meet you afresh. In that there is no contradiction, though you may not have changed, or you might have changed. I approach you with a mind that is freed from yesterday's insult, in that there is no contradiction. There is nothing to agree of disagree about this matter.

So the past has its own movement. Right? Accumulating, discarding, modifying, adjusting, it has its own movement. That is, if one is a doctor there are so many new investigations, examinations, information, diagnosis, and this is accumulation of knowledge which is also a movement. I don't know if you are following that? And life has also its movement. No?

Q: What do you mean by life has its own movement?

K: What do I mean by, life has its own movement. All right. We see knowledge as a movement from the past through the present to the future, adding, taking away, modifying and so on. That's a movement, isn't it? It is not a dead static thing. Right? And do I realize that the past is interfering in a relationship which is also a movement?

Q: How do I make use of past memory?

K: I am going to show it to you in a minute, I am just looking at it, sir. Look at it first. That is, the past is a movement, it is not a dead thing, because there are experiences being added to it all the time, modified, changed, adjusted, it's a movement. At one level it is very, very superficial, and at other levels it's very, very deep, so between the superficial and the depth there is a contradiction, there is a variation. I am technologically terribly advanced but I am still a narrow bigoted Christian or a Catholic or a Hindu. So there is a variation, there is a contradiction. Unless this contradiction ceases there must be conflict in my relationship. Isn't it?

Q: The movement of the past can be in harmony with the present.

K: Now wait a minute, what is the present? Tell me, sirs, what is the present? Do you know what the present means?

Q: Now.

K: Wait, before you answer, please, I haven't finished the question. What is the present? The present is now, while you are sitting, is that the present?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, enquire, enquire, please. Is that the present, being here? You are physically here but your thoughts may be ... Or you might say, I am listening to what is being said, I am comparing it with what somebody else has said. So what is the present? Is it a chronological time as the present, the number is ten past, whatever it is, is that the present, by the watch? Is there such a thing as present? So to understand really deeply what it means, the present, one must understand this whole movement of the past. And you say, well, don't bother about that, let's live in the present. That has no meaning. And there are a great many philosophies founded on this idea, let's live in the present, forget, it doesn't matter what has happened, let's make the best of this awful life, now.

So to understand the movement of the present, and it must be a movement otherwise it is not a present, one must go into this whole question of the past as memory, which is time. Right? I must understand time to find out what is the present. And time is memory, time is something that has been put together, either vertically or horizontally. And that is the memory which each of us has - linguistic, technological, psychological, traditional and so on, it's a vast accumulation, both conscious and hidden. Right? Now let's find out how to observe or learn or be aware of the deeper layers of memories. You follow? Please, does this interest you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Quite right.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I have been insulted yesterday and I have the memory of that insult and when I meet you I meet you with the image of that insult. So my relationship with you is through the image of that memory, through that recollection, so there is no actual relationship between you and me, only the memory of that insult. That's fairly simple, we can't stick to that example, I am sorry.

Q: Suppose it repeats itself day after day.

K: You live with that image. Your next question is, how am I to be free of that image. Right? Is that we are discussing?

Q: Should I be free of it at all?

K: You have insulted me, you have robbed me, you have flattered me, and that has left a mark as memory. Memory is an image, as you the central figure in that image. And should I wipe away the memory of that insult, or that flattery? Or you have robbed me, should I forget it, and be robbed next time by the same person? What should I do? What should I do? I am very simple, you can rob me, I have nothing very much except a few clothes. So that is not a problem to me. But if you have a lot of things and you are robbed then you will think about it twice. How to deal with a person who has hurt me. It is so complex really. How to deal with a person who has hurt you, both physically and psychologically. Physically in the sense, taken away your things, or hurt you physically, wounded you, or wounded you inwardly. Now how to be free of this hurt - that's what I am coming to if you would go with me a little bit.

Which is - let's go back - we were asking, there is this vast

collection of complex memories, inter-related memories and contradicting each other. The conscious memories, knowledge, are necessary, technologically. If I don't remember where I live I can't get home, I won't be able to speak the language, I won't be able to recognize you. So technological knowledge is necessary and I classify all the recognition, the information, the knowledge, scientific, biological, law, all that as superficial knowledge. Now there are deeper layers of memory. Now how shall I, how shall you examine all that because they are constantly interfering? They are constantly modifying, or changing the superficial. Right? So there must be an awareness, a recognition, or an understanding of the hidden. Now how is that to be done? How is it to be done? Go on, sirs.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's all. That's quite right. Only you enquire into the hidden when there is trouble, when there is suffering, when there is pain.

Q: A mistake.

K: The same thing. A mistake and all the rest of it. And we live with a great many mistakes, a great many worries, a great many problems, both superficially and so on and so on. I am asking you a question, which is: how am I, how is this conscious mind with all the information it has, which is also conditioned, how can that mind enquire into the deeper layers, into the very dark recesses of one's own brain, memories, how do you propose to do it?

Q: By wilful forgetfulness.

K: Go slowly. Let me answer the gentleman. By wilfully forgetting it. Can you do it, say, 'I won't look behind the garden',



and the filth is collected there. Can you wilfully deny this? So that is not all right, we can brush that aside. The action of will, which is to say, 'I must look into it', will not answer it, or wilfully saying, 'I will forget it' - it is there. Then what will you do?

Q: By being constantly aware.

K: By being constantly aware of what?

Q: Of it.

K: Listen to the gentleman's question. He says, by being constantly aware of it. What is the 'it'?

Q: Past memories.

K: Past memories, hidden. How will you know it? So just watch it, sir. Will you know it through analysis? Which is what all the world is doing. Please, don't deny it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking, sir, that's just it. Will you find out through conscious analysis the content of the hidden memories? Right? Will you use analysis? Do you know what is implied in analysis? There is the analyser and the analysed. Right? Who is the analyser that is going to analyse? Is the analyser different from the thing analysed? You don't know about all this. And if you do analyse it will take time, won't it? No? Day after day, day after day, analysing, which you are doing, unconsciously or consciously you are always analysing. And one hasn't enquired into the whole structure of analysis, what it means - oh, just analyse. I am pointing out to you when you analyse there is always the analyser and the thing to be analysed. There is a division in that, the analyser is the censor. Right? Has assumed a position of authority because he says, 'I know more, I have learnt more, I can analyse the thing

which I am going to' - so he separates himself from the analysed and begins to analyse, to examine. In the examination, unless the analyser is completely free of the past, his analysis will be entirely wrong or partially wrong, therefore valueless.

And analysis implies time, because I have so many memories and I have to examine each memory. Do you know what it means? It will take all my life time and by the time I am dead. And when there is time between the completion of analysis other factors come into being, so there is no end to this process, therefore it is totally wrong. You are stuck, aren't you?

Q: No, sir. All you are saying is the analyser is equal to the conditioning of the past.

K: That's right.

Q: He is trying to analyse the conditioning by the conditioning.

K: That's right, that's right, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, I am going to show it to you, don't come to any conclusion. Don't come to any conclusion, always examine, look. So I have this problem.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are trying to find out. Sir, please. Wilful discarding of memory, hidden memories, doesn't work, deliberately saying to myself 'I will forget the whole thing and start anew', you can't do it. Nor will analysis free the mind from the past, the past hidden as well as the insults which have left a mark. I can't analyse, through analysis get rid of it. Because I have explained what analysis implies - the observer and the analyser, and so on and so on. Then what shall I do?

Q: Become conscious of it.

K: You become conscious of it - conscious of what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Therefore, that is the past insult, I was insulted yesterday, that interferes with my relationship with you today who have insulted me. So can I, can the mind - listen to this quietly, please - can the mind forget that insult? Can the mind analyse that insult and discard it? Right? Or both those ways take time and all that, or is there a different way altogether? You are following, you have understood my question?

Q: Ignore it.

K: Whether you ignore it or forget it, it is still there. I can ignore my tummy ache but the tummy ache is still there, or try to forget it. So, sir, just listen to the question, see the complexity of it first. Understand the question first. You insulted me yesterday, I reacted to it, that reaction is from the past, with the collection of many hurts and I respond. So how am I to completely wipe away that insult?

Q: Is it possible to do that?

K: I am going to show it to you. Don't say it is possible or not possible, let's find out, otherwise I am a bundle of hurts, I am a bundle of excruciating pain because people have insulted me, trodden on me, bullied me. You follow? So I am asking, is it possible not to record - please listen - not to record any insult? Is it possible, not after having recorded how to wipe it out, but how not to record at all? Right? You have understood my question? Please, investigate it with me. You insult me and that has left a mark, and from that memory, that memory is going to meet you tomorrow.

And it cannot be wiped away by will, by analysis. So that's gone. Then what shall I do, what shall the mind do not to record insults? Never. Let's let the past go, we will deal with that presently, past insults, but no more recording of any insult, how is this to be done?

Q: Switch off the current.

K: Wait. Switch off the current - who is going to switch it off? What kind of inanity this is, please, sir, really.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right, sir, but how are you going to not record his insult?

Q: I don't take it seriously.

K: All right, I don't take it seriously, he calls me an ass, or whatever he does, what shall I do? Insults my wife or my husband or my children, hurts them, I can't help recording, the mind records.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, I understand, sir, but I'll show you something much simpler than all this.

Q: Analysis is introspection.

K: Who is the person introspecting?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, I know, you gradually modify your reactions, gradually, then you are dead and other things happen. This is so simple. The question is - please do pay a little attention to this - the question is: how am I, how is this mind not to record, not only insults but pleasures, experiences, pleasurable, painful, not to record so the

mind is always fresh? You follow? That is the question, how is it to be done.

Q: Don't consider it as hurt.

K: He has hurt me, sir. Hit me in the face - not consider that as a hurt? Apparently you haven't gone into this. You can't forget it, you can't say, it is a temporary reaction, it will pass, or gradually it will wither away. I haven't time to allow it to gradually wither away because other factors are happening in the mean time. So my question is: how is the mind, the brain cells, not to record at all, the insults, the flatteries, the yesterday's pain, physical pain as a toothache - please follow this - and not say, 'It will happen again tomorrow, I must be careful' and there is fear, all that is recording of pain, pleasure, fear. How are the brain cells not to record but yet observe, yet look? Not just withdraw completely into blindness. How is this to be done?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, yes I understand, but I hurt you physically, I slap you in the face, or you slap me in the face, what happens? You record it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, that's partly it, I said that. We react according to our conditioning.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, now the point is this sir, look: I have been hurt, physically, psychologically, I have had pain last week and that mustn't happen again next week, and therefore there is fear of recurring pain, there is fear of recurring incidents which have happened before. Those are all memories repeating themselves. Now how is it possible for the mind, which is the brain cells, not to

record these psychological memories but retain the factual memories? You have understood? Retain scientific, technological, linguistic, directional memories. Right? You have understood my question? Not that there is a division between the two, but the one interferes in all relationships, so I must first understand why I record at all. I record, the mind records because it strengthens the past, and the past gives me a sense of security, both linguistically, I said, 'I have been angry, and I am angry', the very recognition of anger in terms of the past, which is verbal, strengthens that memory. That's one side of it. And also I respond because it is a tradition, it is the habit, it is the conditioning. That's also another. I say, can all this be prevented so that there is no recording at all? Have you got my question? How will you answer this? If you are given this problem, how will you respond to it, what is your answer? Will you turn to your yogis, Veda, Gita, Upanishads and all the rest of it, what's your answer? What will you do?

Q: Recording is a biological response.

K: I understand that, sir, we said that. Recording is a biological process, like language is recorded, but I am asking. Sir, you hurt me very deeply, not by word only, by what you have done, you have hurt me very, very deeply.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please. I have been hurt very deeply, as most people are, from childhood, beaten, frightened, nervous, anxious, avoiding, you know, all those bring hurt, and I am accumulating more and more and more hurts, and I end up when I die a withered human being. So I say to myself, how is it possible not to record the psychological memories? Please, I'll show you something very

simple. When you insult, at that moment give complete attention. It is only inattention that records.

Q: Complete attention to what?

K: Wait, please. You see, you are all too clever. Complete attention to what, the gentleman asks. To your slapping me in the face, to your calling me an ass, when you are violent to me, or when I am violent to you, at that moment to be completely aware of your word, your gesture, your attitude. You know what that means, to be attentive? Have you ever tried this?

Q: To be one with the aggressor.

K: Oh, no. To be one, which is identify yourself with the aggressor. Look what a bothersome thing that is. You don't even listen, you go on with your own ideas. Incredible!

Look, sir: you call me a fool, and to be attentive at that moment. At that moment, you understand? Attentive means, give full attention with your mind, with your heart, with your body, with your eyes, with your ears, to be fully attentive at that moment when you call me an ass, because in that attention there is no recorder, there is no me who is recording the insult. Why are you all so silent? Look, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right. That is complete attention. Seeing the whole picture, not just the word.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, no, sir, no, sir. Let's approach it differently. What is it to be aware? What does it mean to be aware? I am aware of you sitting there, I am aware of the tent, or what you call this, I am aware of those flowers, the bright sunlight on the flowers, I am

aware, the colours of the sweaters, the dresses, the saris, the people's faces, I am aware. In that awareness I say, 'What a lovely flower that is', by saying, 'what a lovely flower that is' the response is from the past. Can I be aware of that flower without the response of the past? Just to observe without naming it as a bougainvillea, then in that attention there is no past at all. Right? Do see this, please, it is a very simple thing if you do it. I see that sari, that dress: visual response, conditioned response which says, 'I don't like that colour', which means I look at it with a prejudice, therefore I am not aware at all, I am aware of my prejudice responding. Now can I look at that sari, or that coat, that colour, without the reaction of like or dislike, just to observe, which doesn't mean I am indifferent, I've gone to sleep, but to actively observe. When you observe there is no centre of observation, there is no centre which is observing. The centre is the memory, is the past, which says, 'I don't like that colour', or 'I do like that colour'. Right?

Now when you are insulted, to observe completely, without any response. Try it, do it. I say you are a silly man - see what are all the responses that come into being. Which is, all the responses of the memories of the past. Now when I say you are a silly man, can you listen to it without any response of the past? But listen, not say, 'I don't care what you say, you are a perfect idiot also' and forget it. But just to listen. Then will there be any recording at all? Then you find out that you record only when you are inattentive, when there is not this complete attention then there is recording.

Then the question is: how is one to sustain this attention all the time? You have understood my question? I see that there is no



recording at the moment of insult when there is complete, total attention. Which is, in which there is no response of the old brain. I am introducing a new word, I hope you don't mind - old brain being the conditioned brain with all its memories of insults, pain, to attend without all the response of the past. You can do it, one does it. When there is a tremendous crisis in life you do it. At that time it happens automatically. See what is involved in that. In a moment of crisis, real crisis, what takes place? The crisis is so enormous it knocks out the observer. Right? It knocks out the recorder because the thing is so great. Haven't you noticed it, when somebody dies -not yours, my son dies - at that moment, at that second or may be a few minutes I am in a state of complete shock, there is no recording. The incident of death has knocked out all my memories for the time being. Haven't you noticed this? Then the old habit comes in, then the recording takes place: he is my son, what shall I do, my loneliness, my self-pity, you know, all the circle begins.

Now to observe that insult and many other forms of recording, with complete attention at the moment it is given. Then you will say, how is the brain to maintain this attention all the time. Right? That's a wrong question. Because you say, I have learnt a trick and I want to continue keeping that trick. That is, pay attention completely to that insult and forget it, let it go. Next time be completely attentive. You follow what takes place? Each time you are completely attentive there is no recording. But if you say, I must continue that attention, you are just continuing the memory of that attention. Right? Therefore be completely attentive at the moment of insult. Finished. Then an interval, something else

happens, and at that moment be also completely attentive so that the mind is attentive to every incident, not it must maintain a continuous attention. Got it? If you haven't got it, it's up to you.

Q: How are you to be attentive?

K: Is there a way, a system, a method which will help you to be attentive. Is that the question? A method, a system, is a practice, a repetition. A repetition is the contrary of attention. Therefore there is no method, full stop. Oh, you don't see the beauty of this. You see, sir, it all implies freedom, freedom means freedom from the past, freedom from recording, so that the mind is free.

Q: Does that mean only the free mind can attend?

K: I didn't say that. Please listen. At the moment of pain - look: I had pain last week, physical pain, very bad toothache - I didn't have it - very bad toothache, what do I do? I go to the dentist and he does something and that physical pain has left a mark, which is the memory of that pain. And the memory, which is thought, says, 'I hope I shan't have it next week, I must be careful', therefore I am nervous, therefore I am frightened because I have a recollection of the pain of the toothache a week ago. Now can I have pain, the toothache and finish with it, not carry it over to next week? You understand? It's time to stop.

Look, sir, first of all, you see most of you I am afraid are used to reading books and trying to find out how to live according to the books. Right? According to what somebody has said, and therefore you never find out for yourself what is actually going on. You know, which means never to repeat what somebody has said, never. Never to say something that you yourself actually do not know, you yourself have not actually experienced. You know what

would happen if you said that, never to repeat what somebody has said, never to say something that you yourself do not know, never to assert that there is or that there is not, you know what would happen to your mind? Then you would begin to observe for yourself, then you would find out for yourself, not live on the past memories, which are dead anyhow, and that's why you are so dead, you have no energy in all this.

## MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 13TH JANUARY 1971

As we have talked about so many other things like fear, pleasure, and the ending of sorrow, I think we ought to talk over together the question of meditation. Of course that word is loaded, specially in the East. One has all kinds of ideas of what meditation is, what systems to follow, what methods, what practices, what disciplines. And I think we ought to consider this because it is part of life, like death, love, and the sense of great beauty, meditation also is not only a part but perhaps covers the whole field of life.

I don't quite know how to begin about it because it is rather a complex thing and we ought to begin, I think, that one must change radically, totally one's way of living, not only outwardly in our relationships, in our attitudes and activities but also inwardly, most profoundly. There must be a really marvellous change so that our minds, our very structure is entirely different. And as man, centuries upon centuries, has sought a way of life that is not worldly and so he has escaped from life, he has denied living and created his own idea of what a religious life is. And if you are going to go into this question of meditation and what is a religious life, what is a religious mind, one must turn one's back upon everything that man has thought about what meditation is, or what a religious life is. We have to totally abnegate, deny all that. And I'll show you why.

First, reason is excellent, the capacity to reason logically, sanely, healthily, objectively, is essential, not to get emotional, but to clearly use the capacity of the intellect. The intellect which is a

part, not the whole of man, must be capable to observe clearly, reason objectively, efficiently, sanely, not neurotically and realize that the intellect is only a part and cannot possibly solve all our problems.

And one asks, if one is at all serious, and I hope you are, how to bring about in ourselves and therefore in the world because the world is ourselves, we are the world and the world is us because we are conditioned by the culture in which we have been brought up, and that culture is created, put together by man, by you, therefore there is no difference between you and the world about you. You are the world and the world is you, and if you really seriously, profoundly see the necessity of change then one must ask, can this whole structure, the structure of the brain, the mind, undergo a total change. Now that is what we are going to find out. And that is the beginning of meditation. Not how to sit straight, to breath deeply, to do some various kinds of tricks and hope thereby to achieve some kind of marvellous enlightenment.

So we will begin by seeing what it is not, what is not meditation, and through negation come to the positive. But you must negate, not merely verbally or intellectually, theoretically but actually, negate everything that man has said, it doesn't matter who it is, what meditation is because one has to find out for oneself, because truth is something not to be bought through another, it's not something fixed, something that you can repeatedly add to in order to discover it. We will go into all that. But first please do realize that if one is really serious one must totally negate all the propaganda, for religion is a continuous propaganda - you are told what to do, what to think, either for five thousand years or two

thousand years. So one must if you are serious totally put aside all that and find out for oneself what truth is, if there is such a thing.

So it is important to understand oneself, not what others say about yourself, the psychologists, the analysts, the religious teachers and the religious books because if you follow what they say what you are, if you follow others, what they say you are, you are not discovering yourself, you are discovering what others say. Right? Is that simple and clear? That is, if I follow a psychologist or a philosopher or an analytical, intellectual person or one of the ancient teachers, however ancient, respected and all the rest of it, you are merely following what they are telling you about yourself. Therefore you have to deny all that because then you begin to find out what you are. And meditation is part of this, because without knowing yourself, not only superficially but at the very depths of one's being, you have no basis for any action, you have no foundation whatsoever on which you can build, the mind can build a house that is stable, orderly. So it is absolutely necessary if you would really take this extraordinary journey, and that's what we are going to do, journey together into this enormous complex problem of understanding oneself. And please see the absolute essential necessity of it, that nobody can teach you about yourself except yourself, so you have to be the guru, the disciple yourself, the teacher yourself and learn from yourself. What you learn from another is not truth. So you have to find out for yourself what you are and to learn how to observe yourself.

You know it is one of the most arduous tasks to go into this. It's like taking a journey together. You know when you walk together you must be friends, you must love walking together, you must

love. And that is one of the most difficult things. And we are going to find out. To learn about oneself is not to accumulate knowledge about oneself. Please follow this. I want to learn about myself, so I have to observe myself. If I learn about myself through the accumulation of knowledge I do not learn about myself. Right? Sirs, would you please be quiet?

Look: I want to learn about myself. There are two ways of learning: to learn in order to accumulate knowledge, and from knowledge observe, observe through the screen of the past; I learn about myself, observe myself, having experiences and accumulating knowledge from those experiences, and looking at myself through those experiences. That is, looking at myself through the past, for knowledge is the past. Right? That's one way of looking at oneself. The other is to observe and watch the movement of all the thought, of all the motives and never accumulate, therefore learning is a constant process. I see it needs further explanation, let's go into it.

I see myself being violent, and I have condemned it or justified it, and I have learnt from it that there should be no violence. I have learned from it. The next time I observe myself being violent I respond according to my knowledge of what I have learnt. Right? Do you see this? And therefore there is no fresh observation. I am looking at the new experience of violence with old eyes, with previous knowledge, therefore I am not learning. Learning implies a constant movement, not from the past, movement from moment to moment so that there is no accumulation. Because we are the result of thousands of accumulations, we are accumulating, and if you would understand that accumulation you have to learn about it

and not further accumulate. Right? Do you see this? So there must be an observation which is a constant learning without accumulation? Accumulation is the centre, is the 'me', the ego, and to learn about it one must be free of accumulation, and not accumulate at another level in a different direction. You are understanding all this?

So there must be learning about oneself by watching, not condemning, not justifying, but just watching, the way you talk, the way you walk, the words you use, the motives, the purposes, the intentions, to be totally aware without any choice. And awareness is not a matter of accumulation, learning, be aware from moment to moment. When you are not aware don't bother, begin again so that your mind is always fresh. Therefore the learning about oneself is not only at the conscious level, superficial level, but also the deeper levels, the so-called unconscious, the hidden. How are you going to learn about something that is very deeply rooted, hidden, not open? Right? We are, our whole consciousness is superficial and hidden, and one has to learn the content of all that consciousness because the content makes up the consciousness. Right? The two are not separate, the content is consciousness. Therefore to understand the content there must be an observation without the observer. Right? I don't know if you understand this, we'll go along. You know it's one of the most fascinating things in life, to find out how to look anew at life.

To observe the hidden one has to have eyes that are not conditioned by the past, as a Hindu, Christian and all the rest of it, one must look at oneself as though for the first time, and look at it for the first time each time, and therefore never accumulate. If you



can so observe yourself in action, in the office, with the family, with the children, when you are sexual, when you are greedy, ambitious, you know, all the rest of it, observe without condemning it, without justifying it, just to observe, then you will see that in that observation there is no conflict whatsoever. And a mind that comes with a torture, with a distorted mind, can never possibly find out what truth is. And most of our minds are distorted, tortured, made small by control, by discipline, by fear.

And there is another factor, which is, the psychologists say, not that I have read their books or anything of that kind, but people have talked to the speaker about their special subjects, professionals, that you must dream otherwise you go mad, there must be when you sleep, there must take place dreams. Please be interested in this because you dream in life, every night when you sleep some kind of dream activity goes on. And they say that it is essential for human sanity that you must dream. Now we are going to question it, we are going to find out whether it is absolutely necessary to dream at all. So we have to discard the professionals and find out for ourselves. So we have to ask, what are dreams? Are not dreams the continuation of the activity of daily life - right? - only in symbolic form? Right? Please don't agree or disagree, we are enquiring together, taking the journey together therefore there is no agreement, or disagreement. We are both of us observing. We are asking, is it necessary to dream at all? And what are dreams? Are they not the movement of daily life, the daily observation, the daily wrangles, you know all the misfortunes, violence, bitterness, anger, a movement of that continuing while you are asleep, only taking a symbolic, a ritual, or a verbal scene. You find out.

So if you have observed also you will see that the brain needs order otherwise it can't function rationally. Right? You are following all this? Have you noticed before you go to sleep that you review the day and you say to yourself, 'I should have said that differently', 'I should have done that in a different way', 'I shouldn't have said that', 'I wish it hadn't happened, I must correct it tomorrow' - haven't you noticed it, that you review the day, just before you go off to sleep. Why? Because if you don't do it consciously while you are asleep the mind is spending its energy to bring order within itself. Are you following all this? I am afraid you are not.

Look: order is necessary in daily life, not only when you are asleep, the brain demands that you have an orderly, sane life, otherwise it can't function efficiently. And order is virtue because if you are not virtuous, if you are disorderly, how can the brain which can only operate excellently when it is secure, when it has order within itself, haven't you noticed all these things? Look: if you lead a disorderly life, as most of us do, a contradictory, stupid, shallow life, you can have a superficial order; but the superficial order becomes disorder when there is a relationship with other human beings. So order is necessary. We will come back to that.

So while you are asleep, while the body is asleep, the brain is bringing about order in itself because the next day it has to face disorder again therefore it must have some capacity of order to bring out of disorder. Right? And the bringing about order is a form of dream, but if you in the waking hours established order then the brain while the physical body is asleep then the brain can enquire, live a totally different kind of life. We will go into that

also. Is this all Greek to you? Are we talking Chinese? Look, sir, this is part of meditation. A mind that has no order, that is disorderly, doing one thing, saying another, thinking, acting in another way, as we do, such a mind cannot possibly understand what meditation is. There must be order. Now how do you establish - how does the mind, the brain establish order during the day? Order being virtue, not the social morality. Social morality is immorality. We are not talking of social order, social morality, we are talking of a virtue that is orderly. Now the order is not a blue-print established by the Gita, the Bible, by the teacher, order is a living thing, it has no blue- print. If you have a blue-print then there is disorder between what you are and what you should be. You are following all this? Therefore in that there is contradiction, therefore there is conflict. Conflict indicates disorder.

So you can only find out what order is when you observe, learn about what is disorder. In the understanding of what is disorder you have order. Right? And our daily life, as we live, is disorderly, isn't it? Would you say your life, if you are honest to yourself, is very orderly, very sane, balanced, harmonious? Obviously not. If it was you wouldn't be sitting here. You would be free human beings, marvellous human beings, establishing a different kind of society, but we are disorderly human beings, contradictory. So observe without denying, justifying, just observe your disorder, how contradictory you are, how frightened you are, how envious you are, seeking prestige, position, bullied by your wife or husband, a slave to what your neighbour thinks of you, a constant conflict, struggle. Observe that without justifying, condemning, learn all about that disorder, and you will see out of that comes an

extraordinarily sweet order with a movement, with a life, with vigour.

Then you will see that because during the day you have established complete order in your life, a mathematical precise order - and to understand that you have to understand fear, you have to understand pleasure, which we went into briefly the other day. I am not going into all that. All the egotistic activities, the vanities, the agonies, the despairs, all that is disorder, and by being aware of that, choicelessly, you will see that when you go to sleep your mind then has no dreams at all. Therefore such a mind, such a brain is made fresh during sleep, renews itself and therefore the next morning you will find the brain has an extraordinary capacity. And that's part of understanding oneself. And one has to give time to it, you must love this, you know. Oh, lord! You must give your life to this because it's your life, you must give your life to understand your life. Because you are the world and the world is you, if you change you change the world. This is not a mere intellectual idea, you must burn with this, you must have passion, and meditation is the release of tremendous energy. Now we are going to go into that some more.

You know to change the environment there must be a system, a method - method, system is to act efficiently. Just follow this. If you want to change the environment round here there must be planning, what to do. If you want to build a house you have to plan. And when you establish a system, what takes place? Outwardly, what takes place? There must be a few who will be capable of running that system. Then what happens to them, the people who run the system? They become much more important

than the system or the consideration of changing the environment. Haven't you noticed all this? No? They are the bosses, they are the people who use the system in order to become important themselves, like the politicians the world over. Haven't you noticed this? Please follow this. To bring about an environmental change there needs to be an efficient group of people with a system, but the efficient people are human beings, they are angry, jealous, envious, wanting position - you have seen all this, haven't you. And therefore they use the system and forget the whole business. Right?

Now we want a system to meditate. You are following this? See the relationship between the two. We think we can be efficient in our meditation, in our thinking, in our enquiry if there was a system. Now what does a system imply? Please bear in mind very clearly the distinction between the two: if you want to change the physical environment there must be a group of people who are efficient to carry out that system, they must be impersonal, not egotistic, not lining their own pockets, you know, metaphorically and physically. And therefore human beings matter more than the systems. You see the importance of this? So we say the same thing about changing, bringing about a change in ourselves, that only through a system we can change, only through a system we can learn what meditation is, because that appears to offer efficiency. Does it? You know, every potty little guru in India, and elsewhere, has a system of meditation - mass, come together, meditate together, do this, don't do that, you know, all the racket that goes on in the name of meditation.

Now systems imply a repetition, practice, following a method. If you follow a method, a system, do practice, it becomes a routine.

Right? And when the mind becomes a mechanical thing then you have conflict, then there is an escape through sex, or through different forms. You are understanding all this? Therefore at all costs avoid any system of meditation because a mechanical mind can never possibly find out what truth is. The mechanical mind can become very disciplined, orderly; but that orderliness is contradiction to the order which we were talking about. Because in that orderliness, which is co-called repetition, there is contradiction between what you are and what you should be, the ideal, the perfect, and all the rest of that business. So there is contradiction in that. And where there is contradiction there is distortion, and therefore a mind tortured. And a tortured mind can never find out anything. So don't belong to any system, don't follow any guru. You know once a very famous guru came to see us. It was rather an amusing incident. Some of us were sitting on a little mattress as big as this, and out of politeness we got up and we asked the important man to sit on the mattress. He sat, he had a stick, he put the stick in front of him, sat very dignified, and he became the guru because he was on a little mattress. You have understood? He was telling us all what we should do, because out of politeness we offered the little seat which was an inch higher. Vanity and the demand for power, position, and people to be followers, such people will never find what truth is; they will find what they want which is their own gratification. So there is no system. But if you understand there is no system then your mind becomes alive, sharp to find out.

Now what is it that you are going to find out? We want, most of us, to experience something other than the daily experiences, we

want to experience a transcendental state, an experience of enlightenment. The word 'experience' means to go through. And when you demand to have greater experiences, that indicates that you are bored with living. Right? All the people who take drugs, they think through drugs they will have extraordinary experiences, and they do take a trip. Their trip, their experiences are the expression of their own conditioning. It gives them certain vitality, certain clarity, but that has nothing whatsoever to do with enlightenment. So through drugs you cannot possibly come upon it.

So what is it that we are seeking? You are following? What is it man wants? He sees what his life is, a boredom, a routine, a battlefield, a fight, this constant struggle, never a moment of peace, except perhaps occasionally, sexually or otherwise. So he says, 'Life is transient, life is changing, there must be something extraordinarily permanent' and he wants that permanency, something other than mere physical daily routine and experience. And he calls that god. So he believes in god, and all the images, rituals are based on beliefs. Belief is the outcome of fear. If there is no fear you can see the leaf, the tree, the beautiful sky, the light and the birds and a face, there is beauty. And where there is beauty there is goodness. Where there is goodness there is truth.

So one must understand the daily living. One must understand why our lives have become mechanical, why we follow others, why we are so childish, believing, not believing, fighting, violent, you know what is going on in daily life. And we want to escape from it, therefore we want wider, deeper experiences. And books, gurus, teachers, promise that enlightenment, that extraordinary

thing. And systems offer you that. That is, do these things and you will get there, follow this path and you will find yourself there. As though truth is like a station fixed, and all the roads leading to it. The same idiotic idea that there is a station, or a road, it doesn't matter what road you take you will all come there, therefore be tolerant of other paths. There is no road, no path, and no fixed truth. Therefore there is no path, therefore you must have a mind that is extraordinarily alive, working, learning.

And there is this whole question of concentration. You see, I don't know who tells you these things, that you must concentrate, learn to control thought, you must suppress desires, you must be this, you must never look at a woman, never look at a man, you know all that business. I don't know why you listen to any of this. You know, have you ever concentrated? That is, focusing your intention on something, have you done it? Like a school boy when he wants to look out of the window and see the movement of the tree or the bird or the passer-by, and the teacher says, 'Look at your book, don't look out of the window'. That is concentration. That is, give, focus your intention and build a wall round yourself so that you are not disturbed. Concentration becomes exclusion, a resistance. Right, do you see this? And in that concentration there is a battle. You want to concentrate and your mind goes off, your thought chases something or other, so there is conflict. Whereas if you gave attention - please listen to this - if you were attentive, not at the moment you want to be attentive but attentive during the day. For a few minutes at a time, completely attentive, give your mind, your body, your heart, your eyes, your ears, your brain, completely, totally attentive, then you will see there is no border to



attention, there is not a resistance, in that state of attention there is no contradiction. And you can only be attentive not by learning to be attentive, the method, the system, the practice, by looking at your toe, you know, but be attentive and then forget it, begin again. Pick it up each time so that this attention is fresh each time. And then you will know when you are not attentive. Then in that state of non-attention is conflict. Then observe that conflict, be aware of that conflict, give your total attention to that conflict so that the mind becomes extraordinarily alive, non-mechanical. That's part of meditation.

Then you have been told that you must have a quiet, silent mind, haven't you? Even the speaker has told you that! Forget what the speaker has said, but see for yourself why your mind must be quiet, must be silent, see it for yourself, not what anybody says, including the speaker. You know, to see anything clearly your mind mustn't chatter; if I want to listen to what you are saying the mind must be quiet, mustn't it? I want to understand you, what you are talking about, why you say this, I must listen to you. Right? And when I listen to you if I am thinking about something else I can't listen. You see the point? That is, to listen, to observe, the mind must be peaceful, must be quiet. That's all. Now you say, how is the mind to be quiet when it is chattering all the time about something or other. You understand my question? Not how to stop chattering, then that becomes a conflict, doesn't it - you are following this? The mind has got into the habit of chattering, talking to itself, or talking with somebody else, endlessly, using words, words, words. And if you try to stop it by the action of will then that's a contradiction, isn't it? You are chattering and you say,

'I must stop it', so you have battle again. You understand this? Therefore find out why your mind chatters. Enquire into it, understand it. And does it matter very much if it chatters? Why does it chatter? Because it must be occupied with something. You know people say, you must be committed to something, to some activity, you must be totally involved, and the mind is totally involved in chattering. And why does it chatter? Because it has to be occupied. Why does it demand to be occupied? Observe it yourself, ask the question. I am asking it for you but find out. What would happen if it didn't chatter, if it wasn't occupied? Have you asked that? If your mind is not occupied what would happen? It would face emptiness, wouldn't it? No? Suddenly stop the habit and you feel lost. And this emptiness is a fear of your own loneliness. And you try to escape from this loneliness, from this fear, from this emptiness by chattering, or by being occupied with this or that. So if you went deep, into the very depth of this loneliness, not try to suppress it, escape from it, but just to observe it, and you can only observe it if your mind is quiet. You are following all this? Because the moment you condemn it, the moment you say, I must not chatter, then you have conflict and all the ugly things begin. But if you merely observe your own loneliness, then you will find that your mind facing this emptiness becomes completely alone.

You know there is a difference between loneliness and aloneness. Loneliness is isolation, total isolation, which is what we are during the daily life. You are following? During the daily activity you are isolating yourself; you may be married, you may sleep with your wife or not, or whoever you sleep with, but what

takes place? You have your own ambitions, your own greeds, your own problems, and she has her own problems, and you are trying to establish a relationship between various problems. So the self-centred activity is loneliness. You are following all this? The self-centred activity is isolating and therefore there is this sense of appalling, frightening loneliness. And when you understand this you have that aloneness which comes when the mind and the brain cells have understood this whole problem. Which is, the denial of all authority, all spiritual authority, not legal authority. If you do not pay tax you will be taken to prison. One has, unfortunately, to obey laws, but to change laws which you have made you have to change yourself. Right? See the logic of it. By throwing a bomb, a physical revolution, you are not going to change the human mind. When you bring about physical revolution you are bound to have dictatorship, bureaucratic dictatorship or the dictatorship of the few. But what we are talking about, authority, the authority of another or the authority of your own accumulated knowledge as experience, which is the past. When you discard totally in yourself all authority, when you are no longer following any system, and when you have understood fear, pleasure, and in the understanding of fear and pleasure there is joy. And joy has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure. You may have a moment of great joy but thinking about it reduces it to pleasure.

And you have to understand yourself, which is all this. Not the higher self, there is no higher self. The higher self is part of yourself only thought has built it a little higher. The atman is still thought but only a little guru sitting on a little mattress. And you think he is going to guide all your life, which is sheer nonsense

because then you have conflict between the lower and the higher and all that childish stuff.

Then you have understood order, which comes with the understanding of disorder, that is, your life. Order is not a blueprint, virtue is a living thing, like humility. You cannot cultivate humility. So when all this is done the mind becomes extraordinarily clear, unconfused and therefore it is alone because the other minds are confused, other minds are in sorrow.

So out of this aloneness there is a quality of silence, which is not the result of practice, it is not the opposite of noise. That silence is without cause, and therefore it has no beginning and no end. And such a mind is absolutely orderly and therefore completely alone, and therefore innocent, which means that it can never be hurt. And out of this comes a marvellous silence. And what happens in that silence there are no words to describe it, there are no words. If you describe what happens then those words are not the thing. What is described, the description is not the described, therefore truth, that blessedness, that extraordinary silence and the movement of that silence has no words. And if you have gone that far then you are enlightened, you don't seek anything, you don't want any experience. Then you are a light, and that is the beginning and the ending of all meditation.

## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC DISCUSSION 15TH JANUARY 1971

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Questioner: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, not a long question, please, I have to repeat it so make it, please, brief.

Q: Is it possible to have mental order?

K: All right, sir.

Q: Is it possible to live in this world without exploiting morally and physically?

K: That question is enough, sir. How can we live in this world without exploiting morally and physically.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, that's what we said.

Q: What do you mean by awareness without the observer?

K: What do you mean by awareness without the observer? Any more? Sir, sir, you have already asked a question. Yes, sir, I know, but let the others have a chance.

Q: What is conceptual life?

K: God knows.

Q: For the last twenty years I am behind you because I can't understand how to have a true mind.

K: Sit down, sir, please, sir. Right, sir.

Q: Why should God incarnate in a human body?

K: I don't know why but we'll see. What kind of questions are these, sirs? You see all these indicate, don't they, I am just asking, sir, that we are really not concerned with changing our own life,

our daily, every day battle. We want theories, or say, what do you mean by this or that. We don't seem to apply what one has heard or observed to oneself. So shall we discuss this question, which is, that gentleman raised: what do you mean by awareness? Shall we discuss that? Would that be worthwhile?

Q: What is the role of effort?

K: Yes, sir, yes, what is the role of effort. Shall we discuss, talk over together this question of awareness? Yes? Would that be of interest? Sir, just a minute.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going to go into all those things, sir. Shall we discuss this, what it means to be aware? Shall we? Does that interest you, please, not as a theory, not as a speculative formula, but actually find out what it means to be aware in our daily life. Shall we?

Sir, aren't you aware of the things about you? When you come into this tent, or whatever it is called, aren't you aware of all the surroundings here? Are you?

Q: Yes.

K: Be quite sure, sir, be quite sure.

Q: We are terribly sure about that, sir.

K: Yes, that's what I am saying. Are you aware when you came in of the pillars, posts, how this tent is built, what that mango tree looks like, you know, to be aware, physically aware of your surroundings? Is one aware of it? Or one walks in with blind eyes, just making your way, not observing anything. Isn't awareness, doesn't it begin by being aware of the things about you, environmentally, being aware of the environment? What do you say, sirs? This is a discussion, it is not a talk by me.

Q: It is difficult to be aware of different things at the same time.

K: I said, sir - this is just an argument. Is one aware, are you aware, not of everything but just the colours of the plant, the creepers, are you aware of it?

Q: Any normal being is aware of that.

K: First of all he says, any normal being is aware of that - are we normal? Sir, do find out, don't just make statements. Let's find out what it means to be aware, let us explore it, dig into it. Once you begin to enquire into it you are going to discover an awful lot. But if you just listen speculatively you won't find out. So let's begin by being aware, if one is, of the environment in which one lives - the squalor, the dirt, the pollution. You understand, what is taking place around you. Now if you are aware of it, how are you aware of it? Sensorially, with the senses? Or with a conclusion in your mind about the environment? You understand my question? Are you aware of the environment as it is, or are you aware of it through a series of ideas? You understand my question? Which is it?

Q: A series of ideas.

K: So, you look at the environment through a series of concepts, images, ideas. Don't you? That it is beautiful, that it is not beautiful, that it is ugly, that house shouldn't - you follow. You have got concepts, conclusions, and through those conclusions you observe. Right? Are you aware of this fact? Are you aware that you look at the environment through your own concepts, your own images, or the images or concepts of tradition? You understand my question?

Q: We are aware primarily of different things. For example,

when I came in here I was seeing some things.

K: Quite. Yes, therefore you are not aware of the whole thing, of the environment. So just please go slowly, we will find out a great deal. Do we observe, aware, are we aware through ideas, concepts, images, or are we merely aware without any directive, without any motive, without any conclusion? You understand? You have understood my question? Which is it, which is it you do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right, sir. So you are aware of your environment through a series of conclusions. Just a minute, sir, go slowly. What do you say?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just to observe, sir, with your eyes. Do you see the flowers, the trees, the cars, people, actually see them, or do you see them with your images, with your conclusions, with your fears? You understand, sir, this is a simple question.

Q: I see them through images.

K: So you see things through your ideas, is that it? Through your conclusions. Right? Would that be right?

Q: How can one see without one's mind?

K: How could you see without your mind - we haven't even talked about the mind. I am just asking you, sir, first listen, sir. Do you look at me, the speaker - just listen - with ideas, concepts, or do you just observe him? He is part of your environment, how do you look at him? Obviously you look at him with certain conclusions, don't you. Now these conclusions, these ideas prevent you from looking, don't they. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)



K: Sir, therefore you don't observe totally. That's all.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, be simple about this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, do listen, sir. Do you look at your neighbour, who is part of the environment, without a conclusion that you have about him? Or do you look at him through a conclusion, through a prejudice? And if you do look at him through a prejudice, through a conclusion, you don't see him entirely. That's all, just a simple point, sir. Right? If I want to see you, I mustn't say to myself, you are a Brahmin, non- Brahmin, you are a lawyer, you don't look nice, you haven't washed - I must look at you, mustn't I?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We will come to that, sir. Slowly. So I am asking myself, and I am therefore asking you, how you observe, how are you aware. Are you aware totally or partially? Partially being to look at somebody, or the environment, the trees, the flowers and so on, through a series of conclusions, ideas. You have to know this, sir, find out. Now when one does that you can't neglect the conclusions, you can't neglect the ideas you have about him and the prejudices and so on. You put that aside for the moment and you observe, don't you? No?

Q: We do look but afterwards we make a conclusion.

K: I give it up! Sir, look: do you, the questioner, observe with ideas or having ideas and conclusions and prejudices, look, putting those aside for the moment?

Q: I can do it when I look at a stranger.

K: I know, of course not, when you look at a poor stranger of

course you have no ideas, but the moment he says something you begin to have your conclusions. You see you are not even ...

Q: Sir, then we have an animal life.

K: Sir, do try it on yourself, don't talk about the animal. Do it yourself, find out.

Q: You will reduce yourself to the level of an animal.

K: Find out, sir, don't say you will reduce yourself to a state of animal before you have tried it. Which means you have to understand before you put aside your ideas and conclusions why you have formed them, haven't you? Why they have become so extraordinarily important.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You observe a flower without a conclusion, then you form a conclusion then you say 'I like that flower', or you don't like that flower. First you observe, then you like or dislike enters into that field. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, why should you have a concept, observe first. Why should I have a concept about you, first I must observe, mustn't I? I must look at you.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You just throw up a lot of words, you don't see how and why these conclusions arise.

Q: If you don't have a concept you won't know how to reply.

K: I give it up! I really do. You are not experimenting, you are not digging into yourself, you are just throwing up ideas. First, sir, look, may I talk a little? I know you are used to being talked to but let me talk a little.

You see we want to find out what it means to be aware, whether it is possible to be aware with a prejudice, with conclusions, with a series of ideas and if you have them will they prevent awareness, and what does it mean to be totally aware. That is what we are discussing. That is, what does it mean to be totally aware, and is it possible to be aware without any conclusions, and what does it mean to be partially aware even? You see. Now let's begin: what does it mean to be partially aware? I come into this tent because I want to find the best place. Right? And I rush in and sit in the best place. I am not aware of all the people around me, of the environment. I am concerned with having the best seat in the place. So that is a partial awareness, isn't it? Right? No? Because I have a motive, because I want the best place, therefore that prevents me from observing the whole thing. That's simple, isn't it? No? So can I come in - listen to it, listen to it first - without a motive, observe everything around me and sit where I can? That observation is entirely different from the awareness of coming in, wanting the best place and sitting down. You see the difference? Do you see the difference?

Q: Yes, sir. How would it be possible ...

K: Wait, sir, wait, sir, a moment. So what happens? I come rushing in, wanting a place, sit down, I am not aware what is going on around me. And there is another who says, 'I'll find a place where I can but I am awfully interested to see all those flowers, what marvellous colours they are, lovely with the light on it, how beautiful they are', and I find a place. I am observing the environment, watching everything, and find a place. But the place is irrelevant; I'll find the best place I can, that is not relevant. What

is relevant is to observe. You are listening to all this? So the partial awareness is when I am concerned with having the best place in the tent, and an awareness which observes everything and finds a place where it can. You see the difference? So the mind that is watching everything may find a best place. You follow? But that is irrelevant. So the mind observes, but it is incapable of observing all round if there is a motive. That's clear? Now have you a motive when you look around? Find out, sir. When you look at somebody, have you a motive, have you a prejudice? If you are a Muslim will you look at a Hindu without a prejudice? If you have prejudice then you look partially. Right? If you have no prejudice then you can look. Find out whether you have a prejudice.

So from that we begin to find out that it is possible to be aware without a motive. Right? Right? Aware, observe, without saying, 'I must have the best place' and forget everything and get a best place. Whereas if you were aware of all this you may find a best place but that becomes irrelevant. So the mind can observe without motive. Right? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, yes, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What happens then? You see what that gentleman said? First time I come here I observe, I take in everything, I make a picture of it, record it in my mind and there they are, the flowers are there on the right hand side, or on the left hand side and all the rest of it. Then the second time I don't observe so clearly, the third time I take it for granted. You see what has happened? Just see what has happened. I have formed a habit which prevents me from

observing. Right? So conclusions become habits. Right? Ideas. The first time I observe all this, how nice, or not nice, I observe, then the second time I observe a little less, the third time I take it for granted, which is a habit. So habits prevent observation. Right, sir? So have I habits? Find out, sir. Have you habits, which are conclusions, which are prejudices, which are a series of ideas? And these habits prevent you from observing. So a person who is burdened with habits is not capable of being aware. Full stop. Have you got that? If I think in terms of a Hindu, or as a professor, or as a scientist, and that's my habit, then I observe very casually everything around me. Right? So have I and you a series of habits which prevent you or me from observing? I have to find out, haven't I? So be aware of the habits. Forget the environment for the moment, be aware of your habits. Are you aware of your habits? Not merely physical habits.

Q: If I am angry, if I am aware of my anger, the anger doesn't dissolve.

K: Wait, sir.

Q: It gets suppressed. After some time the anger comes again. I am aware again it is suppressed. As long as the anger is suppressed it cannot be released or it cannot be dissolved.

K: Sir, we are coming to that. Sit down sir, we haven't come to that point yet. We will come to it, sir. The gentleman says, anger can only be emptied in the mind when you yield to anger completely. We will come to that presently if there is time.

We see that there is no awareness as long as there is a series of well established habits. Have you established habits? We have, haven't we? We are bound to have.

So the next question is - just go slowly: to be aware of those habits and can those habits be dissolved, put aside? You understand? I have a habit, if I have, of - what?

Q: Of getting irritated.

K: I have a habit of getting irritated. Right. Now is it irritation? I don't accept first of all, when you say I am irritated, I don't accept it, I want to find out. I don't say I am not, or I am, I want to find out. Am I irritated? When you ask the same question over and over and over again, not listening, and somebody asks an irrelevant question, am I irritated? Or I say, look, please stop, we are sticking to this point? So suppose if I am irritated, can I observe that irritation - please listen to this carefully - can I observe that irritation without any conclusion? You understand? Without saying, I must get rid of it, I must not get rid of it. Can I observe that irritation?

Q: You cannot.

K: Wait, sir. Find out, don't say, we cannot. You see, would that be called an irritation? I said, please wait, we asked you a second time, you follow? How you translate and I translate. What appears to you as an irritation I don't consider as a irritation. So I am - suppose I am irritated. First of all I am aware of it, I say, 'By Jove, yes, I was angry, I was irritated, they are too stupid, they can't think clearly, I am irritated'. Then I say, 'Why am I irritated?' I don't want to be free of irritation, I don't know why. Is it that I didn't have proper sleep? Go into it, sir. Proper sleep, lack of food, not enough rest? You follow? All these are contributory factors to irritation. Are you following all this?

Q: Or do you not examine this irritation with the knowledge

about irritation?

K: I have to go through the analytical process just to show, but I don't analyse. You see. So what happens? Then I say to myself, 'How is it possible for me to be free of this irritation?' Right? I have found out I am irritated, not because you tell me, I want to know. You understand? I want to know why I am irritated. I have found out why I am irritated and I say to myself, now is it possible to be free of irritation altogether? Right? You understand my question? Now, how? I am aware that I am irritated or angry or envious, being aware of that fact, my next question is: is it possible to be free of that fact?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir. If you thought by slapping me, it is necessary by slapping me you can get your material wants. Q: Maybe.

K: Maybe. Don't speculate, sir. By hitting me you think you will gain your material want, but then I call the policeman, if there is one nearby.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You see, now we are off. I just want to know, sir - please just listen - don't call it capitalist or communist, these terms are the most dangerous terms. We are talking of the necessity of not getting angry. Right? I realize I am angry or irritable or envious and I say to myself, I am aware of it, I know I am irritated, angry, jealous, envious, or ambitious, or stupid, and how am I to be not these things? Don't you ask that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't, sir. Will anger produce - first find out - will anger produce your necessary wants, physical wants.

Q: Sometimes it does.

K: So you are saying, anger, two people angry with each other ...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, why? Isn't yours also a very hypothetical case?

Q: Anger is necessary to live in a complicated society.

K: You assert that anger is necessary to live in this society.

Q: In a complicated society.

K: In a complicated society. No, wait, I have understood it. Anger is not necessary in a communist society! Do you know, sir, how angry people are in the communist world?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's it, now we are back, you see! You are had, sir! Sorry. Look what you are saying, sir, you are not observing the facts, what is actually going on.

Q: Sir, you want some facts?

K: Wait, sir. When you say, anger is necessary ...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, no. Sir, sir, please. Sir, we talked about the other day that society needs changing, and society is a structure created by human beings, by you and me, we are part of the world, whether the communist world or the capitalist world, or a world that is supposed to come, a Utopian world, we create all these patterns ourselves. And we are saying, as human beings living in this world, is it possible to change so as to bring about a different society altogether, not a communist society or the capitalist society, quite a different kind of society? So to find that out I have to enquire as a human being, myself who is part of the world and the world is me,



not as an idea but an actuality, is it possible for me to change. And is it possible for me to change radically? Is it possible for me to change my habits, as a Hindu, as a Muslim, as a communist, as a capitalist, as a Catholic and so on and so on, is it possible radically to change?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand all this, please we have been through all this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, no please sir. This is the well known pattern repeated all over the world: first establish the perfect world around you, materially arrange everything, then human beings change. Right? That is the good old communist or dialectical concept of life: change the environment and everything will come in order. Now who is going to change the environment? The bosses? The politburo? The theoretician of a particular theory? And you see what has happened throughout the world, they don't change, on the contrary they suppress, they deny freedom. So to change the world you have to change yourself, not apart from the world because you are the world. So you have to change yourself. So you have to observe yourself, you have to empty your mind of habits, as a Christian, as a Hindu, as a Buddhist, you follow, or as a communist, because that is necessary. That's why we are saying, is it possible becoming aware of my envy - let's take envy, because all our society whether in the communist world or in this world is based on envy, different degrees of success. Now is it possible being envious to free the mind of envy? Because if I have envy I am going to create the same kind of society, a hierarchical society, a society of authoritarianism - more and less, the man who is a

great artist gets everything he wants, and the poor labourer doesn't get it, even in the most communist world.

So is it possible for the mind, becoming aware that it is envious, to be free of that envy? Right, sir? Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's what I mean.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am going into that sir, I am coming to that. One has many, many, many habits, not only envy but physical habits, not only physical habits but habits of fear, sexual habits, you know, habits, dozens and dozens of them. Unless the mind is free from these habits you cannot possibly create a new society. Full stop.

Obviously. So is it possible for the mind to be free of habits, not just one habit but the entire gamut of habits? You understand? My habit is to consider myself as a Muslim, or as a communist, that's my habit, with all the other habits involved in it, and as long as I have that habit I will regard the rest of the world as infidels or god knows what else. So I'll fight, I'll be angry because I am going to defend my habit.

So if one is really deeply serious about this matter then one asks: is it possible, being aware of these habits, to empty the mind totally of all habit? Go on, sirs. Habit being a repetition, saying, I am, I am not, I am, I am not, you know, repeating, repeating, repeating. Now can the mind be empty of it?

Q: A child has no habit.

K: But it soon gets a habit. Sir, do watch yourself, you have habits, haven't you? Now how you will free the mind of the habits? You understand, sir, how difficult this question is? If I consider

myself as a capitalist or a communist or a religious person, or this or that, I have established and I live in that habit, that habit is me. And that becomes an enormous weight on the mind, I can't see clearly. Therefore I am asking, is it possible for the mind to put aside this habit? Now how is this to be done? Right? That's the next question. Not form another habit, you follow: drop capitalism and become a communist then become a Mao, then become - I don't know - Mao, Mao, Mao, and so on and so on. Don't laugh, please, this is what is happening in the world. I move from one theory to another, hoping thereby to create a different environment, establishing a Utopia in the distance and working for it. It's all in the same pattern.

So the next question is, I am asking: is it possible for the mind to free itself? Now having put the question let's investigate it. Right? First of all, if there is an action of will against habit it breeds conflict, doesn't it? If I say, I will have no habits - you follow, that's impossible. You understand, sir? That is, if I exercise will against habit, habit doesn't end. Haven't you noticed it? Right? Therefore you say, now I won't exercise will, I will put it aside because will is not the answer. Right? So have I really put any action of will altogether away from me? Find out, sir. Because I know will will not answer this question. We have tried it. Will implies suppression, conflict, denial, running away from it, every form of escape through the action of will. Right? So there will be no exercise of will at all. That's one point.

Then analytically will not solve the problem either. You understand analytically, what is implied? Need I go into that? You know what one is saying, analytically? That is, examine it, the

cause, why the habits have existed, trace it, go very, very deeply into the cause and the effect. Right, you follow? Cause and effect. Now watch it, watch it carefully. We think cause is fixed and the effect is also fixed. Isn't it? The cause is one thing and the effect is habit, and we think these two are fixed, unchangeable. But if you observe, cause becomes effect. Right? And the effect becomes the cause for a future effect.

Q: With modifications.

K: With modifications. So there is a chain process, it is not a fixed thing, it is a movement, cause, effect, effect becoming cause and so on and on and on. In that we are caught. You follow? So there is no way out of that either. Right? So analysis is not the way out. Will is not the way out. Are you following all this? Then what is the way out?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking purposely, sir. I am not so dumb as you think I look. Please, let us go into this. Please, don't laugh, sirs, please. Please, just let's look into this. I see examination, analysis of the cause which takes time does not solve this question of freeing the mind from habit; nor will. Right? Because will implies resistance. Where there is resistance there must be conflict, and where there is a conflict it becomes a habit. You have accepted conflict as a habit, haven't you? You say, that's part of life. I question whether it is a part of life.

So, then I want to find out is there another way of looking at it where habit can be freed without any effort at all. You understand? Because I see if there is an effort there must be will, there must be resistance, there must be conflict. Right? Which means, when there

is the analysis or the action of will there must be duality. Do you understand? There must be duality: the analyser, the introspector, and the thing analysed and looked at - those are two things. And when you resist there are also two, duality. Now is there a way of looking non-dualistically? You are following all this? Is there a way, I am asking, I don't know yet, I am going to find out. I can only find out if I have discarded these two. You are following this? I must put these aside completely and never go back to them again because they are false, they don't help man. So I am asking: is there a way of looking without duality at habit? Right?

Now what has happened to my mind when I have put away these two: analysis and resistance, which is will? When I put those two away what is the quality of the mind now when it has discarded those two? What is the quality of your mind when you say, 'No, I won't any more exercise will, I won't analyse any more', what is the state of your mind?

Q: It becomes simple.

K: It becomes simple. Right. What else? Go on, sir, explore.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, don't use that. Go into it, sir, find out what is the quality of your mind when it has put aside that which has no validity.

Q: It is a pure mind.

K: You are guessing, sir, just guessing. You see what that gentleman said, just listen, listen: he said, it is waiting for an answer. You have understood what he has said? He has discarded those two, will and introspection or analysis, and now the mind says, 'I have finished with those, now I am waiting to see if there is another way'. Right? Waiting. Listen to it, just listen to it. Waiting.

Why should it wait? If it is waiting it is hoping, then you are caught. You understand? The moment you say there is a hope that I will get rid of it, then you are had because that hope becomes the motive. That motive then prevents you from observing, as when you came into the hall, into the tent, you wanted a seat and rushed in and sat down and never observed. So in the same way when you have a motive there is no way out.

So you have found one thing: motive, will, introspection. If you have got rid of those three then what is the quality of your mind, the quality?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Too bad!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's it. Throw out a lot of words, you are not observing yourself, sir. You haven't done these things, that's why you are saying things which are totally irrelevant.

Q: The mind is free of those things.

K: That's it. Is your mind free of those, sir?

Q: Free of those three things at moments.

K: At what moment?

Q: At the moment when get angry or have a habit, and when those two are not duality, it is in abeyance, it becomes free.

Q: It is not so easy.

K: You see, sir, it is not so easy as he points out to put aside these three things. And that's why you have no answer. You are just guessing, you are just throwing out words. So we have to go back and find out why you exercise will to get rid of anything. Because will means resistance. I resist communism, I resist

capitalism, I resist Catholicism, resist, fight, fight, fight. Because I have an idea, I think there is a perfect Utopia in the world, I belong to it and everything else I am going to push in that direction, and so I fight. Until I resolve that problem, that question of will, all its implication, I shan't move to the next thing. So I must really go into this question of will which man has accepted as a habit: I will do this, I won't do that, I will become that. Which means - please just listen - which means we are slaves to the verb 'to be'. Please listen. We are slaves to the word 'to be', in which is involved becoming, or having become. You follow? We are caught by that word.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir, wait. Just listen first. The word. The word creates the idea, the verb, with its active present, with its past and future: I will be, I have been, I am - we won't go into all this. So we are slaves to habit and because it is the easiest, we think that is the easiest way to function most efficiently. If I say, 'I will not have habit, I will not be angry' we think we have solved the problem. We haven't. It has gone down, hidden, suppressed, and it is going to come out another time. So I have to go into this question of habit and find out its true worth. And we don't do this. Whether it is in the communist world, socialist world or in the capitalist world, this has become one of our habits: I will be the great man, I will be the dictator, I will be this or that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The opposite. Yes, much more obvious there. So is it possible to function without will? Well, sir? Where are you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Ah, no. Is it possible, it may not be possible. You don't have to accept the possibility or the impossibility; all that you have to do is to examine, explore. I don't know whether you can live without will. And that means a tremendous intelligence because we have always functioned in habits. Which is, the habit of will: I want, I don't want. So for the man who has really understood habit and will, the whole structure of analysis, which implies motive, such a mind - you see, I am asking what is the quality of such a mind, you will never find out unless you have done this. If you haven't found out you will create another society which will be equally rotten as this one is, whether you call it communist, Mao, or super, whatever it is, because this is a central human problem. And you think by changing the environment you are going to change the human quality of the mind. The very brain cells themselves are caught in this.

Therefore - listen, sir, I'll stop now - you know the brain cells are the result of time, they have evolved, they have been put together through experience, through knowledge, through various incidents, millennia, thousands of years, and these brain cells have retained the memory of all that. You can observe it in yourself, you don't have to read books. Now if the brain cells themselves are functioning in habit - listen to my question - if the brain themselves are caught in habit how is it possible to be free of habit? You follow? Because intellect is part of this habit of the brain cells, it says, the intellect will solve my problems. So how is it possible for the old brain - you understand, that is the old brain, which has lived for millennia upon millennia, seventy-five thousand or a million years, or more - how is that old brain which has accumulated such



extraordinary information, memories, remembrances, knowledge, which is necessary at one field, at one level, and how is that brain to be free of all the unnecessary habits, like nationality, like ambition, like envy and so on? I am asking the question because unless there is a mutation in the brain cells themselves you will not create a new society. So the important thing is to find out whether that thing can be changed. I will show you it can be changed if you will just listen. What is the good of telling you to listen because you will repeat it. And that's all. You have read so much, that's why. Ton mieux.

Now you know when there is a challenge - and challenge is always new, isn't it, otherwise it is not a challenge - when you have a challenge like death, like an earthquake, like insult, challenge, the old brain instinctively responds. Haven't you noticed it? Have you noticed this simple fact? The old brain with all its habits responds instantly to a challenge. Now if the old brain could retard, hold back, and not immediately respond there is an interval between the old and something new taking place. You get it? Are you following this? Look, sir, just look: you know, look at the progress, from the bullock cart to the jet. You know what the jet is, the jet aeroplane. Now, the man who invented the jet was very, very familiar with the internal combustion machine, engine, he constructed it, he was part of that, he knew all about the internal combustion machinery. And that same man discovered the jet. You follow? How did he discover it? There was an interval between knowledge of the old where he said, 'I must find out a new way of functioning, of producing engines', he waited, he didn't let the old brain come into operation, he waited, watched and suddenly came upon it. You

follow? I have been told this by a friend who is an engineer. He says, there was an interval between knowledge, which is old, and the new. The new can only take place in that interval when the old brain is completely quiet. Right? You get the point? No.

Now can you with your response of the old brain all the time - you are a Hindu, you are a Christian, you are a communist, you are this, you are that, you follow? - can that old brain remain quiet for a while, not all the time. Don't ask, all the time, which is silly. Can that old brain, when there is a challenge, be quiet? And that is meditation. You understand? To understand the whole structure and the nature of the past, which is the brain, which has been put together in time. So can the old brain which is the repository of all habits - you understand - of all memories, which is the past, can that old brain hold back, quieten down, so that when a challenge comes there is a totally different kind of response? Not a Hindu response, Muslim response, communist response, but a totally different kind. Therefore you have to understand the whole nature and the structure of the past. You understand? After all the past is the repetition of memory, the past is the result of thousands of years of propaganda that you are a Hindu. Right? Thousands of years. And you say at the end of ten thousand years, you say, 'I am a Hindu'. So repetition, repetition, propaganda, that is the function of the old brain.

So if you want to discover something new, a different way of living, therefore a different environment, therefore a different government, therefore a different relationship between human beings, you have to retard the old brain from jumping into the arena.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 9TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

Q: Could we talk about violence sir?

K: Something about violence - that is just what I was going to talk about!

I wonder why human beings have become so extraordinarily aggressive and violent, not only in their personal relationships but also in their relationship with the world and with each other in the world. I think it has to do a great deal with ideologies, with lies and the search for power and position. Of course one can understand how ideologies, whether the communist, or Mao or any religious ideals have inevitably produced terrible violence. Politicians throughout the world have said so many lies and they have produced violence. And one of the major causes of violence is this division between man and man, as national, religious, sectarian divisions. I think those are the main causes of this violence that we indulge in. And one can give many, many explanations, a thousand explanations depending on one's reading, cunning thought and psychological analytical explanations. But at the end of these explanations violence still remains. And what is a human being to do? Here we are gathered here and going to talk about violence, the violence that has recently been going on, murdering people, every form of violence throughout the world between the rich and the poor, the people who live in slums and all the rest of it, the violence which we exert on the animals, killing animals for our pleasure, for our food and so on.

To really go into this matter very, very deeply and therefore

seriously, is to learn all about thought. Learning is not memorizing; learning is immediate. Whereas memorizing takes time. To learn a language needs time, or any kind of technique, a piano, painting and so on, but learning is instant perception and action - right? Can we go on with that? You know, if I may point out, this is not a weekend entertainment. This is a very, very serious matter, at least I consider it so. When I have spent many, many years as a human being investigating all this, one doesn't come to any conclusion, because conclusions are ideologies in a different form. Whereas if one is constantly learning, not memorizing, then one has to go into this question of thought.

Can there be complete freedom of thought? And being free of thought then thought can be used intelligently, efficiently, objectively. Because it is thought that has created this violence, thought with its ideologies, with its conclusions, with its separative beliefs, ideals, and when one observes thought it is the very basis of fragmentation. All right? Are we communicating with each other. That is, we are sharing together something about which we have to learn. Sharing means learning and therefore in learning there is a possibility of communication, to commune together, to learn together, to share together. It isn't the speaker sitting on a platform and giving information, but rather together, and I mean together, and that is the beauty of it, and I think in that there is love. The sharing together of this problem of not only violence, but the whole human existence, whether it is possible to live totally differently, with a totally different kind of consciousness, at a different dimension, in which there is no violence, no fear, no sense of anxiety, uncertainty. So if we could during these talks here

and discussions, go into this question: what is the position, the place of thought in human existence, and whether the mind can ever be free totally of all the things that thought has created - the myths, the teachers, the saviours, the whole religious structure, which is a bondage. All the national egocentric divisions are all the result of thought. And until we learn about it, what place has thought, merely discussing or explaining what is violence, how we should avoid it or get rid of it, or become peaceful, seems to me rather trivial. Not that there is not violence, not that there is not action which will put an end to violence, but to discuss violence is to go a peripheral awareness of something that demands much deeper penetration. So may we go on?

One can see for oneself if one has observed, how thought, however subtle, has bred this extraordinary human structure of relationship, of social behaviour, of division, and where there is division there must be conflict, there must be violence, whether it is a linguistic difference, a class difference or the difference brought about by ideologies, difference brought about by systems, whether the communist system, socialist system or the American system or the Mao system, whatever it is, such divisions invariably must create violence. And until one learns very deeply how this violence has come about, not merely the cause of violence but to go far beyond that, much farther beyond the causation we shall never, at least it seems to me, be free of this extraordinary misery, confusion and violence that is going on in the world.

So I am asking myself and we will ask each other: what is freedom in relation to thought, and human behaviour? Because it is the human behaviour in our daily life that is bringing about this

chaos in the world. So can there be complete freedom, freedom from thought? And if there is freedom from thought then what place has thought? Please, this is not intellectual philosophy. Philosophy means the love of truth, not speculative opinion, theoretical conclusion, or theoretical perception. But it means actually the love of truth in our daily life, in our daily behaviour. And to go into this very seriously - and I hope you will also go into this very, very seriously - one has to enquire, learn and not memorize - memorize something which we think is true, or about which we have come to a conclusion - because we are not going to come to any conclusion. On the contrary. Truth isn't a conclusion. A conclusion takes place only when thought with its opinions, with its dialectical truths, with its conclusion, then thought becomes a means of separation.

So what we ought to do this morning and the other mornings that we are going to be here, is to find out for ourselves and therefore learn, what is thinking. And whether thinking however rational, however logical, sane, objective, can bring about a psychological revolution in our behaviour - right? Thought is always conditioned - right? Because thought is the response of memory. Memory is experience, knowledge, accumulation and all that. And from that conditioning thought springs, and therefore thought can never bring about right behaviour. Do we see this? Because I have met a great many psychologists who throughout the world are saying, seeing what human beings are actually, how dreadful they are, what their behaviour is, how contradictory, what unhappy miserable beings there are, what we ought to do is to reward them and thereby condition them in a different way - you

understand? Right? That is, instead of punishing them for their bad behaviour, reward them for good behaviour. Forget their bad behaviour but reward them for their good behaviour. So from childhood you are conditioned to behave rightly, or what they think is rightly, not antisocially, through rewarding and therefore condition them that way - right? So they are still living with thought. To them thought is tremendously important. And like the communists, like the others, they say, thought must be shaped, thought must be conditioned in a different way, and from that different structure there will be a different behaviour. So they are still living within the pattern of thinking.

This has been tried in ancient India, among the Buddhists and every religion has tried this. And human behaviour with all its contradictions, with its fragmentations, is the result of thought. And if we would change that human behaviour radically, not at the peripheral, at the outer edges of our human existence, but at the very core of our being, then we must go into this question of thought - right? You must see this, not I. You must see the truth of this, that thought must be understood, one must learn all about it. To you it must be tremendously important, not because the speaker says so. The speaker has no value whatsoever. What has value is what you are learning, and not memorizing. If you merely repeat what the speaker says, either accepting or denying, then you haven't really gone into the problem at all. But whereas if you really want to solve this human problem, how to live in peace with love, without fear, without violence, one must go into this.

So how is one to learn what freedom is? Not freedom from oppression, freedom from fear, freedom from all the little things

which we worry about, but freedom from the very cause of fear, from the very cause of our antagonism, from the very root of our being in which there is this appalling contradiction, this frightening pursuit of pleasure, and all the gods we have created, with all their churches and priests - you know all the rest of the business. So one has to ask oneself, it seems to me, whether you want freedom at the periphery, or at the very core of your being. And if you want to learn what freedom is at the very source of all existence then you have to learn about thought. If that question is clear, not the verbal explanation, not the idea that you gather from the explanation, but if that is what you feel is the real absolute necessity, then we can travel together. Because if we could understand this then all our questions will be answered.

So one has to find out what is learning. I want to learn whether there is freedom from thought, first. Not how to use thought, that is the next question. But can the mind ever be free from thought? What does this freedom mean? We only know freedom from something - freedom from fear, freedom from this or that, from anxiety, from a dozen things. And is there a freedom which is not from anything but freedom per se, in itself? And in asking that question is the reply dependent on thought? Or freedom is the non-existence of thought? You understand? And learning means instant perception, therefore learning does not require time. I don't know if you see this. Please this is really fascinatingly important - sorry!

Q: Could you repeat that?

K: I don't know what I said sir, I'll go on, we'll talk about it.

To learn implies time - learn a language, a technique, a method, acquiring certain information, knowledge about mechanics and so



on - that requires time, several months, several years - learning a piano, violin, language. That is really memorizing, practising, acquiring knowledge, which can be translated into action, and that is all we are concerned with - all human beings are only concerned with that, because that gives them power, position, a means of livelihood and so on. And I say to myself, learning must be instantaneous, learning is the seeing and the acting, in which there is no seeing and a gap and then acting. That is, time is required to learn a language. Is time required to learn freedom? You understand? Is time required for the mind to see that as long as it functions within the pattern of thought there is no freedom, however expanded, however worthwhile, marvellous the expansion, the content of that expansion is, to see that, does it require time to learn about the truth that freedom is not within that pattern - right? That is, are you going to take time to see the truth of that? You have understood my question? Look, you have explained to me what thought has done in the world, you explained it to me that a new kind of pattern still made by thought, will help to bring about a different behaviour. And your explanation and my acceptance of that explanation, the logical process of it, the verbal communication, the reference to all the words that you have used which are so familiar to me, all that takes time - right? And at the end of that the mind is still not free, is still within that pattern. Are we following each other? And you tell me to learn what freedom is, is instantaneous, it doesn't require time, time is thought and don't use thought to understand freedom at all. So I say to myself, what are you talking about? I don't understand because I have only one instrument, which is thinking. And I have used wrongly,

rightly, mischievously or nobly, but that is the only instrument I have. And you tell me, put that instrument aside. Learn not about the activities of thought, which you already know, but learn, which is instantaneous, how to look - learn what freedom is without time. Are we following each other or am I talking Greek? There are some Greeks here, so sorry!

You understand my question? That is, perception is learning and perception doesn't require time, and time is basically the movement of thought, and through thought you cannot learn what freedom is. And to learn about freedom, thought must be completely silent.

Q: How can it be silent?

K: Listen. Not how - do you see? The moment you say 'how' then you want a method, a practice, which is still within the pattern of thought.

So I have this problem from you: thought has its right place otherwise you and I couldn't communicate with each other. But to learn about communication I have to learn the language, and since you and I both know English we can communicate together, and to learn English takes time. Insight into freedom doesn't take time, and you cannot have insight into freedom if there is the operation of thought, or the movement of thought which says, "I must understand what freedom is" - right? So there is this problem then: how am I, who am used to thinking, which is the only instrument I have, and I have been educated, brought up to think, all my conditioning, all my existence is based on that, all my relationship is based on the image which thought has created. And you come along and tell me, "Don't use that instrument, but look, perceive,

learn, have an insight". And then you say, "How am I to have an insight if my mind is so heavily conditioned, so burdened with all the things of thought, how am I to be free of that in order to see the other?" Right? You have put the wrong question. If you say, "I must be free of this" - which is the mechanical process of thinking, you have stated a wrong question because you are not learning about the new. You still are concerned with the old and where you are concerned with the old you will remain with the old. I wonder if you get all this?

So the real question is: can the mind, knowing, knowing the whole content of the old, not be concerned with it now, because we are enquiring into something in a totally different dimension? And this enquiry demands freedom, not that you should understand the old and bring the old over, or control the old, or subjugate the old, or suppress the old, but move away completely from the old and learn about the new which doesn't take time. Right, have you got it? It all sounds contradictory and absurd - it isn't.

Q: Surely thought must precede perception? We can't stop thinking.

K: That is just it. You can't stop thinking.

Q: It isn't something that falls out of the sky onto a blank.

K: I understand this. If you want to see something new what do you do? You are inventing, you are an inventor. You know all the old business, you want to find something new, totally new. What do you do? Keep on with the old? The old with which you are familiar, you know what the old is, the whole mechanism of the old. And if you carry that over you can't find anything new. So what do you do? You must leave the old. There must be a gap

between the old and something new that may come into being. There must be a gap. And that gap takes place when you see the whole significance of the old - that the old cannot possibly give birth to the new. So we all want the new because we are fed up with the old, bored, you know what the old is, and wanting the new we don't know how to break the chain. So there are gurus, teachers and all the absurd people who say, "I'll teach you how to break the chain". And their breaking the chain is still within the pattern of thought - right? They say, "Do this, don't do that, follow this, think of that" - they are still caught within the system of thought. Now if you see that, if you have an insight into that, to have an insight into that doesn't require time. I don't know if you see that. You see that instantly, how absurd this whole religious structure is, all the organization around it, the popes, the bishops - you follow - the absurdity of all that. Grown up people playing with childish things. If you have an insight into that it is finished. Then you ask; how am I to have an insight? Which means you haven't actually listened. You are still holding on to your old skirts of the churches, beliefs and ideologies, and you say, "I can't let go because I am afraid". "What will my neighbour think?" "I will lose my job". So you don't want to listen, so that is the problem. Not how to acquire perception, not how to come by insight but rather that you don't listen to the danger of the whole thing which thought has built. And to have the insight you have to listen, you have to let go and listen. If you listen to that pigeon, which means to listen without naming, without condemning, to really listen, then when you listen you have the insight - right?

So freedom, absolute freedom, not relative freedom, absolute

freedom is only possible when the mind understands thought and its place and the freedom of thought - right? Now where are we after saying all this, this morning? Because after all, you and I are learning together. You have spent time to come here, energy and money and all the rest of it, and are you learning or merely memorizing? If you are merely memorizing then you repeat what others have said, therefore you become secondhand human beings. Instead of repeating Lao-Tse, the Buddha, Marx, or whatever, now you'll repeat what K is talking about, but you will still be secondhand, but whereas if you learn you will be out of that class altogether, away from all that rubbish.

So where are we? Is there an insight into freedom, insight into freedom from thought? And when there is that insight into freedom from thought then in that freedom thought can function logically, sanely, objectively, non-personally. So how am I, who are so heavily conditioned, who have used thought from the morning until the evening, during my sleep, dreaming, waking, all the time the mind is employed with thought, how is that mind to have an insight into the freedom in which there is no thought - right? Please put that question to yourself. And when you have put that question to yourself is thought answering that question? If thought is answering that question then there is no freedom, but when you put that question, really seriously, intensely, passionately, you want to find out, then you will see there is freedom which you have not sought. The seeking is the movement of thought.

Is that enough for this morning? Can we discuss this?

Q: Feeling is another way of thinking. You have not mentioned feeling once.

K. You didn't mention feeling. Do you feel very much?

Q. I am, therefore I feel.

K. You are, therefore you feel. You are quoting Descartes, aren't you? What is feeling? Nervous response? You put a pin into me, I feel pain. The response of the brain which recognizes that pain and says that is pain - feeling. What is that feeling? I am an Indian, I feel very strongly about my country. Or I believe in something, in my salvation, in my resurrection, in my continuity, I feel very strongly. That is still part of my thought operating according to a conclusion. I feel very strongly about my wife. I love my wife and is that love, is that feeling part of my thought? Answer it please. No?

Q. Part of your very being.

K. Part of your very being. What is your very being? Please go slowly. What is my very being? My very being is a physical entity with all its conclusions, beliefs, dogmas, theories, insights, casual insights, opinions, judgements, fears, pleasures, all that is me. That is my whole conditioning as a human being according to the culture, race, tradition I have been brought up in, that is my being, which is my words-no? Will you stop? All those are words, aren't they? Go step by step, please see it. I have been brought up in a culture - Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, whatever the culture is, Communist - and that culture has shaped my mind with all its symbols, words, tradition, pictures, ideals, all words, and those words give me a certain feeling. When I say, "I am a Catholic" - the word, the picture, the image, creates a certain feeling in me, neurologically. And that is my being. And that is the whole structure of thought. When I say, "I love my wife" - or my country,

my god, my whatever it is, when I say, "I love my wife" the image I have about my wife - no? The image which thought has built year after year, the pleasure, the pain, the insults, the nagging, the companionship, the sex, the whole of that picture is put together by thought and that picture evokes certain feeling. Those images create certain reactions. To me thought is feeling. There is no difference between the two. And it is fragmentation to think feeling is different from thinking.

Q. Surely emotional feeling like love is something which somebody feels but you can't say that eating and sleeping are part of thought. The need to love and be loved is essential to us as it is to eat and to sleep.

K. It is essential for us to love and to be loved. Do we love? Or do we love the image which we have created?

Q. Yes but whether it is an image...

K. Wait, wait, madame. Just go slowly. If it is an image which we love then we don't love the person, whatever that person is. We love the image which we have created about that person. Therefore one has to go into the question, what is love? Is it related to thought? Is it the product of thought, emotion, sentiment, pleasure, is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love sex? And if it is, then it is within the field of thought, and is love thought? Therefore to find out what love is there must be freedom from thought. See sir, it all ties together.

Q. But the need to love is not thought.

K. The moment I need - I need your love - why should I need your love? Please look at it. I need your love, I need your companionship, I need your sex, I need your whatever it is. And

you need me. That means we are dependent psychologically on each other.

Q. Needing love is love of self.

K. I know but we don't like to think that. So I am asking: why is there this extraordinary dependence - psychological dependence? I depend on the railway, on the postman, on the milkman, and so on, but why this dependence psychologically on each other? If we depend on each other to co-operate, that I can understand. Because then we can co-operate, to do things together, work together, to think together, to learn together. But if I need you to learn - you understand - then I am back in the old pattern again. That means I can't learn by myself, I need somebody to tell me what to learn. So why do we psychologically depend? I need to be loved. What a terrible thing to say! For myself I feel sacrilege when I say, "I need to be loved". Why do I need to be loved? Because I don't love. Something beautiful doesn't say, 'I need' - it is beautiful, like a flower, like a cloud in the sky, like a perfect human action. The moment we need it, is the whole movement of thought which says, "I am lacking", "I am insufficient", "I can't stand by myself" - which are all the activities of thought.

So what is the relationship between love and thought? Can they ever meet at all? Or they are unparallel always and therefore there must be harmony between the two. You understand all this? For god's sake!

Q. Whenever I pose a question you answer it yourself.

Everyone sometimes has this moment of perception but when you try to keep it or show it, it is gone.

K. Surely perception, we said, comes when time is not involved.



When there is a demand for the continuance of a perception you are introducing time, which is the activity of thought. I have an insight into religious organizations - let us take that for the moment - I have an insight into this, I see the fallacy of it. And I use that insight to see other structures. So I have memorized the insight - you understand? - it has become a memory and therefore it has lost its insight. I don't know if you understand this? Surely insight is always fresh, new, it isn't the old insight brought into the present.

Let us go into this question of insight. The word theory, the root meaning of that word theory, means insight. And having an insight means, generally, coming to a conclusion. Scientists, philosophers, and others, human beings, have an insight - from that insight they conclude. And their conclusions become much more important than the insight. And the conclusions become the means of not only satisfaction but stability, certainty, a feeling making me secure. And if I collect a lot of conclusions I have lost insight. So to have an insight and not draw a conclusion - you understand?

Q. I don't know anything about your teachings. This is my first time and I haven't read any of your books.

K. Don't bother sir, it doesn't matter.

Q. But I'd like to think that I was in tune with what you are feeling, saying and thinking. Personally I have found... (inaudible)

K. Yes, I understand the question. I think I understand it. May I explain further? I have to meet the world, I am an ordinary man, I have to meet the world - the world being the environment, the job, the culture, the various relationships socially, morally and so on - the world, with wars, with the Olympic games, everything that is going on in the world, I have to meet it. I meet it intellectually,

pragmatically, according to my temperament, idiosyncrasy. That temperament, that idiosyncrasy, is the response of my conditioning - of course. Do you want me to go into that? And that conditioning is what the society has placed on me, the culture, the environment, so I am the society, the world is me, I am the world. The two are not separate. This is a basic, this is not pragmatic, it is the truth. I am born in a country, in a culture, in a tradition, family, nationally, racial, and all that is me. And I like to think I am separate from the world because I feel I am totally different, I am an extraordinary human being, I am not the mass, I am an individual, and when I look at the word and go into that word there is no individuality at all. I am a repetitive human being. If I am born in this country or a Christian world I repeat everything that has been told to me from childhood - about Jesus, the myth of Jesus and all the rest of it. Or in the Communist world I belong - you know all that. So the world is absolutely me and I am the world. And to change the world I have to change myself, break away from my conditioning. Not a particle of that conditioning must remain to bring something new. And not knowing that I am conditioned, not knowing how to deal with this conditioning, I just go on; change my conditioning a little bit here and there, you know.

So to really basically, radically go into this thing, one has to watch, learn and that is why I began by asking: what place has thought and what place in existence has freedom from thought? Unless these two questions are answered and thereby find harmony between the two - they are not two separate watertight things - then I will know a dimension which is entirely different.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

I hope you don't feel as nervous as I do! Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday morning, if we may? We were saying that thought brings about fragmentation. Thought has its right place but it is misused, it becomes mischievous when there is not the freedom from thought. And that freedom has to be learnt; it is not an idea, a speculative theory - theory being insight - nor is it an ideal. And to learn about it there must be curiosity - like a child that learns mathematics, not knowing anything about it, he begins to learn. But learning mathematics or a language needs time; whereas insight into the freedom from thought needs no time at all. That is what we were more or less saying yesterday.

And if we may go on with what we were saying: one observes, doesn't one, in one's own life a series of fragmentations, a life that is broken up, contradictory - the business life, the family life, the religious life, the scientific life, the artistic life and so on and so on and so on. This constant fragmentation has its own activity, its own action and the more one enquires into it, goes into this question of fragmentation, one tries to integrate these many fragments together, the integrator is still thought who is responsible for the fragmentation - right? We have broken up life into the family life, the individual life, the religious life, the national life, politics and so on. And this division exists and when one becomes aware of it, conscious of it, sees the full significance of these fragmentations, one hopes through the cunning, clever process of thought to bring all these fragments together. I do not know if you have noticed it.

But the entity that tries to bring these fragments together is still a superior perception of thought, is still thought. And how is one to bring about a harmony - not between the fragments which is impossible - but a harmony or perception which sees the whole, not as fragments. I wonder if I am making this clear?

Can one perceive these various fragments and not try to bring them together, integrate them, but look at them from a total point of view, from a totality, from a perception in which there is no fragmentation? Are we meeting this? There is the religious life with all its beliefs, rituals, superstitions, and we play with it, which is totally different from our daily life, with all its conflicts, loneliness, boredom, pleasures, fears, anxieties, and there is the life of earning a livelihood, all totally separate, and therefore contradictory. And we live and accept this fragmentation. I think that is fairly clear. The national, religious, spiritual, you know all these terrible divisions that exist outside as well as inside.

One has to find out, hasn't one, whether it is possible to learn, which is not to cultivate memory, but learn to look at the whole of life from a level which is comprehensive, which has no fragmentation at all in it, and being non-fragmentary act from there, therefore a total action. What is the energy which perceives the total and doesn't live in fragmentation? You know this is a very difficult thing to convey in words - a dimension in which fragmentation doesn't exist at all. Religions throughout the world, apart from their absurdities, superstitions, beliefs, rituals, gurus and all that nonsense, apart from that, religions have maintained that there is a god, a reality, which if you enter into that reality only then you can see life as a whole, in which there is no division as

you and me, we and they and all the rest of it. Divisions exist only where there is measurement - right? Measurement is comparison and comparison is the movement of thought. So thought is measurable, comparative - the more, the less, the better and so on. And it is only a mind that is free from measurement that can see life as a whole. I wonder if I am conveying this? Right sir? How is one then to be free of measurement and yet use measurement, it is necessary - measurement being knowledge, experience, the vast accumulation of memory, conscious as well as unconscious, all that is measurement, because it is the product of thought. And where there is measurement there is fragmentation. That is, I am not happy but I will be happy. I am ugly but I will be beautiful. This constant comparison, this constant measurement makes one feel superior or inferior, or lonely, or expansive ideological unity. And can the mind - which is so heavily conditioned in measurement, because after all the whole of science, mathematics, the way we live, is based on measurement - learn to live without measurement so that the mind never compares because comparison brings about fear and pleasure - right?

Are we meeting each other? Because sirs, as we said yesterday, we are learning together because the speaker happens to sit on a platform, a little higher than you are sitting, which is only for convenience, it doesn't make him into an authority, doesn't make him something special. What we are trying to do together is to learn, to learn about a mind that is free from measurement and therefore free from fear. Free, and therefore free from this constant struggle to be, or to become something. And it is this measurement, which is thought, that brings about fragmentation. I see that, not as

an idea, not as a theory, but as an actuality in my life, in one's living. I haven't learnt it from somebody else. If I learn it from somebody else it is his learning not mine. And when I learn it, it is neither yours, nor mine, it is a state of learning. And therefore all authority ceases, then our relationship is entirely different. Then we are walking on the same road, with the same intensity, with the same vitality, with the same passion to learn. If we could establish that between the man sitting on the platform and you, then our relationship in communication and learning is entirely different, because all our conditioning is one of the factors of authority - you know, I don't know, you are enlightened, I am not, you are my guru and I am your disciple, tell me, teach me, I will learn from you, I will put you on a pedestal, worship you because I think you know, I don't know what you know but I think you know. This is very important because what is happening in the world is that more and more gurus are springing up. Before it was the church with their priests, with their rigmaroles, and now it is these gurus coming in replacing them, which is again a factor of division - your guru and my guru. Your guru knows much more than my guru does!

So when we are learning together there is no division and therefore there is no authority. That is a marvellous thing if one really sees that. Because then we teach each other, we learn from each other and there is no 'you' who is the teacher and 'me' as the disciple. And in that learning there is great beauty because in that there is real companionship and therefore there is real love. You understand all this?

So what we are trying to learn - not trying - what we are learning is whether the mind can learn to love totally, which means

it has no quality of measurement at all. I am only putting the thing differently from yesterday. Yesterday we said, thought has its right place and that thought can be used only efficiently, sanely, reasonably, logically and healthily when there is freedom from thought. And thought, we are saying this morning differently, is measurement and all western civilization is based on measurement, and they have tried to escape from that by or through religious concepts, which again is the product of measurement - right? What we are doing is, trying to find out, learning whether the mind can be free altogether from fragmentation and therefore look at life, act as a whole healthy human entity, without any fragmentation. Because that requires, if I may use the word 'religion' in the right sense of that word - it is what religions have tried to do, not organized religions, not with their priests and all that hierarchical rubbish, but the real religious mind has tried to do this. Which is, it says absolute freedom is only possible when there is no movement of thought. The movement of thought is fragmentation, and the movement of thought is necessary but not when the mind is in a state in which there is no measurement at all, which means the immeasurable - right? I wonder if I am conveying something?

How do you learn this? You understand my question? I see my life fragmented. That is a fact. And I see the futility of integrating the fragments. I see contradiction in these fragments, conscious as well as unconscious. And I have tried various methods, means, systems to bring about a unity in all that. And I can play that game endlessly until I die. And I haven't learnt a thing because basically thought is in operation in all this - yes? I want to find out, I want to learn, the mind wants to find out and learn a dimension in which

the immeasurable, the state of mind which has no measurement at all, and therefore no 'me', which is measurement. The moment I have the 'me', there is a 'you'! The 'me' is the product of thought, the 'me' as an idea gives security. And thought is seeking all the time security. And seeking security in a belief, in dogma, in any form of neuroticism gives it security - right? It is neurotic to believe in god - all right, I'll plunge into it! Because you know nothing about god, you only know, or you think you know, because you are conditioned. The communist doesn't believe in god, he says, 'What are you talking about?' And god can be approached through a process of time, through perfection, through this ideal of always becoming more and more and more perfect, and you have established a pattern, a ladder on which you are always climbing. And all that structure is the product of thought, obviously. Now if one has an insight into that, now as you are sitting there, if you have an insight into this, not induced by the speaker, but see it for yourself, then you are out of time. Because time is part of thinking and thought has said, "I will find gradually the state where there will be non-fragmentation". So thought seeking security all the time, physical as well as psychological, conscious or unconscious, has established for itself various beliefs, dogmas, superstitions, neurotic activities, and is caught in that, it has become a habit. Now can one break that habit without effort, because the moment you make an effort you are back again, there is contradiction in that, there is duality in that, the one that sees that it must be broken and makes an effort, but one who sees it must be broken is the thinker, the thinker is thought - there is no thinker without thought. To have an insight into that now, instantly, is to break it, is to break



the chain of habit, to be aware of all this, the whole movement of thought. And one can be aware of it only when you don't condemn it, then you observe. And to observe without the observer, because the observer is the entity who says, "This I will keep, this I won't keep, this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be" - he is always comparing. The observer is the entity that measures - right?

So I have only one problem - not many problems because all problems, our human problems are interrelated. The problem of death is related to love, love is related to everyday living, everyday living is related to our ways of behaviour, our behaviour is conditioned according to the culture in which we live - the society, the economic conditions and so on. So they are all tied together. And by understanding one issue completely you have resolved the whole. But what we do is: politics is one thing and keep it there, religion is something else, business is something else, family life is something else, our personal pleasure, like, dislike. So in understanding the one issue we understand the total movement of problems.

And one of our great problems is fear, in our daily life, fear. And we try in every way to overcome it, or run away from it, or find a substitute, as courage, for it. Now how does a mind learn about fear - learn, have an insight, not memorize various formulas, how to be rid of fear? There is the fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of mechanical behaviour, fear of not being loved, fear of so many kinds. And in the resolution of fear you have solved the whole problem. Now how is that fear, conscious as well as unconscious, to be completely set aside, because if we do not, we

shall never find out what is meditation, we shall never find out if there is such a thing as the immeasurable. So it is absolutely essential, it behoves us to learn completely about fear, conscious as well as unconscious fears. Conscious fears one can more or less deal with. If I am afraid of my neighbour, what he thinks about me, I can deal with it, it doesn't much matter. But the unconscious fears are much more difficult and most of us are unaware of it, and being unaware of it, it brings about neurotic actions. Violence is one of the factors of fear. As we said yesterday, violence is brought about through ideologies, through lies, whether it is brought about by the politicians, by the priests, by ourselves doesn't matter. And fear if it is not completely understood or learnt about plays havoc with our lives. I think that is fairly clear. There are unconscious fears of which one is not aware. Now what do you do about it? We are learning, I am not telling you about it. We are walking together, communicating together, learning together about fear. How am I or you, who are unconscious of your fears, to bring them to the surface and wipe them away completely? Not gradually, that will take time, that means again contradiction, division which is the product of thought - you are following all this? How is the mind, which has deep rooted fears of which it is not aware, how are those fears to be exposed to the light of intelligence? Because intelligence is not measurement, where there is intelligence there is no measurement, it is not yours nor mine, there is intelligence. You know meditation is the awakening of this intelligence - which we will discuss when we come to meditation.

So our question is: can the mind learn instantly all the content of the unconscious in which there are deep secret fears? Please

listen to this carefully - will it learn through analysis? Analysis implies time, there must be the analyser and the analysed - the division. The analyser is the analysed. And the analyser, if he is not capable of complete analysis, takes over what he has not understood and that will become the means of further examination which is misunderstood. I don't know if you are following all this? So I see very clearly analysis is not the way. I have learnt about it because analysis implies time, implies division, whether it is a professional analysis or you do it yourself, and when you analyse, unless you analyse everything completely, in that incompleteness you examine the next incident, and therefore continue the incompleteness all the time - right? You are following all this? For god's sake follow it, learn about this. So one learns analysis is out, which is our conditioning. Confession, analysis, self-introspection are all the forms of analysis. Analysis, the very meaning of that word, means to break up, and thought has broken it up. So analysis implies time, a separate entity which is the thinker, which is essentially the past, who examines the thing he is going to analyse, and he doesn't recognize the analyser is the analysed, and that it takes infinite time. I can go on analysing myself until I die. So analysis doesn't teach anything. I hope we see this.

Then will dreams teach? We are asking this question because we are trying to expose the unconscious, bring it all out, the content, because the content makes the consciousness - right? The house is what it contains. And it contains so much, so many contradictions, so much information, it is a jumble, and therefore utterly confused. Will dreams clear the basic fear of existence, basic fear of not being, not becoming, not fulfilling, not trying to

achieve? And what are dreams? One has to learn all about all this, please, not from me. You dream - why do you dream - pleasant or unpleasant dreams, nightmares and so on? Why do you dream at all. The experts say you must dream otherwise you will go insane - probably that is true because dreams try to bring about order - right? Indicate that there is disorder - we'll put it that way, that's better. Dreams indicate that there is disorder and during the day you are unconscious of your disorders because you are caught up in so much activity, chattering, talking, going to the office and quarrelling and bullying, and all the rest of it that goes on. During the day you are caught in a routine which breeds disorder and one is not aware of this. And during the night, when you sleep, dreams are the continuation of that disorder in which the mind is trying to bring order - right? I do not know if you have noticed that if you bring order out of disorder, that is, understand disorder, not superimpose upon disorder what you think is order, but if you understand disorder out of that comes order. And the brain needs order, then it can function well, it is protected, and order gives it tremendous security, then it can function beautifully. So in dreams the mind is trying to bring about order; but if during the day you are aware of the disorder and because you are aware there is order, then you will find that sleep becomes quite a different thing. Then the mind is quiet, the brain is quiet, it is not everlastingly working, working, working - you are following all this? Please learn. So the brain is quiet, refreshed, young and therefore clear, and it can meet the day afresh because it has established order out of disorder - right?

So in understanding fear, fear exists only when there is disorder,

when you see something very clearly there is no fear; it is only the mind that is confused, uncertain, disorderly, such a mind is caught in fear. So when you learn about the unconscious, that is the content of it, the content of consciousness is consciousness, consciousness is not something separate from its content - right? You have understood? If I am a Hindu, with all its content, with all the superstitions, social rules, morality and all that, that makes consciousness. And if there is no content in consciousness then consciousness is something entirely different. And that is what meditation is, the emptying of the mind of its content. Oh you don't know all this! You learn. Don't learn from somebody else for god's sake!

So can the mind be free of fear? That is, the mind that has had physical pain last week is afraid that it might recur again next week, the fear of the repetition of pain. If you have observed physical pain, when it is ended by a doctor, or whatever it is, the mind doesn't leave it there, thought doesn't leave it there, it carries it on, it is watching, waiting, fearful, hoping it won't happen again. So thought is creating fear. I don't know if you follow? There is measurement - fear of pain last week, it mustn't happen again next week, I'll watch it, waiting, hoping, there is measurement, which is thought. Similarly psychologically we have various forms of hurts. We have been hurt from childhood, it is a terrible thing this being hurt. Aren't we all being hurt? And against being hurt further, we build walls of resistance, and that means isolation, and isolation means further fear. And to escape from that fear we take to drugs or go to church, or believe in something, or pick up a book - you know the various forms of escapes. Now when you are aware of

this completely, when you have an insight into the fear, then you will see psychologically there is not a flash of fear; and when there is physical pain you will know how to deal with it, thought will not carry it on - right?

And one of the fragments of our life is the pursuit of pleasure opposed to fear, opposed to pain, something contradictory, away from all the miseries, suffering, pain. And that is what we are doing, pursuing pleasure, in the name of god, in the name of whatever it is. Again thought plays a tremendous part in it - doesn't it? We don't have to go into all that, that is fairly obvious. An incident giving a delight, thought pursues it, and therefore the next day, and on and on and on. So thought is responsible for the continuity and the nourishment of fear and the pursuit of pleasure. Pleasure has nothing to do with joy, with ecstasy. When there is joy there is no pleasure, you are unaware of it, but thought comes along presently and says, "What a marvellous, lovely thing that was" and then pursues it and that becomes pleasure.

So what we are learning together is, a mind that is aware of all this, aware of the significance of thought and that has learnt the absolute necessity of thought as measurement coming totally to an end. You see pleasure is not love. If pleasure is love then it is the product of thought, then love is something separate. I love you but I hate everybody else, or I tolerate everybody else. So one begins to learn that love is not pleasure, that is a marvellous thing to learn and there is great depth of beauty in that.

Now we can discuss something together, ask questions?

Q: What is the place of will, decision, in life, if thought is an impediment?

K: That is right sir? We do not say thought is an impediment. Thought is necessary: to communicate with you in English thought is necessary. I have learnt English, there is the memory of it and I use that memory to convey what I am thinking. So thought as knowledge is absolutely essential, otherwise you couldn't function. Therefore we do not say thought is detrimental: on the contrary thought has its right place but that right place is misused when there is no freedom from thought. The two must go together harmoniously. That is all.

Now what is the place of will, decision, in life? When you see something very clearly is there action of will? It is only a mind that is confused, uncertain, unclear that uses the will as a means of action. We all do this. We exercise our will only when we are confused, when we are not clear. When the mind is clear what is the need of will? I wonder if you see this?

You know we substitute our will to the national will, or to the will of the community, will of the society, will of the priest or will of the idea of god - 'Thy will be done'. Please see the implication of all this. Whereas a mind that is not confused, what is the necessity of will at all? If you see something clearly you act, there is not an interval between perception and action, there is no lag of time between seeing and acting. There is the lag of time, space in time, only when you are not sure, when you are not clear, when you are confused, then action. Then in that gap will is necessary, will being the desire to act in a certain way. If I see something very clearly it is finished. If I see a poisonous snake, I act, there is no will involved in it. And the same thing with decision, which means choice, doesn't it? Decide between this and that. Why do you have

to choose? I choose between two materials, cloths, or two houses or this or that, but psychologically why do you choose at all? Is there such a thing as choice psychologically? And there is choice only when psychologically, inwardly I am not clear. When I am not clear then there is choice. Please I am not laying this down, we are learning together. So there is no need for decision at all. There is only action, not choice in action.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you different from thought? You can use thought? If you are different from thought then you can use thought, but are you different? Or you think you are different and therefore when you think you are different you are still...! You know, in Asia they have invented through thought a thing called Atman, the superior self, the supreme self, as you have invented the soul. And they say, allow that superior entity to act, it can only act when all the debris is thrown away. So all that you have to do is to allow that superior entity to come in and work. I am putting it very crudely and quickly, all the subtleties I am leaving out. Which is again the invention of thought. Because thought sees itself insecure, uncertain, easily changeable and as thought requires, demands security in every form, it has invented the superior entity, in that it takes security, but it is still the invention of time, of thought, which is time. So there is no 'me' who is using thought, the 'me' is thought.

Q: May I ask a question please? You said if we see a poisonous snake there is instant action, but what happens if you see a snake which is enclosed where you can't get away from it?

K: What do you do with a snake in a room - right sir? What do



you do with a snake in a room? You can't run away - it all depends what kind of snake it is! Whether it is a human snake or a real snake! If it is a real snake, what do you do? I have been in one, what do you do? You watch it, don't you. No sirs, no, you are laughing too easily. You watch it and when you watch it you are not afraid. I have been with a rattler in a room and I have watched it. And it watched me. And gradually it found some place to hide and I opened the door and it went out later. You watch it and you establish a communication with animals, then there is no fear.

Q: When a snake is in a room with an eagle.

K: When a snake is in a room with an eagle? A snake in a room with an eagle and you are there? I don't know what you are talking about.

Q: Fear, the known and the unknown.

K: I see.

Q: I can grasp the known fears, the conscious fears and face them and dispose of them, but the unknown ones, I just can't grasp this. How do you discover them?

K: All right. How do you discover them, how to meet them? The gentleman asks: I can deal with the known fears - I wonder if you can?

Q: I didn't say that.

K: I know sir, you didn't say that, but I have introduced that factor. It is the unknown fears that I am concerned with, the question is. If I know how to deal with the known fears I shall also know how to deal with the unknown fears. When the unknown fears come I know what to do because I have already learnt with the known fears. Then there is no problem with the unknown fears

because I know, I have learnt about the fears I know. I have an insight into them, which means I have the capacity of insight - you understand? It is insight that matters. And when the unknown fears come tomorrow because there is this insight, that insight will answer the unknown fears. But if I have no insight into the known fears I shall not have an insight into the unknown. And there is no division between the known and the unknown. You see fear is the known always, fear of the unknown is the product of thought. I am afraid of what might happen tomorrow and if I have understood the whole movement of thought, the tomorrow is no fear. You understand? Look sir, tomorrow psychologically, does it exist at all? I would like it to exist because tomorrow is going to be a happy day, I am looking forward to meeting you, I am looking forward to learning something tomorrow.

Q: But the unknown fear I was referring to - the unconscious, the subconscious fears - how do you discover these?

K: I have explained this sir. Conscious fears you say you can understand, the unconscious fears maybe one or may be many, it is like a tree that has many branches, many leaves but the root is deeply established in the earth. Our fears are deeply established in the unconscious and we are always trimming the branches. And to get at the root of fear means learning about not being - you understand? Learning about not becoming, because we are always wanting to become something, which is part of measurement, which is the movement of thought. Or to be, most people say nowadays, "I want to be myself", not society, not all that has been imposed on me but I want to be myself - what is yourself? Yourself is the result of the society in which you live, or your reaction to

that society in which you live, the established order.

So to be free of the root of fear, the root, not just the branches, one has to go very deeply into this question of becoming and being, because in that there is security. If I become something, in that there is security, or if I say I am - in that also there is security - right? So the mind is constantly seeking security - please see the importance of this. In my relationship I am seeking security, in my job I am seeking security, in my ethical, moral, social values I am seeking security, in everything the mind is seeking security, because in security it can function, because you must have security. So the mind seeks security in things that are not secure - right? In belief there is no security but yet it holds to belief. In an ideology there is no security but yet we are all idealists. We seek security in family, in my wife, in my husband, in companionship and in that there is no security. So please see this, learn this, that the mind seeks security and there is security only in the intelligence that comes out of the realization of the things that are insecure, therefore security is in intelligence, not in the things that thought has invented. I wonder if you get all this? Then there is no fear, then you have cut at the root of fear.

Q: What about guilt?

K: What about guilt? Do you all feel very guilty? About what? One has done something, or not done something and you feel you should have done it and you feel guilty.

Q: I am concerned that you felt nervous this morning.

K: Oh madame, I was only partly joking.

Now let us finish this sir. Guilt, anxiety, guilt. Do I feel guilty because the psychologists say this is one of the problems of human

beings? The psychologists, the philosophers, have said human beings feel, guilty. Is that why you feel guilty? Or do I feel guilty not because somebody else said so, but I feel guilty, I feel guilty as I feel hunger. I have not learnt from others about guilt - please follow all this. I have not learnt from others about guilt, as I have not learnt about hunger from others, it is an actual fact - right? It is an actual fact that one feels guilty, that is 'what is' - right? That is 'what is'. Now how do you meet that, 'what is'? Please you understand, we are learning together, put your mind into this. I feel guilty, I haven't learnt that thing from anybody. And I feel guilty and that is a fact, that is 'what is'. Now how does the mind meet 'what is'? Does it resist it? Does it want to go beyond it? Or does it feel ashamed that it should feel guilty? When it feels ashamed, that it wants to go beyond it, that it wants to suppress it, that says, "I must understand it", it is actually not meeting 'what is'? Right? You understand? When I want to go beyond it I am not confronted with 'what is'. When I want to suppress it I am not with it. So I must find out how I meet it, how the mind, which feels guilty, meets what is called guilty. Can you meet it without any reservation, without wanting, condemning it, wanting to go beyond it, just to meet it as it is? Now is guilt a word? And when you say, "I feel guilty" you are establishing or strengthening by the use of that word, and relating it to the past in which you have felt guilty. You follow all this? We are meeting each other? I feel guilty and I use the word 'guilt'. When I have used that word 'guilt' I have strengthened the memory which has had the feeling of guilt before, by naming it I have strengthened it. Can I look at it without the word? Go on please. Then is there guilt?

So what we do is meet guilt, which we feel, according to the old pattern, the mind that has had guilt meets guilt, therefore it doesn't meet it afresh, it meets it with the old habits and therefore it cannot go beyond it - you have understood?

Q: I'd like to ask, at the beginning of your talk you spoke of fragmentation that exists in society...

K: And in us.

Q: ...and in us, in ourselves, yes. And you said that you tried to resolve this fragmentation but finally you have to rise above these and see them as one.

K: No. Not see them as one. I said there is this fragmentation, and this fragmentation is created by thought - right? You must be clear on that.

Q: But the point is that you found you were not able to reconcile them in a material way but you had to, through a change in perspective.

K: Change in consciousness, change in dimension.

Q: Yes. Well I am wondering to what extent are these things - well let's say how different are the aims of religions, of the family, of science and education? I think probably they are aiming at the same goal and I am wondering in the future how this can work itself out in the material realm. It will of course require a change in consciousness of many individuals. But how possible is it, what change would come about in each of these institutions? Would they be necessary any longer?

K: Sir, you are asking about the future. We are talking of the present, now. If you, who are listening, who are learning, if you don't change your consciousness now, you don't change radically,

how can you expect what the future will be? It will go on what it has been. And if you, as a human being, change the whole content of your consciousness you may create a totally different kind of culture.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 12TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

K: This morning, if we may, we are going to have a conversation, talk over things together in a form of dialogue, to discuss, not opinions, not some kind of conclusions that you have come to, but rather go into the problems that one has, whether they are superficial or deep, and really see if we cannot radically bring about a psychological revolution in ourselves. I think it would be worth while and it would be also both interesting and quite fun if we could do this together. So what shall we begin with? What shall we talk over together, like two friends, who have got the same common problem, using the same common words without any distortion of words, without any ulterior motive, if we could so talk over things together, I think it would be worth while.

Q: Could we hear more of the nature of awareness? The way you speak of it almost seems to be so pointed and direct that it is like a concentration exercise. I am sure that is wrong.

K: Would you like to discuss that? Would you like to talk over this question of awareness?

Q: Mr Krishnamurti, may I briefly ask you something which is a very, very common problem. A woman I know well, she is in her fifties, her husband has died of cancer, very, very painful to have cancer, very unhappy about. She keeps on ringing up and saying, "Oh I am so unhappy."

K: Yes, so you want to discuss...

Q: Can you say something, I want to say something to cheer her up.

K: Oh. Then go to a cinema. I am sorry I cannot possibly discuss these things to cheer people up, to give them comfort, to give them a sedative. But let us...

Q: But you see you talk about this view, the problem outside you, so can you explain...

K: We will go into that perhaps. If we could talk over together this question of awareness. Is that what you want to discuss?

Q: Awareness - most people are afraid of being aware.

K: So do you want to talk over that? Right.

The meaning of that word 'aware', as far as I can make out from the dictionary, as well as from one's own interpretation of that word, is to be conscious, is to be cognizant of the things about you, and also to be aware of the movement of your own feelings and thoughts inwardly, to be aware, to be conscious, to be alert, to be in contact with, to be in relationship with the thing that you are observing, of which you are aware. I think that is the general meaning of that word - right? Do we all agree to the meaning of that word? Conscious of what one feels, what one thinks, conscious of the environment in which one lives, being aware of the beauty of nature, the clouds, the sky, the water, the various colours and so on and on. Awareness is not a limitation, I am not just aware of this microphone - please listen to this, it is very interesting - I am aware of this microphone in the space which this tent holds. The microphone has its own space, it creates its own space in the space of the tent. And the outer space is beyond - to be aware of this space - right? To be conscious of it, to see the quality of space.

Now shall we discuss, we will go into it. We are generally, as the lady pointed out earlier, afraid to be aware, afraid to be aware



of our environment, if we are aware from that awareness we come to a conclusion, and that conclusion puts an end to further awareness. I am not giving a talk please, we are discussing, we are exchanging, we are exposing. So when we say we are aware, we are aware of things very, very superficially. I am aware that you have long hair, or short hair, I am aware of the colour that you are wearing. And I react to the short hair, or the long hair, calling you a hippy, non hippy, square and you know all the rest of it. I react to it and my reaction is the response of my conditioning. The other day I saw a rather good cartoon in the New York, I think I saw it. There was a boy and a girl standing at the window looking out on the street, and some hippies were walking down the street, and the boy says to the girl, "There goes the Establishment." Got it? We react to any form of stimuli, that is an obvious fact. And I am aware of that reaction but I don't penetrate further into that reaction. I am not aware what is the source of that reaction. I am aware of the reaction - like, dislike, pleasure, jealousy, hate, whatever it is - but that awareness brings a conclusion that I am angry, I like and dislike, but we don't allow that awareness to penetrate further. Right?

Now let us experiment, learn what it means to be aware of the things outwardly, that is, the tent, the various poles, the colour of the jerseys people are wearing, you know, aware outwardly. And then move from that awareness inwardly and see what our reactions are to that which we have visually perceived. And our reactions depend on our temperament and idiosyncrasies - right. If my temperament is artistic, whatever that word may mean for the moment, I react or I see something much more than the man who is

not an artist, in a tree, in a cloud, in the curve of a branch. And my temperament, idiosyncrasy, is the response of my conditioning also - right? When we say, "It is my temperament; I think it is a marvellous thing to say that", but the temperament is the reaction of my conditioning, obviously. Right sirs, are we meeting each other? I don't want to talk all by myself. So see what happens. I am aware of the cloud, the beauty of the cloud, the light in it, the shape of it, the glory of that extraordinary cloud, being an artist, which is my temperament, I want to express it and I pursue that expression, more and more and more. And I separate myself by my temperament from you, who are not an artist - right? And if I pursue that further inwardly, my conditioning is what is bringing about a temperament, a characteristic, a tendency, an idiosyncrasy. Now I want to find out further if the mind can be free from that conditioning, from all conditioning - you follow? And this is not analysis - right?

Q: You mean, since we tend to be creatures of habit, we must have the ability to break straight through the habit.

K: That's right sir.

Q: To be instantaneous.

K: That's right. After all I am moving steadily from the outer to the inner. I don't disregard the outer, or neglect the outer; there is poverty, starvation, I am fully aware of it, I have to act upon it. I can't just say I am aware of it and just sit back. I have to act. And I see this starvation, the poverty, the degradation, the horror of all poverty. And I want to go into it, not say, "Well, let's organize and feed the poor" - I want to go to the very root of all this. So I move from the obvious to the not so obvious. To me this whole process is

to be aware, and I can't move to the root of it if there is any form of prejudice along the line. I don't know if you see? If I have any bias, an opinion, a conclusion, I can't go to the root of it. So my concern is then, have I opinions - you follow sir? Have I any form of conclusions about Nixon, Heath - about anybody? Because if I have a conclusion an opinion, a dogmatic assertive attitude I can't penetrate, obviously. The mind cannot proceed further. So my awareness reveals that I have a prejudice, that I have a conclusion from which I act. So I then pick up that opinion, in that awareness and say, "Why have I an opinion about something?" - you follow sirs? It is a marvellous movement of releasing energy. I don't know if you see the point. A conclusion prevents the flow of energy - get that point sir, get that point. I am just looking at it, I am getting excited about it.

Q: You mean a conclusion is...

K: That's right. If I say, "There is god" - finished! Or I say, "Communists are terrible", or "The Capitalists are the most marvellous group" and so on and so on. So in this awareness I discover, the mind discovers that any form of conclusion, opinion, prevents the free flow of energy. Then my problem is: how to be free of conclusions and opinions. I am talking by myself, won't you join me?

Q: Can't you be unattached to opinions, like there are opinions but you don't take them seriously. I can't exactly explain it.

K: Why should I have opinions?

Q: I see that it is absurd to have opinions, then it doesn't matter whether one says something or says nothing. The two are just equally...

K: Ah, no, no, no. Look sir: opinion is a form of conclusion, isn't it?

Q: Yes, but you are aware that that conclusion does exist in the world.

K: Yes. I am aware that my friend has an opinion, and therefore I realize that opinion blocks him; and I have opinions also about somebody or other, or about something, that prevents further enquiry. So see what I have discovered.

Q: Well how do you not have opinions? We have got millions of them.

K: How do you not have opinions. How can you be free of opinions when you have got so many of them? You tell me.

Q: I don't know.

K: Wait. That is right. Start from there, please start from there. I have hundreds of opinions about everything and I say, "I don't know why I have them, and I don't know how to be free of them" - right? So you start with not knowing - right? Then you are able to learn. You get it? If you begin to say, "I must have a few opinions, the good opinions, I'll discard the bad opinions, I'll keep those which are comforting, which are fashionable, which are satisfactory, which gratify", then you are still playing with opinions - right? So I don't know how I have acquired them, I don't know what to do about them. So my mind doesn't know - right? See the beauty, come on. Now it is capable of learning. That is, I don't know Russian, therefore I want to learn. So my mind now is capable of learning, and learning then becomes a passionate thing, not why I should have opinions, or why you should not have opinions, but not knowing I want to learn, and that gives me

tremendous vitality.

Q: It gives me tremendous weariness.

K: Because you want to solve it, you want to get rid of them. You want to conquer them, you want to go beyond them, you want to be free of them. I don't. I know nothing about it, I don't know how I have got it, I don't know how to get rid of them, therefore I am willing to learn.

Q: If you start from that knowing then you can put the question rightly for yourself, which brings interest.

K: Yes, that is right. Now are we doing this together? Please sirs, it is fun, you know.

Q: Isn't there some residue of knowledge?

K: Wait a minute. So you are saying: what is the difference between knowledge and learning. Is that right sir? In learning - let us put it round the other way - in learning do you acquire knowledge and use that knowledge as a means of getting rid of the opinions?

Q: When you look at the world you tend to see things like say, Mr. Heath, if you see politicians working, you realize this kind of energy creates problems, it doesn't solve them and this remains in the mind as knowledge. I mean one isn't just a blank state when you see this.

K: What do you mean by the word 'knowledge' sir?

Q: I think when you see external things...

K: Yes sir, let us go very simply at it sir. Let's begin very simply. What do you mean by that word 'knowledge'? To know? I know you because I met you yesterday, I know your name, I have seen your face, so I say, "I know you". Right? I know your name

and where you live because we have been introduced, we have talked about it. So what is that? That is a stored up memory of yesterday's meeting and that is part of my knowledge. So knowledge is always in the past - right?

Q: There is always more to learn about anything.

K: I am adding to it, there is the adding process going on. That is, knowledge is the residue of experience, of accumulated knowledge of the race, of society, of the scientist, all that, all the accumulation of human endeavour as experience scientifically or personally, is knowledge, to which you are adding or taking away. Knowledge which has no basis, knowledge which has basis - right?

Q: Are you saying that knowledge and memory are the same?

K: Yes, obviously, obviously. If I have no memory I have no knowledge.

Q: This doesn't mean they are the same if you have no memory you have no knowledge. Knowledge can be a qualification of memory.

K: Let's look at it. Look at it. You have flattered me or insulted me. I react to that. And that remains a memory, it has become my memory, your insult. And the brain retains that memory. I meet a snake or whatever it is, that is again an experience which has been transmitted to me by generations past that it is a dangerous snake, which is knowledge. Or I experience something totally new and remember it, the remembrance is stored in the brain and that is my memory. So knowledge is either in the books, written down by others, or by myself, and the knowledge which I have kept for myself. This is simple enough sir.

Now is there a difference between acquiring knowledge and

learning? Go on. Enquire. This is fun.

Q: Is there a structure for knowledge, a function of knowledge and the transcendence of knowledge?

K: Yes sir, that is right. Let's use knowledge as functional, because if I don't know how to write, I don't know how to speak, I don't know how to do a job, knowledge is necessary. To function knowledge is necessary. And is learning different from the acquisition of knowledge?

Q: It must be.

K: We are going to find out, we are going to learn.

Q: Don't you ask questions out of knowledge. You have certain preoccupations and then you ask your question. Then you ask your question not of the past.

K: Sir wait. I have no preoccupation now. All that I am concerned with now is to find out if there is a difference between knowledge and learning. It is not a preoccupation, I want to find out.

Q: The meaning of the word 'know' is not to acquire knowledge, there is knowing. Like the words 'Know yourself', it is not acquiring knowledge, it is something all the time.

K: Ah wait sir, wait, wait. When you use the words 'Know yourself', see how complex it is. To know myself - right? It has been said, 'Know yourself'. To know myself, what does that mean? I must know myself, knowing myself means I must know myself as I am, or as I will be, or as I have been - right?

Q: It could mean I have organized my memory so that I can predict what I might do in the future.

K: Yes, all that is implied.

Q: I mean in the sense that it is fairly obvious that oneself is not an idea of oneself, so that when there is no idea of oneself, oneself is there.

K: If there is no idea of oneself, is there oneself? Don't let's enter into this. I want to stick to one thing at a time, which is: what is the difference, is there a difference between knowledge and learning?

Q: It seems that learning is only perception, when perception moves to conclusion then it has function which makes it knowledge.

K: That's all. That is - he has said it! Need I say more. I see the importance of learning. I don't know why I have prejudices, I don't know how to be free of them, so I start with not knowing, therefore my mind is capable of learning. Now I must find out the difference between knowledge and learning. Will learning bring knowledge, how to be free from opinions - you follow? - or will learning, which will be constant, in this constant movement no opinion can be formed. I don't know if you see the difference.

Q: You'd say that learning is something vital and in the present, whereas knowledge is always dead, in the past.

K: Always in the past - yes, that is right. First see this sir. I have caught on to something!

Knowledge I can have, knowledge how to get rid of opinions, I must struggle against them, I must control them, I must say, "I must not have opinions", and keep on repeating, repeating, mechanically. So I say that will not free the mind from opinions. So learning implies never accumulating knowledge, never coming to a conclusion, therefore in the movement of learning how can the



mind form a conclusion, an opinion?

Q: Are you saying...

K: Wait. I don't know what I am saying, I am just capturing it.

Q: Where does necessary knowledge stop?

K: Sir, just play with this a little. I am moving - learning implies movement, constant movement and that which is moving can never accumulate, and when you accumulate it becomes knowledge, which is necessary to function. But in learning which is a constant movement, no opinion, no conclusion can ever be formed. I have got it! Right?

Now are we together learning? Can you honestly and without any sense of distortion say, "I really don't know how to get rid of opinions", and you are beginning to learn. In learning you are asking, "Am I accumulating"? I know accumulation is necessary - to speak a language, to function - but in the movement of learning is the mind acquiring knowledge in order to be free of opinions? But I say you have put a wrong question because in the movement of learning there can be no accumulation - right? Now are we doing that together now? So that you, in the movement of learning, have banished opinions, put away opinions? But if you say, "I must get rid of opinions", you are acting from a conclusion, which is your knowledge which you have acquired in learning and therefore you have stopped. Therefore you are collecting barnacles, which are opinions. I don't know if you see - right?

Q: Each time I look intensely, the idea of not seeing it as a leaf - when I am seeing a leaf now I find that when I am looking, in this state of intensive looking I seem to not be able to see myself. It's as if I can just see the intensity of the colours and I'm not there. There

are moments when I see...

K: Yes sir, and that of course. So what is the question sir?

Q: I am just amazed!

K: Ah! I understand sir.

Q: How does one change the direction in which one learns. In learning one first chooses a direction...

K: Ah, no. No sir, I am not choosing a direction. Just look what has happened! We said we are going to discuss awareness - just follow this sir, put your mind to it a little bit - we said we were going to talk over together, awareness. I said, we are aware from the outside movement to the inner. In seeing that blue colour I say, "How terrible that colour is" - which is the response of my conditioning, my temperament, my etc. etc. And we never go beyond a conclusion. If we go beyond a conclusion I discover there are a thousand opinions I have, then having them I justify them, rationalize them, say these are good opinions, these are bad opinions, the bad opinions I must get rid of and I'll keep the good opinions. There are no good or bad opinions, there are only opinions, which are conclusions.

Q: They are like the currency of psychological life, you just play around with them like cigarette cards.

K: Quite right sir. Quite right, you play with them.

Q: Squirm with them.

K: Squirm with them, bite with them, whatever it is. And you go further. Say, "How have I got these opinions?" - culture, society, the family, tradition, the mother saying, "Do this, don't do that", the father saying, "That is good" - you follow? - society, the culture has given me those opinions, these conclusions and now I

am faced with them I say, I don't know how to get rid of them. So I don't know how to get rid of them, there is only one factor, I don't know.

Q: I am lazy.

K: No, no wait, I don't know. Then it may be I am lazy. I am lazy and decide I don't know and I remain there because I am indolent, my brain is sluggish, so I say, "I don't know, it is very nice" but I remain. The brain is active, I am not going to let my stupid brain become lazy - you understand? The new brain itself now is enquiring. Now I don't know and then I ask: what is the difference between knowledge and learning? We have explained that. Learning is a constant movement - at no time can it collect which becomes knowledge, which is essential for functioning. But learning goes on and therefore in the movement of learning nothing can be collected, except as a function. As a function if you introduce opinions, the function becomes non-functional - right? That's all.

So I have discovered all this in awareness, which is, I see all this instantly. It takes time to explain but the perception is instantaneous and therefore doesn't require analysis.

Q: Does it require effort to keep the movement going?

K: Ah, does it require effort to keep learning going? What do you say?

Q: No effort at all.

K: Why do you say that?

Q: Chapter 1 verse 6 - no effort required!

Q: What happens when some great clot sticks a gun in your face, what happens when the balloon goes up?

K: I don't know them.

Q: No, nor do I.

K: Then why do you put the question?

Q: Well, because, because, because.

K: No.

Q: It creates its own energy.

K: Obviously. Are we learning or are we just waiting to be fed?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How does one slow down the movement of thought so that you can observe one thought? Is that it?

Now how does one slow down thought so as to observe the movement of thought? Because thought is like a chain, going on so quickly through association, through the habit of association, thought is constantly moving and to observe it, it must slow down - right? And you say, "I can't slow down, I don't know what to do". Now we are going to learn about it - right sir? Learn, not form an opinion or a conclusion - right? How do I slow down, how does the mind slow down thought so as to observe it closely? Are you waiting for me? Wait, do listen quietly, we'll stick to this thing. Are you waiting for me to tell you?

Q: What do you want to slow down thought for?

K: What do you want to slow down thought for?

Q: Mine crawls at snail's pace, I'd like to speed it up.

K: The gentleman, sir, asked, the speed of my thoughts are so rapid, so related, so sequential, logical or illogical, that I can't follow them. That is his question. Your question may be: I would like to speed it up. That is quite a different matter.

Q: But sir when I observe myself, many times I am in control, I

am controlling my thoughts and I know exactly what I am doing. But when I observe myself, when I am learning about myself I see that I am the thought and I see that...

K: That's right sir.

Q: What observes the thought? Is that thought as well?

K: Of course.

Q: It is just thought observing thought - how are you going to slow down thought?

K: I am going to show - we are going to learn about it. You don't give a chance to learn. How can thought be slowed down?

Q: If you can see that thought is observing thought and the perception is instantaneous, it will work itself.

K: Is this a fact to you or are you just offering an opinion?

Q: That would be awareness.

K: I don't want to be rude madame, but I am just asking, or being personal: are you aware of the rapidity of your thoughts, and being aware of the rapidity of your thoughts you say, "Now, is it possible to slow them down so that I can look, taste one thought completely?" - you understand? To see the significance of one thought, all its content, its beauty or its ugliness, its depth or its shallowness - you follow?

Q: Who is it that is tasting?

K: That is just a phrase which I use to see the content of a thought, that is all?

Q: Is that thought turned back on itself?

K: We are going to discover it sir, we are going to learn about it. Now first of all why do I want to slow it down? Wait, watch it sir. I am asking, don't answer, wait. Why do I want to slow it

down? You say, "I want to slow it down in order to look more closely at it" - right? Who is the entity that is going to look at it more closely? It is still thought, the observer.

Q: It is still opinion, sir.

K: Still an opinion. The observer says, "I must slow it down in order to observe it more closely". Watch this sir, watch this. The observer is saying that. Is the observer different from the thing which he is observing? Is that a fact, not just an idea, but a fact?

Q: Quite different from somebody who is threatening to beat me up.

K: That is a different matter sir.

Q: It will be yes and no. The observer and the thought would be identified as one and yet they are different.

K: I want to slow it down, my thinking, hoping thereby to observe the machinery of thinking, to observe one thought so clearly, understand it so fully that other thoughts are included in that one thought. And I say, "Who is the person who is observing? Is he the product of thought?" And if it is the product of thought it is the past, so the past says, "I must watch this rapid movement of thought" - the past being inactive, thought which is the response being active. I wonder is you are getting all this?

Q: Living - going back to the original awareness as knowledge - living for everyone is instantaneous. The awareness immediately becomes the past and you can examine that and then...

K: No, madame.

Q: And the forward looking is conditioned by your memory, education etc. and your knowledge and you are preoccupied with what is going to happen, but you yourself, the ego, the personality,

can only be aware of a second at a time. The rest is memory and speculation.

K: You are saying, are you madame, that you, the ego, the person, is only capable for a second to be aware?

Q: Of your life. You don't know, I don't know that you might drop down dead or I might drop down dead in a second. I can only know a second minutely at a time.

K: Madame, is that a fact? Is that a theory, an idea, a conclusion, a hope? But actually is that a fact in my life, that I am only living for one second?

Q: Aware for a second.

K: Ah, wait. I don't know. You see you are coming to a conclusion. You have made a statement that you can only be aware for one second. I say, "How do you know this?" It may not be.

Q: Eternity is in one second.

K: You see you are using the word 'eternity', that is, to be out of time. Do you know what it means to be out of time? - actually, not just theoretically, from a book, from somebody saying eternity, god, or the church saying eternity.

Q: For a second, once or twice in my life I have had this feeling of being out of time when my thoughts actually stood still but that was never by any kind of conscious effort, this was from some outside stimulus, fear or something of this sort.

K: That's right sir. When there is a crisis, when there is a tremendous shock, either the shock of beauty or a shock of pain, or a shock of deep challenge, thought is driven out. At that moment you feel, by Jove what an extraordinary state of intensity! Which is dependent on an external stimuli, and knowing that state, or having

had an experience, you want to reach it again, then begins the whole problem. The observer is different from the observed and wants to pursue the observed, which becomes pleasure and he is pursuing pleasure and not the actual moment of that extraordinary state.

Q: There is no understanding of that type of experience. You can ask a question of that experience, you are seeking that experience but ask a question of that experience. Therefore what you are left with is a question.

K: Sir, please, you have asked a question, which is quite important and essential, which is; thought is in constant movement, can that thought which is constantly revolving from one thing to another, can there be a gap between two thoughts and observe what takes place in that gap? You are asking that question, aren't you sir? Because in that gap you may see things which you have never seen before. You may, I don't say you will, you may. So we have to find out, we have to learn, see the movement of thought, the rapid movement of thought, and to slow it down - is that possible?

Q: That is why one aspect of my life will always hold my interest, and in that intense interest thought is observable or slows down. If I find that I have opinions and in being intensely concerned about opinion, thought, the nature of thought will be observed too.

K: Yes sir but we are asking something different from that. We are asking: is there a gap between two thoughts? And if there is a gap, in that gap is it possible to observe the coming of thought and the going away of thought? You understand? Then I have slowed it down, thought has slowed. I don't know if you follow this sir.



Q: But in the gap...

K: Wait, wait. We are just learning.

Q: Thought doesn't slow down by any effort.

K: Now wait a minute. Effort implies division, doesn't it?

Right? Effort basically implies conflict, struggle between two countries, division, between two people, division, between two beliefs, division, between two conclusions a division and conflict. So where there is division there must be conflict. That is a fact. It is not my invention or yours, that is a fact. Now if I try through effort to slow down thought then it becomes conflict, I am battling. In that battle I never discover anything. So to see the truth that division is conflict, to see it, to perceive it, is to end division. You understand sir? As a Hindu, if I am still a Hindu, meeting a Pakistani that is a division, that is a quarrel, a war and all the beastly business of it. If I see the truth of it I am no longer a Hindu, or a Muslim - you follow? I see the truth of it and therefore it goes, it is finished. The seeing is the learning, which has nothing to do with a conclusion. Right.

Now, I am asking, can thought be slowed down? Not controlled slowed down, not thought made to go slowly by concentration, by effort, by struggle - I am asking if it can be naturally slowed down.

Q: Talking about is it possible to have a gap between thoughts, or whether thought can be slowed down - are we agreed what thought is? As far as we can.

K: I thought we went into that. All right, what is thought? Again no conclusions, we are going to learn. What is thought? I ask you a question - do listen to this - I ask you a question: what is your name, and your response is instantaneous, isn't it, because you are

familiar with it, you have repeated it a thousand times and you say, "My name is so and so". There is no interval between the question and the answer; but there is an interval between the question and the answer when the question is a little more complex, with which you are not familiar. I ask you something and you are not familiar, then what takes place? Thought is searching in its memory for the answer, if it cannot find it it looks into books, if it cannot find it in the books, it will ask somebody else. So the interval is longer between the question and the answer. Follow all this sir. And if I ask you something of which you don't know, you say, "I don't know" - right? Because "I don't know" is an instant response of truth, about which you say, "I don't know".

So thought is the response of memory, memory being experience that has been accumulated in the brain cells through generations and generations and generations, tradition, culture, all that is stored up in the brain.

Q: I wonder if we can say that thought is conclusion.

K: Yes, obviously. Don't jump, I want to learn. So I know what thought is. And I am asking whether that thought can be quiet, slowed down and in that slowing down is it capable of being observed without the observer? The observer is the past, and the thought is the response of the past. So if the observer observes thought as an outsider he is still playing the part in the past. See that. So how is thought to slow down?

Q: Well one way is to have an intensive experience, like a shot.

K: If you have a shot, oh, take a drug, take LSD or whatever it is. Now let us go into that.

Q: I have found that when I am thinking a lot that if my thought

subsides, I find there is a certain amount of pain within myself.

When I am thinking I am not experiencing the pain.

K: I see what you are saying: you are saying thought is a means of escape from my suffering or from my misery, or from my frustration, so I think.

Q: And it is not being able to resist the pain which I have that one keeps thinking.

K: But we are not asking thought as a means of escape from pain. We are examining thought itself.

Q: It is easier to see the gap between thought than to see how to slow thought down.

K: Is your thought sir, sitting there, discussing, talking things over, have you discovered that you can slow down thought? Don't theorize.

Q: I can experience the state between thoughts.

K: Wait, wait. Can you? If you can, what is that space?

Q: Thinking of it.

Q: Attention.

K: Then if it is still thinking of it - no, no. Do please find this out, because I'll tell you why it is important. Meditation is the emptying of the mind of its content, that is the real meditation, not all the phoney business that is going on. Emptying consciousness of its content. Its content being the furniture, the house, the memories, the images, the various conditionings - you follow? - the whole content is consciousness, and to meditate outside that consciousness, or to go beyond that consciousness is illusion; until you empty the consciousness of its content meditation becomes merely the means of further distortion.

Q: When you say emptying consciousness of its content are you implying consciousness is...?

K: I said madame, consciousness is its content. The content of my consciousness and your consciousness is made up of all your memories, not only conscious and unconscious memories but also all the remembrances, the hurts, the agonies, the pain, the physical pain, the psychological hurts, your attachments and your fears, your pleasures, the accumulation that you have gathered is the content which is your consciousness. The understanding of the content and the emptying of that content is the process of meditation. The process of meditation is to empty consciousness otherwise you are still a prisoner in it. You may invent, you may think, well I have seen Christ, I have seen Krishna, I have seen Buddha, but it is all within that, therefore no reality - right? And thinking is the basic content of consciousness, which is the response of my conditioning. If I am a Communist, a hard boiled Communist, I have been indoctrinated by Marx, Lenin and all the rest of it, and that is my conditioning and I think from that. If I am a devout practising Catholic, my conditioning is such and I think from that - or a business man or whatever it is. And to meditate, having this content, being conditioned, is like playing a childish game. So in asking this question, can thought be slowed down, I am enquiring into the whole content of my consciousness - you follow sir? Not just, thought can be slowed down, that is fairly easy. But in asking the question I am asking a much deeper question, which is: can the mind with its content empty itself without the least effort?

Q: Earlier on you were going to talk about the effect of certain

drugs, LSD.

K: Would you please go on about LSD and various other forms of drugs slowing down the mind. I have never taken any kind of drugs. Your LSD, marijuana, pot, grass, hash, hard drugs of any kinds, but I have seen and talked to a great many people who have taken it, serious people who have - scientists, experimenters who have gone into this. First of all why do we take drugs at all, including tobacco - you follow?

Q: Escape.

K: Go into it, I want to learn, I am not going just to say 'escape', I want to learn why I smoke.

Q: We are looking for something we think we don't have.

K: You want to experience something which you don't know, is that right? But do you know all experiences in living before you ask that question, something I don't know? Which means you are bored with the present living and you want to experience something more.

Q: Mr. Krishnamurti, what about people who are suffering from severe mental illness?

K: Suffering from severe mental illness - you are suffering from severe mental illness.

Q: I want to help them.

K: Wait, madame.

Q: Not dangerous drugs like this mescaline and hashish.

K: I don't know they are dangerous, they say they are not, some of them say they are perfectly healthy, marvellous.

Q: They are. They work wonders.

K: Good! Please madame. Look, first of all I am asking myself,

why do I take drugs, alcohol, smoke, why?

Q: For a breakthrough from your limited consciousness.

K: So you are saying, chemically, listen to it sir, chemically - through chemical processes I will break through the limitation of my consciousness - right? I will fast, not eat food for many days and that sharpens the mind and that will help me to break through - right? I will practise certain systems and that in the practise of it I will strengthen my mind and that will be a breakthrough. It is all implied in this. My intention is I want to break through my petty little consciousness - Christian, Hindu, whatever it is. And drugs, systems, anything that will help me to break through I will accept - right?

Q: It is a matter of experiencing, not accepting. There is no acceptance until you have experienced.

K: Yes, that is what I mean. You will take drugs, you accept it and then take it because you want to break through. Go at it sanely sir, step by step. Now I am asking: can you break through, or you break through, or you expand your consciousness and you call that breaking through?

Q: No but on the acceptance - you accept that you don't know the experience. You just take the drugs and then have the experience. You don't accept the drug as being that which will break consciousness, you accept the drug that will give you an experience.

K: Yes sir, that is what I mean. You accept the drug because somebody has said if you take this drug you will have an extraordinary experience.

Q: Well the matter of it being extraordinary is up to your own

judgement.

K: Yes sir, that is what I am saying. Don't quibble over words. You will have an experience. I accept you as my authority because you have taken it and you say, "Take this old boy and you will have a breakthrough". And I say to myself, why do I take it, is it a break through at all? Or the breakthrough is the extension of my conditioning, which I think is a breakthrough. Look sirs. Have you ever observed a tree closely? - without the image of the tree, without a conclusion of the tree, actually observe it so that there is no gap between you and the tree, no distance, so that you observe this extraordinary phenomenon called the tree. If you can observe it without the word, without the image, without the knowledge, there is a tremendous contact with that tree - not that you become the tree, that would be absurd, but you have direct relationship with it. You see things that you have never seen before. Now that is a break through.

Q: What about the grass under your feet while you are looking at the tree?

K: Oh, for goodness sake, I am talking of the tree sir. Then you can look at the grass too.

Q: It would be a heightened awareness.

K: I said sir, it is not identification, I can't identify. I am too alive to identify with a tree. I am not the tree.

Q: In resonance then.

K: No. I explained it sir. Look sir, you have an image about me and I have an image about you, haven't you? You have an image about your girl-friend, your husband, your wife. You have an image. The images have relationship - right? I have an image about

my wife and she has an image about me, this image has been created through years, and our relationship is between these two images. I don't know her and she doesn't know me actually, but I think I know her through the images which I have about her. Now if there was no image at all, then my relationship with my wife is entirely different - my wife or friend or whatever it is. Similarly when I watch a tree, or cloud, or bird, without this screen of words, knowledge, conclusion, then there is direct relationship with it. Now the content of my consciousness cannot be broken through any chemical. If it is as simple as that, by taking a drug, it is all finished. That would be marvellous. Then why aren't we all happy human beings - you follow? Those who have taken drugs.

Q: Mate, it is not a drug, it is the experience that comes from it.

K: I explained sir. Experience. Now why do you want experience? Why this craving for experience?

Q: To be satisfied

K: That is not an answer, is it.

Q: I am bored.

K: Which is, you are bored with all the experiences you have had, right? That is right sir. You are bored with all the experiences you have had and you want to experience something more. You have had sex, you have had every kind of silly and good experience and you say, "For goodness sake these are all rather trivial and I want something more".

Q: For myself anyway, it wasn't a case of wanting something more, it was a correlating factor, to tie everything together, the experiences in my life.

K: That is the same thing, all right. Co-relating all the factors of



experiences so that you are made a whole. Watch it sir. Correlate all the experiences one has accumulated, there are different kinds of experiences, sexual, mental, you know dozens and dozens of separated experiences. And you hope by taking a drug they will all join, or see the experience as a total. Which is: asking further experience, which is the same thing - you understand sir? I ask the experience what happens if I take a drug, perhaps I will break through, whatever that word 'breakthrough' is to my consciousness, and you say, "I want to experience that state of mind when the fragmentation of experiences don't exist". It is exactly the same thing, only you put it in one way and I put it in another way, but we both want experience. I say, why? We need experience, as when there is a challenge you respond, that is an experience, and that challenge keeps you awake, if there wasn't the Communists, the Capitalists would be further Capitalists, if there wasn't somebody - you follow? Challenge is necessary to keep us awake. Now you say the drug will act as a challenge to further response which will be beyond - right? So you are looking for a challenge which is the drug. Right? And I say, why do you want a challenge at all? You say, "My friend I want it because I am asleep" - right? "I am asleep, I don't know how to keep awake so that I see the whole thing." So you are dependent on a drug to keep you awake - right? Be clear, don't accept what I am saying.

Q: I suppose we are bored.

K: Yes, you are bored, we said that.

Q: It is better to be awake on something than asleep on nothing, isn't it?

K: Why aren't you awake? Much more important than saying

that drugs will keep me awake. Why aren't you awake, what is wrong?

Q: Well a lot of people I know have said that in taking LSD that it has shown them what and how they are normally - they weren't aware of really how thorough enlightened was until they took the drug,

K: Yes sir, that is right. The drug gave you a sense of awareness and then you began to live and see what you were doing.

Q: You can see how you live, how squalid you are, how you squirm, you portray it out, and you terrorize yourself with the way you usually are.

K: Yes sir, I understand that.

Q: If you get something beyond that, well then that is a bit of good luck.

K: Yes I understand that. That is by taking a drug...

Q: It is no easy matter, not really.

K: I know it is not an easy matter, nothing is an easy matter except the drug.

Q: It is easy to do that, it is easy to roll up a cigarette.

K: That's right sir, you want the easiest way out.

Q: I don't want the easiest way out, and don't want the hardest way out, just a way out.

K: You want a way out, way out of our misery, out of our problems, financial, emotional, intellectual problems, our suffering, our pettiness - you follow? - we want a way out of all that. And I say, "Why do you take the longest method to do it"?

Q: Because of suffering.

K: Wait sir. Why do you take the most complicated, the most

unrealistic, impractical way to live differently? You follow sir? Why have you become so impractical? By taking drugs you are not any more happier at the end of it, you are not much more alive, active, creative.

Q: Mr. Krishnamurti, may I very politely point out if you are really ill you just take drugs to get back to normal...

K: Madame, look, when the dentist gives me a novacocaine, or whatever it is, that is a sedative, isn't it, it prevents the pain and he can extract or whatever he wants to do, that is natural, isn't it. But to say I'll take drugs in order to - that is what we are talking about.

Q: Sir, that lady is talking about psychological medicine...

K: Sir, do you know how we began this - do you know how we began this discussion? We said, what is thinking, can the mind investigate, learn, the whole machinery of thinking and in the very act of learning there is the slowing down of thinking. That is all that we are discussing. Not how to break through, not which are the beneficial drugs, what the effects of drugs are. The effects of the drugs you can see, those people who have taken them for a long time, their brain deteriorates.

Q: There are exceptions.

K: Of course there are exceptions. You may be the exception! But generally, as I have seen many of them, it is terrible what goes on with drugs. That is an irrelevant question.

The question is: in learning about thought, the machinery of thought, the necessary function of thought, in learning about it, the slowing takes place without control, without subjugation, without effort. And to learn about thinking one has to watch the machinery of thinking, be aware of it, how you think, what makes you think.

Prejudice? A conclusion? A conditioning? All in the past. So thought can never be free because it has its roots in the past, so thought can never be new. What is new is when thought comes to an end and there is a new...

Q: Didn't you say we have to keep on thinking to learn?

K: You keep on thinking to learn, no. I didn't say that. What does it mean to learn? Does it mean thinking? Learning a language needs thinking, which is accumulation of words and their meanings, in Italian or in French or whatever it is. There I have to exercise thought and relate each word and so on and so on. Now I am saying, does learning require thinking, or only a perception and the continuing of that perception, which is learning?

I'll begin again. I am aware of the necessity and the functional value of knowledge. And has knowledge any relationship with learning? I see learning is constant movement, in that I have to function and knowledge is necessary but it is a constant movement. And that movement is not thought but constant awareness, perception, insight. The moment that insight makes a conclusion then it becomes knowledge and an impediment to further enquiry. That is all.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 14TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: The very posing of the question is a moving away from 'what is' - if I understood you rightly. So one asks: are questions necessary at all if we have understood you rightly in the first place?

K: Are questions necessary if we see things very clearly - obviously not. So what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: Could we talk about what happens when you put the question: why aren't you sufficiently interested to see the division between the observer and the observed?

K: Right. Do you want to discuss that? Why is it that we are not sufficiently interested, or sufficiently aware, or see the futility of division in ourselves outwardly, which causes conflict and misery? That is the question isn't it? Shall we discuss that? I wonder what you want to discuss. Please let us talk over something which is really a problem to each one of us.

Q: What about the ending of thought?

K: Ending of thought. Is that a problem to you? No.

Q: What is emotion?

K: I thought we went into that the other day.

Q: The desire to be certain about anything.

K: Can we be certain about anything.

Q: Sir, sometimes I am watching my thought processes, or not watching them, I become aware of what I am doing and I see quite clearly but then I turn away from them. There is a moment of clarity and then again there is confusion. I do not understand how

clarity becomes confusion. Why it begins at all.

K: Well sirs, there are half a dozen things, what do you want to discuss, talk over: love, education, responsibility, ending of thought, all the machinery of thinking, why is it that we don't see the danger, the damage, the conflict, the wars that come about when there is division, both inwardly and outwardly. I wonder which is the best thing to take out of this and go at it.

Q: I think that question about the division between the observer and the observed.

K: Yes, I think so too. Shall we discuss, talk over this question of the observer and the observed - shall we? And then perhaps we can come to the question of the ending of thought, love, education and all the rest of it.

Why is there this division between the perceiver and the perceived? I perceive the tree, the cloud, the person, all the politicians, and I see I perceive both visually, psychologically, having an insight, that division as the perceiver and the perceived does bring conflict invariably, that is obvious. The perceiver is a Muslim, a Christian, a Communist and he separates himself from the non-Communist, non-Catholic, non-something else and where there is division there must be conflict, both outwardly and inwardly, that is clear. Right? And inwardly there is the division as the perceiver and the perceived. The perceiver sees he is angry, anger is something which he perceives, not at the moment of anger. When the anger is over then the perceiver says, "I have been angry", so he creates the division between himself and the state of anger - right? And from that division arises control, suppression, justification and all the rest in order to justify or to deny anger -

right? And in this there is conflict - no?

Q: It is surely anger that created the division.

K: At the moment of anger, sir, is there any division?

Q: Not right at the moment, sir.

K: That's all. A second later the thinker comes into operation, he says, "I have been angry", and when he says, "I have been angry", he knows from past experience that he has been angry, and therefore he identifies from past memories the anger which is now, which is in the present. Haven't you noticed this? At the moment of jealousy, the intense feeling of jealousy, there is no separation is there? Or at the moment of great happiness you don't say, "I have been happy" - in that state there is no division. It is only when a moment later, or a second later the division takes place - right? Shall we go on from there?

Now why does this division take place? I am jealous, at the moment of jealousy, at that second there is no division; at the moment of hate, at the moment of anger, at the moment of envy, there is no separation. A second later separation takes place - why?

Q: Because of the memory.

K: No please, don't answer me. Find out for yourself why the separation takes place in each one of us.

Q: Because we have been educated not to be angry.

K: That's right, which is, not to be angry or to justify anger.

Q: Sometimes.

K: Yes, sometimes. Or justify jealousy. So the perceiver comes and says, "My habit is not to be angry, I must not be angry" - right? No? So separation takes place when the past comes into action - no?

Q: Not only the past but because of your imbalance.

K: Put it any way you like - yes, all right. Imbalance takes place when the past with all its memories, with all its activities, with its experiences comes into operation and says, "I must not be angry". No?

Q: Or justifies.

K: That is the same thing. Again you may say, "My anger is justified".

Q: It may not only be the past that is concerned with the person who has been angry, he may be concerned with what the consequences of his anger are going to be in the future.

K: Yes, which is still from the past.

Q: But isn't it something from the past that created that moment of non-separation.

K: Sir, look at it in yourself. At the moment of jealousy, or of anger, or of envy, or of hate, whatever it be, happiness, at that second there is no division is there?

Q: No, but if the thought, "She doesn't love me", created that non-division, then it was something out of the past that created that non-separation.

K: Yes, sir - I don't know if you are saying the same thing.

Q: Yes but if someone is yelling and shrieking at you, really having a go at you, they get very angry at you, they are bawling at you - right? They are throwing things all over the place.

K: What has that to do with what we are talking about sir?

Q: Well the thing is when I leave here I won't be sitting in a nice, neat, tidy tent.

K: We are trying to find out, sir, aren't we, why there is this



division in human beings. And how does this division come about? Why there are so many fragments in us - anger, jealousy, competition, contradiction - those are all various fragments of which we are made up. And I am asking, how do these fragments come into being? Not that somebody shouts at me, but I want to find out for myself why these fragments exist. Is it education, the culture in which you have been brought up, the whole religious concept of god, the devil, the sinner, you know all that?

Q: You were asking the other day how you could see without this fragmentation?

K: That's right sir, that's right. First of all to find out how to observe, how to have a mind that is not fragmented so that it can look without fragmentation, at the fragmentation as it takes place - right? That's what we are trying to find out. Don't we know we are fragmented? Let's begin from there. Are we aware that we are fragmented? - the family, the nation, the ideals and 'what is', the suppressions, the controls, the business man, the artist, the military, you follow, the church and so on, division - outwardly the nationalities, linguistically, and inwardly all the broken up entities that we are - are we aware of it, first? Come on sirs.

Q: Yes, I see this.

K: You see it. Now just a minute. How do you see it? Let's go into - please, if you are serious, let's go into it step by step. When you say, "I see it" - what do you mean by that word 'seeing'? Is it an intellectual concept?

Q: No.

K: Go slowly sir. I am not saying - we are enquiring. Is it an intellectual concept, an idea which you accept and you say, "I see

the idea, I see the concept", "I understand verbally what you mean", which is intellectually, but that is not seeing, that is only accepting the words. When you say, "I see", it must be actual, it must be as actual as I see you sitting there and me sitting here, otherwise it is just an idea and therefore of no value. So when you say, "I see I am fragmented", we must be very careful in the usage of that word. When I am hungry, I don't see I am hungry, I am hungry. So in the same way, am I aware that I am fragmented?

Q: Only in the moment of a challenge.

K: All right, only in the moment of a challenge. We are challenging now. If the challenge is strong enough, if the challenge is important enough and if the challenge is urgent, a shock to you, then do you see it? Not as an idea, not as a concept, not as something somebody has told you, but actually you see it.

Q: The moment that you are seeing it, it does not exist.

K: Wait sir, wait, we'll come to it, go step by step. Please this is really quite important - if you would give a little attention without answering me immediately. Which is, I have heard you say I am fragmented. What you say sounds reasonable, sounds true and I apply that to myself because I see the truth of what you are saying so I say, "Yes, I am fragmented", but I don't see it myself - right? So is it a discovery for myself that I am fragmented? A discovery - you understand? Something that I have found, or I have found it because you have told me, then it becomes an idea.

Q: I don't quite understand the word 'fragmented'. Could you express it another way?

K: Broken up, contradictory, I say one thing and mean something else, I have an ideal and act the opposite, I say, "I must

be peaceful" and I am boiling with violence. I say, "I must be charitable" and I am tight-fisted - whatever you like. So am I aware that I am contradictory in myself?

Q: No, but you are aware of a kind of an alienation in oneself, that is all.

K: Yes, that is the same thing.

Sir, take an ideal which most people have, which is not 'what is', is it? 'What is', is entirely different from the ideal - right? Isn't that so?

Q: Do we call them ideals when we cannot see?

K: No madame. Look, I have an ideal that eventually we will all be brotherly, and in the meantime I am hating you. The ideal is over there, the fact is, I dislike, I hate - right? So what is important the ideal or 'what is'? Come on sirs. Obviously 'what is'. So why do we have ideals?

Q: I have given them up.

K: Good! Please sir, it is one of the most difficult things to face actually 'what is' without any distortion of the ideal: either the ideal which I have experienced in the past, which has established itself in my brain as memory, which says, "I must not", and therefore I am not facing the fact. No, this is really a very complex problem if you want to go into it very seriously. Which is, the division between the ideal and 'what is'. The ideal may be in the future, or the ideal has been in the past, which I have forgotten, which has established itself in my unconscious and acts, or prevents the perception of 'what is'. So when you understand this, this contradiction, and you say, "How is the mind to be free of contradiction totally" - that is the real issue, not the observer and

the observed, which we will come to later, or the perceiver and the perceived, but this quality of the mind in which there is contradiction. So I ask myself why does contradiction exist? One of the factors is ideals, obviously. The other factor is measurement.

Q: If I am experiencing pain and I say, "I don't like this"...

K: Quite, the same thing sir. We said, ideals, which is "I don't like it", "I must not", "I must be", or comparison - right? Which is measurement. As long as I am measuring myself, comparing myself with you who are more intelligent, bright and all the rest of it, there must be contradiction, from 'what is' and 'what I should be' - no? Oh, come on sirs. So can the mind be free of all comparison?

Q: Isn't that an ideal?

K: No sir, no. I have explained. We asked why does this division exist in the human mind? We say one of the factors for its existence is an ideal, either in the future, or deeply embedded in the unconscious. And one of the factors of this contradiction is comparison, measurement. When I compare myself with you, you are important, not what is a fact - right? When you compare in a school one boy against another boy, you are sacrificing, you are destroying B who is not so clever as A - right? These are all simple factors. So that is one of the reasons why this division exists. This division exists also because we are educated in this. You are always comparing, in the business world, in the artistic world, in the world of psychology and in the world of religious organizations, there is the priest, the archbishop, bishop, you know, the racket of it all! Right?

So does this contradiction exist in me? Because as long as there is contradiction I am in conflict. Contradiction means division,

division between the perceiver and the perceived. Now having heard this, is it a fact to you? Which means can you put aside completely every form of ideal - both conscious ideals of which you are aware, and the unconscious, so that you are only facing every minute 'what is'? This is an extremely serious thing to do, because then you have no illusion, then you are tremendously honest - right? Because you admit only the fact. If I lie, I lie - you follow? If I am jealous, that is a fact. Not rationalize, condemn it, or justify it. So when we see the fact you have tremendous energy to go beyond it? I wonder if you see this?

Q: The thing is how we can see the fact.

K: Yes sir. You can't see the fact.

Q: The way you put the question for example, immediately my mind...

K: I understand sir. It is not what I am saying. As I said sir, it is not important what the speaker is saying. What is important is to use the speaker to find out if what he is saying is false or real, if what he is saying is actual, which is yourself, what is actually going on within you.

Q: So we use you as a mirror.

K: Right, as a mirror, reflection, look at it.

Q: Is it only when we stop striving to become...

K: No madame, that is a different question, please listen to what I have said. Are you aware that in you there is this contradiction brought about by ideals, by comparison, by wanting to be something, are you aware of this, as something actual, as you are aware of pain? If you are not, why?

Q: No, I am not aware of this as a fact.

K: No, do please listen. The gentleman says, "No, I am not aware of this as a fact" - don't you hear? Is it you are not paying attention? Is it because you don't see the danger of it?

Q: You are afraid of the effect.

K: You are afraid what would happen if you stop comparing yourself with somebody else?

Q: We don't see the danger.

K: Look, why don't you see the danger?

Q: Could it be that we are dull?

K: Wait, wait. Now you say, could it be that we are dull? Now just look at it, just listen to this. How do you know you are dull? No. How do you know you are dull? You only know you are dull because you are comparing yourself with somebody else.

Q: No, because I can't understand you.

K: Wait. Therefore say, "I am not dull", don't say, "I am dull", only "I don't understand". Which is entirely different. When you say, "I am dull", you say it because you compare yourself with somebody who is clever, who is bright, who is intelligent and you say, "How dull I am". We are not talking about dullness, we are talking about a mind that says, "I don't see the danger, I don't understand why contradiction isn't all right, I have lived with it for the last fifty, twenty, ten, years and what is wrong with it".

Q: Part of the difficulty is that at one level it is all right, and it is very difficult to switch that off when one is looking at something at a deeper level.

K: Yes. At one level, you say, comparison, measurement is necessary, obviously. When I am buying a house I must compare, when I am choosing between two cars I have to compare, and so

on. And this process of comparison is carried over psychologically to a deeper level. So the question is, why don't we carry this through, why don't we see where it is necessary and there end it? Why carry it further? You understand my question?

Q: Doesn't it help if we see that our psychological reactions which constitute 'what is' are mechanical?

K: Ah, no sir. Look, look, they are not mechanical. May I go on with this? I compare myself with somebody and in this comparison, measurement, inevitably contradiction comes - right? Because I don't know what I am, but I am comparing myself with you, which means I must be like you, or go beyond you. So I have created a contradiction in me. That is a fact. So I say to myself, "Why do I compare, let me see if I can put aside comparison" - measurement is necessary at one level - right? We are not discussing that level. Let me see if I can put aside comparison. Why do I want to put it aside? What is the motive behind my desire not to compare? Is it to be myself? Right? Am I prepared to face myself, whatever it is - you are following all this? Which means I take facts only, whatever is me I am going to take it - facts. Therefore - listen to this - in comparing myself with you who are cleverer, brighter, nobler, I am wasting the energy - right? Now I have energy because I don't waste it through comparison, I have energy to observe 'what is', whatever that is. Now what am I? I am one of the habits which is comparison. I don't know if you see this? Do you see this? I have removed one habit, which is comparison, and I have also put aside ideals, conscious as well as unconscious. So I have energy now to face whatever it is, which is me. Are you following all this? Are we meeting with each other?

Q: I am not clear about the levels, material and psychological.

K: No, we have said that sir. I have to choose, measure, compare between two materials when I buy a pair of trousers, I have to compare, measure when I am buying a house; I have to compare, measure when I am buying a car. Now the same habit I carry through psychologically. In the field of psychology, which is myself, I say I am measuring myself with you who are bright, and I say to myself, 'Why do I do this? Is this a habit, is it a part of my education, part of the culture, the society I live in?' If it is, it is rubbish, I won't measure myself. I want to find out. Oh, come on sir. Is that clear so far?

So I have got energy now. You understand sir? I wasted that energy in comparing.

Q: Well I don't know what I am unless I compare myself with somebody.

K: I am going to find out sir, what am I? If I don't compare myself with you, who are a saint, who are the chief executive, the archbishop or whatever it is, a saint, a guru, or whatever, if I don't compare myself with you, what am I? I don't know - right? Isn't that a fact? I only knew myself in comparison with you - right? In comparing myself with you I have said how dreadfully dull I am. Right? If I don't compare with you, am I dull? I don't know. Come on sirs.

Q: Are you saying that if we go into comparison carefully without comparison, we shall get rid of one of the fragments of our fragmentation?

K: That's right sir. Wait, wait careful now. Are you going to get rid of fragments one by one? That will take a long time, won't it?



Q: I don't know.

K: Right, right. You don't know. I have got many fragments, I am jealous, envious, ambitious, greedy, violent, occasionally happy, suffering, believe in god, or not believe in god - these are various fragments. Am I going to put them away one by one?

Q: That would take too long.

K: Therefore there must be a different way of looking at all this.

Q: It seems that when we look we see the habit of comparison. I say that I see that I am comparing myself with another, perhaps that comparison will come to an end and I don't know what I am and I look. But it seems that there is some difficulty, in the act of looking there is a distortion.

K: That's right.

Q: At that moment it seems as if one fragment of the mind is looking at the rest of the mind...

K: That's right?

Q: ...so the fragment that looks is a loaded fragment, it is senseless, it cannot see that that fragment is more important than the other fragment.

K: Why does the mind give to one fragment greater importance than to the other fragments? You have understood? You have understood my question sir? Oh my Lord! Are we travelling together, or are we going somewhere else? The mind has given to one fragment greater importance, it is the judge - why? Why has that fragment assumed greater importance over other fragments, although it is also a fragment - you understand? - why? You are all so puzzled aren't you?

Q: It gives oneself a sense of permanence.

K: Which is what? Go ahead sir.

Q: Well I am here now so I must be here tomorrow.

K: Which is what he is saying, it gives a permanency. Wait, wait. One fragment has assumed greater permanency than the other fragments. That fragment has a greater sense of security, greater sense of certainty, greater sense of clarity - why?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do look at it before you answer it sir. Take the question in first.

Q: It has a greater emotional power behind it.

K: A greater emotional power at that moment to hold that thing as permanent.

Q: We always want to feel that the entity that looks is something, and we are not prepared to face the possibility that is nothing.

K: You are going to find out in a minute sir.

Q: It begins to measure again.

K: Yes sir. So look at it.

Q: Without the observer sir.

K: That's right. It is a marvellous thing, sir, if you go step by step, you will see it yourself. That brings total freedom from fragmentation, you will see it in a minute. Why does one fragment assume the power or prestige over the other fragments? Is it part of our education? Because intellectually we are terribly cultivated. To us the intellect is extraordinarily important and we say, "Oh, well he is not so bright you know, he is rather dull". But the man who is very bright we say, "What an extraordinary brain he has got". Have you noticed this? The intellectual capacity has been cultivated. To

us the intellect has become a tremendous thing. And the intellect is different from emotion, the intellect has power to argue, to discuss, to create, to build, and the emotion becomes rather sentimental, vague, unreal, therefore words become extraordinarily important, which is part of the intellectual play things.

So is it - go step by step - is it that we are educated to give to one fragment the Soul - you understand? - or the body - greater importance? We are educated in this. To us the artist has greater value than the business man, the musician is much more important than the cook. Is it that our whole education emphasizes one fragment?

Q: I think sir that you talk about education as if it were something out there, that was imposed upon us. But whereas I really feel that we are willing to be educated in this particular way. There is a sort of social contract among all the selves that this part of us will be pre-eminent.

K: Yes sir. So you are saying our education is not over there, it is here. And part of our education is to find out now how to learn to look at things differently.

Q: But we can't because we are not educated, we are indoctrinated.

K: That's right sir, that's perfectly right. We are indoctrinated by the church, by the society, by the culture we live in. And one of the indoctrinations is, that there is an entity which is far superior than the other fragments, which is will. Right? A man of character, a man of will, he will stand up against anything - you follow? - the hero.

So can the mind be without the perceiver, who is the superior

entity - right, you understand this? - who is the past, can the mind observe 'what is' without the superior entity? The superior entity is the image which society has built, the Establishment - right? So can the mind observe without the observer, the perceiver, which is the past? And when it is observing with the eyes of the past then it is wasting energy, therefore it cannot face 'what is'. Got it? So where there is no comparison, no ideal, no superior entity which guides, which dominates, which has will to say, 'I will' and 'I will not', which are all factors of division and therefore conflict. When you see this as you feel pain. When you feel this intensely everything drops. Now does this take place as we are sitting here and listening? Or you are not completely paying attention, you are only half listening and therefore half learning and therefore not learning at all. Come on sirs.

Q: There is nothing left to do.

K: There is nothing left to do?

Q: 'I will' and 'I will not' - if you abandon that there is nothing left to do.

K: No madame, I don't abandon it. I see the truth of all this and therefore when I see something as true, then the false goes?

Q: It can be so much more subtle though than the sort of description of will which says 'I see' or 'I don't see'.

K: Of course, much more subtle.

Q: What I want to ask you is: is it true to say that as long as there is any conception of looking, or watching, one is still caught in this fragmentation.

K: Of course. As long as there any conceptual observation...

Q: ...that I am looking.

K: Yes. Any conceptual, verbal, intellectual perception - there is fragmentation obviously.

Q: Even the shadow.

Q: Don't we now come to face the problem of fear in this question of will?

K: We don't listen or learn because of fear? You know why do we take so long to learn about something like this which is so clear, which is so simple, which gives you such a tremendous practical way of life and gives you tremendous energy? Why do you refuse all this?

Q: It's because I'm used to that kind of thinking.

K: But I'm saying, sir, that kind of thinking is all right at one level but at the other psychological level it has no value at all. Why don't you learn that? Why do you keep on repeating? Why don't you say, "Yes, let me learn, I don't know this, I am going to learn a new language, a new way of looking, let me learn" - you don't do that.

Q: Isn't that a fragmentation?

K: Of course sir, that is the what we are saying, it is part of fragmentation.

Q: But I mean separating the material life and the...

K: No. Sir, I am not separating. You see it is not separation. The two must go together. I have to choose between two materials, I have to choose between two cars, between two houses, between the kind of pen I will use; and also at the same time can the mind be free of comparison, the two moving together?

Q: In other words what you are saying is that at different times...

K: Ah, no, no. Not one time you compare and another time you do not compare. Oh Lord! Sir please it is not a question of time. When you choose a tie you compare don't you? And when you see comparison breeds conflict within you and outside of you, what will you do? Keep them in watertight compartments? Or let both of them live together harmoniously? You have got it?

Q: In choosing between two cars I am bound to end up in some sort of fragmentation.

K: No, no necessarily. He says when I compare two cars I am bound to be psychologically comparing. First get the idea, get the feeling that you are always comparing - right? And see the fact that comparison is a distorting factor in life - right? See that fact, only that. Then we will discuss when comparison should exist and all the rest. Come on sirs.

Q: It is rather like searching for truth in a lot of nonsense really.

Q: Your concept is so obvious and so simple.

K: Your concept is so obvious and so simple - is it a concept? I have no concept. For god's sake let's move away from that. I have a horror of concepts because it has done so much mischief in the world - the Arab concept - you understand sir? - the whole of the Arabian world is anti everything else, anti Israel and all the Jews and so on. And the Hindus have a concept, which is an idea, a Hindu is a concept, is against Muslim - you know. So can the mind live without concepts? Therefore free to live. When you have concepts you are not living, you are living in an idea. Oh come on sirs, this so simple.

Q: So we mustn't get a concept of what you mean?

K: No sir. Learning is not a concept. To learn about the ending

of thought is not a concept, you are learning.

Q: I didn't imply that.

K: Oh, I beg your pardon.

Q: I said that to live without a concept, one has a concept of living without a concept.

K: Then you are playing with words.

Q: Could you continue with what you mentioned before: that we are only half listening.

K: Yes. Sir, look, I want to learn a language. What is necessary to learn a language? First of all I don't know the meaning of the foreign words, French words, or Latin or Russian words. So I am curious, I must give time to it, I must be patient, I must have the ear to listen to the sound as it is pronounced by the native of that language. I must listen and I must look at the word printed on a page - right? I must give attention to it. If I say, well I'm tired today I won't listen but I must listen - there is conflict - you understand? Whereas if you say, I want to listen, I want to find out, I want to learn, that requires attention, that requires passion, that requires energy. If you haven't got it you say, "Well, I'm not interested; I don't want to learn". Why do you sit here then, it is such a waste of time?

Q: In learning there is no sense of extension...

K: That's right sir. In learning there is no extension of the 'me'. I learn, how can you bring the 'me' into it?

So let's come back. Which is: we began by asking why the human mind is fragmented? Is it the culture, the society, the religion, the various beliefs, dogmas, ideals that have brought about this division in ourselves, which is education? Is it that we

are always comparing ourselves with somebody? He has got a beautiful face, he has got a lovely sense of beauty, he has got very great intellectual capacity. We are always comparing, comparing, therefore we destroy ourselves and put the other on a pedestal, which brings about a fragmentation. Can the mind live without comparison? Just try it sir, learn about it, and not make it a formula.

Q: It's all fragments until you put out the ideals, then you see the violence in yourself.

K: If you see the violence in yourself.

Q: It is frightening to live without ideals.

K: Now wait a minute. You see violence in yourself and to have no ideal is very frightening. Which means, the ideal is an escape from your violence - right? Then you are not frightened if you can escape from violence through an ideal, you are not frightened. So ideals act as an escape from 'what is'.

Q: To be vulnerable.

K: That's vulnerable. Now I want to find out - please listen to this - I want to find out whether I can face violence as it is without any ideal. I want to learn. I see I have learnt what ideals do, they offer an escape from the fact of violence, so I say, "I want to resolve completely violence, so I won't escape through ideals". Now I am faced with violence in myself. Right? Now is that violence a word? Wait sir, don't say 'No', let's go into it step by step. Is it a word to which I have become so accustomed that you say, "I am violent" - you use the word before you have the feeling. You are following? Does the word encourage the feeling of violence? Look at it, please look. Why do I use that word violence?



Because I have had that feeling before and have used that word, and that word is convenient to identify the past with the present - you are following all this? So I am using the word as an identity, as a remembrance of an experience of violence I have had and so use that word now. So what takes place when I use the word and identify that present experience with the past, what takes place? I strengthen that violence - no? So can I observe that feeling without the word? And if I don't use that word and identify that feeling with the past, does the feeling exist?

Q: I hit somebody then.

K: No please, you don't hit somebody. Just listen. I am violent, angry and I say, "I am angry". When I am learning I say, "Why do I use that word anger?" Why do I use words all the time with regard to certain feelings, why? Is it because I don't know what to do with the feeling, I don't know how to go beyond it, therefore I resort to the past and so thereby strengthen the feeling? You are following all this? Come on sirs. So can the mind, when this feeling of violence arises, not use any word at all? If I don't use the word, and if the past doesn't project itself on the present, does that feeling of violence exist at all? I am learning, you understand. I am not saying that feeling should exist, should not exist. I am learning.

Q: The mood exists, because it is this we become aware of, the label comes later

K: Yes, that's right, that's right. So can you observe your violence without the label?

Q: What if the mood leads to action before you have awareness?

K: If the mood leads to action before awareness, what am I to do? If the mood leads to action before awareness takes place what

am I to do? Why need you ask me? That is what you generally do. You write off a letter, or hit somebody, or use a word and so on and so on.

Q: I think I saw something when you were talking. I feel violent, then half a second later I say it is violence, I put it off into a category which creates the opposite category of non-violence. And these two categories in my mind have to necessarily be in conflict, have to be violent. But the idea of non-violence is contradictory, it creates the idea of violence.

K: Quite right sir? Therefore we are only saying, freedom from violence, not becoming free from violence in order to be non-violent. Freedom from violence.

Sir, what we have said is very simple, what is the difficulty? Is it that you don't listen? Is it that you are not paying attention to what is being said? Is it that you want to keep your violence, put garlands round it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: One of our difficulties is that attention is devoured by a process. Awareness becomes a process, mechanical. Now why does the mind become mechanical? We have made our life mechanical - right? Sex, relationship, habit is mechanical, the way of our thinking, which is comparison, ideals, is mechanical, why does the mind become so easily mechanical, a process that goes on, why? Having a mechanical habit makes life easier, doesn't it? So the mind is seeking an easy way of living - right? I believe in god - finished. You follow? Believe in god, carry on. Or I say, "I am an Englishman" or a Dutchman or god knows what else, that is a mechanical habit, that is the easiest way of living. Which means

what? The mind is seeking security - no?

Q: Conformity.

K: Conformity, of course. Conformity, security. Because when I conform with the rest of the world I am perfectly safe. So the mind is seeking security through conformity, through habit, through processes, through continual assertion of something totally unreal, because essentially it wants to be secure - right?

Q: Isn't this related to what went just before? The social system has a most powerful influence on the individual and generally we feel it is much easier to float with the river than battle against the tide.

K: Right sir. Please listen. We are asking, why don't we learn? Is it the new learning may be very disturbing, it may change the whole pattern of our existence? Therefore we are frightened, therefore we say, "Please make that new way of living a habit", "Tell me how to live in habit in the new way". And you tell me, sir, that you can't make the habit of a new way, you have to learn it, you have to keep moving. And that is what is taking place. You won't listen because of habit. And we say that way of living is the most disastrous way of living. Look where you are, what it has done, wars, misery, confusion - you know what is happening in the world. You say, "It is all right it is only happening in Munich, not here" - you follow? My house isn't burning, somebody else's house is burning. So you say, "Please leave me in my habits". Or "Please introduce me to a new habit, but make it a habit, so that it will be completely secure". So you are seeking security, and quite rightly too because the brain cannot function without complete security. Right?

Q: I don't understand.

K: I have just said sir, if you had no house, no home, no shelter and no food, the brain deteriorates. So it must have shelter, food, clothing of any kind, even a little room, it must have so that it feels secure, like a child. You must feel secure otherwise everything goes wrong for the poor child. Broken families and all that takes place and the child goes to pieces. So the brain must have security, but it has sought security in things that are not secure. It has sought security in god, which is an idea, it is not a reality. In the name of god probably Christians have killed more people than anybody else. Right?

Q: Sir, dismissing those ridiculous beliefs in politicians, in god, in all those ideals, surely people here can see that it is absolutely ridiculous to believe in all that nonsense. So my question is: how can I if my brain needs security, how can I provide it when the very activities are destructive?

K: I'll show it to you. If the brain sees those factors are destructive, what has taken place in the brain? What has given to the brain the capacity to see all those things are false? Go on sir, answer it. Wait. Watch it sir, don't use words yet. The brain has seen, the mind has seen god, nationalities, religious divisions, are disastrous for human relationship, what is the capacity that makes the brain see that? What is that capacity, sir?

Q: Awareness.

K: What is that capacity that you have, that says, "That is silly"?

Q: It is just a directness.

K: Is it not intelligence? Of course it is. When you say, "It is stupid to be a nationalist, stupid to belong to any organized

religion" - it is your intelligence that says it is stupid. Therefore in intelligence is security. Wait, you are not listening.

Q: But it will also tell me that to be a business man you must exploit people.

K: No, it won't tell you. If your intelligence says, that is stupid, your intelligence also says, we must have money, we must have better... let intelligence operate not your idea of intelligence.

Q: I think that is baffling that last one, if you don't mind me saying so. This question of security, the intelligence says...

K: Is that intelligence? Now wait a minute. Go into it. Is that intelligence. I will be a better business man, I will have more money, I will cheat, I will do everything - is that intelligence?

Q: It is the opposite.

K: Why do you say it is the opposite? Sir, listen to it. What tells you it is the opposite?

Q: I can see it is destructive.

K: What makes you see it?

Q: It just is. I look at it simply and I see it.

K: That's right sir. So you see we have sought security in things which are not intelligent - right? And we are learning to seek security in intelligence and let that intelligence operate. That intelligence is not yours or mine, it isn't the communist, or the Catholic, it belongs to nobody, it is intelligence. When that intelligence operates, in that action there is security. Got it sir?

Q: So education is contrary to what you have just said.

K: That's right sir. That is just it.

Q: What we have called intelligence, what we were trying to look on as intelligence is unintelligence.

K: That's right sir.

Q: So we are standing on our heads.

K: Ah no, we have been standing on our heads, now we are standing on our feet.

Q: It's like when you think things for yourself, understand for yourself, people, especially when you are young, people say you are being selfish.

K: No, no. What were you going to say sir?

Q: There is one question that worries me. If we come here to listen to you sincerely, lecture after lecture, but go away and can't put this into practice - what is wrong?

K: Sir, I'll tell you what is wrong. Don't put anything into practice. The moment you put it into practice it becomes mechanical. But if you see the facts of it, you understand, if you see the truth of it it acts.

Q: That is what I mean, we don't see it, otherwise...

K: That's right sir, why don't you see it? Is it that you are not listening properly? Is it that you are frightened? Is it that you have not enough energy to listen? Is it that you don't see the world and everything collapsing, burning, you don't see it, you don't feel it, it is not in your blood?

Q: We might be just too far gone.

K: Yes, you might be too far gone. Our brains have gone to pieces, that might be true.

Q: I don't know about other people here, but I'm not too far gone. I can see that clearly the world is collapsing, there is terrible destruction, and people are fighting with each other in various ways and I ask myself where do I come into this, how do I fit in? I

obviously can't just provide for myself, it is meaningless for me to provide for myself.

K: Just listen to this. The world is fighting - right? Killing each other. There are the Catholics, Protestants, Communists, Hindus, Muslims - you follow - appalling things are going on. My guru is better than your guru - right? All that kind of thing is going on. What is my relationship to all that? Right? I think - not think - I see all that is most destructive, which is, my intelligence says it is destructive. Now what is that intelligence to do and what is its relationship to all that is taking place? Right? What is the relationship? Look at it carefully sir. What is the relationship of that intelligence to a world that is insane?

Q: There is no relationship.

K: No relationship. Right? How can sanity have relationship with insanity? No, it can't. Therefore what will you do? You must do, you must act, you must live, what will you do? What will that intelligence do?

Q: Act the same.

K: Wait. See it sir.

Q: I don't know.

K: Why do you say I don't know?

Q: Because I find myself here in this tent examining this question, my whole being is fixed on this question of what will I do.

K: I understand, what will you do? I'll show you sir. Go into it, take time, look at it. What will you do? You say intelligence is sanity. They are living unintelligently therefore insanely. And you say sanity has no relationship with insanity - right? Then what will

sanity do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madame, are you listening to the question he has asked? The question he has asked is, what am I, who have seen the unintelligent world as it is, the insanity that is going on, intelligence says, I am finished with that, I have no relationship with it. He has asked that question and we are asking, what is that intelligence to do? Because it must act, it can't say, "There is tremendous intelligence" - it must act. Go slowly sir. Are you acting, or intelligence is acting? If you are acting, or intelligence is acting? If you are acting, you belong to that. Listen sir. If you say, well what am I to do?, then you are putting a wrong question. What is the action of intelligence, is quite a different question. You don't say, what am I to do. Right? If you say, what am I to do, you are still playing with insanity. I wonder if that is clear.

Q: Is intelligence different from me?

K: Of course, for god's sake we have moved away from that altogether.

Q: Are you saying, how do I act intelligently?

K: No, on the contrary. I am saying, what is the act of intelligence which has discovered that the world is insane? Right? Do you see the difference sir? What is intelligence to do?

Q: It is choiceless.

K: Do listen sir. See what we have discovered. If you say, what am I to do with intelligence, then you belong to a group of people who use intelligence unintelligently - you get it? Whereas if you say, what will that intelligence do? How is that intelligence to act? Why do you even ask that question? Why do you ask that



question? Because you are not sure of your intelligence. Look at it. You are not sure of that intelligence. If there is that intelligence it will act: but if you are not sure of that intelligence then you ask the question: how will that intelligence act?

Q: In other words we are so egotistic that we think this intelligence cannot act without us.

K: Yes, that is right sir. That is right sir. You have got it sir? So look what happens. There is the responsibility of intelligence, intelligence is responsible to act, intelligence has the responsibility of action - right? When I say, I have the responsibility to use action, then I am playing, I am going to use intelligence in my corrupt way. Whereas intelligence operating has its own action. Now is there that intelligence operating in you? Clear - you follow? - not uncertain, not saying, I am not quite sure, I don't know if I have got it, I am a bit hot under the collar but I am not sure. Which means you don't follow anybody, no guru, no authority, no system. All that is involved in that intelligence. When there is that intelligence there is sanity - right? Then a sane mind will act sanely. You don't have to ask, what am I to do. Got it? Right?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 16TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

What shall we talk about this morning? If I may I would like to talk about something that perhaps might be of value and significance. And then after I have talked a little we can ask questions and go over them.

Considering what the world is, the violence, the extraordinary indifference to what happens to other countries, to other people, the continuing wars, the utter immorality of society, the divisions which religions have created between man and man, the nationalities, the left and the right and all the rest of it, I wonder what our response is to all that. What is our responsibility? What is our action to the world around us, of which we are a part? We are the world and the world is us, the world is not separate from us; and looking at all this, not merely intellectually, verbally but observing it with care, with attention, with that sense of quality of a mind that really wants to solve all these problems, not superficially, but profoundly, what is our responsibility to all this? What are we to do in the world of chaos, this appalling suffering that is going on? People killing in the name of ideologies, in the name of a revolution, what is a human being to do and what is his responsibility? What is your responsibility? The word 'responsibility' - I looked it up in the dictionary just now - means to respond, to respond either totally or respond according to the immediate demands - political, personal, nationalistic, respond fragmentarily; or respond totally. Our responsibility in face of all this is either to act according to our temperament, to our

conditioning, to our particular idiosyncrasy or to a particular belief, religious, political, or otherwise, and if we do respond fragmentarily that action obviously, as one observes, leads to more and more chaos, more and more mischief, more and more complications. I am sure we are all aware of this. And so one asks, at least one must ask faced with all this appalling misery, what is total action so that politically, religiously, economically, in our personal relationship there will be an adequate response, a total response? Can we go into that? Would that be of interest?

One can observe quite objectively how fragmentary responses, responses at different levels, breed not only contradiction in action but it brings with it inefficiency, contradiction and confusion. And if one is aware of all this, not intellectually or verbally, but actually feel all this, aware in the sense not only our own particular fragmentary activity, our own temperament and idiosyncrasies and characteristics, but also aware of our deeper levels of conditioning, in that awareness what is the right action? What is the adequate total response to a society that is so immoral, to morality that has no meaning whatsoever as it is, to a religion that has ceased to be really religious at all? And a response in our personal relationship to each other. Many people being aware of all this try to answer it by forming a community. I do not know if you have noticed young people all over the world saying, "This is all so ugly we are going to form a little community by ourselves". That community is soon broken because it is based on some ideology, or it is the denial of authority, which is associated with the establishment, and they themselves have to have an authority in the community, and when you reject authority without understanding it the community soon

breaks up. Or you join some political party. Or you join the latest guru with extraordinary ideas. Or you take to drugs. Surely none of these are adequate responses - joining a revolution, which is a physical expression of violence to bring about a different kind of society and so on. We know all this. Again being aware of all this, what is one to do, you and I, not belonging to any particular organization, not believing in the religious doctrines, beliefs and saviours and gurus, not being nationalistic except perhaps carry a passport, what is your direct response to this challenge? How can you respond totally with your mind, with your heart, with your intelligence totally so that in the action there is no contradiction ever? I think this question is important to ask and to find out, or to learn what the answer is. Not come to any conclusion because the moment you come to a conclusion, how to act, then that very conclusion breeds contradiction between you who have one kind of conclusion and another who has a different kind of conclusion or opinion.

So how is one to act, being responsible, because freedom implies responsibility? When you put aside the religious doctrines, beliefs, political chicanery, political ideologies, communism or socialism, you know what they are leading up to, how do you, as a human being, respond to this? And to find what to do, one has to learn it, it seems to me, the whole process of living - what is implied in living, in existence, in our daily activity. Without understanding that, to try to answer a vaster question has no meaning. One has to begin very near to go very far - right? One has to begin with oneself to go very far. Unless one has this deep psychological revolution in oneself, to answer that question will

inevitably be fragmentary and therefore mischievous.

So one has to understand psychologically, beginning with the psyche, the mind, and from there moving outwards. I don't know if we are communicating with each other. Communication means, as we said the other day, learning together, sharing together, observing together, creating together. That means communication. So we must, you and I, must both move together step by step, and not wait for somebody to teach you. We are learning together. That is real co-operation, that is a real community, this understanding together, travelling together, sharing together, learning together and therefore creating together. That demands naturally affection, love, care, attention.

So to answer this question, which everybody is asking, whether you go to India, or to America, or those people who are under tyranny, secretly they too are asking: what is this action that will be a total response to a world that is so insane, where freedom is denied and yet man is seeking absolute freedom? So absolute freedom implies absolute responsibility, that means absolute response totally to the problem. And one cannot possibly respond totally if one has not understood, not verbally, if one has not learnt to live a life in which love, death everyday living is understood, is learnt - right?

Now let's proceed. Having laid the foundation of that, that is you are laying it as well as I am laying it, together we are laying it. It is not I am laying it and therefore you build on that foundation your house, but we are together laying the foundation, it is our house. It is our earth to live in, to be happy, to enjoy without sorrow, pain, anxiety.

So we have to understand our life, the life that we lead, the life that has become meaningless, the life that is full of travail, sorrow, conflict, competition, dishonesty. And in learning about that we shall also learn what love is. And in learning what love is we shall learn also what death is, because life is all that - death, love, everyday living. And to merely concentrate on everyday living, that is, bread and butter, position, more things and so on and so on, and neglect the rest of it, which is what the world is doing, therefore it is imbalance, therefore it is contradictory, and therefore it is mischievous. So we have to learn about the whole thing - death, love and daily living.

First we must see clearly for ourself what our daily living is. What is our living? What is the thing that we call living? Do we live, or do we tolerate living? Do we live according to an idea, according to a conclusion based on a belief, a dogma, a memory? Because the mind is always concerned with remembering, imagining, contriving. Please we are moving together. If you have observed your mind you will see imagination plays a tremendous part, remembering and calculating, contriving. On that is based our life, the daily existence, the images which we have built about each other in our relationships with each other. And these images have their relationship and so we lose direct relationship. If I have an image about you because I have lived with you for ten years, or five days, and you have your image about me because you have lived with me for ten days or five years, our relationship is essentially based on that image. The images have relationship, not you and I, there is no direct response between each other. And therefore relationship comes to an end.

So our problem is - one of our problems unfortunately! - is how to end these images and how not to create these images in relationship, because all images are a kind of knowledge. And one must have knowledge but in relationship when there is this image between you and me which is the knowledge of you and me, then that image, that knowledge becomes an impediment in our relationship. I don't know if you see this. I hope you see it. See it in the sense that you feel hungry, as you feel so many things so strongly. So when you realize in our daily living, whether it is in the office, at home, with a neighbour, or playing golf, or whatever you do, how extraordinarily important these images are, which is part of remembering, imagining, contriving. So how can the mind be free of this image which it has built up, and how to prevent further images being formed. Are you asking all these questions or am I asking you these questions? Well it doesn't matter, I am asking you therefore you have to reply.

To understand this one has to go into the question of attention: to attend. We rarely attend to anything because we are lazy, accept so many things for granted and we do not want to disturb the pattern of habit, what it might reveal and we are frightened of it, therefore we are never totally attentive. You are not totally attentive now when you are listening. You are listening, comparing, judging, wasting your capacity of attention by distraction. So you are actually not listening. Now to find out, to go into this and learn how to end the formation of images and what to do with the images that you have already, one has to understand this question of attention. That means when you are attending - listen to this please - when you are attending no image is formed -

do you understand? It is only in the state of inattention, when there is no attention, images are formed. Are we meeting each other? That is, when you, in our relationship with each other, insult me, I react instantly. That reaction is the habit. In that habit all kinds of other responses come into being. So when you insult me or nag me or whatever you do in our relationship, when there is attention, when I am listening to you totally, there is no necessity of image at all because I am listening to what you are saying.

We are learning this please; you are not memorizing this and practising it. Because the moment you practise it it becomes mechanical, then it is a remembrance, and when you remember something and then put it into action it is the past that is operating and therefore it is inattention. I don't know if we meet all this. We are meeting each other? And what do you do with all the images that you have about a dozen things? What will you do? Will you get rid of them one by one, becoming aware of each image and saying, I must not and so on? Or is there an action which dissipates all images, whether the past or the present - the images that one has formed and the images that one is forming? Attention means energy, energy in which there is no wastage - please see this. When you form an image it is a wastage of energy. And when you give complete attention there is no waste at all. So you have this energy operating and therefore the past images have no value. I wonder if you meet this. Because we are talking about relationship between human beings, and that relationship is not harmonious, real, truthful, honest, and you cannot be honest, truthful, if our relationship is based on images, which it is now. And to be totally completely free of the formation of images, the machinery that



forms images, is attention. And in that attention you have energy to observe the images taking place and therefore dissipating them.

You understand this? Can we go on?

Are you listening and learning, which means learning as we go along, which is observing yourself and in the observation of yourself you are learning?

So in relationship, which is life, unless we live in relationship there is no living; isolation which is the forming of images is non-living, the non-living is living according to a conclusion, to remembrance, to memory.

So from that one asks: what is this relationship in which there is no image? Is that love? And we don't know what it is. We are going to learn. We are going to learn together, to learn together and come upon what is called love. We depend on each other, and it is necessary to depend at a certain level. I depend on the postman, the milkman, the builder; but when we psychologically depend on each other, because I am lonely, isolated, in my loneliness I need somebody to lean on, somebody through whom I can escape. Haven't you noticed all this? So I am attached to you. I am attached to you because you give me comfort, you give me companionship, you offer me sex, you give me a dozen things, and therefore I cling to you because you are my security, my hope, my pleasure, my escape from my isolation. And all the time the mind is isolating itself. See what is happening. I want to escape from isolation because I see where there is dependence there is pain, fear, and yet my activity is self-centred and therefore isolated. I wonder if you see all this?

So freedom means responsibility. Freedom implies absolute

responsibility. That means absolute order, not order of calculation but order that comes when I understand disorder. And disorder is the image in relationship, disorder comes when there is dependency and attachment, which means the mind needs security in companionship, in you - are you following? And when that security is threatened, as it is all the time being threatened, then I become violent, vicious and all the rest of it follows. So one asks: is love dependency? Please we are learning together, not saying yes or no. And is love pleasure? Pleasure is the response of memory and the pursuit of that memory in daily life. Learn this sirs, you will see it for yourself. And so one sees love is not pleasure - not that there is not pleasure, not that there is not a sense of joy and real enjoyment of life, but when there is the pursuit of pleasure you deny joy, you deny really love.

So to understand what love is one has to understand the machinery of thinking. And thinking is the response of memory and in relationship when memory plays a part then that relationship ceases, therefore there is no love in that relationship. Right? Are we learning together as we go along, not merely accepting a lot of words that have no meaning? Because we see in the world the utter absence of that love, though religions, churches, human beings have talked about it. When they say to each other, "We love you", it is the love of that image which they have about themselves and about the other and hence endless conflict between each other. Although they may live together in the same house, in the same bed, they are always living apart, and therefore in that relationship there is no sense of real love, affection, care.

And we also have to learn about death because life includes

death. Death isn't something apart from living. Death isn't something at the end of our life - old age, disease, accident, pain and then die. And we have separated death from living, from love, from the whole of our existence. Please see this. People are frightened even to talk about it. So we have to learn about it, as we have to learn about living, how to live without conflict, to live without images in our relationships, to live in the movement of learning all the time, which includes death. And to understand the movement or to learn about death, fear must be understood.

Because most of us, young or old, diseased or not, old age with all its difficulties, we are always avoiding that inevitable thing. And that inevitable thing is treated as something sorrowful, something to be avoided at any price. So we are going to learn together about it. It sounds funny on a lovely morning with clouds and blue sky and the pattern of leaves on the tent, to talk about death. But it is part of our life, you cannot deny it and only live in a secluded thing called living, you have to take the whole of it. And when you understand the whole of it then your responsibility, your action to the world is entirely different.

Why is man so frightened of death? Or not being frightened, rationalizes it, sees that it is inevitable, that it is natural, like the tree that falls in the forest feeds the new tree, there are dozens and dozens of explanations but at the end of it there is that thing called death waiting. And man wants comfort because he says, "I have lived 20, 40, 80 years; I have accumulated tremendous experience, knowledge; I have suffered untold agonies; I have fulfilled in this and that, and frustrated in this and that; I have never reached the end of things which I want to do; I have always lived with great

burdens and great sorrow." And the mind wants comfort. Because if living is to die and the ending of the whole thing, it is rather an appalling thing to realize that. Therefore we say I must have comfort. And the man who seeks comfort will find comfort in an illusion, not in reality. For him it is more important to be comfortable, not to be disturbed, not to break down the habits which he has built for so many centuries. Therefore he invents a belief that there is a living after death, or that there is a resurrection after death, or that you are absorbed in the light of truth and so on - right?

To learn about death fear must end. Learning about fear is the ending of fear, and the mind that seeks comfort can never find the truth of death - right? Are you meeting all this? Are we putting too much in one talk? We are but it doesn't matter. It is up to you.

So we are learning about something which we don't know, about something of which we are afraid. And when one dies look what happens. You die with disease, unconscious, a burden on the rest of the family, or on the society - we don't die like wild animals, naturally, easily, we are always dying with fear and pain - haven't you noticed all this? In a hospital bed, and the little money that you have collected is dissipated on nurses and doctors. We have lived wrongly; we have never learned to live rightly. And we end up in a bed in a hospital, or in an accident, or in disease - right?

So to learn about death is to find out if death is at the end or at the beginning. If death is something to be avoided - or rather to live with it, knowing the inevitability of the mechanism of the body, the organism wearing out. It will wear out naturally if you live a natural life. If you live an unnatural life you will naturally end

unnaturally. I do not know if you have noticed in the autumn a leaf turning yellow, how beautiful it is, full of colour and it falls to the ground its pattern is so clear and so beautiful, so alive. And we never die that way.

So one has to learn how to live with death, which doesn't mean you commit suicide, or morbid or any of that silly nonsense, but to live with death. You understand sir? Now what does that mean? To live with no image - we understand it very well, that is fairly clear, both intellectually and verbally and perhaps some of you see it very clearly because you are attentive and you have seen the truth of it in your relationships. And also perhaps you see, learn what love is. You see that it is not pleasure; pleasure is the pursuit of thought in things that have happened before and the demand for pleasure. One sees that very clear. And also one sees that where love is, will is not. But to learn what death is in living, to live with death is quite another matter. So we are going together to learn about it. What it means to live with death. You understand? I don't know if you have ever put that question. I'm afraid you have never put it. You have either put it in a morbid mood, depressed, or feeling utterly inferior because you have compared yourself with somebody whom you think is superior, depressed, agonized about some silly thing, then you say, "How am I to die" - which is the invitation to death. That is not what we are doing. What we are trying to learn is how to live with that thing which we call death, to learn about it. YOU learn about it is not to be afraid. You understand sirs? Therefore to be afraid implies that mind, thought, foreseeing its own end, and is frightened of the unknown, and therefore clings to the known, which is my family, my house, my

property, my beastly little mind, my quarrels, my memories and all the absurdities which I have built up during, 40, 50, 60 years. And the known is familiar, and what is familiar is what I am used to, I accept it, the known is my home, my abode, my sense of security; the unknown I am uncertain of and therefore I am frightened. The unknown in comparison with the known, otherwise I don't know the unknown. I don't know if you understand this. Because I compare the known with the unknown, I am frightened of the unknown. If I don't compare, the unknown has no meaning. And to find out I learn, but when I compare I am comparing the known with something I do not know. I don't know if you see it, and therefore there is fear.

So what does it mean to learn about death and living? It is really rather a lovely question, isn't it? I don't know if you see the beauty of it. Why is the mind so attached to the known, to the familiar, to the habits, to all the memories which it has accumulated, the remembrances of things past? Why is it? And the things past are words. When I remember the joyful afternoon in the bright clear sunlight, and the shadows, that is a remembrance known, accepted. And I live with that memory because that is the most pleasant memory I have had during the whole of that summer, in the whole of that year. And in that memory the mind seeks, finds security. And so you can expand it, complicate it, put it in various forms. That is, the past is the mind - it may project from the past to the future, or operate from the past in the present, but it is always living in the past, the known, whether that known is conscious, or unconscious. And the unknown is death. As long as the mind holds on to the known it will always be frightened of the unknown. We

are learning, please go on.

So can the mind free itself from the known? That is, the known is knowledge, whether personal knowledge or the accumulated knowledge of the race, of the culture, the known. And can the mind be free of it and yet use it? It can use it only when it is free intelligently. When it is not free it will misuse that knowledge, which is what is happening in the world. You have marvellous technology, go to the moon, and the extraordinary things they have invented. And also they have invented extraordinary instruments to kill each other, from all the accumulated knowledge of centuries. Knowledge is necessary, not to kill each other, knowledge is necessary, and it is misused, as it will invariably be misused when there is no freedom from the accumulated of memory, which is the mind. I wonder if you meet all this?

So dying is the ending of knowledge. Are you meeting this? Don't agree, you don't know what it means. The knowledge which I have accumulated about myself, the knowledge which I have gathered through experience during my life time of 40, 50, 10 years. The knowledge which I have invited, which has become my habit, the very structure of my being, and that is the 'me', and that is the 'you'. And that knowledge is always within the field of the known and I won't let it go because I don't know what the other is. I would rather have my furniture - or rather not have furniture, have an empty house.

So from that arises the question: whether a mind can ever be free from the known, and the freedom from the known and the known moving together? You understand this? Not keeping one in a watertight compartment and the other in a compartment, divorced

from each other, but married together, living together, moving together. That is dying to the known, and that is to learn to live with death all the time, to the end of our daily existence. You understand? Move together in this freedom from knowledge and freedom. When you understand the whole of it - the living, the sense of love and death, when you understand the whole of it then your responsibility to society will be an adequate response, it will be a total response of a human mind that is really cultured, of a mind that has depth, meaning.

So without understanding the totality of existence, but only a part of it, it must inevitably lead to utter chaos. So when we see this it becomes extraordinarily important for each one of us to learn to live totally differently. Right?

Perhaps you can ask questions from this. Or is that enough for this morning? What sir?

Q: What is the place of literature in our daily life?

K: What is the place of literature with all its images in our daily life? Is that it? Is that it sir? You see I don't read books, thank god! I read occasionally detective stories. What place has literature in our life? What Shakespeare has written, what Aldous Huxley has said about *The Doors of Perception*, Durrell, Graves, T.S. Eliot - what place has all that in your life? The images, the poetry, the use of words, the beauty of the description - is that your life, or the life of the author who wrote them? Or through literature you enjoy life, through literature you see the beautiful tree, the mountain, the river, the description of the author of relationship between man and woman and all the tortures they go through, the boy everlastingly meeting the girl, in a thousand different ways. Is that your life?



Which means you have no life of your own. Not what life I want. We are not doing propaganda. If we live on literature you are a secondhand human being. If we live on what the churches have said you are a secondhand human being. If we live according to the Bible, or to the Bhagavad Gita, or to the Koran, we don't live at all, we are living according to what the prophets have said, or to what the psychologists have said.

So find out sirs what place literature, art, beauty, museum, all the things man has put together, has, the truth of them, or the falseness of them, or their relationship to your daily life - you have to begin with yourself. You have to find out what your relationship is to literature, what your relationship is to that thing which they call god, if there is god. Perhaps we will go into it tomorrow morning, that question. So unless you, as a human being, find out for yourself and learn what your relationship to the whole of the world is, if you don't find out, if you don't learn about it, you are bound to create the horrors that are going on, increase them.

Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Right sir. The question is - may I repeat it and if I don't repeat it please correct it properly.

In 1928, the questioner says, you dissolved the organization called the Order of the Star, of which you were the head, with thousands of members, property and so on - you renounced all that, put aside all that. (I don't use the word 'renounce' - put aside all that) As you were brought up to believe, or you were conditioned by the Masters - I don't know why you bring all that in now but it doesn't matter - and the essential teaching of a Master is to know

yourself - isn't that it sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No sir. What I have said was - you see we are talking how to live without conditioning. And you are bringing in something which you think is conditioned response from me. Sir I have said Truth is a pathless land. You cannot come to it by any path, there is no path to Truth. And you can only come to it when the mind is free from all conditioning, and the conditioning takes place when there is an end in view, when there is fear, when there is pleasure, when you have not understood the whole meaning and the living of life, love and death. That is all we are concerned with. You see that needs no Masters, no gurus, no paths. All that it needs is your attention. If you are willing to learn, if you are willing to learn together that is all that is needed. If you don't, don't bother. Don't make your life more complicated than it is by introducing somebody else's teaching, including mine.

Q: Sir, may I ask you when you see a person in distress, or they come to you in trouble, it is very difficult to help them without relying on thought and memory to help.

K: I understand sir. When people come to you and you want to help them it is very difficult not to introduce images, conclusions, thoughts. When people come to you with their problems, are you trying to help them? If you are trying to help them, you will prevent their understanding of themselves. So don't - please don't misunderstand what I am saying - don't help them. Right? That sounds terrible, but who are you to help them? It is like the analysts who are analysing others, when they themselves need analysis! And they have analysis every year if they are good analysts, by

another analyst who needs analysing and so on! Please just listen to it, listen. I come to you with my problems. My wife has run away, I feel despair, I am lonely, I am in great sorrow over many things. My brother, son is dead, I am exhausted with all the tortures of my mind. I come to you. And you feel you can help me. I come to you to talk things over with you, I want you to listen to my problems. And in talking over, and you are listening to me, something takes place. That is if you know how to listen. But if you say, "Well I must help you my dear friend", then our relationship is entirely different. You are the helper - I am the helper! Whereas if I come to you with real problems, and I have, you have - and I come to you and I talk it over with you and you are listening, if you listen without the image, without conclusions, without the supposition that you can help me, then in that listening and my exposing myself to you, in that relationship the understanding, the learning takes place. There is the fertile soil in which a new thing can take place. Isn't that enough for today?

Q: What do you mean by thought? Thought doesn't lead to violence.

K: Thought doesn't lead to violence, right. Sir you are not understanding what I mean by thought. That would be another literature, but you are trying to understand what thought is for yourself, aren't you? What is thought? You are trying to learn about it, aren't you? Therefore it is not mine, not what I think thought is. But you can see it for yourself very simply, what thought is, which is the response of memory. I ask what your name is and you say, 'Yes, my name is so and so. Or you have memories, knowledge and from that you respond. And the response may have an interval

between the question and the answer. In that interval, in that gap of time, in that lag your mind is searching for the answer in memory, or in a book, or in whatever it is. So thought is always the response of memory, therefore thought can never be free, thought can never be new. Only when thought comes to an end something new can take place. That is quite a different matter.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH SEPTEMBER 1972**

I believe this is the last talk. So what shall we talk about?

Q: Could we go into the question of fear?

K: I thought we went into the question of fear the other day, and on several occasions.

I think we ought to talk over together the question of immortality: if there is a state of mind that is without time, not science fiction timelessness, and a quality which is not measurable. And in this perhaps we can also talk over together the question of meditation, and if there is something beyond all thought, imagination, memory, all the contrivances which man has put together in order to find something which is imperishable. Perhaps we could talk these things over this morning, because we have not touched upon these things before. So may we go on with those.

You know wherever one goes in India, America, all different parts of the world, one observes from the very crudest form to the most subtle, the endeavour of the mind to find something that is sacred, that is really holy. And it takes so many different forms - the temple, the church, the primitives who worship a tree and are frightened of the thunder; wherever one goes there is this constant enquiry of the human mind, whether there is something really sacred, divine, that is not corruptible. And in the search of that the priests throughout the world have said you must have faith. Faith in what I don't know, but faith in god, in something that man has called god. To find out and to learn about it, whether it exists or doesn't exist, whether it is merely the invention of a mind that is

frightened, the invention of a mind that sees everything in a flux, everything transient and seeks something which is permanent, which is beyond time, which is not at the behest of any particular religion or any particular belief. And to learn about it, it seems to me, if you are interested in it, and one must be interested in it whether you believe or don't believe, because unless one comes upon it, learns about it, life will always be superficial. One may be astonishingly moral in the right sense of that word, without any compulsion, without any interference from the environment, from the society, from the culture, really truly be moral, virtuous, which is really to be deeply within the area of order. However much one may be moral, lead a life that is fairly harmonious, not contradictory, not frightened, that is sane, balanced, harmonious, unless one finds that thing that man has been seeking life becomes rather superficial, however moral one may be, however socially active one is, trying to do good and all the rest of it.

So it seems to me very important, if one is at all serious, really concerned with the whole phenomenon of existence, one must find out, one must learn for oneself whether there is such a thing as something unnameable, beyond time, not put together by thought, which is not an illusion, an experience which the human mind craves beyond experience. One must learn about it, because that gives to life an astonishing depth, not only a significance but great beauty, in which there is no conflict, a great sense of wholeness, a completeness, total sufficiency.

Now if we can this morning go into this question, it might be worth while. Of course first one must totally discard altogether the whole thing of organized religions - right? That must be

completely and totally set aside because if you are born in a communist country you are educated not to believe, if you are born in a Catholic country you are educated to believe, or if you go to the East there is also the same phenomenon going on - propaganda, education, conditioning. If a mind would find out, would learn about that thing, naturally it must set aside the things that man has put together which he calls divine, in which he is conditioned with all its religious rituals, beliefs, dogmas and all the rest of it. I hope we are communicating with each other, and I hope you have actually set aside, not merely verbally but deeply inwardly so that you are completely capable of standing alone and not depending on anything, psychologically.

If you are so inclined, if you have so perceived the truth or the falseness that exists in mythology, and most religions are myths, which have held together people for a certain period, because that is the function of all myths to hold society together for as long as it is possible, and when that myth is exploded society begins to break up, which is what is happening now. We have lived on myths of various kinds, and they have held man in a particular culture and when that myth ceases to exist there is no *raison d'etre* to continue, except along our own particular tendencies, characteristics, pleasures and so on, which is exactly what is happening in the world now. Nobody believes in anything anymore - thank the Lord! Which has its misfortune because doubt is a good thing - doubt but it must be kept on a leash. And to hold it intelligently on a leash is to enquire, but to doubt everything has no meaning.

Now if one has actually set aside all this intelligently, not that you drop one and pick up another, window shopping all the time,

then it is utterly futile, but if you have enquired into it, seen the fallacy of it for yourself, seen the implications of all the structure which man has put together in his endeavour to find out if there is, or if there is not, an immortality, a state of mind that is timeless, which is not perishable, then if you have set aside this we can begin to learn.

First of all thought cannot find it because thought with all its cunningness, with all its imagery, with its various remembrances and conclusions, thought is time, thought is measure and thought, however subtle, however disinterested, however far reaching, can never come upon this - which doesn't mean that the mind must be thoughtless, which doesn't mean that the mind must forget everything. As we said the last few times that we met here, we said that thought must function within the field of knowledge, and it can only function efficiently, truly, beneficially when there is freedom from thought - the two must go together in harmony: the freedom, the absolute freedom from thought and thought functioning in the field of knowledge objectively, sanely, non-personally. So thought can never find it. I think this must be very clearly understood, if we are to go any further. Because thought is not only time and measure but also the whole content of the past, conscious or unconscious, and when thought says, "I am going to search out, seek, if there is something real", then thought can project what it considers to be real. Please follow all this. And therefore that becomes an illusion. When thought sets out to practise in order to discipline itself in order to find, as most saints, religions, doctrines, various gurus offer this - that is, train your thought, control it, discipline it, force it to the pattern that we give to you so that you



will ultimately come upon the real thing. Right? And when one sees that thought can never find it because thought is essentially not free, thought can never be new, and to find that which must be totally something unperceived, unknowable, unrecognizable, thought must be totally quiet - right? Are we moving with each other?

So the question then is: can thought, without any effort, not be controlled, because the moment you control it, there is a controller who is also the invention of thought, and the controller then begins to control his thoughts and then there is conflict. Wherever there is conflict there must be the activity of thought. So can the mind, which is the result of time, evolution, which is the storehouse of great knowledge, which is the result of a great many influences, experiences, which is the very essence of thought, can that thought be quiet - without control, without discipline, without any form of effort, because when there is an effort there must be distortion? Please do see this. If you and I learn this thing then we will be able to function sanely, normally, healthily in everyday life, and at the same time there is this extraordinary sense of freedom from thought. Now how is this to take place - you understand the question? Because this is what man has been seeking, because he knows very well thought is a transient thing, thought can be changed, modified, enlarged and knows thought cannot really penetrate into something which is not perceivable by any process of thought. So then he begins to say, how can thought be controlled - you are following? How can thought be held? Because one sees very clearly that only when the mind is completely still can you listen to that aeroplane, only when the mind is completely still can

you hear something clearly, or see something. I think that is fairly clear.

So how is the mind, which is the brain, in which thought as matter lives - how can this whole brain, mind be completely still - right? Are we following each other? I do not know if you have asked that question ever. And if you have asked and if you have found an answer, the answer must be according to your thinking. Now can thought naturally realize its own limitation, and realizing its own limitation be quiet? That is, can the mind, and therefore the brain - the brain cells themselves, if you have observed your own brain operating, are the content of the past, every cell in it holds the memory of yesterday because yesterday and its memory gives to the brain great security because tomorrow there is uncertainty and in the past there is certainty - in knowledge there is certainty, which is the past; so the brain is the past - right? - and therefore the brain is time; it can only think in terms of time, yesterday, today and tomorrow, the tomorrow is uncertain therefore the past, through the present make the tomorrow more certain - so can that brain, which has been trained, educated through millennia, be completely still - you understand the problem? Please understand the problem first. Because when we understand the problem clearly, see the problem with all its implications wisely, intelligently, the answer is in the problem not outside of it. All problems, if you examine, have their answer in themselves, not beyond it.

So the question is then: the brain, the mind, the whole organic structure, can that be utterly still? You know there is a different kind of stillness. There is the stillness between two noises - right?

Between two verbal statements there is a silence. There is a silence which can be induced. There is a silence which comes about by tremendous discipline, control. And all such silences are sterile - they are not silence, they are the product of thought which wishes to be silent and therefore it is still within the area of thought. Got it?

So how is the mind, which is the whole thing, how is it to be quiet without a motive - if it has a motive it is still the operation of thought? Do you know what the answer is? You don't do you? No. Good, I'm so glad! Because this requires tremendous honesty - you understand sirs? To really to find out if there is something not of this dimension but of a totally different dimension, you require great honesty in which there is no deception, therefore there is no wanting - you understand? The moment the mind desires to find that state it will invent, it will be caught in an illusion, in a vision. That vision, that experience is the projection of the past however enchanting, however pleasurable, however great it be, it is still of the past.

So if all that is very clear, not only verbally but actually, then the question is: can the content of consciousness, which makes up consciousness, can that content be completely emptied? Is this all Greek? Are we following each other? Do please.

Q: Is consciousness and the content the same?

K: That is what we are asking sir. Please do give me two minutes. Let me go on for a while.

Our consciousness, the daily, the unconscious and the conscious, the whole inward content of consciousness is its content, is what it has thought, what it has accumulated, what it has

received through tradition, through culture, through struggle, through pain, through sorrow, through deception, the whole of that is my consciousness and yours. Without the content, what is consciousness? You understand? I only know my consciousness because of its content. I am a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, Catholic, Communist, Socialist, an artist, a scientist, a philosopher - you follow? - I am attached to this house, she is my wife, you are my friend, the images, the conclusions, the remembrances, the images that I have built through 40, 50, 100 years is the content. And the content is my consciousness, as yours is. And that area of consciousness is time because it is the area of thought, it is the area of measurement - comparing, evaluating, judging - it is within that area. Within that area of consciousness are all my thoughts, unconscious, conscious, the future, within that area. And any movement within that area is within the movement of consciousness with its content Therefore space in consciousness with its content is very limited. Are you getting all this? Sirs, please learn this together. If we learn this together it will be yours not mine. Then you are free of all leaders, you will be free of all teaching, it will be your mind learning, therefore there is energy, you will be passionate to find out. But if you are following somebody like a dog, then you lose all energy.

That is, as we were saying, within the area of consciousness with its content, which is time, space is very small. You can expand the space by imagination, by contriving, by various processes of stretching it out, thinking more, more subtly, more deliberately, but it is still within the limited space of consciousness which is its content - right sirs? Are you getting it?

So any movement to go beyond itself is still within the content. That is why when you take drugs of any kind, LSD, marijuana and all the rest of it, grass, pot, hashish, opium and all the rest of it, it is the activity of thought within that consciousness, and when you think you are going beyond it you are still within it. It is only an idea. Or you experience more deeply the content. So one sees the content which is the 'me', which is the ego, which is the person, the so-called individual, within that consciousness, however expanded, time and space - limited space - must always exist. Right? So to consciously make an effort to reach something beyond itself invites illusion - I wonder if you understand this? To set out to seek truth, which is so absurd, to be told by a Master, a guru that you will find it, without understanding all the content, and without emptying that content, merely to practise in order to get something is like the blind leading the blind, and generally the gurus are blind anyhow, and so are the followers.

So that is the question: mind is its content; the brain is the past and from that past thought functions, and thought is never free and never new. So the question arises: how can that content be emptied? Not method, because the moment you practise a method, somebody has given it to you, or you invent your own method and that becomes mechanical, and therefore it is still within the field of time and limited space.

I do not know if you have ever thought or gone into yourself to find out what is space - not science fiction space, or time according to science fiction, or timelessness according to them, but to enquire, to learn what is space. We are going to do this. Can the mind see its own limitation? And the very perception of that

limitation is the ending of that limitation. Not how to empty the mind, but to see totally the content of it and the consciousness - the content that makes up consciousness, to see that totally, and to see, perceive, listen to all this movement of that consciousness, and the very perception of it is the ending of it, not how to end it. You understand? If I see something false, the very perception of the false is the true - I don't know if you see it. Do you understand? The very perception of my telling a lie is the truth - you understand this? The very perception of my envy, is the freedom from envy, is the truth. That is, you can only see very clearly, observe very clearly when there is no observer - that the observer is the past, the image, the conclusion, the opinion, the judgement. So can the mind see clearly without any effort its content, the limitation, which means the lack of space, and the time binding quality of consciousness with its content - right? Can you see this? And you can only see the totally of it, both the unconscious content as well as the conscious content when you can look silently, when the observer is totally silent. That is if I want to see you my vision mustn't be blurred, I must have very good eyesight to see all the outline of you, the hair, the structure of your face, the bone and so on, I must look very clearly. That means there must be attention, and in that attention there is energy. Whereas when you make an effort to be attentive, that effort is a wastage of energy. When you try to control, that is a wastage of energy - control implies conformity, comparison, suppression - all that is a wastage of energy. When there is perception there is attention, which is total energy, in which there is not a breath of wastage of energy.

Now when you look with energy, the whole conscious as well

as the unconscious content, the mind then is empty. This is not my illusion - you understand? This isn't what I think, or the conclusion I have come to. If I have a conclusion, if I think this is right, then I am in illusion. And knowing it to be an illusion I wouldn't talk. Because then it is like the blind leading the blind. But you can see for yourself the logic of it, the sanity of it. That is if you are listening, if you are paying attention, if you really want to find out. That is, how is it possible for the unconscious with its content to expose totally all its depth? You have understood?

First see the question and then we can proceed from there. Like everything else in life we have divided consciousness into the conscious and the unconscious, the artist, the businessman - you follow - this division, this fragmentation exists, induced by our culture, by our education, by all the rest of it. And you are asking a question, which is: there is this division between consciousness and unconsciousness and the unconsciousness has its motives, its racial inheritance, its experience and so on - all that - how can that be exposed to the light of intelligence, to the light of perception? Do you ask this question? If you ask this question, are you asking it as an analyser who is going to analyse the content and therefore division, contradiction, conflict, sorrow and all the rest of it? Or are you asking this question not knowing the answer? You are following this? Because this is important. If you are asking the question, which is: there is all this content in the unconscious, I don't know honestly, seriously, how to expose this whole structure of consciousness which is hidden, I really don't know. Therefore when you approach it not knowing, you are going to learn, but if you have any kind of conclusion, opinion, for or against, that it

cannot be, that it can be, then you are approaching with a mind that has already assumed the answer, or no answer. Therefore a mind that says, "I do not know", which is the truth, which is honesty - I may know it according to some philosopher, some psychologist, some analyst, but it is not your knowing - it is their knowing it and you interpreting it and trying to understand them, not what is actual. So when you say, "I do not know", what is there then? Have you understood? When you say, "I do not know" the content has no importance whatsoever - you get it? Oh do see this sirs. Because the mind then is a fresh mind - you understand? It is the new mind that says, "I don't know". Therefore when you say it, not just verbally for amusement, but with depth, with meaning, with honesty, that state of mind that does not know is empty of its consciousness, is empty of its content. It is the knowing that is the content. You got it? Do you see it?

So the mind can never say, it knows, therefore it is always new, living, acting, therefore it has no anchorage. It is only when it is anchored that it gathers opinions, conclusions, and separation. Now this is meditation. Which is, meditation is to perceive the truth each second - not the truth ultimately. To perceive the truth and the false each second. To perceive the truth that, content is consciousness, that is the truth. To see the truth that I do not know how to deal with this thing - right? That is the truth, not knowing, therefore not knowing is the state in which there is no content. It is so terribly simple - that is what you are objecting to. You want something clever, complicated, put together, and you object to see something extraordinarily simple, and therefore extraordinarily beautiful.

So can the mind, which is the brain, see its own limitation -



limitation of time, which is the bondage of time and the limitation of space? And as long as one lives within that limited space and time-binding movement, there must be suffering, there must be psychological despair, hope and all the anxiety, everything takes place. So when the mind has perceived the truth of this, then what is time? Then is there a different dimension which thought cannot touch, therefore cannot describe? Look sir, we said thought is measure and therefore time. We live by measurement, all our structure of thinking is based on measurement, which is comparison and all that which we have gone into the last few days. And thought as measurement tries to go beyond itself and discover for itself if there is something immeasurable which is not measurable. And to see the falseness of it is the truth. I wonder if you see this? The truth is to see the false, and the false is when thought seeks that which is not measurable, which is not of time, which is not of the space with its content of consciousness.

So, you understand, when you have put all these questions and have enquired, when you have learnt as you go along, then your mind and your brain becomes extraordinarily quiet, there is no need for any discipline, any teacher, any guru, any system to make you quiet. There are various kinds of meditation in the world at the present time - the Zen, the Alpha meditation - have you heard about the Alpha meditation? No? Invented by the gadgeteers, the Americans. Which is, they have an instrument, an electronic instrument, and they put electrodes on the brain and they watch in the measurement whether the brain is quiet or not. You understand this? And any silly ass can do this! And train himself to be quiet. These are games that they are all playing. And you go to Asia, or

Japan, or various monasteries and learn there to be attentive - you know trained, like some animal trained to perform. And then there are other forms of meditation - the latest is Kundalini Yoga - have you heard all about that bilge? You know what that means? I won't go into it all because - you know there are certain things you cannot possible talk about because man is too eager, too greedy, to experience something which he doesn't know anything about. The whole idea of Kundalini in India is the awakening of energy - I won't go into all the details of it - and that energy completely held, no, that energy without any distortion acting. And some people in the West now, because it has been brought by some Indians, are practising Kundalini Yoga. And there is obviously the fashionable thing now - Yoga - right? You know all about it don't you? Yoga means, as it is translated now, joining, yoking two separate things together. I am sure it had quite a different meaning at the beginning. Yoga meant probably harmony, not bringing two things together, the soul and the body and the Atman - and you know all the rest of it. And I once saw at a station in India a beggar doing Yoga most beautifully. They were throwing coins to him from the railway carriages. And he was doing the most complicated Yoga with the greatest of ease. And that Yoga has been brought to the Western world to make people healthy, happy, young, find god - you follow - everything is involved in it now. Originally, from what I have been told, there was a certain weed, a certain leaf in the Himalayas which only a very few people chewed and it kept their brains and their minds tremendously alert. And as the vine or the bush disappeared then they had to invent a system called Yoga which kept all the glands perfectly healthy, operating efficiently.

And that is how Yoga came into being, which is exercises. And also in it is involved a way of life, not just doing some silly exercise, a way of life in which there are no drugs, morality, all the rest of it.

And also now there is the pursuit of the occult - don't you know all that? More and more because it is more exciting. I have seen everything in the world and I want to see something beyond the world, extrasensory perception and so on and so on. Sirs, a man who is pursuing truth, who is trying to understand life totally, who sees the false as the false and in the false the truth, to such a mind the occult things are fairly obvious, such a mind will not touch it. They are totally unimportant: whether I read your thought, or you read my thought, whether I see angels, fairies, some kinds of visions which I have not seen before. Because we want something mysterious and we don't see the immense mystery in living, in the love of living - you understand? We don't see that. And therefore we spread out in things that don't matter.

Now when you have finished with all this, there is the central problem which is: is there something which is not describable, because if you describe it is not the described, is there something which is not of time, which is without borders as space, which has immense space? I do not know if you have ever watched birds sitting on a telephone wire; if you have watched it you will see that each bird has space very carefully, because when your space is limited you become vicious, which is what is happening in the urban, in the cities, where there is no space you become violent, you want to break things - you know, you want space. The mind cannot, thought cannot give that space. Only when thought is quiet

there is this space which has no frontier. And it is only the completely silent mind that knows, that is aware, not knows, is aware if there is or if there is not something that is beyond all measurement. And that is the only thing that is sacred, not the images, the rituals, the saviours, the gurus, their visions, but that thing which mind has come upon without asking, because in itself it is totally empty and therefore that which has emptiness, a new thing can take place.

## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH DECEMBER 1972

May we go on with what we were talking about yesterday afternoon? We were saying how very important it is to be very honest, not to some idea or to some behavioral pattern but the honesty and integrity that comes when you are completely faced with the facts as they are. This honesty and integrity is so necessary as we are going more and more deeply into the nature of our behaviour, our moral conduct, love, death and that extraordinary thing that we have been calling meditation. To penetrate into all this without any kind of illusion, any kind of deception, the mind must be capable of complete honesty to see exactly what it is.

Corruption is the pattern of our behaviour, as it is. Corruption, I am using that word in the sense, when the mind functions in fragments, when the mind is broken up into a political activity, separate from religious activity, from the family activity, or the artist separated from the business man, the religious man and so on. Where there is this fragmentation taking place there must be corruption. I am using that word literally, which means to break up. And when the mind lives in various categories of activity, various departments of thought, ideals, there must be corruption. Corruption ends only when the mind is integral, whole, not broken up.

We were saying yesterday afternoon, weren't we, that seeing what the world is, not an abstract ideal of a world but the actual world of our daily living, in our daily relationship, there is a great

deal of sorrow, misery, confusion, occasional spurts of joy. And society as it is needs tremendous reform. And (song of bird) - nice bird, I hope you all heard it - and when the reformer himself is corrupt in the sense I am using that word then society will be corrupt. And our present political, economic, social, business, artistic world is corrupt because it doesn't take into consideration the whole structure of man, his whole nature. And we are concerned with the totality of the human mind, not one fragment of it. If you are concerned with one fragment, whatever it be, there must be division, conflict, and from it a great deal of deception, which is in its very nature corrupt. Right? Again we are concerned with actually what is, not with what should be, or what might be, or with the transformation of 'what is' but merely concerned actually with the facts as they are.

It's quite a nice evening, isn't it, I hope you enjoy it as much as I am enjoying it, the lovely birds, the trees, the leaves moving in the breeze and the strange quietness that comes of an evening before the sun sets. There is great beauty. And to see that and feel that great beauty the mind must be utterly total, unbroken, not fragmented. And we are trying - or rather we are together this evening exploring, which means communicating together over this problem of thought, its extraordinary capacity, technologically and psychologically, inwardly what misery, confusion, strife, despair it creates. And we are sharing this together, therefore you are not merely listening to a speaker, agreeing or disagreeing, which is comparatively easy, or being entertained. Entertainment takes many forms - religious, when you go to the temple or the church, when you go off chasing some guru and accepting his authority,

when you take a drink, when you do any kind of ritual, those are all entertainments, in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of social reform. Because what we are concerned with, and man should be concerned, in bringing about a radical transformation in the whole structure of the mind, and when you are concerned with that totally every form of entertainment comes to an end, and therefore the mind becomes totally serious. And being serious it cannot deceive itself.

There are two varieties of seriousness, or perhaps many varieties of seriousness. The man who believes in something, identifies himself with that belief and committed to that belief, he is considered very serious. He is as the neurotic who believes in some fantasy and identifies himself with that fantasy and is totally sincere. Such people are not serious. A mind that is serious is a mind that is concerned with things as they are, with the misery, confusion, poverty, riches, the social appalling things that are happening in the world. Those are the facts. And a serious mind is concerned in going beyond that fact. And that's what we are going to discuss throughout these talks and discussions.

What is necessary is to have energy. We cannot go beyond 'what is' if we have not sufficient energy. We waste our energy in speculation, in abstractions, in trying to go beyond 'what is'. Please understand this because I think it is very important. Thought has brought about this condition in the world of which we are a part, we are the world and the world is us. That's an absolute irrefutable fact. And thought which is so capable, which is so alert, which has such efficiency in action, has brought about division between man and man. Again that's a fact. The religious, economic, social,

political, governmental division. Now the question is: can the mind go beyond that, beyond this division and therefore beyond conflict? And to observe the fact you need energy. And this energy is wasted when you have an ideal. Please follow this a little bit, give your attention to it, because we are journeying together. When you have an ideal it is a wastage of energy, because the ideal takes the mind away from the fact. That's a wastage of energy. When the mind wishes to go beyond the fact, that's a wastage of energy. When the mind tries to control the fact, that's a wastage of energy. When the mind suppresses the fact, the `what is', then that's a wastage of energy. In this wastage of energy most minds are living. Right? Please, watch your own minds, not merely listen to the words because the word is not the thing, and the description is not the described. The described is your mind. And the described is the wastage of your mind. So don't get caught in the description or in the word but watch your mind, how it wastes its own extraordinary energy. It is not, how to stop this energy being wasted but rather to observe the wastage of energy. To observe. But in that observation if you say, `I must not waste energy and therefore I must control', then that very control becomes a wastage of energy. You are following all this?

Suppose you have a belief, and unfortunately most people have beliefs, opinions, judgements, conclusions, you hear the speaker say, that's a wastage of energy, he shows you the reason - the reason being that the mind refuses to face the fact as it is. It is educated not to face facts as they are. Through our education, social reform, society, culture, religion, all that has brought about a conditioning of the mind that accepts wastage of energy through



these various channels. When the mind sees that it is a wastage of energy, a belief, then the reaction to that is, try to control or suppress or do away with that belief. That suppression, control, or doing away with that belief is a wastage of energy. Whereas if you observed the whole structure of belief, the nature of belief, what lies behind belief, the observation reveals the structure and nature of belief. Then there is no waste of energy. Right? Are we sharing this together? Not verbally, but actually are you doing this? Because we are going to go into something much deeper, and you need all your energy and attention to go into this.

So can the mind observe the fact, the fact being 'what is', your violence, your aggression, your desire for power, success, security, that is 'what is'. Can you observe that without any movement of thought which is conditioned to accept the various forms of escapes from the fact, and therefore wasting energy? Am I making myself clear? Yes? If I am not I will go into it again, over and over and over again until you are clear. Because, please, do see this, I am not your teacher, you are not my disciples - thank god, I wouldn't have you! Not because you are silly or grotesque, but to follow somebody is the greatest corruption, in that there is no love, in that there is separation, conflict, brutality, a hierarchical system of thought and action. Whereas what we are trying to do is to think out these things together, to be serious together, to unravel this very complex problem of living together, because we have created together this misery in the world, and together we have to undo it, not you alone, or I alone, together we have to do it. And this is not possible if you are not clear, logical, sane in your own observation. Therefore you become your own teacher, your own disciple,

therefore you don't follow anybody. Then the burden is all yours. And you may not be willing to carry that burden. Whether you are willing to carry it or not, it is yours, you can't shirk it, you can't try to escape from it, it is yours. And nobody in the world, including specially the speaker can remove that burden from you. You have to go into that burden yourself, look at it, observe it, cherish it, be committed totally to understand it.

So the mind, being conditioned to the wastage of energy, is incapable of meeting actually `what is'. And to meet `what is' you need great energy. It is this great energy that goes beyond or resolves `what is'. Right? Look, sir, culture, I am using that word `culture' in its broadest sense, has conditioned the mind to be envious. Envy means measurement; we measure ourselves with another, compare ourselves with another, try to imitate, follow. So our minds are conditioned to live and function in the field of envy. That is a fact, both in the so-called religious world, when the priest wants to become a bishop, when the disciple wants to become the great master, when the business clerk wants to become the manager. So this whole conditioning of our culture is based on envy. You may ideologically say, one should not be envious, but the fact is, you are envious. Now to go beyond that fact, which means to be totally free of envy, is to observe how the mind regards this reaction called envy. How does it observe? It observes with another fragment of a mind which is conditioned, which says, you must not be envious, therefore control it, and if you would come near god or whatever that is, you must not be envious. So one part of your mind is envious, conditioned through culture, another part of your mind says, you must not be envious, again

conditioned by a culture, so there is in this contradiction, and this contradiction is a wastage of energy.

So can the mind - please do this, as you are listening do it with your heart and with your blood, with your passion do it and you will see what happens - can the mind which has been divided to be envious and not to be envious, the 'not to be envious' is not a fact but the fact is envy. Now can you, can the mind look at that envy without its opposite, which is not to be envious? Or to control envy, or to suppress envy. All these factors of suppression, control, denial or rationalizing envy is a wastage of energy. Are we travelling together? Come on, sirs. So can your mind observe envy without any contradiction, without its opposite? Just stop a minute there.

Is there an opposite at all? You are following all this? There is the opposite, man, woman and so on, but we are not talking of that, we are talking of psychological opposites: courage is the opposite of cowardice. Right? And we are questioning whether there is an opposite at all. And when you have an opposite there is choice, discrimination between this and that. And when the mind is very clear, what needs there be to have choice? Please, go into it yourself. So I am questioning as an investigator, I say there is no opposite at all. There is only 'what is'. And therefore no choice. Come on, sirs. Whereas all your tradition, all your conditioning is the battle between the opposites: when you are passionate, sexual, to have the conditioning which says, you must not. The opposite has its root in 'what is', otherwise the opposite is not. I wonder if you are meeting all this.

So there is only 'what is' and therefore there is no choice, there

is choice only when there are two or three things. Look, sir, when you are uncertain of a road you ask somebody, in that there is choice, you can take that road, or that road, or that road, but when you know the road there is no choice, you go straight. Choice only exists when there is confusion. And where there is confusion there must be conflict. So when you are observing the fact there is no confusion, no choice, no opposite. Do you see the beauty of this, sirs, do you? This is logical, you follow, this is not something that you have to think about, it is so. That is, envy is man's conditioning, for various reasons which we don't have to go into now. He doesn't know how to go beyond it without effort. So he hopes by having an opposite and using the opposite as a lever he can go beyond it. You are following all this? Oh, come on, am I talking to people that are not following? Please do. Look, sir: if one is a coward, that's `what is', why do you want courage, why do you develop courage? It is because you do not know how to deal with cowardice, if you knew how to deal with cowardice and go beyond it you don't have to have courage. You follow? But we are trained to develop courage because we don't know how to deal with cowardice. And I say, that is a wastage of energy because you have invented the opposite and you are caught between `what is' and its opposite. Therefore when you observe only `what is' there is no opposite, and therefore no conflict. Have you understood this? Have I made myself clear? Yes?

So thought has created division between you and me, we and they, the division between the business man, the politician, you know all that, the fragmentation of life is brought about through thought seeking security in different ways. And thought has not

been able to go beyond its own structure, its own fragmentations. Now I am going to take one factor of the process of thought which has brought about this fact and go into it completely with you. The fact is that most human beings are frightened. Fear is there, in their hearts, in their minds, in their bodies, they are involved totally in fear; losing a job, losing your wife, your husband, afraid of death, afraid of not succeeding, afraid of so many things. Aren't you? Aren't you? No? Aren't you? Oh, for god's sake, you are frightened, you are frightened human beings, of being alone, frightened of not having psychological security or physiological security, of failure, of having no love, of not being loved, fear of loneliness, despair, not going beyond this everlasting sorrow and strife, and ultimately there is the fear of death. There is conscious fear as well as unconscious fear. Are you aware of all this, sirs? You know it, don't you? Nobody has to tell you that, do they? Do what you will, go to temples, go to gurus, do anything you will, that flower will keep on blossoming. Right? Whether you know it consciously or unconsciously it is there.

Now the mind living in fear becomes violent. Have you noticed that? Violent in speech, violent in so many ways. Violence is not merely physical violence, violence is conformity. You understand? When you conform to a pattern there is fear involved and therefore there is violence. Right, sir? So fear is one of our major factors in life, which darkens our life, which destroys, creates illusion, brings about neuroticism. Now can the mind go beyond fear? And to go beyond fear you need great energy. Right? And you cannot have that tremendous energy if you are wasting it by running away from it, trying to suppress it, trying to analyse it, trying various ways and

means to overcome it. Right? So you have to observe it. And you have to observe it without any opposite, without a mind that has a fragment which is looking at fear. Right? That is, can you observe fear? What is fear? How does fear arise? Because if you solve this problem completely, if your mind is totally free from fear, do you know what takes place? You are the most marvellous human being, you are the flower, you are the light, you are the beauty. But a mind that is frightened is a dull mind, a stupid mind, a mind that lives in others, books and values and so on. So it is absolutely necessary for a man who is serious, for a man who is really religious - not the phoney religions that you have - a man who is really religious has no fear. And therefore we must understand it completely.

Now we are going to take a journey together into this. You understand, sir, together, take your fear, which you have, become conscious of it as you are sitting there, whatever it is - your losing a job, fear of being alone, fear of loneliness, fear, you know, of public opinion, god knows what your fears are. Take one of them, observe it. Can you observe it without any wastage of energy - which is to suppress it, go beyond it, naming it, all that - merely to observe. Which means give your total attention at the moment - at this moment, when you have invited fear, which is there, you have exposed it and say, 'I am going to look'. So when you are looking at it, what is the cause of fear? Not analytically investigating the cause. You understand this? Ah, I see you don't. What ignorant people we are. We are other people's knowledge, other people's information, we have never gone into our hearts and minds ourselves.

I said just now, what brings about fear. And I said, don't look for the cause, don't analyse fear to find out the cause. The word 'analysis' means the breaking up. When you analyse there is the analyser and the analysed. Right? The analyser - the analyser is the observer, is the experiencer, is the accumulated knowledge of the past, he is the analyser, and he separates himself from fear and says, 'I am going to investigate, analyse what is the cause of fear'. You follow? In that there is division: the analyser and the analysed. And therefore in that division there must be conflict. Right? You see that, don't you? And also when the analyser analyses, his analysis must be total and complete each analysis, otherwise he takes over what he has analysed, with that memory he analyses the next time, therefore all analysis is fragmentation. I wish you would see this. Therefore you will never analyse. Therefore you will be free of the burden which man has imposed upon himself which is to analyse his psyche, his inward states.

I am pointing out, not teaching you, but together we are investigating, we are showing, we are asking, what is the nature of fear, why does fear exist at all? You can find ten different causes, according to the specialists, the professionals, you know, many, many reasons they give you, but the reasons, the causes are not the fact. The fact is fear. Now I am asking, why does fear come? What is the source of it? You are asking too, are you? What is the source of it? The source of it is time. You understand this? I have a job, I am afraid I might lose the job, I haven't lost it but I am afraid I might lose it tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. So fear arises where thought is, which is time. Get it? You get it, sirs?

So time, thought is the factor of fear. Whether that fear is

deeply rooted in the unconscious of which you are not aware, or consciously aware of your fear, that where the mind functions within the field of time there must be fear. The field of time is thought. Do get this thing. I wish I could give it to you. Because you see, sirs, if you understand this, you will leave this evening without a breath of fear and then you will know what love is, but not before because suffering and love don't go together, and fear brings suffering. So time is the factor of fear: death, which is over there, I am living, time involved, you follow, the postponement, the evasion, all that is brought about by thought, and thought is time because thought is the response of memory which is the past.

So to observe fear - please listen to this - without the movement of thought which has been conditioned to suppress fear, to observe completely fear without any movement of thought, which is past, which is time. Can you do it? Do it as you are sitting there. To observe completely. Then you will see that conscious and unconscious fear, however deeply rooted, however secreted, however hidden, is totally exposed. And that's one of our principles of life, which is fear. And the other principle is pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure. Haven't you noticed how you pursue pleasure? Sexual, pleasure of a good meal, pleasure of seeing a marvellous picture, the pleasure of a sunset, the delight of looking at a tree that is so alive, gentle, full of beauty, at that moment there is great delight. And that moment is gone, then thought comes along and says, 'How lovely it was, I would like to have that repeated again'. Right? Haven't you noticed all this? Your sex, on which your life is also based, is this pattern of the pursuit of pleasure. We are not saying pleasure is wrong, we are only pointing out the nature of



pleasure, which is an incident that may give you great delight at the moment, unsurpassing joy, a thing that cannot be invited that comes in a moment of beauty, sacredness, then thought says, 'How extraordinary that was, how beautiful, I must repeat it'. And man is pursuing, hunting after this all the time. Which is, again, the movement of thought. Thought says, 'I have had that extraordinary delight yesterday' - whatever it is, and insists on having it today. The insistence of a past delight by thought is the pursuance of pleasure. Where pleasure is denied thought becomes violent. Haven't you noticed if you don't get your accustomed meal how angry, irritable you get?

So thought - just see the picture, sir, don't do anything about it, just look at it - thought is playing this game all the time. The ultimate pleasure is what you call god, what you call enlightenment. It is pleasure. As you cannot invite joy, so you cannot possibly invite enlightenment. So when you see this, see the whole picture, and to see that whole picture you need tremendous energy. You understand? And then you will see that envy, which has been the major factor of our life, which has bred so much conflict, misery and pain - because envy is measure, measuring yourself against somebody - when the mind is without measure there is no greed. You understand, sir?

Now for the mind to be in that movement in which there is no comparison, it has to face envy totally and completely, and it cannot face it if the mind wanders away by trying to overcome it. You have got it? You have understood it? Are you doing this? Or waiting to do it tomorrow? There is no tomorrow, there is only the moment when you listen to the truth of things. Therefore it is very

important how you listen. You cannot listen if you are comparing what somebody has said with what is being said, you cannot listen if you are impatient, if you are trying to say, 'Well, I must have this energy to go beyond', you are not listening if you do not love that which you are listening to. If you are listening to the crows that are calling before they go off to sleep, as they are calling in the distance, if you listen totally, then you learn the beauty of the night and the clarity of sound. And learning is not a movement in time, learning is at the moment of actual listening and learning. You have understood this? Sirs, do it then you will see that a mind that is free of envy, fear, that is not pursuing pleasure - pleasure, enjoyment, delight is one thing, and the pursuit of them is another, the pursuit of them brings misery, mischief, confusion, but the mere enjoyment of a sunset, of a beautiful face, and a beautiful movement of a tree, in that moment pleasure doesn't come in, it is only thought brings it in as it brings in fear. So if you can look at all this then the mind is totally free from fear. Then you will put away all your gods, then you will be out of the stream, a totally different human being.

Do you want to ask any questions? Or this is enough? This quietness, this attention which perhaps has been stimulated, or this attention which you yourself have gathered now, you will perhaps like to remain quietly and not ask questions. If that is so, that's all right. So may I then go this evening?

## **MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 16TH DECEMBER 1972**

If I may this afternoon, or this evening, I would like to talk over many things: freedom, order, love and death. And in talking over together these questions, which are our daily problems of life, I think we have to bear in mind that together we are investigating, together we are taking a journey into rather complex issues of life, and to investigate together. As we said previously, there must be that quality of intensity, a quality of mind that is not tethered to any particular belief or a conclusion, but is willing to go very far, not in distance of time but in depth.

And if we may we will begin by observing certain things. One comes to this country, as one has done for the last forty years, except during the war years, and one notices the terrible deterioration, one notices disorder, not only in the streets and governments but also the great disorder in ourselves. Our culture is going, or probably has already gone, our standards, values, moral quality have disappeared, and in their place, if one observes quite objectively, money, position, status have become very important. It's a tragic affair to see a country losing its very roots, an ancient culture which has lost its mooring, and in its place every kind of disorder is going on. And as one observes, surely a new culture must be born, a new way of living, a mind that will not accept corruption, both outwardly and inwardly, an action that is whole, healthy, holy. That word `whole' implies that. The word `whole' means healthy, holy. And such a culture must be brought about for any community to survive.

And if one is really deeply moved by all the tragedy that is going on one has to do something, a totally different kind of action, a totally different kind of living, a mind that understands what is compassion, if there is such a thing as freedom from death. And this evening, if we can, as a group of people listening, and perhaps very, very serious, then we can together investigate these things, whether the mind which has been so terribly abused, which has born many hurts, many tragedies, great sorrows, personal and non-personal, whether such a mind can transform itself, letting all the conditioning disappear so that it is a total, whole, a holy thing.

So we will begin by enquiring what is freedom. Whether the mind, our mind, your mind, can be free, or must it always live within the prison of the known, which is the past, whether that past be tradition, knowledge, experience, the various influences, the education that it has received, the impositions, the suppressions, whether such a mind can be absolutely and totally free. We are going to enquire into that. There are many varieties of freedom: freedom of the press, freedom of expression, freedom of choice. I don't know why one uses freedom of choice as though it was a very great thing, because really a mind that is confused can never choose, and what it chooses must always be confused therefore it is not free at all to choose, but we will go into that. So there are many kinds of freedom, national, political, freedom of the press, freedom of the seas, and so on and on and on. But we are not talking about all those kinds of freedom. We are talking about a mind, your mind, our mind, which is in disorder, and whether there can be total freedom from that disorder. To us freedom is generally from something: freedom from anger, freedom from jealousy, envy,

hate, and so on. I think there is a different quality of freedom, not freedom from something but the quality of mind that knows freedom - not from. When it is freedom from something it is the opposite, and therefore not free.

So we are going to enquire together whether in our life, in our daily life of relationship we can bring about order. Because relationship is society, the relationship between you and me, between me and another, and so on, is the structure of society. That is society, relationship is the structure and the nature of society. I am putting it very, very simply so that we can get on. And when there is no order in that relationship, as there is at present no order, then every kind of action must not only be contradictory but also producing a great deal of sorrow, mischief, confusion and conflict. Please, don't let me talk but share it together because we are taking a journey together, perhaps hand in hand, with affection, with consideration. But if you merely sit down and be talked at, or lectured to, then I am afraid you and I cannot take the journey together hand in hand. So please do observe your own mind, your own relationship, it doesn't matter with whom it is, your wife, your children, with your neighbour, or with your government, and see if there is in that relationship order. Because order is necessary, precision is necessary, order is virtue, order is so mathematical, so pure, complete, and we are going to find out if there is such order.

No one can live without relationship. You may withdraw into the mountains, become a monk, a sannyasi, wander off into the desert by yourself but you are related, you cannot escape from that absolute fact, you cannot exist in isolation. You mind may think it exists in isolation, or bring about through action a state of isolation,

but even in that isolation you are related. And when one looks at that relationship, because life is relationship, living is relationship, we cannot live if you and I have built a wall around ourselves and just peep over that wall occasionally, but unconsciously, deeply, under the wall we are related. I do not think we have paid a great deal of attention to this question of relationship. Your books don't talk about relationship, they talk about god, practice, methods, how to breathe, don't do this, do that, and the everlasting back and forth. But I have been told, because I don't read books, thank god, I have been told relationship is never mentioned.

Relationship implies responsibility, as freedom does. And to be related is to live, that's life, that's existence. And if in that relationship there is disorder our whole society, culture goes to pieces, which is what is happening now.

So what is order, what is freedom and what is relationship? This is the first thing we are going to enquire into. And from there go into this whole question of what love is and if the mind can ever be free from this tyranny of death. Don't wait or neglect the previous things, that is love, relationship, freedom and order, because you may be only interested in death, and you say, 'Really I am not interested in all the other things, but as I am terribly interested in death and what happens after life and so on, I will neglect the rest and I will pay attention when you come to that part' - if you do that then you will never understand what we are talking about. You must take the whole thing together: order, freedom, disorder, relationship, love and death, they are together, they are not separate things.

So what is disorder? Because when the mind understands what

is disorder, really deeply inwardly what brings about disorder, then out of that insight, out of that awareness, out of that observation comes naturally order. Not the blueprint of what order should be, because that is what we have been brought up with, a pattern has been laid down by religions, by cultures, what order should be, or what order is. And the mind has tried to conform to that order, whether it is cultural order, social order, legalistic order or religious order, it has tried to conform to the pattern established by the social activity, by certain leaders, teachers and so on. To me that is not order because in that there is implied conformity. So where there is conformity there is disorder. Where there is the acceptance of authority there is disorder. Where there is comparative existence, that is measuring yourself against somebody, comparing yourself with somebody does produce disorder. I'll show you why. It's not a wild statement. Need I explain all this? Have you caught on to it? Or must I go into it? I see I must go into it. All right.

Why does the mind conform? Why does your mind conform? Have you ever asked? Are you aware that you are conforming to a pattern, it doesn't matter what that pattern is, whether you have established a pattern for yourself or it has been established for you. We are always conforming - why? Where there is conformity there cannot be freedom, obviously. And yet the mind is always seeking freedom, the more intelligent, the more alert, the more aware the greater the demand. The mind conforms, imitates, obviously because there is more security in conformity, in following a pattern. That's an obvious fact. You put on all kinds of marks, on your forehead, all kinds of activities you do, because socially it is

better to conform. You may be educated abroad, you may be a great scientist, politician, but you always have a sneaking fear that if you don't go to temples or do the ordinary things that you have been told to do, something evil might happen, so you conform. So what happens to the mind that conforms? Investigate it, please, together. What happens to your mind when you conform? First of all there is a total denial of freedom, total denial of perception, total denial of independent enquiry. When you conform there is fear. Right? Do you see all this? Are we going together? And when you imitate - and the mind from childhood has been trained to imitate, which is, conform to the pattern which society has established, pass through examinations, get a degree, if you are lucky get a job and get married, finished. And you accept that pattern, and you are frightened not to follow that pattern.

So inwardly you deny freedom, inwardly you are frightened, inwardly you have this sense of not being or being free to find out, enquire, search, ask. So that produces disorder in our relationship. Right, sirs? Do watch it. Sir, look, don't agree with the speaker, that's the least important thing. What you and I are trying to do is to really go into this so deeply, to have real insight, see the truth of it, and it is the perception of the truth that frees the mind, not your practice, not your silly activity of enquiry but the actual perception of 'what is'.

So in relationship both outwardly and inwardly we bring about through fear, through conformity, through measurement which is comparison, disorder. And our relationship is in disorder, not only with each other, however intimate it may be, but also disorder outwardly. Right? Now to see that disorder clearly, not out there



but in here, deeply in ourselves, to see all the implications of it, then out of that perception comes order. Then you don't have to live according to the order. You understand? Because order has no pattern, it's not a blueprint. It comes out of the comprehension of what is disorder. The more you understand disorder in relationship the greater the order. Right? So we have to find out what is your relationship with each other. You are following all this?

What is your relationship with another? Have you any relationship at all? Or it is a relationship with the past image, with the past, the past with its image, experience, knowledge, brings about what you call relationship. Right? So knowledge in relationship causes disorder. Right? No? Look, sir, I am related to you, I am your son, your father, your wife, your husband, whatever it is, we have lived together. You have hurt me and I have hurt you, you have nagged me, you have bullied me, you have beaten me, you have said hard things behind my back and to my face. So I have lived with you for ten years or two days, and these memories remain, the hurts, the irritations, the sexual pleasures, the annoyances, the brutal words, and so on, those are recorded in the brain cells which hold the memory. So my relationship with you is based on the past. Right? The past is my life. If you have observed you will see how the mind, your life, your activity, is based, rooted in the past. And relationship when it is rooted in the past must create disorder. Right? That is, knowledge in relationship brings disorder. Sir, look: you have hurt me, I remember that; you hurt me yesterday, or a week ago, that remains in my mind, that's the knowledge I have about you. Right? That knowledge prevents relationship, that knowledge in relationship breeds disorder.

So the question is: you hurt me, you flattered me, you scandalized me, and can the mind wipe away at the very moment you are insulting, never recording? You understand what I am saying? Never recording your insult. Have you ever tried this? Yesterday - how lovely that moon is, isn't it, looking through the leaves and the cry of those crows, and the evening light, and that extraordinary moon through the leaves, a wondrous thing, look at it, enjoy it - yesterday somebody said to me rather harsh things, which are not true. What he said can be recorded, is recorded, and the mind, since it is recorded, identifies the person with that record and acts according to that record. And where the mind is acting in relationship with the knowledge of that insult, the harsh words, that untrue thing, then that knowledge in relationship brings disorder. Have you understood this? Right? Have you even verbally understood this? Now how is the mind not to record at the moment of insult, or at the moment of flattery? You have understood my question? Because to me the most important thing in life is relationship, without relationship there must be disorder. And a mind that lives in order, total order, which is the highest form of mathematical order, cannot for a single minute allow the shadow of disorder to come upon it. And that disorder comes into being when in relationship the mind acts on knowledge which is over. So how is the mind not to record the insult, but know the insult has been given, as well as flattery, it has been given but yet not recorded, so the mind is always clean, healthy, whole in relationship? You have understood my question?

Are you interested in this? You know if you are really interested in it, it is the greatest problem in life, how to live a life in which the

mind has never been hurt, never been distorted, in relationship. Now is this possible? We have put an impossible question, you understand? It is an impossible question, and we must find the impossible answer. You understand what I am saying? Because what is possible is mediocre, is already finished, done, but if you ask the impossible question the mind has to find the answer. Can the mind - because this is love, sir, you understand - the mind that records no insult, no flattery, knows what love is.

We are asking a question which is, can the mind never record, never, absolutely never, record the insult or the flattery? Is that possible? If the mind can find the answer to that one has solved the problem of relationship. You understand? Because we live in relationship, relationship is not an abstraction, it is a daily every day fact, whether you go to the office, come back and sleep with your wife or quarrel, whatever it is, you are always in relationship. And if in that relationship between you and another, or between you and many or one, if there is no order you will create a culture that will ultimately produce disorder, as is being done now. So order is absolutely essential. And to find that out can the mind, though it has been insulted, hurt, brutalized - not brutalized - brutal things have been said to it, knocked about, never for a second hold it. The moment you hold it, it is already recorded, it has left a mark in the brain cells. See the difficulty of this question. So can the mind do this so that the mind remains totally innocent? You understand what I am talking about? No, don't shake you heads, you don't understand. The word 'innocent', a mind that is innocent means a mind that is incapable of being hurt. Because it is incapable of being hurt it will not hurt another. You understand all

this? Now is this possible? Every form of influence, every form of incident, every form of mischief, distrust is thrown upon the mind. And can the mind never record and therefore remain very innocent, very clear? We are going to find out together.

So we will come to it by asking, what is love. We will come back to it, I'm not avoiding it. Is love the product of thought? Is love in the field of time? Is love pleasure? Is love something that can be cultivated, practised, put together by thought? So in enquiring into this one has to go into the question, is love pleasure, sexual or any other kind of pleasure. Because our mind is pursuing all the time pleasure: yesterday I had a good meal, the pleasure of that meal is recorded and I want more, a better meal or the same kind of meal tomorrow. I have had great delight, in the sunset, looking at the moon through the leaves, or seeing a wave far out at sea, that gives great delight, beauty, and that is great pleasure. The mind records it and wants it repeated. Sexually thought thinks, chews about it, wants it repeated, and that you call love. Right, sirs? Don't be shy when we talk about sex, that's part of your life, you have made it hideous because you have denied every kind of freedom except that one freedom. So is love pleasure? Is love put together by thought, as pleasure is put together by thought? You are following all this? Is love envy? Can a man love who is ambitious, greedy, violent? Go on sirs. You are ambitious, aren't you, all of you? Can you love when you are ambitious, when you are competitive? And you talk a great deal about love, don't you? Love of god, of course, I forgot that! That's your favourite slogan. When you don't know how to love man you love god. Oh, don't laugh, you are so immature, childish.

So can a man who is envious, who is greedy, ambitious, violent, conforming, obeying, totally in himself in disorder, can he love? So what is love? It is not any of these things, obviously. It is not pleasure. Please understand the importance of the pleasure; pleasure is sustained by thought, therefore thought is not love. You understand? Thought cannot cultivate love. It can cultivate, and it does, the pursuit of pleasure, as it does fear, so thought cannot create love, put together love. See the truth, see it and you will put away your ambition, your greed, altogether. So through negation you come to the most extraordinary thing called love, which is the most positive.

That is, disorder in relationship means there is no love, and that disorder exists when there is conformity. So a mind that conforms can never know what love is. Oh, come on! Conforms to a pattern of pleasure, or what it thinks is love. So a mind that has understood the whole ripening of disorder comes to an order which is virtue, therefore which is love. Do you see it, sir? It doesn't matter, I'll go on. It's your life, it's not my life. If you don't live this way you will be most unhappy people, caught in a social disorder and be dragged for ever in that stream. It is only the man who steps out of that stream that knows what love is, what order is.

Now let's go into the question of what death is, shall we, because they are all related. Now can the mind be free of death? Not what happens after life. When the mind is free of death there is no time. Have you understood? Oh, come on sirs! So time is death. Are we journeying together? There is time by the watch, there is time as space between here and death. The space between now and death is time. And the mind cannot and will not allow that space

between now and that thing called death, the mind will not allow that time to disappear. And the mind says, I know the body dies through accident, old age, disease, an incident, there are so many ways to die, and the shedding of tears, the misery, the suffering, all that is involved in death, both physiological as well as psychological. And must death always exist, and can the mind be ever free of death? You are following? I want to find out. If you want to find out you must enquire what is freedom from death? Is freedom something from death, or is the mind free when death is not? The mind be free when time is not, not freedom from death. You understand? But when death is not there is freedom. That is real freedom.

Now we are going to find out whether the mind can be free of death. The mind being the whole structure of one's life, what you think, what you feel, what your envies are, the whole content of your life is the mind. Right? Your gods, your fears, your anxieties, your sorrow, the whole content makes up your life. Without the content you have no life. You understand sirs? Are we travelling together? Your house, your name, your bank account, if you have a bank account, the techniques that you have learnt, your relationships, the pettiness of your existence, all that is the content of your life and that content is life, your life, in which is included death. Right? Death is not something over there, it is here, because that is part of life, isn't it? So can the mind be free of the content, including death? You have understood? Be free of the accumulation which you have gathered through time? So time is the factor, the central factor of death. Are you meeting all this? Are you meeting all this, or am I talking vaguely to some abstract?

Look, sir, come with me, look at it, it's your life: your job, if you have got a job, the beliefs, the gods, all the things that thought has put together, the books that you have read, the Upanishads, the Gita, whatever the books, sacred - I won't call them sacred, they are just books - all that you have read is accumulated in the mind. This accumulation, including jealousy, what you think is love, and death, is the content and therefore that is your life. That content is fragmented, broken up - business, artist, dancer, businessman, scientist, and so on and so on - and so this fragmentation is brought about by thought, thought is time, and thought says, I don't want to die. Right? All the things that I have accumulated is me. So thought, which is the product of the past accumulations, and so on, is time. Memory is time. And thought which is the child of time maintains time as a means of avoiding death. Have you all gone to sleep?

Look, sir: you are caught in the social stream of life, aren't you? The social stream of Brahmin, non-Brahmin, the politician, the economist, the artist, that is the stream, endless stream. Your mind is caught in that. You are that stream. And we are asking whether the mind can be free of that stream, and if it is not free there will always be death. You understand? It's only the mind that is not caught in the stream, whether it is the technological stream, or the social stream, or the stream of this disorder in relationship, that stream is your life, that stream is you. You are the world and the world is you, that stream is you. Now when you die you still belong to that stream, don't you? Don't you? No? You are not an individual, are you? Individuality means indivisible, non-fragmentable, a human being who is not in fragments - fragments,

broken up, contradictory - only such a person is individual. But when the mind is caught in the stream he is no longer an individual, he is just like a million other people only he has got his peculiar characteristics, peculiar tendencies, idiosyncrasies, which are the response of his conditioning. So your character, your temperament, your tendency is the reaction of your conditioning, and that conditioning is the result of your culture, your society, your economic position and so on. So your tendency, your idiosyncrasy, your character, is nothing, that's not individuality. I wonder if you get all this. It doesn't matter, I'm going on.

So as long as the mind flows with the stream, the whole idea of a permanent ego, which is the invention of thought, permanent entity in the human mind doesn't exist. You all believe, you all are greedy, you are all envious, therefore you are pursuing, following, caught up in this stream. And in this stream there is death. You understand? And when a man says, 'Will I be born next life?' - you are following all this? I must tell you a story afterwards, rather an amusing story. When a man asks, shall I be born next life, what is he asking? Who is he to be born next life? You understand my question? Is there a permanent you? Is there a permanent you? Look at it clearly. What is the 'you'? Your furniture, your ambitions, your greed, your envy, your disorder, your sexual life, all that is you. And thought invents a super you, super self, and thought says, there must be something which is permanent, I like the idea of permanency. And you hope that permanent thing will be reborn. Right? You are following all this? There is nothing permanent in you, obviously.

You know, I was going to tell you a story, rather an amusing



one. I saw a cartoon the other day of two dogs sitting on a pavement watching human beings go by, with their cigars, cigarettes, drunk, quarrelling, you know, the whole stream of them going by, the business man with his hat and with his bag, the sannyasi, everybody goes by. One dog says to the other 'Reincarnation gives me the creeps because I don't want to be born to be like one of those.' Do you see the tragedy of this?

So there is this enquiry whether the mind can be free from time, which is death. Not that there is immortality. You understand? There is something far greater than immortality. Immortality, the very word means mortal and not mortal. As there is nothing permanent, nothing, your furniture, your bank account, nothing is permanent. All your beliefs, your gods, are all put together by thought. And thought is time. Now can the mind be free of this quality of time? You have understood now? Therefore love is not time. Relationship, where there is disorder, is time. Where there is order time doesn't enter at all.

So we are asking whether the mind can be free of time. It can only be free when there is complete observation of facts as they are, and going beyond them, and that requires energy. When the mind is greedy, envious, brutal, telling things which are not true, fearful, then it is caught in the field of time. And to see this, see it, not merely verbally, with your eyes or with your mind, but to see the totality of it, then the mind becomes extraordinarily free of time. You can't practise this. You understand? There is no way to it. You can read all the books in the world, and follow all the gurus in the world, but this is the central factor of human existence, time. Time is knowledge, time is the past, time, the past through the

present to the future, that is time. Thought has put together all our human behaviour, social structure, everything that man is doing is based on thought. And we are asking, though knowledge must exist to function, to go to the office, to drive a car, you need knowledge, there you need time, but we are asking a mind that is caught in greed, envy, ambition, violence, imitation, conformity, and all the rest of it, can that which is the product of thought, which is the product of time and therefore death, can the mind be free of time? Please listen to this. Because the mind itself is the product of time. Right? It has evolved, it has grown, it has structured in time. And the mind is asking itself whether it can be free of time. That's a wrong question. You have understood? All that it can do is to observe the movement of time. Just to observe without resistance, without trying to go beyond time, just to observe it. That means the mind being completely attentive and at the moment, at the second of attention there is no time. You have understood this?

This is meditation, sir. You understand? We will talk about it tomorrow evening, this whole question of meditation and the implication of meditation. But if you don't understand this, which is order that comes out of the flowering of disorder, not the suppression of disorder, seeing what is disorder, out of that comes order; without order you will never have love, there is no love. That means you have to understand relationship. Your wife, your husband, your children, how you bring them up, a new kind of education, not just the passing of examinations, getting a job and all the filthy business of it. And you have to understand the meaning of the content of the mind, the unconscious as well as the conscious content. And to see this as a whole, not as fragments, to

see it as a whole is to be totally attentive, totally attentive to that insult or to that flattery at the moment of flattery or insult, totally attentive. You understand? Then there is no recording. Therefore in relationship, when there is attention, there is no image building, then you are related. That attention means love, care, responsibility.

So a mind that is free of time is a mind that has total order. Such a mind is really the truly religious mind.

## **SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 16TH JULY 1972.**

I wonder why you have all come. I think that is a good question to ask you: whether you have come out of curiosity, or you have problems that you want to be solved by someone else, or you are serious, profoundly concerned with the happenings in the world, and being serious desirous earnestly to solve these appalling, frightening problems that one has around one. So one must ask oneself, it seems to me, why you are here - curiosity, wanting your personal problems solved, or seeing the extraordinary things that are going on in the world - the sorrow, the violence, the division of nationalities, political, religious, separative issues. So one must be, it seems to me at least, very clear for oneself why you are all here. I know why I am here: I want to say something very clearly and very definitely. I have spoken for the last fifty years, all over the world, except in Russia and China, and in observing all these years the state of the world, the state of human beings and their relationship with each other, one sees very clearly that the problem is not only external but much more deeply inward. And without solving the complex, inward issues, merely to be concerned with the outward phenomenon has very little significance. And I feel, observing all this, that one must take a totally different action, enter into a totally different dimension, neither belonging to any religion, organized religion, or any country, any politics, totally uncommitted so that one can look clearly, objectively, sanely at all the phenomenon that is going on around us and within us. That is why I happen to be here.

And obviously one cannot tell why you are here. It may be out

of habit, it is a nice place, Saanen, lovely mountains, a holiday, beautiful mountains with snow - you know - all that. But if you are here, and I hope you are, for a serious purpose, then we have a relationship with each other, otherwise we have no relationship whatsoever. That is clear, isn't it? If you and I are both serious in understanding this whole phenomenon of existence, not only the outward but also much more deeply inward, and be totally concerned with the resolution of this problem, then you and I, the speaker and you who listen, have relationship, then we can move together, then we can think together, and share together. And sharing, thinking together, investigating together and therefore creating together, is communication. I hope I am making myself clear. We cannot communicate with each other if you are interested merely in trying to solve a particular little problem of your own, which we will deal with presently, later on during these talks, or if you are merely curious what that chap has to say from India with his strange philosophy, or exotic nonsense, then I am afraid you and I will have no communication. Because the speaker is not bringing or talking about any particular system of philosophy. Philosophy implies the understanding of truth in daily life, in daily action, which has nothing whatsoever to do with Christianity, with Buddhism, with Hinduism or any culture.

So if we are really very earnest, and the time demands that we be earnest, then we must see very clearly, objectively, non-personally, this whole world as it is - the world that is divided, that is broken up by nationalities, by religious beliefs, whether that religious belief be the beliefs of politics, ideologies, the communist, socialist, religious, sectarian beliefs, dogmas, each

fighting the other and trying to bring about a unity and keeping themselves separate. There are wars, there is all this political chicanery and the slow speed of bringing human beings together through politics. You know all this. And I wonder if you are aware of it intellectually, verbally; or you are aware of it with your heart, with your whole mind.

So one has to first find out for oneself how deeply you are aware of this division between man and man, through nationalities, through religious beliefs, through belonging to this set, that set, following that guru, or another guru, this system or that system - they are all divisions. And through divisions there can never be unity of mankind. Now how deeply is one aware of this phenomenon? Intellectually, admit that it exists, verbally assert it, or does one feel this extraordinary division between human beings, between a wife and a husband, between friends, division of colour, race, classes and so on - how deeply is one aware of it? Then if one is aware of it in the normal sense of that word, which is to be concerned, to know all the implications of this division - then what is one to do? Right?

What is a human being, you, to do, act, in a world that is so divided - the outer and the inner, conscious, the unconscious, the division of the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the technician and the layman - you follow - the artist, the businessman, the hippie, the long haired, the short haired, the whole division. Now if you are aware of it, what is one to do? Do you ask that question casually, in the sense that this division will eventually end some thousand years later, therefore it depends on its outer environment, political, certain political systems and so on,

therefore you take it casually? Or it is a problem that demands your immediate attention and action, which means you are intense about it, you want to solve it with your whole being? So that is why we asked why you are here? Are you aware of this division between man and man which has existed for thousands and thousands of years, not only outwardly but in himself divided, in himself in conflict, in himself fighting, battling to become, to be, to fulfil, to assert, to dominate?

And there is also this question which is: what is one to do, how is one to act? A collective response or the response of freedom of a human being, and therefore in that freedom act collectively - you have understood? We must act collectively because great changes are demanded, deep psychological revolution is necessary, not mere physical revolution, not throwing bombs and killing thousands of people in the name of order, in the name of a new society, in the name of peace. What is demanded, what is necessary as one observes, which is not a dogmatic statement on the part of the speaker, is that there must be deep, psychological revolution. Is that revolution to be brought about by a collective action? That is, through different types of education, so forcing the individual, the human being, through conditioning him to behave properly which they are doing, and therefore denying total freedom to the human being, though it may bring about a collective action. Or in freeing the mind from conditioning and therefore freedom, and in that freedom bring about a co-operative action. Are we communicating with each other? Am I making myself clear? Good.

So we are not emphasizing the individual or the collective, because the world is divided that way. Neither emphasizing the

individual freedom and therefore allowing himself to do what he likes, or the collective action which will drown the individual. But we are talking about something entirely different, neither this nor that. Right?

You see human beings are so disorderly, so self concerned, so utterly selfish, and so religious throughout the world with their beliefs, dogmas, rituals, saviours, and all the rest of that circus, have tried to condition man to behave through fear. You can see it in Christianity, you can see it in Buddhism, you can see it in every kind of organized religion - you understand? Condition human minds through fear. And modern psychologists from what they have told me, and those psychologists who have come to see me and discussed the matter with me, they are the prominent ones who are trying to condition man through non punishment but through reward. It is the same thing. It is two sides of the same coin. Because man must behave, he must become sane, orderly, have right relationship with human beings, whether black, brown, coloured or whatever it is. And as human beings apparently cannot be controlled, cannot be made to behave, therefore they impose authority, conditioning through fear and reward, or offering security, physical or psychological - you are following all this? May I go on? I'll go on anyhow because it interests me tremendously because we must create a different kind of people, different kind of human mind, which doesn't belong to the past, which is neither left nor right, which is entirely different.

So seeing all this, there must be collective action in which the human being is totally free, and whether that freedom can bring about harmony in relationship and therefore in behaviour - you are



following? So that is our problem: how a human mind, your mind, which has been so conditioned by the past, through the present to the future, how can such a mind be changed radically? So that is one question, whether it will take time, time being gradually, taking several years, or as the Asiatics say, several lives, which is the same thing. Or is it to be brought about by instant perception? You are following all this? That is, my mind, suppose, my mind is conditioned as a Catholic, Buddhist, Communist, whatever it is. I realize that it is conditioned, not as an idea or as a speculative formula, but actually I realize it is conditioned. Now will it change through analysis, analytical processes or through pressure, which is reward and punishment, or is there a totally different approach to this problem - right?

Please you are sharing this with the speaker, you are not just listening to his talk, which is not of very great importance if you merely listen to it as casually accepting certain words and denying it, agreeing, or disagreeing, but if you share in it, that means actually communicate with each other, sharing, then you will have to find out for yourself whether time is involved in this problem - time being a long period through which you have to go through analytically, either doing it for yourself or done by another, or compelled by circumstances and environment to bring about that change, all implying time. Or is there a totally different approach to this question? Have I explained the question properly? Good.

Now what do you think? What do you in yourself, how do you look at this problem because we are sharing this together, we are exploring this together. The speaker is not an authority, nor your beastly guru, nor are you his followers. We are human beings,

trying to resolve this immense problem of existence; and therefore if you are serious we have to share this thing together. Therefore you have to listen - you understand? Listen not only to what the speaker is saying, but also to your reactions, your own thoughts, your own feelings. You have this problem put before you: man has said you cannot possibly change the human mind instantly but it needs time, gradually bring about this radical human revolution psychologically and therefore allow time. All that has been said in the past and in the present - you are following this? This has been their philosophy, their attitude, their assertion: you cannot change the human mind, which has been so conditioned, instantly.

Now we are going to find out whether this idea - it is really an idea, you follow, a formula that the human mind cannot be changed radically, psychologically instantly, it must have time. That is a concept, it is a supposition, it is a theory. Now the word theory means - the root meaning of that word means to behold - you understand? Theory means to have an insight. Now follow that. You have an insight into something, then from that insight you formulate an idea, a concept, and act according to that concept. Now how is a mind, that is so heavily conditioned as ours are, whether we acknowledge it or not, consciously as well as deeply - conditioned being the past, whether that past is of yesterday or a thousand yesterdays, that is conditioning - now how is that mind to free itself from its conditioning so that it is free to behave properly, to establish true relationship with another, to have relationship in which there is love, not division? Now how do you set about this? Now you have understood the problem, I hope, now how do you set about it? What is the truth of this? Not according to any

psychologist, modern or ancient, not according to any religious teacher - wipe out all that, if you can, and look at it. Can you wipe out your associations with any group, with any particular system, with any particular ideology, can you? I am afraid you can't. To wipe out means to stand completely alone - right? Then you can face the problem. Are you doing this?

Q: Yes, I am.

K: No sir, don't say that. It is one of the most difficult things to stand alone in the world. You understand? Not to belong to any nation, except perhaps to have a passport, not belong to any ideology, not to belong to any particular kind of activity, left or right, not to repeat a single word that you yourself have not known. So that there is integrity, because if you belong to any organization, any group, follow any guru, anyone, you are not being honest. It means to be able to stand completely alone in a world that is so disorderly, divided, full of antagonism, bitterness and falsehood - can you do that? No, sorry, either you do it, or you don't do it. You can't say, "Well I just belong to this little particular group, but I really am free from all that". You know when there is no integrity, when there is no honesty and virtue, systems, organizations become tremendously important. Haven't you noticed it? Then the organizations, systems control the mind; but if the mind is really honest, straight, clear, then no system is required because it is totally virtuous. I wonder if you follow all this?

So we have this problem in front of us: how is a mind that is so controlled, shaped, by environment, conditioned by various influences, by or through the education that one has, competition, aggression, violence, you know all that, how is such a mind to free

itself so that it is totally, wholly free and sane? Now how would you, who are also very intellectual, who have read so much, how do you solve this problem? You understand my question, how will you solve it? Wait a minute, madam, don't answer yet, we will discuss after I have spoken this morning, and also there are going to be discussions for a whole week after the first seven talks. How would you solve this? Would you rely on anybody to solve it? That means the authority - right? Whether the authority of the analyst, psychologist, the priest or the authority of a saviour, you know the whole business, would you put your faith, belief, in somebody to solve this problem? Go on sirs, answer it to yourself. You see unfortunately we do because we say, "I don't know, I don't know how to solve this problem, it is too complex. I haven't given enough time to it, I haven't really thought about it. And somebody has given time, gone into it greatly and I will accept what he says". And you say, "Why not, he knows, I don't". So you make him into the authority and therefore you are living a secondhand life - you follow? And this is not a secondhand issue, it is your issue, you have to solve it, not through somebody, not having faith in something. We have played that game for thousands of years, in your gurus, in your saviours, in your masters, you know in your professionals, we haven't changed, therefore it is your problem, therefore you cannot possibly rely on anybody, especially the speaker. Right? The speaker means me! (Laughter)

So can you discard what another says you should think or do, so that you are face to face with yourself, directly first-hand - you understand my question? Therefore you put aside all authority, except the authority of law, which says keep to the right of the

road, or pay tax - you follow? I am not talking about that kind of authority. The authority on which you depend for your belief, in which you have faith, in whom you acknowledge that someone else knows more than you do about yourself. So it brings you totally to yourself and therefore you have tremendous energy - you are following this? I waste energy in listening to somebody else, following somebody else, putting my faith in something - in a society, in a community, in a person, in an idea, in some system. That is a waste of energy. Whereas when I discard totally the dependence on another for my behaviour, for my integrity, for my honesty, for my sanity, then I have tremendous energy to look at what I am. Are you doing this? Do it, then it is fun discussing with you. Because this needs tremendous energy, to stand alone.

So now we are asking the question: can this mind which has been conditioned, the conditioning is both at the superficial level and also at the deep unconscious level, the totality of it, can that be radically transformed? If you put that question seriously to yourself then you and I have a relationship in investigating the question - you understand? Therefore you are not taking sides. It is you who are investigating, not through the eyes of somebody else. Now how do you investigate? I have this problem, how do I investigate it? I cannot investigate it if I want to get through it to reach an end - right? I say that I will investigate it to find a different state, I will investigate it in order to be free - then it is not investigation. You have already started with a motive, and that motive is going to direct your investigation - right? Therefore the mind must be free of every motive in order to investigate. Are you doing this? Because you see one sees so much suffering in the world, the poor,

the starving, the people who live in the ghetto, the overpopulated, underdeveloped countries, where poverty is a curse, there is all this physical illness, poverty. And there are other kinds of suffering - suffering created by man in his division, the wars - you know the sorrow, don't you? One sees this, feels this, one is aware of it, both the inward sorrow, as well as the outward sorrow. And one has to respond, one has to solve it, one can't just say, well it is part of existence, it is the inevitability of human nature and so on and so on and so on. You have to solve it, you have to go beyond it. And we have the intelligence to go beyond it. And that intelligence comes into being only when you don't depend on anybody, when you are face to face with yourself and with the problem. Intelligence is after all the capacity of total energy in application - you have understood?

So now I have the energy, I don't depend on anybody - right? Can you honestly, seriously, say that you don't depend on anybody - your friend, your environment, your guru, your book, have a faith in something, or believing in something - which doesn't mean that you become agnostic or all that silly stuff? You are a human being completely with yourself, resolving the human problem of existence and therefore not somebody else resolving your problems.

As we said, investigation demands energy, energy is the application of intelligence and intelligence cannot be if you are looking to another. He may be intelligent, but if you look to him you are ignorant. Right? Now how do you investigate? Who is the investigator? It is no good saying to oneself "I am going to investigate" without trying to find out who the investigator is.

Sorry, is this becoming too complex? All right.

I say I want to investigate into this problem of the mind, which is me, my mind, I want to investigate it - why it is conditioned, to what depth is it conditioned and whether it can wholly be free from that conditioning? Because then only I can have a right relationship with another human being. Because my conditioning divides me and brings about a division between you and me. My image of me is the dividing factor. So I must find out first who is the investigator. Is it one part of the many fragments of the 'me' who is investigating - you are following - one part, one fragment says, "I will investigate into the different fragments", which is the 'me' that is conditioned - right? So one part assumes the authority, the capacity to investigate the other part. One part is broken up and against the other part. So is that investigation when one part assumes the authority, or the part who investigates the other fragments? Therefore that is not investigation. It is a conclusion which says, I will investigate - you see it? Good. It is a conclusion, you follow? And that conclusion brings about a division. So to investigate there must be no conclusion, no hypothesis - if you have a hypothesis, the meaning of that word is foundation, if you start from a foundation, which is inevitably a conclusion, then when you investigate with the conclusion, it brings about a division, therefore it is not an investigation. Have you understood this? If you see this clearly you will proceed further.

So is my mind, which is investigating, free from a conclusion? Which is, I will investigate, a conclusion is the will - right? Oh come on sirs. When I say, I will investigate into myself, it is a conclusion brought about by my desire to understand, to go

beyond, to reach a certain dimension in which all this misery doesn't exist, it is a conclusion, it is the action of will that says, "I will investigate" - right? So can my mind be free of that conclusion? Otherwise I cannot investigate. It is like a scientist, if he wants to investigate, he looks, he doesn't start with a conclusion, then he is not a scientist, he is just a - I don't know what he is.

So, to investigate, to enquire is to be free of any conclusion. Therefore the mind then is now clear, fresh. And when you proceed then is there an investigator at all? Then there is only observation, not investigation - you get it? Got it sir? Therefore such a mind is not broken up, only it is capable of observing. Observing, which means having insight without conclusion therefore continuous insight. Are you getting all this? So the mind is free to observe and therefore act totally.

Would you like to ask any questions? I am sorry to force you all to observe!

Q: Can you state more clearly, exactly your attitude towards psychoanalysis and neurosis?

K: I wonder how many of us are neurotic? - which means not sane. Obviously any man who belongs to any nationality is not sane, or follows any guru, or any authority, is not sane - right? Sanity means whole, the word means whole, healthy. How can a mind that is healthy belong to any group, to any tribe which is the extended nationalism, or follow anybody? Right? So when one says, who is neurotic? I am afraid most of us are.

And, the questioner asks, would you please explain clearly, more clearly your attitude towards psychoanalysis. Are you interested in it? I don't know why people get analysed. When the



analyser himself is so terribly conditioned why should you put yourself in the hands of that conditioned human being? When you yourself are conditioned, slightly in balance, more or less, that is up to you, why should such a person hand himself over to an analyst, you know what he is, he is conditioned according to his study, his Jung, Freud, this, that and the other, and also he is conditioned by his own worries, his own family, his relationship, his position in society, you know all that.

So analysis implies examination doesn't it, to analyse means to break up. The word analysis means to break up, the dictionary meaning. And we are broken up human beings, right? - contradictory, there is self-contradiction in ourselves, we are different fragments, we are happy, unhappy, we are dishonest, honest, we hate - you follow? Broken up. And analysis implies the analyser, either outside, the professional, or the analyser who is yourself inwardly - you are following this? I analyse myself, I have to find out who the analyser is before I trot out the analysis. Who am I that is going to analyse myself. Right? Who am I? Well I'll examine myself why I behave this way or that way, why I do this or that. One part of me examines - right? And so that part brings about a division among other parts. Now is there analysis if there are no parts? Oh come on sirs. Of course not. So my concern is not analysis but to see if there is the possibility of bringing about total harmony. And this cannot be brought about by integration. That is putting, adding parts to the broken parts to make it whole - you are following all this? Integration implies adding parts to make a whole. And who is the person who adds - we come back to the same thing.

So to me analysis is a waste of time because I can go on analysing myself to the end of my days, creating conflict in myself by saying, this is right, this is wrong - you follow? Beating myself sick, which is neurotic. Whereas my question is: can I see, observe wholly without division? And to observe wholly is sanity. So I must watch how my mind is operating - watch, observe, not correct it, not shape it, not say I must be whole, I must be sane, which is insane, but watch. So it depends how the mind watches. Does it watch with a conclusion, with a condemnation, with a judgement, with evaluation, with previous memories? So it can only watch when the mind is completely free to observe. And you do that if you have got tremendous interest and vitality. Right.

## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 18TH JULY 1972.**

We were saying the other day how important it is that seeing what the various types of organizations are, both religious, secular, and social structure, how corrupt they inevitably are, and to belong to any of them prevents not only the unburdening of one's conditioning but also prevents one from seeing things clearly. So we said that it is important to stand completely alone, not belonging to any group, sect, following any guru, or teacher, and being able to stand completely alone so that we can bring about quite a different kind of society. That is what we were more or less saying the day before yesterday morning.

I do not know if you see the importance of it. I do not know if you recognize, or have an insight into this question. Because most of us are very confused, we don't know what to do, there are so many demands, pressures, that most of us lean on somebody - we want to be guided, we want to be told what to do. In ourselves we have no clarity and naturally there are those who say that they are very clear, that they are in a state of enlightenment, or freedom, and so on. And being uncertain, confused ourselves we more or less yield to their persuasion, and so become not only more conditioned but accept a new form of conditioning. I don't know if you see the importance of this. Because if we are so conditioned it is inevitable that our mind becomes almost mechanical - right?

Please, you know as we said the other day we are sharing this thing together, and I really mean it. We are thinking over these problems together and therefore understanding it together. It is not, I telling you what to think or how to think, but rather together

investigate, understand, have an insight into all these problems so that you are very clear at the end of it. So that in that clarity you stand alone. Because one must create, or bring about a totally different kind of society, a totally different kind of human being, and more and more as one sees what is happening in the world the greater demand of such a human being.

And it is only the mind that is really capable of standing alone, in the sense of not belonging to any group, to any party, any community, any set of dogmas, beliefs, conclusions, it is only such a mind that can be creative. I think we have to go into that question of what is creation, what it is to be creative because if that is not clear we are apt to follow those things that make the mind more and more mechanical, more and more dependent, more and more attached. You see this.

So what is creation? What is it to be creative? Because if you are not creative inevitably you will be fragmented, accept authority, follow all the absurdities of escapes. So one has to understand very clearly for oneself what it means to be creative in this world - right? I do not know what that word means to you. It is not, surely, creating some physical thing which is new - new invention, new mode of speech, new painting, new kind of music. We are talking of a mind that is alone and therefore capable of being creative - right? Most of us are in conflict, most of us are caught in various kinds of demands, not only physical but environmental, social and so on. We depend on each other both physically and psychologically and therefore our whole nature, psychological structure, is fragmented - right? You are following this? Please observe it in yourself. Can a mind that is fragmented,

contradictory in itself, be creative? Or does creation take place when there is this absence of the continuity of fragmentation? I don't know if you follow all this? Does it interest you? Because you see if we are not creative in the deeper sense of that word, into which we are going, we are bound to escape from the central fact of deep frustration - right? And the escapes become very important, whether they are religious escapes, political escapes, sexual escapes, or escapes into good works. So the escapes become all important and not the factor of this fragmentation in which a mind is caught - right? Please do follow this. And observing this in oneself, how one is fragmented, contradictory, being pulled by different desires, demands, how is a mind to be free in which alone there can be creation?

First of all do you know what it means to have an insight? Do you know what takes place when you have an insight into something? Say for instance, you have an insight into the whole religious organization, let's take that for an example. An insight, see what is implied in it, how corrupt it is, how false it is. Now that insight you can only have when the mind is not conditioned, is not attached to any particular form of belief - right? Now having an insight into the religious structure, then you draw a conclusion from that - right? When you draw a conclusion you are terminating that insight - right? You put an end to that insight when you draw a conclusion which you perceive through the insight. Is that clear?

Now look: I must make this very clear so that you understand it. I see very clearly belonging to any political party, which is nationalistic, run by people who are utterly corrupt, people who are working for themselves in the name of the party, wanting power,

position, and all the rest of it, I have an insight into that. Not through book knowledge, not through reading, but actually see it. From that perception I draw a conclusion - right? I see all politicians, all politics are dreadful. Now when I have drawn a conclusion I have terminated that insight. Right? So I act from that conclusion not from that insight. Right? So my action from a conclusion is mechanical - you follow this? And being mechanical then I say, "How terrible to live mechanically, I want to escape". I join a community, I become whatever I do, escaping from the mechanical process of living, which is the result of a conclusion which came when I had an insight into something. You get it? You see the sequence of it? So when I act on a conclusion my action must be continuously mechanical, though at the beginning I may have had an insight into it - right? Now if one doesn't draw a conclusion at all but only insight then action is non mechanical. Therefore that action is always creative, always new, it is always living. So a mind that has insight and doesn't draw a conclusion and therefore acts, is in the movement of continuous insight, constant insight. Have you got it? Have you understood this? Understand, not verbally but actually see the truth of this, as you see the truth of a precipice.

Now this constant insight without a formula, without a conclusion which puts an end to that insight, is creative action - have you got it? Please look at it, go into it yourself. It is astonishingly beautiful and interesting, how the mind, which is thought, is absent when you have an insight - you follow? Thought cannot have an insight. It is only when the mind is not mechanically operating in the structure of thought, then you have

an insight - right? Having an insight, thought draws a conclusion from that insight. And then thought acts and thought is mechanical - right? Are we following each other? So I have to find out whether the insight into myself, myself being the world and world is me, and I am the world, having an insight into myself, which means into the world, and not drawing a conclusion from it, and if I draw a conclusion I act on an idea, on an image, on a symbol which is the structure of thought, and so I am constantly preventing myself from having insight, preventing from understanding things as they are. So I have to go into this whole question of why thought interferes and draws a conclusion when there is a perception? You have understood my question?

I perceive something to be true, I perceive that to control oneself - listen to this carefully - to control oneself brings about a division in myself - right? The controller and the controlled and therefore conflict. I have an insight into that, that is the truth, but my whole thinking process is conditioned on the idea that I must control, my education, my religion, the society in which I live, the family structure, everything says to me 'control', which is the conclusion which has been handed to me, which is the conclusion which I have also acquired, and I act according to that conclusion, which is mechanical. And therefore I live in constant strife - right? Now I have an insight into this whole problem of control. So I have an insight which came into being when the mind was free to observe, unconditioned, but this whole structure of conditioning still remains - you are following all this? So there is now a mind that says, "By Jove, I have seen this thing very clearly, but I am also caught in the habit of control". So there is a battle - you are

following? The one is mechanical, the other is non-mechanical - right? Now why does thought cling to the whole structure of control - you are following? Because thought has brought about this idea of control - right? You see this? No?

What does it mean to control? First it implies suppression - right? Division in oneself, which is one part, one segment of me says, I must control the other segments. That division is created by thought - no? Are you clear? The division is created by thought. Thought says, I must control myself because otherwise I would not adapt myself to the environment, to what people say and so on and so on, therefore I must control. So thought being the response of memory, and memory is the past, memory is the experience, the knowledge, which are all mechanical, has such immense power. So there is constant battle between perception, insight and the conditioning.

Now what is the mind to do? You understand? This is our problem. You see something new but the old is still there - the old habits, the old ideas, the beliefs, all that is tremendously waiting. Now how is the mind to sustain an insight without a conclusion at all times? Because if I have a conclusion it is mechanical, the conclusion is the result of thought, is the result of memory - right? From memory there is a reaction as thought. Then it becomes mechanical, then it becomes old. Now you experiment with me please.

You understand the question? There is insight, seeing something new, seeing something totally new, clear, beautiful, and there is this past with all the memories, experience, knowledge, and from that the thought that is cautious, watching, afraid, how to



bring the new into the old. Now when you see this question, when you see this problem clearly, what takes place? Have you understood my question? We are the result of the past, though the younger generation may try to break away from the past, and think they are free to create a new world, they are not free from the past. They are re-acting to the past and therefore continuing with the past. I don't know if you follow this - right? It is not a break with the past, but a modified continuity of the past. I see this: I see what thought has done, and also I see very clearly there is clear perception that insight exists only when there is absence of thought - right? Now how do you solve this problem? I do not know if you have thought about it, and perhaps you are thinking about it for the first time, looking at it for the first time, and how do you respond to this, how does the mind respond to this?

Let me put the question differently. Mind must have knowledge: I must know where I live. It must know the language it speaks. It must exercise thought - thought which is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, which is the past. It must operate otherwise there would be no communication between you and me, I wouldn't know where I lived and all the rest of it and the absurdities begin, if I am not capable of thinking clearly. So I see knowledge is necessary to function in the mechanical world - right? Going from here to the place I live is mechanical, speaking a language is mechanical, acting from knowledge is mechanical, acting from all kinds of experience is mechanical. And that mechanical process to a certain extent must continue. That is my insight. You have got it? So there is no contradiction between knowledge and the freedom of knowledge when there is an insight.

I wonder if I am making it clear.

The insight I have now, that knowledge is necessary, and there is also the insight which comes when there is the absence of thought. So there is perception, insight all the time, not a contradiction. I wonder if you see this?

See the difficulty of putting into words what I want to convey. I want to convey to you that a mind that is constantly operating upon a conclusion becomes inevitably mechanical, and being mechanical it must escape into some kind of illusion, some kind of mythology, some kind of religious circus - right? And you have an insight into that. You say, "By Jove, how true that is". Now if you draw a conclusion from that insight, you have moved to a different place but it is still mechanical. I don't know if you see it. So when you have constant insight without conclusion, that state of mind is creative - not the mind that is in conflict and through conflict produces pictures, books, you understand? Not the mind that is in conflict, it can never be creative. Now if you see that, that is an insight, isn't it? You can see it, we'll take that up.

You know in literature, in the world of art, and so on, people say, he is a great artist, he is a great creative writer - right? Now if you look behind the literature, the author, you will see that he is in conflict daily - with his wife, with his family, with society, he is ambitious, he is greedy, wants power, position, prestige. And he has certain talents for writing. Through tensions, through conflict, he may write very good books but he is not creative in the deep sense of the word? And we are trying to see if each one of us can be creative in the deep sense of that word, not in expression, that is, writing a book, poem, or whatever it is, but having insight and

never drawing a conclusion from that insight, so that you are moving constantly from insight to insight, action to action. That is spontaneity.

Now such a mind must obviously be alone - alone in the sense of not being isolated. You know the difference between isolation and being alone? Do you? No? Oh good Lord, must I explain every word? I am isolated when I build a wall of resistance round myself - right? I resist. I resist through any criticism, to any new idea, I am afraid, I want to protect myself, I don't want to be hurt. And therefore that brings about in my action a self-centred activity which is an isolating process. Is that clear? And most of us are isolating ourselves. I have been hurt and I don't want to be hurt. The memory of that hurt remains and therefore I resist. Or I believe in Jesus or Krishna, or whatever it is, and I resist any question of doubt, anything criticizing my belief because I have taken security in my belief - right? That isolates. That isolation may be of thousands of people, millions of people, but it is still isolation. When I say I am a Catholic, I am isolating myself, or a communist or whatever it is, isolating myself. And aloneness is entirely different, it is not the opposite of isolation but having - listen to this carefully - but having an insight into isolation that insight is aloneness - have you got it?

So: I do not know if you have noticed - which we will go into much more deeply on a different occasion - mind is completely alone when it is in the state of dying. You know death is the final state of complete isolation - right? You are leaving everything behind, all your works, your ideas, you are completely isolated through fear of that thing - right? And that isolation is wholly

different from understanding the whole nature of death. If you have an insight into that, you are alone. I wonder if you are getting this? I see you are not understanding this. Leave that for the moment, we'll come back to it.

So, a mind that is free has insight every minute, a mind that is free has no conclusion and therefore non-mechanical. Such a mind is in action, non-mechanical action because it sees the fact, the insight into everything each minute - right. Therefore it is constantly moving, alive, and therefore such a mind is always young, fresh and incapable of being hurt: whereas the mechanical mind is capable of being hurt.

So thought, upon which all our civilizations are built, becomes mechanical, all our civilizations are mechanical. I don't know if you are following all this? And therefore corrupt. Therefore to belong to any organization is to become corrupt, or allow oneself to be corrupted - right? Now that is an insight, isn't it? Now can you move from that insight to another insight and keep moving, which is living, and therefore relationship becomes a totally different thing - right? Our relationships are based on conclusions, aren't they? Do watch this, please do have an insight into this and you will see how extraordinary a change takes place in your relationships - if you have really insight into this.

First of all our relationship is mechanical, which means our relationship is based on ideas, on a conclusion, on images - no? I have an image about my wife, or she has an image about me - image in the sense of knowledge, a conclusion, experience - and from that conclusion, knowledge, image, she acts, and she adds to that image, conclusion, through action as the other does, as the man

does. So the relationship is between two conclusions - I don't know if you see? And therefore mechanical. You may call it love, you may sleep together, but it is mechanical. Being mechanical then you want excitement - religious excitement, psychological excitement, and every form of entertainment, escape from this mechanical relationship. You divorce and try to find another woman or man who will have something new but it soon becomes mechanical - right? So our relationships are based on this mechanical process. Now if you have an insight into this, see it as it actually is - the pleasure, the so-called love, the so-called antagonism, the frustrations, you know the images, conclusions that you have built about her and about yourself. Now if you have an insight into that, all that disappears, doesn't it? You no longer have an image, which is a conclusion. I wonder if you are following all this? So your relationship is direct, not through an image. And our relationship is based on thought, on the intellect - right? Which is mechanical, and that has nothing whatsoever to do with love, obviously. I may say, I love my wife, but it is not the actual fact. I love the image which I have about her when she is not attacking me, you know all the rest of it. So I discover that relationship means the freedom from images, conclusions, and therefore relationship means responsibility and love - you follow all this? Which is not a conclusion, you understand?

So my brain is the storehouse of various knowledge, experiences, and memories, hurts, images, which is thought - right? Do see this. And my brain, which is yours as well as mine, my brain is conditioned through time, through evolution, through growth. And its function is to live in complete security, naturally,

otherwise it can't function, and so it builds a wall round itself as belief, dogma, the prestige, power, position - all that, it builds that around itself as a means to be completely secure. I don't know if you have followed all this? Have you watched your own brain operating. Then you will find that it can function remarkably well, logically, sanely when it is not frightened. That means when it has complete security - right? Now is there complete security? So being uncertain of complete security, it then proceeds to conclude that there is security. It makes a conclusion. You are following this? So conclusion becomes its security. Is this too much? Are you following all this? Look sir, I am frightened, I see I can only function, the brain can only function, when there is really happy, enjoyable security. But I can't enjoy it because I am frightened, I may lose my job, my wife, this and you follow? I am frightened. And so through fear I invest my energy in a belief, in a conclusion, that becomes my security. Therefore that belief, that conclusion, may be an illusion, a myth, a nonsense, but it is my security. People who believe in all the business of churches, and all that, it is an absolute myth, and that is my security - right? So I find security in a belief, or in a neurotic behaviour - right? - because to behave neurotically is also a form of security.

So the brain can only function freely, fully in complete security - right? So it must have security whether it is real or false, or illusory or non-existent, it will invent a security - right? Now I see that there is no security in belief, in a conclusion, in any person, in any social structure, in any leader, in following anybody. I see that there is no security in that - right? So I have security in seeing, in having insight. I wonder if you see it? There is security in insight,

not in conclusion. I give it up! Have you got it? Not from me, for yourself, have you captured it, is it real to you?

So we have this problem: this problem of a mind that, or the brain that can only function in complete order, in complete security, in complete certainty, otherwise it gets deranged, neurotic - right? Therefore I see that any person, myself included, who belongs to any organization, putting his faith in an organization, his faith in a leader, is a neurotic action - right? What is the security that a mind has when it has discarded all this? You understand? Its security is in the insight which brings intelligence - right? Have you got it? Security is intelligence - right? Not in knowledge, not in experience, but in the insight of the value of knowledge and therefore that insight is the capacity of sustained intelligence, and in that there is security. Therefore that intelligence, that insight is never frightened. I don't know if you get all this. Do you get it sirs?

I don't know if it is the occasion, perhaps next time we meet, to go into this whole problem of fear, pleasure, enjoyment and that thing called joy.

But it would be a tremendous thing if we could, all of us together, understand this one thing: the nature of awareness, nature of perception, nature of insight - you understand? Because then the mind is free to live - you understand? To live, not live in conflict, in battle, in suspicion, in fear, being hurt and all the rest of it, the misery.

Now sirs, have you any questions?

Q: Today we hear about the new Jesus wave acting in the world, for instance in the USA among young people. Is there a spiritual power, Christ, at present acting on this earth?

K: You know if I live in an Indian village, a remote Indian village, I shall never have heard of Jesus, will I? I wouldn't know anything about Jesus, but I would know about my particular Jesus, Krishna - right? Or some other deity in which I have been brought up - you are following? So those people who have been conditioned for two thousand years in the Jesus mythology, break away from it and come back to it. Have you noticed it? Haven't you noticed it? You give up Jesus for one year, and in a couple of years pick it up again. You become a communist or a socialist, drop it and then go back to church. Or join a new cult. So you look at it carefully, now we will have an insight into this.

The whole western world is conditioned on a religious concept which is based on an idea, on thought, on a personal worship, as the saviour and all the rest of it. In India and in Asia, they are conditioned similarly by a different series of images, ideas, conclusions - right? Probably they have never heard of Jesus. In a Buddhist world they don't even consider Jesus. You are following all this? So there are different parts of the world conditioned by a religious concept - right? And the questioner asks: is there a new spiritual awakening? Right? Is there a new spiritual wave? Obviously the wave of the Indian concept of religion, you understand - or the Christian concept, Jesus - is not a new wave at all - right? It is the continuity of the old conditioned responses acting differently, but it is still conditioned responses - right? Let me put it differently.

When the speaker goes to India, there are various gurus with immense following, and the followers say, "This is a new wave, new spiritual awakening". And because they follow their old guru



it is not new, it is just a repetition of the old in a different form - right? So this is happening right through the world - the repetition of a conditioned mind, religiously, acting or not acting in a different way. To me, personally, that is not a spiritual awakening at all. Are you following all this? Obviously it can't be. If I become a Hindu, or I am a Hindu, I do all the circus involved in Hinduism, there is nothing new in it, I am going back repeating the old stuff. The newness lies in freedom, you understand? In freedom from being conditioned, so that I am neither a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu, nor Muslim.

Because to find out what truth is the mind must be free - right? It cannot be free if it accepts any authority of any church, or any saviour or any book. And a new spiritual awakening is only possible when there are some in the world, a few or many, or who have really gone into this whole problem deeply, and have freed themselves completely and stand completely alone, because it is only when people are alone, the human mind is alone, then it is possible to have real relationship with others. And it is only such a mind that can find out, can come upon that thing which is beyond time, beyond measure. Right? That is the real awakening, something totally new takes place. And that is your responsibility - right? Not just sitting here and listening to a speaker, agreeing or disagreeing, accepting a few ideas. But it is your responsibility to see that you, as a human being, are free from conditioning, stand alone and therefore live in integrity, honesty and virtue - and that is the new. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Our minds are automatic, limited, small, mechanical, how

am I, the questioner says, to be free of it. I have just explained. All right, let's go into it.

My mind is petty, mechanical, small, what am I to do with it? Right? Do you know your mind is small, petty, anxious, jealous, envious, competitive, comparing? Do you know it? Are you aware of your mind being like that? Yes? Oh for god's sake let's be honest sometimes. Right. I am aware of it. What shall I do?

When you say, I am aware of it - what do you mean by that word 'aware'? When you say, I know my mind is petty - what do you mean by that word 'know'? Please, this is important. Do you know it because you have compared your mind with another mind which is not petty? You understand my question? I say my mind is petty, narrow, stupid, dull, idiotic, neurotic. How do I know it? Because somebody has told me? Because I have compared it with another mind which I think is not neurotic, which I think is free - right? So do I discover my pettiness through comparison, through measurement? Right? Now, measurement, comparison is the factor that makes the mind petty. I don't know if you see this. Now this is an insight. You understand? I compare myself with you who are very clever, bright, clear eyed and nice looking, you know, compare, measure myself with you. And I say, 'My god, how dull I am'. What does that mean? Through comparison I have found that I am dull, and this is my education - you understand? I have been educated to compare myself always - in the school, in college, as I grow, compare, measure myself with another. Therefore I say to myself, why do I measure at all? Are you following all this? Why do I measure? If I don't measure, am I dull? I don't know. I have assumed through comparison I am dull. Please follow this. This is

an insight. And can the mind which is conditioned through centuries of education to compare - religiously, economically, socially, in every way to compare, measure - can that measurement come to an end? That is my first question. It can only come to an end if I have an insight into the stupidity of measurement. Why should I compare myself with you? You may be the most marvellous human being, the greatest saint on earth, or the saviour, why should I compare myself with you? I compare myself with you because I have been educated to compare - my brother is better than me, my uncle is much brighter than me - you follow? So I have an insight which says, don't compare, how silly. Now having an insight into that I stop comparing, then what am I? You are following? What am I? I don't know. Right? I really don't know. Are you following this? When you don't compare yourself with somebody, what are you? You are going to find out, aren't you? Right? You don't say, I am petty, small, bourgeois, limited, how ugly, this or that. I don't know. So I am going to find out - right? When I say, I am stupid, dull, narrow, I have come to a conclusion through comparison. A conclusion puts an end to insight. So the insight shows to me the futility of comparison. I won't compare. It is finished, forever. You understand? Therefore I am going to see what I am. The moment I reject comparison, I am no longer stupid because I have an insight into the whole structure of comparison. You have got it? Which is intelligence, which is greater than the comparative value of pettiness and greatness. You have got it? Right.

## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1972.**

You know I hope we gather here to be serious, and this is not an entertainment, something that you can just cursorily, casually attend when you want to and discard, and do other things, but I am sure most of us are serious here and so please refrain from taking all these pictures, photographs, tapes, or even notes because what is important is that we should listen, not give your attention to something else.

If I may, I would like to talk about something this morning, which seems to me rather important and perhaps it is the most fundamental problem of our life. And we should understand it not merely verbally but also go beyond the words and have a deep insight into what is being said. I can talk about it for an hour or more because I have gone into it pretty thoroughly in myself, but I would like, if I may, to share with you what I think is really important. You know the word 'share', means to share the beauty of a tree together, look at the river together, take interest, see all the movement, the colour, the shadows, together. And sharing implies a responsibility, that you and I, both of us, sharing together something when we look at the mountains, that feeling of extraordinary beauty, of great height and nobility, majesty. And sharing can only take place if you are also looking at the same thing at the same time, with the same intensity, otherwise you can't share it. And sharing implies also, doesn't it, that one has to listen, listen not to mere words and their reference and their dictionary meaning, not giving a particular meaning to that word which you may have, but rather listening to that word and the meaning of that

word in the dictionary. And when you can listen then we share something. And that I feel we should do in all these discussions and talks that we have here.

I think the central problem of our existence is thought, the whole machinery of thinking and, if I may, I would like to go into that because our civilization both in the east and in the west is based on thought, on the intellect. Thought is very limited, it is measurable, and thought has done the most extraordinary things in the world - the whole technological world, going to the moon, building houses that are comfortable for everybody if it is possible. But also thought has done a great deal of mischief - all the instruments of war, the destruction of nature, the pollution of the earth, and also thought, if one goes into it very deeply, has created the so-called religions throughout the world. Thought has been responsible for the mythology of the Christians with their saviours, popes, priests, salvation and all the rest of it. And also thought has been responsible for a particular kind of culture with its technological development, artistic, and the cruelties, the brutality in relationship, the class division and so on. This machinery of thought is mechanical, is a mechanistic philosophy, mechanistic physics, and thought has divided human beings as the 'me' and the not 'me', the 'we' and the 'they', the Hindu, the Buddhist, the communist, the young and the old, the hippies, non hippies, the established order and so on and so on and so on. All that structure is the result of thought. I think that is fairly clear, both religious, secular and political, including national.

Thought has created, as I said, an extraordinary world - the marvellous cities which are decaying, the quick transportation and

all that. And also thought has divided human beings in their relationship. Thought, which is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, divides human beings. That is, in our relationship with each other thought has built, through a series of incidents, activities, the image of the 'me' and the 'you'. The images that exist through constant interacting relationship. These images are mechanistic and therefore relationship becomes mechanical.

So there is not only the division brought about by thought in the outside world but also there is division in the human being inwardly. And one sees thought is necessary, absolutely necessary, otherwise you can't do anything. You can't go to your house, you can't write a book, you can't talk, you can do nothing without thinking. Thinking then is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, which is the past. Thought projects the future through the present, modifying it, shaping it, designing it as the future. I hope you are following all this? We are sharing this together, you are not merely listening to me.

So thought has a logical function, efficient, if it is not personal and the accumulated knowledge as science, and all the accumulation of ideas. Knowledge becomes important. but knowledge which is the known prevents the mind going beyond the present and the past. Thought can only function in the field of the known, though it may call the unknown according to its conditioning, to its knowledge of the known and project the unknown - right? And you observe this phenomenon right through the world - the ideal, the future, the 'what should be', what must happen according to the background, to the conditioning, to the education, to the environment. And thought is responsible also for

behaviour, the vulgarity, the crudeness, the brutality, the violence in all relationships and so on. And so thought is measurable.

Now I do not know if you have noticed, or thought about it, that the west is the explosion of Greece, which thought in terms of measure - right? Are you following all this? To them mathematics, logic, philosophy, all the things they discovered, which exploded on the west, is the result of measurement, which is thought. Right? Does this interest you? I am coming back to you presently.

Because without understanding the whole machinery of thought, what is its tremendous significance, meaning, where it becomes utterly destructive, meditation has no meaning. So unless you really understand, have a deep insight into the whole machinery of thinking you cannot possibly go beyond it. Haven't you noticed that in the east, India exploded over the whole of Asia, not the modern Indians, the ancient Indians - the modern Indians are just like you - romantic, vulgar, superstitious, frightened, grabbing money, wanting position, power, prestige, following some guru, you know all that business that goes on in the rest of the world, only they are a different colour, different climate, different morality, partially. So the ancient Indians, not that I have read any scriptures but I have observed a great deal, which is good enough. They said measurement is illusion because when you can measure something it is very limited and if you base all your structure, all your morality, all your existence on measurement, which is thought, then you can never be free. Therefore they said, at least according to what I have observed, that the immeasurable is the real and the measurable is the unreal, which they call Maya.

But you see thought, as the intellect, the capacity to understand,

to observe, to be able to logically think together, to design, to construct, thought shaped the human mind, human behaviour, as it did in India, as it does in Asia. In Asia they said to find the immeasurable you must control thought, you must shape it through behaviour, through righteous conduct, through control, through various forms of personal sacrifices and so on and so on. It is exactly the same thing as in the west - you are following? In the west also they said control, behave, don't hurt, don't kill, but both the east and west killed, misbehaved - they did everything.

So the question is: as thought is the central issue of our existence, which we cannot possibly deny, we may imagine that we have a soul, that there is a god, that there is heaven, hell, invent all these things by thought, the knowable qualities and the ugly existence, all the product of the machinery of thinking. Right? So one asks oneself what place has thought if the world, the outer existence is the result of mechanistic philosophy, mechanistic, the result of mechanistic physics, what place has thought in relationship, and what place has thought in the investigation of the immeasurable, if there is the immeasurable? You are following all this? You must find out and this is where we are going to share together.

I want to find out what is thought, and therefore thinking, what significance in existence has thought, and if thought is measurable and therefore very, very limited, can thought investigate something which is not of time, of experience, of knowledge? I don't know if you are following all this? You understand my question? And both the east and the west have said, that to find the immeasurable, call it by different names it doesn't matter, the unknown, the



unnameable, the eternal, the everlasting, you know they have given dozens and dozens of names to it, which is not important, can thought investigate it? Then if thought cannot investigate it, then what is the mind that is capable of entering into that dimension which has no word? Right? Because the word is thought. We use a word to convey a particular idea, a particular thought, a particular feeling. So thought, which is concerned with remembering, imagining, contriving, designing, calculating and therefore functioning from a centre, which is the accumulated knowledge as the 'me', can that thought investigate something which it cannot possibly understand? Because it can only function in the field of the known, otherwise thought is puzzled, is incapable of really thinking. Is this clear?

So what is thinking? I want to be very clear in myself and therefore you, to find out what is thinking. And to discover, or to find out its right place. We said thinking is the response of memory, experience, knowledge stored up in the brain cells. Therefore thought is the result of development, evolution, which is time. So thought is the result of time. So thought - can I go on? - thought can only function within the space it creates around itself. And that space is very limited, that space is the 'me' and the 'you'. Thought, the whole machinery of thinking, has a rightful place. And thought in relationship between two human beings becomes destructive. You see? You are understanding this? Thought, the product from knowledge, time, evolution, the result of mechanistic philosophy, science, which are all based on thought, though occasionally a new discovery takes place in which thought doesn't enter at all. You are following this? That is, you discover

something totally new, and that discovery is not the discovery of thought. You translate what you have discovered in terms of thought, in terms of the known - right? The scientist, though he has great knowledge if he is really a top scientist - I am not talking of all the political scientists who panders to governments and all the rest of it - a great scientist though he may have immense knowledge, that knowledge is absent at the moment of seeing something new. He has an insight into something totally new, then he translates it into the known, into the word, into a phrase, into logical sequences - right? And such thinking is necessary.

So knowledge is absolutely essential. You can add to it, take away from it but it can be increased, decreased but the immensity of knowledge is a human necessity - right? Now is knowledge necessary in relationship between human beings? Right? Have you understood my question? We are related to each other, we are human beings, we live on the same earth, it is our earth, not the Christian earth, or the English earth, or the Indian earth, it is our earth, the beauty of it, the marvellous riches of it, it is our earth to be lived on. And what place has thought in relationship?

Relationship means to be related, relationship means to respond to each other in freedom, with its responsibility. I don't know if you are following all this? So what place has thought in relationship. Thought which is capable of remembering, imagining, contriving, designing, calculating and all that, what place has it in human relationship? Has it any place, or no place at all? Please we are enquiring into ourselves, not somewhere else mechanically.

Is thought love? Don't deny it, we are enquiring, we are going into it. What is our relationship when we live together in a house,

husband, wife, friend or whatever it is, what is our relationship? Is it based on thought? - which is also feeling, the two cannot be divided. If it is based on thought then relationship becomes mechanical, mechanistic relationship. And for most of us that is the relationship we have with each other - mechanistic. I mean by mechanistic, the image created by thought about you and about me. The images that each one creates, defends, through a number of years, or through a number of days. You have built an image about me and I have built an image about you, which is the product of thought. The image becomes the defence, the resistance, the calculation, the building of a wall round myself, and as I build a wall, round you - you build a wall round yourself and you build a wall round me - this is called relationship, which is a fact. Right?

So our relationship is the product of thought, calculated, remembered, imagined, contrived at. And is that relationship? It is easy to say, 'No, of course not'. When you put it so clearly of course it isn't. But the fact is, it is our relationship, if we don't deceive ourselves that is the fact. I don't want to be hurt, I don't mind hurting you, and so I build a resistance, and you do the same. This process of interrelationship becomes mechanistic and destructive. And being mechanistic, destructive relationship we try to escape consciously or unconsciously - right?

So I discover - discover, I have an insight that any kind of interference of thought in relationship becomes mechanistic. I have discovered it. To me that is an immense fact - as a fact that a snake or a precipice or a dangerous animal is destructive, as destructive as when thought interferes in relationship. I see that. Right? So what am I to do? I see thought is necessary at a certain level, and

thought in relationship is most destructive. That is, you have hurt me, you have said things to me, you have flattered me, you have given me pleasure, sexual or otherwise, all the rest of it, nagged me, bullied me, dominated me, brought about frustrations - those are all the images, conclusions I have about you. And when I see you I project all that. I may try to control it, I may try to suppress it but it is always there. So what is one to do? You understand my question? I see, I have an insight into the whole machinery of thinking - the whole machinery, not in one direction, the machinery of thinking in human existence, outwardly and inwardly, it is the same movement. And if the mind is to go beyond it, beyond and above it, how is thought to be controlled, to be given enough scope to play with without bringing about its own frustration. You are following all this? Come on sirs, see the beauty of all this.

Life without understanding, or without coming into that state of something which can never be entered into by thought, life becomes very mechanical, life becomes routine, a boredom, a tire, you know what it is. And knowing that it is boring, lonesome, dreadful, ugly, with occasional pleasure or joy, we want to escape, run away from this horror. And therefore we imagine - create myths, and myths have a certain place. The Christian myth has held people together - you are following all this? The Indians have great myths and these myths have brought about a unity, and when the myths go away, fragmentation takes place, which is going on in the world at the present time. You have no myth if you really think about it very seriously, you have no myths about Christ, Jesus or Buddha, you have dropped all that.

So how is the mind to bring about a harmony in which the

division between the known and the freedom from the known doesn't exist? You have understood what I have said? The known is knowledge, the functioning of thought, and freedom from it. The two moving together, the two in perfect harmony, in balance, in the beauty of movement. Have you understood this? Have you seen the question first? And the beauty of that question? Not an integration of the two which is impossible, because integration means putting several parts together, adding new parts, or take away old parts, that implies an entity who is capable of doing this, who is an outsider, which is the invention of thought. As the soul, the atman in India, and so on, it is still thought. So my question is: like the two rivers joining together, moving together, the known and the unknown, the freedom from the known and a mind that has insight into a dimension in which thought doesn't happen at all. Have you got it?

So is this possible? Or is it merely an idea, merely a theory? Theory being, as I have already explained, the dictionary meaning, is to behold, is to have an insight. The word, theory, means to have an insight, to have the capacity to observe instantly the truth of it, to behold. Now that is the problem. Thought and non-thought. Thought - when I have to build a bridge, write a book, make a speech, calculate where I shall go - thought. And in relationship no thought at all because that is love. Now can the two move together all the time?

So thought says - listen to it carefully - I am asking the question: can the two harmoniously live together, so that behaviour is not based on thought, then it becomes mechanical, conditioned, then it becomes a relationship of images? So can this movement of

knowledge - because it is always moving, it isn't static, you are always adding - this movement in which thought as image-maker doesn't come into it at all? If the question is clear then you will see thought, which is still operating, says, to do that you must control. You understand? You must control thought, you must hold it and not let it interfere in relationship, you must build a wall. So thought is calculating, imagining, remembering - remembering what somebody has said that these two movements must go together. So thought says "I will remember that, that is a marvellous idea" - so it stores it up as memory, and according to that memory it is going to act - you are following all this? Therefore it says, "I must control". And all mechanistic philosophy, civilization, all religious structure is based on this - control - after you have controlled, sufficiently suppressed then you will be free, which is sheer nonsense! Right? Are you working as hard as I am working? You should! I don't know if you see the beauty of this. I am absolutely delighted - you follow?

So thought begins to create a pattern of how to behave in order to have that harmony, therefore it has destroyed it - right? Now I have an insight. I have an insight into this question, that control is not the way - control implies suppression, an entity who controls, which is still thought as the controller, the observer, the see-er, the experiencer, the thinker. I have an insight into that. So what does the mind do?

How do you have an insight? What is insight? How does it take place? You know what I mean by insight - when you see something as the false and see something as the truth, see it instantly. You do, on occasion. You see something totally and say,

"By Jove, how true that is". Now what is the state of mind that says, "It is so?" - which has nothing to do with thought, which has nothing to do with logic, dialectic, which is opinion. Now what is the state of the mind that sees instantly the fact, and therefore the truth of it? Obviously if the thinker is there, there is no perception. Right? If the thinker, who is the creator of will, which is the product of desire, because I want to achieve that state, which must be extraordinary, and the mind then says, thought says, "I will bring about that state by suppression, control, by various forms of sacrifice, asceticism, no sex or whatever it is" - it goes through all that phenomenon, hoping to come upon the other. The other is accepted because this is limited, this is tiresome, boring, mechanical, in its desire to have more pleasure, more excitement, it will accept the other. The other is perhaps seen by very, very few, or seen as an idea by a few, and because of that idea they experience that, and then say, "I am enlightened", "I have got it" - and he becomes a beastly little guru.

So: we are now enquiring into what it is to observe without the observer? Are we meeting? Because the observer is the past, is the known, is within the field of thought, because it is the result of knowledge, therefore experience and so on. So is there an observation without the observer, which is the past? Can I look at you, my wife, my friend, my neighbour, without the image which I have brought about through relationship? Can I look at you without all that coming into being? Is that possible? You have hurt me, you have said unpleasant things about me, you have spread scandalizing rumours about me (I'm afraid you do, but it doesn't matter) - pleasant or unpleasant rumours are the same. And can I

look at you without bearing all that memory? You are following all this? Which means, can I look at you without any interference of thought, which has remembered the insult, the hurt or the flattery? Can I look at a tree without the knowledge of that tree? Are you following? Can I listen to that sound of the river going by without naming, recognizing, saying that is that river that is making - just listen to the beauty of the sound? Can you do this? You may listen to the river, you may see the mountain without any calculated design, but can you look at yourself with all your accumulations, conscious or unconscious, look at yourself with eyes that have never been touched by the past? You understand what I am saying? Have you tried any of this? Sorry, I shouldn't have said 'tried'. To try is wrong. Have you done it? Looked at your wife, your girl friend, boy friend, or whatever it is, without a single memory of the past? So you discover that thought is repetitive, mechanical and relationship is not, therefore you discover love is not the product of thought. You understand? Therefore there is no such thing as divine love and human love, there is only love. Do you follow all this?

Thought, which is the whole machinery of thinking, on which our life is based, the whole machinery of words which we use to communicate through a novel, through a word - through word - without that word is there thought? Or is the mind such a slave to words that it cannot see the movement of thought without the word - you are following all this? That is: can I, can the mind observe me, the whole content of me, without the word? Do you understand? Observe what I am without association - the association is the word, the association is the memory, the



remembrance - therefore there is a learning about myself with never a remembrance, without the accumulated knowledge as experience of an anger, or of jealousy, or of antagonism, or of desire for power - you are following all this? So can I look at myself - not I - can the mind look at itself without the movement of the word, because the word is the thinker, the word is the observer?

Now to look at yourself so clearly the mind must be astonishingly free from any attachment. You understand? Attachment to a conclusion, which is an image, attachment to an idea, which is the product of thought, idea being words, phrases, concepts put together as an idea, not attached to any principle, to any movement of fear and pleasure. This perception is in itself the highest form of discipline. You understand? Discipline in the sense of learning, not conforming. Are you capable of following all this?

We began with enquiring and therefore sharing together, what is the place of thought in existence? For now in our life all our existence is based on thought, that thought may imagine it is not based on it, that it is based on some spiritual, etc. but it is still the product of thought. Our gods, our saviours, our masters, our gurus, are the product of thought. And what place has thought in life, in existence? It has its place logically, sanely, effectively when knowledge functions without the interference of the 'me', who is using knowledge. The 'me' who says, "I am a better scientist than that person," "I am a better guru than that guru". So knowledge when used without the 'me', which is the product of thought, which creates the division between me and you, then knowledge is the most extraordinary thing because that will bring about a better world, a better structure of the world, a better society - you

understand? We have enough knowledge to bring about a happy world, where we can all have food, clothing, shelter, vocation, no ghettos, but that is denied because thought has separated itself as the 'me' and the 'you', my country and your country, my beastly god and your beastly god, and we are at war with each other.

So thought has, as memory, remembrance, imagination, design, a logical healthy place but it can never come into relationship. If you see that, not logically, not verbally, not with the sense "I will be happier if I do that", not through words, through imagination, through formulas, then if you see the truth of it, you are there. Then there is no conflict, it happens naturally. Like the fruit on a tree that ripens. Right?

Are there any questions?

Q: I feel that I am real.

K: You feel you are real? The gentleman says he feels he is real. I wonder what we mean by that. I am real. I am sitting here, I have got a body, I see things about me, my thoughts are real, the words I use are real, I like and I don't like - real. You have hurt me, you have flattered me, that is real. My gods, I realize, I have invented them. It is me out of fear that has produced these things. It is my pleasure that makes me attached to them, and therefore out of that pleasure I say, "I love you". In a certain way they are all real. Words are real. And if you are caught in words then they create the illusion. So there is a certain reality which is obvious, and the illusion begins when thought produces, out of fear and pleasure, the image of reality.

Q: What is the relationship between the body and thought?

K: If I had no body would I be able to think? - body, all the

organism with its nerves, with its sensitivity, with all the operative mechanical processes of the physical system, without that would there be thinking? If I had no brains, which is the cells, which hold the memory, which is connected with the whole body through nerves, would there be thinking?

Now listen to all this carefully. When the body dies - you see, now we sit up! - when the body dies what happens to thought which we have created - you understand? Are you following all this, does it interest you? I have lived 50, 30, 100 years, I have worked, most of my time spent in an office, god knows why, earning a livelihood, fighting, quarrelling, bickering, jealous, anxious, you know, my life, the dreadful thing that I live. And I die, the body dies, which is inevitable, old age, disease, accident, pain, and I remember all that. All that is me. Is that 'me' different from the body? Go into it very carefully. Is that 'me' different from the instrument? Obviously it is different. The 'me' is the result of my remembering the hurts, the pain, the pleasure, all that, the remembrance, which is stored up in the cells as thought - right? Will that thought go on when the body dies? You are following all this? You have asked that question sir - will my brother and my friend whom I have remembered, loved, walked with and enjoyed things together, that friend, the brother, the son, the husband dies - do I remember him and does he exist? You are following all this? And I am attached to him and I don't want to lose him. But I have lost him physically. But I don't want to lose him. See what takes place. I don't want to lose him, I have a great memory, experience, pleasure, pain about him, or her, I am attached to that, and I hold on to that.

So thought says, "He does live, we will meet next life, or we will meet in heaven. I like that idea, it gives me comfort" - and you come along and say, "What nonsense, it is just superstition, old man" and I fight you because this gives me great comfort. So what I am seeking is comfort, not the truth of anything, but comfort. Now if I do not seek comfort in any form - which is the fact - if I have lived a shoddy narrow life and petty, jealous, anxieties, like millions and millions and millions of people do, what is the importance of me? I am like the vast ocean of people. I die. You follow? But I cling to my little life, I want it to continue hoping that at some future date I will be happy. And with that idea I die. And I am like a million others in a vast ocean of existence, without meaning, without significance, without beauty, without any real thing. And if the mind steps out of that vast stream, as it must, then there is a totally different dimension. And that is the whole process of living: to move away from this vast current of ugliness and brutality. And because we can't do it, we haven't got the energy, the vitality, the intensity, the love of it, we move along. Right sir.

Q: Why do you speak of a blissful state? It holds out a promise of something other than 'what is' for us. If thought is not there consciousness can never know about it, so why talk about it? Your talk of a blissful state is what keeps us all coming.

K: Do you all come because I talk about a blissful state? Oh my god, I hope not! Look sir: what is important is not the blissful state of somebody else. What is important is to understand 'what is'. 'What is', yours - not my blissful state or X's blissful state. And if you understand that, and to understand it you must have tremendous energy, and that is what we are concerned with, not a

blissful state. And I hope you are here for that, not to achieve somebody else's blissful state, which is then an illusion. You want to kick that overboard. What we are concerned with is the understanding of 'what is' and going beyond it. The understanding of thought, which is 'what is', the structure of thought, the nature of thought, which is 'what is', and seeing its right place and its destructive nature, and to see the freedom from the known and the known moving together, whether you can find out, because it is your life, it is your existence not mine, not somebody else's, it is yours, not Mr Nixon's or Mr Heath's or Mr somebody else's or the communists or the pope's, or even of Jesus - it is your life. And if you know yourselves actually 'what is', then you will be beyond it.

Q: I who am neurotic wonder if being around a person who seems to be sane can help me to become sane also?

K: If you know you are neurotic you have already stopped being neurotic. But most of us are not aware that we are neurotic, and being unaware that we are neurotic, we hope to become non-neurotic by being with somebody else. But with somebody whom you think, you who are neurotic, you who think somebody else is sane, is also neurotic. This is not just a clever statement. If I am neurotic and I think you are sane, how can I know that you are sane because I am neurotic? (Laughter) No, please. How do I know that you are enlightened - please listen to this - that you are the saviour, that you have achieved heaven, when I am in misery? How do I know? I can't. But I would like to think you are in heaven because it gives me comfort. On that all our religions are based, which is so utterly silly. So if I am aware that I am neurotic that is enough?

Now at what depth are you aware that you are neurotic? Who

told you that you are neurotic? Have you found that out for yourself? Or your friends kindly told you that you are neurotic? (Laughter) Have you found out for yourself that you are neurotic, that you act not sanely? Or you think you have watched people who act sanely and compared yourself with that person and therefore say, "I am neurotic". You are following all this? So when you compare you are neurotic - right? When you assert that somebody else is sane, when you yourself are neurotic, that person is insane.

So what is important is to be aware deeply, profoundly that you are not balanced. Aware - that very awareness dispels neuroticism. You understand? If I am aware that I am angry, which is a form of neuroticism, or jealousy, or the search for power, position, prestige, all forms of neuroticism, if I am aware of that, I want to find out if I am aware verbally, intellectually, or just a conclusion, an idea, or have I gone beyond it, deeper? Then if words, conclusions, ideas are pushed aside then I am really aware that I am. In that awareness am I insane, am I neurotic? Obviously I am not. It is these things that make me neurotic. Have you got it.

## **SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD JULY 1972.**

We were discussing the last time we met here, the nature of thought, memory, experience and knowledge, what place has thought in daily relationship, and how deeply it is destructive in that relationship; and knowledge as thought and expression in action is absolutely necessary. I do not know how deeply you have gone into it since we discussed. And it seems to me, if we are at all serious, and not only the times demand that one be very, very earnest but also as one leads rather a superficial life - superficial in the sense, give full vent, full expression to the whole field of thought in every day, which I call superficial - I do not know how deeply you have gone into it. If you have, what place has thought in the whole of consciousness? How deeply the unconscious, the hidden parts of our minds, the secret recesses, how deeply they are contaminated by the environment, by the society in which we live, by or through education and so on. How deeply the whole mind is polluted and whether it is possible to free the mind altogether from this pollution of civilization. Whether the mind can ever be really, in the true sense of that word, be free. And that can only be understood when we understand, have an insight, into the whole question of thought, which we discussed the other day, more or less.

But what I would like this morning, if I may, is to go into this question of how deeply thought has conditioned the mind, how deeply our culture, in which we live, has shaped the whole consistency of thought, for thought is matter.

If I may I would like to point out again, we are not merely

indulging in theories, in speculations, in concepts, but rather going together, sharing together, exploring together into this question, whether the mind which has been conditioned through millenia, through every form of culture, society, environmental influences, how deeply this conditioning has taken place, and whether it is at all possible to cleanse - of course, if one uses the word 'cleanse' there must be a cleaner - how deeply we are affected by whether it is possible to expose the deep contents of oneself so completely that the mind is really totally clear, and therefore free.

You know, we shouldn't say anything verbally that we have not actually directly perceived, otherwise we become hypocrites, otherwise we use other people's ideas, conclusions and their illusions. They become the authority and we merely follow. Whereas if we could for ourselves, putting all the outward authority of another and their knowledge, investigate into this question, have direct perception ourselves, then what you say will be true for you. And then one acts tremendously honestly. And I feel, if we could this morning, spend a little time together enquiring how deeply we are secondhand, how deeply we accept what others say and repeat so glibly and easily, cleverly, in reacting to what others say.

So what we are going to find out together, if we can this morning, is whether the mind, your mind and the mind of the human being, can be totally unconditioned and therefore act in freedom and yet together? Society, the culture, the various economic divisions, social activities have created in us an image - right? Please don't accept anything that the speaker says unless you see it for yourself completely, deny everything everybody says,



psychologically, especially the speaker, so that you don't set him as an authority, so that you directly for yourself see and therefore it will be yours.

As we were saying, the culture in which we live - culture being the economic conditions, the religious divisions, the class struggles, the various forms of conformities, imitations - has created in each one of us an image of ourselves - is that so? That is, you have an image about yourself, haven't you? Not one, perhaps half a dozen. How do these images come into being? Who has created these images? Surely the culture in which all the influences - religious, psychological, educational, environmental, economic movement - living in that culture it has created in the human mind the image of what I am, or what I should be - right? I think there is no question about it. If I am born in a particular environmental state, I accept that from childhood - I am a Catholic for the rest of my life, or a Protestant, or a Hindu or a Communist, or whatever it is, a Nationalist. And that image is deeply seated, it is the formula on which I live. The 'me' is that formula. Please observe this. Not my description of it but the actual fact of it. You understand? The description is not the described - right? I can describe the mountain but the description is not the mountain.

So this image is the whole of our consciousness. The content of this consciousness is consciousness - right? We are sharing this together? It is a lovely morning, really we should be out, looking at the deep shadows, lovely mountains, the flowing waters and the still quiet woods, damp, which have an odour of their own, a beauty that is not there but here. But here we are trying to be awfully serious, and we should be terribly serious because we have

to create a totally different kind of civilization, a totally different kind of human being - not a freak, not a Jesus freak, or Krishna freak, or a Marxist freak but a totally different kind of human being who has completely, totally understood himself and has gone beyond himself.

So we have an image of ourselves. That image is part of our thought. That image shows superficially, outwardly, very little, but inwardly it is deeply seated - right? Whether that deep conditioning, that deep roots of the image can be exposed, understood and gone beyond. That is the problem that I would like to discuss this morning. You have understood my question?

I show myself very little outwardly, like an iceberg nine-tenths of it is below and one-tenth is above. What is below, hidden, secret, unexplored, never seen consciously, can that be completely exposed so that there is no contradiction between the outer and the inner, so that it is a total awareness, a total insight, so that the mind so fragmented, so broken up, can be free and whole, sane? That is my question. I do not know if you have ever put it to yourself and if you have not, we are putting it now and you have to face it. How you regard it, how you face it, depends on your intensity, on your interest, on your energy and vitality.

This image, this conclusion, which has various symbols, various names, which are irrelevant, we'll keep to that word image - those two words image and conclusion. This image is constantly receiving impressions, both outer and inner - right? Every word that is said in friendship or enmity has its effect. That image gets hurt from childhood - you are following all this? We human beings hurt each other terribly. That image which society, which thought,

created gets not only hurt but also gets flattered. So there is this constant process of being hurt, resisting, building a wall round myself and whether the superficial hurts can be dealt with, which is comparatively easy, and we are asking whether the deep hurts of the human mind can be wiped away so that no mark of hurt is left - right? You are meeting me? You are hurt, aren't you, from childhood, when your mother, your father, your teacher, your aunt says, "You are not as good as your brother", "You are not as clever", "You don't look so nice", "You look like your aunt who is ugly". Don't you know all these things? And then at school you are compared with another boy, the marks, the standards, the comparison hurts you very deeply. When you compare one boy against another boy you are destroying that boy. So all those hurts remain, which in later life expresses itself in violence, in anxiety and so on - escapes from this hurt. And it escapes in illusion, which is another form of image, where in that illusion you will never be hurt, which is a state of neuroticism - right? Please look at yourself.

The words which the speaker are using are a mirror in which you are looking at yourself. Now whether those hurts can be freed completely, wiped out completely so that there is not a single mark of hurt left. And a mind which has been hurt and has understood, can never be hurt again - you understand the question? Because, after all innocence is a state of mind in which there is no hurt. The word, the meaning of that word 'innocent' means not to be hurt, not to hurt. Not the Christian meaning, the lamb and all that stuff. A mind that is not capable of being hurt and therefore doesn't hurt. You have understood? We will go into that.

How is this possible? I have been hurt all my life, I am sensitive

- you know what hurt is, the wounds that one receives, and what effect it has in later life. I have been hurt. I can deal with superficial hurts fairly intelligently. I know what to do. I either resist, build a wall around myself, so isolate myself so that I will never be hurt, grow a thick skin - which most people do. But behind that they are wounded deeply. One can deal with the hurts superficially, that is, not to build up any resistance, be superficially vulnerable - you are following? Because it is only a mind that is vulnerable that can never be hurt. You are following all this? Have you ever noticed a spring leaf? A new leaf just coming out after a heavy winter with the bright sun, and light and warmth, and that leaf is so tender, so alive and there are breezes, winds that can never tear it, it is there. That is vulnerable - you understand? I think one can intelligently bring this about outwardly, superficially. But the question is: how deeply can all the hurts be wiped away? That is: how can the unconscious hurts, which are deeply rooted, be wiped away? You understand? Can it be done through analysis? Please watch it carefully. If you see the truth of it once, you will never do anything but the right thing. Can these hurts be wiped away through analysis? You understand? The word 'analysis' means to break up, the root meaning - right? Break up. You have broken it up in analysis. Who is the entity that is analysing the broken parts? You are following all this? It is another part of thought, isn't it? Right? Thought itself is a fragment of the total. You are following all this? So one thought examines, analyses, the various fragments of other thoughts, which is to continue fragmentation. If you see that - you understand - if you have an insight into that you will never analyse. Have you got an insight

into that?

Analysis means the analyser, time, and each analysis must be complete otherwise there is a remnant, and that remnant the next day examines - you follow? Therefore you are always dealing with the remnants, not with the complete end of analysis. You get it? And if you analyse, it takes months, days, years. So if you see the truth of it, the danger of it, then you will never indulge privately or publicly in any form of analysis. Can I go on from there? That means you have stopped analysing, collectively, individually or through a professional. So analysis is not going to expose the secret deep hurts - right? Then what will you do? I'll take, after hurts, other things, so please follow this carefully; what will you do? I will not analyse, I see the foolishness of it - not because the speaker says so, you yourself see it. Therefore what shall I do to expose it? Will dreams expose it? And are dreams necessary? The professional analysts and psychologists say, that you must have dreams otherwise you will go mad. Dreams are the continuation of what we are doing during the day, obviously. If you are not conscious of what you are doing during the day, our thoughts, our feelings, our reactions, playing with them, watching them - you know? - not taking them terribly seriously, watching them, then are dreams necessary when you go to sleep? You are following all this?

Then if analysis, dreams are not the way, then what is? How does the mind wipe away all the hurts, the hurts that one has received from friends, from casual acquaintances, from intimate relationships, how do you do this? Are you awaiting an answer from me? Are you? I am afraid you are. Now just a minute please,

if there was nobody to answer it, you understand, nobody, what will you do? You have discovered for yourself analysis is not the way; you have discovered for yourself dreams have their value at a certain period of life but intrinsically they have no value. If they have no value, if during the day you are alive, watching, listening, you know, taking everything into account, going beyond the words, then dreams have very little value because during the day you are awake, during the day you are alive, full of energy, without any contradiction, watching every kind of contradiction, then when you go to sleep you will find dreams become unnecessary and therefore the brain has complete rest. It is the conflict during the day that destroys the mind, the brain. Oh, come on sirs.

And if you put order in your life during the day the brain hasn't got to put order during the night. You have understood? Come on, sirs, move! And order can only be brought about when you understand the disorder in which one lives. You understand? Understanding disorder, not, what is order. If you create order then it will be a blue print, won't it? Right? Whereas if you begin to understand the nature of disorder, about one's life, in one's life, the ugliness, the pettiness, the quarrels, the nagging, the gossip, the stupidities that go on in our life, everlastingly talking about opinions, and offering opinions - in understanding disorder naturally order comes in.

Now, if there is nobody to answer you, to tell you, and you are faced with this problem, which is: the deep hurts, how are they to be wiped away so that the mind can never be hurt - right? What is your answer? You, who are very clever people, read a great deal, can quote Freud, Jung and all the professionals, what is your

answer? Please be honest, what is your answer? Would you honestly say that you don't know? Can you honestly say, "I really don't know how to answer that question". Can you? Now please be careful, can you, with truth, with integrity, say, "I really don't know"? Or is your mind still searching to find an answer in books, or in people who have said there is an answer. Are you following all this? Come on sirs. Can you say with truth that you have no answer for this, you really don't know? Right? If you really truthfully, honestly say, 'I really don't know. I have no answer. I have only the problem, I have no answer. I know what the problem is, I am fully aware of the meaning of that problem, the significance, the depth of that problem. I have looked at it, I have watched it, all round it, from different angles, I have looked, worried, examined, but I have no answer.' - right?

What makes it a problem - please listen carefully - what makes it a problem? Do you understand my question? A problem exists only when you want to resolve it. Right? Please listen carefully. I have a problem: my problem is I want to have a mind that is so clear, unhurt, not polluted, free, vital, full of beauty and energy. And I have examined, I have looked at it and I see analysis is not the way, dreams, examinations, going off to somebody to say, "Please help me" or following some guru who will say, "Forget all that, think about god" and all the rest of it. I see all that is of no value - right? So I have this left with me, and it has become a problem. And I say why has it become a problem. If I can't do anything about it, it is not a problem. You are following all this? It is only when I think I can do something about it, it becomes a problem. I don't know if you understand this?

If I actually know when I am confronted with a gigantic mountain, and I can't do anything about it, it is there, with that great height, dignity, majesty, full of stability, splendour - why should I make a problem of it? It is only when I want to go beyond it - right? Climb it, go beyond it, then it becomes a problem. You understand? But when I see that I can't do anything about this, is it a problem? You have understood? If it is not a problem then it is resolved, isn't it? This is not a trick please. It is the truth. It is not a trick. A river is flowing by, full, strong, heavy with water, it is only when I want to cross to the other side where I think there is more freedom, there is more beauty, there is more loveliness, peace and all the rest of it, the crossing the river becomes a problem - right? But I see I can't cross the river, I haven't got a boat, I can't swim, I don't know what to do. Therefore what happens to my mind? It is not content with remaining on this side - you understand? It has no problem. I wonder if you are getting all this? So my hurt is not a problem - right? Therefore I am not hurt - right? Oh, it is so simple if you see this. It is so simple that we refuse to see it.

Now leave that for the moment and look at another issue. Our image which we have about ourselves is created by society, by the culture in which we live. The culture says, compare, measure yourself against another - right? Compare yourself with the hero, with the saint, with a clever man, with a man who puts words onto pages, or sculpts, compare yourself from the beginning to the end - you are comparing, aren't you, no? Measuring yourself. And this measurement is part of our culture. And so you say to yourself, "I am clever, or I am dull" - you are dull in comparison with somebody who is clever. You are following all this? More learned,



more subtle, more intelligent - when you have a measure there must be more or less. Right? That is part of our culture. Now I am asking myself: why do I have this measure? It has been given to me. Or I have carefully cultivated it myself - the bigger car, the bigger house, the bigger mind, the gradual process of attainment - you know. The whole process of our existence is based on measurement - the rich, the poor, you know, build it up, the man who is healthy, the man who is unhealthy, the man who is a saint and the sinner. Now can the mind live without measurement, which means comparison? Can you? Have you ever tried psychologically never to compare? You have to compare when you get a cloth, I am not talking about that. You have to compare a house, there it is necessary, but psychologically, which is part of our inheritance, like Jesus, like the Buddha - you follow - it is our inheritance. We are brought up from childhood to measure, which is part of our hurt - you are following? If I have no measurement, I am not hurt. Now what am I to do? I measure. You sit there and the speaker sits on the platform, there is a division, height and low - you follow? And you say, "By Jove, how does that man sitting there know so much? I know so little." You are following all this? This comparison, everlasting. And when you compare you become inferior or superior.

And in comparison you come to a conclusion, and that conclusion brings about neurotic habits. I conclude about something - right - through comparison and I hold on to that comparison, that conclusion, irrespective of facts, of what is real. Because I have compared, I have watched, I have learned, I hold on. Haven't you noticed it? And that is a state of neuroticism, isn't

it? Now why do I compare? Partly habit, partly inheritance, partly it is profitable, and through comparison I feel I am alive because I am struggling - right? I am fighting to be like you, and that gives me vitality. I get depressed and all the rest of it. So I am asking myself, is it possible to live a life in which there is no comparison at all, and yet not be satisfied?

The moment I do not compare is there satisfaction in 'what is' - you follow? Or when I cease to compare then I am face to face with 'what is', and when I compare it is an escape from 'what is' - right? And therefore it is a waste of energy and I need energy, there must be energy to face 'what is' - you are following all this? So am I dissipating energy through comparison? And if I am, and I have an insight into all this, which is your insight, not mine, then you have energy which is not wasted through comparison, measurement, feeling inferior, superior, depressed and all the rest of it. Therefore you have energy to face what actually is, which is yourself. How do you know that you are dull, or unintelligent? Because you are comparing with somebody else and therefore you say, "I am unintelligent"? If you don't compare, are you dull? Only you don't know so you begin to face things. Come on sirs, move!

So we have many, many images, a collection of images, religious, economic, social, images based on relationship and so on. These images are deep down conclusions. And if I do not analyse or use dreams as a means of analysis, if I am awake during the day and watch, then the problem is non-existent. I wonder if you see this? Thought has created the problem. Thought that says, "Yes, that is so, I compare, I have images, I have been hurt, I must go beyond it" - it is thought that is saying it, it is thought that

created these images - right? So thought is creating the problem about the images - you are following? And when you see the truth of it, then thought doesn't make it a problem - right? For god's sake see how extraordinarily simple and subtle and beautiful it is. If you see that once, it is finished. Then you have energy to face actually what is.

So then you can say, "What am I?" If I am no longer comparing - you follow? - no longer imitating, comparison means imitating, conformity, if there are no hurts, no conclusions and therefore no image, what am I? I am all these things - right? The thought that says, "I must analyse, I must go beyond this, I am in conflict, I must" - you follow? It is thought that created all these images, divisions, and it is thought that says, "I must go beyond all this to live a peaceful, heavenly, quiet life of enlightenment". It is not enlightenment, it is just an idea of enlightenment. And then: what am I? Do you understand? Am I the word? Am I the description? You understand? Am I the thought, which is the response of accumulated memory, experience, knowledge, which are all words - you follow - symbols, ideas, you are following all this? Then the mind is completely empty - right? Can the mind face this complete not being? You have understood? It is the wanting to be that is the problem. I wonder if you are getting all this? If you can't I must go on, so. Take what you can, what you can't, let go.

Civilization says to me: be something, success, join this community, grow long hair, short hair, take drugs, don't take drugs, go to church, don't go to church, be free, think independently - you follow? The society, whether it is small or large, is forcing me to conform to a pattern. And the pattern is my image, I am that image.

I am the image that is described by the professionals, by myself, when I am alone, the agonies of that image, the jealousies, the fears, the pleasures; when I see all this image is what makes the mind so utterly superficial - right? Do you agree? Are you aware that your mind is superficial? Or are you agreeing with the description of the superficial mind?

So can the mind be without comparison, without conformity? I conform when I put on trousers - right? When I go to India I don't conform, I put on some other cloth. I have to conform at a certain level - right? Keep to the left side of the road, or the right side of the road - you are following all this? But psychologically there is no conformity any more. Because this urge to conform is the product of the society in which I live, the image which I have built in myself with the help of others. And I see that image can be hurt, it is the image that is hurt. And it is that image that in comparison feels great or small, inferior or superior. And when there is no measurement, is there an image? Therefore the mind is capable of living without a single image, and therefore incapable of ever being hurt. Do you see it? Then only can I have relationship. I may want that relationship - I have that relationship with you but you may be hurt, you may have an image about me - you follow - and you refuse to move from that image. Then the battle begins - you are following all this? You have no image but I have an image. And I refuse to give up my image because I love my image, that's my neuroticism, that's my conclusion. And where is the relationship between you and me? You understand? There isn't any. You say you must have relationship. The neurotic person says always that you must have relationship with everybody. How can

you have relationship with me who have got an image, and I am holding on to that image. I don't know whether you follow all this?

So the mind is capable of living without a single image and therefore without any conclusion so it can never be hurt, or be in a state of measurement. It is only such a mind that is innocent and therefore free - right?

Do you want to ask any questions about this, about what we have been discussing?

You know the speaker said previously, the content of consciousness is consciousness - you understand? What it contains makes for consciousness - right? Have you understood that? My consciousness is made up of nationalism, I have been educated - you follow - innumerable things. The content makes up consciousness. And therefore the content makes the borders of that consciousness, fixes the borders, the frontiers, draws the line because of its content, how wide, how narrow, consciousness is - right? If there are no contents, which are measurement, ideas - you follow - then what is consciousness? Does this interest you? No sirs, it doesn't. I only know consciousness as the 'me' in conflict - right? If there is no problem, no conflict, what is consciousness? Then there is no border is there, there is no frontier is there? There is no demarcation made by the content. Then there is space, isn't there? Space without a centre, therefore no circumference. You see it, don't you? You know that is what love is - we'll go into it the day after tomorrow - because love has no dimension - I mustn't go into it now.

Q: All effort to unify in this conditioned state results in further diversity. If this is so, is it the negation you speak of, and if it is

can one use the residual energy as one pleases or will it result in regeneration?

K: The questioner says: we are always trying to unify, to bring about unity in a mind that is conditioned - right? That is what the questioner says. I am conditioned and you are conditioned and we want to bring about a unity between you and me. I am conditioned as a drug taker - all my experiences, all my etc. And you don't take drugs but you are conditioned in a different way. And we are trying to establish a unity. You are a Catholic and I am a Hindu - you follow? Establish unity. You know the other day one of the high dignitaries of the Church, Anglican Church, very high, he was being interviewed and he was asked: what do you think of all the various religions that exist in the world? "Oh," he said, "they have some truth in them, they are all right." But the questioner said, "What do you mean 'all right'? What do you mean they have truth?" "Oh," he said, "partly probably, a great deal" and he began to expiate, enlarge on that. Then he said, "You know what is remarkable? We have the only thing that matters in our religion, which is Jesus Christ, and nobody else has got it." You understand? High dignitary, 20th century - I'll leave it at that!

Now can there be unity between two conditioned minds? Or will it not be inevitable that there will be conflict between two conditionings? You understand? Conditioning implies division. Where there is division there must be conflict. If you are my wife, I am your husband, or I am the wife, and you have your own ambitions, and your own greeds, and I have my own, I am conditioned, you are conditioned. So though we are married, we have children together, and all the rest of the business, we two are

separate conditioned human beings - right? And how can there be unity between us? And because there isn't there is everlasting battle between us. Right? All the Women Lib., and all that is going on in the world.

So there can be unity only when there is no division. You follow? It is so simple. I am divided because of my images, of my conclusions, my opinions - right? When I have no conclusion, no image, there is no division. Sir, that is love, you understand?

Now we, being conditioned, spend our energy in strife - right - in wars, in battles, all that is going on in the world. And that is a tremendous waste of energy. Though that waste of energy may be productive - you understand? - because I may have a little talent to write a book and I become, you know, I sustain my vanity through the book. So when there is no division, because I see the fact, the truth, that where there is division, which is conclusion, image, comparison, all the rest of it, that division must inevitably create conflict - if I have an insight, if I see the truth of that - then I have an enormous amount of energy to act totally differently - you understand? Right.

Q: You say free and together. Would you please go a little further into this idea of together.

K: The idea of together! I can't go into the idea of together. You understand? Then it remains an idea and how can you go further in an idea, which means more ideas - you understand? - but you can't go into it. You can only go into it if you have no ideas. I don't know if you follow this?

Now I said this morning when we were talking, I said we are sharing together, aren't we, you understand? We are sharing

together our problem. We are talking over together. That means you and I are both interested in the problem - right? We both are concerned with the problem, we both together are examining the problem - not you don't examine and I examine, then you share what I examine, that is not together - right? Together implies moving together, that is, thought with thought, feeling with feeling, intensity with intensity, together. Don't you know what it means to be together? I doubt it. That means sharing - right - partaking, investigating, examining, thinking together, therefore there is no division - the one who thinks, the one who doesn't think, then there is division. But we are both of us at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity looking at a problem, we are together. Right? And this is possible only when you give your life to this - and this is our life.

Q: You speak of the authority of beliefs, but never, hardly ever, at great depth of all that is involved in the authority of money, slavery, oppression, fear and violence.

K: By Jove, you can ask questions, can't you?

The questioner says you talk about authority but you never, hardly ever go into the authority of money, the authority of domination, the authority of slavery, poverty and so on. Right?

Now what is the central issue in this problem? There is the authority of money, the authority of those who have power, religious and non-religious, the authority of the man who owns the property on which I live - right - the authority of social division, the authority of injustice and so on. The authority. What is the central issue involved in this? There is not only the psychological authority - you understand - of the priest, Karl Marx, you know,



outward authority of knowledge, science, physics; then there is also inward authority - the authority which I assume, because I know better than you do, I see more clearly than you do, I happen to sit on many platforms therefore I assume tremendous authority. And there is the authority of the man who owns the house in which I live, he can throw me out any day - right? So there is this tremendous complex authority. Now where shall I begin? You understand? Are you meeting me? Where shall I begin to tackle this enormous complex authority which exists outside as well as inside? Go on sirs, tell me, where shall I begin. You have asked the question, I want to go into it. Where shall I begin? Out there? That is, the authority of the money, the authority of property, the authority which the poor have and the rich have? Where will you deal with it sirs? You are very silent. My question is sir: where shall I begin? I see there is the authority of money - keep to that one thing because money implies all the other things. Now there is the authority of money and then there is the authority of ideas, of beliefs, ideas. So there is the authority of money outwardly, and there is the authority of tremendous knowledge, of which I am part. Now I see the danger of authority, don't I? Right? You understand? The danger of authority, because it enslaves the mind. If I am born, as I was, very poor, poverty is a degradation, it destroys. So power of money is tremendous; so is the power of idea - right? Marx, Jesus, Buddha, whatever it is. So I say to myself, where shall I begin to understand this vast complex problem of authority? Where shall I begin? Attack money? You understand? Throw bombs at those people who have money, who have houses, burn them up, kill people because my authority says, that is wrong? right? So

where shall I begin. There or here? There is created by this (pointing to here) because I want that authority, I want the authority of money - no? I want the authority of property.

So I have to tackle the authority from where I am. Where I am is the nearest, therefore I can begin there, not out there because I can't do anything about that. I can, I think I can by electing the right President, or the right Minister and when I put faith in any politician I am done, finished, I am destroyed. So I don't put faith in any politician, in any priest, in any idea, or in any power.

Therefore I say I must begin here. That is, I want to find out why my mind worships authority in me or out there. You follow all this? Why do I accept and worship and demand authority? Why do you demand it sirs? Don't you demand it? Be honest. You do. Why do you demand it? Is it the basic issue of great pleasure? To own property, doesn't it give you tremendous pleasure? Though you have all the complications of taxes. And does it give you prestige, a position - no? Oh come on sirs. Have you noticed a man who has got plenty of ideas, who has written books, well known, what power he has? And don't you want to be like that bird?

So we all worship power, in different forms. So to bring about a totally different kind of society, a different kind of culture, each one of us must understand, have an insight, into this question of authority. And to be free of authority, you understand? - not just talk endlessly about it. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 25TH JULY 1972

I would like this morning, if I may, to talk about something which seems to me rather important. We have been talking during the last two or three discourses about the whole structures and nature of thought, and what role, beneficial and destructive, it plays in one's life. I think we ought to go this morning into the question of suffering, not only the physical ailments, the pain, old age and disease and accident, but also the whole psychological meaning of suffering. This has been one of the great problems of human beings, and apparently one has not been able to solve it. One has run away from it, given various explanations - and the explanations are never the real thing. And one has avoided it, rationalized it, but it still remains. And if we could this morning spend some little time together over this question perhaps it might be very beneficial.

The Christian world has accepted sorrow and worships it in the form of a person. And the eastern world has various logical and illogical explanations. But man remains in sorrow, not only personal sorrow but also the immense collective sorrow - the sorrow of wars, what is going on in Vietnam, thousands are being killed, children are being burnt, not only in Vietnam but also during the last war millions were killed in Russia under Stalin - you know all that business. And there is this immense collective sorrow, it is like an enormous cloud. And also there is a personal, individual, human sorrow, which is caused by a sense of frustration, not being able to resolve any problems of our life, living always in ignorance - ignorance in the sense not of book

knowledge but ignorance of oneself, of what is going on within? And apparently when one considers all this, quite objectively, non-sentimentally, why is it man, that is you and I, human beings right throughout the world, have not been able to resolve this question? Because without going beyond sorrow there is no love. Sorrow creates a circle round itself, either through self-pity, through a sense of frustration, through comparison - I was happy and I am not now - the sorrow of losing somebody whom you think you love. This whole question of human sorrow - collective, the result of human appalling behaviour towards other human beings, what the wars have done, what tyrannies have done, not only the recent tyrannies but of the past - when you put all this together, your own particular sorrow and the enormous sorrow of mankind, one observes how mankind, how human beings, you, escape from this, avoid this, never come directly into contact. And without understanding it, going into it, resolving it, however much one may seek or demand, or enquire into the nature of love, it seems to me that it is impossible to find out what love is without the ending of sorrow. And if we may this morning, let us go into it.

What is sorrow? You have suffered, both physically and psychologically. You have suffered when you have seen children starving, poverty, what human beings have done to animals, to the earth, to the air, how they kill each other at the least provocation - for their country, for their god, for their kings, queens, for their religion. And one has suffered oneself - someone whom you love, whom you think you love, has gone and there is this sense of enormous loneliness, isolation, lack of companionship, the utter sense of feeling forlorn. I am sure most of us have felt this at a

crisis or vaguely in moments of unawareness. Unless one totally understands it, goes beyond it, there can never be wisdom. Wisdom comes with self knowledge, or with the ending of sorrow. Wisdom you can't buy in books or from another. It comes only when there is self knowing and therefore the ending of sorrow.

Now why does one suffer? One can understand when we have physical pain, we are not talking about that, you can do something about it, or put up with it intelligently without becoming neurotic. That is, if I have constant physical pain, a sense of agony during the day and night, without distorting the mind that pain can be understood and lived with, without bringing about an action which is not only neurotic but also contradictory, aggressive, expressing itself in violence and so on. That kind of physical pain we can bear, tolerate, understand and do something about it logically and perhaps also illogically, which is sanely and insanely. But we are talking about together, it is not my problem please, it is your problem, we are discussing it together: what is sorrow, why does one suffer? Will the discovery of the cause of suffering end suffering? One may suffer because one is desperately lonely. In that loneliness one has no sense of relationship with another, it is a total isolation and one feels this perhaps when you are alone in your room, in the middle of the night, or when you are in a crowd, sitting in a bus, or at a party, you feel suddenly utterly, hopelessly deserted by everybody and there you are utterly empty, utterly isolated. Haven't you felt all these things? This loneliness is very painful and we escape from it through various forms - churches, social work, marriage - you know - children, companionship, drugs, anything to escape from this great sense of isolation.

Now how do you resolve this? We will go into it step by step. We are doing this together please. It is not that I want to speak about it, therefore I am pushing it on to you, but it is a problem of every living human being whether rich or poor, whether tyrants, or the most dominated slavish people. Now how does one go beyond this sense of utter loneliness, which is one of the factors of great sorrow? I don't know if you have gone into it, if you have even looked at this problem. Our gods, our churches, our literature, our ceremonies - you know, all the circus that goes on round us, (including the Olympia Circus - I saw an advertisement this morning, as we were going along) is brought about to give us comfort. That has been the function of the priest, to help us tolerate this ugly life and promising a new life in heaven. And so that becomes a marvellous escape from this sense of utter despairing lonely existence. Although we may be married with children and all the rest of it, there is this isolation, which has been carefully built up through our daily activities, the self centred existence culminating in this isolation. Now what is one to do? You understand my question? What is one to do? How is one to resolve this problem?

First of all, just look at the problem clearly. I am lonely because in my life, daily life, I have been ambitious, greedy, envious, making myself terribly important, isolating myself, although I might have a wife or husband and all the rest of it. And this self-centred activity ultimately brings about this isolation, this sense of utter empty loneliness. If you have not felt it, you are not a human being. Right? Because we have escaped from it and so you are blind. And we escape in various forms from one of the central

issues of our life - religions offer - you know the whole escapes that we have very carefully established through thought - our religions, our systems of meditation, our social work, the despairing, destructive, appalling wars, killing animals and all the rest of it, is the product of thought.

Now what is a human being, you, to do when you are confronted, when you are aware of this sense of loneliness, which is one of the factors of sorrow? You understand? During our daily existence we expend energy in being concerned with ourselves, and that energy is dissipated in activities which ultimately block all expressions of energy, and that is loneliness. I don't know if you follow all this? You are with me? Shall I go on? We are together in this? Loneliness is after all a blocking of all energy. Before I was aware that I was lonely and I expended energy in escapes of various kinds - trivial, nonsensical, brutal, so-called spiritual, which is nonsense. And this expanse of energy has kept me going, and I suffer through loneliness and the energy is completely blocked. I don't know if you realize this. It is quite interesting. And when this energy is not expended through escapes then energy is concentrated. And when you don't escape there is passion - you understand? Passion. There are various kinds of passion - sexual passion, passion for trying to be great, trying to be better, trying to improve, trying to become some idiotic person.

So I realize, one realizes that any form of escape, any form - subtle, conscious, unconscious, deliberate, by act of will - any form of escape doesn't resolve this problem. On the contrary, it makes it worse because from that escape you do all kinds of absurd irrational activities. Whereas if there is no escape because you see

the truth of it, you have an insight into it, then this whole sense of loneliness disappears and something else takes place, which is that sense of passion. You know that word 'passion', the root meaning of that word is sorrow. It is rather curious, isn't it? When there is sorrow and no escape from it - there are very subtle forms of escapes - when there is no escape whatsoever that sorrow becomes passion.

And we are enquiring also, why one suffers, apart from loneliness, why does one suffer? Through self pity? Do you know what self pity is? And is that one of the reasons why one suffers? Again self pity is concern with oneself: you have such a beautiful life and I have not. You are so brilliant, you are so famous, you are so etc.etc., and I have nothing, my life is shoddy, petty, small. So through comparison, through measurement I feel small, inferior, and that is one of the causes of sorrow. You are following all this? Now can the mind put an end to itself, that is thought as measurement and therefore no self pity whatsoever? So please do this as we go along.

What are the other factors that bring sorrow in human life? I want to love. I love you and you don't love me, and I want more love from you, I feel I must be loved by you, you are the only person who can love me and nobody else. I shut the door on everybody else, but I accept you, I will keep my door open to you; and you look the other way. Doesn't this happen to all of you? And you spend your life in sorrow, in bitterness, in anger, jealousy, you know, fury, frustrated, because you insist on going through one door! And you find that you are not loved. I don't know if you see what a terrible thought that is: that you are not loved. You



understand this? Isn't it appalling to feel that you are not loved? Have you ever noticed a flower on the wayside, the beauty of it, the colour of it? It has a perfume and it isn't asking you to look at it, it isn't asking you to smell it, it is there. But we human beings have this machinery of thought, which says, "I must be loved, I haven't got enough love", or "I must love you". So one of the factors of our sorrow is the sense of not being loved. Isn't that so? Right? And we demand that love be expressed in a certain way - sexually or in companionship, or in friendship, platonically or physically. Which all indicates, doesn't it, a human mind demands that it have a relationship with another based on its own urgency - right? - and so this prevents the love coming into being. We said: there is love only when there is the ending of sorrow. Love cannot exist within the circle, or within the field of sorrow.

And sorrow exists also when there is fear. So one has to go into this question of fear. Why are human beings, or a particular human being, why does he fear, what does he fear? What does fear mean basically? The sense of insecurity - right? Are you meeting me? A child demands security, complete security: and more and more the mother and the father are working, homes broken up, the parents are so deeply concerned about themselves, their position in society, having more money, more refrigerators, more cars, more this and more that, they have no time to give complete security for the child. Don't you know all this? Security is one of the essential things of life, not only for you and me, but for everybody. Those who live in the ghettos, those who live in palaces and so on, security is absolutely necessary otherwise the brain can't function efficiently, sanely. Watch this process, how this happens - I need

security, I must have food, clothes and shelter, so must everybody. And if I am lucky I can arrange it physically. But psychologically it becomes much more difficult to become secure, completely. So I seek that security in a belief, in a conclusion, in nationality, in a family, or in my experience, and when that experience, when that family, when my belief is threatened there is fear - all right? There is fear when I have to face danger, psychological danger which is uncertainty, meeting something I don't know, the tomorrow, there is fear. And there is fear when I am comparing myself with you who are, I think, greater.

So can the mind have security? Can the brain have complete security in which every form of fear has come to an end? Please listen to this. I am afraid because I demand, I see that security in the sense of a brain that cannot be disturbed, so that it can function effectively, sanely, rationally, and when it cannot there is fear. I see that, very clearly. Now how is the brain to find complete security so that there is no fear - you have understood? Please meet me. How is your brain, from which your thought, your existence, your whole being, begins, how is that brain and the mind, which are the same thing, how is that to have total security so that at no time consciously, or unconsciously, it is ever caught in fear, fear which is uncertainty, fear which is not knowing, or incapable of finding out? Now how is this to take place? Will there be security in any belief, in any conclusion, in any opinion, in any knowledge? Obviously not, though human beings have tried those things.

So can the mind realize that there is no security in the things that thought projects? You understand? Thought has projected belief, thought has projected conclusions, thought has created the

dogmas, the rituals, the saviours, you know this whole psychological outward conclusion upon which it relies. And when those are threatened there is terrible fear. And most intelligent awake people have put all that aside, not perhaps completely but some of them have. They no longer go to churches, no longer accept any form of Marxian theory and so on and so on.

So how is the mind to be secure? Because that is absolutely necessary, because that is one of the major causes of fear. So what is intelligence? You understand? Because if the mind is intelligent there is no fear. If the mind is capable of meeting life intelligently (I am going to find out what intelligence is presently) - if the mind is intelligent, awake, then it can meet any situation without fear, therefore the mind itself becomes the sense of security - you understand? The mind, as it exists now, is confused. We don't know what to do, we don't know what to think, we have put our faith in something and that has failed, we have believed in something that has broken down. We have relied on tradition, that has gone. We relied on friends, on relationships, on family, everything is broken down. And the mind is utterly confused, uncertain, seeking, asking and that is why most of you are here - no?

So what shall a mind do that is confused? A mind that is confused mustn't do a thing - right? I don't know if you understand this. Because whatever it does out of that confusion will be confused. Whatever choice it makes must be confused. Whatever leaders it follows it must be confused. The leaders must be confused too otherwise you wouldn't accept. You are following all this? If you are following somebody, your guru, the guru must be

confused because you are confused, otherwise you wouldn't follow him - right? Oh do see all this! Give your heart to this, be passionate about it and you will find out. So what do you do when you are confused? We generally ask somebody to help us to be clear, read some philosophy and escape through that and so on and so on, which are all the actions of confusion, and therefore are bound to lead to more confusion, more misery, more conflict. So what am I to do when I know I am confused? I know there must be complete security. I am confused therefore I will not do a thing. You understand? I am confused because I thought I could do something to clear out this confusion - right? You understand? And I thought I could go beyond confusion but the entity that says, I am going beyond my confusion is part of the confusion, and is the creator of this confusion. I don't know if you follow all this? Therefore thought, which has brought about confusion, says, "I can't do a thing about it" - you understand? The moment it realizes it cannot do anything about it, it is out of confusion. So the mind then becomes very clear.

And as we said, we have put our faith, our belief in something, faith in education, in science, in politics, in religion, everything has failed. If you don't see that you are not aware.

Now where shall the mind find its own security? It finds its own security when it sees what is false, what is illusion, when it has no insight - the moment it has an insight that very insight is that security, which is intelligence. You have got it? I see, have an insight, I am aware, I see the truth that any kind of organized religion is destructive. That is the truth. And the very perception of that is security. I see very clearly, have an insight that in

relationship if there is an image between you and me, that image prevents relationship. The insight into that is the security. I see, there is the perception, that any form of escape from loneliness is destructive, has no value, that very perception is security and this is intelligence. So there is complete security in this intelligence. You are getting it? Therefore fear doesn't exist. You are following this?

That is, one is afraid, not only of darkness, not only of physical pain, not only of what people say about you, there is fear of death, of life, of almost everything, and there is not only conscious fears but the hidden fears, which you suddenly discover. And you don't know what to do, how to deal with them - not only the conscious fears but also the unconscious deep rooted fears. Now how shall the mind deal with them? Because I see very clearly that any fear, any fear, physical or psychological, any fear brings about a state of darkness, a state of misery, confusion, ugliness, sorrow. You know all this. I see it - you understand? It is not an intellectual perception but actual perception that fear in any form is the most destructive thing. And there is deep rooted fear inherited through the culture, through my family, through the religions and so on - fear. Now how shall I deal with them? Has fear many heads or only one head? You have understood my question? Has fear many expressions, or only one expression which seems different? Are you getting tired of all this? You are following all this? Shall the mind analytically pursue every fear, every form of fear, every expression of fear? Or is there only one central fear? You have to find out, haven't you? Do the many facets of fear make the whole of fear, or is there only fear, one root of it that expresses itself in a different variety of ways? I can see that tracing one fear,

expression of fear, comes to a central issue. Take one fear which you have and go into it very deliberately watching it, if you can watch it, if you can objectify it and remain with it, not escape from it, look at it, go into it step by step and you find the root. And you take another fear and are the roots different? Or is there only one root with different branches, like a tree? If I can understand that one root completely then it is finished. You are following all this? Fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of losing my job, fear of not being able to talk the day after tomorrow. You understand? Fear of falling ill. Are they the various movements of this central fear? Or there is only one fear, the root of it, like an expanding tree. And if the mind can go into that deeply, into the very complex root system, then the examination of various fears has no value - you are following this?

Now can the mind - listen to this - can the mind look at this total root, not the various expressions of that root but the total root system? It can only observe that root system completely when the mind is not concerned with the solution of a particular fear - right? Oh come on sirs. I am afraid of what my wife is going to say, I am afraid of losing my job, I am afraid of not being able to fulfil myself in some blasted little work. And I examine each one of them and I come to the root thing, which is the desire, the will to be - please follow this - the desire to be, the will to assert. And this desire to be, this demand for existence in that root system is the factor that brings the various other fears. So can my mind look at this fear, live with it, not try to change it, because the moment I exert will upon it, or choice upon it, my mind is working from a confusion, from a conclusion, trying to go beyond it, therefore

conflict and conflict feeds fear. Come on sirs.

So is the mind capable of looking at this whole fear, not only the expressions but the root? You understand what that means? Looking at the whole tree of existence in which one of the factors is fear. Now how do you look at something totally, you understand? - not only the particular fear but the root fear, not only your particular idiosyncratic fears, your fears of various kinds, but the total human fear. How do you look at it? So we have to see what does it mean to look at something totally? You understand? Come on sirs. We are meeting each other? Or are you going to sleep?

We are asking the mind, which is fragmented, the 'me' and not the 'me', 'we' and 'they', my house, your house, my god, your god and my system and your system, my guru and your guru, my politics - the mind fragmented, how can such a mind look at the whole thing, at any whole problem? Unless it can look at the totality of it, it cannot resolve it, it cannot go beyond it. So how is - not how, not the means - when does the perception of the total take place? That can only happen when thought, which in its very nature is fragmentary, which in its very nature must create confusion, and because of thought I am frightened of tomorrow - you follow - when that thought realizes that it is fragmentary, it cannot perceive the total, then that insight is perception of the truth - right? You see it? By Jove I am working very hard. I wonder why I am working so hard, don't you? I don't want a thing from you, not your money, your looks, your flattery, your insults, nothing. Thank god! Therefore I can talk because I want to - you follow?

So, can the mind observe without the observer, which is

thought, can the mind observe the total fear? And when the mind is so capable of observing total fear, is there fear? Do please look at it - total fear which means not only the unconscious but the conscious fears, the total. That means the mind is the total - I don't know if you see this - not the total fear. The mind that is capable of looking at something wholly, that mind has no fear, obviously.

You know when we are talking about fear we must also go into the question of pleasure, enjoyment, joy and a sense of beauty in which there is no demand for expression. Does this interest you, all this? You see most of us pursue and cultivate pleasure. We are not saying pleasure is right or wrong. We are just investigating, looking at it. Our philosophy, our religion, our social structure, our morality is based on pleasure - the ultimate pleasure is god. Now what is wrong with it? What is wrong with pleasure - which everybody wants? And in the pursuit of it, if there is no fulfilment of pleasure then there is pain, there is fear, there is violence, brutality - everything follows. So the mind must always find out about fear and pleasure - the two dominating factors in our life.

What is pleasure? We have sufficiently enquired into fear. What is pleasure? Is it related to love? Is it related to enjoyment? Is it related to joy? Or is pleasure, the pursuit of it, the product of thought? You are following this? I enjoy tremendously looking at a mountain - the delight of it, the beauty of it, the dignity of it, the majesty of it, the glacier, the deep valleys which are blue and the upright standing pines, the whole beauty of it I enjoy, looking out of the window or from a height to see the beauty of all that. There is a stimulation which brings a great delight. I go away from it but the memory of that delight, of that mountain remains. Then the



memory, as thought, says, "I must go there again tomorrow morning and look at it" - that is pleasure. You have understood? That is, a delight that is natural, normal, healthy, sane, a delight pursued by thought turns into pleasure, which must be repeated, and when it is not repeated there is pain, frustration and so on and so on and so on - right? So again there is an insight that thought breeds fear as well as pleasure, gives it a continuity. The insight into that brings about an intelligent awareness of fear and pleasure, not the denial of one or the other. Are you following all this? Am I saying too much in one talk? I must go on.

Then what is joy? Is pleasure desire, love? And there cannot be love if there is not the understanding of going beyond sorrow, the understanding of fear and pleasure.

And what is joy? Can the mind invite joy? Or does it happen when you are not looking for it? And when it does happen then thought steps in and says, "I must have more of it", and therefore it becomes pleasure. I don't know if you are following all this? See how extraordinary the whole thing is, what thought does. So love can only be when the other is not - right? Through negation you come to the positive. The understanding of fear, of security, of sorrow, the whole pursuit of endless pleasure, when you see the totality of all this and go beyond it and you know what love is.

Perhaps you would like to ask some questions.

Q: How may one help another in a given crisis?

K: I object most strenuously to the word 'help'. Who am I to help you? Do listen to this carefully. You can help me in the kitchen, you can help me in driving a car. The questioner is not asking that. He says, how can I help another in a crisis? Who am I

to help? Why do I think I can help? Please I am asking this seriously, don't brush it aside. I say, "I can help you" - is it my vanity? Do I know more than you do, and if I do know more about the crisis than you do, can I help you to understand that crisis? I can only verbally talk about it. You understand? I can communicate with you about the crisis verbally, but can I help you to go beyond the crisis? Or you have to do it. It sounds cruel.

So what am I to do when you are suffering? You understand? Crisis is some kind of sorrow, some kind of pain, some kind of fear. What am I to do to help you to understand that crisis? That is the question, isn't it? What am I to do? Come on sirs. I talk to you about it. It matters very much how I talk to you about it - sentimentally, emotionally, trying to comfort you - does that help? So what shall I do? Give you my sympathy? Hold your hand? Does that help you to face the crisis? Can I give you so-called strength to face the crisis, cheer you up? What shall I do? Come on, please tell me. I am in sorrow, my son is dead, gone, or my husband or whatever it is, what will you do with me, I am in tears, full of self pity, sense of loneliness, I feel I have lost everything that I had? You can hold my hand. Give me a book to read that will give me comfort. Will that solve any of the problem for me?

All perhaps you can do is to be quiet and if you love, you know what that means to love, be in that quiet affectionate state, you can't do any more can you? But to love is one of the greatest things in life. And to do that, to have that sense of compassion, passion for everybody, love, you must understand yourself, you must know yourself - yourself who is in sorrow, self-centred activity, lonely, miserable, frightened - you follow - you are all that. If you

understand yourself then you will have wisdom how to deal with another. But don't if I may suggest, don't start out wanting to help somebody. The missionaries want to help people. You ought to go to the eastern countries and see them. They do help people, only they bring another burden with them for the people to bear. They have their own burdens, their own gods, their own beliefs, so they bring another set of beliefs, another god. And there begins a lot of misery and confusion.

Q: Is it because we have not your insight that we ask you to do something that we cannot do ourselves?

K: I have no insight. Who told you I have insight? I really mean it. Who has told you? We are sharing the insight together, it is not mine, nor yours. Do please see this. It is not my insight I am sharing with you, it is insight for both of us; then it is not mine, or yours. It is insight. It is intelligence. If there is that intelligence between us then we will do the thing, then we will do the right action, then we will create a new world, a new human being and so on.

Q: Could you please talk a little about the nature of indecision.

K: That is not being able to decide, indecision. It is only a confused mind that wants to decide. Right? Do you see it? If I am confused I say, "I must do something". If I am clear there is no decision, there is only action. Oh come on sirs. It is only when I am uncertain what to do, what to think, how to act, uncertain, when there is uncertainty there must be choice. Then choice is based on my uncertainty, which is indecision and being undecided I decide to do something. I don't know if you all following all this. So out of confusion you must have a choice of decision. When there is

clarity there is no decision. Right? Isn't it simple? Really it is extraordinarily simple if you look at it, live with it.

I have never decided anything in my life - coming to the talks, or not giving talks, nothing in my life. I didn't say, "I must give up property" - you understand? Or I must do this, or I must do that, or I must not - never. There is beauty in that because decision means will, doesn't it? I decide. Decision implies contradiction. Between two things you have to decide - who is that entity that decides? Thought? Of course. But thought has created this division - right? Thought has created this uncertainty between whether I should do this or that.

Q: Is indecision not there at all?

K: Of course there is. I am pointing out that there is indecision only when there is no clarity. You know, look I don't know how to go to Bern or Montreux, I don't know how to get there so I ask - right? If I know it, I don't ask, there is no decision, I follow the road. Now can my mind be so clear that there is no asking, deciding anything - you follow? That is freedom isn't it?

So can my mind, which is so confused, so fragmented, so broken up, can that mind be completely clear? It can only be clear when I see the totality of my mind - the totality, not the various fragments of it, or put all the fragments to make a whole. When I see, when the mind sees the total fragmentation, how these fragments are brought about, why they are in contradiction, non-analytically - you understand - you can see all of that at one glance - you can do that only when the mind doesn't allow thought to come into it, when thought doesn't interfere in your observation, because thought is the entity, is the factor that brings about

fragmentation.

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 27TH JULY 1972

We have been talking over together the whole nature of thought. And we ought to talk over together this morning and try to discover for ourselves, what is the state of mind that is not afraid, that is not pursuing the demands of pleasure, that can enjoy without making joy into a pleasure; and what is the quality of a mind that can understand, have an insight into the question of death; what it means to live completely totally; and perhaps also come upon the question of what is love.

We have been talking in fair detail how our brain and our mind works, how important it is to have complete security; it is only then that the brain can function normally, sanely and healthily. We said that the brain tries to find out if there is a security in belief, in dogmas, in conclusions and hopes to find it in them, and so becomes terribly attached to them - attached to a belief, dogma, conclusion, to opinions. And discovering, if it is at all awake, that security, certainty, the quality of assurance, doesn't lie in any of these, then it tries to invent an illusion, an illusion that intellectually, emotionally, will be satisfactory. I don't know if you have not observed this process that is going on all the time in our life: trying to find in relationship security, certainty and not finding it in them, then come to a conclusion and it becomes attached to that conclusion and when that conclusion is questioned, disturbed, then it runs away from it to another series of conclusions, and gradually the mind begins to attach itself to things - right? So there is attachment to property, to people or to ideas.

And as we grow older there is this question of death. And I

think we shall understand the deep meaning of that word if we could go into this question of attachment. Why the human mind, our mind, your mind, is attached to property, to people, to ideas - ideas being conclusions, opinions, traditions, a formula, which are all put together by thought, either in the form of an image, symbol which is the word, or a nebular visionary illusion. Why is the mind attached to all these things? If you are not attached to an illusion or to a person then you are attached to property - property whether it is a house, a piece of land or accumulated furniture - you know all that kind of stuff - why? What makes the mind, the thought cling to something like property, money? When we use the word 'property' it includes all that - why? Because as we said the other day, mere enquiry into the causation doesn't free the mind from the cause. Intellectually you can break down by analysis why the mind is attached to property, but at the end of it there is still attachment. That attachment comes to an end if we have an insight into the whole structure of attachment. Because to have an insight into something, to see the truth of something brings its own freedom, brings its own intelligence. Now why does the mind attach itself to property? We will investigate why it is attached to people and to conclusions, ideas, symbols, visions and all the rest of it. Why?

You understand that property is not only things but also the attachment to one's own body, which is also a thing. You see we get attached to a property and then safeguard it and when we realize that it is not worth it then we try to cultivate detachment - attachment then detachment, and the conflict. Please, as we have been saying during all these talks, we are sharing this thing together. You are not merely listening to a series of words, ideas,

conclusions, but we are sharing the thing which we are talking about. Sharing implies listening and enjoying the thing that we are examining, because when you enjoy something you learn much quicker, but if you make a problem of it you won't learn. To me it is very enjoyable, if I may use that word, to find out why my mind is attached to property. I want to learn about it and therefore I am not going to make a problem of it. If I make a problem of it then I want to go beyond it, then the mind creates the idea of detachment. Then in that there is conflict between attachment and detachment. And the mind that is in conflict can never learn. It can learn the results of that conflict but not the root cause of attachment.

I do not know if you have gone into this question of enjoyment. There is a vast difference between pleasure and enjoyment. Pleasure has a motive. The pursuit of pleasure is the memory of a previous pleasure, and enjoyment is from moment to moment. You can't cultivate enjoyment, but you can cultivate pleasure. And when there is enjoyment then the brain relaxes. You watch it. But when it is pursuing pleasure then it becomes tense, it becomes purposeful, thought then cultivates determination, will. Whereas if there is enjoyment the whole brain cells relax. I was told the other day by somebody who seemed to know something about this, that recently scientists have discovered that when there is an enjoyment a new gland, a gland at the very centre of the back of the head, functions and brings more activity to the brain, which is not the activity of strain - are you getting it?

So to learn there must be enjoyment. One must enjoy that which one is learning. And you cannot enjoy, be happy in the act of learning when you are comparing, judging, evaluating; or when



what you are learning you are storing up in order to enjoy more. Right? Please watch your own brain cells in operation. Which is really a part of meditation, it is to observe completely without the act of will. When there is the act of will then there is conflict. And what we are trying to do this morning - not trying, sorry - what we are doing - I don't like the word 'try' - when you try it means an effort. If you do it actually, it is going on. What we are trying to... (Laughter) What we are doing is, to observe happily why the mind is attached to property, because unless the brain cells understand, the mind understands why there is this attachment death then becomes attachment - right? Why is the mind attached to so many things? Is it because there is nothing so permanent as property? There is the house, there is the furniture, the carpet, the picture, they are solid, and in that solidity the mind can take rest and be attached to it. Look at it, go into it fairly deeply and you will see for yourself.

Human relationship is uncertain, in that there is conflict, in that there is every form of struggle, jealousy, anxiety, fear, pleasure, sexual or otherwise, companionship and so on and so on, and that is an uncertain quantity; and ideas too are rather uncertain, unclear, and property is the only thing that is solid, that I can see.

Q: It is bombed so many times it is not solid, not solid at all.

K: Of course not sir, wait a minute sir. It has been bombed so often, destroyed so often, but human beings go back to it, you and I intellectually may say, "Well property doesn't matter", but if we look into it very carefully, property, it doesn't matter what it is, a pair of boots, one gets terribly attached. Perhaps those poor people in Vietnam may say that property doesn't matter, but it does matter

because otherwise they would have nothing.

So is that the reason? Is that why mind gets attached to property? Mine or yours, or property of an institution with which it identifies itself as, my property. And also is it because mind needs to be occupied? The mind is never in a state of not being occupied. Please watch all this in yourself. And occupation becomes extraordinarily important. The man who goes to an office for forty, fifty, sixty years, when that occupation comes to an end, he also comes to an end. So occupation becomes extraordinarily important and the mind can be occupied with property, looking after it - you know all the business of owning something. Now if one has an insight into it that the mind needs to be occupied, it demands occupation whether it is occupied with furniture, with social work, with a book or with an idea of god, it is exactly the same, because it demands occupation. And is it because also the mind in itself seems to have no existence apart from the thing to which it is attached? Right? What is the content of my mind, of my consciousness, or your consciousness, the content? The property, the idea, the images that I have built about another or about myself. So the mind in itself has no existence apart from its content, and one of its contents is the furniture. You are following all this? And so it is not a question of being attached - furniture is the mind. And when the mind has no quality of itself then attachment becomes extraordinarily important. Please observe this in yourself.

So the material existence of property, and being occupied with that property, the mind being lonely must have occupation, and so property takes a great deal of time with which one can be occupied, and the loneliness and so on, and the mind having no existence of

its own finds existence in the content, in the attachment, in the idea - right? And why are we attached so much to people - this is much more interesting. Why are you attached to a person? Are you really attached to the person, or to the idea, to the image of that person? I am attached to you for various reasons, which is: my attachment to you gives a quality, an existence to the mind, and my attachment to you is its existence. Now I am attached to you because I love you. You give me pleasure, sexual or otherwise, you give me something to which I can cling to, a companionship, an existence with you gives more certainty to the mind - you are following all this? And without you I am lost. And being lost I have to find another companion, another attachment. Or if there is trouble between you and me, which is between the image I have of you and the image you have of me, which is called relationship, if there is in that relationship conflict, I try to break it up and establish another form of relationship, which is another image. You are following all this?

So again I see the mind having no quality, vitality, existence, energy of its own, it tries to find in relationship all that. Please watch this in yourself, not what the speaker is saying but actually what is going on in your mind when you are attached to a person, as obviously you must be attached, which you call love, with all its responsibility, with all its neurotic behaviour and so on and so on. Then there is this whole gamut of ideation, mentation. That is, the images that thought has created and put together as an idea, an idea is the reasoned out, verbal assertion of a thought - right? Can I go on? You are following all this?

And we live on a formula, on conclusions, which are put together by thought. Thought being memory and the past, so we

are living in the past, which may be projected into the future but has its roots in the past, so our attachment is to the past. Now why does the mind live, act, behave upon a series of conclusions which thought has come to - why? I don't know if you have not noticed this in yourself, you have experience, it doesn't matter what it is, however trivial, however great, you have an experience and that experience becomes the memory and that memory with its knowledge is the process of thought, which comes to a conclusion, and according to that conclusion you live. The conclusion is non-physical, non-existent, as the furniture, it is still an idea. And the mind having no vitality of its own has to depend on ideas, formulas, beliefs, doctrines and all the rest of it, and therefore there is constant division between the conclusion and the act. Are we all asleep? I want to be quite sure.

So I see the mind is its content. The mind is not without its content. And it is afraid to let go its content otherwise it has no existence. And so it has got to occupy itself with its content - furniture, the people, the person or the idea, idea being god, you know all the rest of it. You see how extraordinarily interesting it is, because meditation, what they call meditation, is the cultivation of an occupation with an idea, and the practising of that idea, which is not at all meditation - we'll discuss it perhaps on Sunday - but see how the whole thing hangs together like a marvellous structure.

Now one has explained all this: the attachment to property, attachment to people, to conclusions, to your images, symbols, ideas. To have an insight into that, into the whole of it, is the liberation from attachment, not at some future date but instantly. This is really important to understand. When you listen to this do

you say, 'I will think about this a little later. When I go out of this tent I will go into this much more. Because here there are too many ideas, too many being poured out, I must take it up and think about it later' - which prevents you having an insight now. And if you are sharing this thing together there is no time for you to think about it later.

We are sharing the food together because you are hungry, and the speaker is also hungry, we are sharing the food together, eating together. You don't say when you are eating together, or when you are hungry, "I will eat later" - you are sharing it, actively eating. And if you have no insight into what has been said, why? Are you frightened of not being attached, not being occupied, not finding out what happens to a mind that has no attachment - and therefore fear. Because the mind is incessantly occupied, whether with the house, with sex, with god, with drink or with your politics, with your guru - occupied. And that gives it a vitality, a certain quality of energy. And one is afraid if there is no occupation at all what is going to take place. Therefore when there is that fear you will not share. That fear will prevent you. Therefore you have to have an insight into that fear, which is far more important to have an insight into attachment. So there is constant insight. And when you have such an insight attachment altogether is gone and a different quality comes into being, the quality which the mind itself has, if it has understood, is aware, has an insight into the whole process of attachment. That is love. You understand? How can I love you, or you love me, if I am attached to you? My attachment is based on my pursuit of pleasure, which you give me, your images and so on. I am attached to that image of you and you are attached to the

image of me. And the image is the past, is the response of experience, knowledge. So is love the past? Is love experience? Is love memory? Is love the reaction to that memory as pleasure? Follow all this.

So one discovers, or one comes upon, the mind comes upon that where there is attachment of any kind there is no love. It is not a statement, an idea, but an actual fact which the mind has discovered, which the mind, having an insight into attachment, sees the truth of it. And seeing the truth of it, it is not occupied with the person, or with furniture, or with the idea, and therefore it has its own energy. I wonder if you are meeting all this. It is that quality of energy which is love. Right? And therefore love can never be hurt. Oh, you don't see all this, do you? Can never be jealous, never lonely, never asks to be loved - what a horror that is.

And one observes what one's life is. What is our life? What is our existence? Look at it please. Your existence, not mine. Which is: what is the existence of the 'me' in the field of knowledge? What is my living in the field of experience? What is my actual activity with the whole structure of memory which is the past? Is my life based on the past - the past being yesterday, or ten thousand yesterdays? Please look at it. I want to learn about myself and I have learned happily what my attachments do to the mind, and I want to find out also what my actual life is, not the imagined life, not the life I would like to have, not the life that depends on environment, on stimuli but actually what is my daily existence based on? You are following all this? Am I living in the past, is my life the past? Operating, reacting to the present, based upon the past and therefore projecting that to the future - you are following?

I want to find out, please listen to this carefully - I want to find out whether the temperament and the idiosyncrasy are my life; or is my life my conditioned state; or the temperament, idiosyncrasy and the conditioning is my whole life? Am I making this complex?

What is temperament, what is idiosyncrasy? You understand? You have certain temperaments, you have certain idiosyncrasies - no? Temperament is, according to the dictionary meaning, as far as you can make out, based on experience; idiosyncrasy is something that is put together. We all have various kinds of idiosyncrasies and their idiosyncratic activity and temperamental activity, but basically we are conditioned though the temperament and idiosyncrasy may vary from person to person. Are you following all this? You and I are basically conditioned according to the culture, to the past and all that, deeply, conditioned consciously or unconsciously, conditioned deeply through inheritance, heredity, through culture, through a thousand years of man's struggles. That is our basic conditioning, add to it more, tradition and so on and so on. From that according to time, climate, culture, which varies the expression of idiosyncrasy and temperament. Because that is, you are different in temperament from me. You have your idiosyncrasies different from mine. And we try to balance these idiosyncrasies and temperament and try to bring harmony between us, which can never be done; whereas harmony between us can come only when the mind has an insight into the total conditioning. Right? Am I going on too much?

Shall we take a breath here for a minute? Because this is really quite important and rather interesting if you go into it. You see we are trying to bring harmony in relationships between temperaments

and idiosyncrasies, outwardly. But inwardly, deeply we are conditioned, and we try to somehow to live together with our absurd idiosyncrasies and temperaments, and in that there is always a battle, a strife - I am trying to adjust myself to your temperament and you are trying to adjust to my idiosyncrasies - aren't you? This is what is going on in life. And there is this constant effort, battle, and I say to myself, "That is totally wrong somehow, it has no value". Because your temperament and idiosyncrasies can vary, change, that has no value. Therefore no character. So character has no value. Are you getting this? But what has significance, is to find out, have an insight into this whole conditioning. Then if the mind is free from its conditioning, which is its content, then our relationship is entirely different, then there is no conflict between you and me because it is not based on pleasure and all the rest of it. Are you getting it?

Now can I, can the mind see this whole business of conditioning, temperament, idiosyncrasy, how the mind is the result of the past, which is evolution, can it have an insight into that? Not tomorrow but now, instantly we have insight into ourselves and therefore that insight brings its own energy to transform 'what is'. Insight has its own energy, which is not dependent on any stimuli, and therefore that insight which has its tremendous energy, transforms what is observed, which is attachment. Have you got that insight, and therefore that tremendous energy to change actually your attachment totally? So the mind doesn't derive its energy in attachment, in conflict and all that but it has its own vital energy, independent of environment, of culture, of people. Come on sirs. Therefore living has quite a



different meaning than the living which we do now, which is conflict.

Then we have to enquire into this whole question of what is death? Do you mind it, enquiring into that? Because a lot of people are young people and you may live very long, and there are a lot of old people here too, including myself, we are the people who are going and you are the people who are coming. But you are going and coming and you also have to face death. So we are going to enquire into it, which is, we are going to have an insight into it. And you cannot have an insight into it if there is any kind of fear, and fear comes only when you are attached to the things known, which is, the things known are your images, your knowledges, your attachments, your furniture, your opinions, judgements, culture, your shyness, politeness - you follow - all that is the field of the known. And if you are afraid you will never have an insight into this, into this whole problem of death.

I want to find out, as you must, what is death. Why am I frightened of death? Why am I so scared of old age and suddenly coming to an end? It is really a very complex business, the whole understanding of what is death, very complex. And the very complexity of it makes one frightened because it is like a very complex machinery, you daren't touch it, because you know nothing about it. But if you approach it very simply, which means really you are trying to learn about it, therefore you are enjoying it - not the idea of death but enjoying the investigation, the approach, the enquiry, therefore you are learning and you cannot learn if you are not happy, therefore you cannot have fear. That is the basic thing.

So if you really want to go into this you have to be very clear that your mind, which means your thought, doesn't create fear - fear of what it considers coming to an end, what it considers entering into something it doesn't know.

Now first of all I have to find out, because I am not frightened, you understand, I am not interested in fear at all, I want to find out if there is anything permanent as the 'me' - you understand? Permanent that is, which has a continuity. I can leave my furniture to my brother, son, or whatever and therefore it can remain in the family, or sold in an antique shop and somebody else buys it, and I want to find out if there is anything substantial, continuous, permanent as 'me' who is frightened of death.

Is there anything permanent in me, in you? - permanent in the sense a continuity in time, a duration in space as the 'me'. The 'me' is the name - right? Has that name any permanency? Or thought gives permanency to the name. In itself it has no permanency, but thought, identifying itself with the body, with the image, with the knowledge, with all the experiences, sorrows, pleasures, agonies, all identifying itself with that, that gives it a quality of permanency - right? Otherwise is there anything permanent? A thing that has a continuity in spite of the non-existence of the body? Are you interested in all this? You are going to face this, whether you like it or not. Either you are going to face it accidentally, or through disease, or the natural decay, the decay of the organism. It is inevitable. You can avoid it by living longer, healthier, taking more pills and all the rest of it - you know, carry on. But at the end there is this fact. Unless I find out for myself if there is something permanent beyond death - permanent which means timeless, which

cannot be corrupted through civilization, through culture, something that in spite of all experience, knowledge, stimuli, reactions, it has its own existence, and goes on as the 'me'. So man has said, "There is not the 'me' but there is god" - follow all this carefully. In India, in Asia they put it differently, but it is still the act of thought, which says, "There is the soul", it is an act of thought, when it says, there is Brahman, as they say in India it is still the act of thought, thought which is frightened of the unknown, because thought is the known, thought is time, thought is old, thought is never free: because thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, therefore it is always old, never free, and being of time it is uncertain of the timeless, that is, beyond time. So it says, "I am not important, 'me' is transient, is being put together by culture, by time, by accident, by the family, by tradition, by the culture in which it has been put together, it has developed certain tendencies, idiosyncrasies, it has its conditioning but beyond all that there is the soul, there is something immense in me which is the permanent." All that is the process of thought. And thought confronted with the inevitable, which is death, the ending, says, "I can't tolerate this", therefore it says, "There must be a future life", or it says, "I believe there is a future life", or "There is heaven and I'll sit next to god" - it wants comfort faced with something completely unknown. And there are thousands of people who will give you comfort. All the organized churches offer that, and you want that, and therefore they exist.

Now if you see how it is still the action of thought and therefore based on fear, on imagination, on the past, that is the field of the known, which is: "I am attached to the field of the known, with all

its varieties, changes, its activities", and what I demand is comfort, because I have found comfort in the past, I have lived within the field of the known, that is my territory, I know its borders, the frontiers - the frontiers are my consciousness which is its content. I am completely familiar with all that and death is something I don't know, I don't want it.

So I ask myself, my life has been the past, I live in the past, I act in the past, that is my life - listen to this. My life living in the past is a dead life. You understand? My mind which lives in the past is a dead mind. And thought says, "That is not death, the future is the death." So I see this as a fact - you follow? I see this as something enormously real, therefore the mind realizing that actually dies to the past; it will use the past but it has lost its grip, the past has lost its values, grip, its vitality. So the mind has its own energy which is not derived from the past. Therefore living is dying - you understand? Therefore living is love which is dying. Because if there is no attachment, then there is love. If there is no attachment to the past, the past has its value which can be used, which must be used as knowledge, then my living is a constant renewal, is a constant movement in the field of the unknown, in which there is learning, moving, therefore death is the ultimate aloneness. And therefore there is a totally different kind of life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Ah, I didn't use the words 'giving up' or 'surrendering'. I said the mind, consciousness is its content. Right sir. Its contents are the books, the televisions, the amusements, furniture and so on - all the contents which civilizations, cultures, have put into it. And if you say you must be unattached then it is an act of will by thought, and

therefore there is no freedom in that. But if you have an insight into this then it is total. Yes sir?

Q: Is it not blind faith to accept that there is a different quality of mind?

K: The questioner asks: is it not a blind faith to accept that there is a different quality of mind? Isn't that it? How can you accept what another says? How can you have faith in what somebody else says? He may be mistaken, he may be trying to convert you to some idiocy, and all conversion is an idiocy. But he says to you: look at it for yourself, learn about it for yourself, have an insight into this whole process for yourself, therefore there is no authority. You don't have to have faith in something, in a belief, or in a person.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How do images have real feelings though I know they are dead? Isn't that it sir? Look: I have images which are put together by thought, put together through experience, through reactions, through various crises. Those images are real because I accept them intellectually as being real. The intellect, which is part of thought, lives with those images and derives energy from those images and therefore they have a life of their own. They give you vitality, they give you feeling, they maintain you, nourish you, but that nourishment, that maintenance, that stimuli - (noises of aeroplane) - I can't compete with that! Intellect may say they are false, they are unreal, but unless you have deep awareness of the machinery that makes the images and are aware of it, have an insight into it, these images will go on giving you neurotic reactions. And they are all neurotic, every form of image that you

have are bound to create a neurotic action and neurotic feelings.

Q: Sir, during sleep without dream there is no image. I would like to know if fragmentation and images are necessary in order to have an insight into them.

K: Sleep without dreams is a state of mind in which there are no images, no conditioning, no time. Now are you telling me that or have you heard somebody else tell you that?

Q: I think it is obvious.

K: The gentleman says, "I think it is obvious". Sir, the mountain is obvious, the beauty of it is obvious, the majesty, the depth of it is obvious, but I have to climb it, I have to live with it, I have to move with it. What is obvious is not necessarily real. What is real is to see if I have images, to see if the mind derives energy from those images, and to see in my daily life, in my every day life where these images play a part in my relationship. And what my day is, my night is. The movement of my daily life is the continuation in dreams when I sleep. To have no dreams at all - you understand - that is one of the most important things because when the mind sleeps, when it is absolutely in a state of quietness then it rejuvenates itself. But if it is a continuity of the day then it is struggling, and the struggle is to bring order. I don't know if you have not noticed it. The brain can only function normally, healthily, non-neurotically when it has no image, when it is not in conflict, when it has complete order. But if during the day you have no order then it tries to establish order during the night, which is part of the dream.

So if during the day being aware in learning, insight, enjoying the insight, trying to find out, learn, then during the night then the

mind which has established order during the day, then it can sleep completely without a dream and therefore it has quite a different movement, quite a different vitality.

Q: I have a problem. Sometimes in life it seems to me that you have to be egotistic to go this way that you are talking about right now, because you have to change yourself in relationships and others may be hurt.

K: Sometimes in life, the questioner says, you have to be selfish. You may hurt others in that selfishness and they may hurt you. What is the answer? Is that right sir? Is that the question?

Q: You have to be egotistic to go the way of freedom.

K: You have to be egotistic to be free. You have to be egotistic to be free. I think we are misusing, or misunderstanding each other in the use of that word 'egotistic'. I see something which is true, not because of my temperament or my idiosyncrasy or my conditioning, but I see something to be real, to be factual. Now wait a minute, I'll show it to you. I see that to belong to any group, psychologically, that to hold any belief is destructive and I don't belong to any group, to any organization. You will call me very selfish, won't you? Because you think I am having my own way, I am following my idiosyncrasy, my particular character, and so you call me selfish. Am I, because I see something to be true? You don't see, for instance, nationalism to be a poison. I see it to be a poison. I say, I don't belong to any nation, and you say to me, "You are very selfish in following your own particular opinion", because you live in opinion and you think also that I am acting according to opinion. I am not. I see that it is a danger, like I see a snake to be a danger. If you don't see it as danger and I see it, why call me

egotistic? I am not. So my mind must be very clear that it is not acting on idiosyncrasy, temperament, experience, but being aware, having an insight - which has nothing whatsoever to do with my past, with my egotism.

Q: Can you go into the question of words and concepts and the problems they cause in communication inside and outside oneself?

K: Can you stand anymore of this. We have talked for nearly an hour and a half, can your brains go on receiving any more. Don't say, yes. Well, this will be the last question.

Words are necessary, aren't they? Words are necessary to communicate aren't they? There are other forms of communication but we will take up with words first. I want to tell you something, I must use words or a gesture, or a look. So words become important in communication, that is, if we both speak the same language.

And words become important if we both give to that word the same meaning. If I call that an elephant when it is really a microphone, it has no meaning. So words have a meaning because they have a common reference between you and me. And words are also a danger because words are used to convey thoughts - I am thinking one thing, I put it into words and convey it to you. And if my thought is crooked, not clear, I use the words which are clear to you but therefore bring deception. I want to deceive you, consciously or unconsciously.

Words are put together by thought and are necessary, and is there another means of communication which are not words? Can you read my thought without that thought being put into words? That can be done, obviously it is done. When two people are fairly friendly, fairly sympathetic, fairly interested in the same thing, they



can convey very quickly without words. And is there other means of communication beyond the words and thought? I can convey to you that those bells are ringing and it is 12.00 o'clock, I am using words because you are also listening to that bell. And also I can communicate with you through a gesture, through a look. And must thought always be expressed through words, and is there thought without the word? Then what am I communicating with you - you understand?

Look sir: is love a word? Is love a thought? Is love a sentiment? If the word is not the thing then how do I communicate the thing to you without the word, without the gesture, without holding your hand - you follow? How do I communicate that love which is not the word to you when you are used to the word, when to you the word has become tremendously important? I must keep on telling you, "I love you", "I love you", "I love you". And if I don't use the word and I have that thing called love, then how is it communicated? It can only be communicated to you if you are at the same time, at the same level, at the same intensity, then there is communication without the word. But to us the word is very important, naturally. And that word can be misunderstood and so on and so on.

But there are qualities, there are states, there are certain facts which are incommunicable through words.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH JULY 1972

We have talked about so many things during the last six talks; and I would like this morning, if I may, to talk over with you the question of religion, what is meditation, and try to come upon something which may be not visionary, not visions, experiences, but an actual dimension which thought possibly cannot enter.

I do not know if you have not noticed that most of our lives are rather boring, tiresome, have very little meaning by itself. We try to give meaning, intellectual meaning to our existence - that too has very little meaning either. And we try to enrich our lives by studying or enquiring into witchcraft - which I believe is the fashion now - into occultism, which is as old as the hills, and not very, very serious either, and various forms of distraction. Because our own lives, as they are lived, are rather narrow, a repetitious existence, tiresome, fearful, anxious and so on. So when we talk about religion it becomes an escape rather than an actuality. And if we could this morning share together in the enquiry of what is actually religion, a religious life, a religious mind, a religious way of existence.

Obviously all the organized religions with their beliefs and dogmas, with their priests, with their structure which thought has put together - if we could put all that aside, because in themselves they have no validity, except what man has invented, or a few have experienced and assert that this is so or that is not so.

What is a religious mind? What is a religious way of living? I think we should go into this, because its a vital question, as love, as death, sorrow, and human relationship - it is as important, perhaps

its not more important than all these, to find out for oneself what it is to live a life which is truly and deeply religious. The word 'religion' means - I looked it up the other day in the dictionary, and it says, 'tie together'. And the word 'yoga' - perhaps you know that word, do you, most of you? - also means joined together, like two oxen are yoked. So religion in the ordinary dictionary meaning, and yoga, imply the same thing, that is, bring together, tie together, yoke the higher part to the lower part, the spirit and matter, and so on.

First of all, that implies division. When you say bring together, join together, tie together, implies that there is a division in existence. Why is it that we have divided life into a religious and non-religious life, spirit and matter, the higher and the lower - why is there such fragmentation in our existence? There is the mind, the heart and the body. And this division has existed throughout the ages. They don't treat it as a whole. They treat it as a thing that is divided and must be brought together. That implies, the bringing together, implies, doesn't it, an outside agency or an agency in yourself. Please follow this a little bit, if you're interested in it. And we are sharing this together. It implies an outside agency that will bring the divided, fragmented existence together, through a religious activity, through yoga, through meditation, through various forms of exercises, control, and so on.

Now is there such a division? Or thought has divided existence, life, as separate from the higher state of thought. Thought obviously has invented the higher state. No? The soul, the Hindus call it the atman, and so on. Thought has brought about this. Thought is responsible for this division. And, not being able to

bring this together, not being able to bring about a total harmony, it then invents a superior entity which is going to integrate the various fragments. Now that integrating factor is called god, outside agency, or your own will and so on.

One can see that one needs the total harmony, that is, a harmony between the mind, the intellect, the capacity to reason logically, sanely and the heart, which is to have compassion, love, kindness, consideration, and the physical, with all its complexities. One can see there must be a harmony. Then only the total existence can function healthily.

And we're asking, is religion based on belief, on an insight of the few who have established a church, organized priesthood and so on, is this structure, or can this structure, bring about harmony in you? Or it has nothing whatsoever to do with belief? You are following all this? It has nothing whatsoever to do with any saviour, with any guru, with any sense of an outside agency, or an inward effort to bring about harmony. Am I making myself clear? You look rather puzzled, don't you? All right, I'll put it this way.

For myself I see that the mind, with the brain, can function only when there is complete harmony inside - total harmony, not fragmentary harmony. Now how is this to be brought about? I don't know how, but people say, religions say, authority asserts, that there must be an agency outside of you - god, whatever name you like to give to it. And if you could concentrate on that, give your life to that, believe in that, perhaps you can bring about this extraordinary quality of harmony - they don't put it this way, I'm putting it that way.

Now belief is conceived by thought, belief is the result of

thought and fear. I see that, therefore I reject totally, all belief, and therefore all authority. There's no guru, no teacher, no saviour, nobody outside that can bring about this extraordinary state of harmony. And I realize harmony is not integration of the various fragments. To bring about integration, that is, to put together the various broken parts, implies there must be an entity who, through act of will, or desire, or urgency, can bring this integration about. That is again a fragmentation. So I reject that too. You understand? I reject belief, I reject authority, the whole structure of a religious organization based on authority - all that goes. Then how am I, how is the mind to bring about this harmony, because I see that it is essential to be healthy, to have tremendous energy, and to have a mind that is extraordinarily clear?

Is harmony a thing to be cultivated? Cultivation implies time, doesn't it? I need time to cultivate a plant. So I say, I need time to cultivate this harmony, either through various forms of exercise - give your mind to it a little bit, please - share this together with me - either through various forms of exercises, mental, physical, or through control. Or set a course and follow that course, which is the action of will. I see that the mind, the brain, and the heart, and the physical entity can function beautifully, easily, smoothly, when there is complete sense of the whole, in which there is no division. I see that very clearly. First I see it perhaps intellectually, verbally, and I realize that has no value. Then how does the mind bring this about? Does this question mean anything to you? Because this is the religious life, not the belief in gods or disbelief in god or have your own experience of various attitudes, various visions, various experiences - to me that is not a religious life. So I have got to be

very clear, I have to find out what it means to live a religious life. Because I feel, if that can be brought about, or comes into being, then my action at any level will always be harmonious, not contradictory.

So my mind has rejected the whole structure of belief, which is based on fear and therefore illusion. You're sharing this with me, please - we are walking together, thinking together, creating together, and therefore establishing between ourselves right communication. And therefore I reject also, completely, any authority, because it is still outside of myself, it is still the act of thought which seeks guidance from another. So that brings about a division, and hence a conflict - what I should do according to what another says, and try to conform to the pattern set by another, therefore that brings about a conflict, and therefore disharmony. You are following all this?

Then, I ask myself, will any act of desire, which is will, bring this about? Because will plays a great part in our life. Will is based on choice, on decision - I will do this and I will not do that. Will, that is, the concentration of desire, plays an extraordinary part in our life. Haven't you noticed it? I must do this, I must not do that, I will follow this. And this constant decision is part of our existence. And I see, where there is the act of will there must be division, and therefore conflict. And where there is conflict there can be no harmony. So is there a way of living without the action of will? As I said, will comes into being when there is choice. And choice exists when there is confusion. And you do not choose, you do not decide, when you see things very clearly, then you act, which is not the action of will.

So I am asking myself, why is it my mind cannot see clearly, all the time, not on vague, uncertain occasions - all the time function clearly? Why do you think your mind doesn't function clearly? First of all, it's confused, it's confused because our conditioning, which is the past, meets the present and is not capable of understanding the present, and life being so uncertain, people asserting, the authorities asserting so many things - work for this, don't work for that, this is true, this is false, a dozen gurus telling you what to do - and we're caught in all that.

And also confusion exists because we want clarity, we want clarity, we want to reach the other shore where we think there is clarity. So we are always making life, which is this shore, into a problem, because I want to get over there, where I think I'm going to be perfectly happy, sitting next to god, or entering in Nirvana or liberation of whatever it is. So the other shore makes the problem. And that is one of the causes of confusion.

So I have an insight, there is an insight into this question of the action of will. Have you got that insight, as we are talking? Therefore there is no conflict in the mind, it acts when there is insight - action is insight, not the action of will, or belief, or fear, or greed. You follow? The insight that comes when you observe very closely this pattern of existence established by will. When you have an insight into that your action is entirely different, and therefore non-contradictory, and hence that insight brings harmony. You are following this? I have no insight because I live in the past, your life is the past, isn't it? Your remembrances, your imaginations, your contriving, is based on the past. So our life is the past, which through the present, modified, becomes the future.

So as long as you live in the past, there must be contradiction, and hence conflict. You are following all this?

So, harmony comes into being when you have insight into all this. Now, you know, we are educated to control. Aren't you? To control ourselves. Or, having been educated in the structure of control, you discard all that and go to the extreme, which is happening also. And control implies again division - the controller and the thing controlled. The controller says, "This must happen, I must do this, I must not get angry, I must be" - all that. So there is a controller and the thing he's trying to control, and hence a division. Is the controller different from the thing he's controlling? Or both are the same? Of course both are the same. And not being able to go beyond the thing controlled, thought invents the controller, and hopes thereby to go beyond the thing which he is trying to control. Do you get all this? I am angry, and I say, I must not be angry. That is, instantly there is a division. But the entity that says, "I must not be angry" is part of anger, otherwise it couldn't recognize it as anger. Therefore the controller is the controlled. When I have an insight into that, that is, the division that exists when there is an act of will through control, in that division there must be strife, when I have an insight into that there comes a totally different kind of action which is not controlled or without any restraint.

Is this all becoming too much? Can we go on? Anyhow this is the last talk. Now see what my mind has done - I have an insight into belief, I have an insight into will, I have an insight into control, authority, measurement. And that is our social, educational, religious structure. That is our cultural background,



religious, ethical, moral, social - that's based on that. And, having an insight into that, there is the cessation of all that. When I see something false, when there is a perception of something dangerous, it is dropped, you run away from it. So the false, the untrue creates disharmony.

Then mind wants to find out if there is something more than mere thought and its structure. Man throughout the ages has sought this. He has enquired into the known and is always adding more and more into the field of the known - more knowledge, more technology, better means of communication, pollution, you know all that is going on is within the field of the known, including your gods, your saviours, your masters, your gurus, your enlightenment - it's all within the field of the known which is the function of thought.

Are we communicating with each other? So thought is measurement, because to measure according to the known, according to the memory, according to knowledge, experience. So people say, "You must meditate to find out if there is something beyond the known". Are you following all this? So they say, "Control, control your thought, discipline your thought, become aware of your thought," so they are still dealing with thought - control by thought, discipline by thought. And through thought they hope to find the thing that is not measurable. And also they say, you must stop thinking, kill the mind. You are following all this? Now we're going to find out.

As I said, we were going to talk this morning about religion, meditation, and to come upon something, if it is possible, which is not measurable, which is totally a different dimension. We talked

somewhat about religion. Now we are going to find out what it means to meditate. I don't know what it means to you. If you had never heard that word, if you had never heard any of the gurus telling you how to meditate, it would be much better, because then we could, both of us together, investigate it, not knowing. But if you know what it is already, then it becomes a burden, a block. Right?

So I want to find out what it means to a mind that is capable of meditation. The dictionary meaning of that word is "to ponder over, to be concerned with, to have an intellectual, an emotional grasp," and so on. That is the dictionary meaning.

And there is the meaning which all the religions have given to it, in different ways - contemplation, in the west, and meditation in the east. And, being a human, I want to find out, because I don't belong to the east or the west, I'm neither a Zen follower nor Krishnamurti follower. I don't know, and I've no authority because I've no guru, thank god. So I want to find out what it means to meditate. But I can see one thing very clearly, that as long as thought is functioning, it must function according to the past and project itself into the future - from the known to the known - I see that very clearly. As long as thought is in operation, nothing new can take place. Be clear on this. Because thought is based on the past, thought is the reaction of memory, thought is the outcome of the knowledge, of the experience, which is my background. So thought is the old, thought can never bring about freedom, because it is not in itself free. I see that very clearly, nobody has to convince me of it.

So I see, the mind has a perception, as long as there is the

movement of thought it is living in the old, and it is incapable of perceiving something totally new. Right? Please don't be convinced by me, by the speaker - observe it for yourself. Thought has invented the whole structure of the religious way of life - monks, nuns, rituals, priests, the authority - the whole structure. And what they say is still within the pattern of thought, therefore I have an insight into the whole process of thinking, and the illusions that it can create.

So I see this, that there must be the emptying of the known. That is, thought must function at one level, because otherwise I can't do anything, but if we are to enquire and come upon this something, if there is something, which is immeasurable, thought must be completely still, then only it can see something new. The seeing of something new is creation - not my painting, writing a book or doing some silly thing, because that is still within the pattern of the known, within the pattern of thought, which has imagination, contrivance, remembrance. So I see the mind must be completely quiet, not that it must be made quiet - then who is the entity that is going to make it quiet? That entity is the desire that wishes to have a mind that is quiet, and therefore there is a division in that and hence conflict, and therefore disharmony. So how is the mind to be absolutely quiet, which means the brain cells themselves? Brain cells hold the memories, and these memories, if they are healthy, will react healthily. If they are not healthy, neurotic action takes place, or one is caught in illusion.

So the brain must be quiet, but active when demanded. So I have a problem - not my problem - there is this problem, which is to have a very quiet, extraordinarily subtle mind, pliable, quick,

sensitive, and free of the known, and yet function in the field of the known. The two must go together all the time, otherwise there is disharmony. So how is this to happen? I can see very clearly, one can see very clearly that memory, knowledge, experience is necessary, absolutely necessary, otherwise you couldn't talk, you couldn't - you know, its absolutely necessary. But it becomes a danger when thought, in its desire to be secure, uses knowledge for its own self-centred activity. So one must be aware of that.

Now how is the mind to be quiet - is there a system, a method? Now look at it. If there is a system established by you or by another, a system being a method, a practice, the daily practising of that system to make the mind quiet. Now who is the entity that is practising the system? That entity is thought which says, "If I could practise this method, this system, then I will have a quiet mind, and then it must be a marvellous state. I want to experience that state". So thought invents its own system or accepts another system, other systems, in order to experience something totally new, in which thought can take pleasure. So that becomes a problem. So the mind has to find out why there is this constant demand for experience. Why do you want experience, any kind of experience? Either you have it directly or indirectly by reading novels or books or watching television. Why do you want experience? Have you ever gone into the question of it? There is sexual experience, there is the experience of so many kinds - why does the mind demand it? Because you're bored with every day experiences - it becomes a routine, a mechanical thing. And you want to experience something that is non-mechanical. And you set about it through a mechanical means, which is thought. Right? So through a

mechanical means you hope to experience something which is non-mechanical. And if you do experience it, then it becomes mechanical because thought has invented that experience. So the mind says, I don't want any experience because I see its value - I need experience when acquiring knowledge in the everyday life. The more I have experience in putting machinery together, the more I can bring about a way of living which will be mechanical. Right?

So the mind says, any demand for experience, high or low, noble or ignoble, is still part of thought which wants to experience something in which it can take pleasure. You don't want to experience ugly things, painful things, you only want to experience pleasurable things. And god of course is the ultimate pleasure. So the mind sees that, therefore it is no longer asking for any kind of experience, therefore no illusion. The moment the mind wants to experience something great, it can invent that greatness, it can invent something which it calls enlightenment. But if there is a cessation of all experience, then what is the state of the mind that doesn't demand experience? You need experience to keep you awake. But the mind, having insight into all this, doesn't need an experience to keep it awake, it is awake.

We're asking, can the mind and the brain be completely still? And you want to know if it is still, don't you? I want to know if my mind is still. And there is a gadget in America which they use and they call it Alpha Meditation - that will tell you by electronic measurement that your mind is still. You know, Americans are good at gadgetry. And it's called Alpha Meditation. I can be silly, stupid, dull with it, illogical in daily existence, and I attach this

instrument with wires to my head, and it tells me when I'm quiet.

So Zen, all these forms of meditation, mantra yoga, you know, the repetition of words - all those are means of knowing for oneself that your mind is quiet. Can you know your mind is quiet? Please, do think it out. If you know your mind is quiet, then there is no quietness because you are observing the mind that you think is quiet. So you cannot experience a mind that is quiet - see the beauty of it, sir. Anymore than you can experience happiness, anymore than you can experience joy. The moment you say, "I am joyous", it's gone. Or the moment you say, "How happy I am," it's no longer happiness. So the mind, when it is quiet, has no observer. Are you learning all this? Because you can learn when you are happy, not when you make a problem of it. And the problems only exist when you want to have a quiet mind. But when you're happy and want to learn what it means to have a quiet mind, learn, then you find out a quiet mind comes into being when there is no observer, when there is no experiencer, thinker. But you say, "How am I to stop the thinker from acting?" You can't stop it, but you can learn the whole nature and the workings and the movement of thought, learn about it. And when you learn, the other comes into being.

So when the brain and the mind and the body are absolutely quiet, that is, when there is no entity that is measuring all the time, comparing - 'I have had this experience yesterday and I'd like to have it more, or I would like to have further experience,' which is all measurement.

And this quietness implies space, doesn't it? Have you noticed in yourself how little space one has, both outwardly and inwardly?

When you live in a city, in a small flat surrounded by other flats, across the street another set of flats, living in a small, enclosed space, outwardly, you want to break things, don't you? That's part of our violence. There's not only hereditary violence derived from the animal, which is aggressive, which we are, but this living in towns, enclosed, with very little space outwardly - you can take a holiday once a year for three weeks. My god, what a way of living, and therefore your whole body revolts - this constant going to the office, 40 years of your life, all enclosed, in close contact with each other. And a strange thing - have you ever noticed of an evening when the birds are sitting on the telephone wire - have you noticed it - they have space between them, regular space, which they demand, which they must have. But we don't want space, we want to be close together, because we are frightened to be alone. There is that.

Then emotionally we have no space either, because emotionally we are attached - I must be with that person, I can't bear to be alone, I must have companionship, I must be occupied. So inwardly and outwardly we have very little space, and therefore we become more and more violent, or escape from this altogether, through sectarian attitudes, through various religious organizations, following all the bearded gurus and so on and so on. Escapes.

And space is an extension in which there are objects and no objects. Right, you are following this? Now for most of us, our minds are filled with things - things. Things are also thought, not only furniture and books and knowledge but thought is matter, thing. So inwardly we have very little space. And in that little space there is the movement of occupation, self-centred

occupation, or put it outside and still occupation, from the centre.

So the mind, which is absolutely quiet, has space without any object in it. The moment there is an object, that object creates space around itself, and therefore there is no space. You understand this? The moment when there is, in my mind, in one's mind, an object, a chair, a belief, fear, the persistent demand for pleasure - objects, then each object creates its own little space round itself. And we try to expand these little spaces, hoping to capture the great space. I wonder if we are meeting this? So the mind that is completely quiet has space in which there is no object, and therefore an attention, not about something, or attention towards something, simply a state of attention. And if you notice, when there is attention there is extraordinary space. It is only when there is no attention the object becomes important. So attention is not a matter of cultivation, going to a school to learn how to be attentive, going to Japan or India or some Himalayan town to learn how to be attentive, which is all so manifestly silly, but attention is this extraordinary sense of space. And that cannot exist when the mind is not completely quiet. And this quietness is total harmony.

Then the mind is not dissipating energy. Now we dissipate energy - in quarrels, in gossip, in fighting each other, in dozens of ways. And we need tremendous energy to transform 'what is' - 'what is', is my anger, your anger, your ambition, your greed, your envy, the desire for power, position, prestige, the 'what is' - to go beyond 'what is', you need tremendous energy. But you have no energy if you are battling with 'what is'.

So life is a movement in harmony when there is this energy that has gone beyond 'what is'. Because attention is the concentration of



total energy. And all this is meditation. And one asks, is there something beyond all thought, something which is not measurable, not nameable, that no words can describe - is there something like that? How are you going to find out? Will you accept what another says? Will you put your faith in the words of another? Or in the experience of another? Because if you put your faith in another you know what happens to you? You are destroyed, because the other fellow becomes all-important. So as you cannot put your faith in anything or anybody, there is freedom. And when there is freedom, the mind, which has relied for its energy through struggle, through conflict, through the pursuit of pleasure, the mind itself becomes extraordinarily full of energy, without any outward stimuli. Only in that state is there something which is not measurable and which is not nameable; and nobody can convey it to you.

Do you want to ask any questions?

Q: How does one go about finding what one loves to do, instead of just accepting an adequate job?

K: As things are now arranged politically, economically, with all the social injustices, you can't find a job that you love. That is, if you are an artist you say, "I love what I am doing." If you are an artist you might love your painting, or writing a poem, or shaping the marble, the clay. But you depend for your livelihood on another, you have to sell your pictures, your poems. So you have to accept what others have to say, whether your poem is good or not, to be published or not, or saleable or not. So you depend on society.

And if you become a monk, you also depend. So as things are, as the society, the culture, the economic structure of the world is,

as it is, how will you find out, and how will you, if you really love what you want to do, how will you be able to live? Or is that the question? The questioner says, "I want to find a job which I really love," Is that the question? Or will you accept any job because you are not emotionally and psychologically dependent on the job? That is, through a job you are seeking a status - most of us are. We don't want to remain cooks, we want to become the chef, because the chef has a status. We don't want to be merely a priest, we want to become bishop, and then archbishop and finally the Pope, because that has immense prestige. So most of us are concerned not with functions but with status. Now if you can remove from your mind the status, not seek it at all, then you accept what job you can, don't you? And then that job becomes interesting. I don't know if you follow all this - somebody disagrees with all this.

Q: It's more complicated.

K: I know it's much more complicated. Because I'm married, I have children, I want more money, cars, position, you know the responsibility of having a family in the modern world. It becomes terribly complicated. How will you answer the problem of each one? I may want a very simple job, I don't care, I really don't care whether I'm a cook or a gardener or a Prime Minister - I'm not, thank god. I really don't care, because I'm not seeking status, therefore I'm only concerned with good functioning. Another may want a good position, he is driven by ambition, he's always competing, aggressive, and being aggressive he has his own problems, and so on and so on and on. Now how will you answer this question, that will answer every variety of human being, who wants a job? And for every job there are three thousand people

who are after it.

I was told the other day, somebody advertised for a cook, and BA's and MA's came to offer themselves as cooks. Now how will you answer this question, that will be acceptable, true to each one? Then it won't be complex, will it? We're going to find out - I haven't thought about this before, enquired into it - we're going to enquire into it together - that will answer every human being. Does he seek a job according to his temperament? According to his character, according to the demands of the society - society demands that there should be more engineers or more scientists, or more artists - more artists because you have a better position then you are more respected, like in Russia, you have special, houses and special facilities.

Now are you dependent on your temperament in seeking a job, that is, according to your character. Please listen to this. We're enquiring, I'm not laying down the law, I'm not the Delphic Oracle - we're enquiring. So I am seeking a job according to my temperament, which is, I love that job. And my temperament, my character is the outcome of my conditioning. So according to my conditioning and character, according to that, the job is decided. Or my conditioning expresses itself in peculiar idiosyncrasies, the artist, the scientist, this or that. Shall I seek a job according to my idiosyncrasies, which means, according to my conditioning? You are following all this? The conditioning is the result of the society I live in, and that society says, "Prestige, status, is most important, not the function". And so my conditioning says, "I must be at the top of my profession." - the prestige.

So shall I, being brought up in the culture in which I have lived,

follow the dictates of the culture, dependent on temperament and idiosyncrasy, or - what shall I do? Go on, sirs, what shall I do? So I ask myself, what is a human being to do who is very, very serious, living in this society, with all the complexity of it - perhaps you see more of the complexity and I may not - but it is complex, what shall a human being do, knowing all this, knowing what is relationship, in which there is no image - we went into that - knowing that knowledge is necessary, having an insight into the whole process of thinking, what it means to lead a religious life, what it means to live meditation - knowing, observing all this, what shall he do? Just go and seek a job which he loves, dictated by his character, temperament, conditioning? Or when he realizes the whole, when the thing is laid out - all the things we have discussed, talked about - very clearly laid out, what will he do? Please look at it. What will he do?

Can I leave that question with you or do you want the speaker to answer it? Look, sir, what will you do? You, who have listened for the last fortnight - we have discussed, gone into the question of psychological revolution, and that's the only revolution, not violence. We discussed, went together, shared together the whole question of relationship; we talked about knowledge and the necessity and the importance of knowledge, and at the same time, freedom from the known, two together living, moving together. We discussed, we have talked over religion, authority, love, death. And a mind that is so marvellously clear, lives in a different dimension and so on - we've discussed all this. What shall I do, after hearing all this? What's my job after hearing all this? Well, sir, what do you say? You want me to tell you? My job is what I am doing - you

understand? To teach, to learn, to bring about a different human being - that's my job. If you have listened carefully right from the beginning, that will be your job. And if you don't love that job, don't do it.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 2ND AUGUST 1972.

I think we have to lay ground rules before we begin to converse together. I think the word 'discussion' is rather misplaced.

Discussion means explanation or examination through argument, opinion against opinion, judgement against judgement, one's characteristic conclusions against another's. I think that word 'discussion', we shouldn't use, if I may suggest. But rather use the word 'dialogue', which means converse together, talk over things together.

So what shall we talk over together today? I mean by talking over really as two friends with a very serious problem. As two friends, companions, with affection, with consideration, with attention, really talk over what they feel, what they think, what their problems are, how to solve them. If we could do that during these seven days I think it would be worth while.

So we need in order to talk over things together a certain quality of affection, not tolerance, because that's an ugly word, because then you put up with each other - I tolerate you and you tolerate me. Whereas if we could seriously, with consideration, with a great deal of affection, and naturally, attention - talk things over, then perhaps we could come to some kind of resolution of our problems. May we do that? So what shall we talk over this morning - one problem, you know, one thing, let's go to the very end of it, each day, you understand - then it will be worthwhile.

Q: Sir, there seems to be a distinction between the older and the younger people. And there is a difference in time between some

people. There is also a distinction between long hair and short hair. Now, of course, this distinction exists within our minds, but when we stand in front of people, perhaps this distinction doesn't necessarily enter into our relationship; these are only sort of boxes that we put people in in our mind. There are sort of partitions we put them in which only exist as a sort of dictionary existence but not as an actual existence when we face these situations with another person. But there is also within our minds distinctions.

K: So what is the question, sir?

Q: The question is: how shall we go beyond this division?

K: Obviously many so-called young people, short hair, long hair, whatever it is, asked if they could have a discussion, a dialogue together in the tent, here, and so I thought we should have one meeting of that kind. It isn't that there is a time-lag between the young and the old, but just the feeling that young people have their own peculiar problems and they want to discuss. That's all.

Q: I did not want to say anything against that, I only wanted to make this question about the compartments that we put in our minds.

K: I understand sir. Right? So what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: Is it possible to transform the human mind?

Q: I'm wondering what it is that prevents a person from being aware of his own inward state. He says he is going to watch himself and he's not going to escape. And one wants to run away, smoke a cigarette or whatever it is and he says, "I won't run away; I'm going to watch myself." And yet one still doesn't watch oneself, one doesn't see...

K: Now we can take that. One question, which is, he asks - how is it possible for me to watch myself, not force myself to watch myself, not deliberately avoid escapes, but just watch myself. Can we discuss that? Do you really want to go into it? Right?

What is the necessity of watching oneself? Why do you think one should watch oneself?

Q: To learn about oneself?

K: I watch myself in order to learn what is actually going on - factually, not theoretically, not in abstraction, what is going on in myself. I want to learn. Now what does that word mean, to learn, because I think we ought to be clear when we use words that have different meanings. What do we mean by that word to learn. I want to learn about myself. First of all, myself is a living thing, isn't it? Right? Or you don't think it's a living thing.

Q: The word myself?

K: No, not the word but the fact - myself, the 'me'. I want to learn about myself. Right? We are examining the two words 'learn' and 'myself' - not the word but the content of that word. Myself is a living thing, isn't it - I'm adding, taking away, there is - it is a living, not a dead block of material or wood, because it is always moving. Are we clear on that?

Q: Why do we want to be concerned with ourselves at all?

Q: I want to watch myself and learn about myself but let's say I'm unhappy, and I'm running away and always...

K: Wait, sir, we're coming to that.

Q: ...it has no meaning and I want to be able to learn about myself.

K: And the lady asks, why are you so concerned about yourself?



Q: I didn't say that in answer to that.

K: No - she asks, why is one so concerned about oneself.

Q: Because we are unhappy?

Q: Because we compare ourselves with other people.

K: Is it a habit? Is it a necessity? To be not concerned, to learn, is different from being concerned, surely. I am concerned about my property, to hold it. I'm concerned about my dog. I'm concerned about my garden. But here we are trying to learn, which is entirely different from being self-centred, in a self-centred way be concerned. So that's clear.

Now I want to learn about myself. What do I mean by that word to learn? Is there a difference between knowing myself and learning about myself? I'm sorry to be - this is not splitting hairs - I want to learn, I want to find out the meaning of words, you understand, sir - otherwise we'll talk two different things. So when I say I want to know myself, and when I want to learn about myself, is there a difference between these two words?

Q: To me there is - knowing is something dead, final, and learning is a constant movement.

K: The lady says, knowing myself is a dead statement, whereas learning about myself is a constant movement. That is, I know you because I met you yesterday, or know you because I've seen you for several years. I have an image about you and I can add to that image, then I say, I know you. But in the meantime you might have changed, but I retain the picture of you which I have had for the last five years. So when I say, I know you, I am judging you from my dead conclusion about you. So we can leave that word 'know' aside. So what does it mean then to learn?

Q: To be aware of what you are thinking and feeling every moment.

K: To be aware of what you are thinking and feeling every moment. Learn.

Q: I guess to learn is to collect information.

K: Learning means collecting information. You see - let me go on, may I go on a little bit and then you can. I want to learn about myself. Myself is a living thing, though myself is the result of various experiences, memories, conclusions and so on, through those conclusions, memories, experiences, one adds all the time, it isn't a dead thing. So it's a living thing. I want to learn about myself - learn means, doesn't it, learn about myself who is living, all the time changing, adjusting, conforming, denying, pushing, aggressive - I want to learn about that.

Now to learn I must have curiosity, mustn't I? Right? Because I know nothing about myself, I'm going to learn about it. But if I come to it with a prejudice - prejudice being a previous judgement, previous opinion - I can't learn about it. So to learn about myself I must come to it without any prejudice, without any conclusion, without any judgement, otherwise I can't learn. I want to learn Italian or Russian. I must come to it afresh, because I know nothing about it.

So if I want to learn about myself I mustn't come to it with a conclusion. Right? Now this is going to be the difficulty. Because when I look at myself I say, "How ugly", "How beautiful", "This is rights; this is wrong." Those are all conclusions which I have arrived at previously, therefore I am not learning. Right?

Q: We must approach without pre-set limitations.

K: That's right, sir. Now can I observe myself without prejudice, for or against. If I can't there is no learning. Now please begin - we are talking over together. You want to learn about yourself and I want to learn about myself. First of all I want to learn about myself because there is a division between you and me, not only biological differences but psychological differences, which bring about a division between you and me and therefore there is a battle between you and me, we and they and so on. So I want to learn about myself to see why there is this division. To learn. Now to learn implies, doesn't it, that it is a constant movement and therefore it is not an accumulation of knowledge about myself. Please see the difference. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's what we are doing now. Wait, I'm coming to that, madam - go slowly. I want to learn about myself. First I see that myself is a living thing. And if I come to it with any prejudice, I can't learn.

Q: That question about myself: To learn about myself, I feel I wish to be myself. If there's learning, then there's a separation and that's what's painful, the separation.

K: I'm coming - wait a minute, sir. You're all too quick for me. I want to go into it step by step and then see for myself why there is a division between the observer, who is trying to learn about the observed. Now is there a division between the observer and the observed? We're going to find out, sir - go slowly. We must be clear on this because then we can proceed quickly. Learning implies that any form of accumulation as knowledge will prevent further learning, it will be only an addition to what I already know.

So I am looking at myself with the previous conclusions which I have had about myself. Is that learning? Look, I want to learn about myself, and to learn about myself I must look at myself without any conclusion, mustn't I? No?

Q: When we say I am a living entity, we have there an assumption.

K: No, when I say I am a living entity, is that assumption or is it a fact?

Q: But as we understand ourselves, when we say we are a living entity, then we mean we are living, conscious?

K: Yes, living.

Q: And so we are discovering ourselves in life.

K: We are discovering ourselves, we are observing ourselves, we are learning about ourselves. There is no discovering of ourselves factually if we come to it with a prejudice.

Q: What is the difference between a fact and a conclusion?

Q: Please look at the yellow question, the yellow piece of paper on which he has written his question.

K: He has written a question on a piece of paper - I won't. Sorry. This is a friendly discussion, a dialogue, communication, talking things over - how can you give me a piece of paper, when we are two friends sitting here.

Q: I have no microphone, so he cannot talk from so far.

K: I don't know what to do.

Q: How do you know when you're seeing a fact and how can you distinguish that from when you come to a conclusion? I don't see the difference between a fact and a conclusion - seeing a fact about yourself and coming to a conclusion.

K: The gentleman says, I don't see the difference between a fact and a conclusion. Good Lord! Wait, I'll tell you. A fact and a conclusion. A fact is that I have a toothache. Right? The conclusion is, I must go to the doctor, dentist. One is a fact, the other is a conclusion, I must go to the dentist to have something done about it. Now a conclusion about myself prevents me from looking at the fact. That is, if I have a previous conclusion, which is a prejudice, I cannot see the fact. That's all we are saying.

Q: But that is an example.

K: I don't like examples, but he wanted to know the difference between a conclusion and a fact.

Q: I understand what you are saying better, that is, any prejudice about myself will prevent my seeing myself.

K: That's all. And am I looking at myself with various conclusions? Then I want to find out, who is the entity who is looking, learning. Who is that entity?

Q: Are you suggesting that this process is a lifelong process, never at any time must we have a conclusion?

K: Are you saying, the questioner asks, that throughout life one mustn't have any conclusions? You will find out. Please, you are not following step by step, you're going, thinking, that's the difficulty when we're talking with so many people.

Now let me begin again. I want to learn about myself. I cannot learn about myself if there is any form of conclusion. And I see I have got a great many conclusions about myself - good, bad, that I am great, ignoble, this or that. Now who is the entity that is gathering all these conclusions. Right? You're following? And so these conclusions divide from the fact. Right, sir?

Q: Sir, when I say I'm bad, is that a fact or a conclusion?

K: How do I know when I am angry - is that a fact or a conclusion? How do I know that anger is a fact and the opinion about anger is a conclusion. Right? Don't you know? The opinion, the judgement about anger is a conclusion. And the fact I'm angry is a fact.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand that, sir. There are two things involved, aren't there - the observer and the thing he observes. The observer says, "I must learn about myself." And so there is a division between the observer and the observed. That's a fact. The observer says, "I must learn about what I observe." That is, the observer says, "I must accumulate knowledge about myself." Please think, look at it. There is myself and the observer. The observer says, "I must learn about this thing which is myself." Now is there a division between the observer and the observed?

Q: To my mind there is.

K: Why, why do you think that there is a division? Is the observer the entity that concludes, that says, "I must learn about myself"? The observer is the past, isn't it? The observer is saying, "I know a great deal and I must learn more about myself." The observer doesn't say, "I know nothing." The observer says, "Yes, I know about myself a little, because I've been angry, I've been prejudiced, I've been hurt, I've got a great many images." And with those images, hurts, with those judgements he looks at the thing he calls himself. No? So I say to myself, who is this observer who is saying, "I must learn; I must do this," you follow - who is this observer? Until I'm very clear about that I can't move any further.

Be clear on this point.

So who is this observer?

Q: It is ourself.

K: Wait, go slowly - don't jump to conclusions, go slowly. Who is the observer in you?

Q: If you say, who is the observer, maybe it depends how you say it, but usually if I say that it is just another observer saying it.

K: No, just look at it slowly, take it slowly. I have my make-up which is divided, fragmented - the body, the heart, the mind. I have the image I have been hurt and I love - I'm broken up into a great many fragments. Now go slowly, please. Now who is the observer among those fragments.

Q: My parents.

K: Yourself.

Q: No, my parents.

K: Your parents. Your parents are the observers, are they? Are you being serious, sir? Or pulling my leg. Yes, sir?

Q: That keeps up the division of the observer and the observed.

K: That's what we are saying, sir.

Q: This arises unless I get a kind of slap on myself, then I...

K: Just wait - I don't want to be slapped, I don't want to suffer and then find out, I want to intelligently observe. I don't want to be shocked into this thing, that's silly.

Q: It seems to me that the division between the observer and the observed arises just from thinking, when I think about myself.

K: Look at yourself, sir, don't put it into words yet. Look at it. You are fragmented, aren't you? Now which of the fragments is the observer?

Q: Sir, I am leaning, but it is with a fragment.

K: I understand that, sir.

Q: Why do you come to the conclusion that we are fragmented?

K: Aren't you?

Q: I do not feel fragmented.

K: Then you're a happy person. Finish. When you say I want to learn about myself, it is a statement of fragmentation. No? So one fragment has assumed the power or the authority as the observer. That's all. Be clear on this. I am fragmented because I hate, I love. I am ambitious, I am greedy - you follow, fragmented, I am - it's not a question of why do I say it, it is a fact. We are not a harmonious whole - that's a fact.

Now, being fragmented, one of the fragments assumes the power as the observer, and therefore he maintains the division. Now, keep to that, see the fact of that - as long as one of the fragments assumes authority, as the observer, that observer maintains a division. Now, my next question is, how is the observer not to divide himself apart from the other fragments?

Q: By seeing himself as the cause of the division.

K: By seeing himself as the cause of division - do you see yourself as the cause of division? Sir, I'm not asking an impudent question but is it a mere verbal statement, an intellectual concept, or as an actual fact, that you see that the observer is the cause of division. Do you see it? Do you feel it?

Q: I feel it, sir.

K: Then there is no observer. If I see the cause of division is nationalism, you understand, and therefore war, all the rest of it, if I actually see the danger of it, its finished, isn't it? - I'm no longer a



nationalist. Now in the same way, if I see very clearly the observer maintains, sustains, nourishes this division, the danger, then the observer is not. There is only the observed.

Q: Yes, but only momentarily - tomorrow it comes back again.

K: It may be momentarily we discover the danger of it. Now is that so? Do you momentarily see the danger of a precipice, do you momentarily see the danger of a wild animal, or you see it at all times?

Q: I don't feel this as my opinion, I feel that life is demonstrating this everlastingly.

K: Yes, sir. Look, though we say this, nationalism is a poison, we contribute to war by being a national. So we never realize the danger of the observer who maintains the division. That's all I'm saying - do you see the danger?

Q: No.

K: No. Let's be honest. You don't see the danger. Why? Go into it, take time. Why don't you see the danger of division?

Q: Because we...

K: Wait, don't please find excuses. See the fact first. There is Germany and Russia, divided, England - you follow - Italy, India and Pakistan, divided, divided, divided. That causes conflict, war, hatred. And one feels that division is the most deadly thing. Now, why don't you feel this? Why don't you see it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, don't you see the danger of nationalism?

Q: Yes, I do.

K: Then are you national?

Q: No, I'm not.

K: That's very simple, because you see the danger. That's all - keep to that. What, sir?

Q: As soon as we see that you come to a conclusion about it...

K: I understand, sir. See it without a conclusion. The moment you conclude, that conclusion becomes the observer. You follow this?

Q: The conclusion observes.

K: Be simple, sir - step by step. I am asking, who is the observer who says, "I must learn about myself." The observer is one of the fragments of which I am, so when there is an observer, he maintains this division. That's a fact, not a conclusion. Right, sir? That's a fact, that as long as there is a division between India, Pakistan, Russia, China, there must be conflict. Wait, sir. There must be conflict. As long as there is a division in myself there must be conflict.

Q: Sir, does not the State depend on nationalism?

K: Why do you make it so complicated, sir? I'm just going from one fact to another. One fact is that there is an observer and the observed. When I am angry, I say to myself, "I must not be angry." A division. That's all.

Q: When I feel very unhappy I say, "I must work; I must see what it is, why I am unhappy..."

K: Wait, that's good enough. When I am unhappy I say to myself, 'Why am I unhappy, what is the cause of it?' So that is the division, isn't there - there is an observer who says, "I must examine why I'm unhappy." Now, is the observer different from the thing he observes? Wait, madam, take two seconds to look at the question.

Q: It is the observer who is unhappy.

K: Look, I am angry, there is anger. At the moment of anger there is no observer. Look at it. At the moment of your happiness, there is no observer. Only a second later, you says, "How happy I have been." At the moment of anger there is no observer, only a second later there is the observer who says, "My anger was justified or I mustn't be angry."

Q: A child developing...

K: Leave the child alone - you see how we cannot stick to one thing - you.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, of course we are showing, trying to find out if life can be lived without conflict. Don't just say, yes, and pass it off as a theory we're trying to find out.

Q: Is this an automatic thing?

K: Madam, look at it - you don't have to ask me - look at it. I am happy. At the moment of happiness there is no observer, is there? Don't say hesitantly - either it is or it is not. When you are happy, when you are angry, when there is tremendous sense of sorrow.

Q: But it doesn't last, always something happens.

K: It's only a moment after that you say, "I have been happy. I have been angry." So division arises. Watch it - please go slowly. At the moment of enjoyment, at the moment of great delight, there is no observer. That delight has moved, gone. Then you remember that delight. The remembrance is the observer. Listen to it, please just listen to it.

Q: One can be aware...

K: Please just listen to what I am saying. I have been happy, and

it's gone. The memory of that happiness remains, the memory. That memory is the observer who says, "I would like to be more happy." So memory as thought is the dividing factor.

Q: One can be aware of enjoyment, one can be aware of it.

K: I did not say - when you are not aware of it, then begins the problem of separation. Why can't we be simple about this. Look, sir, You hurt me, you have hit me. At the moment of that - you follow - then the memory of that remains. Then I say, I must hurt you back. So the memory is the observer. Please apply it to yourself, sir - look at it for yourself. When you have great joy you don't think, do you? It is there, the full delight. It has gone. Then the memory of it remains, and you want more of it.

Q: No, it's not necessary.

K: It's not necessary, always, of course not. You've had sex, and at the moment of it there is no observer. Later on, the image, the picture, the remembrance, the imagination is the observer who says - what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is memory part of the present? It's there, but memory is the result of an incident which has taken place, which has gone.

Q: But you don't always long for it.

K: Madam, don't you long for something?

Q: Sometimes yes.

K: I'm asking sometimes - yes. Now why do you long for it? Because you have a remembrance of something that was pleasant. That remembrance is the observer who says, "I wish I could have that again." That's all we are stating.

Q: I say that it's possible to have a memory and not long for it -

one can have it or not to have it.

K: Of course.

Q: Why make a problem of it?

K: Who is making a problem?

Q: Well, you - that's what we're talking about.

K: Are you taking a superior attitude? (Laughter) I am asking something very simple. I want to find out, who is the observer. And can I look at the fact, is there observation of a fact without the observer. That's all I'm asking. You've got it, sir, up to now?

Q: Yes, for a moment, for example yesterday, there was observation of myself without any observer.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: For an instant.

K: That's good enough - wait a minute. Look, sir, for an instant there was an observation without the observer. It happens to all of us, it's not something mysterious. Now, what takes place, after that? Once for a second, five seconds, or a minute you observe without the observer, which is the past. You observed. Now, what then takes place next?

Q: Thought.

K: Wait.

Q: It seems that if one can only observe like that...

K: I'm going to show you something, sir. You have a memory of that, haven't you? And then you say, "I wish life could be lived that way." Which is what - listen to it carefully - that experience has left a memory, and that memory says, "Life should be lived that way." which is a conclusion. Therefore that conclusion prevents you from experiencing that thing next time. That's all. So

don't conclude - you had that moment of extraordinary clarity - finished. Don't say, "I must have more of it." The 'more of it' is the observer who says, "How delightful that was; I must have more." He makes the problem. Yes, sir?

Q: I watched a movie on television - there's no observer at that time.

K: Quite right.

Q: Is that all we are talking about?

K: Oh no - not the movie. No, no.

Q: Then there is something else that we are looking for while we are watching that movie.

K: Sir, when you watch the movie, a film, what is taking place?

Q: There is no observer.

K: Wait, look at it, let's see. There it is, you're watching it - what takes place? It's an exciting scene.

Q: You're completely absorbed.

K: You're absorbed, aren't you. Wait, go slowly, sir. You are absorbed by that incident, by the things that are happening on the screen. A child is absorbed by the toy.

Q: An observer.

K: Just - you are absorbed. That is, the film drives out all your thinking, all the observer, because it's so exciting, if it is exciting - as the boy is absorbed by the toy. Now life isn't that film.

Q: At that moment it is.

K: Wait - because that's an escape. You're being absorbed by something outside of you.

Q: There is no 'you' escaping.

K: Sir, you are absorbed, aren't you?

Q: There's no observer. There's no you that's absorbed.

K: Wait, go slowly. You are absorbed, aren't you, by that scene.

Q: The statement is loaded because you say 'You' are absorbed.

K: No, the scene is so exciting that you for the moment cease to exist. Put it ten different ways. What has taken place there? That scene has pushed away all thinking, for the time being. When you have finished with that film and gone home, it is what you are at home what we are talking about, not about the film.

Q: I don't want to talk about the film.

K: Wait. So you are absorbed by the film. Another is absorbed by going to church, another is absorbed by a book, another is absorbed by Billy Graham. Wait, go step by step, sir.

Q: I think we should talk about why I went to the movie...

K: No, I'm not going to talk about why you went to the movie, I'm not interested.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am saying that, sir.

Q: Well, how can we discuss this together, because I'm saying that at that time there is no observer.

K: Quite right.

Q: We reached that point in conversation.

K: Quite right, I agree with you, sir.

Q: Now my next question is, are we talking about something more than that?

K: Much more, much more.

Q: That's what we want to know.

K: Much more. My life is not at the cinema, my life is not consumed by a book, my life is not absorbed by looking at a

mountain, my life is what I am. They may absorb me for the time being, but I am back to myself when that is not. I am talking about myself when that is not. I don't say it's an escape, why do I go - I'm talking about myself when I am not at the cinema, when I am not reading a book, when I am not listening to some excited idiocy - I'm just watching myself, that's all.

Q: It is your idea, about the observer and the observed - it's not our learning, it's not our factual spontaneous idea.

K: That's fairly simple. So I am asking you now - forget your spontaneity, look at yourself, watch yourself - is there not an observer who is different from the thing he observes. That's all, sir - that's a fact, isn't it? When you look at yourself you don't have to have a subconscious or be told, it's a fact when you observe. Look, you have a mirror - when you look at yourself in the mirror, what takes place? The image is not you. And the image is different from you inwardly, though it is as if you look at it at yourself in a mirror, inwardly there is the image and the maker of the image.

Q: May I suggest that we are inundated by environmental pressure.

K: Sir, of course, that's one of the factors. We are inundated by external pressures. Who has created these external pressures? Go into it - who has created it? Society? The politicians? The doctors? The scientists? Yes?

Q: All of us.

K: Which is you.

Q: No, not necessarily.

K: So you - listen to this, watch it - you say there are external pressures all the time forcing us. And these external pressures are



the politicians whom you have elected, the warmongers, the army, the businessman - of which you are part. No? Wait - so you are compressed by the pressures which you have created.

Q: Yes.

Q: Sir, I see many motives in myself, and each motive becomes the observer.

K: I quite agree, sir.

Q: And when I see that and I see that all observers are these motives. Also is the observer always false?

K: Yes, sir, I understand it, sir. Now look we have listened to each other for an hour - what have you learned. You learned, not what I have told you - what have you learned? Learnt means as a fact, that you know it as a fact, for yourself. Have you learnt for yourself as a fact that the observer is the past? Wait - have you learnt that? Now what do you mean by learnt? Have you learnt it, have you seen the fact that when there is an observer there must be division, there must be conflict? Do you see it as factual as you see a thunderstorm, a danger, an animal - it's real, not a conclusion, an idea? That's all.

Q: We don't see it.

K: That's right, sir, you don't see it.

Q: What is it that prevents it? What is it that prevents us seeing it?

K: Why do you ask it, sir? You're asking, what prevents you? What prevents you? Wait a minute - I've asked you what prevents you from seeing this fact as you would see danger, a precipice, as you would not swallow a poison, because you see the danger of it. Now what prevents you from not seeing this as clearly as that?

Wait - take it to yourself, don't answer me yet. Is it laziness, is it that you have no energy, or is it that you don't want to see it, because if you see it, things may alter, you follow? Your life may be changed. So you are frightened to see it, so you say, "I don't see it; I don't see it; I don't see it."

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, sir, I'm asking you, the gentleman asked, why is it I don't see this clearly. Is your mind lazy, you understand - active, hasn't got the energy to say, "Well, I must find this out," because the mind has been fed on other people's ideas, you understand, lives on quotations, has become a secondhand instrument. Therefore it says, "I cannot see this." Therefore forget if you can't see it, but find out if your mind is secondhand. You understand? That's it. And to see that you must have energy, mustn't you?

So why is it that I don't see this thing which is so prevalent, which is so persuasive, which is so factual - all my life it is that way. I'm a Hindu, I'm a Buddhist, I'm a Christian, I'm a Communist, I'm young, I'm old, I'm good, I'm bad, Jesus is right and I'm wrong - this division. And why don't I see that this division in any form, outwardly, politically or religiously or psychologically, it's a deadly thing - why don't I see it? The Jew, the Gentile, the Arab - you follow, sir? Why don't you see it?

Q: Is it because we are subscribing to it and won't accept responsibility for the subscription.

K: That's right, sir, I'm saying that. And yet this thing creates war, this thing is going to destroy you.

Q: Because we have not learnt to think and we think we are able to thin.

K: We are not able to think? Why are you not able to think?

Q: We have never practised it.

K: We are doing it here. You see - do it, sir, find out, take time. You're here, sitting down, talking over - why do you not see this. You're lazy? Are you lazy? Yes, that's a factor. You're lazy. Why are you lazy? Go to the end of it, don't just say, "I'm lazy" and sit back. Why are you lazy? You've overeaten, over indulged or you've not enough of the right kind of food - find out.

Q: Because of this conflict that the observer brings about.

K: So you say, "Well, this conflict is destroying our energy." Then why don't you stop it, find out how to stop it. I'm asking, therefore, enquire, go into it. That is, as long as there is an observer, there must be conflict. As long as there is nationality there must be conflict, as long as you are a Christian and somebody else is a Muslim, there's going to be conflict.

Q: So why is it so hard to enquire?

K: Why is it so hard to enquire? Because you have never done it before, because you've always been spoon-fed, because you've always accepted what others have said, what the psychologists, what the religious people, what the priest says, what the professor - you don't say, "I know nothing and I'm going to find out. And I'm not going to repeat a word which I don't know."

Q: Sir, it makes it difficult for me to understand this at the moment but as you say, it is dangerous, there is a second observer saying that the first observer is dangerous.

K: No, sir. Look - you've heard about the recent war in India between Pakistan and India? Haven't you? War between Israel and the Arab world - that's a fact isn't it? And the fact shows, as long as

there is an Arab way of looking at life and an Israelite way of looking at life, there must be conflict. That's all.

Q: It seems like a new observer saying, that observation was wrong.

K: No, no - that's a conclusion. Do look at it, sir - you, not you - one is married - you have a relationship with a man or a woman. There are two entities, aren't there? As long as there is a division, not biological, but psychological division between the two, there must be conflict. You have an image and she has an image, and there must be conflict. Images are your conclusions - that she's good, that she's bad, that she thinks you're an absurd idiotic man, or whatever it is.

Q: Where does the awareness go when the body dies?

K: Where does the awareness go after the body dies - we haven't come to that point. Please stick to this thing; if you once understand this deeply, when you see this fact, you will see for yourself that you have not to depend on anybody. Come on, sirs.

Q: What happens to memory without having had an observer?

K: Yes, sir, I'm going to show you - that's a good question. Can you have knowledge without that knowledge being used by one of the fragments. Right? Have you understand my question, sir? Have I translated your question?

Q: Will you please repeat it, I couldn't follow you.

K: Would I repeat it. I have knowledge. There is accumulated knowledge which is part of the brain - the memories, which is knowledge, experience, the past. Now one of the fragments uses that memory, knowledge, for its own benefit, it exploits that knowledge. I see you are not getting it - let me begin again. The

questioner asked, can knowledge, memory, all the scientific, technological personal memories that have been gathered through centuries, can that remain without an observer using that so that it creates a division. You've understood the question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right. Have you understood the question? There is all this scientific knowledge, all the knowledge which human beings have gathered, through millenia - which is the past. All knowledge is the past. I can add to it, more and more, but it is always in the past. Now when that knowledge is used in our relationship with each other, there is conflict. No?

I have lived with you, as a friend, as a wife, as a husband, boy or girl - I have lived with you. I have images of you, I have built a series of memories, incidents in our relationship. Those incidents, those experiences, those images are the knowledge. That knowledge divides you and me.

Q: Why should it?

K: Why should it? Because I'm living in the past.

Q: But everybody isn't living in the past. Everybody is not living in the past, why should we be living in the past - you take it for granted that we are living in the past.

K: I don't say that - I am pointing out, madam - I'm not saying you are living in the past - don't get angry with me. I'm just pointing out that as long as you have these memories, these images about me or I have about you, there must be division. I don't say you are living in the past - I'm just pointing out. Now, knowledge is necessary, otherwise I can't build a bridge, I can't go home, I can't ride a bicycle, I can't talk English. But that knowledge which

is the past, when it interferes in our relationship, brings division. That's all. And that division is conflict. I don't say you have no conflict or you have conflict - it is up to you to find out. So knowledge can be used totally impersonally. But when that knowledge is used personally it creates a division. That's all.

Q: Who uses that knowledge?

K: Who uses that knowledge? Listen to the question - who uses that knowledge. Tell me, who uses that knowledge.

Q: You can't say who uses that knowledge. It can't be said, what is using that knowledge.

K: We're going to find out if it can be said or cannot be said.

Q: It's a trap to ask the question.

K: Wait - he has asked it. He has asked it. Either you say, 'Look, that question is not valid,' or it is valid.

Q: It is an improper question.

K: We'll find out.

Q: I see it.

K: You see it. If he saw it he wouldn't ask it. Since he has asked it we must find out if that question is valid or not. His question was, who uses that knowledge. There is the knowledge, consciously and unconsciously, which is the 'me'. Right? The culture in which I have been brought up, the tradition, the religious beliefs, the superstitions - all those things are the knowledge which I have. There is that knowledge. Right? Now who uses that knowledge? Look at it - who uses that knowledge? It's there - I can't deny it, I can't say it doesn't exist - it is there. When does that knowledge come into operation? Go on, investigate, don't wait for me to answer it. When does that knowledge come into action?

Q: When the observer takes the memory out of the knowledge.

K: Make it much simpler, sir. My question was: you have all this accumulated knowledge, consciously or unconsciously, which is the content of your consciousness - I say to you, when does this knowledge precipitate in action? You answer it to yourself - you're not relying on me or some book.

Q: When I need it.

K: Wait - when you need it. What do you mean by need it? Wait - please, sir, do talk slowly - I don't understand you. Unless you actually do it, don't repeat something which is not yours. I am asking, when does this knowledge come into operation.

Q: When action needs it - when action needs this knowledge it comes into action through my speech.

K: Yes, sir - when does it come into operation? Why do you take such - I mustn't be impatient. Go on.

Q: When you want...

K: Sir, I ask you what is your name. Don't you tell me?

Q: The answer comes from external stimulation.

K: He says from external stimulation. I ask you what's your name: the memory, which is accumulated, responds. Watch it - go slowly. Because you know your name very well, you have repeated it a thousand times. There is the knowledge - it only responds when there is a challenge. Now, go a step further: I ask you, what is the distance, or what is something more complicated, and you take time between the question and the answer, don't you? What takes place between that question and answer - the time lag - what takes place?

Q: Thought.

K: No.

Q: memory.

K: What takes place, sir? I ask you what is the distance between here and Geneva - what do you say? What takes place inside you? You are trying to remember, aren't you? You say, yes, somebody told me its 90 kilometres or is it 80, I'm not quite sure - you follow? The mind is investigating, isn't it, looking at it, trying to find out. And you say, yes, it's 90 kilometres or 100, whatever it is. Now I ask you something much more complex and you say, I really don't know. That is, immediate answer because you are familiar with it, with the question what's your name; a more complicated question and you take time. It may be one day, you look at books, you ask people - you take time. Then there is a question to which you say, "I really don't know how to answer it because I have no knowledge." So knowledge responds according to a challenge. If that response is not adequate, complete, then the observer comes into being. I wonder if you see it.

I've got something new - you see what I'm talking about? Now - I'm glad, I can explain it. Look, sir, when I ask you a question, what's your name, it's an adequate, complete answer, isn't it? Right? In that there is no conflict, is there? Now, I ask you something much more complex which needs time, and if you can find the answer to that challenge, that is a complete answer, in that there is no conflict.

Now, if I ask you something to which your answer is not adequate, complete, what takes place? There's conflict, isn't there? No? Come on.

Q: I give up.



K: You give up. But if it is a question that has to be answered, life and death, it's a crisis, and in that crisis, if you don't answer completely, there is conflict, isn't there? Come on sir. And that conflict is the inadequacy, which is the observer, who depends on memory. Come on - that's simple - I've got it.

K: So there is, to any challenge, if there is complete response, there is no observer in operation. That's a conclusion to you, not to me because I see it, it's a fact. So I say to myself, is there a living in which every challenge is met totally, not mathematical problems - any challenge in relationship, which is the most important thing in life, not mathematics only, because in that relationship there are challenges, can I, can the mind respond totally. Then if it can respond totally, there is no conflict and therefore there is no observer. Just see the fact, sir, see it, swallow it, chew it, let it be part of you.

So in your life, daily life, which is relationship, can you live in a way in which you respond totally to every relationship? That means you have to be extraordinarily sensitive, energetic and aware in that relationship - when you're talking to the cook, or to your servant, or to your boss or the factory etc.

## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DISCUSSION 3RD AUGUST 1972.**

We were yesterday trying to talk over the observer and the observed, and I'm afraid it was rather complicated - I'm not at all sure each one of us understood what was said. But I'm afraid you're trying, aren't you, to understand what the speaker is saying. Don't bother. That's not at all important, what the speaker is saying. What the speaker is saying is: we have this problem of existence with all its complexities - there is war, there is violence in our daily life, there is the religious divisions, there are the divisions caused by priests, by their idea of what god is and so on. There are the divisions of nationalities, there are the divisions of racial hatreds and so on and so on.

The house is burning, not only your house but everybody's house is burning. One may have put away a little money for old age, or bought a house or flat or this or that, hoping to survive the chaos, and instead of understanding what the speaker is trying to convey, wouldn't it be better, far better if we, each one of us, looked at the problem of the world in which we are, of which we are a part. The world is not different from you, the world is you, we have built this world - the chaos, the uncertainty, the misery, the sorrow, the confusion - we have put it together, it is our world. So instead of trying to understand what the speaker is trying to convey, wouldn't it be better if we took one of those problems, which is your problem. Wouldn't that be better? Or are you rather uncertain about it? Haven't you problems? I don't want to put on to you what I say, to make it into another problem - you have enough

problems.

So in understanding your problem, really going into it very, very seriously, you and I will meet, completely. But if you are trying to understand the observer and the observed, and all that I want to convey, you'll be confused still further.

So what I propose, with your - what is it, goodness, kindness - that we take the problem of existence - your problem, your house, your relationship, your daily, monotonous, lonely, unacceptable existence. Can we start from there? Wouldn't that be much wiser? So, now, this morning, what shall we talk about, discuss - not discuss - converse together.

Q: Could we talk about the problem of over population?

K: Overpopulation. Fortunately I have no children. What am I to do about it - what are you to do about overpopulation? You go to India, which I do every winter, except last year, and there are 570 million people, crawling. For one job there are about 5,000 people, people sleeping in the streets. Tremendous population - China is the same, go to the East, it is burdened, and in Europe too. So what are we to do - you and I, not somebody else - what are we to do about it? Join the Family Planning Board? Advocate which is the best contraceptive and so on? Is that your major problem? Come on, sirs, is this what you want to discuss, talk over together, how to prevent...

Q: That's not what I mean, sir, but in connection with talking about life and death, there is a connection with death and multiplying. Not how to solve the problem of over population...

K: Connection between life and death and the overpopulation. Is that it? I don't quite understand the question then.

Q: You have talked in the past days about life and death.

K: Yes.

Q: And our connection with death. But it is the necessity of nature to multiply.

K: Yes, nature multiplies. And then what - what is the question, sir?

Q: I think the questioner wants to say something about procreation, and the necessity of procreation.

K: Why do we procreate? I think it is fairly clear, isn't it? Is that your problem?

Q: I have a problem: in the process of learning about myself there arises something which distorts it eventually - an active movement which seems to be fear, which seems to turn round the whole thing, as I watch that

K: Have I understood, sir - I'll have to repeat it. What is the factor of distortion in our life? Is that it?

Q: Yes, for me it seems to be fear.

K: Wait - what is the factor of distortion in our life? I want to go straight, or walk easily, quietly, happily, with great energy, vitality and so on, but certain factors enter and distort the whole movement of life. There are certain seeds in one, conscious or unconscious, that bring about chaos, misery. Is that what you mean? That's right. Now shall we discuss that? Is that your problem?

Q: Can I give another example? We buy food and the shopkeeper has to pay tax. The tax goes for nuclear weapons and so on.

K: Yes, sir, yes.

Q: And also by the revenues we pay we are contributing to war.

K: By buying a stamp, you're contributing to war.

Now, you understand his first question. What are the factors that distort life? What are the seeds conscious or unconscious in one that brings about such a disgraceful existence? Do you want to talk it over together? It would be rather fun, if we could go into it. Now how do you find out? I want to lead a good life, a sane, balanced, healthy life - intellectually, emotionally, and I want to have a very good physical body so that I function harmoniously, happily, easily. I see this as an idea, or as an ideal, or I have a feeling for it, not as something outside but inwardly, innately. I feel this would be marvellous, if I could live like that.

Now what happens? What happens so that things go wrong? I take to drink, you follow - everything goes to pieces. Go on, sir, discuss with me - let's talk it over. Is it a factor of heredity, the genes? Is it that there is a seed in me, in one, that has been so overlaid by environment, by the culture in which I live, and that seed begins to grow and distorts everything, all my life? Now what is that seed?

Q: I project ideas and ideals.

K: He says ideals. I have no ideal. I see the futility of ideals. I've dropped them. I want to lead a really good, sane, balanced life, a happy life. But something goes wrong. I want to find out if it is a seed in me, in one, that gradually puts out its destructive force. I'm enquiring. Is it my parents, is it the society, is it the culture that I live in, that has compelled me to conform, shaped my mind and my heart, and when given an opportunity it breaks through? Which is it? I've seen so many people - I've lived a long time - from the age of fifteen, I've seen this happen, with people of my own age - begin

beautifully, you know, and gradually finish, destructive, cruel, brutal, self-centred, ugly, drunk.

Q: For me it's habit.

K: Habit?

Q: That seems to stamp on the...

K: Have you understood my question, air? You say ideals create this horror. I have no ideals, I don't look to a future life or to a future action - I want to live a life now, from day to day, happily, energetically, clearly. But at the same time there is a flowering of the ugly - the religions have called it the devil, the evil one, and the Hindus and the Asiatics explain it as karma - the word 'karma' I believe means to act, and that action is conditioned by your past actions. So your actions control your life, therefore behave. If you don't behave properly this life, next life you're going to pay for it, therefore behave, and all that's involved.

So I want to find out why a human being who wants to live a straight, harmonious, active life, totally, all round, gradually goes to pieces? You've understood my question now? That was his question.

Q: In birth itself is the propensity to respond to the existing environment.

K: You're saying, at the very birth itself there is this destructive element.

Q: Not necessarily destructive, but the propensity.

K: Yes, the propensity is there. Sir, don't give me explanations. I don't want explanations - there are about one thousand or nine hundred people here, we'll all give explanations - that doesn't solve my problem. My problem is, there is in me some seed which

begins to flower over which I have no control, and that destroys my life. And I want to find out if I can wipe that seed out, destroy it. And I want to find out if that seed in me can be understood, resolved, so that I can live a normal life, and all the rest of it. That's my problem - don't give me explanations. I'm thirsty - you understand, sir - don't give me ashes which are explanations. What am I to do?

Q: Sir, when things start going wrong it's because one starts to compare oneself with others.

K: Yes, sir, you compare yourself, you imitate others, you conform to the social pattern, or reject the social pattern and react against that and try to form your own pattern. We know all this. But the seed goes on. Yes, sir?

Q: Does one recognize what it is?

K: Look, sir - I've been brought up fairly well, educated, so-called educated. And it happens I take to drink. And gradually I drink more and more and more, which destroys my brain cells. What was the origin of it, why did I do this, when I could have walked as - you know - why did I take to drink, destroy myself? Doesn't this happen? Some of you take drugs, LSD, marijuana, pot, all the rest of it. Why? You know very well it destroys your mind and you keep on taking it. I want to find out what is the factor in human beings that brings about this catastrophic activity.

Q: It seems to me that people don't see that it destroys.

K: I know - yes, sir. You see it outside, I don't see it. Why don't I see it? It comes to the same thing.

Q: It seems to me a person takes to drugs or drink because the seed which he has - the centre which is separating him from

everything makes existence so intolerable, he has to put himself out of his misery.

K: That's an explanation, isn't it? I want to find out why it happens, why do I do this thing? Is it inevitable because the seed has been planted - put yourself in somebody's place, sir.

Q: The seed can be a conditioning of the past.

K: The seed can be the conditioning of the past, some weakness in the character, some unsolved desire - I want to be great and I can't be great. I see somebody capable, full of life and beauty and I would like to be like him but I can't. I'm jealous, I begin to hate, and escape through drink. I know all this, I conform, or I compare myself with somebody and in that comparison I hate everything, because I can't reach up to that level, I'm jealous. So I take to drink, or drugs, or sex, or whatever it is.

Now after explaining all this, what am I to do?

Q: Become aware of your negative side and it would disappear.

K: If you would become aware of your so-called negative side, then perhaps it would disappear.

Isn't this one of your problems? You may not be so violently destructive, but there are these two sides, aren't there? I want to be kind, generous, I want to have deep affection. At the same time in its wake comes jealousy, antagonism, hate. Haven't you noticed all this? Now how does this happen?

Q: Pursuing pleasure brings about all this. There is no pleasure in duty...

K: I don't know - we're not meeting each other.

Q: Sir, is it because we identify with the seen instead of the seer.



K: You're not meeting my point. I want you to help me.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, I understand - I want you to help me. I want to lead a good social life, and I suddenly become antisocial. I'm taking a different example.

Q: Nobody can help me.

K: Nobody can help me - can't you help me?

Q: How?

K: No? Then what is the point of your existence? I come to you with a problem, you're a human being. You are educated, you have lived a long time, you've seen life. And I say to you, "Please, for god's sake help me." Have you a right to say, "No, it's your own job, you have to go through it."? Because you are also exactly in the same position, you're not different from me. In you there is that seed, in you there is the opposite of what you want to be. So don't say you can't help me - that's an easy way out.

Q: It might be the right way out.

K: It might be the right way out - is it?

Q: Why is my solution good for you?

K: No - you have this problem, haven't you?

Q: You have it.

K: I haven't got it, sir - this gentleman asked this question, and he says, "What is the factor, what is the seed in me that makes all life so destructive, so ugly - which all of us have, either hidden or actively in operation?"

Q: Is it because we look for the happiness outside instead of inside?

K: Is it because we look for happiness outside instead of inside.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Let's settle this first - aren't you exactly in the same place as the questioner? Haven't you got this dual factor active in you? Wanting to be kind, generous, affectionate, full of beauty, and at the same time there is an ugly thing going on. Haven't each one of you got this? So your problem is his problem - don't say, "Well, I can't help you." We have to solve this problem together, that's why you are there and we are sitting here.

Q: I feel there are very great individuals who are also very destructive. And that this destructiveness comes from a fear of not being perfect, of searching for perfection in oneself.

K: Please, I understand this. I can give explanations. I say, one of the reasons is the desire to be secure, another reason is the pursuit of pleasure, another reason is fear, the desire to have somebody to help you or to lead you, or some element in you which wants to escape from all this chaos. I can give a dozen explanations. At the end of it I'm still there. Look sir, haven't you been through all this before, haven't you heard inside yourself, or seen your friends going to destruction - haven't you observed all this, of which you are a part?

So what will you do, how will you stop the seed from operating, but only one movement, not double movement? How will you do this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: First, don't answer my question yet - please just listen to my question first. One sees this dualistic activity going on. I am asking myself: how is this dualistic, the opposites to stop, only one continuous activity, not an activity which distorts the movement?

Now what am I to do? Go into it - I'll show it to you in a minute.

Now first of all, is there a duality? You understand? The good and the bad, love and hate - is there this dualistic reality? You've understood my question? Or there is only one factor, not its opposite, because the opposite contains its own opposite. Have you understood? When I say I must not hate, the 'must not' is contained in love. So the opposites contain each other - is that a fact, as it is a fact that it is raining? Do you see it as a fact, or is it just an intellectual concept with which you agree? It is not an intellectual concept when you hear that rain on the canvas. It is raining. You don't speculate about it - it is so. Now, do you see it as clearly as you hear that rain, that the opposites contain each other? Therefore there is no opposite at all. Right?

Look - I am jealous, because my friend or my girl or my wife does something of which I disapprove, or goes away from me. I become furious, angry, jealous. And I fight with jealousy, I rationalize it, I say, "How stupid of me, let her go, what does it matter." But the thing is boiling. Now I say to myself, the fact is, I have never loved her. You understand? Otherwise I wouldn't be jealous. We have taken for granted jealousy is part of love. I heard a friend say the other day, "Oh, without jealousy there is no love".

Now take that - love and jealousy. I'd better begin at the beginning. There are opposites, aren't there? Sunny day and a rainy day, night, darkness and light. There is a man and a woman. Now psychologically are they opposites? Or only one factor and because I do not know how to solve that one factor, I invent other factors. Are we meeting each other? No. All right.

Look - I am angry, that's the only factor, isn't it? When I say, I

must not be angry, that's a conclusion, that's an abstraction. But the fact is I'm angry. If I know how to resolve that anger, its opposite wouldn't arise. Are we meeting each other? I am angry. Now can I solve that anger without resorting to its opposite, saying "I must not be angry." The 'must not be angry' is its opposite. And that comes only when I can't understand the whole structure of anger and go beyond it.

So I say, can I understand anger, not control it, not reject it, not yield to it, but understand it, have an insight into the whole structure of anger? If I do, then the opposite doesn't exist. You're meeting my point? Please do come. Shall we go on?

Q: If I don't control my anger I'm afraid I'll kill someone.

K: Look: before you kill somebody, try to find out if you can resolve the anger. To control it is to suppress it. To say, I must not be angry is to create the opposite, and therefore a conflict between 'must not be' and the fact that I am. Or if you try to escape from it, anger is still there.

So now I do not escape, I do not suppress, I do not say, I must resort to - there is anger. Now how am I to go beyond, how is the mind to go beyond it, without creating its opposite? You've understood? Please come on, sir, some of you understand this? Good, then come with me. Then what am I to do? Look what has taken place. Before I tried to control it, which is a wastage of energy. Before I tried to suppress it, which is a wastage of energy. Before I tried to escape from it or rationalize it, which is an avoidance, an escape from the fact. If I don't escape, control, suppress or try to rationalize it, all that energy is concentrated, isn't it? So I have got that enormous energy to deal with one fact, which

is anger. Have you got that? Please, otherwise we can't go on - if you haven't got it then it becomes merely verbal. You understand? You're angry, your tradition, your culture says, "Suppress it, control it, escape from it, and rationalize it." I say, that is wasting your energy which prevents you from observing the only factor, which is anger. So anger has no opposite, there is only that, and you have the energy.

Now, next step. Why do you call it anger? Because previously you have been angry, by naming it as anger, you have emphasized the previous experience. So you are observing the present factor with the previous experience, therefore conditioning the present factor. Are you meeting this? So the naming is a wastage of energy. So you do not name, no control, no suppression, no escape, and you have the energy. Then, is there anger? Don't say you don't know, because you are then facing the only factor. And when you are facing completely that factor, the factor doesn't exist, because it exists only when you are escaping, fighting, controlling, suppressing. Right, you've got it?

So, there is in me, in one, a human being, this duality. And I ask myself, "Is there a duality at all?" There is man, woman, sunshine - that's obvious, but psychologically, are there opposites? Or only thought invented the opposite because it could not solve the one factor. Have you got it? Please. And this requires attention, doesn't it? Because to see this clearly you need to observe. And you're prevented from observing when thought says, "I must do something about it." It is thought that has said, "I must control, otherwise I'll kill somebody." It is thought that has said, "I must suppress it, I don't know what to do about it, I must run away from

it, I must watch it". These are all activities of thought - when you say, "I must watch it".

So thinking about the factor is a wastage of energy. You understand all this? There is no wastage of energy when there is only observation.

Q: Do you mean by observation that you are that?

K: You've understood the question? Do you mean by observation you see you are that? Aren't you that? Do see it clearly - aren't you that anger? It's part of you. So thought says, "I must do something about that part." So thought begins to function - I must not, I must, it's right, it's wrong, it should be, you follow? So to observe without thought. You've understood, sir?

Now can you listen to that rain - please listen quietly - can you listen to that rain without thinking about the rain? You can only listen to the rain completely when you are not resisting it - when you say, "I can't hear it, I must hear." So you listen, observe, when there is no resistance of any kind. Now are you free of the opposite? Are you free at the end of this talk, are you free of it, never enter into the field of the opposite? Come on, Sirs. Yes, sir?

Q: When I see anger or confusion - when I see confusion very clearly - the thing that I see very clearly is clarity, then it's not confusion, it's clarity. Clarity is the end of confusion.

K: The gentleman says, when I see confusion, observe it totally, not wanting to get beyond it, not trying to find a way out of it, or ask somebody to help you to clear up the confusion, when you see it clearly, then there is clarity. There is clarity, obviously no confusion.

Q: May I ask the question - when I see the brutality of war

clearly, it is not the end of the brutality.

K: Of course not. Wait, sir. I see brutality, war, very clearly, all the reasons, the whole structure, the army and the navy, the investment, you follow? - the whole of it, the nationality, pride of leader, white and black and all the rest of it - I see it very clearly. In that perception there is clarity, but war still goes on. Then what is your relationship to the war? You see it clearly, you understand? First of all, do you see it clearly? Or is it just an idea that you see it clearly? To see it clearly you cannot belong to any group as nationality - to any group, politically, religiously, economically - to any group. Then if you see clearly, because you do not belong to any group, to any religion, to any leader, or to any community, then what is your relationship to the fact of brutality, which is war?

Q: I was not talking about the brutality within.

K: No, of course not.

Q: When I see that brutality clearly, that brutality is finished.

K: Yes, I said that. I've no brutality - please listen - I've no brutality because I see the whole business of it and I've finished with it and for me I've finished with it, you understand, not just verbally. Then what is my relationship to the brutality, to the war, to the killing?

Q: You have none - none - it is finished.

K: Have I any relationship with that? Obviously not. Wait - go step by step. I have no relationship, but it's still going on. But I have to do something about it, I can't say, "I've no relationship," and walk off. Right? So what shall I do? I'm very clear - I don't belong to any group, to any race, to any culture, to any religion, to any leader, because all that is part of brutality, and that brutality

has produced the war. I see it very clearly - see in the sense, feel it, wipe out the whole thing. Then the brutality exists - what's my relationship? I have no relationship in the sense I don't participate in it, I am not related to it, I have no connection with it, though I buy a stamp which goes to create a war, psychologically I have no relationship with it. But I have to do something, I can't say it has nothing to do with me.

So what shall I do? Are you in that position?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes, sir - are you? Don't say so easily you are. It means that you stand completely alone, don't you? If you have no authority, if you are not following anybody, you are not dependent or attached to anything - because attachment to a group, to an idea, to a person, breeds antagonism, breeds brutality. So what is your relationship if you see clearly and you say, "I have no relationship, but yet I have to do something, I have to act in this world, I can't just sit back and say, well I have nothing to do with it, with this beastly world." So what shall I do? Is it your problem? You're not a pacifist, you follow? So what will you do? Come on, sirs. Tell me, what am I to do? Go for a walk? What shall I do?

Q: Sir, if the understanding is clear I think the action also would take place.

K: Yes, what is that action?

Q: It would be an individual action.

K: Wait - will it be individual? Or will it be non-individual but human - you see the difference between individual and the human? I want to make a distinction there, if you don't mind. What is the difference between an individual and a human being? Look, sir -



you live in Europe, another lives in India, Asia - each of them have the same problems as you have, though modified, but the same problems - hunger, starvation, pleasure, sex, war, worrying about tomorrow, uncertainty, you follow? - the agony of existence - it exists there, it exists here. They are human problems, aren't they? But I can, the individual can translate it as a particular issue. The individual is his temperament, his character, his idiosyncrasy, depending on his conditioning.

So the human is much bigger, wider, whether you're brown, black, purple, Indian, you belong to the whole collective human race, human beings. But the moment you separate yourself as an individual, you are creating a division, and hence conflict and all the rest of it.

So what are you to do as a human being when there is this war going on. Go on, sir.

Q: You identify with it.

K: I can't - how can I identify myself with it? That has been created by nationalism, by the military, by the engineers, by the scientists, by the - you know, all the rest of it - they have invested a tremendous lot of money in the material of war. Each nation does this, it's their peculiar dirty game. And I see the whole thing, I say, "Out." Now what shall I do, as a human being - you understand?

Q: It is very hard to understand the nature of the conflict. But you will attempt to bring out the nature of the conflict, of the duality.

K: What am I to do, sir? This is not a question of duality - what am I to do?

Q: Would it not be better to try to decide what I should not do?

K: What I should not do? All right, let's begin - what should I not do. Should I not buy stamps? Should I not travel by car? Not pay taxes, go round doing propaganda for anti-war, demonstrations, all the rest of it? You follow? You are not answering my question - what am I to do?

Q: I don't see the point of trying to decide the way I am now what to do about that. When I got there, if I got there, I would do it, whatever it was, corresponding to that understanding.

K: I understand your question, sir. He says, why do you put that question when I am not there. What do you mean, you are not there? You mean, you do not see this thing clearly?

Q: That's correct.

K: Therefore why don't you see this thing clearly. People are shedding tears, you understand, sir? Children are being burnt, whole forests are being destroyed; and we sit here and say, "We don't see this." What's wrong with me, when I say, "I don't see it", what is wrong with me when my house is burning, and I don't see it. Is it an avoidance?

Q: If you see this activity going on, one has to resist it, one has to fight against it.

K: Sir, look - please, don't you read the newspapers. Don't you look at what is happening around you? Why do you say, 'I'll wait till I get there.' It is there, it is now, not tomorrow.

Q: We know - it is very easy to become pessimistic about it.

K: Sir, you're not - don't tell me, wait till it happens to you, then I can wait till I die. It's happening now.

Q: What is one to do?

K: I'm asking this - what am I to do? I have no relationship to

the war, I can't just sit still and let the war go by, I'm part of this, I've cut myself completely off, and yet I must act. What shall I do?

Q: If one is really gentle inside oneself, then doesn't this bring about a healing action in one's everyday life?

K: Yes, but the war goes on. I can probably talk to you or to a friend and say, "Look, let's..." - you follow? - "Let's understand all this business", but is that all I can do? Put yourself...

Q: You have to die but we don't know how.

K: You have to die, you don't know how?

Q: The individuality.

K: Isn't this a problem for you?

Q: Yes, of course.

K: Then what do you do about this problem? Just let it remain and go on with the problem till you die?

Q: Can one find a different kind of life without any brutality?

K: I am leading a different kind of life when I don't belong to any country, when I don't belong to any group, when I don't have any kind of relationship with any kind of brutality - I'm leading a different life. And yet round me the misery is going on. What am I to do?

Q: Just try to do as you are doing as far as we have understood.

K: All right, as far as we have understood, we'll do, but have you understood this thing totally? Why don't you see totally, that as long as you have any feeling for nationality, you are breeding war. Why don't you see clearly, that as long as you belong to any sect, any group, any religion, you're breeding war. What prevents you from seeing this? Lazy?

Q: Survival.

K: The Bible. That's a good idea. (Laughter) That's a marvellous idea. I like that. And in India they would say the Bhagvad-gita, which is the same thing - what a lovely idea, sir.

Q: Survival - the necessity of survival.

K: I haven't understood, sir.

Q: You state that we should hold merely a passport. What nationality would we be allowed to put on the passport?

K: I've got a passport which says I'm an Indian - I'm trying to change it, the passport. (Laughter) It's an awful nuisance when you have to get a visa for every country in the world.

Now let's come back - what am I to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, listen to this - what is action? Action means the doing, doesn't it? Which is always in the present. Right? The acting is always in the present. Now what is my action based on? On the past, isn't it? No? Please discuss. Isn't my action based on the past, on my memory, on my experience, on my idea of what I should do, on my conditioning? So when action means the present, and what I do is related to the past, then it is not action. If my action is shaped according to my remembrance, then I am acting according to the pattern which my memory has set. Therefore there is no action taking place. Wait. So when I am acting according to a principle, according to an ideal, which is the future, it is no action either. Do you see that? See the reality of it? When you do, then I'm asking myself, what is my action in relation to war, though I'm not related to it. What is my responsibility?

Q: Isn't it to be what you are, having shed these things, then you are free to be what you are?

K: I don't know what I am. I am not all these things, but I don't know what I am, I am not interested, for the moment, what I am. That's not the question. My question is, when I say what am I to do, am I thinking in terms of what to do with regard to the past, or with regard to the future, or only what to do now? You see the difference?

Q: As long as you are acting there's a problem, but if you just live so intensely, and not asking the question what to do but you are living.

K: Yes, quite, that's quite right. I want to - the lady says, if you are living, then there is no question of what you are going to do. But do we live, or do we live in the past, or in the future and therefore we do not live. And therefore the question is - I won't put it yet. Have you understood the question? Look, there is this war, any war, not my favourite war, or my not favourite war - war. I see all wars are caused by many things. And I don't participate in any of them psychologically. Then I'm asking myself, "What is action?" One always acts according to the pattern of the past, a repetitive or non-repetitive action, based on memory, the past. Or action based on a future ideal, or a principle, which I have established as a concept and according to that, act. Now is that action? You follow? Or is action only when there is neither the future nor the past. Therefore there must be an insight into the past, and also an insight into the future, therefore then only there is action. Then when there is that action, I will then relate it to the present.

Has somebody understood?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, Signora, I understand that. Please apply this to yourself, look at it: do you act or are you acting according to a memory? Do you act or you are acting according to a concept, belief, a conclusion, a principle, an ideal - find out. And when you find out you will see that's not action, it's either a continuity of a dead thing, or a future thing which is not now. Now, if you see that very clearly, then what is action? Action then is what you are doing now. What you are doing now, is it related to war? Or is it something totally of a different dimension? You've understood, sir?

Q: Seeing all this and the fact that the Vietnam war is not over there, it's everywhere, is the action...

K: Sir, I don't know - I only know what we call action is either the projection of the past in the present, modified by the present, or I am acting according to a principle or an ideal, which is the future. So my action is always there or there, behind me or in front of me, but never in my lap, never acting.

Till I find that out, I can't answer what shall I do with regard to the war. Do you understand my question? I'm not avoiding my action with regard to war. I want to find out what is action.

Q: Isn't the acting according to a principle or an idea, the past or the future, the major factor of war.

K: Obviously, sir, that's just it. You've understood what the gentleman said? Acting according to a principle, to an ideal, or acting according to your conditioning, is perhaps the major factor of war. So till I have really grasped the whole nature of action, any answer will be contributing to war. I don't know whether you see that. Because if I act according to the past, the past says I'm a national. The past says you must be loyal to your country, the past

says this is a good war, this is a bad war, the past says, your memories, the inheritance of your race says you must fight to survive.

So if I act according to the past I am contributing to war. Or if I'm acting according to the future ideal, I'm contributing to war, because my culture in which I've been brought up emphasizes these two. So I have to find out for myself what action is. I see these two are not action, which are contributing to war. So my action then doesn't belong to this dimension.

Q: Action in the present is love?

K: Is that an idea? How do you know? If you are acting in the past or in the future - why do you call it love? It may be, but why do you - unless you actually live it, don't call it anything.

Q: I don't even call it war.

K: Don't call it war. War means destroying, war means conflict - give it another name but it's there. Now, sir, have you seen this, have you seen the beauty of this? So a mind that is acting in the past or in the future must contribute to war. A mind that is caught in nationalism, in religious beliefs, rituals, sects and so on, must contribute to war. So have you a mind that doesn't belong to all this? Then if you have, you are doing the right thing. You are acting.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 4TH AUGUST 1972.

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: I'd like to enquire into every facet of myself to see if 'I', the sense of 'I' could come to an end.

K: You said the other day that observing what is happening in the world around us and also what is happening inwardly, and understanding it, having a deep insight into it, from what you said, should one go out and teach, or just live? You've understood the question? I'm not quite sure if I understand it yet.

Q: She's asking whether one can teach what one has understood through one's own being, or through words and...

K: Yes, sir, the same thing. I wonder if that's a problem. As we said yesterday, surely what we have been talking about from this platform, for the last ten meetings - surely it's much more important, isn't it, that you understand and live and act in a totally different way, to bring about a psychological revolution in yourself, through your own observation, and from that revolution, various kinds of social activity and all the rest of it will take place. It's your life you're concerned with, not with what I'm talking about. I made that quite clear from the beginning that we're concerned, aren't we, with transforming our own life, the life that we lead, the petty, narrow, stupid life of business - you know, the whole thing, moneymaking, only be concerned with that, or be an artist, only be concerned with that, or so-called religious person, only be concerned with that, what he considers is a religious life and so on.



Surely it's much more important to understand what is happening outwardly and inwardly, and from there, act. Because it's yours then, nobody else's. But if you are trying to merely understand what the speaker is saying, then you are trying to understand what he is talking about, not your own life. But if you deeply seriously go into your own life, into your own activities, your own thought-processes, then you and I will meet, it will be the same.

Now what shall we discuss this morning?

Q: How does one to bridge the gap between the individual life which is so superficial and narrow, and the vast complex life.

K: How is one to bridge the gap between the individual life which is so superficial and narrow, to the vast complex life, that's going on around one. Is that the question, sir? The human life. Is that what you want to discuss?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand. When I observe myself, I see the observer is absent. And to remain in that state you require a lot of energy, a great deal of vitality. But at other times, the image comes into being, and so destroys that which has been perceived. Now, is that what you want to discuss, all of you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is that the question, sir? I'll put it fairly simply, if I can. When you observe the mountains, the trees, the river, or oneself, when you give sufficient attention, and therefore energy, the observer, with all its conditioning, with its past, is absent. And can one maintain that, can one sustain that sense of total attention continuously? Is that the question? Shall we discuss that?

What do you mean by attention - let's begin with that. And what do you mean by giving total attention. What do you mean, sirs? When you attend, what is involved in that? Help me, please. Sir, let's begin very slowly - the question has been put, which is, when there is total attention there is no division as the observer, there is only observation. When I look at that mountain, with the snowcap, completely, with all my energy, interest, vitality, intensity, then the past as the observer, with all its content as the word, conditioning is not. Now, what is that attention? Is it brought about through practice, the repetition, following a particular system, a method - will that bring about attention. What do you say?

Q: No.

K: Why? Why do you think a practice, a method, a discipline, a continuous, mechanical repetition - will that bring about attention?

Q: It comes sometimes fortunately, and other times it doesn't come.

K: Is it a matter of chance, or is it a matter of insight, perception? Is it a matter of chance, as the gentleman points out, or you give total attention in which there is complete insight into what you are observing. Look, sir, you're listening to what the speaker is saying. How are you listening? Are you giving total attention? Or the part of you listening to the noise of the river, part of you saying I must pay attention to what he's saying, part of you trying to translate what he's saying according to your own understanding, interpreting, explaining, judging - all that indicates lack of attention, surely. Which is it you're doing? When you look at a tree, do you look with total attention or only give a very, very partial, passing interest. When you look at the blue sky, do you see

the vast space or only a colour which is a rather beautiful morning, isn't it, and pass on. Which is it you do?

Q: The moment we answer that question we are not attentive.

K: He says, the moment we answer that question we are not attentive. I'm not asking you to answer that question. I'm asking whether you are attentive, which you can answer for yourself. How can we go about this - it's really quite interesting if we can go into this. Look sir, let us take something which is much nearer. Most of us have fears. Right? Of various kinds. Now unless you comprehend the whole structure and the nature of fear, it will go on. Now can you investigate into the whole structure of fear attentively, investigate in the sense, observe the nature of fear. Shall we go into that? Would that be of interest? Because I think most people have fears of some kind or another, haven't you? No?

Q: Yes.

K: I'm so glad. Now what is fear - we are non-analytically observing, non-analytically. Analysis means to break up, the meaning of that word means to break up. We are not trying to break up fear into various causes and how to get rid of them but merely watching the whole nature of fear. Have I explained what I mean? Look, I am frightened, consciously and unconsciously, deeply I'm frightened of superficial things, I know, I'm aware of it - nobody has to tell me that I'm frightened. May we proceed - we are sharing this together, we are investigating this together, we are being aware of the whole nature of fear together, we are sharing it. So don't sit there and let me go on talking - we are moving together. Right?

Now I say to myself, what is the cause of fear? Why am I

frightened? Which is an investigation into the cause, therefore an analytical process. Aren't you frightened of something?

Q: Yes, but I don't know what it is.

K: Oh, you don't know what you are frightened of? Losing a job, not having money - investigate it, sir, look at it - don't say, no, right off - fear of death? Not coming up to the ideal which you have set up for yourself? You have measured yourself against another and you feel that you cannot completely fulfil, completely reach that point. Or you are frightened of what others say, you're frightened of your wife or your husband or somebody. Don't you know all these things? This is a common thing, isn't it? We're talking this over together, it's a dialogue, conversation - you don't have to sit quiet and let me go on talking. I did that last week, last two weeks. Now we are trying to meet each other and try to find out the nature of fear and to see if the mind can go beyond it.

Q: Sometimes there is something we want to ask but we're all afraid to talk.

K: Yes, we have some kind of fear.

Q: I think that the reason why we are afraid is we're afraid of the unknown, afraid what the other person's going to think or what's going to happen in the future.

K: We're frightened of the unknown whether it's in the distant future or in the immediate - I don't know what you are going to say, I don't know, you might hurt me, and so on. There is fear.

Q: I'm shaking just from saying that.

K: How is one aware of this fear? Why do you call it fear? You see, you're not following this, you're sitting there like - I've no contact with you.

Q: There is a physical reaction.

K: Now what is your reaction.

Q: I said there is a physical reaction.

K: There's physical reaction, I know all that, sir - you sweat, you get nervous, you kind of tighten up.

Q: That's how you know - you asked how you know.

K: Proceed a bit further, don't stick at the obvious - go on. It has happened before. You recognize it - press it further, go into it, sir, go on, move.

Q: I know that I'm afraid often because I have a compulsion to escape in various ways, in various kinds of pleasures and pursuits. And the compulsion seems to prove that I'm running away.

K: That means you want to conquer it or run away from it, because you don't know what to do with it - is that it? One doesn't know what to do with fear. Therefore one runs away, one explains it away, or one tries to control it, suppress it, develop its opposite, which is courage - we go through all those processes, don't we. But yet fear remains.

Q: It seems to remain because I'm not aware that I am fear myself.

K: I think it's very important to understand this, because fear is a destructive thing, it blinds you, both physically and psychologically. So one has to go into it very, very deeply, understand the conscious as well as the unconscious fears. Right, sir.

Q: Is it possible that many times when one tries to face fear, when one actually does, it's useless trying to look at it because then thought comes in. So thought is there more than the total

awareness.

K: Yes, sir - look.

Q: There are two points, one is aware that fear is passed on to us but I think basically its because of the duality of being and non-being. This is basically at the root of every fear.

K: But you still at the end of it have fear, haven't you? After giving me that explanation there is fear still.

Q: Yes but that's not what was meant. You suggested the possibility...

K: I'm afraid of various things - public opinion, what you might say to me, I'm afraid of death, the unknown, I'm afraid of losing my job, I'm afraid that next year you won't all turn up, I'm afraid that I might get ill - I've got dozens of fears. I'm as good as you at explaining why fears come into being. I want to find out how to be free of it, how to go beyond it. That's all my concern, I have no other concern. I don't want explanations, I don't want a verbal description of my fears, and I see how dreadful, how calamitous, how destructive fear is. Now I'm asking myself, how is it possible to go beyond it - that's my whole concern, you understand - that's all I'm interested in. I'm giving my total attention to it, because it's a crisis in my life, because I see how it perverts every activity, how neurotic I become, how in comparison with somebody I further this fear. So my concern, my interest, is, I'm asking, can I, can the mind, this mind, be totally free of fear and whenever fear arises in the future to meet it totally? That's all I'm concerned about and nothing else. Are you?

Q: But when you give your whole attention to fear you are not afraid.

K: I understand, madam, but I don't know how to give my - that's again, if you give your total attention to fear, then you're not afraid. But I don't give total attention.

Q: Didn't we go into this two days ago instead of fear we used anger.

K: Yes, sir, I'm doing the same thing in different ways.

Q: Why?

K: Why? Because the gentleman raised a question, how am I to maintain a continuous, total attention. To him that was a problem.

Q: Was his problem fear or attention?

K: Both are involved in attention.

Q: Fear is involved in attention?

K: Obviously - if I am deeply unconsciously frightened I can't give attention.

Q: If you're angry you can't give attention.

K: Obviously.

Q: And if you're in love you can't give attention.

K: Wait - if you are in love, what does that phrase mean? I am only taking one thing at a time, which is, we discussed the other day anger, jealousy, and I'm saying today that wherever there is any form of fear, conscious or unconscious, attention is not possible. Don't expand that more by saying, if you're in love, or if you are lame and so on.

Q: Yesterday we went into anger, today we are going into fear, are we performing analysis or by going into one are we in reality going into all of them?

K: Sir, aren't you frightened? Isn't there fear in you? No?

Q: Sir, the other day we paid attention to anger and we came to

a point where anger or confusion or whatever it was, was gone. Now the attention has turned upon itself and said, "How can I maintain myself?"

K: Yes.

Q: A new condition has come in, attention which was - I don't know how to put it - attention has now split itself and looked at itself.

K: Sir, he is saying - listen to his question, he says, I can give total attention but I can't maintain it. Wait. How am I to do it? I have a feeling that it's a marvellous thing if I could give total attention to everything I'm doing.

Q: And now the attention has turned upon itself - attention is now part of thought, not pure attention.

K: That's so - we are pointing out - quite right. So attention gave him pleasure, or rather, in that state of attention there was nothing, there was attending. Then thought comes in and says, "That was a marvellous state - I'd like to have more of it, a continuous momentum of it." Which is, thought has made that attention into a pleasurable thing which must be continued. That's all.

Q: It doesn't seem quite that way - the other day I had a certain insight into fear, I saw that I was afraid and I saw that I was the fear, and now it's gone. But it was only for a flash. Now I'd like to learn more about my fear - it wasn't enough, the attention wasn't long enough so that I could learn about it.

K: Now, all right, I won't discuss fear. Is it possible to maintain continuously attention? That's the question he asked. Now why do you want to maintain it?

Q: To learn.



K: Wait - in order to learn you want to maintain attention. Is that it?

Q: Because I am aware of a lot of thoughts which destroy the attention and prevent me from looking.

K: Yes. When I am not attentive, the whole momentum of thought comes into being, and there is a division between the thinker and attention. Now - please just listen - we've all understood this question now. How is one to maintain attention? Can you maintain it? What is involved in that statement, which is to maintain, to sustain, continuously, attention? That involves time, doesn't it. Right? I have been attentive now for a few minutes and it's gone, but I would like that attention to last, to go on. Now when you are attentive, is there any question of time? No. Then why are you asking that you must have time to be attentive, or time must be given for its duration? When you are attentive, there is no time. Then who is asking that it must last a long time?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: He says either there is attention or there is no attention. But he is asking, when there is attention there is no time. He says that. But at the same time he says, I wish I could continue in that state of attention.' That's his problem.

Q: There is another problem.

K: That's what I'm pointing out.

Q: There are two problems.

K: When you are attentive there is no time, there is no wanting for it to continue, thought doesn't come into being. When you are not attentive, the whole process begins - thought, time, wish, will, all the rest of it begins. Now, why aren't you merely attentive at

that one moment - that's enough, why do you want to have more of it?

Q: Because most people have moments of attention, flashes of attention, and then the rest of the time they are inattentive and in conflict. And those flashes for just a moment, for a second once a week, is not enough to transform your life. You go on in the same old way. So therefore one asks, how can one be attentive more and more.

K: I see the questioner says, at the moment of attention there is a sense of vast change, but that doesn't last, and one falls back into the old rut, into the old routine, the old habits, and therefore there is no change in life, in one's ways of living. Now what are you concerned with, attention or with bringing about a revolution in your life, psychologically - which are you concerned with?

Q: Obviously psychological revolution.

K: Are you?

Q: I would like to have it.

K: You would like to have - that's a lovely thing. Which is important, sir - attention or psychological revolution?

Q: Are not the two not connected?

K: I don't know.

Q: I think they are.

K: Sir, are you really concerned with psychological revolution, deeply, will you give your life to it? Or is it just a theory? So you want to give your life, your energy, your whole being into bringing about a psychological change. Do you, sir?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Do you know what it means to give your life, your attention,

your love, your energy, your whole life to find out if you can change yourself radically? Do you want to do that? Or do you say, "If I have attention then this will happen"? You understand? "I have attention at rare moments, and it's marvellous. If I had that attention, then it will bring about a deep psychological change." So your concern is to have this attention. Not - please listen - not the bringing about psychological revolution in yourself.

Q: That would be an ideal.

K: Yes, that would be an ideal.

Q: (Italian)

K: They are all very clever, these birds. What he's saying is, if I have that attention, then I will change psychologically.

Q: (Italian)

K: If I have attention, if there is that state of attention, then I can cancel with that attention, fear. You see, what is important, attention or fear?

Q: Attention.

K: Yes?

Q: Attention to wipe out fear.

K: That's lovely - look, I'm going to show you something. You say, attention is important and not fear, not the psychological revolution, because you think, through attention you will bring about this revolution inside. You don't know anything about attention, it happens very rarely, occasionally it bursts, but it soon goes away. But the constant thing is your daily, miserable, suffering, petty life. That is important, not attention. If you want attention, then as it has been pointed out, it becomes an ideal, and then you have to fight for it, seek a method to achieve it and all the

rest of it.

So I am not concerned with attention. To me, that's nothing. Sorry. That has no value because my life is ugly, petty, narrow, stupid, jealous, fearful, frightened, competitive and all the rest of it - pretension. Now in understanding that, the very nature of understanding it is attention. I don't have to seek attention.

Q: Sir, with this degree of fear and the possibility of reversing the trend, can I suggest it is the attention which prevents the psychological revolution, I don't know.

K: I don't understand your question, sir.

Q: Is it the attention that prevents the psychological revolution?

K: Is it attention that prevents psychological revolution? If you are seeking and making attention into an ideal, then it is preventing psychological revolution. You won't let go attention, will you? You are so attached to that word because perhaps I've talked a great deal about it. But that's not important - please, sir, just listen. I am concerned with the world, what's happening in the world, the wars, the brutality, the appalling things that are going on, the ugly things of the politicians. And from there I see what I am. I am the world, you understand, sir? You don't feel that, do you? I am the world, because I have created this monster. No? It's so obvious. Right. And without a radical revolution in myself, I can't do a thing outside. So my concern is: is it possible to bring about this deep revolution in myself? That's all my concern, not how to be aware.

Q: I say, in order to change...

K: Wait. No. Find out if you can change, and then see what is implied in this revolution.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, I am saying, sir - I have no attention, I don't know what it means, but I do know and I can go into my sorrow, my competitiveness, my violence - not into something I don't know.

Q: Can we say that every person in this room is really responsible for the whole world situation.

K: The questioner asks, do you mean really, all the people who are in this tent are responsible for what is happening in the world? Aren't you?

Q: We are sharing the responsibility.

K: Yes, but first of all aren't you responsible?

Q: If I say that it is wrong...

K: I don't say it is wrong - responsible. I am the world.

Q: But if I am the world...

K: I don't condemn the world.

Q: Then how do I act?

Q: Who is this 'I' who is the world?

K: Now we're off!

Q: The word 'I'...

K: The 'I' is only a means of communication. When I say I am the world, the 'I' is the world, the world and the 'I' are not different, they are one.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir. You see, we are going off always from the central issue. If I had that energy, if I had that attention, if I could see clearly, tell me, you follow? - out there. You don't face the fact, of what you are.

Q: May we come back to the point where we were talking about attention and of being aware of inattention.

K: Sir, look, please, let us once and for all drop attention, shall we? If I had that energy, that interest, that vitality, I would do this. That's sheer speculation.

Q: I can't see that.

Q: Could we go back to the only thing we're sure of, which is fear.

Q: If I understand you aright, if I look at inattention, then attention comes. My only problem now is to look at inattention...

K: I have said on previous occasions, don't bother about attention, be aware of inattention. If you are aware of your inattention, there is attention, that's all. But sir, that is not the problem - how you refuse to face this thing.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Right, sir. Look, sir - let's forget the ifs, the attention, the ideals. Now take one thing, which is common to all of us, and go through right to the end of it, and see if the mind can be free of it. You follow? Nothing else. Now I'm going to take one thing, which is, we all live in comparison, don't we? We're always comparing, aren't we? No? Both outwardly and inwardly. And this comparison breeds in me, not only fear, the sense of inferiority, the sense of wanting to be like him, imitation, conformity, acceptance, depending on what I think is much better than 'what is'. Right? Shall we take that one thing and go to the very end of it, and see if your mind is completely free from all comparison. You understand my question? Shall we go into it?

Q: It's no question, we just have to be free. This is not a question, it is a fact that you have to be free.

K: Right. Why does my mind, your mind, compare? Look at it,

sir. Why? Is it from childhood we have been taught to compare? That's one factor. All our social structure is based on that too. Our religious environment is based on that - you are nothing, you must be like a saint, this whole business is based on comparison.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam - take one thing. You do compare, don't you, yourself with another. Now look at it and find out why this momentum exists in you - this constant measurement, not only with somebody else outside of you, but also the measurement that you have established according to your memory, the past. So you are always measuring, comparing, conforming. Are you aware of it? Wait, just hold on a minute. If you're aware of it, what do you mean by that word 'aware'? Just the word, don't say "It should be, it must be". What do you mean by being aware, I am aware that I am comparing.

Q: I see that I compare for a second.

Q: It may be that I don't get pleasure enough, so I think I will look at it and get more pleasure.

K: Is it that you don't look at this measurement of yourself, because if it gave you a lot of pleasure you would look at it longer? That's what the questioner says. Can you look at it, sir, do you know you are measuring yourself all the time? - 'I must be, I will become, I should not, I have been happy,' measure, measure, measure. Now can you look at it - which is a fact. I am looking at that microphone and I look at it. Now, when you look at it, what takes place? Go on, sir.

Q: I think I find excuses.

K: You find excuses for being, for comparing.

Q: We don't want to look at it.

K: We don't want to look at it. What are you going to do with such a - what shall I do? I know I'm comparing - my life, my education, the culture in which I have been born, all bring about, or shape the mind, the brain, everything, to compare myself with others, or compare myself with what I have been. Compare in the present, in the future, and in the past. And when I am aware of it, I find excuses for it - why should I compare, what's wrong with comparison, all the world compares.

And then I condemn it - how terrible to compare myself, why can't I be myself, I won't compare any more. You say you won't compare yourself any more because you say, "I'll be myself." Right? Then you say, "What is yourself?" You are following all this? I won't compare, I will not compare, I'll be myself, then you say, "Who is myself, what is myself?" Go on, sir. Myself is this comparison. No? If you don't compare, what takes place - you're not yourself, there's something else. Is that clear? Now are you like that? - that you say, "I have lived a life of comparison, becoming a scholar, professor," all the rest, comparing, comparing, comparing. And you justify it, because everybody else is doing the idiotic thing. And you also, being an idiot - not you - me - I'm also an idiot, so I follow. Now I realize that.

Then I say to myself, but I'm comparing myself with what I was yesterday. I was so happy yesterday, I'd no problems yesterday, it was such a lovely time yesterday. So you look at that, and again go through the process - I must keep some of that and relinquish the other. So you are constantly in battle, between the past, the future, and what you have, what you think is right in comparing yourself.



All that is based on comparison. And then you say, "I'll be myself, I don't give a pin for others, what others - I'll be myself, identify myself." What is yourself? Yourself is part of this momentum of comparison. Now when you don't compare, what takes place?

Q: I am not myself.

K: You're not yourself? That's right, that's what we are saying. Please, just listen - when you don't compare, when you don't say, 'I'll be myself,' what takes place in the mind?

Q: There's a sense of detachment.

K: The gentleman says there's a sense of detachment - detachment from what?

Q: From previous comparisons.

K: Is detachment freedom? Sir, first we're talking about comparison. Then we say, "I'll be myself." When it is pointed out that yourself is the momentum of this comparison, comparative values and so on, then there is no detachment. I say, what takes place when you are not comparing? When you are not being, when you say, "I will be myself," - when all that's pushed aside, what takes place in your mind?

Q: Silence.

Q: There's attention to 'what is'.

K: Attention to what is - I don't know what that attention is. I'm going to cry presently.

Q: You're experiencing directly 'what is'.

K: What are you experiencing?

Q: There's no centre. No 'I'.

K: Is it so easy to say there's no 'I', because I've just learnt from another...

Q: But there is no...

K: Wait a minute, madam - I've just learnt from another, this whole momentum of comparison, and therefore I say I'm no longer, there is no 'me'. Who is saying there is no 'me'? I want to find out what happens to my mind when there is no comparison at all - and I don't say, "I will be myself" - all that's part of comparison. What takes place there?

Q: Silence.

Q: That's the psychological revolution we're talking about.

K: Psychological revolution of which you're talking about. I want to find out for myself what happens when there is no comparison. Listen quietly for two minutes, please. Just take two minutes to look at it. The mind is free of one burden, isn't it? It says, "The thing which I have carried about all my life, I've put it aside." So the mind, by examining, observing, being aware what the content of comparison implies, suddenly realizes the futility of it, the stupidity of it, the utter unintelligence of it. Therefore the mind has become intelligent.

Q: Before you spoke about comparison, I saw this in myself and I realized the comparison by sort of - not pushing it away but embracing it. Going with it - I am it. And then it disappeared.

K: Sir, by looking at comparison I have an insight into comparison, haven't I. I have an insight, I see it has no value, it has no meaning. The seeing is the intelligence. That's all. Now I want to have an insight into fear, into attachment, so I don't condemn it, I don't say I must be free of it, I just look at it, I want to learn about it. Therefore when I want to learn, I'm curious, I don't say, "I must have no fear, I must go beyond it, fear is this and fear is that," I

want to look at it. Therefore when I look at it with that curiosity, with that affection, I begin to see things very clearly. Therefore the mind, unburdening itself of something it's carried for years and years, is free of it.

Now are you free of this comparison?

Q: No.

K: No. Why not?

Q: We always want to do something about it.

K: You always want to do something about it - we've been through all that. The gentleman says, "I really don't understand what you're talking about", let's go into it again. There is comparison between two things, when I choose between this cloth and that cloth, between this car and that car, between, I don't know - physical things - between material things there must be comparison. We're talking about psychological comparisons, psychological measurements. Psychological measurement comes into being when thought says, "You are much better than I am, you look so much more beautiful than I am, you are clever, I am dull," so I compare myself with you and I have made myself dull. Am I dull if I don't compare? I don't know. So I won't call myself dull any more. So is your mind, after listening to this for half an hour, free of comparison? Find out, not yes, no, it should be, it should not be - find out. And if it isn't, why isn't it? Is it because through comparison ambition takes root. And ambition is part of the social structure, religious, all the rest of it.

So I compare myself with somebody who is great or successful, has a bigger car and all the rest of it, because it gives me energy in my drive to be like, go beyond, which is ambition. Is that why you

cling to comparison, because in that there is great pleasure?

So when you don't compare there is no ambition. Which doesn't mean you become a vegetable, or you accept things as they are - on the contrary. Now, are you like that, that when you see something through you've dropped it.

Q: Right now, as I hear you say this and I think to myself, immediately I look around me and I see another person, and I'm comparing already. Again. The very instant that I'm understanding. I'm looking at you on the stage and I can understand as clearly as possible what you are saying, and I say to myself, "That man's wiser," It doesn't simply stop for me.

Q: Isn't it that we all experience it but we don't know we are because we do not experience and know it, so we talk about it, we identify ourselves with the conditioning. But we are free.

K: We are free?

Q: Yes, when we are...

K: Oh, Lord, don't let's go back to that.

Q: Listen, I want to ask you something, because I've heard thousands and thousands of people for years talking, and this is a very vital question.

K: It is.

Q: When I talk to you, I'm asking, I identify myself with the conditioning, don't I? Because I have to work by intellect, I am forced to do that.

K: So you're saying, madam, that I am basically free, we are basically free, we are basically god...

Q: No.

K: Wait - it comes to the same thing. We are basically beautiful

- when you say free, all these things are implied - not just free and then it has no meaning.

Q: God, freedom...

K: No, these things are implied when you say, "I am free." You say you're free, basically. In Asia they say, basically they have the elements of God, Atman and all the rest of it. I don't accept anything I don't know.

Q: You're not understanding me - what I mean is, in the instant when I look into myself and I don't identify myself with my intellect, in that second I am free, that's what I meant.

K: If you don't identify yourself with your intellect you are free.

Q: With the mind.

K: With the mind.

Q: No, listen - I'm trying to ask you something which is very important.

K: I understand, madam.

Q: And I'm very unhappy when I listen to you, and I feel it in myself and I'm trying to explain that I cannot...

K: What is that? What are you trying to explain?

Q: I'm trying to explain this, if we go on saying, we go on and on getting more and more concepts. But if I look really at myself, it's not...

K: Madam, that's what we are trying to do.

Q: Well look, you explained this - but when you look into yourself when you are not identifying, comparing, you are free.

K: When you're not identifying yourself you're free. Then the question arises, why does the mind identify, why do you identify yourself with your furniture, with your house, with your belief -

why do you identify?

Q: Another habit.

K: Is it a habit? If it is a habit, seeing it is a habit - drop it. Why don't you?

Q: What I mean is, if I say I am identifying, I am identifying. If I'm not I'm free, that is completely free. Look at the picture - I come here and see Krishnaji for ten years and look...

K: I'm so sorry.

Q: And I'm very unhappy because Krishnaji is not there and I feel deep sorrow because he's not there. Well, what can I do about it, I can't bring you there. So I'm there and I see the same scenery and you're not there.

K: Look, madam, you've stated two things, or rather one basic thing, which is, don't identify, then there is freedom. That's the basic thing. Don't identify, but all the time I am identifying myself with something.

Q: All the time I am not identifying.

K: All the time I'm not identifying - so some of the time I'm identifying, at other times I'm not identifying. The times I identify when it becomes very important, I identify. Other things I don't identify with because they have no importance, so I'm playing this game all my life. Now, I say to myself, "Why does the mind identify itself with something, with my country, with my god, all the rest of it." Why? It's not only an intellectual question, but if I put that question to myself it brings about an awareness why I identify myself. Why do you identify yourself?

Q: Because without identify there is no one.

Q: I want a continuity of me.

K: No - what would happen if you didn't identify yourself?

Q: How can I answer that question?

K: Wait, I'll show it to you, sir, don't be so quick. I have identified myself with my books, with whatever it is, family and all the rest of it, country, belief and so on. Now first of all, in asking myself why I identify, I am not looking for the cause of my identification, but by putting that question there is not only the intellect operating, but also my emotional nature comes, and says, 'Why am I doing this?' which is an awareness, which is a total awareness, both intellectual understanding and all my emotional feelings enter into it. Why do I do this?

Q: Sir, is it because we are seeking a relative reality? A reality that is relative.

K: I don't know anything about reality or relevant - why do I identify myself with something?

Q: Security.

K: You say it is security.

Q: I get pleasure.

K: Pleasure - look at it, please go into it, see the answers - security, pleasure.

Q: If I got pain I wouldn't do it.

K: If you had pain you wouldn't identify yourself with it. If somebody kicked me I wouldn't identify myself with it, but I would identify myself with somebody who gives me great pleasure. So watch it, sir, go into it. I identify myself because it gives me pleasure, gives me security, makes me feel certain, gives me comfort, satisfaction and so on, and I don't identify with anything that is uncomfortable, not pleasurable. That's a simple fact, isn't it?

Q: Sir, we identify and compare with ideals. Then if you see that ideals aren't very important, what's the conflict between the others, the conflict between ideas?

K: Just a minute, sir - how can I answer that question when we are discussing this. So I see this, that identification takes place when there is pleasure, pleasure is involved in security and all the rest of it, and there is no identification when there is pain. The one I want, the other I don't want.

Q: Isn't it the same thing?

K: Wait - it may be the same thing. Now what am I to do? What is my mind to do when it has been trained, when it has been educated, when it has been brought up in a culture which says, "Identify with everything that is pleasurable, that which is rewarding, and don't discard everything that gives you pain." Now what am I to do? Go on, sir, this is your problem. The more you identify with the things that give you pleasure, the more you are attached to it - your beliefs, you follow? Because it gives you pleasure, it gives you a sense of stability, security, gives you a sense that you are living. The other does not. Now, do you see this, do you see it intellectually, therefore verbally, or as a fact? Then if it is a fact, what takes place? Are you getting tired? We'll stop in five minutes.

What takes place if I see the meaning of identification, and therefore attachment? Then are you attached, identified with something, attached to something? I am attached to my wife, or I am attached to my house, or I am attached to a belief, because the belief gives me pleasure, the house gives me pleasure, though there is a lot of pain involved in it, insurance and all the rest of it. And



also I am attached to a person, because that person gives me pleasure, comfort, flatters me, occasionally nags me, all that. But I put up with it because the pleasure is greater. So I'm attached to things, people and ideas. That's clear. And I see where there is attachment, identification, there must be also pain. I might lose my property, I might lose the person I'm attached to, or I must protect the belief to which I am attached, with which I have identified myself, therefore I'll fight you.

So I see where there is identification, however pleasurable it is, there is also in it pain. No? So I can't keep one and discard the other - they both go together. Do you see this? When you see this, are you attached, have you identified yourself with a person, with a property? When there is no identification, no attachment, what takes place in the mind? You've got rid of another burden, haven't you? The mind says, "All right, I've lived in a kind of fantasy, in a myth, which has given me tremendous pleasure, also it has given me a great deal of pain, so..."

Q: It is a shock when you stop.

K: Then it has no identification. Then what takes place? You don't know it, so you don't invent it, don't speculate about it. So your only concern is with identification, with attachment, not what happens afterwards. Then you're dealing with facts, and that will give you tremendous vitality.

## **SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE (WITH YOUNG PEOPLE) 5TH AUGUST 1972.**

We said this morning would be reserved for the young people. I wonder what we mean by young people. What do we mean by youth - youth is supposed to be vigorous, enthusiastic, vital, with their weakness and unpredictability, with their curiosity and quick decision. That is more or less what is implied by youth. Youth is supposed to start a new kind of revolution, outwardly, and they are attempting to do it, right throughout the world. Youth has experimented with drugs, hard and soft drugs. And they're generally supposed to be anti-establishment. Am I correct? Am I giving the right description?

And they've started student revolutions, demonstrations, they've formed communes, gone to India, Asia, in search of reality, walked across the Continent of Europe and Turkey, Afghanistan, and landed in India - I've met many of them there. And they are supposed to be seeking new truths, having been fed up with the old. They are trying again throughout the world, to bring about a different kind of government, more honesty in politics. And there are all those who are called Jesus freaks, the people who get terribly excited about Jesus, and so on. I think that covers the field, doesn't it? Right? No? You're uncertain? More or less.

So what would you like to discuss after laying down the ground rules, what shall we do? May I unroll it a little bit, may I? How does the youth, the young people, respond to the modern challenge? The challenge being not merely social reform, not merely a political revolution with a different kind of politics,

honesty, more or less incorruptibility, there are all these vast changes technologically and physiologically taking place, there is the breaking up of religions, and it's a tremendous challenge. And how does youth respond to it? Is that right? Is that a fair question? You're supposed to be young and how do you respond to it? Respond to the total challenge, not just form a little commune, or take to drugs, or say, "Well, the old people don't understand young people," there is the generation gap. But there is this enormous challenge. And how does youth, you, young people respond to it? Go on, sirs - discuss it.

Do you form a commune? Withdraw from society, from the whole structure, and buy a piece of land, if you're lucky enough, and establish a commune there, a commune being, a new kind of commune being, no authority there, all working together freely? But soon they find they can't work freely, they may exchange their wives, all the rest of it but they need some kind of order, and gradually authority steps in, and they break away. Haven't you noticed all this?

And they vote for McGovern, or a new leader or whatever it is, politically, because they're fed up with the other gang. Or they join a monastery - very few - go off to India, and there are, I believe, fifteen or twenty thousand young people, foreigners in India. And I have met several of them. They put on Indian clothes, grow long hair - you know that's one of the things Indians can beat you at because they've got tremendously long hair, and long beards. And there are some of them quite clean and some of them quite dirty, just like the rest of us. And you find them at various Ashramas, retreats, practicing what the guru teaches, you know, all the rest of

it. And they are anti-war, and few of them are anti-all wars, or perhaps they're anti-war of this kind but they may have their own favourite wars.

So there is this enormous challenge, you understand - the world broken up, fragmented, injustice, political chicanery, economic division - there is this vast house on fire. And how does youth respond to it? By acting fragmentarily? Joining the Red Revolutions, beating Mao, more Mao than Mao himself? So when you face this enormous challenge, what's your response?

Q: Sir, I think it's very important to find out how to be alone.

K: He says it's very important to find out how to be alone. We'll come to that, sir, if you don't mind. How do you respond to this, actually - do you respond fragmentarily or do you respond totally to the whole problem? You understand my question? What, sir?

Q: I don't understand.

K: You don't understand my question. There is political action, there is business action, there is artistic action, literary action, theatrical action - all fragmented, not interrelated. And I, being a youth - what shall I do? Take part in politics and forget the rest? Or become anti-establishment, and revolt against the whole thing? Or run off to some fanciful Jesus mythology. And apparently that's what we're doing, not a total action. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

Now how do you react to this - is that a fair question?

Q: Sir, I'm going to become a schoolteacher and be working in schools, and I don't want to start with a kind of fragmentary education. I want to teach differently.

K: So the questioner says, I'm a schoolteacher, education now is

fragmentary, and I want to teach differently. In my teaching I want to include the whole problem of existence, not just passing some stupid little examinations. Please, this is a dialogue, a conversation between you and me - we must both go together - what do you say?

Q: Sir, you're asking us all the questions we've been asking ourselves.

K: Good.

Q: So we are trying to seek the answer ourselves - that's one of the reasons, why we're here.

K: Good. That is, you're asking all these questions yourselves, education, how to bring about a different kind of education so that there is a new generation, new kind of educated people, who are not merely caught up in technology, who are, may be, interested in technology, but also interested in the whole problem of existence. Now how do you as a youth respond to this? Take one fragment and devote your life to it? - school, new kind of education, or just a political action, irrespective of all the others? Or do you take the whole thing and consider what is a total action, in which all these are included? You follow, sir, what I mean? Right? How do you respond to that - is it a fragmentary response or a total response? You know what I mean by total.

Q: What do you mean by, total action?

K: He says, "What do you mean by total action," He doesn't understand that word 'total', a whole action. Do you want me to explain it. Why? Sir, look - I am a politician - god forbid - I am a politician, then I am not interested in anything but politics - left, right, centre, extreme right, extreme left, and forget all the implications of existence. Or I might be a businessman, and I

forget everything else except making money. Or I might be interested in religion and get caught up in one of the sects, whether it is a large sect or a small sect, they are all sects. Or I might say, 'I must be alone, I must leave all this and go away by myself.'

Now all those are fragmentary actions, aren't they? Now if you deny all such fragmentary action, then what is a total action? You've got it?

Q: I think for the most part we do see that they are all connected. For the most part, I think most young people see that each field is connected, you know, politics, education. But we are looking, I feel, for a new idea to be born.

K: So, are you saying, sir - we see this, most young people are aware of this, at least intelligent youth - they are aware of this, so they're waiting for a new idea to be born. Is that what you're suggesting?

Q: More or less, yes.

Q: We see this intellectually, but not actually.

K: Oh, you want an intellectual concept, is that it?

Q: Yes, not actually. You see that actions are fragmentary, and then you don't want that, you see fragments are false.

K: So, you see the fragmentation of the world, and fragmentary activity. And you're saying, "What is a total action?" Isn't it? You are enquiring, what is an action which will include all this, as action which will be whole in each action? Is that what you're asking?

Q: Sir, many of us are involved in trying to create a self-image because we are being moulded into images that possibly our parents created for us, or we create self-images of others and we

place them into those categories and then deal with them as such, rather than as human beings. Would you discuss that?

K: You mean, sir, that we just follow or live, accept the images that our past generation have given to us?

Q: And we create synthetic self-images of ourselves.

K: We create synthetic images of ourselves - all images are synthetic, anyhow. Now is that the problem?

Q: We don't know how to act totally, so that now what we do in the meantime...

K: Wait, we'll find out now, this morning, talking over together, what it means to act totally. But we must first see how we act now, otherwise asking, what is total action, has no meaning. We must see how we are acting now. And we are acting fragmentarily. That is a fact. So I want to find out why this fragmentary action exists - I'm sorry, I have to go into this. It's not an intellectual investigation but an actual enquiry - investigation means to trace it right through, not just stop in the middle of it. You must have sustained interest to go into it and trace it right to the end.

As a youth - I am not a young man, I'm 77 - so I'm saying, if I'm a youth, I would be concerned, seeing this fragmentary action, I'd say, "How am I to act, which will be so intelligent, that it will respond to every challenge - political, religious, business - an intelligence that will be whole." Of course, intelligence means a wholeness, a sanity, healthy. How is the mind, which is so fragmented, to acquire this intelligence, that will act intelligently politically, religiously, economically, psychologically and so on? Right, sir? Do you see that? Fragmentary action, however vital, however enthusiastic, however popular, is unintelligent. Do you

see that?

Q: Sir, I'm frightened so I see it fragmentarily - I can't see even that totally, I can only see it as fragments.

K: But first, sir, see the fact, the fact acting fragmentarily, is an unintelligent action. Let's begin with that. I act politically, forget about psychology, forget about religion - I act, I have got blinkers and I only think in terms of politics, politics means government, government means my party, or the tyrannical party - I join that. I'm only concerned with that and not with the rest. Now such action is unintelligent action.

Q: But my mind is fragmented.

K: Wait, we'll come to that. You see the statement.

Q: But seeing it isn't the point.

K: Wait, you see it intellectually, which is fragmentary - but you see it, you understand it. Now, I, you, or young people, live and act fragmentarily, and do you see it as not an intelligent action, related to yourself? You follow? And do you see it as being stupid action, or is it still a concept, an idea? Which is it? Is it still an idea or is it an actuality, which you yourself see in your life? Look, sir, this opens up a tremendous lot - I don't know if you want to go into all this. Are you thinking in terms of formulas, concepts, ideation, - which are fragmentary, aren't they? Or, I have an idea that I must act wholly - that's just an idea, somebody has told you, and you think that's a very good idea but it is not an actual fact to you, but it is only an idea. A fact becomes real when you have pain, doesn't it? In that there is no formulation, a concept, you have actual pain.

Q: Sir, my mind takes in what you say and...

K: Wait, sir, I took that only as an example. When you are



hungry, really hungry, that's not a formula, a concept, it's an actuality, it's not an abstraction, it is a fact that you are hungry.

Now, is it a fact to you that fragmentary action is unintelligent action, or is it just an idea? Which is it? Is it just an idea or is it, say, "By Jove, that is so, I see it. I see it intellectually, I feel it emotionally and it is so." That means, for you it is a fact, not an idea. I can't explain any more than that.

Q: I see that if I continue to act...

K: Wait, first see it. Now you say, "I see it as an intellectual idea, but I don't relate it in my daily life." So you have a gap between the idea and the action. That's what all people are doing, which is fragmentary action, therefore it's stupid action. So I'm asking, has youth, that's you, who have devoted the whole morning for this, do you see for yourself when there is this challenge - the challenge, the house is burning, the house, politically, religiously, socially, it's burning - and do you respond to it, that challenge, partially or wholly, wholly being intellectually, emotionally, with your body, completely? Or do you say, "Well, I have a religious idea, I believe in Jesus, therefore I will act according to my belief." Therefore such action would be fragmentary, wouldn't it? Or I believe in Communism, Marxism, and I, being committed to that idea, will act, when this challenge comes. Which is also fragmentary, isn't it?

And I'll act wholly, thinking I'm acting wholly, when I go and join a commune. There I can live with half a dozen people, fairly co-operating, being friendly, being affectionate to each other and all the rest of it, and I won't accept any authority because if I accept authority I'll go back to the old establishment. And gradually if I

don't accept authority there, gradually disorder comes in. And that breaks it up. All such activity is fragmentary, and therefore that is stupid.

Q: Sir, on a financial level most of our requirements are making money, making a living...

K: Yes, sir, we're coming to that.

Q: Can we do this together, both economically and intelligently, in a practical way?

K: It is. I want to find out, sir, how to live so that when I earn money - that means, I must have food, clothes and shelter. And in the demand of it, in the necessity of it, that doesn't become fragmentary action. You follow that? And also I see there must be a social revolution, a new kind of order must come into the world. And I must find out how to bring about that order. Is it a total order that would be order everywhere or only in a particular direction?

So the challenge is, that you respond totally, wholly, and not fragmentarily. You've got it now? Now how do you get this total action, how do you come by it?

Q: By seeing the fragmentation.

K: By seeing the fragmentation you come upon the action which is whole. And do you see it, or do you see it as an idea?

Q: I see that I see it as an idea.

K: Wait, you see it as an idea.

Q: I'm seeing it, I'm watching it.

K: You're watching as an idea. Then how will you feel it, how will you incorporate that idea with your feeling, with your vigour, with your, you know, with your whole being - how do you relate your whole being to that idea?

Q: Sir, isn't wanting to relate to that idea with your whole being, isn't that rather like having a technique again?

K: Quite right, sir - I'm just asking for you to investigate. Are you interested in all this, young people? Or are you thinking of having a nice walk on this lovely morning?

Q: Sir, I think the difficulty is being interested in all this about social ideas. When we talk about personal tragedies then I can really feel inside of me, but not with ideas of social problems.

K: Sir, first of all, do you see what's happening in the world? How do you respond to it? Not as an idea, not as a concept, how do you say, "By Jove, the house is burning, what am I to do?" Not as an individual, as a Christian, as a Buddhist and all that - as a human being, do you see this thing burning and what is your response? Do you respond to it as an artist, or as a whatever it is? Or you say, 'All that is silly, I must respond with my whole being.'

Q: I respond in different ways.

K: No.

Q: I think the problem is that we don't know how to respond.

K: Just listen - look, we human beings are conditioned, aren't we? Whether the young or the old - they're conditioned. They are conditioned according to the culture they live in. They can react to that culture and form their own conditioning but it's still conditioning, isn't it? Now from that conditioning there comes character, there comes temperament, which is character, and according to that temperament you act, and you call that individual action. Are you following this? Please do follow this. I know the child is crying - in fun, let it cry, but do please pay attention to this. You understand what I said?

I am conditioned as a Hindu, brought up in a certain class, very orthodox, very religious, superstitious and all the rest of it. That's my conditioning. And when I meet this challenge I act according to that conditioning which is my character, my temperament, my idiosyncrasy and I say, "I am acting as an individual." And you are acting also on the same principle. Therefore you say, "Now how are two individuals, you conditioned and I conditioned with my temperament, my characteristics, and you with your idiosyncrasy, how are these two people to co-operate?" You follow the problem. And I say that is not possible, cooperation or working together or living together, having good relationship with each other is not possible as long as my conditioning, your conditioning exists, which makes me act fragmentarily. You get it? It makes me act according to my temperament and I think it's marvellous.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Which is another conditioning.

Q: It's conditioning but it's the same, so we can co-operate.

K: They don't co-operate, they soon break up. They are breaking up also, they are criticizing the government, they are having trouble, being put in mental hospitals because they criticize the government. So you must first see the importance of being conditioned, we act thinking that we are free according to our temperaments, characters, idiosyncrasies.

Q: You speak one language and I speak another - you have certain kinds of words and I have other kinds. But that's not what should be happening.

K: Wait, sir. But first see that predominates our behaviour, our relationship. I'm answering that question of that lady there. So what

we are saying is, do you respond to this enormous challenge as a conditioned human being, with its peculiarities, and those peculiarities have become so important because you say, "They are mine I am an individual, I have identified myself with it." Do you respond to the challenge according to your cultural conditioning, or do you respond without that conditioning? I'm putting the same thing in different words.

Q: I think we respond to our conditioning. I think that most of us feel that we can conceive it first, and then we try to make our lives more radical because we can't conceive of a full, total action.

K: I know that, we can't. We want to conceive it first and then act according to it, that's what I'm objecting to. We want the picture of it, the description of it, the verbal explanation of it, but the picture, the description, the word, is not the thing. So I am saying, how do you respond? If you don't respond totally you are creating great mischief in the world, though you're young - growing a beard, long hair, is not a response; taking drugs is not a response, total response; or running off to form a little community - that's not a total response. Or joining god knows what, all that. I say that's not total response, that is a response according to your tendency based on your conditioning, and therefore it has no value at all.

Q: But sir, you think living in a city, having to go to work...

K: I'm coming to that, sir - let's take that up.

Q: I find in order to survive I need plastic money. What can you do?

K: I'm coming to that, sir.

Q: Sir, you have to go in the old people's patterns of the past.

K: So what shall I do?

Q: You go about in the country, you get together a couple of people, and you have fun, you find out things, you make experiments.

K: The gentleman says - just a minute, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: He's off, I know this chap.

Q: And then you might have time to do something about one's responses. But living in a small little town, it's very difficult.

K: Right. Now this is what he is saying - I live in a city, or one lives in a city and there you have to earn a livelihood, follow the old method, live in the old pattern of going to the office from eight to five, for the rest of your life. And you have no time, no time to think. So you abandon that and form a little community where you have time to think. Try to find out in that little community how to live totally. This is the problem.

Q: You are seeing this from the psychological point of view.

K: Not at all. The questioner says you only look at it from a fragmentary point of view, which is a psychological point of view.

Q: Of course.

K: You say of course. Of course.

Q: In this sort of discussion isn't there is a certain danger if you put the problem...

K: I don't put the problem, I have not put the problem.

Q: When you say, my point of view, then we have just to survive in this society without working...

K: We're going to find out, sir. I said at the beginning, earning a livelihood is a problem, which is not psychological. I said at the

beginning, you have to live in this world, you can't run away from it - that's not psychological. You accused me of fragmentary psychological activity, while you yourself are fragmentary.

Q: If you say...

K: Wait, I don't say anything. I beg your pardon, sir.

Q: I would like to ask the question of whether it is possible to act completely without being fragmentary, and to go into the question of whether it's possible to go into a school, an establishment type of public school where it is like a gigantic machine, a programme, whether it is possible to go into such a school and somehow actually do something.

K: The question is, I'm a teacher in a school that is mechanical, that is over-weighted, all the rest of it. And how am I to act there totally, without being crushed by this vast structure? Where I have to teach fifty boys in a class, or sixty, and the boys being rowdy and all the rest of it, how am I to deal with that? How am I to act totally in those given circumstances. Right, sir? Now this is not psychological, is it?

Q: No, but I can see...

K: Wait - what am I to do. I must answer this question, please. I earn my livelihood at teaching in a school, in a system, that is overburdened, that is mechanical, that in every class there are fifty to sixty students, they have no order, each rushing, all the rest of it. How am I, given this condition, to teach wholly? Can you do it there? Wait, find out. Can you do it there? Where - you know all the system, how it works, but then I do - can you do it there?

Q: Let's say that I've not so far succeeded, in fact I've been fired.

K: Quite right, sir. You can't do it. It can't be done. Look, teaching fifty boys in a class, where you want to teach them, what, mathematics, and you're not merely concerned with teaching mathematics, you're concerned with their mind, bringing about their intelligence, making them behave properly, the whole of it - with fifty boys you can't do it. Therefore you're fired - wait - therefore what will you do? Wait, sir, find out - what will you do? Just go into another profession? Or say, "By Jove, teaching is the most important thing, because that deals with young people, creating new - all the rest of it, tremendously important, I'll find out with others, with the few who feel this thing, and start a school." Wait - which means tremendous energy, which means you are giving your whole life for this, not just casual action. Now wait a minute, we'll answer that gentleman who says, "I live in a city and I have to earn there a livelihood, I have no time, therefore I withdraw and form a little commune."

Q: No, not withdraw, go away.

K: Wait - go away.

Q: Listen to the words: you are putting it into a 'little commune'...

K: No commune, a few people living together.

Q: But why...

K: I don't condemn it.

Q: Then why did you use the word 'little'?

K: Call it big. Call it small, big, it doesn't matter - I go into a commune, where I have time.

Q: That is a fragmentary kind of thing.

K: Would you mind letting me finish what I'm saying? I have



no time to think in the present business livelihood affairs, I go away with a few friends if I can, and we live together, cultivating our own garden, or living in town, come back to that, earn a livelihood, live together and have time to think how to bring about this total action. That's what you said. Is it my intention when I go and live with a few people, is it my true, real intention to find out a way of life in which there is total action? I don't say, I've no intention - is it my real intention. I abandon or call it what you like - I go away from the present structure of society, and try to live a life in which I comprehend this total movement of existence. The monks have tried to do it, various communes have tried to do this; they either accept an authority of a person, or the authority of a belief, or the authority of the necessity of working together. Or does one go, discarding all authority, belief, person, or the necessity that we must live together in order to give me time to think - do you discard that and therefore find out for yourself what is the way of existence, living, that will not be fragmentary, that will act, both economically, psychologically and more, in a whole manner? So it depends on you what your serious intention is, whether psychologically as well as outwardly, inwardly as well as outwardly, you want to live differently. Come on, sir, you are one of the young people.

Q: Sir, are you saying that the making of a commune or going to business are the same thing. It is no action at all but realizing that this is action.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It is not just giving up, but on a practical level...

K: You do it, you do it on a practical level, but that practical

level depends on your intention, on the depth of your honesty.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: It may be, you have to live, find out.

Q: Does all intentional behaviour have some ideal behind it?

K: That's just it, sir - you follow. How do you respond to all this, sir? You're young, you see how we've spent this morning, someone saying, "Oh, you're only concerned with psychological", somebody else saying, this that and the other - when you see all this, how do you respond? Run off to a church, join a political activity, become a Communist, Mao, this or that, or lead a completely irresponsible life because your father, some friends will give you money, therefore you don't care?

Q: So there's nothing you can do?

Q: Do I not first have to see my own conditioning?

K: That's what I've been saying during all these talks, madam. Sir, look at it - you see or act what you think is a total action when this challenge is given to you. And I don't see it, I act fragmentarily. What is your relationship - I want to act fragmentarily, you want to act as a total human being, including physical survival, psychological understanding and all the business of it, and also want to find out something beyond all this? And I say, "Look, please, I'm only interested in political or a narrow, or big, or little action." What is your relation, how can you co-operate with me? I'm young, I'm just like you, long hair, short hair, whatever it is, sex-ridden, or not driven by sex - I'm like you. So I say to you, "Where do we meet? At what level? At the verbal level, intellectual level, psychological level, or in the level of earning a livelihood?"

Q: At the psychological level, but very few people do this. But what you have to do all the time is to live on the practical level, so in the meantime you live on the practical level, you sleep in the barns or you sleep in a hotel, or try to do something. But if you don't have money...

K: Sir, I know a young boy, twenty one - I saw him in India. He made his way across the continent, hitch-hiking from California to New York, took a boat from there as a sailor, came to India, worked in India, across India, and I met him on the seashore. To him what was important was to find out what truth was. You may say, how silly that is - he wanted to find out. Therefore he gave his life to it, he didn't talk about practical life and he didn't say this - he worked. Wait, sir.

Q: Last night I was asked to move on.

K: Please, sir - would you mind.

Q: It was by a policeman - very nice. He said go into any of the big cities.

K: If you have money or if your parents have money or friends give you money, then you have no problem. Or you have the problem of depending on somebody, your parents. Then you can play around with all these ideas. And most, some of them do.

So we are coming to the point again: are you aware as young people, and also the old people - there isn't much difference in this - that any kind of fragmentary action is really the most unintelligent, mischievous action? That's what the old establishment has done. That's their way of life: keep the business world in one way, religion for Sunday, and politics on Thursday, you know, all the rest of it. And you are doing exactly the same

thing only call it by a different name. And I say you, as the youth, which is supposed to be vigorous, enthusiastic, though in spite of the weakness, in spite of unclarity and all the rest of it, you're supposed to have tremendous vitality to act - act, knowing what the older generation have done. And you are as confused as the others. Therefore there is no generation gap at all. Sir, do you see that makes me realize how hypocritical one is - you deny the old establishment and you are doing exactly the same thing as they do, only in other words. So as we are young - not I, sorry, I don't belong to you - as you are young you have to create a new world. You are responsible for a new world. And if you say, 'Well, I'm only concerned with money or with only psychological things, or only - it has no meaning.

Q: If you are concerned with total action, you don't act fully, I mean...

K: I understand. One realizes, you realize, we act fragmentarily. Let's stick to that thing. Do you realize it as an idea or as a fact?

Q: Yes, as a fact.

K: If it is a fact, then you are already acting non-fragmentarily.

Q: Yes, for a long time I have been concerned with acting totally and that is preventing me from acting totally because it is a concept.

K: Yes, quite. You're saying, as long as it is an idea, there is no total action. Why do you see it as a concept, as a formula, as an idea - why do you see that? Why does that thing happen first? You understand my question sir? Why do you see everything as an idea first? Is it because intellectually we are overdeveloped? Is it because we are afraid what total action might involve, therefore an

ideation, a formula, over there, which I am going to live presently, therefore I continue the way I am. So I'm asking, why do we always see the thing in words first, words being idea, thought, formula, and which then becomes a remembrance? Why do we do that? Why don't we see it right away, non-verbally?

Q: Because we're sitting here listening to you talking about it - I mean, if we had never heard of you in our lives and had just come upon it all by ourselves, it'd be one thing, but we are listening to you, therefore...

K: Look, you say, if I hadn't listened to you and I came upon this myself, it would be much better. A friend also said this yesterday - he said, "I must find this out for myself - I wish I could do it."

Q: For most of us here, we never had any idea that anything else was possible but that same kind of fragmentary existence. So then you come along and you say something else is possible and so then we sit here and listen to you talking about it, but we have only the words.

K: Sir, why should you listen to another? Here you are listening to me, why are you listening to me? Why don't you find it all out for yourself? Come on, answer it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I'm not saying that. Look, he says, "Why have I got to listen to you? Why can't I find it out for myself?"

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Answer the question, madam.

Q: Sir, for the same reason that you can't follow - the same reason - if I could find out for myself I could...

K: Why can't I find out all this by myself?

Q: Is it an idea that there is something to find out at all?

K: All right - why can't - I don't know how to put it, sir - let's put it this way. For the first time, perhaps, you hear, non-fragmentary action. Why didn't you think of it yourself and live it, work at it, and live non-fragmentarily? Why didn't you do it? Why do you have to listen to somebody? And what's wrong with listening to somebody?

Q: I didn't say there was anything wrong with it.

K: I'm putting it, I'm going the other way, putting it the other way.

Q: Sir, I'm happy to listen to you - you're not a conclusion of mine.

K: But the others are not. They say, "I wish I could come upon this by myself."

Q: We all wish that.

K: Which means, sir - listen to this - which means, I want to find out everything by myself. Can you?

Q: It's the only way of finding out.

K: Of course, the only way - but if you put it that way, it's wrong, isn't it?

Q: You have to learn.

K: I haven't conveyed it properly, then. When I say to myself, 'I have to find out the whole thing by myself, and not listen to anybody,' that very statement is a false statement, that's all I'm saying. Because then you become tremendously important. You don't say, "Well, I will find out, somebody will tell me, not tell me, I'll move, I'll walk," and in the process of that I'll discover or not

discover. But to say, "Well, I will only move till I find out by myself," then you're dead.

Q: Sir, it seems that the 'I' who sees the fragmentation is itself a fragment.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: So if I see this fragment...

K: That's what I said, sir - how do you see this thing?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand, madam. What are you to do? Look, sir, I want to convey something to you. I want to convey, not that you must accept it, as a friend I want to tell you something. First of all verbally, then non-verbally. I say to you, I want to convey to you that acting without a formula is complete action. I say, "This is in my heart," as a friend I say, "Look, if you do this, you will live a totally different kind of life. Whether you have to learn a livelihood, whether you have to paint, you lead a totally different life". To you, you receive it as an idea. I say, "Don't receive it as an idea, but move with me, don't turn what I'm saying into words, into a formula which you are going to accept and follow presently." But move together, see the thing together, which is, don't live in formulas. I want to tell you this, not because I want you to join my group or - I just want to convey this to you. But you don't receive it, you see - you immediately turn it into an idea. And are ready to fight over that idea - psychological, business, non-business, all the rest of it.

So how am I - see my difficulty - you're there and I'm sitting here: I want to convey this to you non-verbally, through words. You understand what I mean? I want to convey to you that there is

an action which is immediate perception, and therefore non-formula. And I tell this to you, seriously, with all my affection - I feel it strongly. I'll do anything to convey it to you. But you receive it as an idea. And I say, "Don't do it, it is this idea that is separating, it is this idea that is fragmentary." So can you listen to me who wants to tell you that there is an action which is totally complete only when there is no ideation or a formula or a prejudice. Then you say, "I am prejudiced, everything turns into words for me. What am I to do?" I say, "Don't do anything about it, but just listen."

You see, sir, I have no formulas, I don't have a concept and then act, but only I see, act. I don't say, "By Jove, if I act that way I'll lose my popularity, I'll have nobody, or I won't have money", all the mentation that goes on, which prevents direct action.

So you, being young, can you listen with a mind that is young, or is your mind already the old mind, which always thinks in formulas, in categories, in divisions, in fragmentation? Young mind means, it sees, acts. And that acting is rational always, whether you've got to live in a commune, whether you have to live in a town - it is altogether total.

Is the youth meeting over?

Q: Can we have another day for the youth?

K: Sir, every day is a youth meeting. This is what we've been saying for the last three weeks: how to communicate without the word, and therefore the idea.



## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH AUGUST 1972.

You know this is a dialogue, a conversation between us, between two friends who are seriously interested in all the problems of existence. So it is not a talk by me, but together to converse, to go into amicably, without any aggression into all the problems that perhaps one has. So what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: (Italian)

K: Why don't we go straight to the point. We always go round and not come to the central issue. That's the first observation.

Q: (Italian)

K: I'm glad it's a nice morning, anyhow. We've know each other for the last forty years?

Q: Forty five.

K: Forty five - he says, why shouldn't we spend these three mornings talking over the question of how to look. If we had the key to that, then we can open any door. Do you want to discuss that? Yes, sir?

Q: It seems to me that one of our problems is that we have so many powerful motives to understand ourselves, and very little simple curiosity to learn the truth, find out the truth.

K: So what is the question?

Q: You have said several times that the motive to understand hinders understanding.

K: Quite. Now which do you want to discuss, talk over - observation? Yes? And we could include all the others in that, shall we? M. Ortolani asked if we could find out for ourselves how to

look, how to observe, not only the world outside but also the world inside. And if we are capable or if we know or are aware how to look, then we have the key to many, many problems. And he wants to discuss, talk over what it is to observe. And I think if we could go into that, then the question of why don't you start from the unknown, but always have started from the known, then perhaps we shall be able to understand much more. And the relationship between thought and feeling - so perhaps we could include all those questions in this one question of his, which is: is it possible to observe or learn what observation is? Shall we start with that?

I wonder why we find it so difficult, this question of observation. To understand what observation is, we must also go into the question of abstraction, and 'what is'. Most of us live in abstractions. That's right isn't it? You know what I mean by abstraction. A formula or a belief, not entirely based on proof, short of proof. I looked up that word this morning in the dictionary - it says exactly that, and the root of that word is to stretch. Most of us look at things, at people, or ideas, with a mind that has already acquired a series of abstractions. Don't we? That is, abstractions are concepts, formulas, opinions, judgements - judgements which are contrary or acceptable.

So we have these abstractions, these images of words, ideas. We are sharing this together, please, you are not just listening to me - we are sharing together. Have you these concepts, ideas, beliefs, abstractions, which are short of proof? I have an opinion about you. I don't know you, I met you once or twice, but I have already opinions. I say, "You should or you should not." You know, you should do this or you should not do that. A judgement. You have

opinions, haven't you, galore, about everything, almost - what I should do. Have you?

Q: Yes.

K: Now, how can you observe when these act as a screen between you and the thing which you observe? I've an opinion about the politicians, I've an opinion about the gurus, I've an opinion about, you know, dozens and dozens of things, of which I really don't know - I've no proof, but I have opinions, conclusions.

Now I'm asking myself why do I have opinions about anything, that is, images about anything? That lady asked, would you talk over laziness in relation to fear. Why have I an opinion about laziness? How do I know I am lazy? Discuss with me. How do I know that I'm indolent and therefore afraid to learn? When I say, I am lazy it's already an opinion, a conclusion, a judgement, which prevents me from looking at the fact that I do not want to learn, or that I want to learn. I've interposed the idea of laziness and fear.

Please, we're understanding, I'm not laying down the law, I'm not saying one should or not be lazy, I'm just looking at the fact that any abstraction, any image, any conclusion, and therefore any previous knowledge prevents perception. If I have an opinion about you, because I met you two or three times, next time I meet you the image which I have about you comes between you and me, therefore I do not perceive you, but I perceive you through the image which I have about you. Right? Wait, first see it. Then we will discuss what to do, how to prevent, or what is the mechanism which creates the image and see if that mechanism can lose its energy.

Have you images, conclusions about something? You have,

haven't you, galore, dozens of them. Can you drop them? The next question is, how is it that these images come into being? What is the mechanism that produces these images? - images being conclusions, words, opinions, judgements, saying so and so is like that. Or so and so didn't listen to me while I was talking, and I'm hurt, because the person to whom I'm talking may be tired, may have been seeing all kinds of things happen to that person, and I want to hurt, or him to pay attention to what I'm talking about. So if that person doesn't, I get hurt. All these are abstractions. Are we sharing this, going together? Which means, you see the fact that you have images.

Q: (Italian)

K: Wait - he says, this applies to a false image, not to a right image. Wait - that's good enough, sir. There are good images and bad images, false images, and worthwhile images. Right? We are talking about all images, not the good and the bad.

Q: Is the structure of technology image-building?

K: Is it? I learn how to run a motor, and I have acquired knowledge of piston engines, internal combustion machine. And that knowledge is my memory, I've cultivated memory about that engine. And when I see another engine, a similar engine, my previous knowledge helps me to undo it or put it together again. That is, a mechanical thing, isn't it? We are talking not only of mechanical knowledge but psychological knowledge.

Q: If we're talking about psychological problems, knowledge, that doesn't seem to me that same, it isn't a formula.

K: Yes, it's a formula. But I need that formula to run a machine.

Q: That seems to apply only to mechanical things.

K: If I had no formula about a machine, must I learn each time? Must I each time forget what I've learnt and come to it new - about a machine?

Q: Obviously you couldn't.

K: Wait - obviously I couldn't, it would be absurd, wouldn't it? Now in human relationship, between you and me, you're not a machine, I'm not a machine.

Q: It seems to me you are avoiding the question, because if I have images about machines...

K: Wait - the gentleman says you are avoiding my question. We said, we need knowledge to run a machine, knowledge or a formula or previous examination and a remembrance of that. I need that to run a machine. Now between you and me, two human beings, you're not a machine and I'm not a machine. If I have a formula about you, a remembrance about you, a conclusion about you, or a judgement about you, that is the image I have about you. And you have an image about me. So what happens - the formula I have prevents me from meeting you anew.

Q: I still think the question is being avoided.

K: What do you mean - we are going into it, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I want to know out of curiosity how to go to Montreux. I go and get in the station, get into that train, and the train is a mechanical thing that's moving down, going down, to Montreux. Now you and I are not, you are not a station, I'm not a passenger - we both are human beings - isn't there a difference between you and me and the train and the technology?

Q: Obviously there is.

Q: Obviously there's feeling.

K: Not only feeling, but we are such complex entities, aren't we? What is the difficulty in this?

Q: You know that a man has been in a concentration camp and certain subjects must not be spoken about. Isn't it a good thing to know this?

K: One has been to a concentration camp - and one has gone through hell. And isn't it good to remember - is that what you are saying?

Q: No, isn't it good for the other person to know that there are things not to be spoken about?

K: I have been to a concentration camp and it is good for another to know about it. Is that it?

Q: What the lady said was, if there was a man who had gone through concentration camp - isn't it a good to know certain things about this so that you do not touch on certain subjects.

K: That's it - you have understood the question? If a man has been to a concentration camp and you know that he has been there, you don't touch certain things - his experience, because it's painful to him, so you don't enter into that. So you have an image about that man which prevents you, or helps you not to enter into all his pain and revive his anxiety and all the rest of it.

Q: Sir, is it because we are either seeking expansion or avoiding contraction from the environment - the 'I' seeking expansion.

K: Look, sir, I just want to know, as the gentleman asked, how to look. What it is to look at trees, mountains, at the whole technological world, and also at the world within - I just want to look. And he wants to know, what does it mean to look. And we

are making this tremendously complicated. I can't look at you if I have any opinion about you, that's a simple fact.

Q: Doesn't technology, the train and the passengers, force you to have opinions.

Q: (Italian)

K: He says, it's fairly obvious that opinions, judgements prevent understanding of each other. That's fairly obvious. And why don't we go further beyond that. You can't go beyond that if you haven't dropped your prejudice.

Q: (Italian)

K: I don't know how to deal with all of you - I'm lost. For me, it's very simple. May I state it, very simply? If I look at a tree, to me the seeing of a tree is the non-interference of thought. When thought interferes between my observation of that tree, I am not looking at the tree. Right? Thought is the knowledge of that tree, which is useful when I am classifying what kind of a tree it is. But before I classify it, I just want to look at it. And I cannot look at it if there is any form of image about it - that's simple. The same with the mountain, with the river and the green meadows. That is, when I look without the interference of thought, which is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, then there is a totally different relationship between me and the tree. I do not identify myself with the tree, but the observation is much more intense, the observation is completely total. So I observe without the interference of any conclusion - the mountain, the tree, the sunset. I don't know if you saw, yesterday evening, the sunset, on the hills. It was a marvellous sight, just to look at it, without saying how beautiful, how lovely, what extraordinary Alpengluehen, what a beautiful thing it is - just

to observe, without a word, then you see much more, the intensity is much stronger. I do not know if you have ever done it.

Now, I want to look at you - you've hurt me, you've praised me, you've talked behind my back, you've said you should, you should not do that, this, you are an idiot, you are a great man, you're a saint, you're an ass - you've said all these things. And I look at you - should I look at you with all the incidents, accidents, words which you have used against me? If I look at you with all those, I don't see you. That's fairly simple, isn't it? I don't see you, I don't understand you, I have no relationship with you, though you have called me all kinds of things, pleasant, unpleasant, talked, scandalized me or whatever you do - that's your affair. And if I accept all the gifts you have given me, the insults, the flattery, the gifts become more important, don't they - I don't see you. And I want to see you. So any image that I have about you prevents me from looking at you.

Similarly, any conclusion I have about myself, that I'm good, that I'm bad, that I'm noble, ignoble, there is great nobility in me, but I act ignobly - all that kind of thing - all that is an image, a conclusion about myself. So I can't learn about myself if I have any previous opinion about myself. That's all. Wait. The world outside, technology, the trees, the mountains, science, all that, I want to look at it as though I'm looking at it for the first time in my life. If I do I see things much more vividly, more intensely. I find new things in that look. And if I want to look at you, if I have an image about you I can't see you, I have no relationship with you, the image prevents me from having a contact with you. Inwardly if the mind has any opinion about itself, then it can't learn about itself.



That's very simple.

Now is that clear? Clear both verbally and intellectually - we're not talking about the feeling about it, the feeling that how destructive it is in relationship to have an image. We'll come to that. Now I say to myself, why do I have opinions or knowledge about the tree? You understand? I'm beginning with the most simple - why do I have knowledge about the tree? It is useful to have knowledge, it gives you interest, what species of pine, species of oaks and so on. It's fun to have knowledge about it. But when that knowledge comes between me and the tree, I don't see the tree. And to me the tree is extraordinarily important, the beauty of the tree, and so on and so on.

Now the next question is, why does the mind prevent direct contact with the trees, mountains and so on, but always it creates an image about it? Why does it do it? You've understood my question - you answer it, sir. Don't listen to me.

Q: Sir, is it possible to look at the image of the tree with the same intensity that I look at the tree?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: In other words, it's not the way of looking.

K: The capacity to observe - wait. The capacity to observe the image that you have about the tree, and the tree. To look, is what the question is. Now what happens, see the logic of it. To look at a tree without the image requires energy. To look at that tree, which is alive, which is moving, which is marvellous, with its branches, its leaves - to look at it you need energy. But that energy is dissipated when you have a conclusion about the tree, when you have knowledge-knowledge is useful about the tree, but when

you're looking and that knowledge comes in, that knowledge prevents you observing with your total energy.

So laziness comes in when you have this conclusion, opinion and so on about the tree. Laziness is a conclusion. Right?

Q: I think it might be useful to look at why society educates people to think in terms of cliché.

K: Why does society train people to think in clichés? Why do you blame society when you have them. Just a minute - stick to one thing, please.

Q: Sir, to look I must be present. To look, to observe, I must be there, I must be present. I have had also the feeling, I am present - it may be imagined but I don't think it is - this feeling, I am present, I am here.

K: Yes, sir, I understand your question but we'll come to that presently. For the love of god, stick to one thing, step by step into it.

Q: Sir, when you look at the tree, you suddenly see that you're looking at it through the image, a cliché - you can see that - I think it's very disagreeable so you drop it.

K: But do you drop it?

Q: I do.

Q: May I ask if perception is the same thing as the energy for perception? Does this happen the same with emotion?

K: Sir, go slowly with me, will you? Will somebody protect me?

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: (Italian)

K: No, I made that clear, sir. May I go into it a little bit - give

me a little hearing, lend me your ears! Really, it's a very interesting problem, tremendously interesting, because we have made life so dull, so boring, so mechanical, there is nothing new, it is always secondhand. And to see a tree as though for the first time in your life - you understand what that means?

Q: (French)

K: He says, why do you talk about the mountain, trees, why don't you see the fact that we are here. The fact that you are here is because you have an image about me. Come on, sir. You don't know a thing about me, but you have an image about me, because you have read books, there has been propaganda, articles, all the rest of that rubbish. So you have an image.

Q: No, not necessarily.

K: Wait, madam. You have an image about me - why? What right have you to form an image about me, not knowing a thing about me. I may be a crook, I may be, god knows what - but why do you have an image about me?

Q: Don't you have an image about your secretary, sir?

K: Could I have an image about my secretary? I have no secretaries. Why should I have an image about my secretary? You don't meet it - you are avoiding the issue. You're all here because you have an image about me. Right?

Q: No. I mean, if you hear Beethoven once and you like music, you want to hear the music again - that's nothing to do with an image of Beethoven. If I am touched by your words, it's nothing to do with an image of you. Simply I'm touched by your words, as I'm touched by music.

K: Madam, just listen - I understand that. I took the train, the

mountain, the river, the bird, because it's fairly easy to observe the images that we have about them. It's fairly easy. And I do not know if you have ever experimented with yourself to look at all that without a single word. Then if there is no movement of thought, which is the word, then you see the thing entirely differently - that's all my point.

Now you are here because some of you have an image about the speaker, and therefore you don't listen to the speaker at all. You are interpreting what he is saying according to the image you have about him. Now if you are listening for the first time, as though for the first time, then what is the relationship? Then you are curious. The next moment you and I are going to die, and then you would listen, wouldn't you? You'd put your heart and mind, you'd have no image, you'd say, "What are you saying? I want to find out." You won't be interpreting, you won't say, "Well, Jesus said that, the Buddha said that and Jung said that or Mr Smith said that." You don't listen.

Now, to come back to the question, why does the mind create these images, and live with those images, and project those images? Find out, sir, why. Why have you an image about the speaker? Or you may not have an image, you say, "By Jove, he's saying something, I'd like to find out, I like to hear music, I like to see that tree, it doesn't matter, a dozen times - it's different each time." Because each time I look at it without a single word, without a single thought, therefore it's always new. And therefore it's always my friend.

Now I want to find out why the mind creates these conclusions, images and holds on to them. And they are abstractions, they are

not facts - the tree is the fact, not an abstraction about the tree. And I live in my abstractions. I don't know if you follow all this. Why do I do it? Why does the mind insist and sustain the images - what is the meaning behind it?

Q: Because we are taught to do so, we are trained to do it.

K: We are trained to do that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, just let's take that one question, please. We are trained, from childhood, by the culture we live in, the religions, with the image, all the rest of it. We are trained. And so you retain them? And if you see what it does, will you drop them?

Q: If...

K: Wait, find out, do listen to this. I've been trained by the society, the culture I live in, to have the images about my saviour, my god, my belief, my wife, my husband, my neighbour. I have images. I say, why do I have images, and I blame it on society, or I say, examine it, analyse it, but at the end of it I've got the images still.

Q: After...

K: Wait - I'm going to show you - be patient. I want to see why my mind creates it, and why it lives with these images. It lives with these images because it's essentially lazy - it's easier to live with an image than with the fact of a tree. Therefore I say, "By Jove, my mind is lazy and therefore it lives in abstractions." You've understood what I've said? Because it's easier to live with an idea, with an image, rather than with the fact which is always changing. It's easier for me to live with an image about you, because I've come to a conclusion, and, you know, I don't want to think any

more about it. I think you are a great man and that's the end of it, or I think you're an ass, a fool, and that's the end of it?

So to learn means the image comes to an end, which means the mind must be active, alive, and it cannot be alive if there is an image.

Q: Sir, that simply means that the image is also a fact, but that fact doesn't observe the tree first.

K: Of course, sir, I'm telling you that, I've said that previously.

Q: Then the image disappears...

K: Wait, it doesn't disappear - look at it, take time - all that you are concerned about is how to get rid of the image. I'm not, I want to see why it comes into being, what is the machinery that builds the image, if that machinery has no energy it comes to an end naturally. So I want to see. Look what takes place. If I have an image about you, I'm in conflict with you, and I like that conflict. It says, "That keeps me alive". Which is part of my laziness.

So I see first of all, the mind is lazy and likes to live in a rut - the rut being the belief, the opinion, the conclusion. I've talked to several people, and they've formed an opinion about somebody, and you can't shake them - you show the facts, you show the logic of it, the truth of it, nothing doing, because their opinion is right. Haven't you met such people all your life? Christ exists and that's the end of it. Marx is right and that's the end of it, the Little Red Book is the most marvellous thing - that's the end of it. So why does the mind do it? Because it finds in the Red Book, in Marx, in Jesus, complete security, which means complete laziness - it hasn't to think any more. And it's afraid to learn any more, because to learn something more means disturbing 'what is', what is your

conclusion, your image. So I see the brain likes to live in security, in abstractions. So abstractions are more important than the fact. I have formed an opinion about you, rightly or wrongly. And that opinion is a conclusion, and to change that, and say, "By Jove, I'm mistaken, you are different," that needs little thought, a little energy, that is, I don't want to be wrong. I would rather you be wrong.

So the brain, says, "I want security, and my security is in a belief, in a conclusion, and don't disturb it." Right? So having found what it imagines to be a belief and having found security and therefore becoming lazy, it doesn't want to be disturbed. Watch your own mind, sir, not mine - I haven't been through all this mess.

Q: It seems to me, sir, that when one observes something, say a mountain in all its glory, one receives an impression. Can you tell us what an impression is, it doesn't necessarily leave an image.

K: Of course, sir - an impression. I have an impression about the mountains, I have an impression about you - I don't know you, I have an impression, a vague feeling, you have impressed me, you've left a mark on me, pleasant or unpleasant. Next time I meet you, that impression is strengthened, and I say, "By Jove, he's a nice chap", or not a nice chap, and from that, the third time, the image is concluded. Please look at it - the brain would rather live in an abstraction, in which it finds security, and though it is very disturbing, that is the only security it has.

So the brain needs security. And therefore the image becomes the most important thing. I have formed a conclusion that there is no life after death, or there is life after death, it gives me tremendous comfort, don't talk any more about it. I live in that

belief. It gives me tremendous security, whether that belief is neurotic, real, illusory, doesn't matter. So I've found out an image about you, about anything, gives security to the mind, to the brain, and therefore refuses to shake it. And that's what's the matter with all of you.

Q: Must we not see if there is such a thing as security, or it is just another concept?

K: I'm coming to that. So as I said, the brain needs security, otherwise you can't function properly. You understand, sir? Like a child given complete security, it's happy, it learns quicker. And when the family is broken up, when the father and mother are quarrelling, the poor child feels lost, gets neurotic, and becomes violent, begins to shoot, kill people. You've seen all this.

So do you find security in an image? Go into it, be aware of it, don't talk about good image, bad image, people who have been to concentration camps and all the rest of it - do you have images, conclusions, in which you take security - have you?

Q: Temporary.

K: Temporary security.

Q: Or if you are separated from your beloved, you have an image.

K: Yes - when you are separated from your beloved. That is, when you love somebody in America and you're here, and you feel separated, and therefore you have an image about him and temporarily that image gives you comfort. But my beloved over in India might be chasing another girl!

Q: Sir the whole of science is based on images, and that's natural.



K: Sir, keep it simple, it's complex enough. Do you have an image in which the brain, your mind, your feelings have established vested interest in them and therefore they won't break away, you won't drop them. And therefore your mind is lazy. Then you say to yourself, "How am I to stop image-making? How am I not to conclude at any time but always a mind that is completely free, so that it meets everything anew - the tree, you, everything anew, fresh, free?" I have seen how the machinery builds the image. Have you seen it? Have you really seen it, that is, to observe? Have you observed, have you an insight into the image-making? If you have an insight into it, you won't make any image at all, because the insight is the security. Do you get it? No, sir, don't shake your head.

Q: Is it your memory makes you aware of the image?

K: No. Is it your memory that makes you aware of the image? Not at all - I've been through this. Need I go through all that again? I've an impression about you, from the first time I meet you - impression, pleasant or unpleasant. That imprint may be very, very light, like a light footprint on the sands, but the next time I meet you that footprint has taken a little more shape. And the third time it's solid. Now, that impression has become strong by my contact with you, because if I had no impression I'd have to look at you each time anew, have to watch you, listen to you, have to feel you anew each time - which is much more troublesome, rather than say, "I've an image about you, you are this" - finished. And having established that image, it gives me security and I don't want to learn anything more about you.

So I see from that, I observe from that, the mind, the brain,

having established a belief, finds in that belief security, whether it's real or unreal, and acts according to that belief, and therefore acts neurotically. I'm a Muslim - that's just an idea, and I take security in that. And because it is divisive it is neurotic action. Do you feel all this?

Q: Could we say that the energy to meet each new experience is our security?

K: No. Each new experience is our security - no, there is no security in that at all.

Q: No, the energy to meet the new experience is our security.

K: The energy to meet that experience, in that energy there is security.

Q: That is the security.

K: That is security. That is, to meet each experience anew demands energy, that energy is security. What do you say?

Q: (Italian)

K: He says - I understand what you have said very clearly. It is my laziness. And what is wrong? If I like my laziness, why should I change? I say, "Don't."

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The same thing.

Q: I don't go on...

K: Madam, you understand what that question was? He said to me - I understand what you have said very clearly, but I like to be lazy, and most people are.

Q: (Italian)

K: That is, when the security in illusion is convenient, happy, why leave it? Wait - don't leave it, stay with it, stew in it, boil in it.

Wait - so you boil in your security, and the other has his security, and when you meet you have battle. The Communist finds in Marxism complete security, and the capitalist in his, and when they meet there is war. If you like it, keep it.

Q: (Italian)

K: Therefore I say that is no security at all. Security lies in the insight to see where there is no security. You have understood?

Q: Is there not the danger of the word?

K: The word also becomes illusory. Sir, have you understood this so far? Understood, that means you have insight into this, therefore you have dropped your laziness and your image. Have you? If you have not, why not, what's wrong? You've spent money, energy, sitting in a hot tent, and you leave it today with your images back. What's the point of it? Why do you go on when you see for yourself the stupidity, the lack of security in the things in which you have put your faith, your security in? Don't you, sir - the Stock Market, if you have any stocks, when you see danger in the Stock Market, don't you sell? Buy something which is much more secure? Why don't you do the same here - not that this is a Stock Market.

Q: Sir, if I drop my beliefs, my images now that I've seen them, there is nothing there. And I'm scared of having nothing.

K: I see if I drop my images, my conclusions, my laziness, I've nothing left and I'm frightened. Why do you drop them? Because somebody says drop them? Or you drop them because you have insight, you have an understanding in that, therefore your understanding is your security. Therefore there is no fear. You understand, sir? Once you have the key of observation, which is

insight, which is the capacity to look, understand intelligently, then that intelligence is the security. And you're lazy, that's why.

So observation means non-abstraction. There is only observation, not the observer who is an abstraction. The observer is an abstraction, is an idea, is a conclusion, is the past. And through the eyes of the past you are looking at the trees, the mountains, your wife, your children and all the rest of it. And it's part of your laziness. Now to see that, to have an insight into it, to be aware of this extraordinary structure of illusion, which is an abstraction, that observation in itself is the total security. You've got it?

So can you leave this tent this morning happily, free of all the images, and therefore only have this light of insight? Have you?

Q: (Italian)

K: Madam - you've understood? I'm not going to translate, I'm sorry. She says - I must translate - The mountains and the trees, the rivers and the green meadows are different from man, and the collective man, the mass, the mass of people. Now what is my relationship with the mass? What is my relationship with this total seething mankind, with all its miseries, and all the rest of it? Is it laziness that I don't find my relationship with it? Is it my indifference? Or in asking that very question I have activated my energy to find out? Don't look at me, sir - what do you say? You understand? The lady says, it's easy to talk about the hills, the trees and the mountains and the flowers, but when it comes to human relationship, whether with one or with many, life becomes very difficult. It is difficult, as we said, because we have no relationship with anything - we have relationship in abstraction. And therefore we live in abstraction - the mass, the 'me', the conclusion, the

image - we live in abstraction. Do you realize what it means? That we don't live at all but live in images, in conclusions which have no value.

Q: Sir, how can we get rid of all that?

K: I've shown it to you, sir. What shall I do? Look, sir, let me make it very simple - keep it very simple. When you see a physical danger you react, don't you. Why? When you see danger you react instantly, because you are conditioned to the danger, whether it's a wild animal, a bus or somebody trying to hit you, you react instantly. That is, you react according to your conditioning, instantly. Now you are conditioned psychologically, mentally, intellectually and in the cell, you are conditioned to live in speculations, in concepts, in formulas - you're conditioned to that, and you don't see the danger of it. If you saw the danger of it as you see the danger of an animal, you'd drop it instantly. So you say, "I don't see the danger of it, therefore I can't drop it. How will you help me to see the danger of it?" Are you doing the work or am I doing the work? I am doing the work, you are just listening. You're not working. You say, "Now tell me how to break down these images." That is, you are not exercising your energy to find out. That means you're being lazy, and want to be told. Then you can say, 'Well I agree or disagree, it's not convenient, it is so - ' you play with it. But if you say, "Look, I want to find out," because you see the truth of it - I can't live with images because they are destructive, they're dangerous. And you, to see that you must have energy, you must work, it isn't a matter to be told by another. I've told you, but you don't put your vitality into it.

So the mind, the brain, which is old, conditioned, and always

living in the past, or projecting in the future from the past, cannot face something that is living, because it means you have to apply, you have to move, you have to watch. And so the mind says, "Please, I am lazy, don't, I'd rather live with my images, face the dangers, dangers of everything, but rather, please, I like to be comfortable." That's all you want.

But, sir, to find the truth you have to live tremendously, without a single security. That means, only security in intelligence that comes through insight. Then you'll be a first-class technician, because you don't project your image into doing a technical job. Then you have a marvellous relationship with each other.

Q: (French)

K: Madame, listen. Some author has written a book in which the author says that man must live alone now, not depend on Jesus, on Marx or this or that.

Q: (French)

K: Yes. God, heaven, hell, all the rest of the works. Now isn't it very strange that you read a book and learn from that? No? Somebody tells you, a first-class biologist, or a first-class physicist, or a first-class psychologist, that you must throw away all these cultural inhibitions, and fears and stand alone. And you read it, and you say, "By Jove, I must stand alone." Suppose there were no books at all, suppose there was nobody to tell you, what would you do? Which indicates you will accept a first-class biologist because he is a first-class, and therefore you don't live it yourself - you're all secondhand people.

Now what would happen if there was no Marx, no Jesus, no psychologist, you'd be left, wouldn't you? You have to solve this

thing yourself. And that's what we have been trying to do, during these eight or nine talks, to force you into a corner so that you look at things. And if there is no speaker sitting on the platform, then you'll have to face it yourself - and we are too lazy to face it ourselves, we'd rather be told - and then make that into a problem.

So I hope this morning, after listening for an hour and a half, whatever time it is, that you walk out leaving all your images behind, and look at the tree as though you were looking at it for the first time. Then you will have tears in your eyes because of the beauty of the tree. Then you will see the mountains and the hills and the shadows as you have never seen them before. Then you will see your wife, your friend, your husband for the first time, and the beauty of that first time. And then you will see yourself without any image and you realize that you are nothing. And in that there is vast beauty, being absolutely nothing. Then you will know what truth is.

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 7TH AUGUST 1972.

K: We have two more discussions, this morning and tomorrow morning, two discussions altogether. So what shall we talk over this morning?

Q: Sir, I spend one third of my life, approximately a third of my life, sleeping every twenty four hour period. And as I have got older I have found that the ability to sleep with harmony with myself seems to be less and less so that the quality of the rest that I get doesn't really prepare me too well for my day.

K: Would you like to discuss what is the function of sleep?

Q: Yes.

Q: Could we talk over the problems of existence.

K: Problems of existence - that's what we have been talking about for the last ten days, haven't we?

Q: Sir, how can we gather enough energy for meditation.

K: How to gather enough energy to meditate. Do you want to discuss meditation? Be quite sure, please, because it is a very serious subject, and don't kind of say, "Well, that's a nice subject to talk about". If you are really interested in it, we have not only to go into the question of energy, harmony, and what is the function of sleep - all these are involved in meditation, not just sitting cross-legged and going off into some fantasy. So do you really want to discuss this?

Q: Yes.

Q: Could we talk about education in the same way?

K: Could we not deal with education in the same way?



Q: Together.

K: Whom are you educating? The children or the educator?

Q: Both.

K: Wait - both. Is the educator capable of really educating the child? No. You say no? She agrees - no. Which is, the educator has to understand the whole problem of existence, not in departments, not classified as technology, science and so on. He has to understand, if he is to be a really good, efficient, worthwhile educator, he has to understand the whole problem of existence. Now during the last three weeks, we have been talking about existence - we have not perhaps mentioned the word education, but the educator is being educated here in this tent, if he would listen. Shall we go on with the other - which is part of our education.

Q: Sir, have we not been talking about meditation the last three weeks?

K: Yes, sir - he says, haven't we been talking about meditation for the last three weeks.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The capacity to understand existence, does it depend on individual, biological structure, or on his tendency, character and idiosyncrasy, or does the understanding of existence...

Q: Is it common to all human beings.

K: Is it common to all human beings - I should have thought it is common to all beings. I may have my peculiar tendency, my peculiar idiosyncrasy and character, but surely understanding must go beyond all that. So it is common, it's not restricted according to one's character, body, and so on.

Q: Can we talk about death.

K: Death - you're quite young, aren't you? She wants to discuss death.

Q: And to talk about health and disease, accident.

K: Health, disease, accident and all that kind of thing. Now how can we put all this together - health, disease, death, education, thought killing feeling, sleep, meditation, and death? How can we put all this together.

Q: Curiosity.

K: Curiosity. Put it all in.

Q: Isn't it all in meditation?

Q: For me, the house is still burning and I feel that there are many people who have clear eyes in the world. But the people in power can't bring about a change. How can we bring about a change in the people in power?

K: Yes, I understand, madam. There are some people who see clearly, but that is very limited and how to affect, how to bring about a change of heart in the people who are in power.

Q: What is the meaning of freedom?

K: What is the meaning of freedom? Lots of it now.

Q: Sorrow and education.

Q: For the ending of the image is it sufficient to have love?

K: Is the ending of the image, is it sufficient to have love? All right, sir.

Q: Is meditation an effort?

K: Yes, sir, meditation and good old effort. Throw it all in, sir, let's all get together.

Q: Sir, it seems to me that we have every variety of motivation to understanding, except the very simple one of curiosity, the

desire to find out. Why does the motivation prevent us from understanding these questions, and why do we have so little curiosity, desire to find out?

K: Look, sir, all these things are involved, aren't they - curiosity, death, education and sorrow, sleep, the whole mechanism of thought, feeling, and so on - all these things have a central issue, they have a central point from which we can start. Can we do that?

Now what is the central point, the root which has the trunk and many branches and leaves. If we could understand this whole process of living, which is the root, then we'll deal or have the capacity to deal with all the branches, with all the leaves, with the dying leaves and the new leaves, and the spring leaves and old leaves. Now what do you think is the central issue?

Q: Love.

K: Don't jump, and say, love. It may be love, but consider it for a few minutes. I want to find out if there is a source, a fountain, waters that once drunk will bring about such intelligence that will reply, answer, solve, all the problems. You understand my question?

I want to find out if my mind can live both at the level of knowledge and also at the same time, move with knowledge the unknown, so that both of them are living together, moving together, in harmony? You have understood my question? Now if I can find that out, then I'll have answered all your questions - you'll have answered for yourselves all the questions. How to deal with the known, known being the accumulated knowledge of centuries, and also at the same time, enter or allow the unknown to move also, so that the two together function, in harmony. Would that

answer all your questions?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't say, 'Yes' too quickly and then bring up later on, what about physical existence. I've a problem, one has a problem, which is, sleep, death, education, strong emotions, passions, controlled by thought and thought gradually getting stronger, and destroying all one's feelings, sensitivities, intuition, curiosity - all these are the problems of life. If I have a mind that's very clear, not corrupted, not polluted, not distorted, then such a mind will answer all these questions.

Now what is that mind - don't say it is this or it is that, because the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. So I want to find out, what is that mind that whatever problem it faces it resolves it and goes on, it doesn't become a burden, it doesn't become something to worry about endlessly.

Now can we together this morning spend a little time in trying to find out what is the quality of that mind - mind being, the brain, the feeling, the whole physical organism, the total thing, not the body, the emotion, the intellect, the brain, divided, but the total entity. Now how do you set about trying to find out? Existence implies jobs, food, clothes, and shelter; existence implies all this travail, this battle, this struggle, the pain, the anxiety, the guilt and the sorrow. Existence implies relationship between two human beings; existence implies the hours we spend in sleep; existence implies love, which is translated as jealousy, hate - all that, and sleep, death, and meditation - all that is involved. I want to find out for myself, not having read a book, and I don't want to read any books about all this - I want to find out what that mind is, I'm very

curious. Shall we discuss that? Please don't be casual about it.

Q: Yes.

K: I don't want your encouragement, you understand - I do this in my walk. Now how shall I find out, a mind so clear, a mind that has no conflict - not an ideal, actually has no conflict - a mind that can be completely quiet, a mind that when it sleeps, makes itself new, that lives in complete absence of the 'me', which is the essence of conflict. Now how am I to go about it, because I'm curious, I've got enough energy, I am not frightened, whatever the consequences of my enquiry is, I don't depend on anybody, for money, food - it doesn't interest me. If you give me food I'll take it, if you don't, it's all right, I'm not interested. My whole concern is this.

Q: Sir, I'm not curious - I'm scared, I want to attain it.

K: He's not curious but he wants to attain it. I don't want to attain it. How can my stupid little mind attain that - it can't, can it, because I think in terms of attainment, in terms of success, in terms of getting something. That's my motive. But I say, I've no motive, I want to see what such a mind is like. You see the difference?

Q: If there is such a thing.

K: I'm going to find out, sir. That's just it, I don't know if it exists, because I have no guru, thank god, I have no teacher, I don't accept any description or whatever another says about that - I brush all that aside. They may be an illusion or they are racketeers, so I'm not interested in them. I just want to find out, if there is such a mind.

Now how am I to begin, how am I to start? Please, go on, help me. Where am I to start? At the unknown end, which I can imagine

and therefore not real? Or where am I to begin to discover this mind that can respond without contradiction, without effort, without denial, sacrifice, forcing? Where am I to begin?

Q: Begin by asking why all these problems have arisen?

K: Would you begin by asking why all these problems come into being. Look, sir, we've talked for ten days or three weeks, we've been through all that. I start enquiring if there is such a mind, and to find out I must start not knowing. I don't know a thing about it, do you? Come on, sir. You may have read what people have said, you may have heard what people have said, I discard all that. All that I know is, I don't know. Are you also in that position, that you don't know if such a mind exists, and if it is at all possible to come upon it. You don't know - don't pretend, that's all. I don't know. A mind that says, "I don't know", therefore it is free to enquire.

There is freedom, that is the first step and the last step. Take it slowly. When I say, I don't know, I do not depend on anybody, on any circumstances, on any environment, either of the past or of the future. When I say, I don't know, I really completely mean it - I don't know. Are you in that position? Or you have your hidden masters, your hidden guides, your hidden memories, and pretend that you don't know.

Q: I think that I really don't know whether I know or not.

K: Please, this is too serious, don't play with words. Can you honestly say to yourself, I don't know whether there is such a mind? And therefore I'm free to enquire. Therefore enquiry demands that you be free first. Free first, not at the end - free from your Zen, free from your meditations, your systems, your gods,

your myths, your gurus, your concepts - out, out of the window all that. You're neither a Christian nor a Buddhist nor a follower of Jesus - out. Then you're free to enquire. That means the mind is not frightened, frightened to be alone.

Now I'm going to enquire, because I don't know what's going to happen. I'm not looking for a result. I don't want to find it or not find it, because my insistence is that mind must be free to enquire, and therefore never a moment of distortion. There is distortion when there is a motive. I've no motive, I don't care. I don't care, if that mind exists, doesn't exist, my enquiry is motiveless, endless, and has no authority whatsoever, past or present, therefore it's free to enquire. Come on, sir, will you move with me.

Now what am I enquiring into? I'm free to enquire - enquire what? Sleep? You're all very silent.

Q: Free to look?

K: Free to look - look at what? The tree, the mountain, the green, lovely, sparkling meadows.

Q: It's automatic to...

K: Don't speculate.

Q: I'm not speculating. When there is something you see immediately that creates space, and the mind has to be empty all the time.

K: When you say, "I don't know" the mind is empty. When it says, "I'm enquiring," it says, "What am I enquiring into." Am I enquiring into death, which is part of living? Am I enquiring into sleep, which is part of living? Job, fear, what am I enquiring into?

Q: The fact that I'm bored...

K: Yes.

Q: ...and I'm asking myself whether it is possible to live differently, and I really don't know.

K: You don't know, so why don't you start from there? I don't know how to end conflict. I live in conflict, contradiction, all the rest of it - we won't go into all the details of it - I live in conflict, I'm enquiring into that because I don't know what's going to happen. Wait. I'm enquiring into conflict, with a mind that says I really don't know if I can ever go beyond it. But you start with a mind which says, "I really don't know. I live in conflict but I don't know how to solve it." Wait, go step by step into it. But you start with not knowing, and therefore you start with freedom.

Q: If you enquire further into an idea...

K: You're going to find out, sir - don't verbalize it yet.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam. We had all these questions, hadn't we: life is death, sleep, conflict, suffering, education, thought opposing feeling, feeling opposing thought. We've had all these questions. I said, where am I to start, in the resolution of all this - in the understanding of all this - where am I to start? I say I really don't know whether I should begin here or there, therefore not knowing, I meet them all. You get it? Because I don't know, therefore I have the capacity to look at them all. This is not mystifying - how can I go on with all of you? You know, this is really a marvellous subject if you go into it - with two or three people we could do a great deal, but with so many contradictory problems and all the rest of it, it becomes extraordinarily difficult.

I don't know what meditation is, I don't know what death is, I don't know if life can be lived without strife, without any kind of



strife. But I am free to enquire. Now I'm going to enquire, being free, what is the significance of sleep? I'm taking that. The sleep which most of us have is a disturbance. No? Isn't it a disturbance, with dreams, with pictures, nightmares, all kinds of things are going on, aren't they?

Q: There are other kinds of sleep, too.

K: Do you know it?

Q: Yes.

K: What is that?

Q: When I did not know anything about dreams and all that.

K: So, when the brain gets tired of dreams it becomes quiet, is that it?

Q: Yes, probably - yes I suppose.

K: You're enquiring, you can't suppose.

Q: He has to suppose because you can't ask him while he's asleep, he's awake now and he has to answer you.

K: That's what I mean, sir. Look, we're enquiring into the question of sleep. I'm asking myself, during the day, my whole day is a disturbed existence. I'm disturbed all day long, I've got a job where I'm insulted, I accept great confusion during the daytime. And at night the same movement is going on, it isn't a break, which is translated into dreams.

Q: You asked if there is another kind of sleep.

K: I don't know - I'm going to find out. I see that during the day my life is disturbed, my brain is in conflict, I'm pushed around, I'm dominated or I dominate - it's a constant threat, constant pain, constant pleasures and so on. It is the same movement carried on when I go to sleep, that is when I dream. So I say to myself, "I'm

enquiring, can I during the day bring order in my life, because when I sleep dreams are a means of bringing about order." Have you noticed, just before you go to sleep sometimes the brain says, "What kind of day have I had? It's time to bring about order before going to sleep." Have you noticed it? Oh, no, don't tell me - come on. Some of you have, therefore before you sleep, the brain tries to put order. If you don't put order, then while you sleep the brain is trying to create order, which are dreams, interpretations, all the rest of it. Is that clear? I'm enquiring, I don't want to know what happens - I see this fact.

Now can I bring order during the day in my life - if not I'll dream, if not my brain will have no rest? And it must have rest, otherwise it's like a machinery that's working for seventy years, it wears itself out. So it must have complete rest.

Q: Scientists say that dreams are necessary. Scientists also say that there are states between dreams. Now we can enquire as to whether the mind is so completely tired it has given up trying to put order, really it's too exhausted.

K: That's right.

Q: And I think what you are asking is, there is a third kind of sleep.

K: Yes. I put my life in order during the day. I have - not you. To me it's tremendously important this, not to have conflict. So I have the order and this order can be brought about only when I see how chaotic the disorder is. Through the understanding and examination, enquiry into disorder, order is brought about. Order isn't a pattern, which I follow regularly, a blueprint which I accept blindly and go on. Order is something that comes out of the

understanding of the insight of disorder. Therefore my life during the day is orderly. Then at night, what takes place? Sleep then is without dreams. Am I telling you and therefore you're accepting it, or is it a fact to you?

Q: You are telling us because the very fact that...

K: Therefore leave it.

Q: That's why we can only talk about the day, the waking state.

K: That's all - so my enquiry goes much further than yours.

Because I think I have brought order in my life, and I know if there is disorder what to do; and I say the brain then, when it sleeps, is absolutely rested. And what happens during rest, and further, that's my enquiry, it's not your enquiry, therefore I won't go into it. I know it's exciting for you to listen to what happens but that's of no value.

Q: Some scientists have made experiments where they keep somebody awake.

K: I know, sir, I know all that.

Q: And then they conclude from that that you have to dream. Of course that only shows you are disorderly during the day and then you...

K: So my question is, have you put order during the waking hours of your life?

Q: Obviously not because I dream.

K: Therefore obviously not, therefore why don't you put order?

Q: I don't know how.

K: Wait, I'm telling you.

Q: But there's so much to cope with. Isn't there disorder to cope with?

K: No, there isn't. The lady says there is so much to cope with - there isn't. What you're coping with is disorder.

Q: Well there's this disorder to cope with. Isn't there disorder to cope with?

K: No, disorder has many forms but it is disorder - sexual disorder, mental disorder, disorder in our relationship with each other, disorder in my body, disorder - psychological, physiological, psychosomatic, whatever it is - disorder. Why don't I bring order into all that?

Q: Sir, because I don't know how and I want you to tell me.

K: I'll show it to you, sir. Are you aware of this disorder?

Q: Yes.

K: Now watch it, sir. You are aware of this disorder - what do you do about it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look at your own disorder - not that gentleman's disorder. His disorder is your disorder. He says, "I'm in disorder, I don't know what to do with it." Why not? What is disorder - contradiction, isn't it? Basically, disharmony - disorder - I think one thing, do another, say one thing, act in a different way, I feel and I mustn't feel, I want peace, I'm violent, which are all contradictions. Therefore my life, which is disorderly, is the result of contradiction. When a neurotic person believes in something and holds on to that, for that person there is no disorder, because he says, "This is so." I believe tremendously in Jesus or Buddha and that's finished - I've no disorder. Because that to me is real, everything else is unreal.

So if there is to be order you have to examine disorder in your

life, which is brought about by contradiction, which is not seeing actually 'what is', wanting to change 'what is' into something else. That is disorder. Come on, sir.

Q: As I walk along I am aware of a centre which is the essence of disorder. And I want to change it, I still want to get rid of it and find order.

K: Do listen to what I am saying - you are aware of your disorder, disorder basically implies contradiction, which is, not facing 'what is', not looking and moving away from 'what is'. When you move away from 'what is', that is disorder. When you try to go beyond it, that is disorder. When you try to suppress it, that is disorder. But when you look at 'what is', you've all the energy to go beyond it. That is order. Have you got it - not my verbal explanation, actually, have you got your teeth into it.

Q: Sir, what about compromises? It is sometimes necessary...

K: What about compromising - sometimes it is necessary. All right, compromise. Why do you make a problem of it - I have to compromise in putting on trousers, I have to compromise when I have to put on leather shoes. Why do you make a problem of compromise - because one has a principle that you mustn't compromise?

Q: Well...

K: Wait - follow it up. One can compromise about little things, but is there compromise when you see the fact that war is caused by nationality, one of the causes. Is there any compromise there?

Q: Yes.

K: What?

Q: Yes, the consequence if you won't fight is that they take your

passport and nationality.

K: Then let them take my passport, but fortunately they've given me one. And if they say you can't travel, all right, I don't travel, I stay where I am.

Q: But I might starve.

K: If I starve, I starve, all right - you people are so frightened. Let's move. So I've brought order in my life, daily living, waking hours, there is order and therefore the brain is absolutely quiet, incorruptible in that state. And when it wakes up, it's got vitality - that is, not yours, but what I am saying.

Now I am enquiring because I don't know - I am enquiring into meditation. What does it mean? I see at first, the mind must be absolutely quiet, because if it is not quiet it cannot see clearly. That's all.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I see if I want to listen to you, I must hear what you are saying - I can't be distracted. I want to listen to you, therefore my attention is effortless, because I'm curious, eager to find out what you want to say. Therefore there is no effort. I see very clearly that to listen, to see, the mind must be completely quiet. That's all. And my interest is to listen to you, my interest is to see clearly, therefore the mind is quiet.

Q: I think we're going to enter some difficulty...

K: Lots of difficulties.

Q: ...at this point because we're going to start talking in contradiction as words. In order to listen, the mind is quiet, but listening, listening to what - sound? That sound emphasizing the quiet - so once again. So you said that the mind must be quiet in

order to listen, but that's a contradiction in terms - quiet for listening.

K: No, sir.

Q: The words are contradictory but not the actuality.

K: All right, if you have understood it, then it's simple. To see clearly...

Q: ...there must be no colour in the mind.

K: That's all, sir. And to make the mind quiet is absurd. To force the mind to be quiet is absurd - it's not quiet. Or to follow a system which will make the mind quiet, is absolutely silly - whether it is offered by the greatest guru or the lowliest of the gurus.

So I see, in my enquiry into meditation, I see, there is an insight into the quality of a mind that is quiet. Have you? No? You haven't, have you? Why not? If you want to see the tree, your girl, the mountain, hear what others are saying, you have to be quiet, haven't you? What is the difficulty? Therefore your difficulty is, you don't want to listen, you don't want to see.

Q: You see for an instant and then it disappears.

K: Why does it disappear - you see it for an instant, it disappears. All right, let it disappear. You want to have the whole thing, don't you? You're so greedy. Just one second of perception is enough.

So I'm enquiring into meditation. I see my body must be quiet, relaxed. Then in that state of relaxation, the blood goes much easier to the brain. Therefore they advocate sitting in postures, you know, sitting cross-legged, all that game. Or you can lie down or do anything, walk, it doesn't matter. So the body must be sensitive,

alive, quick, supple, mustn't it? Is your body quick, supple, sensitive? Obviously not, because you overeat, not enough exercise, smoke, drink - carry on, and yet you say, "Now I'm carrying on my daily life, I want a quiet mind. Tell me how to work at it." So you want all your pleasures and get the other pleasure. Too childish all this! Now, the problem is, can thought be still? Mind means thought, the whole mechanism of thinking. How is thought to be still?

Q: You just said that thought is still, when you are really interested to observe.

K: Yes, sir, I'm examining - is your thought quiet?

Q: No.

K: Therefore you're not enquiring.

Q: That's right. There is a part of me which just sits there.

K: Therefore you're not enquiring - I say I'm enquiring. I say, can thought be quiet, operate when necessary, logically, sanely, impersonally, vitally, and the rest of the time - quiet, not all the time operating?

Q: Sir, if you are enquiring, it is already quiet.

K: Sir, if you're doing this thought is quiet, but you're not doing it, are you? No, therefore we are enquiring - I'm enquiring for you. Look, all our life is spent in thinking, isn't it? Most of our life is the activity of thought. Thought is going on endlessly, consciously or unconsciously. Is that so or not? Now how do you bring this mechanism to an end for a while?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Therefore what do you do about it - therefore don't talk. I want to find out, I want to put my blood into it to find out, if



thought must all the time go on. Or I say, "Is there an interval between two thoughts. Or is thought one continuous movement taking different forms?" You're not enquiring, you've never done any of this.

Q: There's an interval between thoughts.

K: There is an interval between two thoughts. The lady says yes, I know that interval, she says. Now what happens in that interval? Is it an interval of tiredness - please enquire - don't say no or yes - an interval caused by tiredness, by boredom, by daydreaming, or is it a conscious interval?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking the question for you, not for me.

Q: You're not asking it for everybody?

K: I'm asking for everybody who is here.

Q: Then you say you're asking for you, that's for you. Are we moving together?

K: No, we're not, for the simple reason, you have never gone into this question: whether the mind, which is the instrument of thought, which is, thought being memory, experience, knowledge and all that - all the time operating? And I say I am enquiring for you. Do you find any time that this thought naturally comes to an end? Or is there an interval between two thoughts? Or if that interval is laziness, slackness, tiredness, or are you aware of this interval? And if you are aware of this interval, then what takes place?

Q: There's energy in that interval - that's what energy is.

K: Energy is in that interval. To pick up again another thought? Are you guessing? Unfortunately - this is our trouble - you've not

gone into this.

Q: We recognize what solution and what you are saying at the same time.

K: So you recognize it.

Q: As far as I'm concerned, what you are saying is, if I give my whole mind and everything I've got to enquire, then my mind is still.

K: I didn't say that, sir. I simply said, if you want to listen to somebody you have to be fairly quiet, haven't you? That's all.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait. And I want to listen, listen, not I want to - is there a listening without a word?-

Q: There may be.

K: I give it up. Experiment, sir, do it now, find out if you can listen without a word. Find out what is the quality of that listening, and find out whether that quality is imagined or real.

Q: Sir, when one tries to do this, the weakness I have is that the mind gives instructions to itself.

K: Yes, sir, that's part of thinking. You see, I wish you had never heard the word 'meditation'. I wish you had never heard what it is to be quiet. I wish you'd never heard what may happen beyond, when the mind is quiet. If you had never heard any of these things, but only had to deal with your life as it is - as it is - that is, our conflict, our misery, our sorrow, in the resolution of that, the other thing may happen. But you haven't solved it, but you want the other. That's why I said, if you could start with not knowing. I don't know if there is a reality which is not touched by thought - I really don't know. I don't really know if there is a mind which is so

religious - not in the orthodox sense of that word - religious, that is capable of seeing what is sacred. Is there anything sacred in life? Will you enquire into this? Can we go together into this to find out if there is anything sacred in life? If we don't find it life becomes meaningless. No?

Q: Maybe that's why it is meaningless. It is now and I don't know anything else.

K: You people don't know, can't move. Look, I'll go on. I want to find out if there is anything sacred in life - sacred not in the image which man has created, not in an idea that there is sacredness, not in the religious books or their idols, because all that has been put together by man. Jesus, Buddha, they've all been put together by thought, by thought which is in agony, which is in despair, which is tremendously in sorrow and pain and fear, and therefore it says, 'That is sacred.' Isn't that clear? And I say that's not sacred, obviously. I used to know a friend - as he was walking one day in the woods he saw a piece of wood which had the face of a human being. So he took it home and put it on the mantelpiece. He looked at it and said what an extraordinary thing that is, because it had vitality - rain, people walking on it, had produced this shape. And one day he brought to it, that piece of wood, a flower, and put it beside it. And it still looked more beautiful. So every day he added a flower, and gradually within a year that became the most sacred thing in his life.

Therefore that is not sacred. I can make that piece of wood into the most sacred thing, like the altar put together, or, you know, the Christians, their myths, their idols are just the fantasy of the mind. That's not sacred. I want to find out if there is anything sacred in

life; that is, in living, dying, in love. Are we walking together?  
Now how do I find out, because I see that if there is no discovery of that beauty, life becomes rather shallow and empty? I can invent a lot of things, sit meditating endlessly about something, all that becomes very, very superficial and rather childish and stupid. So I say, out. I push away all that. Then what is sacred? Is love sacred - the love that has anxiety, fear, jealousy, that dominates, that possesses, the human relationship which is called love which is sex, pleasure, pain, anxiety, all that - is that sacred? I don't know - what do you say?

Q: Obviously not.

K: Obviously not, why?

Q: Because you have shown it to us.

K: I didn't show it, sir, watch it. You say, why. I'll show you. That piece of wood became sacred. So thought made it sacred. Thought has made love into what it is. So thought cannot make anything sacred. Come on, sir. Whether it is the Buddha, Christ, Krishna, whatever it is, an idea - thought cannot make anything sacred. You understand the beauty of this, sir. To discover that, to come upon that - feeling, thought can never make the tree beautiful, the mountain beautiful, your face lovely, thought cannot make it, therefore thought, which is the response of memory, thought which is measurable can never be sacred.

So that which is sacred is the moment when thought is not. And at that moment, thought says, "I'll measure and I want more of it" then it becomes pleasure. And thought pursues endlessly pleasure. And so all the temples, all the churches, all the mosques are put together by thought for pleasure, therefore there is nothing sacred

in it.

Q: How can...

K: Wait, I'm showing it to you. So can the mind be without thought, and use thought when necessary? Which means, the mind being empty of thought can use thought, and live with thought, in harmony, not one and the other. And this is meditation. So that the mind has no illusion; and illusion arises when you want to achieve. When you say, "I must attain that," and then you can invent something which you will attain and think you've got it. But always if you can remember that piece of wood on the mantelpiece - you follow?

So my mind, so the whole of my mind is sacred - not it's content is sacred. I wonder if you're meeting all this - but that quality of mind that's completely empty. And out of that emptiness, space and silence, thought can operate. This is all my description, you understand - it's not yours.

Now if a few of us see this together, and it is not mine or yours, but it is so, then we create a new generation. And then you won't be bothered about changing the people, changing the heart of the people in power. They are not worth changing. Any man who is in power is corrupt.

Have we any of us travelled together? Up to a point. Is that good enough?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Let them destroy. They are destroying.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: They are destroying the world, all the politicians put together are destroying the world. What are we going to do - wipe them

out? You and I vote against them - 90% of the people want that kind of thing, they want power, position, prestige. We want to change the heart of others, without changing our own hearts. Don't bother about the others, begin with yourself. That sounds a cliché but it isn't.

Q: I would like to clear up a point. You said, I think, that nothing is sacred. And then you went on to say, about the pursuit of pleasure and I didn't understand how you connect that.

K: I don't remember that, sir. I can't repeat it.

Q: You were talking about the enquiry into what is sacred. Then you followed on and you said that nothing is sacred.

K: I know - I've got it, I understand. Look, sir, when there is happiness or great enjoyment, you learn a great deal. It is only when the mind is happy, relaxed, enjoying, you learn a great deal. And in enquiring into what is sacred, perhaps there is a second when you see, when the mind sees itself completely without being anything. That moment is the most extraordinary moment. And having seen that thought comes along and says, "I must have more of it", and that is the beginning of pleasure, and not enjoyment. You understand? Joy is something beyond pleasure. But once having smelt, tasted it, thought says, "I must have more of it". Don't you know this? You have had sex and once you have had it thought says, "Let's go on with it". You see a beautiful sunset, at that moment there is no thought at all. There is complete enjoyment of that beauty. Then thought comes along a few minutes later and says, "Let's go back to that mountain, it was such a lovely thing." So thought is always avoiding pain and pursuing pleasure. This is so simple.

To find out what is sacred the mind must know the total content of itself. And its content makes consciousness. You understand, sir? Consciousness is its content. If there is no content there is something else, isn't there? If my content of my mind is worry, resentment, wanting to fulfil, bitterness, anxiety, fear, afraid of so many things, wanting to do this and that, that is the content of my consciousness. When the content is not, there is something entirely different. And we try to make one of the contents into the sacred thing. You understand? That's why one must know the total content, consciousness or unconscious. And that's another problem.

## **SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 8TH AUGUST 1972.**

K: As this is the last discussion or dialogue, what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: Could we continue with yesterday's discussion, the understanding of order and what is order?

Q: What is a religious mind and is it possible in this day and age to live such a life?

Q: How can I ask the right question when my mind is so confused?

K: How can I ask the right question when I've got a rather confused mind. Is that it? But we do ask questions, don't we, though we have confused minds and rather disturbed minds, we ask questions. And the gentleman asks, what is the right question to ask when one is confused.

Q: (Italian)

K: You have affirmed that love is without object and without a continuity. What is this statement that has been made, that love is without object and has no continuity?

Perhaps we can answer all these questions if we go into the problem of time. Would you like to go into that? Does that interest you, because that will include, how to understand order, and perhaps we can then find out for ourselves if there is such a thing as love without an object and without time. Because love without continuity means love without time. Right? Are you interested in this?

Q: Yes.



K: You see, we've always been brought up in the prolongation of time, using time, which is measure, as a means of achievement, both outwardly, physiologically, as well as psychologically. (I see two or three people who are yawning - I hope you had a nice night). You know, it is really a very important question, this, because if we could understand it, really, deeply, then perhaps we'll solve this question of love, order, and what it means to live neither in the past nor in the future. So I think it is important to go into this question.

We use time as measure, both outwardly and inwardly. We use time as measure as going from here to there, that is, covering the distance needs time, physically. And we also think or have been educated in our culture, we think that psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were, we need time to understand, we need time to conquer, we need time to break down our bondages, we need time to understand sorrow. So we use time as a measure both outwardly and inwardly.

This is a dialogue, please - I'm not talking by myself, which I can do in my room. We are discussing, trying to take the journey together. I need time to go from here to Geneva. I need time if my body is rather unwilling, the muscles are rather hard, I need time to make them subtle - it will take a week. That is, the week is the measurement of time which is necessary to make the body a little more subtle.

Q: Is it a fact that it takes?

K: Is it a fact that takes place in time. The fact that one's muscles are rather unyielding, it takes time to make them more subtle, there needs to be time. The fact is the muscles are rather

hard, not soft, and to make them so you need week. The week is the measure, the week is time. To learn a language there needs to be time, two months, three months or six months.

So to cover, from a certain point to another point needs time, which is measure. Now we apply the same measurement inwardly. I need time to get over a habit, I need time to stop smoking, I need time to conquer my anger, I need time in order to achieve a certain psychological result, I need time to find enlightenment, I need time to get over my sorrow. So outwardly we apply the measure of time, and inwardly we do the same, psychologically. Gradualness is accepted as a fact. To put machinery together it must be done gradually, I can't all of a sudden put it together. Time is necessary, as a gradual process, in order to learn a language.

Now I ask myself, and I suppose you must have, whether time as measurement exists at all and is there psychological evolution at all, evolution being time? The brain has evolved through centuries upon centuries, to come to this unfortunate point. And it has evolved under great pressure, great uncertainty, calamities, pains, suffering. And it has achieved a certain result - it has evolved. And to have evolved up to this point you need time.

To learn a technology one needs time. Now we are asking if time is necessary at all for psychological understanding, for being free of a habit, habit being the conditioning. The mind, the brain is conditioned in the culture it has grown - religiously, psychologically, socially, economically, family and so on. That conditioning, does it need time to break it down, to go beyond it?

Q: But understanding itself, or the insight, does not need time, although a lot of work is necessary to come to that point.

K: Is insight time - does perception need time. Or time is not necessary for perception. That's what the questioner says.

Q: That wasn't the question - I was saying that insight itself is instant but there's a lot of work necessary.

K: Insight is instant but to carry it out needs time.

Q: No, not to carry it out.

K: To work it out. Look, I'll make it very simple. I have an insight that I shouldn't smoke, but it takes some time for the body to adjust itself because it has been drugged narcotically for many years, and it takes time to get over it. Is that what you were saying?

Q: The insight is instant but to come to the insight, that's what I think he wanted to say.

K: Insight is instantaneous but to come to that insight needs time. Let's put it that way, he says. I am lazy, one is lazy. And laziness prevents insight, obviously. But being lazy, to dissipate that laziness needs time. To approach insight, the approach needs time. That's what I've understood from his question.

Sir, let us go slowly into this, because we can ask all kinds of questions a little later, but let's get the simple fact. I need time to learn a language, and I'm asking myself, and we're asking ourselves, whether time is necessary to bring about a radical revolution psychologically? What do you think?

Let's begin: the brain has been conditioned in the culture in which it has grown. Does that conditioning, the freedom of that conditioning, does it require time - time being, being conditioned it'll take some time, days, years, months, to be free of that conditioning - now I'm asking, does it take time?

Q: Whatever takes place in time must cause more conditioning.

K: Whatever takes place in time must be more conditioning.  
Let's begin much simpler: one smokes, there is a habit of smoking - the abandonment of smoking, the giving it up, does it take time? I don't know, I don't smoke but tell me.

Q: No.

K: You say no. Why do you say no?

Q: I did it.

K: Because you did it. What is implied in that - the body has been accustomed, has acquired a habit of nicotine. And the body demands it, though intellectually you may have decided to give up smoking, the body being accustomed or used to nicotine, demands it. So there is the bodily demand and the decision to give up smoking. So there is a conflict, isn't there? And to overcome this conflict you say, I need time. Are we meeting each other - please let's get going, not let's stop at nicotine. And is there a way of giving up totally smoking without this conflict? Conflict implies time, the body, being used to nicotine, demands it. But the mind has said, 'How stupid, how dangerous it is to smoke, it will affect my heart - I won't do it.' So the decision and the fact, the fact being the body is used to nicotine, so there is conflict. And to overcome that conflict you need time. So you say, "I will gradually get over it." Now I'm asking myself, is there a way of dropping the habit totally without conflict, in which the body has accepted the fact?

Q: It seems to me that just as the body requires a week for its muscles...

K: Wait. I know that. We know this - I'm enquiring, don't assert anything. My body used to take nicotine, and the mind has said, "No, I won't do it." The body says, "I must have more of it." Now

can the body be so intelligent that it sees the danger of it and drops it, doesn't demand it?

Q: Nine years ago I used to smoke. I had this battle between the body and decision. And suddenly I dropped it.

Q: Casually?

K: Is it casual or there was an instant co-operation of the body with the perception. Give a little time, please - time in the sense, you are impatient, you want to get ahead. I want to go into it step by step.

Q: It seems to me that in giving up smoking the conflict is not so much between the mind and the body as with the pain on the one hand and my decision to give up smoking, and the fact that I need to smoke as an escape.

K: Yes, sir, all that is implied. I want to find out if the body can also see as intelligently as the mind does, and give it up without the least friction. You've understood my question? How is this to be done? Take any habit, doesn't matter what habit, and there is the momentum of the body, the momentum of the mind that says, I must give it up, or I am afraid to give it up because I'm escaping from a particular thing. So can the body and the mind together see the fact and drop it? Discuss it.

Q: There is a separation between the mind and the body, therefore there is conflict.

K: There is the separation between mind and body, that's why there is this conflict. But the fact remains that nicotine has become a habit for the body, though the mind says, "I will drop smoking." There is this conflict.

Q: This 'I' makes the conflict.

K: No, don't reduce everything to that - haven't you got habits? And haven't you noticed to break a habit it takes time? The decision, you are aware of the habit, and you know, all the rest of it, it takes time, doesn't it. And I'm asking, why is there not a complete perception by the body as well as by the mind, so that it's finished?

Q: There's no doubt too that the nicotine causes some physical effect. But I wonder how much effect it really causes and is it perhaps possible that the mind or the body can cause conflict too.

K: Of course. You're conditioned, aren't you, as a Catholic, as a Christian, aren't you all? No? All right, some are not, some are. Or you're conditioned in another way. Now take your conditioning, if you're aware of it, and see whether that conditioning can be dropped instantly.

Q: Sir, it takes time, it takes time to make it, so it can't be dropped instantly.

K: Please, don't speculate.

Q: Sir, doesn't the word instant imply time?

K: Heavens, look, everything, conveying through words implies time. Instantly may be two seconds or a millionth of a second, but let's go beyond that word, if you don't mind.

Q: Then why do you stay with nicotine when you know that to give up nicotine the body itself has its own metabolic process and will not give it up. So why not go beyond. It is possible to stop smoking with no bad effects, but with a hard drug...

K: Hard drugs, that is heroine and all the rest of it, the hard drugs have affected the body, the cells. I wish we hadn't entered into the nicotine and the hard drugs, but because that needs a lot of

time. I want to get at something much deeper than that, sir. Does the freedom from conditioning take time?

Q: May I say something? I was standing on a rock one day, there was lichen and rock and moss. This may have taken a million years or a billion to grow, but it seemed to me that in that moment the lichen and I existed together. Is there anything in this?

K: I don't know, sir. I'm only concerned with one thing - I am conditioned, brought up in the culture in which I was born. That culture has conditioned me, with its illusions, superstitions, with its myths, with its gods, with its economic and social status. And I want to find out if my mind can drop that conditioning without conflict, without time. I won't even use instantly, because then you'll say, instant is one millionth of a second. That's my concern, because I see that is the most important thing in relationship, that's the most important thing in the world where human beings have to live, not to be conditioned.

Please is this simple. Can I go on? Will it take time? That is, will it take time to see that I'm conditioned? And, the next step is, the decision to uncondition myself, and the effort involved in the unconditioning, and so on - all that is a progression in time. I want to find out if it can be done without time. Don't say it is possible, it is not possible - don't theorize about it, find out for yourself you're conditioned - to find that out, does it take time? It will take time if I tell you you're conditioned, then you accept the fact that you are conditioned, or disagree, or argue, and decide later that you are conditioned - all that implies time. But if you yourself see directly that you're conditioned, that doesn't take time. To see for yourself that you're hungry, it's a fact, you're hungry. But to be told that you

are hungry, you say, "Am I really hungry?" You evade the question - how do you know I'm hungry? Does my face show it, my behaviour, and so on - you take time to be told that you're hungry and then say, "I'm hungry" takes time, but to see for yourself, to be aware for yourself that you're hungry needs no time. That's one fact - is that clear? Proceed, sir.

Q: It doesn't take time to see one single factor, but each moment is linked by thought, we don't see the totality of it.

K: Sir, you've gone ahead of me - come back where I am, which is, I said, to be told that you are conditioned and then be aware that you are conditioned takes time. But to be aware of conditioning needs no time. Now what is it with you? The speaker has said you are conditioned, and therefore you realize you are conditioned. And that realization comes through time - verbal message, arguing, disagreeing, but all that takes time. But to say, "Yes, I'm conditioned," that needs no time. Now which is it with you? Go on, sir. Move from there.

Q: I've already formed an opinion because you have said for many years that one must be free of the conditioning. And that doesn't need time. So I have accepted that as an opinion - I don't know. So that opinion now I have formed and to break it down needs time.

K: But if you are aware that you are conditioned, that needs no time. Look, sir, I say to you now, please listen very carefully, give your attention for two seconds, I say to you now, you are conditioned. How do you receive those words? Do you see instantly that you're conditioned, or do you say, "What do you mean by that? What's wrong with being conditioned, conditioning



has helped to hold people together?" A myth, Jesus myth or any other myth has held people together for centuries. It's an historical fact. So I say to you, "Are you aware now, as you listen, that you're conditioned." Wait, please take a minute - are you aware? That has not taken time, has it? You see it.

Then, go the next step: is that conditioning to be broken down bit by bit, layer after layer, fragmentarily, or is it to be broken down instantly - not instantly, without time?

Q: If one sees the reason for conditioning.

K: Look, don't, please don't use the word if, when, those conditional clauses, then you'll never do it. Please listen to what I'm saying. I say to you that you are conditioned. You see that fact - without argument, without going all round it, say yes, that is so, it's so obvious.

Now my next question is, do you break down that conditioning fragmentarily or do you break it down totally? Listen quietly. Our mind is used to breaking down bit by bit.

Q: You put us in front of this problem. Our response to that problem is not adequate.

K: I'm making your mind adequate to look at it - I'm helping you. Stick to one thing.

Q: Sir, to say you are conditioned is wrong, you are wrong as you're saying it, because as you're saying it and see the conditioning it's gone.

K: Don't complicate it, sir. I say to you, are you aware of your conditioning?

Q: But you are conditioning.

K: No, I've been through all that, I'm asking you now, are you

aware of your conditioning now. That's all, sir - skip the words.

Q: Just what do you mean by, am I aware of my conditioning - could you tell me that? When I came into this tent and I looked at you and I had a sort of hardness in my eyes, and I said, I'm being conditioned by Krishnamurti. Now when I saw that, was that being aware of my conditioning?

K: Obviously. Now you are aware of your conditioning as being competitive. Will it take time to be free of that conditioning, of that particular conditioning.

Q: Sir, when you say free, do you mean never do it again?

K: I mean, free means never again. Listen to it: when you see a poisonous snake, you're always careful, aren't you, after that. You're free to face danger, and to know what to do. I am asking if you are aware of your conditioning as being competitive. When you are aware of it, does it take time to be completely free of it? Go on, sir, help me.

Q: (Italian)

K: Need I translate it? Yes? Somebody understands Italian and English - why don't they translate it. I'll do it. I want to go ahead - we are sticking at such small things. All right, sir - what did you say?

Q: (Italian)

K: What M. Ortalani is saying is - I'll put it very briefly, sir, correct me if I'm wrong - that if I am aware of one conditioning, a particular conditioning, does it mean that I comprehend the total conditioning? Through a particular conditioning, will that make we aware of the total? Right?

Sir, I am aware that I am competitive, and does that awareness

free the mind from all competition hereafter, there is no competition in my nature at all? I'm taking that one thing, for the moment. And the next question is, through a particular perception, will it reveal the whole structure of conditioning? I'll come back to that. That is, I am aware that I am conditioned to be competitive, will that awareness free the mind from all competitiveness, or will it take time to be free of that particular conditioning?

Stick to that one question, please. I am aware that I am competitive and I say to myself, I know that I am competitive, I see the effects of it in the world, logically, it's most destructive, it leads ultimately to war, both economically, socially and so on, I see, intellectually, verbally, I see very clearly the structure and the nature of competition. And does that wipe away altogether competition from my nature? Wait. I'm asking you. Or do I need time to wipe it away? Stick to that. Were you aware that you are competitive because you were told? No. Because you are competitive you are aware. Then what is the next step? We're all competitive, it isn't only that gentleman - everybody is competitive in some way or another, wanting bigger, better, nobler - this whole momentum of competition, which is really measurement. What is the next step when you are aware of it? Does that awareness wipe away competition from you?

Q: Apparently not.

K: Why not? That means, you are not aware, as you are aware of a poisonous snake. When you see a poisonous snake your body, your mind, your emotions, altogether move away. So you only perhaps saw - I'm not criticizing you, sir - perhaps you, many of us only saw intellectually that you're competitive.

Q: But the snake is outside, that is not competitiveness inside.

K: Yes, both outside and inside. I am competitive, one is competitive - do you see it completely, or do you see it partially?

Q: Like the nicotine, if you can't see it poisoning you, you can't stop.

K: Like nicotine, it can't stop, it's poisoning you and you go on smoking.

Q: No, you must feel the poisoning, you must not only think it.

K: That's right, sir, not you must, do you - don't preach to me.

Q: Yes, I must, I do.

K: Do you, when you see competitiveness and realize that it is poisonous, drop it altogether? If you don't, why don't you, is it that you see intellectually, verbally, that competitiveness is ugly, and you haven't related it to your heart, heart in the sense of feeling, you don't feel it? You verbally state it but without any content behind those words. If there is a content behind those words, which is, that you feel very strongly that competitiveness is destructive, if you see it, it is finished.

Q: Sir, who are the selves that are competitive? It's measuring.

K: Yes, I understand that, sir.

Q: If...

K: Not 'if', madam.

Q: Either you do see it, understand it totally, or you don't.

K: Wait - the lady says, either you see it, feel it, understand it totally or you don't. So it's much better to say, "Look, I haven't seen it, I don't feel it totally, it is only a fragmentary part of me that sees it, the rest of it is in darkness, the rest of it is not aware of the danger." Now why? But you are aware of the danger of a snake.

You are aware of it because you have been conditioned to it, haven't you? Danger, a precipice, a bus, a poison is a frightful danger, and there is instinctive protection. Now you are not conditioned to the danger of competition. If you were conditioned to the danger of competition, you would not touch it. Wait, look at it. Consider it for a moment, don't raise a question, go into it. You are conditioned to the snake, you are not conditioned to the poison of competition. So if you were conditioned to the poison of competition you would react and say, "That's terrible." Listen to it carefully - but we are talking about conditioning, not competition to this or that - the fact of being conditioned. Do you see the difference, sir? Go slowly - I am conditioned to the snake, I'm not conditioned to the poison of competition. If I were conditioned to the poison of competition, I would avoid it, I would run away from it. Of course, it's an obvious fact.

So we act only according to our conditioning. Wait. But I'm questioning all conditioning. There with the snake I see how the mind has been conditioned, through centuries of experience it has been said, snakes are dangerous. And I say, "My god, I must be careful, I mustn't go near it" - tiger, crocodile, whatever it is. But I have not been conditioned to the poison of competition, so I go on. Wait. I go on.

So my mind depends for right action on conditioning. See the importance of that. My mind has been conditioned in a myth - Christian myth or Hindu myth or whatever it is - and that has held people together, all myths have held people together for some time. And that myth has conditioned me, and I act according to that myth - communist myth or any other myth.

So I realize my mind functions only happily when it's conditioned. No? Because then I'm sure what to do. There is no uncertainty in it. Snake is a snake, dangerous. Competition is poisonous. To follow anybody is poisonous. So your mind constantly functions only and happily in the field of conditioning. So I am questioning the whole field, not whether it's useful or not useful. If you haven't got it, I can't go on.

Q: Sir, the poisoning of the snake is there for everybody to see - you'd get plenty of support for that. But to see the poisoning of competition, you must see it for yourself.

K: Yes, sir, but I'm not...

Q: It seems I want to be competitive so I've allowed myself to be conditioned because that will help me to be competitive.

K: Right, sir, put it that way if you want to.

Q: I can't see my conditioning.

K: Don't you see your conditioning when you meet a snake - have you never met a snake, except in the Zoo? Then don't you react to it? So you're conditioned.

Q: You have told me I am conditioned.

K: No - I said you were conditioned with regard to the snake. You're conditioned, you're conditioned in a different way to competition - you accept it, that's your conditioning. So you function only according to your conditioning. Obviously, sir. If you're conditioned through reward and therefore behave, you're conditioned, aren't you? If you're conditioned through punishment to behave rightly, that's also conditioning. So I am saying, look what happens when you are conditioned, your mind is mechanical.

Q: Sir, is there any action at all that is not conditioned?

K: We're coming to that, sir. So your action is always based on your conditioning, pleasant or unpleasant, rewarding or unrewarding. That's a fact. And if one's life is based on conditioning, life becomes mechanical. I'm a Christian for the rest of my life, I'm a Communist or whatever it is. I don't want to think, I don't want to observe, I don't want to go beyond the little narrow field of my conditioning. And I say, in that lies sorrow.

So I say to myself - follow this - one conditioning I can understand, two I can understand, but I want to understand the whole complex conditioning. Is that possible with one glance, not take little by little, but at one glance see the poisonous nature of all conditioning? You've got it now?

Q: (French)

K: I didn't say it was difficult. You are saying it is difficult. The moment you say it is difficult you are blocking yourself.

Q: But you can't say that this conditioning is dangerous. You can see the conditioning, but you can't say the conditioning is dangerous.

K: I'll show it to you. Isn't nationalism one's conditioning? Isn't it dangerous. Isn't the conditioning about some god, a belief in something - isn't that dangerous? Because you believe in something and I believe in something else, and we are at each other's throat. So it is dangerous, isn't it?

Q: Can't I have my own space so that I don't interfere with you?

K: You have that space in tolerance, you tolerate me outside your little space. Isn't that dangerous?

Q: You've got to see that all your pleasures are dangerous.

K: It is so.

Q: Why is it so?

K: Because if you don't get your pleasures you're annoyed, aren't you, you get angry, you get frustrated, you begin to hate - depending on the denial and the strength of your pleasure.

Q: How can one be aware of one's brutality?

K: Don't ask that question yet, but first see how your mind operates. It functions what it considers happily in conditioning. The snake, and you're conditioning to be competitive, and you say, "Let's be competitive". You are conditioned to be nationalistic and you say, "Let's be nationalistic," wave the flag and fight each other - these are facts which are dangerous. Do you see the danger of it, not verbally but actually as you see the danger of the snake? And you may not see it as the danger of the snake because you're lazy, you don't want to see it, you've all kinds of objections and reasons for not seeing it. Now to get rid of all those objections, formulations and reasons, takes time. You're meeting all this?

So you would rather live and continue in the state in which you are, conditioned, creating mischief, not facing danger, and ready to be killed.

Q: (Italian)

K: He says, why don't you talk about the conditioning here - I'm doing that. You are conditioned, aren't you - as a Frenchman or as a whatever it is - you're conditioned. And the mind takes shelter behind its conditioning because that is safe. It is safe for me to call myself a Hindu; I feel protected, and in that conditioning I accept and I live within that. But I don't see the danger of it.

Q: You are conditioned in this tent to listen to the speaker.

K: Are you conditioned by the words of the speaker?



Q: We are free to come or go.

K: We are free to come and go, the lady says - I'm not talking of that - of course you're free, nobody asks you to pay or whatever it is. Are you being conditioned by the words that the speaker uses? Are you being conditioned by the - not ideas, the idea - I'm not conveying ideas, I'm only conveying facts, and you turn it into ideas. Facts cannot condition you. What conditions you is the opinion about the fact.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, madam.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the fact is that the mind functions in habits. That's a fact. No? But you don't see what that fact does, mechanical business, all the rest of it. Then if you see it, then you ask, how am I to get rid of it. So you're bringing an opinion or a desire to get rid of it, whereas if you merely look at that fact without any motive, then that fact undergoes a radical change. You don't listen - all right.

Q: I'm aware of the fact that to approve or disapprove of behaviour is conditioning. If I don't do one or the other, the children may beat each other up. Would you please speak about raising children?

K: Could you talk about raising children - please. You know, that's one of the things we could talk about, which means really, are the parents educated - educated in the deep sense of that word, not passing some exams, getting a job and all that - I mean educated. And the parents are not educated therefore the children are not educated. So the problem arises, how to educate the parents. Right, sir? You're a teacher. And how do you educate the

parents? They don't want to be educated, because they're completely satisfied with their jobs, with their little house, with their gossip, all the rest of it.

So what is important is, the few of us here in this tent, listen to all this, not to the words, but to what is behind the word. And to see whether the mind can comprehend or be aware of the total conditioning. Not one should be free of it, one should go beyond it, or break it up, but to be aware of the totality of this conditioning - which means, mechanical habits, mechanical activities, slogans and all these things that follow.

Q: (Italian)

K: Of course, sir. That's quite right, sir.

Now - we'd better stop, and this is the last discussion. What have you, as a human being, after listening to the seven discussions and seven talks, what have you learnt? Please just find out - take two minutes and find out - what have you learnt during these fourteen talks and discussions - what have you learnt? Not verbal conclusions, not ideas which you have picked up, but what have you actually learnt from it, which is yours?

Q: To be watchful all the time.

K: Is that all what you have learnt? What have you learnt so that your life is different?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please don't tell me what you have learnt. I'm asking, during these fourteen talks and discussions, has your life changed? Is there a psychological revolution which will affect your outward activity? Or you have gathered a few ideas - and I am not a conveyor of ideas, I'm not providing you with intellectual words and statements

- we're only concerned with facts. And during these fourteen days and fourteen discussions and talks, has your life changed, deeply? If not, why have you spent your time here? Just for amusement, curiosity?

So you have to face now for yourself, find out if your life has radically, deeply changed, or you are still playing with ideas. And if you are playing with ideas you have wasted your time - your time, your money, your energy. And that is not the reason why we gather here every year. Why we gather, as far as the speaker is concerned, is to bring about a different generation who see things directly and act directly. Not see and act - the interval, between seeing and acting, and during that interval, all the mess arises.

So can you, when you go home, or when you walk this afternoon, find out for yourself how deeply your life is changed, or not changed. When the house is burning there is no time to discuss about the man who set it on fire - the colour of his face, whether long hair or short hair - you put it out. And your house is burning. So it's up to you?

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1973**

I think we should be rather clear that we are not doing any kind of propaganda, that we are not trying to convince you of anything, nor are we forming any kind of sect. Because to me sects, propaganda and trying to convince somebody of certain ideas, seems so utterly foolish and meaningless. So if we understand that from the very beginning, then we can go into this whole problem of our relationship to the world, and the relationship of the world to us, and whether human beings, as we are, can ever radically change. Or must we go on endlessly, caught in the trap of this so-called miserable, confusing, conflicting life?

I think it is very clear that our relationship to the world, that is, the world about us - the world of nature, science, politics, economy, education and all the corruptions that are going on around us, the pollution, the over population, the corruption of various kinds of governments - when we observe all that, one inevitably asks what is one's relationship to it? In what way can we, as individual human beings, bring about any kind of change in the social structure, in the Establishment, in the religious field? Can any human being bring about a radical change in all that? That is one of our problems.

And the other problem is: what relationship has our thought and action with regard to what man has sought throughout the ages as something beyond and above the daily monotonous, lonely, boring life?

And the other much more deeper fundamental question is: what

relationship has the human mind to that which man has called timeless, the nameless, the eternal and so on?

And also we are going to consider during these talks and discussions whether the human mind, our mind, can ever, through meditation, through deep contemplation, come upon that reality?

So these are the things we are going to consider. And to go into them deeply one must have a very serious mind. I mean by that word, a mind that is logical, sane, healthy and is capable of thinking logically. And a serious mind perceives that which is true and acts instantly. Perception and action are together, and that is what one can call a serious mind, a mind that is committed, wholly given over to the enquiry, investigation, into all these problems, objectively, sanely, without any neurotic pursuits, can think directly. That is what, if I may, I consider is a serious mind. Because throughout the world now there are all kinds of degenerate gurus, philosophies, brought over from the Orient, and people being so very gullible, so willing to be entertained - let's rather put it that way - that they accept all this without real enquiry, without deep investigation. We accept too easily because it is rather comforting. We live a rather miserable life, a kind of bourgeois life and anything that will give us a little excitement, entertainment, a new kind of idea, we eagerly accept.

So if we can during these talks put aside all that; that we are not accepting any kind of authority, except in matters of science, mathematics, and so on. In so-called spiritual matters - if I may use that word without being misunderstood - there is no authority whatsoever. There can't be. If there is, then it is not a reality, it is just a form of acceptance of a guru and following him blindly, or

willingly, or all that silly stuff that is going on in the world.

So we are together this morning, and the following morning, going to commit ourselves, if you are willing, to this enquiry, which is: whether the mind, the human mind, your mind, one's mind can radically undergo a revolution so that our whole life, the way we live is completely transformed. That is going to be our deep fundamental enquiry. Right?

To enquire into any subject one must approach it with a mind that is willing to observe exactly 'what is'. You cannot possibly observe if you have any opinion, any conclusion, any thought that distorts the perception of 'what is'. Are we sharing this together? Or am I talking to myself? Because we are sharing this thing together. To share something really you must be equally interested in what you are sharing. You must have the same intensity, the same attention in sharing, otherwise you can't share. You need a certain affection, care, otherwise there is no possibility of sharing. And as you have taken the trouble to come here on a windy morning, if you are willing to share these things together, you and I, then it is worth while. If we are merely looking at it as though from outside, not very deeply interested, rather curious, seeing what this man has to say, then the sharing becomes impossible.

So to enquire, which we are doing together, means not only sharing of the problems involved, but also investigating, that is, to trace out, that is what that word means, to trace out logically, sanely, objectively all these problems which we are confronted with every day of our life. So to enquire demands a mind that has set aside its opinions, its judgements, its evaluations and is capable of observing exactly 'what is', both outwardly and inwardly. That is

what is implied in enquiry and in sharing. Though the speaker is sitting on a platform a little higher than where you are sitting, he has no authority. The platform doesn't give him authority, or the name, or the reputation, all that tommy rot. So we are enquiring very seriously into these problems.

First of all one must, I think realize, or rather feel also, that we are the world, and the world is us. There is no separation, division between you and the world, because we are the product of the environment, the culture, the economic structure, government, religious sanctions, images, authority, and all that, which is generally called culture. We are the result of that culture. If you are born in this island, in England, you are the result of the culture in which you have lived - the religious culture, with all its images, superstitions, propaganda, authority, fear, punishment, and also the culture of a comfortable, affluent life. The more you are affluent the more worldly. These are all facts. And you are also the result of technological development. The more technology develops, the more our life becomes superficial and mechanical. We pursue greater pleasures and that is what we want. We have created this society, this structure, this culture, religious as well as literally artistic and scientific. And we are part of that culture. So there is no division between the world and oneself, whether you live in India, in Japan or Russia or America or here. I think that is one of the most fundamental things to realize, feel, not as an idea, but actually, as strongly as you feel your pleasures, or your sexual urges, to realize that we are the world and the world is us. You know when you feel that very strongly, not merely as an idea but in your heart, in your whole blood, then this division as 'me' and 'you'

ceases. You understand this? Then when you realize this you become utterly responsible to whatever you are doing, whether in the area of science, politics, religion, what you will, then your actions are totally committed to the transformation of oneself, not as an individual, as a human being improving himself but an individual, a human being that has to transform himself completely so that there can be a different kind of human being in the world, and so a different kind of structure - right?

I think that is fairly clear, that the human mind has divided the world, politically, economically, religiously, socially. It has divided the world in its desire to be secure for itself. It is much more pleasant, more secure both economically and psychologically to say, "I am an Englishman held in this country", or an American, or an Indian or whatever you will. Please don't listen to this merely as a series of ideas, but observe this about you and in yourself. And this division both outwardly and inwardly has brought about great calamity, great wars, great conflicts, racial, linguistic differences, the limitations of complete total political action.

So where there is division - nationalistic, or economic or religious - where there is division outwardly or inwardly there must be conflict. I think that is so absolutely true. The division in me and in you as a Christian, a Hindu, or this or that, Communist, Socialist, you know what is going on in the world, black and white and purple and blue - all that - this division is creating immense conflict, outwardly. And inwardly the division between the observer and the observed. So before we go into that, it is an absolute truth - the realization of it is that any division both outwardly and inwardly must inevitably bring about conflict. And a



mind that wants to live completely without conflict, because it is only a mind that is capable of living totally without any kind of conflict, it is only such a mind that can observe what is truth, what is reality. And it is only such a mind that can have total peace. Are you all going to sleep?

So outwardly, that is outside of our skin, outside of our mind, the world is destroying itself - the world, which we have created, for which we are responsible, a world in which man is seeking more and more pleasure under the guise of religious pursuits or mere physical desire, over-population - you know all that. And inwardly if you observe, and if you are capable of observing yourself without distortion, without desire, without the desire to change 'what is', to observe exactly 'what is' within oneself, you will see how extraordinarily contradictory a life we lead, how broken up we are, fragmented, pursuing various contradictory desires; and so our life inwardly and outwardly is a series of conflicts, contradictions, vast division between an idea and action, and enormous sense of loneliness, sorrow, despair, agony, and our pleasures are the continuation of the desire to find joy - and joy has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure. So we are that.

Now can that structure of the human mind, this contradiction, this division, the division between the observer and the observed, the division between me and you, or we and they, the bigger guru and the lesser guru, the better meditation and - you know all that business, can all that be totally transformed so that the mind is entirely new, fresh? You know this has been a problem for the scientist throughout the world, and also for those people who are really religious, not the phoney religions of belonging to

something, of following a leader, of being conditioned for two thousand years or five thousands of years, to a certain series of beliefs, dogmas. The concern of religion is the total transformation of the human mind, and nothing else. Not what you belief in, whether you are a believer in Christ or Krishna, or some latest guru, but whether your mind, which has created this monstrous ugly world, immoral world, whether that mind can be wholly transformed, so that it can live in peace, not only within oneself but also in all its relationships. That is the function of religion - not the religion of authority, of image worship, of rituals, of dogmas, that is not religion at all. Because you have lived with that religion and where are you? You have had wars and you are preparing for wars. In yourself there is no peace, no quietness, no sense of wholeness.

So our concern then is, if you are at all serious, if you have observed the world and observed yourself, our concern then is, can the mind, which is so fragmented, which is so broken up, can that mind become whole, sane, non-contradictory and therefore a mind which is whole is a sane mind, a mind which is whole - the word implies holy h-o-l-y. So our concern is that. Can the mind, which is so fragmented, which is so broken up, dividing itself as the observer and the observed, dividing itself as pursuing one pleasure and denying that pleasure through fear, contradiction, can that mind be made whole? Right?

You know there have been so many methods, systems, philosophies to bring this about. The word 'philosophy' to me means the love of truth in daily life; not the philosophy of ideas, concepts, but the love of truth in daily life. And is this possible? I do not know if you have ever put that question to yourself?

Realizing for oneself how contradictory, neurotic, how fragmented our minds are, I do not know if you have ever put that question to yourself, and asked, can this mind be made whole, without splintering, without breaking up? If you have then what is one to do? We are going to share in this question, and see what we can do. I think the first thing to realize is the division between the observer and the observed. Is there a division between the observer and the observed? Because the observer is always controlling, shaping, trying to change 'what is', he sees what he is and the observer says, "I must change that". He sees the social structure outside him, the Establishment, political, religious and all the rest of it, and the observer says, "I must change this system", "I must bring about a different system" - right? Is the observer different from the thing he observes? Please this requires a great deal of enquiry, a great deal of attention to find out why this division exists and if that division is false, if it is false, then to see, actually feel, come upon this reality that the observer is the observed. When you realize the observer is the observed then the wastage of energy comes to an end, the energy that we dissipate when there is division between the observer and the observed. I wonder - are we meeting together in this? I am going to go into it much more.

Because this is one of the most important things to understand, not because the speaker says so but when you observe yourself, your relationship to the world, the world that is outside you, the culture, is that culture different from you? And the religions, economic structure, is that structure different from the thing that you are? So we are going to go into that.

When you observe a mountain, a tree, the flowing of waters,

surely the observer is not the observed - right? Are you following this? When one observes a tree or a mountain, and you say, "Yes, the observer is the observed" - that becomes too absurd, you are not the tree or the mountain, I hope not! So there is a division, which is natural, which is inevitable, it is obvious. May we go on? Are you following this? But the division as the observer and the observed which is essentially psychological, inward, then that division brings about great conflict between the observer and the observed. You understand? All right? Have we understood each other? Look, sirs, I watch you, I observe you, obviously you are different from me, taller, shorter, or bigger, better brains, or whatever it is, better position, more money, I observe. There the observer is different from the observed who is outwardly different. I am not you. I have got short hair, long hair, purple eyes or whatever it is, I am different from you; but psychologically, is the observer different from the thing he observes in you. or in himself? Psychologically, that is inwardly, go to India, the problems there are the same kind of problems as here - anger, jealousy, fear, pursuit of pleasure, wanting to find out more. The human problems all over the world are essentially the same. So my problem is your problem. My problem is not different from your problem, and to observe that problem without the observer becomes the most important thing.

You understand sirs, when I observe a mountain, I am not the mountain, the observer is not the observed. But when I observe myself, the observer is the observed: the observer is not different from the observed because the observer has created the observed. That is, the observer perceives, observes, is aware that he is jealous

- I am taking that one thing to look at it completely. He is aware that he is jealous, so there is a division between the observer and the observed - you are following this? When he says, "I am jealous" the observer thinks he is different from the thing he observes - right? But is the observer different from the thing he has observed? If that division can be totally eliminated then there is no conflict - you follow? But there will be conflict as long as there is the division between the observer and the observed. So we must investigate what the observer is - you are following all this? Come on sirs.

Who is the observer? Or who is the thinker, the experiencer from the experience, from the thought, from that which he has observed - now who is the observer? Is not the observer the past? The observer who has accumulated experience, knowledge and has great memory, which is the past - right? - the past as the observer is memory, experience, knowledge. So all knowledge is the past and with that he observes - you understand? Right sirs? I hope somebody is coming along with the speaker. So he observes, observes that which is. That which is, is the present. That which is, is what he has created - right? Look, I'll go into it. He says, the observer says, "I am jealous" and then he says I must conquer it, I must overcome it, or justify it, or get bitter, angry, furious. So there is a conflict between the observer and the observed, which is jealousy. Now is there a division at all? Or the observer is the observed? Now just a minute. The observer, the thinker, says, "I am jealous", the moment he uses that word 'jealousy' he has put it into a framework of words which are the result of past experience - right? Are you following this a little bit, please, give a little

attention? When I say, "I am jealous", I recognize that feeling, I recognize it because I have had that experience, that sensation, that feeling before. So I have used the word 'jealousy' in the past, and I apply that word to the present - right? And the application of that word to the present feeling brings about a division between the observer and the observed. Are we sharing this together? Right?

So as long as there is a division between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. And that is a wastage of energy, the overcoming, the indulging in hatred, the justification of jealousy, all that is a wastage of energy because it is the outcome of conflict. Whereas when there is a realization that the observer is the observed then you have all that energy, which is not being wasted - you follow? Then what takes place? When the observer realizes he is jealous, not jealousy as something apart from him, then what takes place? You understand? I, the thinker, the observer, is jealousy. Then what has transformed, what has taken place? Is there jealousy at all? Or to put it differently: when there is no division, what takes place? There is only then 'what is' - isn't there? There is no trying to overcome it, trying to destroy it, trying to change it, there is only 'what is' - right? Can the mind - please follow this a little bit - can the mind remain with 'what is' without any movement of changing it or undermining it, or overcoming it, just be with it? You understand sirs? I am ambitious - I am not, but I am taking that - I am ambitious, I want to be something enormous, you know. That is a fact, if I am. Before I wanted to fulfil my ambition: I became brutal, ruthless, self pursuit of self-fulfilment, bitterness, frustration, all wastage of energy, and ambition is cultivated in this culture. And I am ambitious, with all

its conflicts, frustrations, bitterness, anger, you know - you all know it very well. I realize I am ambition, there is no division between the observer and the observed - right? There is only ambition. Can the mind remain with that? That is, can the mind not escape it, try to transform it, try to deny it or suppress it, but to see exactly as it is. Then what takes place?

As long as there is a way out, as long as there is the desire to overcome it, or to rationalize it, or to suppress it, there is conflict, but when all that ceases because the observer is the observed, then is there ambition at all? Or a total summation of energy, and no longer called ambition? You understand what I am talking about? No longer this pursuit of its fulfilment. Are we sharing this together? Not as an idea, that would be hopeless, but as an actuality: take your own ambition, take your own whatever it is, look at it, see all the implications involved in it - always wanting to be powerful, you know what ambitions is. It is a self-centred activity, in the name of society, in the name of god, in the name of whatever it is, it is self-centred activity. And when it is frustrated there is anger, bitterness. And in seeing all that, which is a wastage of energy, the mind then says, then realizes the observer is the observed, there is no division, therefore there is no conflict. And then is there ambition, or is there an energy which has come out of this observation? You understand? It is no longer ambitious, it has tremendous energy, which you are wasting now in conflict. Right?

Then the problem arises how does the energy express itself? You are following all this? You understand? Being ambitious, competitive, seeking power, position, all that is self-centred activity - right? One may write a marvellous book and one may

write it through desire to fulfil your particular talent, or it may be desire to have more money - you know all that business. And you have spent a great deal of energy on all that. And when that self-centred activity comes to an end you have an extraordinary sense of energy - right? How does that energy act? We know how ambition acts, we know how self-centred activity acts - jealousy, you know all that, now when there is not that self-centred activity, and therefore a great, total summation of energy, without the 'me', you understand all this, then what is its activity? Will you go and join Communism, Socialism, become Catholics - you are following all this - go to church, temple, mosque, follow some guru? Come on sirs. What will you do with that energy? This is one of our problems, please you understand? You realize how one wastes energy, in conflict, in battles, it took tremendous energy to kill people, wars, now you have no war - actual physical war - but you have economic war going on - right? You have religious war, we know how all that energy is being wasted. Now you say, "I have this energy", there is this tremendous sense of vital energy which is no longer wasted - what is its action? I wonder if you have asked this question, have you? I am asking it for you.

Now how does this energy come about? You understand my question? It comes about only when it has observed 'what is' and remains with 'what is', and it can only do that when there is no division between the observer and the observed. Are you coming with me? The mind has examined what is implied in jealousy, examined what is implied in ambition, and various problems, one can examine them all, look at them, observe them, feel them, investigate them, and through that investigation and observation



comes a realization that there is no division between the observer and the observed. And that can only come about, and the summation of that is intelligence isn't it? Are you following this? The summation of that energy is intelligence, it is not your intelligence or my intelligence, or the racial intelligence, it is something entirely different. And that intelligence will operate, not doing something silly, neurotic, selfish. And that is the real transformation of the mind. You are following all this?

And that involves, all this involves a mind that is capable of observing - observing without any distortion, without any neurotic illusions. Can you observe without any colouring, observe your life exactly as it is? How silly, absurd, or how beautiful, whatever it is, exactly as it is, narrow, petty, ambitious, greedy, frightened, competitive, wanting position, you know all that, caught in a network of fears. Can you observe all that without the division as the observer and the observed? If you can, really, not as an idea, actually, if you have done it, if you do it, then you will see that out of this observation comes an extraordinary sense of great creative intelligence, and that operates in our relationship. Because all life is relationship - right? You can't live by yourself, although we try to. We enclose ourselves with our ideas of how important we are, or how little we are, and we enclose ourselves. It is this part of self-centred activity which destroys relationship.

So as our life is a movement in relationship, movement not just a static state of relationship, it is a movement, and as our relationship in our daily life is so terrible, so ugly, so contradictory, such a battle - probably you know this better than I do, what your relationships are, the fight between man and woman, the

attachments, the dominance, you know what goes on, the sexual pleasures and you know all this don't you? And if there is no right relationship, which can only be brought about when the observer is the observed - you understand - when relationship isn't based on an image, the image which you have created about another, and what the other has created about you, and in that there is division and therefore there is conflict. So as life is all a movement in relationship, to understand that relationship is to understand the self-centred activity, which separates you and me and therefore conflict between you and me. And that conflict is essentially between the observer and the observed. The observer is the past and he tries to control the observed, he tries to change the thing that is 'what is'. But when there is only 'what is' then there is complete change of 'what is', and therefore complete summation of energy, which is intelligence.

Would you like to ask questions about what we have talked about this morning? Just a minute.

Q. How does one find the energy to...

K. Just a minute sir. Before you ask questions, take a breath, will you, because you have listened to the speaker for an hour and ten minutes. So just take a breath.

Now to ask questions is very important, isn't it? And to whom are you asking the question? To whom are you putting the question? To the speaker? Or are you putting the question as a means of enquiry? Which is different from putting the question to another from whom you expect an answer. You understand sir? Are you putting the question as a means of enquiry and therefore your enquiry may lead to something totally different from what

you expect. Or are you putting the question to the speaker to find an answer? You see the difference? So find out before you put the question whether you are putting it to find an answer from the speaker, or you are investigating by asking. In investigating by asking we are both sharing the thing together - you understand? Otherwise you put a question and the speaker says, yes this is the answer, then that is too silly. So we are putting the question in order to enquire, and that enquiry may lead to something totally different from what you want, and you must be prepared in putting the question to see something which you totally detest, or don't want. So your mind then is free to enquire. Right? What do you want to say sir?

Q. (Inaudible, about thought in the past)

K. Are you asking sir, what is thinking - are you asking how to pursue one thought?

Q. To be aware of each thought and to...

K. How am I, the questioner says, to pursue each thought? To be aware of each thought? That is the question. Now why do you want to be aware of each thought? Do you know what is implied in that, to be aware of each thought?

Q. It is very difficult.

K. Very difficult - why? Why do I want to be aware of each thought?

Q. Self knowledge, isn't it?

K. Wait. Is that self knowledge? He says that is self knowledge, to be aware of each thought, that is self knowledge, knowing oneself. Now let us find out, may we?

I want to know about myself because that is very important, to

know about myself. Because if I don't know about myself I know nothing - right? I then only repeat what has been said. I just automatically act. In knowing myself, why there is suffering, why there is contradiction, why I am jealous, why I pursue that pleasure and avoid the other pleasure, why my mind is caught in a network of fears - I want to know all that - right? Because without knowing myself I have no *raison d'etre*. I don't know what it means to live, I just react. So I see the importance of knowing myself. Now shall I know myself by pursuing each thought, being aware of each thought? And therefore I must find out what it means to be aware - right sir? And also I must understand what thought means - right? I must not only know, understand what is awareness but also what is this thing called thought?

So what does it mean to be aware? I am aware, there is an awareness of this tent, of this marquee, with all its posts, people sitting in it, the w'nd, the movement on the canvas, the shadows and so on, I am aware of that. I am also aware of the people sitting there, their colour, their posture, their indifference, their yawning, their scratching, their lack of attention - sitting here I see all that. I am aware of it, outwardly. And also awareness means to observe what is going on inwardly, the reactions to what has been observed outwardly - right? To observe, to be aware: to be aware implies to observe without any choice, doesn't it, otherwise there is no awareness, is there? Are you getting tired? I see people yawning therefore I must stop.

If I have a choice in my awareness then it is not total awareness is it? So why does the mind choose? You follow all this? This is part of awareness. Why does the mind choose? Is it part of its

culture? It chooses between various materials, it chooses different cars, it chooses different kinds of hats and dresses and houses and this and that, but also it chooses its pleasures - I prefer to go to a guru and sit and listen to his tommy rot, or I go to church and listen to all the repetition, you know all that, or I go and sit in meditation which is a form of hypnosis, and I play with all this. Why do I choose? What does choice mean? Are you following all this? What does choice mean? Because we choose we think we are free - right? I can go from this country or to another country, from this work to another work. I can write what I like. You can't do that in Russia or wherever it is. So we think there is freedom when we can choose - right? But why do we choose? Do you choose when you see something very clearly? Is there any choice when there is complete perception of something? So the lack of total perception makes you choose. And makes you choose when you are confused. If you are not confused then there is no choice - right? I wonder if you get all this?

So awareness is attention in which there is no choice and no analysis. Analysis implies the observer and the observed - right? Analysis implies time. The observer who is analysing needs time to analyse the various contents of his mind, his consciousness, his activities. And that is one of the things we accept very easily, we must analyse, and that is the fashion. Awareness is total attention, a complete, whole thing in which there is no choice and no analysis, because analysis I see is a wastage of energy. And choice exists only when there is confusion. So I am beginning to have an inclination, a perception of what it means to be aware - right? Not a practice for heaven's sake, that becomes mechanical, stupid, but see

what takes place.

Then there is this whole question of what is thought because the gentleman said I must examine each thought. Do you want to go into all this? Isn't it your lunch time? If you examine, investigate what the whole movement of thinking is, you have to go into the question of what is memory, what is knowledge, what is the thing that accumulates, from which you act? You understand? What is the brain, where memory is stored up? I haven't read books about it, but you can observe yourself, you can do all this for yourself without reading books and going into all that. There is an experience, an incident, and that incident, that experience leaves a memory, pleasant or unpleasant, that is stored up in the brain cells - right? You can see this, it is so obvious. The very obvious thing becomes very simple, then you can go along with it. So the brain stores memory, memory is the result of experience, incidents as knowledge. So thought is the response of memory. If you had no memory there would be no thinking? Please, come on. Right? Your memory is your conditioning. You are a Christian, an Englishman, an Indian, whatever it is. And from that conditioning you react. To understand this conditioning is also to understand the 'me', which is the self. The knowing of 'me', is the freeing of the 'me'.

So thought, which we won't go into now, perhaps we'll do it tomorrow, or another day, thought is the response of the past. So thought is never new, thought is never free, it can talk about freedom - see how deceptive thought has become. Because it can choose it thinks it is free. You see this? How illusory it is. But whereas, where there is clarity, where there is perception, total attention, there is no choice, and that is real freedom. So awareness

of each thought means, awareness of the whole movement of life in action, in relationship. I think that is enough for today, don't you?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 2ND SEPTEMBER 1973**

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday, if we may? We were concerned yesterday with the question of thought and what takes place when there is only 'what is'. If you remember that is what we were talking about yesterday morning. Thought, as we said, is the response of memory; memory is experience, knowledge; and we said also that knowledge is always the past; and all action takes, as far as we see now, from the past, from this memory, whose response is thought. And all our actions are based on thought, conclusion, idea and 'what should be'. Thought itself is fragmentary, thought is never whole, thought is always from the outside, and as long as we are dealing with thought, concerned with thought and idea we cannot penetrate very deeply. That is one of our problems. We hear a statement, as you did yesterday, and you say, "I can't go into it very deeply, I can't get at it in depth" - why? Because I think what we hear is a series of words and from that you draw an idea, and a conclusion, and act according to that conclusion or idea. So one remains always on the superficial, one never penetrates very deeply, because thought in itself is not only fragmentary, but is always from the outside - right?

Please, I would repeat again that we are sharing this together, you are not merely just listening to a series of words, or ideas or conclusions, or descriptions and explanations, but we are sharing together the actuality, what is implied in all this, sharing. Therefore we must not only hear and have the meaning of the words, but also there must be a verbal communication, as well as non-verbal



communication. Communication means thinking together, sharing together, building together, understanding together. That is what communication means - if you look it up in a dictionary, that is what it means. So we are sharing these things together, You are not merely listening, accepting or not accepting, but when you share something together it is yours. And what is yours comes when we are working, thinking, acting together. Please do bear this in mind all the time, that we are not indulging in ideas, in descriptions, in analysis, in conclusion, but rather investigating, enquiring into this whole problem of a way of living in which there is no conflict, in which action is of supreme intelligence. Now that is what we were talking about yesterday briefly. Now we will go into it.

We said thinking is the result of memory, stored up in the brain, and the brain can only act in the field of knowledge, always within the field of the known - right? And that is why in the known there is so much security for us. That is why we live in the past. All our traditions, all our knowledge, all our conclusions are the result of the past. So our action is based on the past. So what place has knowledge in the transformation of a human being? You are following all this? I see in the world as it is - corrupt, immoral, preparing for war, preparing to destroy human beings, socially, economically, physically, dividing the people religiously - and so there is in the world outside of me, there is always conflict, always battle, strife, pain; and inwardly there is this battle going on in myself and in my relationship with others. This is obvious. And I say to myself, what place has knowledge, which the mind has accumulated for centuries, in which it has evolved, grown, acted, created a structure of culture, what place has that knowledge in the

transformation of my mind? You understand my question? What place has tradition, which is part of knowledge, in the transformation of the mind? And there must be transformation, there must be complete change, because otherwise one lives constantly in pain, in suffering, in misery, in confusion.

So what place has knowledge? Has it any place at all? And what is the function of knowledge? That is, the known, knowledge is the known, and thought always functions within the field of the known. It must, it has no other field. It can invent a field. It can suppose a new field, create a new field, but it is always acting from the known - right? Are you following all this?

So we are asking: what place has idea in the transformation of man? Because we have built our religion, our culture, our whole social economic system of thought, on idea, whether the Communist or Socialist, and so on, idea. The root meaning of that word 'idea' - which we looked up this morning - is to see. You understand? The meaning of that word 'idea' is to see. And from the seeing we have drawn a conclusion, an abstraction, the perfect idea, the perfect form, the perfect society, the perfect god, the perfect human being - you are following all this? From the word idea, which is to see, we have drawn a conclusion, an abstraction, and from that abstraction we act, not from the seeing. I don't know if you follow all this. So we say action can never be perfect, man can never be happy, man can never be peaceful, because we have drawn an abstraction from 'what is', and tried to approximate our action to that, and therefore there is never a complete action. All our philosophies are based on that, from the ancient Greeks to the modern, from all the ancient Hindus, the Buddhists, and so on, are

based on this. Seeing and drawing an abstraction from what you see and from that conclusion act: not from seeing acting. You understand? See what we have done. There is 'what is', 'what is' both outwardly, and inwardly, actual. And the mind doesn't know what to do with 'what is', therefore it draws a conclusion, an abstraction, and from that abstraction it tries to act, therefore action is always incomplete and therefore contradictory, therefore bringing about misery, confusion. That is what we are doing all the time. That is what you are doing now. You are listening to words and to the explanation - and the explanation, the description, is not the described, and you are satisfied with the description, from that description is an abstraction, and you say then, "What am I to do with the abstraction, how am I to put it into action?" - you are following. Whereas the speaker is saying there is no abstraction, there is only 'what is', there is only the seeing, and when you see you act; not the division between seeing and acting. I wonder if you get all this? Are we together in this? You know if you once see this, really see this then our whole movement in action is entirely different. There is no postponement of action. When you are at the edge of a precipice, which is a fact, you don't draw a conclusion, you move. Therefore action is immediate. When you are in front of a snake, a poisonous snake, there is not an abstraction, an idea, a conclusion and then movement. There is instant action. But that instant action is part of our conditioning which has told you precipices are dangerous, snakes are dangerous, therefore avoid them. Either you act from a conclusion, or from seeing 'what is' and act instantly. I don't know if you follow all this? Are we sharing this together? Please move.

So thought is a response of memory, experience, knowledge. So what place has knowledge in the transformation of man? See it. This is your problem, you understand sir? You have accumulated tremendous knowledge, psychologically, scientifically, in every field of human behaviour, human existence. You have tremendous knowledge about meditation, Zen, Transcendental, all the latest idiocy, all the absurd things that are going on, you have accumulated a great deal. You know what war is, you have suffered tremendously with the last two wars, accumulated all that knowledge, and yet you are going on in the same pattern. You are following all this? You are sending your children to be killed, educated to destroy. The other day I turned on the television and young people were being interviewed and they asked, "Would you fight for your country?" - everyone of them said they would. Not like the people before the war, they said they wouldn't fight for King or country, or for anybody. Now they would. And you know what war is, what an appalling thing it is, and yet you are sending your children, educating them to destroy each other. That is a fact. And what place has that knowledge in your life? Will it transform your way of thinking because you have experienced two wars? Come on sirs. Will you change the whole system of your education, the division of nationalities, sovereign governments preparing for wars - it is a game you are all playing. You are not serious - right?

So let's go back. What place has knowledge in the transformation of your mind, of your behaviour, of your conduct? Knowledge may be a symbol, an image, a conclusion, a field of the known. And why does the mind always cling to the known, which

is knowledge, you are following all this - why? You have had experiences of war, the suffering, the torture, the fear, the appalling noise, the destruction. And has that changed the human mind? Has it changed your mind? And why hasn't it? Why does the mind, your whole being cling to the known? Is it fear? Or is it the pleasure in the known? Or the feeling of security in the known? After all when you are brought up in a culture - and all cultures are the known, obviously, because they are based on thought, thought may imagine a perfect god, a perfect saviour, perfect human being, but it is still thought - and has it any place at all except in the field of action where the known must be applied, technology, medicine - please follow all this, it is your life, don't waste it, we have a few years to live, don't destroy it. Knowledge has its place, when you drive a car, when you speak a language, when you function in the field of technology, there, knowledge must exist - science, all that is based on knowledge.

So where does knowledge begin to destroy the human mind? We see the importance of knowledge, otherwise you and I couldn't understand each other, because we both speak English, or if we were both speaking French it would be all right, we both speak English and that implies knowledge. Knowledge has its place and when that knowledge is used for self-centred activity - the 'me' and the 'you', my country and your country, my government and all the rest of it - then that knowledge becomes a destructive knowledge - obviously. Right sirs, you are following all this, not verbally but with your heart, with the depth of your being.

So we see that idea, the meaning of that word idea is to see, and the mind sees very clearly, but immediately draws an abstraction

from seeing. Why does it do it? I see that I am a Hindu, it is stupid to call oneself a Hindu or a Christian. Probably Christians kill more than anybody else. So don't call yourselves Christians any more, or Hindus any more. I see that I am Hindu, I call myself a Hindu, I see very clearly what it does. It separates me from another, separates - my tradition, my upbringing, my culture, separates me from you. I see that very clearly, actually see it. And then I draw a conclusion that it is terrible to be divided, it destroys people. An abstraction from the seeing. Then I ask myself now how am I to put that abstraction in action? You follow? Then I want a method to put that conclusion in action; then there are a dozen people who will give you the method, the Socialists, the Communists, the religious people, the latest gurus and all the rest of it. You are following all this?

So can the mind observe, see and not draw a conclusion? And why does the mind draw a conclusion, an abstraction from 'what is'? Is it an evasion of action? Because if you saw and acted, that action may lead you to all kinds of trouble. Therefore an abstraction is a safe thing to do because you can postpone action. Therefore you live a very, very superficial life. You can never penetrate in depth because you have always this conclusion. So in conclusions, in formulas, in symbols, in the known there is safety. And the mind says, the brain says, I must be completely safe otherwise I can't function. You are following all this? If it is not safe, secure, it cannot function effectively, therefore it seeks security in a belief, in a conclusion, in an abstraction, in a symbol and in neurotic behaviour. Because if I act neurotically there is safety in that! In a conclusion that I am a Hindu, in that there is

safety. So the mind sees absolutely 'what is', it can't help it, it is all in front of it, the war, the stupid religious organizations, all that is very clear, and yet the mind accepts that, lives in that because it feels completely secure. And when it discards the old, it joins the new, the new gurus, the new racket, the new circus that is going on.

So can the mind see and act? That is the real problem. So will knowledge prevent the seeing, and therefore acting instantly? You are following this? Because life is action in relationship; and what place has knowledge in action, in relationship, because we can't live alone, it is not possible, you may think in the abstraction that you live alone, you cannot live alone. You live in relationship with another, and in that relationship between human beings there is constant battle, between man, woman, husband, wife - the whole field. And what place has knowledge in relationship? Because if knowledge cannot transform, bring about harmony in relationship, then why do we cling to knowledge? So in relationship, we are asking, what place has knowledge - knowledge being the symbol, the image, the conclusion? I know you, the image which I have built about you, which is knowledge, which is based on thought, a conclusion, and that image I have built about you and you have built about me. Don't you know this? Don't you do this all the time? Oh, let's be honest for goodness sake. And that knowledge, that image, that symbol, the word which is the known, the knowledge, isn't that a barrier between you and me? Come on sirs. So can there be a relationship in which the past never enters? Isn't that love? Oh come on sirs. Are you working as hard as the speaker to convey something which is so simple? Because we are so

conditioned by ideas, by conclusions, by abstractions, by symbols, by images, which are all the known, built by thought. Can there be a relationship in which the image is not? Have you ever tried it?

Now listen: you know what your relationship with another is very clearly, you see it, the quarrels, the indignities, the flatteries, the sexual pleasures, the comfort, you know, the relationship between you and another. You see it, don't you? Why do you draw a conclusion from it? Is it because you are trained, educated to live in strife? Because you know nothing else and therefore you accept this misery, and therefore the fear of a relationship in which the known, the image doesn't exist. That is one of the causes of fear isn't it? That is, we said idea means - the root meaning of that word is to see - I see what my relationship is, I don't draw a conclusion, an abstraction, I see exactly what it is - the pleasure, the comfort, the escape from loneliness, the attraction, companionship, friendship, sense of security - and the seeing of it doesn't eliminate all that - why? You are following all this? Because the seeing produces the fear of living a life of relationship in which there is never the image. So I have to grapple with fear - you understand all this? I have fear of loneliness, fear of not having somebody to lean on, fear of standing alone, being self-sufficient, which doesn't mean being selfishly isolated. I have fear of things I have not known, I only know this, this relationship in which there is constant battles, quarrels, misery agony, jealousy - you know this better than I do, I don't have to keep on describing it.

Why do we put up with it? Is it because we are educated to it? Because there is comfort in it, security? And there isn't security in it, what security is there in battle, in conflict, in misery? And yet



that is the field of the known. So we are asking: what place has knowledge in relationship, in the transformation of that relationship? Right? None at all, has it? Don't say 'No' - which means your relationship with another has undergone tremendous revolution, and that revolution is love. I don't know if you understand this? Not all this rot talked about love. So the mind, thought can only function within the field of the known. And thought, not knowing any other kind of relationship, except the relationship of conflict, misery, agony, suspense, suspicion, jealousy is afraid to move out of that field. And being afraid it must seek more pleasure to counterbalance, it must have much more pleasure. And the pursuit of pleasure, the principle of pleasure is the action which is brought about by a conclusion. You understand?

Q: Is memory...

K: Just a minute please. Let me finish and then you can ask questions afterwards.

So see what the mind has done, or thought has done. The seeing which is obvious, which is clear. I can see very clearly the results of war, what war does. I see very clearly, the mind sees very clearly what relationship actually is now, the mind sees very clearly where there is division there must be conflict, not only inwardly but outwardly. And not being able to deal with what it sees, it draws a conclusion and from that conclusion it acts. And we have built our whole moral, religious, social structure on this. Oh come on sirs! Now can the mind see clearly in relationship how destructive knowledge is in relationship? See it! And the seeing is the action. Not I see, draw a conclusion and from that conclusion

say, "I don't know what to do". Whereas if you saw clearly, see clearly what your relationship is, not drawing a conclusion is action, therefore action is complete and immediate. So not being able to act so drastically and immediately the mind escapes from it, escapes through pleasure and because it cannot act completely, there is fear. You follow? See what thought has done. And then we say, "How am I, who are caught in a network of fears, how am I to get out of it?" - "I am afraid of my wife, my neighbour, my job, my future, what is going to happen" - you follow? Again thought is responsible for fear. I don't know if you follow all this.

You see very clearly thought is responsible for fear - do you? Do you see it absolutely clearly, in the sense you are caught in a network of fears, aren't you, old age, death, pain, loneliness, boredom, laziness, anxiety, everything, innumerable fears. Do you say then, "How am I to get rid of it?" Or do you see actually the fear - the fear which is brought about by thought, fear of what has been and what might happen again? So do you see the network of fear, as you see clearly a poisonous snake, or a precipice? If you see it clearly it is finished. I wonder if you see this. Then you walk out of this marquee without a single shadow of fear. But as long as you see your fear, then draw a conclusion and say, "How am I to get rid of it?", "Tell me the way to do it, I know I am frightened of this and that and the other" - then you are living in abstractions, and from that abstraction there is no end to fear.

But the mind is not only avoiding fear but pursuing pleasure - right? Have you noticed how the mind is always looking, pursuing, searching for pleasure? Why? What is pleasure? Is it the desire that says, "I must have fulfilment" - you are following all this? And

then you say, "How am I to stop my desires"? - you follow? You have quantities of desires and when that desire is not fulfilled there is fear and the pursuit of pleasure - right? Look at it yourself, it is very clear. So can the mind be aware of that desire, not cut it off, be aware of it, see what its whole nature and structure of desire is, and in the very seeing the action, the acting? You see a beautiful thing, man, woman, car or whatever it is. The seeing, the sensation, the contact, the desire - right? Move along sir, let's move. And that desire needs fulfilment, whether sexually or in any direction. When that desire tries to fulfil itself in pleasure and when there is no fulfilment there is fear. Right? There is frustration, anger, jealousy, and all the rest of it begins. Now can the mind be aware, see totally the movement of the desire, see it and therefore the perception is the action?

So one begins to observe, see, be aware, of the movement of thought. See, aware, observe that knowledge is supremely necessary to function efficiently. And in relationship, and our life is from the beginning to the end a matter of relationship, and in that relationship when there is the image, the knowledge, then all our agonies begin. To see all this, not, "Oh, I have heard you say that, now how am I to carry it out?" - that is silly. But to see it, see this fact and the very seeing of it is the action. So do you see it? Or do you still live in abstractions - Platonic or other kinds of ideas and conclusions, the perfect Master, the perfect Guru, your Guru is better than my Guru - you follow? - all that business.

And is love desire? Is love pleasure? Is love an action in the field of the known? So what place has knowledge, or what is the relationship of knowledge with love? Can knowledge transform the

human mind? Obviously not. What transforms the human mind is the seeing and the action - not the seeing and the conclusion, the abstraction. Is this fairly clear?

K: Now we have talked an hour about this perhaps you want to ask questions. Yes sir?

Q: How can a prisoner in a jail, and I'm tempted to insult one of the guards, now if I insult a guard he will beat the hell out of me. So I have a greater conflict to behave in jail, and a lesser conflict to get out of jail. So by allowing thought to paralyse my action I avoid the greater conflict.

K: But surely sir you are not in jail now, are you? (Laughter). I am not being cynical but that is an abstraction you are dealing with, aren't you?

Q: Some people concretely are in jail now.

K: Surely. Look, are you aware that you are in jail? Living outside, not actually within four walls. Are you aware that you are in jail? Listen to it. Jail means you are conditioned - your culture has conditioned you, your gods, your saviours, your corrupt governments - no? The environment of which you are, that is the prison you are in. That is the prison which you have created, of which you are a part. Are you aware of it - aware totally, completely? Not the reformation of the prison - better toilet, more freedom, less freedom, you know, better, bigger yards to walk about in, bigger golf courses and all the rest of it, within the prison.

Q: What you say seems to sound so clear but I ask is it practical when people are being terrorized excessively?

K: What you are saying is not practical.

Q: No I do not say that.

K: Then what do you say sir?

Q: What I say is, is what you say practical?

K: That is the same thing. (Laughter) Is what you say practical. Wait sir. When people are being terrorized, when Russia is killing all the good writers, you know, all that - is what you are saying practical? Do you think what is happening is practical?

Q: No what I think is practical...

K: Just a minute sir, I am asking you. Is what you are all doing, is it very practical? With your sovereign governments, preparing for wars with your lovely armies, a great deal of fun these army people must be having inventing new gadgets to kill, and you know what is actually happening right throughout the world - is that very practical? People starving. Oh come on sirs. Obviously that is not practical is it? And you say what we are saying is impractical, or not practical. On the contrary, this is the most practical thing because you eliminate conflict in relationship - you understand sir? You eliminate all your structure of religious, psychological, non-phantasies, you are functioning efficiently, completely practically within the field of knowledge, and eliminating totally every form of image in relationship. That is the most practical thing isn't it? But you can't do it and you won't do it, and that is what makes it impractical. If you did it, it would be the most practical thing alive.

Q: Sir, I was wondering from those two gentlemen that were speaking, I was wondering if people that are concerned about the evils that are abroad, if it is just to avoid looking at the evils that are right here now.

K: The gentleman asks are you asking these questions from abroad, what is going on outside, abroad, avoiding what is going

on in yourself? That is the game we all play sir. You are educated to this kind of activity.

So please let us be practical. Which is, to see what is impractical - your gods, your saviours, the images that you have built, they are totally impractical. What is practical is to see the false, see it and the seeing is the ending of that which is false, that is the most practical thing to do. And that is complete action. What is impractical is the fragmentary action, acting irresponsibly, you act fully in one direction and incompletely in another direction. Contradictory, that is most impractical, that is devastating.

Q: We can see the falseness but how to apply the other.

K: How to apply?

Q: I mean the first question was sir that when thought arises it is from the past, to be aware of that, and also are we aware of the action of the past?

K: Sir, just listen sir. I have explained that very carefully. Don't apply anything that you hear. You have heard a great deal from everybody, from philosophers, from the politicians, from the priests, all the rest of it. Don't apply: look, observe, see clearly what is going on under your nose.

Q: I am talking about the observation of thought.

K: Yes sir. Now when you observe thought, observe thought, how do you observe thought? Is there a thinker observing thought? Come on sirs. When there is an observer observing thought, the observer is thought, one thought looking at another thought, one fragment of thought looking at another fragment of thought, and saying "I must be aware of that thought" or "I must control that thought, I must suppress that thought, I must overcome that

thought". But the observer, the thinker is the thought. That is a fact. That is, if you see that, not abstract, if you see that then you will see the place of thought, the necessity of clear thinking. And what relationship thinking has in relationship? You understand? What place has knowledge in relationship?

Q: Sir, as an organism that can't see, it can only attempt to see, surely it has got a double agent.

K: An organism that is incapable of seeing itself, it can only attempt, that brings about a duality.

Q: Listening to your talk, I have no question to ask, you can tell by my voice, the solution is here, right? It doesn't solve my problem. O.K. you can answer me that I can't observe. And I tell you I observe and I say to you, well all right I am not observing. It seems to me that the state of being whatever that may be, is in itself, it is the problem, and the problem is trying to separate from the problem. I mean it can only separate with the part of the organism that is the problem.

K: Sir, what is a problem? Just a minute sir. What is a problem?

Q: Surely it is not seen.

K: No, no. I am trying to understand, we are trying to understand what the word means first, problem. What does it mean? Something you have not dissolved, that is that you haven't understood, that you haven't resolved, that you haven't - it exists. I have a problem, we have a problem, why does the problem exist? I am jealous of you. I make that into a problem, don't I. Because you are clever, you are nicer, in every way you are more etc., and I am jealous, I like to be like you and I am not like you, and I have that problem. That problem implies comparison, imitation, conformity

to what I think you are, and wanting to conform to that. I make a problem of it - why?

Q: Sir you are right, but as a phenomenon, as...

K: Yes sir, go on.

Q: As a phenomenon, as something living, as I am walking about here, talking to people - reducing this - I can't tell it to you any other way - I see what you are saying but again I am talking through my head. I am introducing this idea as a phenomenon.

K: Yes sir, that is just what we are saying. Don't do that.

Q: Precisely but...

K: I know, I know sir.

Q: But not doing it is doing it.

K: I understand that. That is why...

Q: It's a monkey. You are telling the monkey, you are giving him two messages. This is a schizophrenic situation.

K: I understand this, I understand this very well. Then what do we do? You won't listen. Of course sir.

Q: I want to listen but I can't listen.

K: That's it. I want to listen but I can't listen. And you make that into a problem. Don't listen, go out, forget it. (Laughter)

Q: Again that is a thought, because I wouldn't be here.

K: That's it. If you want to listen, listen completely with your heart, with your mind, with your nerves, everything that you have got, with that listen. If you don't want to listen, go out, forget it, but you can't forget it because the seed is sown. And that is what happens with all of us, with most people. The seed is sown and they can't remove that seed. That seed is an idea, is a conclusion, which has no reality. Wait, wait! Therefore live in a world of non-



reality, if you want to live that way. Forget the rest. And if you want to break it, break it, get away from it by seeing actually what is.

Q: One is still concerned with want.

K: I am using the word sir, want, don't stick to words, get the meaning of the words. Look. I want to listen to you. I say if you want to listen, listen, with your heart, with your mind, not only to the words but to the non-verbal statement. That is real communication. Then you listen completely, not partially. If you listen so completely there is nothing more. That is the greatest miracle. But if you say, "Well I am really not interested in this but I like what you are saying, it is a very good idea, it is so good", this, that and the other - then play with it, go out and do something else. But that has no reality, you haven't solved a thing. And when we are talking about human transformation you have to give your blood to this - you understand? - blood in the sense of your whole life to it.

Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I see. Lust is not related to thought, and lust must fulfil. Is that what you are saying sir? One example is good enough. Lust must fulfil irrespective of thought - right? Is that it? I never heard this strange statement before. Let's examine it. Lust, sex, it must express itself - why? Is lust like hunger? Hunger, when there is hunger there must be food, otherwise if food is not given the organism gets weak, can't function and so on. Is lust independent of thought?

Q: We only know it as thought.

K: I am asking you sir. Is lust independent of thought?

Q: I think it is, I don't know.

K: Don't you know? Look sir, what is lust, what is sex, why do we give such tremendous importance to this thing? Why? Have you noticed? More and more sex - magazines - you follow? You are supposed to have discovered it recently!! Is it because you have nothing else in life? Is it because everything else in your life is uncreative, destructive, meaningless? Your gods, your society, wars, nothing has any meaning except this? Intellectually you are secondhand, you repeat what dozens have said, therefore there is no movement there, you are merely repeating, therefore there is no vital, creative, directive energy in that. And you have this left. You go to the office, which is a boredom, go to work, live, everything is meaningless now. And to this you give a tremendous meaning, out of proportion. This has become all life. You see that and you don't do a thing about it. You don't say, "Well I'll find out why I imitate, why I think what others think, what my conditioning is" - you follow? - break up the structure of one's own life, living. And if you don't, your life becomes monotonous, meaningless, useless, and you have this one thing left. There at least you think you are free. And you blow this up out of all proportion. And that you call love.

Yes sir, now if you see that, see that your mind, your brain, your mind, is so secondhand because your mind is full of what others have said, your education, you know the whole business. And when you see that you begin to find out why you conform, why you imitate, what are the implications of imitation. And whether the mind can be really free of every kind imitation. And where

there is the necessity of imitation, keeping to the left side of the road, and when you go abroad keep to the right side of the road. Where conformity, comparison - you don't look into yourself, therefore one leads a superficial, meaningless life. And it is a very short life.

Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible - About inside and outside impressions)

K: But sir...

Q: You get the feeling, I am something because I am not alive. You see those who go to the Maharishi and you say well I am not one of those - you understand?

K: I am going to repeat it sir. You go down the street, you are stimulated by the people you are seeing, short skirts, nakedness, and also you see further along, as you walk along, you see the people of Krishna consciousness, Maharishi Yogi or some other guru, and you say to yourself, "Thank god I'm not any of those people" (Laughter). You are neither associated with the Christians, with the Protestants, with the Catholics and so on and so on. And then you feel alone, and you are frightened of being alone, therefore you cling to something that your mind says you will find there security, whether it is a woman or an idea, or a man, or an image. Now to see all that sir, to observe all the stimuli from outside and how the mind depends on stimuli, and whether the mind can keep awake totally without any stimuli. You understand sir? That is the real thing. We need experience to keep us alive, therefore we look to experience, to outward stimuli, but to have no stimuli from outside, which means to be a light to oneself. A light to oneself.

Q: Surely you can isolate yourself.

K: No, no. I have been through all that sir. Isolation is not a light to yourself. Isolation means withdrawal, resistance, conforming not to that pattern but to another pattern. But to be a light to yourself means you are a light to the world - you understand sir? - not to yourself, you are a light.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What am I to do with the world and myself? Right? You are not separate from the world, and you are the world. That is so. Now what is your action, not only with regard to the world, and what is your action in relationship? What is the practical action? Go into it sir, that is your question, I am trying to investigate that question. You are the world, and the world is you. Are you asking the question, what am I to do with the world, which is so confused, brutal, violent, sick, mad, and what am I to do with the world? But you are the world, you are mad. Yes sir! You are insane, you are immoral. Wait sir, wait. So you say, "How am I to help the world?" - you can't unless you become totally sane you can't do a thing, and the practicality is be sane, not become sane.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **4TH SEPTEMBER 1973**

K: What shall we talk over this morning together? It is really not a discussion but a dialogue, conversation between two or more people: a conversation between people who are really serious, who are dedicated to the discovery of what freedom means, what authority means - you know the whole problem of existence, what is involved in it. I wish we could talk over these things together simply and very clearly. So what would you like to talk about?

Q: The nature of thought.

Q: I have a question for you. You talk about approaching this with a serious mind, and I'd like to ask whether in attempting to discuss with you, in attempting to ask a question, or just a dialogue, there is on my part at least a kind of self flattery. Now with this self flattery there, just in participation, how can there be seriousness?

Q: Sir, at the basis of all this there seems to be a word, at least a reality to which the word points, and it seems that between those two points it needs a certain quality of seriousness to do it, to want to do it. Now if one hasn't got that quality of seriousness, if one hasn't got that passion that you talk about, as I think most of us haven't because we haven't gone beyond the word, you know, is it an impossibility from viewing this question from where we stand, so that we will want to look and really to enquire deeply into these things.

K: Need I repeat that question? Right. Shall we talk first about the nature of thinking, which was first asked? Why is the mind

caught in a verbal dilemma, verbal cage, and how can the mind be serious if it is merely functioning at the verbal level? Shall we discuss that? Would it interest you? Has it any value?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't say 'Yes' casually but let us...

He wanted to know what is the nature and the structure of thought, and whether thought can disentangle itself from the verbal network it has created for itself and functions so superficially, and cannot go very deeply. Would that cover that?

Sirs, first of all to discuss such a subject one has to go into the question: why does the mind shape or form words, symbols, images? Is it the very nature of thinking - we are asking, please I am not laying down anything - is it the nature of thought to fragment, to bring about a fragmentation between the observer and the observed, between the word and the non-word, between the action and the formula - you follow? - is it the nature of thought? Thought in itself must function in a formula, in a framework of words, images, knowledge. I do not know if you have ever realized that we always have a formula, a conclusion, a verbal conceit? You have seen probably on television, and other places, a whole group of children being trained, trained to conform to the pattern of that particular State, or that particular ideology, whether that ideology be Catholic, Communist, Hindu and so on and so on. And we are all trained in that, aren't we?

Q: I was thinking that if a concept...

K: That's right, that is what we said the other day. It is so, isn't it? I see children, students, and I say they must do this, this, this.

Q: The lady said there was a difference between a concept

derived from that tree, and a concept derived from an ideal that I have about something, because the ideal never has been, the tree is actually a fact.

K: Yes, is that what she said. As we said, look at that plant. Why do you form a verbal conclusion about that plant? Why can't you look at it non-verbally? Go slowly, we'll go into it very deeply a little later. Why can't I look at that plant without a formula, without giving it a name, a category, a formula, why can't I observe without all the movement of thoughts, words and emotions, all that popping in? Why can't I just observe?

Q: There is one thing, if you want to communicate with somebody else you have to have words.

K: Or is it that we have so cultivated our memory, cultivated verbally this whole verbal structure, created by thought, that we look at everything through the screen of thought?

Q: Sir you are talking about habit.

Q: Can you observe without being conscious that you really are observing?

K: Can you observe without being conscious that you are observing. Let's begin again slowly. We are going off.

The question is, we began: what is the nature and the structure of thought? Can the mind be free of this verbal structure, that was what you were saying, and not be caught in a series of words, formulas, repetitive memories - right?

Q: That is not quite what I asked.

K: All right, put it your own way, sir.

Q: It was a step before that sir. In order to ask that question it demands a certain amount of seriousness in one already to want to

enquire. That is part of enquiry what you ask. I want desperately to find out that quality of passion.

K: I see, I understand, I beg your pardon. How do we get - that is a different question, isn't it? - how do we have this passion for enquiry? How do we have this passion to find out? Let's begin with that, shall we?

What brings about passion in one? I am not passionate, not in the lustful sense, I haven't got the feeling, the energy, the passion, the vitality, the intensity to go into something very serious, I haven't got it, and I see that quality of passion, energy, vitality is necessary. Like a scientist, if he hasn't got this passion he is not a scientist. Now how does it come about? Shall we enquire into that?

Q: Yes.

K: At last! (Laughter) Now let's differentiate between passion and lust. That is clear, isn't it? We know that, so we can put that aside, shall we? All right.

Q: One inspires the other.

K: Look at it. You say that lust can inspire passion. Can it? Sensual desire, not only sexually, sensual desire to possess a good house, a good something or other - possessiveness, you understand? - lust, lusting after what - not only man, woman, lusting after property, power, position, prestige; that is entirely different surely from having intense passion. No?

Q: It is, yes.

K: Look, the word passion comes from the word sorrow. The root meaning of passion is sorrow. And we all suffer, we all go through various categories of suffering, stages of suffering, but apparently that doesn't produce passion - right?



Q: Even if I look at a scientist I am not at all sure that he doesn't have, in a more higher way perhaps, lust.

K: Yes he may have lust, for wanting to be famous. I am talking sir, of a man who is passionate, not lustful. That is clear. Now we say, how does it come about?

Q: But are we all assuming that we all know what passion is?

K: We are not. Suppose I don't know what passion is. I see passionate people, people who are dedicated, they may be dedicated to some kind of illusion, some kind of stupidity, some kind of state and so on, but we are questioning a passion that is not attached to action.

Q: Not possessed.

K: Not possessed.

Q: Have we even established that passion is related to sorrow?

K: I said sir, the root meaning of the word passion means sorrow, from a dictionary, that is all. I did not say - I am just looking at the dictionary, and when I looked at it passion means, the root meaning is that it derives from sorrow. You see sir, it is so difficult to converse, or have a conversation with you if you have an opinion. If you have a formula that passion is this, passion isn't that, passion is not... you follow, you don't come to it afresh. We are enquiring, you understand sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look here, sirs. He suggested there is a great deal of wastage of energy in all of us. We waste a great deal of energy. And one of the great outlets of wastage of energy is having concepts - right? You see sir what is happening in the world? The Catholics, in the olden days, not so very long ago, they burnt people, they tortured

people, Inquisition and all the rest of it, anybody who thought contrary - right? The Communists in Russia are doing it, anybody who thinks contrary is sent to a mental hospital. And this being trained, educated in a formula, my country is the greatest, the Soviet is the most marvellous, Mao is the greatest god on earth - and so on and so on, these formulas condition the mind - right? Please, that is obvious. Now is that not a fundamental reason for wastage of energy.

Q: Very often a pattern helps.

K: Therefore you say a pattern helps. Helps what?

Q: The pattern that is necessary at this particular period of time.

K: Conditioning the mind to a pattern is necessary at this particular time. So did the Russians say that, the Catholics said that, everybody has said that at the time it is necessary; and therefore you are saying that at this time it is necessary.

Q: I am asking if it is, I am not saying it is.

K: Sir instead of asking, let's first find out. Where pattern, conformity, formula, being trained to operate in a certain manner, is that a wastage of time? Or in certain directions it is necessary and in that field there must be certain conformity and so on, that is not wastage of energy. But whereas when the mind is in relationship with human beings, whether it is a child or a grown up man, when it functions with a formula it is wasteful of energy. That is all we are saying - right?

Q: Do you not see, do not all of us see, tremendous danger of 1984 becoming very close and all this idea of computerization, making each one of us in this tent puppets in the eyes of the authority, all authority, whatever it is, that will undoubtedly arise.

K: Sir, C.I.D. - you know what C.I.D. is, Criminal Investigation Department. They have followed me, FBI and so on and so on. We all may be conditioned in a certain direction, perhaps that is going to happen. We are now trying to discuss - please let's keep to this - what is passion, will it come about when there is no wastage of energy, and what is wastage of energy? Keep to that simple thing.

K: Look sirs, I see conforming to a certain pattern is not a wastage of energy, keeping to the left side of the road is not a wastage of energy, on the contrary if I kept to the right side of the road when the country says keep to the left, there is going to be an accident and that is a wastage of energy, and so on and so on. And it is a wastage of energy when I function with formulas in my action in relationship. Right? I see a group of children, students, I saw it last night, and you saw it here in the tent, and I saw it on the television, where in Russia, everybody is being - you know - put through the mill, to conform. To me that is a wastage of energy.

Q: I don't know anything else sir.

K: I know that is what we are saying. Of course we don't know anything else. We are so conditioned to accept formulas, to live with formulas, to function within concepts, conclusion, that is all we know, and we are monkeys. How do we break through that? As the gentleman pointed out, by 1985 we all may be so suspect by then - you know - the big brother will be with us.

Q: Sir, could we look at it like this? Between seeing and acting, I think the time creates an ego, which draws the conclusions.

K: That is right sir. Where there is a division between action and idea it must be a wastage of energy - right sir? The idea as we know is a concept, concept or a conclusion derived from

perception. Seeing, drawing a conclusion from seeing, and acting according to that conclusion. That is essentially a wastage of energy. And when there is no wastage of energy then there is passion.

Q: This ego is created at that very moment. We feel it is permanent but if we watch it we learn it is created.

K: Look sir, let's go through it. Let's go into it. Do I, or do you, function from a conclusion? Children must work in the garden, students must do this, or you know, formulas, you understand all this, dozens and dozens of formulas we have. Have you? Come on sir, have you?

Q: We have any amount of them.

K: You have any amount of them, the lady says. And do you see that having these formulas is a wastage of energy?

Q: The conditioned formulas.

K: Wait sir, wait. I am just, step by step we will go into it. I have a formula, I function with formulas, from formulas, I look at you and I say you are an Englishman, or a German, or a Jew, or an Arab, or a Hindu, or some blasted race? (Laughter) Wait a minute, please. And from that I look at you - you follow? - I look at young people and say they must work, they must build, they must put their hands in the earth. I agree they should put their hands to the earth, it is marvellous to work with the earth, but I want to force them, I want to compel them - you follow? Now I am saying to you, asking you, having these formulas, opinions, judgements, is that not a wastage of energy? If it is a wastage of energy, why don't you break through it? Why do you keep on formulating?

Q: I don't see how that is a wastage of energy.

K: I'll show it to you. I see a snake, a cobra, a real poisonous snake, the seeing there is immediate action, isn't it? Right? That is not a wastage of energy, is it? Right sir? Now I see I am greedy, and I then begin to say, "I must be greedy, I must not be greedy," - I rationalize it - you follow. I don't say, 'greed', see the whole complex network of the action from greed, and seeing is acting, ending it instantly.

Q: Sir I'd like to say that you are skipping. You are saying that seeing is action. You are already at the end.

K: Wait. I know it, sir. Please just listen. I see a snake, a dangerous snake and there is instant action. That instant action has taken place because generations have said "Beware of snakes" - my mind, the mind is conditioned to snakes, and acts instantly. Follow this up. The mind is conditioned for generations to say, "Well be greedy, but get over it gradually". Have the ideal of non-greed or non-violence but do it gradually. The gradually of freeing oneself from violence is a wastage of energy. And we keep this going - you follow sir? Now some of us have these formulas. You listen to what is being said and you will go on with those formulas, and at the end of it you say, "I have no passion". Right?

So, can you observe, be aware that one has these formulas, concepts, opinions, judgements, which denies freedom, you follow, and it is only when there is freedom there is energy, there is this passion, obviously. Now are you aware of your conclusions?

Q: Sir, a minute ago you said that telling the children to go and work with their hands in the garden was a conclusion. But when you tell the children to go and clean the house and take care of the garden - it is probably a conclusion but a conclusion derived from

absolute reality.

K: Now wait sir, I'll answer that question. You will see it. We have to face that question here.

Q: I know sir.

K: I have worked in the garden, put my hands in the earth, planted trees, dug, all kinds of things and for me it is a great joy to work with the earth. How am I to show the student the necessity of doing it without compelling him? That is the problem. Right sir? I see the garden - it is necessary to work. Now how am I without bringing about the compulsive authoritarian drive, to make that student do it naturally? Right?

Q: Let him go hungry.

K: No, no. You see? You understand sir? How am I to do it?

Q: Can't you say "I'll show them"?

K: You show them and they say, "Go ahead and do it" (Laughter).

Q: Isn't there a responsibility in freedom?

K: Please madame don't emphasize that. Look at it. It is necessary, essential to work with the earth. How am I as a teacher, in a community, how am I to help them to do it without any form of authority, without any form of compulsion, any form of imitation? Right? How am I to do it?

Q: I don't know sir.

K: I'll show it to you. We'll go into it sir. Does this interest you?

Q: Yes.

K: Why? Going away from ourselves? All right.

First of all, as we have done here, I would discuss it with them, talk over it. I would, as we have done, talk about authority, the

dangers of authority, whether it is the authority of the older, the authority of the priest - authority. Then because they are not used to freedom, but are used to reaction - you follow sir - therefore they say, "All right, no authority, we will do what we like" - etc.etc. So we say, "You can't do what you like, etc., etc... This is a community, we all have to live together, if each one did what he liked nothing would happen". So we discuss, go into it; they begin to see. Then we talk about conformity, imitation, how destructive it is, how the mind seeking security will conform, through fear, through reward, through punishment, it will conform; so push all that aside, open the door to all that. Right sir? Some of them see, some of them don't. So we keep on and on, so that the mind, they themselves begin to see the importance of action without compulsion. Right? They do, some of them do, some of them don't. Out of a large number of students, out of a hundred there might be ten. So can we awaken their intelligence, which will then direct them, direct them to work with the earth, you follow, awaken their intelligence? That is the real problem. Not that they must work in the garden, in the vegetable or whatever it is, get up at a certain time, go to bed at a certain time. If we can awaken their intelligence their problem is solved.

Q: Why do you want to awaken their intelligence? Why don't you leave them alone?

K: Wait Sir. Why don't we leave them alone. I wish we could. But society has ruined them, ruined the parents, the grandparents, the generations after generations after generations, each generation has been ruined by their previous generation. And now you have got a product called a baby, a child who if you leave him alone he

does everything opposite, contradictory. Did you see that cartoon in one of the magazines in New York: two little children, brother and sister standing looking down from a window, and the brother says to the girl, his sister, who is watching the hippies go round, "There goes the Establishment" (Laughter).

So our problem is, not only with the students, but also with ourselves, we are brought up to obey, to conform, to imitate, to compete, ambitious and all the rest of it, and all these are words as a formula which condition our thinking, and can the mind be aware of these formulas and be free of them?

Q: Don't we have to have the passion first?

K: No, I haven't got the passion. I see - please - if I have the passion then there is no problem.

Q: Do you know that you are free when you are aware?

K: No sir, please don't go into freedom and awareness. I am just asking you one thing. You have formulas, haven't you? For god's sake, let's be honest about this. Of course you have them. I am a Hindu and I have got a dozen formulas - how to meditate, how to sit when I meditate, what I should think when I meditate, how to control my thoughts and so on and so on and so on. Or if I am a Communist, the State is all important, the individual is not and so on and so on. I have got dozens of formulas. And I see very clearly such formulas in relationship destroy relationship, waste energy. Obviously. Now can you see your formulas and put an instant end to them? If you can't then you are wasting energy, you will never have passion.

Q: Now sir let me bring you back a little to what we were discussing before. Let's translate what we were talking about this



garden, the children in this garden, to a national community anywhere in the world today. And then I question aren't a few of these formulas absolutely necessary, just for survival. There you are with eight hundred million people...

K: I agree sir.

Q: Let me finish please. And then let's say, let's remove all political ideologies and so on and let's just talk about the fact of survival. We have to feed half a million people and therefore we have to instruct them in agriculture - divide the country into so many areas and therefore we have decided that some of this area should be devoted to wheat, corn and so on and so forth.

K: Of course sir.

Q: We have four seasons a year and therefore during the winter time our efforts should be concentrated and so on and so forth because the computers and the science have decided. So I tell the people, the people in the north - whatever the case may be. Now this is a formula and this is a conclusion, as much as it is a conclusion to tell the children here to go and garden.

K: Not at all. I agree sir. I agree with you when you say the computer, political ideas aside, the computer says plant this in the north, that in the east, that in the sunshine, that is perfectly right. That is a necessity for survival.

Q: And it is a necessity for survival here for children...

K: Wait sir, now wait a minute. Now what happens? You have a group of students and they must survive. How will you bring about their survival intelligently? Not just survive.

Q: Why not?

K: Sir this is a problem, we have to meet it day after day as it

arises. Not say well they must do this and they must not do that. So let's come back, sorry.

I have a formula or a thousand, or a dozen formulas, why does my mind refuse to be free of them? I know logically, that it is a wastage, I know in relationship with other human beings it destroys affection, love and all the rest of it, and it creates wars and all that. Why doesn't my mind break from it?

Q: Fear.

Q: Security.

K: In an illusion I take security, and that illusion causes me fear, and I know it has no reality, and yet I go on.

Q: Because everybody else does.

K: Why?

Q: You have got to identify with something.

Q: By looking at the formula I no longer have to observe 'what is'.

K: Sirs, please you are not answering my question, sorry.

Q: We feel safe.

K: You feel safe in a formula - right? Now what is a formula? What is a formula?

Q: The course of action.

K: A course of action. Now wait a minute. A formula in which you take security is the course of action. And before you talk about action, what is a formula?

Q: Words.

K: You are saying words? Hold on a minute. Are they words?

Q: They are distinct movements in the brain.

K: Look. I see the children, the students, and I say they must

work in the garden.

Q: Memory.

K: No, please. I am asking you please what is a formula? What is the nature of a formula? Wait. Do you know what that word form means? It comes from the word form. Form means to give shape to something.

Q: An idea.

K: Wait. Idea means to see. Don't get away, please sir, do give me two minutes. Formula means form. Form means to give shape, give a contour to something. We give a contour, a shape by words - right? - to a thought. Thought is the word - right? Thought is not different from the word. I am a Hindu, the word makes me the Hindu - no? With all the memories, all the images, all this business, all that. So the form means giving shape to, by word to a perception - right? I see the tree, that bush, and the mind forms, gives shapes to a thought, a word. And the mind is caught in that word - right? This is step by step. Are you following? So formula is a series of words which gives shape to a conclusion, to an abstraction - that's right - right sir? Seeing, abstraction, the abstraction is the movement of thought in words. Oh come on sirs.

Q: This formula creates in my inertia the necessity of doing something.

K: No, I think formula makes me more inert. Please the basic meaning of idea is seeing. The seeing is the action and my mind refuses to act instantly because it has got formulas, conclusions, opinions, and therefore there is conflict between action and the conclusion. I conclude I must not be violent. But I am violent. I conclude that I must not be violent. The conclusion of not being

violent is the postponement of dealing with violence immediately.

Q: Sorry sir, can you repeat that?

K: I don't know what I said. I'll have to repeat it differently. I am violent. I am violent because Society has helped me to be violent, from the higher apes I have learnt violence, all that. My whole structure of thought, being, is violent, and it has produced appalling misery in the world, division and so on. So observing, watching, learning, history shows that I must not be violent. The religions say "Don't be violent". So there is the conclusion of not being violent but I am violent. Now, that conclusion is the postponement of coming directly into contact with the feeling of violence and ending it instantly. That is my whole point. So conclusions, formulas, ideologies are idiotic and wasteful.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't accept this. This is how I live, this for me is reality, not just a verbal statement. If I am violent I look at it, I go into it instantly.

Q: Why does violence end if you are in contact with it?

K: I am showing it to you madame. Why does violence end if you are in contact with it. I am going to go into it.

First of all, see this fact, that being violent, my mind has been trained to an ideology of not being violent - right? Right sirs? I accept that, which means a gradual postponement of what should be done now. Evasion, escape. Escape, evasion, running away from 'what is', is a wastage of energy and I realize that for myself, not for you. I see that. Now what takes place? I have no ideology of non-violence. So I am violent, the feeling. Now what takes place? I am violent. What does violence mean? Anger, jealousy, all that,

imitation, conformity, copying, ambition, all that is a form of violence. Now I am investigating, looking, at that word, the significance of that word, the nature and the structure of that word. Why does the mind identify itself when that feeling arises with a word which is called violence? You are following this? You understand? Are we sharing this together?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No sir, no. I'll come to it sir. We will see it in a minute.

Q: I'm sorry...

K: No sir, please don't be sorry for anything. Please sir. Now I want to find out why the mind, when this feeling arises, uses that word. It uses that word because it has had that feeling before, and each time that feeling arises it is identified by a word which is called violence. Now why does the mind do this? Are you following this?

Q: Why does thought do it?

K: Watch it sir, we are going into it. Why does the mind use that word? Is it a habit? Or by identifying through the word it strengthens that feeling, and gives it more vitality for it to continue, and also it gives it a sense of pleasure.

Q: Would it depend on...

K: Wait sir, you watch it in yourself. I am going into it. And in the process of recognition of that feeling through a word, the mind has strengthened that feeling, it rationalizes, or does something, all kinds of things it does. Now can the mind look at the feeling without the word? You understand sir? By looking at it with the word I have recognized and strengthened it - right sir? Now can the mind look at that feeling without the recognition of it?

Q: The...

K: Wait sir, wait, go slowly, do it. Do it as we are talking and you will see it. I understand what you are going to say. Go slowly sir. That requires enormous attention, doesn't it, you understand sir?

Look, you call me a fool, and I become immediately violent because I have an image about myself that I am not a fool, I am a great man. And I become violent. In that moment the mind operates with such rapidity, it says "That's violence". The recognition takes place instantly. I am asking myself: you call me a fool, the feeling arises and is it possible to look at that feeling without recognition through a word at that feeling?

Q: Can you look...

K: Look! Look at it sir. This demands tremendous attention, tremendous discipline - discipline, not conformity, discipline in the sense that you are watching to learn what is going to happen. The learning of what is going to happen is discipline. That is, I have become violent because you have called me a fool and I reject totally the ideology of non-violence, totally, not partially. It has no meaning to me. So I say why does the mind, with such rapidity, recognize that feeling through a word? Why does it want to recognize it at all? Come on sirs.

Q: It wants...

K: Watch it in yourself sir. Please watch it in yourself and don't answer.

Q: Are not animals in the same boat?

K: I am not talking of animals, I am talking about you.

Q: Surely one is conditioned to do this.

K: Please observe it. I am conditioned that way. Now can my mind be free of that conditioning, which is the verbal recognition of that feeling and say, let's observe without the word?

Q: Then you take the life away from it.

K: Please, do it.

Q: Yes, but this takes the life out of it.

K: Look madame, aren't you violent? Not you. Aren't you violent, sexually, ambitious, greedy, possessive - you know, violent? You want your opinions carried out, you want a position, authority, all that is a form of violence. Now it arises in you and the usual conditioning is to run away from it by having an ideology about it. Say I must not be violent, the ideal of non-violence is marvellous, so many people have preached about it, and it is excellent and I will gradually become non-violent in the meantime you are fully violent! Now you reject completely the ideology of not being - 'what is', is violence. Now move from there. Can the mind observe that feeling without the word?

Q: Sir, if you are calling me a fool, and at that moment I choose to observe there is in me...

K: Sir, you are missing something. That word is you.

Q: That's right. That's why...

K: The word is you. The word is violence, the word is me. I am getting at it slowly. Go into it sir, do it with me.

Q: Is the point to observe what...

K: Look sir, you call me an idiot, I agree with you, because you are my boss! You call me an idiot, my reaction, all my cockles rise and say "I am not an idiot" - you know, anger. Now can I look at that feeling without resorting to the verbal expression of that

feeling? Come on sirs.

Q: If one observes...

K: Wait, wait. I am going to find out. So I am asking is the word different from the feeling? Or is the word creating the feeling? Or if the word is not, is there the feeling?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes sir, I understand.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes sir, I understand. But sir, look, mustn't the feeling arise?

Q: That is...

K: Wait, I am asking sir, do look at it a little more. How quick we are, do take time. Mustn't the feeling arise? The feeling won't arise if you are not sensitive. The feeling won't arise if you are not sensitive. You put a pin into me, I am - you follow? - I am sensitive enough to feel the pain. It is only a paralysed leg that won't feel the pain.

Q: But we are paralysed.

K: Wait sir. I am going into it. You call me a fool. The feeling arises because I have an image and so on. The feeling - if I had no feeling at all what would happen? I am dead! You are looking at it the other way round sir.

Look sir, you flatter me, say, you are a marvellous man. And I am delighted. You are my friend and all the rest of it. And if I listen to that flattery having been dead, not hearing at all, then there is no problem - you understand? - if I am dead.

Q: You can hear but it does not...

K: Wait sir, I am going into that. My god! I am being sensitive, that word awakens a lot of things - right? If I am not sensitive, dull,



blind, deaf, then it is no problem. Then that feeling arises, that feeling arises because I have an image about myself. And I say, why do I have that image, because society - all that has been created in me, that is part of my conditioning, I'll reject that image, and really reject it.

Q: Then the feeling won't arise.

K: Wait, wait. How do you know? Look sir, look sir, It was a lovely morning this morning - right - marvellous, the sky was clean, blue, fresh, young - right? There was a great delight in looking at it, through the leaves - you know all that. What is wrong with that? There is nothing wrong with that. Wait.

Q: But you ask what is wrong with that.

K: There is nothing wrong with that, is there?

Q: That is life, which is a quality of joy in oneself. Think of something outside...

K: No sir, you are complicating it so much. I am just taking it so simply. I delight, there was that beauty in the air, fresh and the glory of a morning. Now that is spoilt by my wife, friend, who says, "Oh, go and wash the dishes" - it irritates me. I want to remain looking out of that window and enjoy myself and then somebody comes along and says, "Get the heck out of here and go and wash dishes". And I go and wash dishes - the thing has gone - you follow? The feeling of irritation arises, now can I look at that irritation without the word - that is all, stick to that simple thing. I understand your problem sir. Let us look at it simply first and then complicate it. Don't complicate it first and then...

Now, here it is: can I look at that irritation without the word? And therefore without the person who irritated me - you follow?

Can I look at that feeling? I can. Wait. I can, you are saying?

Q: No, it's much too difficult.

Q: Surely you can do anything you want to.

K: Ah, no. Not I look at anything if I want to.

Q: You must look, if it is there it is there.

K: Look. Because I am irritated I begin to get annoyed with her, or with that person, I begin to get irritated, I become rude, I say things which are ugly, therefore conflict arises. And I want to live without a single conflict.

Q: Why?

K: Why - it is a wastage of energy. It is like a marvellous motor running beautifully: I have got a marvellous mechanism, the organism of the body, the organism of the mind, the brain is a marvellous instrument, most beautifully sensitive, alive and I want it to function without the least friction, because the more it functions without friction the more energy etc. etc. That is real passion. Wait a minute.

Q: To look at something you have to be still.

K: Are you still?

Q: No.

K: Then - don't say you have to be still. Madame we are pointing out, I am irritated - can I observe that irritation without the word, without the formula, without anger and so on - which means can the mind observe that irritation out of silence. Put it any way you like. Can you do it? Not speculate about doing it.

Q: Can conflict ever be creative?

K: Can conflict ever be creative - that is what the modern literature says it can. They are in conflict with their wives, with

their society, with their ambition, they are frustrated in themselves, they are contradictory, there is great tension and out of that tension they write a book. And that book becomes very popular and they call him a creative writer. You know the game that one plays, this is all very simple.

Now I am asking sir, let's come back to this thing - to observe means to observe silently. Can the mind observe the violence it has brought about in itself silently, without the word? When there is the word, which is the formula, the ideology, then there is division, then there is conflict and rationalization, in that conflict you do all kinds of idiotic things, that is a wastage of energy, and that prevents this extraordinary sense of passion coming into being.

Q: What about terror, for instance a very long standing fear, say of a phobia, a fear of spiders, that you've had over years, and you know you are wasting energy. But there is absolute terror.

K: I understand that sir. The question is - I must repeat it - one has absolute terror, say for example of a spider. You see the spider and you get terrified. And you don't know what to do with it, and that goes on year after year, year after year. How is that terror to be put away - right? That is the question is it not sir. How do you think? What do you think? Did that terror arise because your Mother put you on the wrong pot? You understand what I am talking about? Analysis, go back, back, back, analyse your grandmother, mother, pre-natal condition. You are afraid, you are terrified by some animal, darkness, a word, by something, by somebody, terrified. Now how will you meet this? You understand sir? Analysis is one thing and what we are doing is not - right? To me analysis is not an answer, it is an evasion. It is a postponement,

it has no validity when you want to act - paralysis is analysis - right. Let's move from there. Now how is the mind to be free of some terror? Come on sirs.

Q: One is not different from terror.

K: No sir, don't. Look I am in terror, don't verbalize and say that terror is not different from the observer. I know nothing at all about all that. I am terrified.

Q: You watch the spider.

K: Look haven't you been terrified ever?

Q: I can get a picture from my experience.

K: Sir he has expressed his feeling, just a minute sir. He has expressed it and we are discussing. Haven't you experienced terror? You have said something, and the person is going to use it to destroy you, to hurt you. That is a form of terror, and every time you meet that person - em? And you know he is going to do some harm to you. Or you meet an idea, a priest, a concept that unless you do this you will go to Hell - you follow? - the Catholic idea of Heaven and Hell, and that is instilled into you from childhood. You may have left the church and all that but yet this feeling of going to Hell is tremendously strong. Now how will you meet that?

Q: With understanding.

K: Tell me sir, what to do, don't use words. What am I to do, I am terrified?

Q: Admit the terror first instead of just reacting to it.

K: Are you helping him sir. Are you helping me?

Q: Don't run away from it.

Q: Face it.

K: Face it, don't turn away from it.

Q: Accept it.

K: Now wait a minute. What takes place when I meet that spider or that man, or that woman, I am terrified at that moment. At that moment I am paralysed right through. Why am I paralysed? What has made me paralysed?

Q: I have an image...

K: Wait, don't. What has made me paralysed?

Q: Memory.

Q: Fear.

K: Look at yourself. Aren't you afraid of something? Aren't you afraid of something, terrified by something, loosing a job, loosing your wife or your son, or your house, or god knows what - terrified? So what do you do at that moment? You are paralysed, you can't do anything, can you? You can't say, understand, you are the word and the word is you. (Laughter) Take milk and everything will be all right! That has no meaning. At the moment I am paralysed, I can't do anything at that moment, right? The spider or the man, or the woman goes away, then I realize I am terrified, not at the moment. See what has taken place sir? At the moment I am paralysed, which I call terror - right? Later on I become aware of that terror, a second later it may be. Now what takes place then? I perspire. It has happened - you follow sir, I am not talking verbally, it has actually taken place when I was walking and a dog came and held my ankle - never mind. Now, so what takes place later. My whole body becomes aware, alive - right? And the terror is a remembered thing - right? Which has happened. I am out of it, then I say I have been terrified, now I am going to prevent myself from future terrors. I don't if you - right? Now I am going to

prevent future terrors arising, therefore I won't meet that person, I am going to be very careful not to walk anywhere near spiders. I am going to be very careful of dogs, you follow? Which means what? Watch it sir. Which means what? I am not going to meet you any more, I don't want to meet you.

Q: Because you don't want to see him, you will bump into him in the street.

K: I know sir but I am going to avoid it. No. I don't bump into him at all because I am much more aware than he is. (Laughter). Oh, you don't meet all this. I see him far ahead therefore I turn, go away. Do watch it sir. Please watch it sir, what happens? When I say, I won't meet you, I'll be awfully careful of the dogs, I will be awfully watchful of spiders - what have I done? Wait. What have I done?

Q: Made a formula.

K: No. I have built a wall, a wall against you, haven't I? A wall against the dog, a wall against the spider - right? That wall is going to make me more frightened. So I have learnt something. Any form of resistance brings about greater danger of terror. I haven't solved the problem of terror. It is still there but I have built a wall, and that wall, I hope, is going to prevent it, but it won't. So I realize that building a wall is a great stupidity - right? I won't build it - finished. There is action. You see sir? I see actually building a wall against you does not free the mind from the terror. So the seeing is the ending of building that wall. If it has been built already, I won't build any more.

Then my question is: what am I to do with the walls which I have built? See sir what happens. I won't build anymore - what

takes place when you won't build anymore? Is there anymore, old or new? Of course not, when there is no action of the wall, the Berlin wall, if it doesn't exist old - you follow? - so you have no resistance, I have no resistance against you. I have learnt that, I have acted on that. So what takes place? Come on sirs, I am talking. What takes place?

Q: What happens with somebody who has lost his memory by an accident?

K: That is a different question sir. What happens to a man who has lost his memory, amnesia. What takes place? That is a different question. Doctors, nurses if you are well enough, or a friend - that is a different question.

Q: If you don't build a wall you are alone with your fear, you have got no protection from your fear?

K: Have you stopped building the wall?

Q: Yes.

K: Not you, madame. Have you sir, have we stopped building that wall of resistance? Because you see though you have built that wall, terror still exists, it would be stupid, neurotic on my part to keep on building the wall. So there is the ending of building. If I don't build a new wall, the old wall is not. See. Right sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: If you stop building a new wall, you can only build a new wall on the old wall. If you are not building, the old wall is not.

Q: One gets frightened that one will be hurt.

K: No madame, we have been - you see how they go back and forth. I am afraid of you, terrified of you. At that moment I am paralysed. Follow it sirs, step by step and you'll see it for yourself.

Then you realize you are terrified and you say, "By Jove, I must be hereafter very careful not to meet that man again" - or the spider, or whatever it is. I have built a wall against you, hoping thereby to get rid of my terror, but it is there, I am always watching, in spite of the wall. So I see the wall does not prevent or free the mind from terror. So the ending is important, the ending of building that wall is finished. Do you see that?

Q: Yes.

K: If you see it, it has ended. Then what takes place?

Q: Do you mean...

K: Wait. What takes place? If I have no resistance what takes place?

Q: Then you confront...

K: Wait. Look sir, I used to be frightened of you, terrified. And I increase that fear, terror by building a wall. I don't build a wall anymore. Which is, I built the wall in order to protect myself against you. Now I don't protect myself, what takes place sir?

Q: I don't know, I'll find out.

Q: It has a different meaning now sir.

K: No, sir, I have no terror. The moment I resist, fear exists.

Q: Fear is gone.

K: The moment I resist fear exists.

Q: When I met you and felt the original fear, what is the image...

K: Of course, of course, you make an image, ideas, reputation, all kinds of things.

Q: Trying to...

K: Don't try. Do it.



Q: If you do precisely what you are advocating, fly to East Germany and convince them to take down the wall and you will have the thanks of the entire German nation.

K: Sir, sir. There is a wall between Pakistan and India. There is a wall between the Arabs and the Jews, there is a wall between the British and the French and the Italians, there is a wall between... and you are the Italian, the French, the German, the Hindu etc. Remove the wall and you will see what happens.

Now let's go back. Passion exists only when there is no conflict. Conflict exists when there is fragmentation in myself and when my mind is incapable of looking at life as a whole - right sir? Why does my mind not look at life as a whole? Why does it say, "I am terrified here, I have pleasure there and I want to be ambitious." - you follow, fragmented. Why?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH SEPTEMBER 1973**

K: What shall we talk about this morning?

Q: You talked about how we waste energy through the mind. Could we say go into the question about the body and the mind and the heart? About health and so on.

K: You only talked about the mind, and you didn't talk about the body, the heart, health and standing on one's head.

Q: When one observes one's mind one notices a constant gossiping, a constant movement of thought. Is it possible at all to finish, to stop this movement of thought all at once, or do we stop gradually?

K: If one is at all aware, the mind is always chattering, and is it possible to end, to stop at once.

Q: Can we talk about the word responsibility?

K: Shall we talk over together the real meaning of that word responsibility.

Q: Seeing is the action - does thought try to get in, as we are all so conditioned by thought?

K: Seeing, it was said, is the doing. Can thought allow such doing because we are all so conditioned by thought.

Q: Sir could we go into this question of resistance?

K: Could you talk about resistance, which we discussed the day before yesterday.

Q: Can you talk about the conscious as well as the unconscious?

K: Talk about the conscious as well as the unconscious. Any more?

Q: Can we stay with that question? Can we find out about that passion which comes when there is no thought? Can we wait for that passion?

K: I didn't quite get it sir.

Q: That passion which you may come upon when there is the ending of thought.

K: Ah, talk about it. May we talk or wait till that real thing comes upon us. Now we have asked questions, what shall we discuss? Shall we discuss, talk over together, putting all these questions together? The body, the mind, responsibility, the chattering of the mind, the conscious as well as the unconscious, and the seeing and the doing without the interference of thought, and so on. Now can we put all that together and discuss it? What do you say?

What is the central issue in all these questions? What do you think is the central point in all the questions that have been put?

Q: The seeing of the problem and trying to find a way out of it.

K: We have problems and trying to get out of them.

Q: The question of change, when you put all the questions together.

K: When you put all the questions together, the person says, it is a matter of change.

Q: Why are all these questions being asked?

Q: Sir, is the central point the conflict between the observer and the observed.

K: The conflict between the observer and the observed.

Q: What is the difference between the observer and the observed?

Q: Are we not curious? Curiosity perhaps is the central issue, curiosity to know.

K: Curiosity to find out - from whom?

Q: We don't know.

K: There are so many questions that have been put, including the questions here and the one that was put the other day about consciousness. What happens when death takes place and naturally the brain cells die, what happens to consciousness, and what is the meaning of consciousness? That was the question that was put the other day.

So putting all these questions together, I wonder what is the central issue in all this. I would say, subject to your correction, that we have many problems, imposed by society or the culture in which we live, or our own individual personal problems. And we want to resolve them all, in which is included the observer, and the observed, conscious and the unconscious, the interference of thought in the seeing and acting. We have all these many problems, ill health, yoga, standing on your head, the meaning of responsibility, what is love, what happens when there is death, and so on. Now who is going to answer all these questions? These are all our problems, collective, personal, quite impersonal, objective and so on. Now who is going to answer all these questions? Suppose there was nobody to whom you could ask these questions? How would you resolve these questions and the problems that arise? That is the central issue in all this, isn't it?

Q: To be aware.

K: No, don't please - let us explore it. Don't say, "Being aware" - that stops it, please. Now first of all we are accustomed to ask

questions and somebody to give the answers. The world is in such a frightful mess, the dictator says "We have the answer", or the politician says "We have the answer", or the economist, or the socialist, or the religious person. Now if you don't look to any of these people, because they have led us all up the garden, because they are responsible, as well as we are, for the misery, confusion and sorrow and starvation and wars and violence. If we don't look to any of these people, how will you find out? There is no authority - right? No book, no leader, no guru. How will you answer these questions? And I hope you are in that position, that you are not following anybody, that there is no authority that will say, "Do this" or "Don't do that". How will you set about to answer these many questions and many problems that arise in our daily life?

Q: Sir I ask of myself and I still find I have no answers. I don't expect there are any though, are there?

K: Madame, just wait a minute. Just hold on a minute. Are you in that position when you say, "I have nobody on whom I can depend for the right answer"? No book, no system and I am left naked, and I have got to find the answer, because my life is very short, I want to live a life that is completely full, rich and beautiful, all that, intelligent and nobody can tell me what to do - right? Are we in that position? No.

Q: Yes.

K: Don't say yes or no. It is one of the most difficult things to be in that position, isn't it?

So not relying on anybody, how shall I find the answer, or resolve the problems that arise, every day, there isn't one series, one set of problems, problems are always arising. Now how shall I

meet them, resolve them, not be caught in the trap of all this?  
Where shall I start? You understand sirs, what I am asking? Surely that is the only way to find out what is truth, what is a state of mind that has no problem, that is not in conflict, that is supremely sensitive, intelligent, and so on. Now where shall I start?

Q: By looking.

K: Looking at what?

Q: Looking at the problem.

K: Looking at the problem? Who is the creator of these problems? Where shall I look for an answer?

Q: Faith.

Q: In all that is good and true.

K: Oh no madame, don't say all that is good and true, and noble, please. Look I am asking you a very serious question and you say 'Look for all that is noble and true and beautiful'. Keats talked about it endlessly, all the poets, the philosophers and all the writers and intellectuals, but that doesn't answer my question.

Q: By seeing everything that the problem is not.

K: Look sir, I personally don't read any philosophy, psychology, don't follow any guru - no authority. To me authority is poison, either politically or religiously. And I don't read all the sacred books, in India, or here or in Japan or in China - they bore me. Now where shall I start? Wait. Where shall I start? I say to myself, I have no confidence in myself either - right? Because I am what the world has made me, so I can't rely on myself. I don't know if you follow all this? So I say to myself, I must understand myself - myself is the world, and the world is me. And I mean that, it is not just words. And in understanding myself I understand the world -

the world about me, nature, the structure of human relationship, the divisions, the quarrels, the antagonisms, the wars, the violence and all that, it is all buried in me because I am the world. So I must start with myself - right?

Q: If you are the world and the world is you, how can you start with yourself?

K: If you are the world and the world is you, how can you start with yourself. I start with what I have sir. Shall I go on. Do please move. It is a hot morning, rather lovely. Let's get going.

I know nothing about myself. I don't start with a conclusion - I am god, I am not a god, I am the state, I am not the state, I am the world, I am not the world, or I am the world. I know nothing. Right? So I begin there. I know nothing. What I know is what other people have told me. Propaganda. What I know, what I am is the result of what others have made me. Or in reaction to the world I act. So I really don't know anything. Right? So I can begin to learn - right? May I go on? No please, share together. It is not just I go on talking. As I know nothing I begin to learn. So I must find out what it means to learn. What does it mean to learn, not knowing anything, what does it mean to learn? I know, I have to learn a language, Italian, Greek, French or whatever it is. And I store up the words, the meaning of the words, the verbs, the irregular verbs, and so on. So I know a language. I know how to ride a bicycle, drive a car, dig in the garden, or run a machine. I know all that. But actually beyond the technological knowledge I know absolutely nothing about myself. Can we start from there? Can you honestly say, "I really don't know anything about myself" - not out of despair, not out of a sense of frustration, not knowing myself I am

going to commit suicide! You follow?

Q: What do you mean by saying you know nothing about yourself?

K: What do you mean by saying you know nothing about yourself - what I am. Why I do this. Why I think that. What are the motives, the impression. I know nothing about myself except the technological knowledge, the information, the activity in that field. So I know nothing about myself. I only know what people have said to me about myself. The philosophers, the analysts, the psychoanalysts, the mothers, the fathers, the books, I have put all that aside. So I am going to learn, learn about myself. And so before I use that word, I must find out what it means to learn.

Q: To discover.

Q: To wake up.

K: What does it mean to you to learn?

Q: To be vulnerable.

K: To learn.

Q: Isn't it a process of knowledge?

K: I have learnt how to ride a bicycle, I have learnt how to drive a car, speak a language, run a machine or whatever it is. If I am a bureaucrat I have learnt how to push a pencil around, I know all that. What does it mean to learn?

Q: I must be curious.

K: Curiosity. I know what that word means, but will curiosity teach me what it means to learn? I want to learn about myself - what does it mean to learn? If I learn about myself, does that learning lead to knowledge about myself, and from that knowledge I act - you are following? I want to learn about myself, learn. What



does that mean? I have learnt a language, ride a bicycle and so on. Myself is a living thing, isn't it? Changing, demanding, asking, lust, anger, all that. I must learn about all that. Now if I learn about anger, that learning can leave the residue as knowledge - right? From that knowledge I act. Therefore I have stopped learning. I wonder if you understand? (The aeroplane must have its voice too, so let's listen to it).

Q: One mustn't accumulate.

K: Sir if the mind accumulates knowledge about itself, next action or next learning is from a knowledge.

Q: I said I must not accumulate.

K: That is just it. So learning is a process of not accumulating knowledge. I have accumulated knowledge - how to ride a bicycle, speak a language, all that. But when I am learning about myself, any form of accumulation as knowledge about myself will prevent further learning. Is this clear? Please. Because the 'me' is a living thing, it is not a dead thing, therefore the mind must come to it each day, each minute afresh, otherwise it can't learn.

Q: If it doesn't know, then it must come to it afresh.

K: Do listen sir, first listen to what I have said. Not that you must listen to what I say, but as I happen to talk please listen to it.

In learning about myself, in that learning, if there is any form of accumulation as knowledge, as experience, then further learning is impeded by the past. Therefore is it possible to learn without accumulation? That is very important for me to find out. Because if I am learning and if accumulation goes on, there is no learning. Because the 'me' is a terribly living thing, very active. So the mind must be as swift, as sensitive, as subtle as the living thing. Is my

mind capable of that? You are following? Please follow this step by step and you will come to it yourself.

Q: Sir, when you look at something, as soon as you begin to think about it, life has gone on.

K: No sir. Look. You are saying life goes on so rapidly, so quickly, so subtly that learning is not possible. Is that it?

Q: No, I didn't say that. I said that the difficulty is that as soon as one thinks about something, that one has to be able to see something and immediately pass on without trying to think about it, or grasp it in any way.

K: The incident or the happening takes place so rapidly, that thought thinking about it is no good. Therefore I must learn to observe without the previous knowledge which I have accumulated - right? That is the act of learning. Come on sirs.

Q: Therefore one watches carefully one's motives in action.

K: No sir. We haven't come to that. I want to know about myself. I have to learn about myself. What does learning mean? Until I find that out I am merely accumulating knowledge about myself; and you have knowledge about yourself, haven't you? - what the psychologists have said, what the philosophers have said, what the religious books have said, what the speaker has said. So you have knowledge of all that. And when you brush aside all that you are left with nothing, therefore you have to learn. So I am enquiring what does it mean to learn.

Q: Sir, can we question this phrase 'learning about'. Is there a difference between learning about and learning?

K: Yes sir. Learning about and learning, is there a difference between those two? Learning about something, and learning.

Q: Would learning be a spontaneous realization, without reaction?

K: Spontaneous realization. I don't know what those words mean. I am sorry. We are not spontaneous - are we? We are so conditioned, so heavily burdened with the past, with all the knowledge, information, how can the mind be spontaneous? I wish you would...

Q: Is not the word learning associated with accumulation?

K: Therefore sir, knowing that learning is associated with accumulation of knowledge, we are trying to separate them. We can't use other words. So I am learning about myself, therefore I am not accumulating knowledge about myself, if I do then that knowledge will prevent further learning about myself. It is fairly simple sir, isn't it?

Q: To learn you have to have observation.

K: To learn you have to have observation. So how do I learn and observe? Right? Observe myself and in the act of observation learn? Now what does observation mean? Can I watch myself, all the movements of myself, without any distortion, without any previous conclusion, which will bring about the distortion that I am good, that I am bad, that I am divine, that I am marvellous, that I am the most beautiful, lovely person, etc. etc. Can I observe myself without any shadow of distortion?

Q: If I don't try to change myself.

K: Sir. Please do hold. Look at it sir. Can you look at yourself without any opinion about yourself?

Q: Learning is something that has to be practised, like a baby, a child learning to walk.

K: Now do start now. Don't let's talk about a baby, but do start learning now. Please listen to this. Can the mind observe its activity without prejudice? Prejudice being judgement, evaluation which has already been made and through those eyes I look at myself. Can I observe the movement of myself in daily life, cooking, washing, all that, the activity of the mind, observe without any conclusion, prejudice. You say that is not possible. Wait. Do it, sir, please sir do these things.

Q: How do you do it?

K: I am showing it to you, not how sir. I am showing it to you. Watch your mind without prejudice. Can you watch it?

Q: Can I watch my mind prejudicing, can I watch that with prejudice?

K: Can you watch your mind without a judgement?

Q: Making judgement.

K: Not making judgement sir. Look sir.

Q: Please excuse me - I find as I walk about here doing this and that and so on, there is a movement, a momentum of making judgements, prejudicing, that caresses my perception. I can feel its quality almost. Can I observe all that without judging?

K: That is what I am asking you sir? Can the mind watch its activity without any prejudice - prejudice, conclusion, judgement, evaluation, all that, the past, can it watch? So until it does it is not capable of learning - right?

Q: Do you mean observation without thought?

K: Right. Observation without thought. I didn't want to put it that way because then you will go off into: how am I to prevent thought from interfering.

Q: Isn't that what you have to consider?

K: What sir?

Q: How am I to look at thought interfering without prejudice, without judging it?

K: Now there is nobody to answer that question, what will you do?

Q: Squirm!

K: Squirm? Then squirm! (Laughter) But you have to answer that question, it is no good merely squirming, you have got to answer it. Life challenges you. You can't say, "Well I squirm" and leave it at that. Life says, answer it, you are a man, a grown up.

Q: What does squirm mean? (Laughter)

K: What does squirm mean - you have seen a worm squirm! No, sir please, just a minute sir. You see, sir, it becomes really quite impossible when your mind isn't giving complete attention to something that demands attention. I want to learn about myself, not through somebody else's eyes, whether it is Christ, Buddha, or the latest guru. I want to learn, the mind must learn about itself. So it says, how am I to learn, which means I must observe. How can I observe when there is so much prejudice? There are thousands of prejudices which I have, how can I observe?

Then the next thing is, there is nobody to answer, how is the mind to be free of prejudice? You follow? Otherwise I can't observe, the mind can't observe and therefore can't learn. You follow? So how is the mind to be free of prejudice?

Q: When I see something in myself I don't like, that is a fact, not a prejudice.

K: I am asking madame: you have a prejudice, haven't you? All

of us have some kind of pre-judgement - that is what it means, prejudging something. So how is the mind to be free of prejudice, bigotry, conclusion, how is it? Nobody is going to answer me, because I have got to find out. I can't just squirm, lie under the question, I have got to answer it to myself. Life demands it.

Q: When you see the falseness of it.

K: You see the falseness of prejudice, don't you - but you are still prejudiced aren't you?

Q: I don't know, I can't answer it.

Q: You begin only by knowing...

K: You are not answering sir. Answer that question for yourself sir. How is the mind to be free of prejudice? You understand? A conclusion, an image which I have built about you. Do listen sir, I have built an image about you because you are a Christian, I am a Hindu, or I am a Communist and you are something else. Now how is that mind to be free of the image it has built, or the culture has built, or the society has built, which has been implanted in the mind? How is that image to be put away? It is a question sir, don't answer something else. The image is there, how is it to break down, to be free of it?

Q: Sir, that image is memory, so you are asking really, can one change memory.

K: I am asking a simple thing sir, please don't make it more complicated. I have an image, as being a Hindu, Communist, Socialist, whatever it is, Catholic, and I realize as long as that image exists, observation is not possible, and therefore learning then becomes merely accumulation of knowledge, which prevents further learning. So my question is: can the mind free itself from

the image?

Q: You can become aware that it is just an image and not a reality.

K: Now, are you in realizing that, are you free of the image.

Q: If you actually see the image...

K: Not if, this is your question. It is your problem.

Q: If you...

K: Not if. Sir, I come to you and say: look, my friend, I don't know how to get rid of my image, I have got so many images, tell me what to do. And you can't answer because you don't know what to do. You say, well let's talk about it endlessly, and I die by the end of it. My problem is that I want to end it.

Q: Sir, who is the 'I' that asks the question?

K: Sir I don't want to go into that. You see. Can your mind be free of an image which prevents observation. Stick to that thing. Not who is 'I'. We'll go into that.

Q: I am that image.

K: Yes sir. Then what? You are that image. You are the image. Now how is the mind to be free of that image, which is you?

Q: If I am that image, then there is no more image.

K: Are you? Sir please, the house is burning. I must do something about it, I can't everlastingly talk about the man who put the fire there, whether he has red hair, brown hair, white skin, black skin, purple - the house is on fire.

Q: By accepting the image.

K: So you accept the image. It is there, why do you accept it? You see how you are totally unaware, if I may most respectfully point out, totally unaware of what you are doing, how your mind is

operating.

Q: It comes from fear.

K: Fear. Is fear preventing the mind from putting away the image?

Q: Thought itself it preventing it.

Q: Sir, what is this image? I don't know - does anybody see this?

K: I have told you what the image is. Image is a prejudice, a word, an association of words - I am a Christian, or I am a Communist, I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a follower of some guru - those are all images.

Q: But the idea that there is something to see gets in the way of seeing it. You know, if I say I am going to see how - you talk about being a Christian for instance - if I am going to observe myself as a Christian, that very idea to see something would stop me seeing it.

K: No sir. No, sir.

Q: The idea that there is anything to see gets in the way of seeing.

K: No. I am a Hindu, a Catholic, a Communist, that is an image, a verbal series of conclusions, ideologies, dogmatic and so on, those are the images that I have built by words. I am asking, can the mind free itself from that so that it observes without any distortion, otherwise I can't learn.

Q: When I see a prejudice, the only way I can work is to go on seeing it and not try to change it, because that is another prejudice, but to go on seeing it.

K: Now do you see your prejudice? Is the mind aware of the prejudice it has?



Q: Sometimes.

Q: That is the difficulty. Because I don't see that the particular knowledge - I see the knowledge that somebody else has is prejudice - but the knowledge I have of myself.

K: I am talking about yourself, not somebody else.

Q: Quite. Now I don't see the distinction. Some knowledge I have about myself I have in a sort of tentative way, not as a formed solid thing, I just observe certain things, like a scientist, not building it into dogma about it - is there a difference, or is all knowledge such prejudice?

K: Sir, we have explained, all knowledge is not prejudice. Learning to ride...

Q: Knowledge about myself, I mean.

K: Learning about how to ride a bicycle or drive a car is not prejudice. It is a function which I learn. But here I am learning about myself, not from what others have said about me, or through others - the mind discards all that, says, it wants to learn about itself. Now to learn is to observe. Now can it observe without any shadow?

Q: To observe my mind I have to use my mind.

K: No, no, I am asking you - not asking you sir - we are questioning, we are asking whether the mind can observe its conditioning?

Q: But I am using my mind to observe it.

K: Observe it sir. Look I have been brought up as a Brahmin in India, and I say, I am that. That is a deep rooted prejudice, brought about historically, culturally and tradition says, I am that. That is my conditioning. Is it possible for the mind to be aware of that

conditioning? Just only that. No more. When it is aware of that conditioning, what takes place?

Q: You recognize that it is conditioned.

Q: It is no longer conditioned.

K: Are you saying this as an actuality, or a verbal statement?

Q: Well I see it with prejudice for instance.

K: Sir you are brought up as a Christian - right?

Q: Yes.

K: Now are you aware of that conditioning?

Q: Yes.

K: Now the next step.

Q: That is why I am here.

K: Wait sir, just a minute sir. When you are aware of that, are you trying to overcome it, change it, control it or break through it? Or are you merely aware of it?

Q: I am just aware of it.

K: Now what takes place then?

Q: I become free from it.

K: Wait. Either you are or you are not. You can't say, I become.

Q: I am - if you like.

K: Not what I like please. It isn't a game of what you and I like. The mind becomes aware that it is a Christian, a Communist, a Hindu, and so on. That is its conditioning. In becoming aware of that conditioning what takes place?

Q: Change.

K: No. I have to find out what I mean by aware, what I mean by observing that conditioning. Is the observer different from the conditioning? You understand my question? The mind is aware, or

observes it is conditioned. Is the observer different from the conditioning? What do you say? There is nobody to answer you. How will you find out? Is the thinker different from the thought, from the conditioning, or the thinker is the thought and the conditioning?

Q: Do you realize your conditioning when you see that it is part of the mind.

K: Yes sir I understand. I am asking a little more. I am asking - we are asking, when you say I am conditioned, is the 'I' who says, I am conditioned, different from the conditioning?

Q: No, it is all in the mind.

Q: Certainly not.

K: Certainly not. So the observer is the observed. Now wait a minute. Stay there for a few minutes. The observer is the observed. Then what takes place?

Q: I have learnt what that thing is.

K: Then I have learnt - you are saying - what actually is. Is there a learning about 'what is'? I must stick to this one thing sir. Sorry. The observer is the observed - right. We see that. That is the conditioning and the observer who watches that conditioning are both the same. Both are conditioned. That means there is no division between the observer and the observed. Wait a minute sir. Which means there is no division between the experiencer and the experienced. No division between the thinker and the thought, they are one. Right? Then what takes place? Take time. Go slowly. When there is a division between the observer the observed there is conflict. Right? Trying to overcome it, trying to change it, trying to control it and so on and so on. Now when the observer is the

observed there is no control, no suppression, there is no overcoming it, there is only this actually what is. Only the observer is the observed, the image is the observer - right? Now what takes place?

Q: Duality comes to an end.

K: Sir duality has come to an end when you say the observer is the observed. Duality exists and the expression of that duality is conflict. When there is no conflict between the observer and the observed what takes place? There is nobody there to tell you - you understand?

Q: You have immediate action.

K: Wait, go slowly, go slowly. What takes place?

Q: Because I am not different from what I am looking at.

K: Therefore what happens?

Q: Conflict has ceased.

Q: You have a passion for learning.

K: Yes sir, we have said that. When the observer is the observed conflict ceases. Which is the greatest thing, isn't it? You don't see it. Conflict ceases. Has conflict ceased with you when you realize the observer is the observed? Until that conflict ceases you don't see the reality that the observer is the observed. It is just words then. The moment you see that, the reality of it, conflict has come to an end, the 'me' and not the 'me'. The 'me' is the 'you' - you follow?

So what takes place when there is no conflict, which means when the observer is the observed? Have you ever meditated? I see several of you sitting under the various trees, (Laughter) with great attention. Have you ever meditated? This is meditation - you

understand sir. This is the greatest meditation, to come upon this extraordinary thing, which is to discover for oneself - for the mind to discover for itself the observer is the observed, therefore no conflict, which means not just vegetation, you follow? Just doing nothing. On the contrary.

So I have to find the answer; what takes place when the mind realizes the image and the observer of that image are the same? And it has come to that point because it has investigated - you understand? It hasn't just said, that is so. It has gone into itself, it says the learning, observing, to observe there must be no prejudice, prejudice is an image, is that image different from the observer. All that is an enquiry. An enquiry in which there is attention, therefore that enquiry brings about the realization that the observer is the observed, and therefore the mind is tremendously alive, it isn't a dead mind. It is an original, unspoilt mind.

So then what takes place? You understand? It realizes the word Hindu, and the maker of that word are the same. So the image, the conditioning, is it there? Don't say no, or yes. Is it there? The mind is conditioned as a Catholic. When the mind says, I am Catholic, the 'I' is different from that which has been called Catholic, it is its conditioning. The observer says, I am different from my conditioning, and then he battles because he says, I must control, I must be generous, I must be peaceful, I mustn't kill, but I will kill when necessary but I won't kill and so on and so on. It plays a game with itself all the time. So when the observer realizes he is not different from the thing which he sees, that is the conditioning, therefore the whole thing is conditioned, you understand? The whole structure is conditioned. Then what takes place?

Q: Conditioning disappears.

K: Has it disappeared with you madame. Don't say things that you don't know.

Q: We are afraid of the consequences.

K: Sir, no. What takes place? We will come to that. What takes place? You understand sir? When there is an image, a prejudice, a conclusion, there is activity - right? I am a Christian, I must resist everybody who is not a Christian, I am a Communist, I will convert everybody to my ideology - socialism etc., there is activity going on - right. Isn't there? Come on sirs. The activity of the observer trying to convince others, or proselytize, threaten and all that, to become this. When the observer is the observed, all such activity ceases, doesn't it? No? So what takes place? There is complete immobility, isn't there? Oh you don't see the beauty of this.

Q: Marvellous!

K: Immediately put into words!

Q: Peace.

K: My darling sir!

Q: Summation.

K: You understand sir. Watch it sir. The mind when it is prejudiced is in movement - right? I am prejudiced against you because you have hurt me. I resist, that is a movement. The image which I have built about you is the movement of a prejudice against you. I am a Communist and my education is to convince, is to resist, is to bring everybody to that. So having an image indicates a movement - right? A movement from this to that, or from there to this. Change this to that, thesis and antithesis, and produce synthesis. It is a constant movement of the image, the

word, the conclusion. So when the mind realizes, sees the observer is the observed, sees, not just verbally accepts some idiotic idea, but actually realizes it in his guts, blood, heart, mind, it sees that, that it is no division, therefore this movement of the mind comes to an end - right? The movement of the conditioning comes to an end. I wonder if you see this?

Q: My answer is...

K: No. Hold a minute. I want to finish this and then you'll get it. So there is complete immobility of the mind, which doesn't mean it is a dead mind. It doesn't mean a mind that has gone to sleep, it is a mind that is tremendously alive. It is alive because it is not moving in conditioned areas. I wonder if you get this? So what takes place when there is complete non-movement?

Q: The reaction ceases and action starts.

K: Madame we have been through all that, please don't go back to something.

Q: The mind is free of imitation.

K: Look sir, what has taken place.

Q: Silence should take place.

K: Yes sir. Unless it is the real thing, don't use words. Then one plays the hypocrite and says things one doesn't know.

Q: Well I just felt this silence...

K: Yes sir, I am not accusing you sir. Just see. Look sir it really is the most extraordinary thing one has discovered, if you have come upon it. That is, all movement is time, and time is thought, thought is conditioned, and when thought operates it can only operate in the area within the field of that conditioning. I am Catholic, Protestant, Communist, Socialist, Right Wing, Left

Wing, or Centre, I am a Buddhist, I am nothing, or I must be something. All that is within the area of the known, the movement is in time, is time. Movement is time. Now when the observer is the observed there is no movement at all, there is only the observed. And when there is no movement at all about the observed, 'what is', what has happened? There is no movement, no chattering, no movement from the unconscious to the conscious. No movement at all. Therefore the mind sees, has the energy to look at 'what is', when there is a movement away from 'what is' there is desire to change it, control it, transform it. When there is no movement at all, it has the extraordinary energy to observe 'what is'. And what is there? Another series of words. I don't know if you see this.

Q: I do not understand intelligence.

K: I'll show you. The speaker is going into it, you are not. It isn't an actuality to you, it is just a verbal acceptance. You don't say, well I am going to look at this, put my energy into this, I am dedicated, I want to find out. And you can only find out when you have totally discarded everything that others have said.

Q: (Inaudible).

K: That is what I am saying. Unless you do this you cannot learn. You will repeat what others have said, which you are doing. And what others have said may be utterly silly, may be true, or may be false. Others have no meaning in this. They have meaning when the doctor says from his knowledge, take this pill, you have got cancer you have got to do something. That's different. But here I know nothing, I have to learn. Learning means to observe. There is no observation when there is the movement of the image. You



see the beauty of it sir. The movement of the image, which means the conditioning. The movement of the conditioning. And that movement of the conditioning is time. And thought is time. So thought divides itself as the observer and the observed and the conflict. And this is the movement of our culture, of our religious activity, the conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', between the observer and the observed. But when there is the realization that the observer is the observed then the movement of the conditioning comes to an end, because there is no movement. You understand? Therefore such a mind has come to it through meditation, enquiry, looking, asking itself, not anybody else. It has to stand completely alone, which doesn't mean isolated, sitting, becoming a hermit. On the contrary the mind empties everything of its conditioning therefore no movement of conditioning, therefore no movement of time. Then there is no 'what is', there is only something entirely different.

Q: Sir all of this sounds so dreary to me because I can't do anything except pay lip service to you and follow you.

K: Then don't pay lip service.

Q: I can't get beyond observer and observed.

K: Then take time, go into it. Sir you don't say that when you are hungry. When you are lustful, you don't say...! When the house is burning you want to act. And you act when you have pain, when you have toothache, when you have got some disease you don't say, play around.

Q: What you say about the thinker and the thought, the experience and the experienced, the observer and the observed, is this not really saying there is action without the 'I', without the self,

then we are coming upon what you are talking about. In that state there is a possibility of love.

K: Yes sir. Of course sir. But wait sir. How is the self to come to an end? You say that, self is not.

Q: What I was going to say sir, there are moments in peoples lives when the self is not.

K: But that isn't good enough. There are moments when I am healthy, I say that isn't good enough.

Q: But in those moments, maybe a day...

K: A year, half a year!

Q: In those days, there is love.

K: Yes sir.

Q: And this is what you are talking about permanently.

K: No. The moment you use the word permanent, that means time.

Q: But this is what you are talking about.

K: Sir, please. Of course what I am talking about is the ending of the self. The ending of the self is the movement - no, the self is the movement of the image, of the environment which has conditioned that self. The ending of the self - how is it to be done?

Q: It can be done by what you are talking about, but it can also be done for maybe a limited time, when something comes in your way and the self is not.

K: Yes sir, I understand that very well. We have all had those moments when the self is not. Those are rare and happy, like marvellous days, without a shadow, lovely. But those days are rare. They are like English weather! (Laughter). But what am I to do? I can't wait for those days. Or remember those days and live in the

past.

Q: Nor, can we keep coming to your conventions and listening and repeating like parrots.

K: Oh, that is silly. But for a man who is very serious, and it is important to find out how to end this movement of the self. What am I to do? Is the self different from the action? Or the self is the action? Sir that is all implied.

So the first thing is never to repeat what you have not seen. When you use the word silence, either there is silence, or you are talking about silence. So don't, if I may say, don't repeat something that you actually have not seen, not experienced. There is a vast difference between seeing and experiencing.

Yes sir?

Q: Sir, these moments of clarity that you say each one of us has, it seems that they, when you think about the observer and the observed being one - now one finds that it happens in a particular fragmented issue. Say I am jealous, and I can be the jealousy and the jealousy disappears, but I walk out and somebody insults me and I am hurt, which means that there was an overcoming or a dissolving of the one, but it seems - how does one be conscious of the entire content of one's consciousness?

K: That is just it sir. What time is it sir? I think we had better stop. It is ten to one. Perhaps we can take up this question on Saturday morning. That is: what does it mean to be whole? What does it mean to have this feeling of totality - you follow? - this feeling of complete non-fragmentation? I am all right in the tent but when I go out I am hurt. I am all right in the church, when I leave the church I hate people. I am all right as long as I have got

my image, my bigotry and I hold on. But to be free of all that, to have a feeling of the whole - right? Perhaps we will discuss that on Saturday.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 8TH SEPTEMBER 1973**

It seems to me that it would be a great pity if you made this place into a resort and an entertainment affair. It is nice to have a sun bath, nice to go about in the country. There are right occasions and wrong occasions. right time and wrong time. And if you made this lovely place into a place of entertainment, a social gathering, meeting friends, and endless chatter, I am afraid then you would not be very serious. And what we have been talking about, and what we are going to talk about this morning too, demands your seriousness, your attention, your care, your affection, so that we can share together, not merely verbally but also non-verbally the many things that our whole life is made up of - the many fragments, the many contradictions, the many crises, incidents, the vagaries and the vanities of our life. And if we are going to be merely entertained on a lovely morning like this, I think you would be wasting your time. Much better go somewhere else and enjoy yourself thoroughly.

This place is meant for those who are serious, for those who really deeply are concerned with the whole problem of living, which is becoming more and more difficult, more and more complex. And to scatter our energies socially, doing endless hours of yoga here at Brockwood, seems to me, if I may say so, such a waste of your time. But you will do what you please.

We have been talking, having dialogues, going into various aspects of our life, and I would like this morning, if I may, to talk about death - although it is a lovely morning - what is love and

what is this thing called living? The whole problem of it, the various things that are involved in it; and how to look at life, live with life as a whole, non-fragmented, non broken up. That is what I would like to talk about this morning, if I may.

When one looks at one's own life, the everyday life that one lives and leads, it is so shallow, a verbal acceptance without any depth, a verbal explanation with which we seem to be so satisfied, a life that is so broken up - a life of the business world, the life of the family, the life of love, as it is called, the life of amusement, the life of a religious pursuit or entertainment or pleasure or conformity, and our own narrow limited self-centred activity, with all its sorrows, anxieties, fears, joys, and the agonies of relationship, the tortures of one's own doubts and peculiarities and tendencies. We have broken up life, and we think we shall be able to solve them fragmentarily, take each fragment, whether it be the artistic world, or the scientific world, or the world of science or religion, as though they were something separate, unrelated to each other, something that must be approached for themselves little by little. I do not know if you have noticed your own life. Education is something entirely different from our daily activity. Our activity, daily self-centred activity has nothing to do with the beauty of the world, beauty of the earth, the nature, the extraordinary quality of a world that is so full of joy, and when we lose touch with nature we lose touch with humanity. And yet all our life until we die, is this constant battle without and within. And the search to escape from that battle, through drugs, through sex, through power, money, position and all the religious fantasies, imaginations and amusements. That is our life. From the moment we are born until

we die, a battle, a meaningless existence, a thing that soon grows old, decays, diseased and dies. I am sorry to talk about that this morning, when everything seems to be blossoming, when there is perfume in the air, when there are deep shadows and the leaves are dancing with the breeze, it seems rather strange to talk about all this. But that is part of our life - the wind, the flow of the waters, the blue sky, and the shadows with the clear lovely waters. So, if you would bear with me, we will go into all the difficulties, and the meaninglessness of our existence, and see if out of that there can come a beauty, something that is not perishable, something that is not put together by time and thought, something that might exist if man really goes deeply into himself and understands himself and goes beyond it.

A mind that is so fragmented, so broken up, can that mind observe the whole movement of life as one, as a whole? Because if one can look at it as a whole then there is no problem, then death is love, and love is death, and living is the dying and the loving. But the mind, that is, our own idiosyncrasies, our conditioning, our constant endeavour to change the conditioning, and the movement within that conditioning, is our life. And can our mind see the whole of life, not one fragment of it opposed to another fragment, one thought opposed to another thought, the intellect opposed to the emotions, the organism has its own desires and pursuits, and denied and controlled. But to treat, to live life as a whole. I do not know if you have ever thought about it, and what it means. The word 'whole' means sane, healthy, holy, that is what that word means, to be whole, non broken up. And can one lead such a life in the modern world - in a polluted world of a town, or in the country

filled with smog, with all the competition, ambition, the wars, the violence, the bestiality of competition, can we live a life that is totally, completely, absolutely whole? Not as an idea, not as an ideal, because ideals are quite idiotic, they have no meaning. What has meaning is to see if it is possible - not a concept carried out and practised, or to live up to a formula. That is still fragmentation. Right?

I hope we are sharing this thing together, and you are not merely listening to a speaker who is using a lot of words to convey something very, very clear and simple, but you are also sharing, taking the same journey, walking together and therefore sharing, partaking in this problem. To share implies that there is no authority. We are both exercising our capacities, intellectual, emotional, our capacities to think very clearly and to see the logic and the limitation of logic, both verbal and non verbal, and to go beyond it. And to share something there must be attention, affection and great care, otherwise we can't share. And as this requires considerable enquiry, considerable investigation, which is to trace out for ourselves, with the help of each other, this question of living a life that is whole: that is never separate, that is never contradictory, that is a total movement.

Now it is one of the most difficult things to put into words, because words are a means of communication, as we both speak English we know the meaning of those words, at least we hope so, and we communicate not only through words but also through non-verbal perception. There must be both a verbal understanding and a non-verbal communication, they must go both together. Therefore you and I must not come to any conclusion, draw any abstraction.



If you do, your abstraction will be totally different from the other, and that brings about a contradiction, a division. And where there is a division there must be conflict.

So when one observes one's own life, and the life of the world in which we live, the daily monotony, a life of routine, boredom, anxiety, fear, in that world is it possible to live a life that is free of fear, free of anxiety, a life that has movement in which there is never a shadow of contradiction, and therefore remorse and the invitation to all kinds of violence and self-centred activity.

What does it mean to observe wholly? You understand? One's life is fragmented, that is obvious, the artist is different from the literary man, and the literary man is different from the scientist, and the professor is different psychologically as well as outwardly, feels different and so on. So is it possible to observe all this, this fragmentation, as a total movement? That is, what does it mean, or what is the significance of an observation that is complete, non-fragmentary, non broken up? To observe. Because when you observe, in that observation there is action. Observation doesn't mean observe, draw a conclusion, an abstraction, and from that abstraction act. Therefore in that abstraction and action there is a division, a contradiction, and therefore conflict - right? Shall we go on with it?

Can the mind observe, not only what is happening outwardly, but also inwardly, without division, without 'me' as the observer and the thing that is observed, as two different entities? Because if it is possible to observe without division then action is immediate and therefore not contradictory. When action is based on an idea, an ideology, a goal, an end, then such action must breed inevitably

conflict because there is space, time interval between action and the ideology. Where there is division of time between action and a formula, in that interval all kinds of other factors enter and action becomes fragmentary. Is this all right? May I go on? We are sharing this thing together? Not agreeing - if you agree it has no meaning. You are merely agreeing with a concept which you have already. Or you draw a conclusion from what the speaker has said, and you are agreeing with the conclusion, not with the fact - right? I wonder if you see this. Right sir?

So is it possible to observe this whole movement of life in which there is so much contradiction, division, look at it all as a whole movement? And to find that out one must enquire very, very, very deeply into the whole process of what is consciousness - right? Are you interested in all this? I am sorry if you are not, it doesn't matter. It really doesn't matter. At least you will hear some words and perhaps sit quietly for a while and forget it afterwards. But it doesn't matter much. What matters is that you should be acquainted with all this, that you should know something of this, and then it might some day when you are sitting quietly by the fireside, or walking by yourself in a wood, the thing will pop up and you will say, "By Jove, that is so". Then that perception then becomes real, it's yours, it is not planted by anybody else in you.

You know man has always, from time immemorial, tried to solve this problem: a life that is whole, a life that can be lived without any friction. Though friction brings about certain activity, but such activity does a great deal of mischief. And to live a life without friction one must enquire very, very deeply into this whole problem of consciousness, which is the mind, which is the whole

structure of our thinking, of our intellectual, moral, spiritual, organic life. So one has to go into this question: what is consciousness? What is consciousness, in which all the activities of thought take place? The activity of thought with all its difficulties, with all its complexities, its memories, its projections into the future is within the field of this consciousness - right? The consciousness which is the 'me' - right? Come on sirs. I am using ordinary words, ordinary English words, not a new jargon that you have to learn. Because if the whole consciousness is the result of fragmentation, then that consciousness cannot possibly be aware of what it means to be whole - you understand? If my mind, which is the basis of consciousness, if that mind is fragmented and asking that mind to look at the world as a whole, it has no meaning. So can consciousness, which is fragmented, can that consciousness observe life as a total movement, non fragmentary? And that is why it is important to enquire into what is consciousness. You understand? To be conscious. To be aware. To perceive the fragmentations, and when you perceive the fragmentation, is that perception the seeing of one fragment, other fragments? Is perception the observation of one fragment, the other fragments? When there is such perception it is still fragmentation. And that is all our consciousness. And that is what is going on all the time in our consciousness. Right?

Now to ask such a mind, to observe life in which love, death, the jobs, the livelihood, relationship, the enquiry into god or no god, all those are fragments - can the mind observe all that without fragmentation? So it is important to enquire what is consciousness - right? Consciousness exists only because of its content. Its

content makes up consciousness. My consciousness is made up of my conditioning as a Hindu, as a Brahmin, born in India with its tradition, with its superstitions, beliefs, dogmas, divisions, and the recent acquisition of a new poison called nationalism, with all the gods and so on and on and on. The conscious and unconscious residue of the past, the racial inheritance and the recent acquisition, the recent experiences, denials and sacrifices, the temperaments, the activities of personal demands, all that is the content of my consciousness, as well as your consciousness is, that is the content. And that content makes up consciousness. Without the content there is no consciousness.

Please this is very important to understand because when we go into this question of what is death and what is love, one must have understood this, otherwise it will have no meaning. Because when one dies the content of the brain cells, which have stored up all the memory, which make up the consciousness, wither away, with all its memories, experiences, knowledge. Then what has happened to consciousness, as the 'me' which has lived in this world, fighting, struggling, miserable, full of anxieties and endless sorrow? Until the mind understands the nature and the structure of consciousness, that is, what you are, which is your consciousness, that consciousness with its content makes up the total, which you call the 'me', the ego, the person, the psychological structure of your temperament, of your idiosyncrasies, of your conditioning. But without understanding it very, very deeply, non-verbally, though we may use words, one has to understand it. Communion means the verbal understanding as well as non verbal understanding. Communion between two people takes place only when there is a

relationship between the two, in which both of them are deeply, intensely, at the same time, involved in the problem, then there is not only a verbal but non-verbal communication. And that is what we have to do this morning, here, now.

So the mind sees that the whole content of my existence, my consciousness, my awareness, my conflict is within this field of time, of thought, of memories, experience and knowledge, which is within the field of consciousness. Right? If that is very clear - that is, all the religious images, the propaganda of two thousand years of priests make you believe in something, or three thousand or five thousand years of propaganda, reading, literature and all the rest of it, which has gone on in the East, all that is within this field of consciousness, which is time, which is thought. The content makes consciousness. If there is no content there is no consciousness. And the content being fragmented, one fragment observes the various other fragments, and tries to control, shape other fragments. That is what we are doing all the time. One fragment calling itself virtuous, noble, religious, scientific, modern, whatever it is, trying to shape, dominate, suppress other fragments within the field of time, which is consciousness. Right sirs? Are we meeting each other?

So my problem then is, and it is your problem when I say mine, our problem is: how then can the mind observe non-fragmentarily, observe life as a total movement - right? Which means can the mind be free of the content of consciousness? All right sirs?

Let's approach it differently. What is love? Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love the pursuit of a pleasure tasted yesterday and the demanding of it sexually or otherwise? Is that love? Is love

fear, jealousy, anxiety, attachment? That is what we consider love, don't we? No? Don't we consider that love?

Audience: No.

K. Oh my god, so ashamed, are we? That is what we call love, in which there is attachment, dependence, the sense of attachment which comes from loneliness, insufficiency in oneself, not to be able to stand alone, therefore leaning on somebody, depending on somebody. We depend on the milkman, the railway, the policeman - I am not talking of that kind of dependency - psychological dependence with all its problems, the problems of image in relationship - the image that the mind has built about the other, and the attachment to that image, and the denial of this image and creating another image. All that is what we call love. And the priests have invented another thing, the love of god, because it is much easier to love god, an image, an idea, a symbol, created, put together by the mind or by the hand than to find out what love is in relationship. Are you following all this? So what is love? And it is part of our consciousness. This thing called love in which there is the 'me' and the 'you'. The 'me' attached to you, possessing, dominating, you possessing me, dominating, holding. You satisfy my physical, sexual demands, and I satisfy you economically and so on. All that is what we call love, is part of our consciousness. And is that love? The romantic love, the physical love, the love of one's country for which you are willing to kill, maim, destroy yourself, is that what love is? Obviously love is not emotionalism, sentimentality, the sloppy acceptance of - you know - I love you and you love me. And talking about the beauty of love, the beautiful people - you know. Is all that love?

Is love the product of thought? And it is, as we know it, because you have given me pleasure, physically, sexually, psychologically and I love you because without you I can't live, I must possess you legally, morally, ethically you must be mine. And if you turn your face I am lost, I get anxious, jealous, angry, bitter, hateful. That is what we call love. And what are we going to do about all that? Just sit and listen. And you have done that for centuries, just sit and listen, or read about it, or some priest talks about it, gives you a thousand explanations. So is that love? And can the mind, the mind being the fragmented consciousness and its content, can that mind put away all these things? Totally deny all that, the dependency, the pursuit of pleasure, to be able to stand completely alone and understand what it means to be lonely, and not move away, run away from this loneliness. Can the mind in the observation of that, observing not verbally, but actually looking, then the very act of looking denies the whole thing.

So can the mind observe the content of consciousness without the movement of time - do you understand sir? We said time is thought, of course. Whether that thought is the outcome of memories, experience, knowledge, obviously, which it is, whether that thought projects itself into a phantasy, into some illusion, into some future image, it is still part of time. So can the mind observe this thing called love as it is, not as it should be, which is also within the field of what is known as love, can there be observation without the movement of thought which is time? And that observation demands tremendous attention, otherwise you can't do it.

So let's look at it differently, from a different point. Death

comes to all of us, the young, the old, middle age, it is inevitable, either through accident or through old age, with the disease, the discomfort, pain, agony, and the doctors giving you medicine to keep you alive endlessly - I don't know for what purpose. There is death, death being, the brain with all its memories stored up, experience, knowledge, that brain which has sought shelter, security in the 'me', which is a series of symbols, ideas, words, or that brain which has sought security in some neurotic action and feels safe in that neurotic action, or sought security in a belief, I am a Christian, I believe in God or I believe in the Saviour, or the Communist and so on, finding security in a belief, in an ideology which brings about all kinds of neurotic activity, that brain with all its consciousness dies, comes to an end. And man has been frightened of that. And the Christians have taken comfort in the idea of resurrection, and the Hindus and the Buddhists in a future life. Future life of what? The resurrected, the future, what is that? This consciousness with all its content, which has died, and there is the hope, the desire, comfort in a future life. Still within the field of consciousness - are you following all this? While I am living - I don't know why I put so much passion into all this, it is my life - while I am living I know I am going to die, I have rationalized it, I have looked at it, I have seen dead bodies being carried away, I have seen them buried, burnt, incinerated or cremated and the image has built round them. I have seen all that going on around me. And I am frightened, and being frightened I must seek comfort, security, some kind of hope and that is still within the field of my consciousness, in the living consciousness. And when the brain through disease, accident, old age, comes to an end, what



takes place? You are following all this? I am fully aware, the mind is fully aware the content is its consciousness, there is no consciousness when there is no content. And when the mind dies, the brain dies, the content dies, obviously. The 'me', which has been put together by thought, the 'me' which is the image which thought has built through environment, through fear, through pleasure, through accident, through various forms of stimulations and demands, that 'me' is the content and that content is my consciousness, and that consciousness, the whole movement of memory, knowledge, experience comes to an end, when it dies. I may rationalize it, take comfort in rationalization, or take comfort in some ideologies, belief, in some dogma, in some superstition, but that is not real, that is nothing to do with reality, whether all the religions proclaim there is, or there isn't, that has nothing whatever to do with reality because that is mere sayso of another, hearsay of somebody else saying. The mind has to find out for itself.

So can the mind living every day in an everyday relationship, live without the content, which has made up the consciousness, which is essentially the 'me' and its activity. You are following all this? So what takes place when the mind, the brain, the organism actually, not theoretically, actually comes to an end? This has been a problem for man, he has accumulated so much, he has acquired so much knowledge, so much information about so many things and at the end of it all there is that thing called death. And as he cannot solve it, at least he hasn't been able to solve it, he has all the comforting images, speculations, beliefs: I will live, or I will not live. And if you do live all the things, the consciousness carries on with its own content which becomes the stream in which man is

caught - that is a different matter, which we won't go into because that involves another enquiry.

So what takes place when living now, today, this morning, when the brain actually ceases, ends its memories, its images, its conclusions? - which is the content of consciousness - you follow? Can my brain, my consciousness, which is the 'me', can that, with all its content, come to an end, living, not at the end of another ten years through disease, living now? Can that mind, can that consciousness empty its content, therefore empty the 'me' - do you understand all this? Is that ever possible? I get up and go to my room, after I have talked here; the knowledge where that room is must exist otherwise it is not possible to live at all - right? So knowledge, which is based on experience and memory, from which all thought arises and therefore thought is never free and never new, that knowledge must exist, which is part of consciousness, isn't it? Are you meeting all this - right sir? Somebody come with me. Riding a bicycle, driving a car, speaking a different language, that knowledge must exist, that is also part of consciousness. But that knowledge is used by the 'me' as a separative movement, uses that knowledge for its own psychological comfort and power, position, prestige and all the rest of it. Right? So I am asking myself, whether that consciousness, with all its content as the psychological movement as the 'me' can end now, so that the mind is aware of what death means, and to see what happens. Are you following all this?

Sir, look sir. When you die, actually, I hope you won't die soon, when you die this is what is going to happen, isn't it? Your heart will cease to beat and therefore send blood to the brain, and the

brain can only beat for three and a half or two minutes or whatever it is without, fresh blood and therefore it comes to an end. And the brain cells contain all your activity of the past, your consciousness, your desires, your memories, your hurts, your anxieties, all that is there, that comes to an end. Now can the mind, now, today, living, can all that come to an end? If it does then what takes place? You understand sir? The question may be unnecessary, or the question may be put to a mind that has never asked this question but is only afraid of coming to an end. But a mind that is not frightened, a mind that is not seeking or pursuing pleasure, it doesn't mean you can't enjoy the beauty of a sunlight, the movement of the leaves, the curve of a branch, or look at a beautiful this or that, that is real enjoyment, I am not talking of that, but can that mind, can the whole of me with its content observe and end this whole content? Is it then immortality? You are following all this? That is, the mortal is made into the immortal. The mortal dies and the immortality is an idea of the mortal who is the content of consciousness - right? You are meeting all this? Man has sought immortality - in his books, in his poems, in his pictures, in the expression of his desires and their fulfilment. He has sought immortality in his family, in his name, all that is still part of this consciousness with its content, in time, therefore that is not the timeless mind that sees immortality. Therefore what happens to a mind, to a being, whose content of consciousness which makes up the consciousness dies while living? You understand? Put that question to yourself seriously, take time to meditate, go into it, not try to find a quick, some superficial silly answer.

One has always observed as an observer who is different from

the observed. The observer is part of that consciousness with its content, observing another part which is part of that consciousness so he has divided himself as the observer and the observed. But he is still within the field of that consciousness. And when the observer is the observed, which is a fact, which is so, then is the content of consciousness different from that which he has observed, in which there is no observer? Right sir? Because this is very important to ask and find out. The content of consciousness is the observer, with all its content. And the observer separates himself from the observed, which is still part of that consciousness, therefore the division is unreal, it is an artificial division. And when you see that the observer is the observed. Therefore you totally end, the mind totally ends all conflict.

Look sir, make it very simple. All relationship is based on the image that you have built about another and the other has built about you - right? You can't argue about it, it is so. And these two images have relationships, and these images are the result of many years of memories, experiences, knowledge, which you have built about her, and she has built about you. That is part of your consciousness. And what is the relationship when there is no image at all between you and her, and she has no image about you? You understand? Are you - if I may ask - are you aware that you have an image about him, to which you are dreadfully attached? And are you aware that you have an image about her to which you cling? Are you aware of this, conscious of it? And if you are conscious of it you see that your relationship with her, or her to you, is based on that image, on those images. Can those images come to an end? Then what is relationship? If the image has come to an end, which

is the content of consciousness, which makes up your consciousness, the various images you have about yourself, about everything, when those images come to an end, then what is the relationship between you and her? Then is there an observer observing apart from the thing it has observed? Or it is a total movement of love in relationship - you are coming? So love is a movement in relationship in which the observer is not.

So the mind - we are using the word mind to include the brain, the physical organism, the totality - that mind has lived within the field of fragmentations, which make up its consciousness, and without its content the observer is not. And when the observer is not, then relationship is not within the field of time, which comes about when there is the image you have about her and she has about you. Can that image come to an end as you live daily? If that image doesn't come to an end then there is no love. It is then one fragment against another fragment. Now you have heard that, don't draw a conclusion from it, see the truth of it and you can't see the truth of it verbally. You can hear the meaning of the words but you have to see the significance of it, have an insight into it, see the truth of it, actually 'what is'. Then the truth is not within the field of consciousness.

So what takes place when the mind can empty itself of all its content as consciousness? That is, the observer and the observed, two separate things which you have regarded, which you have always thought differently, the observer, the higher self and all that, you know the inventions which you all go into, the content with all its anxieties, fears, agonies, despairs, hopes, joys, you know the thing of losing a job, all that, which is the content, can

the mind see it? You know the other day we talked about idea. The root meaning of that word idea is seeing. The seeing only, not seeing and drawing an abstractions from the seeing. Just seeing. Then action is instantaneous. The seeing of the content of your consciousness, which is your daily existence, the seeing of it and not drawing a conclusion from it. The conclusion is verbal and therefore no reality. But the seeing then is immediate action. That immediate action is the total movement of life. You are getting it? That is a movement in which there is no fragmentation, therefore perceiving life as whole, death as a whole, love as a whole, living as a whole, which means sane, healthy, holy - H-O-L-Y - holy therefore you don't have to seek something sacred beyond yourself, it is there - I won't say it is there, then you would say, I am God - we have got such crooked minds. Then you will see life becomes holy, therefore out of that you respect every living thing, and that is love. Right sirs, that is enough.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH SEPTEMBER 1973**

This is the last talk. We have been talking about so many things which are concerned with our daily life, with our frustrations, fears and pleasures, and the mad world in which we live, of which unfortunately we are. And yesterday morning we talked about a total movement of life in which is included love, death and the endless pain of existence, with its pleasures.

This morning could we talk about, or rather enquire together into this question of whether there is anything sacred. We are enquiring, we are not asserting that there is something, or that there is not. We will leave that to the priests, or to the philosophers, who speculate about these matters. But a mind which sees the transient world, which is aware that everything changes, that there is absolutely nothing permanent, neither in our relationships with each other, nor in ideas, nor in any action, however beautiful however limited, however shallow. And when we see all this, the suffering, and no ending to that suffering, to the conflict, to the endless pain and the pursuit of pleasure, the old age and death and nothing is permanent, everything is in a flux, seeing all this, both verbally and non-verbally, being conscious of what is going on, both outwardly and inwardly, one inevitably asks: is there really anything that is truly holy, that is really sacred? And this morning I would like to go into that.

We are going together to share this problem. Though we may not have asked that question; or you have vaguely felt towards it; or you are already assured by propaganda by tradition, by constant

repetition of certain dogmas, rituals that there is something sacred. But a mind that has come to a conclusion that there is something that is holy, obviously is not really free to discover what is sacred. And I think that is an important question. Because if we can through investigation, through tracing out the innumerable enquiries, and the various conclusions which man has come to, and if we could discard everything that man has said is sacred, or everything that thought has put together and called it sacred - the books, the image, the idea, the ideology, the belief in god, or no belief in god, if we could discard all that, then our minds are capable of enquiring, investigating into this question. Because if we accept everything, if we say everything is a matter of time, a matter of destruction, decay, corruption, then life as a whole, not only has it not very great meaning, but it is rather shallow, and one tries to fill that shallowness, that emptiness with something that is called sacred. So if we could discard all that, not verbally but actually, in our life, totally discard everything that man has called sacred. They have done it in India to an extraordinary extent, a thousand images, thousand rituals, a thousand gurus, thousand systems. Here too in the Christian world there is all this ideology, belief, saviours, rituals with their dogmas, superstitions and astonishing cruelty. Now if we could put aside that then the mind is capable of really investigating and not experiencing - because that word 'experience' is a very suspect word - but come upon something, the mind is capable of this thing called sacred.

To find that out, to come upon it, certain obvious things are necessary: if one is at all really deeply profoundly serious, otherwise what we are talking about has no meaning whatsoever,



don't play with it unless you are desperately serious. Because this demands tremendous attention, tremendous care, a sense of dedication to find out.

So the first thing, it seems to me, that is necessary, is order. Please don't translate that word into what you think is order. Or adjust yourself to a word that has lost its meaning. So we are first going to enquire together what is order and what is virtue. Because that is the very foundation of this enquiry. If there is no virtue, no order the mind cannot possibly go further, because it can go further only in illusion, in deception, in hypocrisy. So one must together find out what is order. In a permissive world there is no order. You do what you want to do. That is the reaction to your Victorianism, your being controlled, shaped, driven, and the reaction is to do what you want to do without any restriction, without any sense of order. And the order to a Communist world is to obey, to conform to a pattern. And that pattern can easily be established by killing millions, and millions and millions of people, in China, in Russia, in all the satellite countries and so on. And to establish what they call order is to destroy people, and destroy people to bring about, what they consider, a society which will be perfect. That is order. Then to the priest, to the whole religious groups, the sects, the gurus, order is control - control, subjugate, suppress, conform, imitate, believe. And such order is total disorder. We are going to go into that.

So what is the nature of order? Is it a blue print which we accept and conform to? That is what we have been doing. Are we sharing this thing together? Because if we don't share what is being said then don't listen, it isn't worth it. It has no meaning. But if you

share what is being said, which doesn't mean you agree or disagree, because in sharing together we are enquiring, thinking, observing, investigating together. Together is important because we create the world together, we are together in our relationship, we cannot do anything by ourselves, it is only together we can create, we can build, we can investigate.

So if we are sharing this, that is, what is the meaning of order? We can see the order which the Communist world demands is not order, it is conformity, suppression and the threat of death or prison or a hospital. The order which the religious groups, whether they are Catholic and so on, throughout the world, again have this sense of complete control, control and by that, through that process discover the image they have created. And the permissive society in which we live, which is also a reaction, to them there is no order, they live in constant confusion.

So in investigating together this word, what does it mean? Does it come about through permissiveness, doing anything you want to do? Which is what you are doing, only occasionally yielding to circumstances, and trying to battle against the circumstances, throw bombs and all the rest of it. Destroy what is called the Establishment and hoping to create a new Establishment. Is that order? Or is it disorder? And the Communist world with their dictatorship and conformity, an absolute obedience, the threat of mental hospitals, you know all that is going on, is that order? And is it order, the structure which the mind has created and that structure is called the religious organization, is that order? Or all that is disorder. The permissive man, or the woman, the Communist suppression, obedience, and the destruction of millions

and millions of people - the Catholics have also done this, probably as we said the other day, Christians have killed more people than anybody else probably in the world, perhaps not more than the Communists. And when you observe all this, you see the total disorder.

So what is disorder? Because by investigating what is not we find out what is. Do you understand? By understanding, investigating into what is not love, then there is love. Love is not jealousy, love is not pleasure, love is not, as we said yesterday morning, love is not the desire, the pursuit of jealousy, hatred, antagonism, aggression, and when all that is not in you, then the other is, the other blossoms, flowers. So in the same way in understanding what is disorder, out of that comes the flowering of order, not according to any pattern, self created or imposed.

So now we are going to enquire into what is disorder, what brings about disorder. Any conflict is disorder - conflict between nations, between groups of people, between different classes of people, between ideologies, the division as the 'me' and the 'you', any conflict essentially breeds disorder. And we live in conflict. We have accepted conflict from our education, our whole way of living is the field of disorder, of conflict. And control is disorder - please listen carefully because most of the permissive society has no control, they have thrown all that overboard, but they are not orderly, virtuous, clear. We'll go into that. So where there is division and therefore conflict, that is one of the causes of disorder. Another cause of disorder is control. Control implies suppression, conformity to a pattern, established by yourself, through your own experience, or the experience of another. Where there is control

there is contradiction. And control implies a controller. And the controller is the controlled - right? Are we going along together, or is this all Greek? Controller is the controlled. The controller is a fragment of thought which says, "I must control the other fragment", but it is still within the field of thought. So where there is control, suppression, conformity, imitation, all that is implied in that word, the controller and the controlled. In that there is division and therefore conflict. So that breeds disorder, conforming to an ideal, to an ideology, to a formula, conclusion and that brings conflict and therefore disorder. And therefore what arises from that question, whether a human being can live in this world without any control at all, not permissiveness. We'll come back to that question.

Disorder comes into being when there is fear and the pursuit of pleasure. Obviously, when the mind is only concerned with pleasure and the pursuit of it, there must inevitably be aggression, violence, fear and all the network which pleasure brings about. That is also disorder. And the action based on a conclusion, an ideology, is disorder - right? Can the mind observe this disorder of action which approximates itself to an ideology, control which implies suppression, conformity, conflict between the controller and the controlled; and the division between thought and the idea. All that is disorder. And in the understanding of that disorder, the flowering of order takes place, which is not conformity, which is not this terrible drill, but the understanding, the investigation, the awareness, the attention to disorder in our life.

That is, one of the causes for disorder is this demand for experience. I am sorry to upset all your apple cart! What is experience, which most people want? You have the experiences of

everyday, the office, the factory, the sexual experiences, the fears, the incidents, the accidents, you have every kind of experience, if you have lived thirty or forty years, and being bored with all that you want something more. Either you want to experience through drugs, or experience some kind of meditative illusion. And when you experience who is the experiencer? You are following all this? Are we together? Please? There is a lot more - I have just begun. So if you miss this you won't go further, because this is very important. We are laying the foundation to what is called meditation. If you haven't done this you cannot meditate, you don't know what it means. You can play with it, sit under trees cross legged, breath properly and all that kind of business, you can sit for ten thousand years and do that and you won't know what meditation is. But unless you lay the foundation, not on sand, but in depth, then the mind will be caught in a network of illusion, deception, and that has no validity, that is not truth. So unless you actually in your daily life lay this, don't meditate. That is mere escape, just a game that you are playing with, it is a form of self hypnosis.

So we said experience is one of the activities of disorder. As we said, most of us are bored with our life, our life has no meaning as it is now. And the mind wants more experience, something transcendental, something beautiful, something everlasting, something glorious. But it has not investigated who is the experiencer. Until it understands who is the experiencer, whatever it experiences is still within the field of the known, therefore it is nothing new. I don't know if you follow all this? So we must investigate who is the experiencer? And he must be capable of

recognizing the experience, otherwise it is not an experience. So the experiencer is the entity that recognizes, he can recognize only that which he has known, he cannot possibly recognize something new. Therefore what he is seeking through experience is the furthering of what is known. Oh come on sirs. And that is one of the factors of disorder. Now can the mind see all this? Not accept it, not as an idea, but actually in our daily life see this: disorder caused by the demand and the pursuit of experience, as enlightenment, as truth, as god, as whatever you will, the conflict between action and the idea, between the controller and the controlled, and the conflict in relationship, the conflict between two images, the one that you have and the one that the other has - all that is disorder. And out of that understanding of that disorder comes order, which is a living thing. And therefore virtue is something alive, living, changing, moving, and without that virtue - because virtue cannot be cultivated, you cannot possibly cultivate humility. If you do you are cultivating subtle forms of vanity. As virtue cannot be cultivated, but it blossoms only when there is no disorder inwardly. And without this basic foundation, meditation, which is really a marvellous thing if this is laid, then we can talk about meditation. Then we can investigate what is meditation, which is so essential to come upon that thing which is sacred. Right?

Have we come so far together? Please come on. It is a hot morning and a lovely morning, full of shadows and great beauty. And beauty is not experiencing. You cannot experience beauty. It is there for you to see it, but if you want to experience in terms of beauty and romanticism and expression, then it is not beauty, it is

merely a furthering of your own conditioning, response.

So a mind that is aware of disorder, and therefore out of that awareness the flowering of order which is virtue, when that is really and deeply and honestly laid, then we can go into this question of whether there is anything sacred. To come upon that you must investigate what time is and what thought is. Can you bear all this, this morning? You aren't tired? I'll go on.

We said we must investigate thought and time. Unless time has a stop the mind cannot perceive anything sacred, anything new. So we must enquire whether thought has any relationship to time, and what is time? Because it is very important. There is obviously the time by the watch, today, yesterday and tomorrow. Planning, going from here to there, planning to do certain things, to learn a language, to learn how to drive a car, to do any technological work you must have time. You must have time to do Yoga properly. You know what that word means, which you all practise, some of you do, I see you doing some crazy things under the trees (Laughter) - do you know what that word means? It means to join, yoking together, yoking an oxen, two oxen, to join. I am sure it means something entirely different because they have translated as joining, the body and the soul, the Atman, the Higher Self, and the Lower Self, and to do that you must do proper breathing, exercises - you know all that business. A false conception of division and then the joining - you understand? And it may mean really a sense of total harmony.

So we are investigating what time is, because without understanding that, if the mind is not free of time it cannot possibly look into something which is timeless, which may be sacred. You

understand? So the mind must clearly understand what time is. All this is meditation - you understand, not just one part, the whole of this morning's talk is the movement in meditation. What is time - apart from the chronological time? Time is movement, from here to there, psychologically, as well as physically from here to that house. So the movement between this and that is time. The space between this and that, the covering of that is time, the movement to that is time. So all movement is time. Both physically, going from here to Paris, New York, or wherever you will, requires time. And also psychologically to change 'what is', into 'what should be' requires time, the movement, at least we think so. So time is movement in space, created by thought as this and achieving that. Thought then is time, thought is movement in time - come on sirs. Does this mean anything to any of you? We are journeying together? I'll go on, I won't ask anymore.

Please this requires tremendous attention, care, a sense of non-personal, non-pleasurable, where desire doesn't enter into it at all. That requires great care and that care brings its own order, which is its own discipline. So thought is movement between 'what is' and 'what should be'. Thought is time to cover that space, and as long as there is the division between this and that psychologically, the movement is time of thought. So thought is time as movement - right? And is there time as movement, as thought, when there is only observation of 'what is'? Which is, the observation as the observer and the observed, not as the observer and the observed but only the observation, without the movement of going beyond 'what is'. Are you getting this? Are you all paralysed? Because it is very important for the mind to understand this, because thought can



create most marvellous images of that which is sacred and holy, which all religions have done. All religions are based on thought. All religions are the organization of thought, in belief, in dogma, in rituals. So unless there is complete understanding of this thought as time and movement, the mind cannot possibly go beyond itself.

As we said we are trained, educated, drilled into changing 'what is' into 'what should be' - the ideal. And the word 'ideal' comes from the word idea which means to see, only that. Not draw an abstraction from what you see, but actually remain with what you see. So we are trained to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. That training is the movement of thought to cover the space between 'what is' and 'what should be', and that takes time. That whole movement of thought in space is time necessary to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. The observer is the observed, therefore there is nothing to change. I'll go on. Because there is only 'what is'. The observer doesn't know what to do with 'what is', therefore he tries various methods to change 'what is', controls 'what is', tries to suppress actually 'what is', but the observer is the observed, the 'what is', is the observer, like anger, jealousy exist - jealousy is also the observer, there isn't jealousy separate from the observer, both are one. So when there is no movement to change 'what is', you understand, movement as thought in time, when thought perceives that there is no possibility of changing 'what is' then that which is 'what is' ceases entirely because the observer is the observed. You go into this very deeply and you will see for yourself, it is really quite simple.

I dislike someone, so the dislike is different from me and you. The entity that dislikes is dislike itself, it is not separate, and when

thought says, I must get over my dislike, then it is movement in time to get over that which actually is, which is created by thought. So the observer, the entity and the thing called dislike are the same, therefore there is complete immobility, which is not the immobility of staticism, it is completely motionless, therefore completely silent. So time as movement, time as thought, achieving a result has come totally to an end, therefore action is instantaneous. So the mind has laid the foundation and is free from disorder. And therefore there is the flowering and the beauty of virtue, that is the basis. And in that foundation is the relationship between you and another, in that relationship there is no activity of image, there is only relationship, not the image adjusting itself to the other image. And there is only 'what is', and not the changing of 'what is'. The changing of 'what is', or transforming of 'what is', is the movement of thought in time.

Then when you have come to that point, the mind and the brain cells also become totally still. The brain which holds the memories, experience, knowledge, can and must function in the field of the known. But now that mind, that brain, is free from the activity of time and thought. Then the mind is completely still. All this takes place without effort, all this must take place without any sense of discipline, control, all that belongs to disorder. You know what we are saying is something that is totally different from what your gurus, your Masters, your Zen philosophy, all that, because in this there is no authority, there is no following another. Because if you follow somebody you are not only destroying yourself but also the other. Therefore a religious mind has no authority whatsoever. But it has got intelligence and it applies that intelligence. In the world

of action there is the authority of the scientist, the doctor, the man who teaches you how to drive, otherwise there is no authority, there is no guru.

So the mind then, if you have gone as deeply as that, then the mind having established order in relationship - and that order is virtue - then understanding the whole complex disorder of our lives, of our daily lives, and in the comprehension, in the awareness of that disorder in which there is no choice, out of that comes beauty of virtue, which is not cultivated, which is not brought about by thought. Therefore that virtue is love, order, and if the mind has established that with deep roots, which is immovable, unchangeable, then you can enquire into this whole movement of time, as we somewhat did. Then the mind is completely still, there is no observer, there is no experiencer, there is no thinker.

And there are various forms of sensory and extra sensory perception, clairvoyance, healing, all kinds of things take place, but they are all secondary issues, and a mind that is really concerned in the discovery of what is truth, what is sacred will never touch all that, because they are secondary issues.

So the mind then is free to observe. Then there is that thing that man has sought through centuries, the unnameable, the timeless. And no description, no verbal expression of it, the image that is created by that, by thought, completely and utterly ceases, because there is no entity that wants to express it in words. That, your mind can only discover, or come upon it, when you have this strange thing called love, compassion - not only to your neighbour, but to the animals, to the trees, to everything. Then such a mind itself

becomes sacred.

You don't want to ask questions, do you?

Q: The resolution of the conflict is part of order.

K: No, madame, no madame.

Madame we have gone into that. Madame, forgive me but we went into that this morning. I know we are conditioned to accept life in conflict, and we said that conflict creates disorder. It is only when the mind is not in conflict there is order. And that order cannot come into being without understanding what is disorder, which conflict has created in different ways - conflict in relationship, conflict between action and idea, conflict as the 'me' and the 'you', we and they, conflict between various ideologies, conflict between various religions - all that has produced appalling disorder, madness, violence, brutality, wars. In understanding all that there is order. That is, to understand is to see what actually is, and when you see 'what is' then action is immediate. You are no longer an Englishman, Jew, Arab, French or German, you are a human being without a label.

Q: How do I reconcile this with the process of evolution?

K: Evolving what? From the monkey to the higher ape to what we are now? We have evolved from that, at least what the scientists, biologists, and the archeologists say. We have evolved, we have got the most marvellous instrument, the organs, the organism, extraordinarily sensitive, which you are carefully destroying through pleasure, through taste. And we have got a most astonishing thing called the brain, which has been conditioned by the culture in which we live, to fight, to struggle, to battle, to call ourselves Hindus, Indians, or Americans, Russians, and all that. It

is trained to battle, to be aggressive, to kill. We have evolved. Physically we have evolved. Is there evolution, evolving, going further, psychologically? Or there is no tomorrow for a person who has understood this, what we have talked about. Progress is a dreadful word. I was told it meant originally to enter into a strange country fully armed! Progress to go forward. Physically we have evolved tremendously, and a great many scientists say, physically there is no further evolution, you can't develop a third eye, or four legs or whatever it is. But psychologically, inwardly, is there evolution at all? Have you evolved psychologically? Evolved? That is, you are no longer brutal, you no longer desire to kill somebody, no longer have the desire to kill an animal to eat. Divide - you follow? Have you evolved? Perhaps you have evolved in having more bathrooms, but otherwise have you evolved at all? Or the whole idea of psychologically evolving is totally illusory. Me getting better. Me becoming more noble. The 'me' is put together by words, the 'me' is a series of experiences, knowledge, memories, which are the past. Me is the past, the dead thing which is active all the time. Oh my Lord! And you call that progress. Me improving. And therefore when you are trying to improve yourself there is more conflict. But when you see what you are actually - shallow, empty, petty, mediocre, repeating, repeating words of others, nothing that you have found for yourself. See actually 'what is', and see that 'what is' is the observer. There is no division between the observer and the observed, then there is complete transformation of 'what is', then your mind is totally different. That is real transformation, not evolution, not the evolution of me getting a little better, a little more cunning, a little more you know -

all that stupid stuff that goes on.

So a mind that is serious, the mind that has observed the world and itself, and this observation takes place only in relationship between you and another, and seeing the total disorder of our lives, of our misery, and the endless sorrow in which we are caught, and seeing the sorrow and the ending of sorrow, and the ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom. And out of that comes that which is timeless, which is nothing whatever to do with you and me. It is for the mind to come upon it.

## **MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 18TH DECEMBER 1973**

It's a nice sunset, isn't it. I would like, if I may, to remind you that this is not an entertainment, intellectual or in any way stimulating or a religious circus. We are here because we are serious. The word `serious' implies that one must be concerned very deeply with what is happening around the world and to what is taking place in the human mind. And those who are serious are entirely committed to this question of how to transform the human mind. And I am sure this is the concern of most people who are involved not only physiologically, sociologically but inwardly seeing how things are, not only outwardly but also inwardly, one must always be asking, it seems to me, why the human mind after thousands of years still lives in such chaos, with such brutality, with such utter self-concern, self-interest, disregarding, neglecting the whole value of existence. I mean by that word `serious' all that, all the implications that are involved in investigating together this question: why we are living as we are in such degradation, corruption, such vanity, meaningless existence. And to investigate together, which we are going to do during these four talks and the discussion, to investigate deeply one must be free to observe, not only the picture that is painted by words but also observe our reactions to the picture, how we respond to the various challenges which we are going to meet in our investigation together.

So communication is very important. The word `communication' implies, if one has looked into a dictionary, sharing, partaking together in the same problems. Investigating

together the issues and therefore where there is communication there is sharing in responsibility. You are sharing, not merely listening to the speaker but sharing together in what he is saying. Again the word 'sharing' implies that you must be interested in it, you must be interested in the problems that we are facing, in the crisis that we are left with, with all the turmoils, all the miseries, suffering, aching, loneliness and all despair. To share it together implies that you must not only be interested, you must meet what the speaker is saying freely. Sharing implies that we meet together at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, otherwise we do not share. If we are sharing food together you must be hungry too. And the responsibility of sharing is yours as well as that of the speaker. So this is not merely a verbal communication in an English language but also there is a communication which is non-verbal. The non-verbal communication is much more difficult, that requires a mind that is not caught in words, in the trap of expressions and explanations but a mind that can meet directly, face 'what is' instantly, such a mind has no need for words and explanations. But unfortunately we haven't got such minds. A mind that is capable non-verbally without the observer to see what actually is taking place, communication then is instantaneous, there is not an interval between the word, the idea and the action. And such communication is not possible because as we said most of us are bound to various forms of theories, speculations, concepts, formulas, ideations, our minds are not free to observe. So we must use language, words, words that have meaning to both of us, words that have content, the same content to both of us otherwise you will



translate what you hear according to your own terminology, according to your own like and dislike, therefore there is no communication even verbally.

So we are together going to look at the world as it is and see for ourselves who is responsible for this colossal mess, colossal degradation, immorality. And whether the human mind, your mind - when we use the 'human mind' we mean the human mind not your individual mind, because your individual mind is no mind at all, because a mind that is fragmented is not a mind. So we will go into all that.

So this is our problem: we need survival, we must survive and we need as human beings a totally different kind of energy. I am not talking about shortage of petrol or oil - the Arabs are blackmailing the world, I am not talking about that kind of energy. We are talking about a different kind of energy that will transform the human mind, the human psyche, the psychological inward structure of the mind. And for that you need a totally different kind of energy into which we are going to go, investigate together, therefore share together. And it is also a matter of great importance, this question of survival. I do not know if you have looked at the world, at yourself and your relationship to the world, and whether we are surviving at all, or whether we are destroying ourselves. We are destroying nature through over-population, through callousness, through industrialization and so on and so on, with which we are all familiar. Man is destroying man, that's an obvious fact - through wars, through national divisions, through religious beliefs, sectarianism and all that. Man is destroying himself and therefore the question of survival becomes

extraordinarily important.

And to survive sanely, rationally, healthily, survive as a whole entity, we need this different energy. And that energy can only be brought about by religion, by a religious mind. Now the word `religion' has several meanings, the word not what the religious mind is involved with now. The religious mind that is now involved in rituals, in worshipping of idols, prayers, ceremonies, going to temples, mosques, churches, masses, all that is not religion. It's just the structure of a human mind that is frightened, of a human mind that cannot understand itself and therefore projects out of its ignorance entities, saviors, gods, rituals that have no meaning whatsoever - we are going into all that. We mean by religion, the word itself, a mind that is gathering all its attention, efforts in the transformation of the mind. And it means also paying heed to, having a mind that is completely attentive, not only in doing little things but attentive totally. Therefore a religious mind is not a negligent mind. In the very negation is the energy that comes. Again we will go into all this.

So let us be clear, both you and the speaker, when we use the word `religion' we are using it in a totally different sense. It has nothing whatsoever to do with images, with so-called sacred books, the everlasting repetition of tradition, prayers, vows, renunciation, all that. What religion means is a mind that has gathered itself together to transform itself totally, a psychological revolution and therefore religion means paying attention, paying heed to. So if that is clear we can proceed.

We said that it's a matter of great urgency that man survives and that he have this new kind of creative energy. Again that word

`creative', everybody uses it. A shoddy little painter uses that word, a man who writes a poem and gets it published, he is creative, and so on. We are using the word `creative' in the religious sense. Because without that quality of a religious mind creation becomes commercialism, without that quality of mind creation is the explosion of total goodness which can be expressed in literature, in painting, in everything.

Now let's proceed. I hope you are following all this, or rather that we are sharing this thing together. We are not asking you to believe anything the speaker is saying. The speaker has no authority, he is not your guru. Please bear in mind that he is not your guru and you are not his followers. We are together investigating the human problems and seeing if we can go beyond them. And in communication with each other we both bear the responsibility in sharing - responsibility, not merely just listening to words, agreeing or disagreeing and go off doing your old habits and your old religious circus. All right? May I go on now? Right.

How do you observe the world - the world about us, nature, marvelous sunsets, and the beautiful sky on a clear lovely morning, the woods, the trees, the seas and the rivers? And how do you look at the world that is destroying itself? How do you look at national sovereignties with their armies and divisions and wars? How do you look at sorrow, starvation, poverty, the corruption that is rampant in this country? How do you look at all that if you are at all serious and are really concerned deeply, not only verbally but inwardly with your heart, with your mind, with your total being, how do you look at all this? Do you look at it as though you were separate from that, or you are that? Man has created this society,

man has put together this culture with their gods, with their superstitions, with their army and so on, this culture is the result of man's endeavour. So do you observe it as part of yourself and therefore feel tremendously about it? Or do you merely observe it as an outsider looking in? It's very important to understand this. If you are merely looking as an observer apart from this messy world, insane, brutal, all the rest of that, if you merely observe it from your traditional personal point of view then you don't see this misery, you don't relate yourself to that, you don't get involved totally with that. So it is important from now on, during these talks, how you observe; how you observe the tree, how you observe the clouds, how you observe the setting sun, how you hear the crows - is there a distance between you and the thing observed? Please, we are going together. How do you look? And who has put this world together, the present mess, the wars, the corruption, you know, all that is happening in the world, people deliberately destroying people, for political, national, various reasons - who has put this world together? The gods, the traditions, the religious divisions? Have you ever asked that question? If you have what is the answer?

So we are going to find out, investigate together that question first. What is the responsibility of thought? Because we all think in some way or another. What is the responsibility of thought with regard to the structure in which it lives? You understand my question? Have I made my question clear? Thought has created the national, religious divisions. Right? Thought has created the idea of the Hindus and the Muslims, the capitalists, the communists, Mao's and the non-Mao's, thought has put together, this miserable

chaotic world and it is responsible for that. It is not only responsible for the technology, for the extraordinary things man has invented, medicine, all that, scientific knowledge, but also it is responsible for the national, secular, social, economic divisions, the `me' and the `not me', `we' and `they', thought is responsible for this. Right? Is there any doubt about that? Thought has made this world as it is, the external world, and we are trying to solve the problem which thought has created through further thinking. Right, do you understand this, are we going to together? Are we understanding each other, sir? You are a Hindu, or a Muslim or whatever you are, with all your traditions of ashes and this and that and all the circum that goes on, it is put together by thought, isn't it? No? You all seem terribly doubtful about it, don't you? Because you say, `Thought is such a shallow business and we didn't create our gods, they exist'. Did they exist or did man invent gods? You think it out.

So thought is responsible for this chaos and misery, suffering that exists outside and inside. There is no question about it. You may speculate, you may quote a dozen books, but fundamentally thought is responsible. And we are now trying to solve our economic, social, religious, scientific problems - not scientific problems but the problems which human beings have come to when they use science in destruction. So thought is responsible for this. And we are using thought to clear the mess. Right? When you say, `God will clear this mess', your idea of god is the structure of your thought, is your conditioning, is your tradition. Right? As the communists want to resolve the problems according to a certain philosophy, according to some concepts, those concepts, those

ideas are the result of thought. So thought is responsible. And can thought solve these problems? Or you need a totally different kind of perception, which is not related to thought because thought in itself is fragmentary. Right? Thought itself breaks things up as the outer and the inner, the `you' and the `me', my country and your country, you are taller, more intelligent than I am, it is all fragmentation created by thought. Are we meeting each other? Do we see this together or you say, `No, thought is not responsible for all this misery.'? If you do, then who is responsible? Human beings with their greed, envy, suspicions, pride, ambition, brutality, that ambition, brutality, envy creates the social structure, which is again thought - I want to be bigger than you, I want to have more money, envy and all that. So thought is fundamentally responsible for that.

And so we must find a different way, a different quality of mind that is not bound by thought. It sounds rather crazy but we are going to go into that. Thought essentially is the response of knowledge. Right? Knowledge being experience, knowledge is the past, the past being one day's tradition or ten thousand year's tradition. It is stored up in the brain as memory and memory is necessary to function; to drive a car, to ride a bicycle, to speak English, or any technological activity, knowledge is absolutely necessary. That is, the past experience accumulated as knowledge both in the scientific world, economic world, and you know all the technological world. So thought which can function only within the field of knowledge - please follow this a little bit, it is not too complicated - thought which can only function within the field of knowledge, and that knowledge is always in the past, knowledge is the past. It may project from the known to the future and modify

the future but it is still within the field of the known. Right? Are we following each other? Please do respond. Don't go to sleep. And if thought is responsible, as it is, then what is the responsibility of thought in the resolution of our problems? You have understood? We have wars, Pakistan and India had a war recently. Wars have existed for thousands of years, that's knowledge. And knowledge has not solve the problem of war, on the contrary, they are inventing more and more refined and more ways to kill en masse, greater numbers. So knowledge which is necessary in a certain direction, in a certain field, that very knowledge becomes a danger in the resolution of our human problems. Are you following all this? Am I talking to myself? Because I don't feel you are coming with me, we are not taking the journey together. Probably you have never thought about these things. You have acted in the field of knowledge mechanically, knowledge is tradition, and you have repeated for generations the tradition, the Gita, the Upanishads, or your gurus, repeat, repeat, repeat, mechanically. That is, always functioning within the field of knowledge and hoping to solves all our human problems within that field. And we have never solved them: we are still greedy, we are still frightened, we still hate each other, deceive each other, try to dominate each other, though knowledge has said, don't do it. So we must understand the function of knowledge and the freedom from knowledge. Shall I go on? Right, may I go ahead? I don't feel I am in contact with you somehow. All right, sir. I'll go ahead.

We are saying that knowledge is essentially the past, it may modify itself through the present to the future, but it is still the past, rooted in the past. And tradition is the past, which is

knowledge, whether the knowledge of great saints or whatever it is, it is still the past. That word `tradition' also means betrayal. Now betrayal means the betrayal of the present. If you with your knowledge come to the present to understand the present you are betraying the present, you are not seeing the present. And to see the present with all its immensity there must be freedom from the known, from tradition, from knowledge. So that freedom means to observe, to observe the tree, the clouds, the birds, your wife, your husband, your ideas, without the past. Which means without the observer. The observer is the past because he is the entity that holds the past, and we are educated to look at the world through the eyes of the past. It may be a day old but it is still the past. So can you observe, without the observer, the tree? You have understood? I mustn't ask you any more. Now can we observe the world and ourselves, because we are the world and the world is me, and the world is you, can we observe this world, the map of this world without the observer, without your prejudices, without your conclusions, without your ideologies, without your traditions, without your books, without your grandmother, your education and all that, just to look?

Now to look, to so look you need energy, and you dissipate that energy when you look through the eyes of the past. Right? Because you are dealing with something actual, man is actually destroying himself. That's a fact, economically, socially, using all the materials of the earth, man is killing himself. And if you want to solve how to stop that killing you have to come to it with a mind that is totally fresh, and the mind cannot be fresh if you come to it with a tradition, with an opinion, with an ideology. Right?



So can you observe violence, which is part of the world, which is part of each one of us. Can you observe your violence without withdrawing from the fact to a conclusion and looking with a conclusion at the fact? Now you are violent. Please, this is important because if you can look at that violence non-ideationally, then there is total freedom from violence. Go into it, you will see. Because man apparently by nature, by education, by various incidents and accidents, by the explosion of population, man is given less and less space, space outwardly and also inwardly, and when there is no space he becomes violent. And also violence is not merely getting angry, and wanting to hurt others, hit others, but violence to distort our mind to conform and so on. So violence, can you look at that violence non- ideationally? That is, just to observe the fact and remain with that fact. I am violent, if I am, I am violent, I have been educated to be violent, I have inherited violence. The social structure makes me behave violently, everything around me encourages me to be violent. Ambition is a form of violence, conformity is a form of violence, suppression is a form of violence, control is a form of violence. So everything around me encourages, educates me to be violent. And I have not been able to solve that. One of the reasons for it not being solved is I withdraw from that fact into an idea, the non-violence, which is an abstraction which has nothing to do whatever with the fact of violence, but I have been trained to oppose violence with non-violence, which is another form of violence. You are following all this? So I have been trained. And it has become almost impossible for me to remain and to observe that fact of violence patiently. It is going to tell me lots if I look. But I begin to tell what it should do,

what it should not do, according to my conditioning. So can I look at that violence without the dissipation of energy as an abstraction? That is, to remain with the word, with that feeling, completely, giving total attention to it. And you cannot give total attention to it if you wander away from it. I hope you are doing this. Then what takes place? You understand my question?

I'll repeat it once more, to make it quite clear. We are violent people, the various causes of that violence and the explanations are innumerable, but the fact is we are violent. And we are dealing not with explanations but with the fact. And from childhood we have been trained to move away from the fact, we are incapable of facing the fact. And can the mind observe violence without any dissipation of energy which is attention? Attention is energy. And can you look at yourself being violent - you may not be violent now, but you know what violence is very well - can you look at that feeling and remain completely immovable with that feeling? Any movement is the movement of thought, therefore in that movement there is the observer and the observed. The observer is then, I must control it, I must suppress it, it is right to be violent, my country is attacked by another country therefore I must protect myself, my sister is being raped therefore I must kill. All those are movements away from the fact of violence, and therefore the moving away is the dividing process which is thought. So can you observe violence without a single movement of thought? And when you do what takes place? Is violence a fact? Or it is related to the word which I instantly use to recognize that feeling. Please follow this. I use the word 'violence' to denote the feeling, the feeling is new and I use the word to recognize that feeling,

therefore in recognition I have brought the present into the past. Right? So I am betraying the present. So can I look at that feeling of violence without a single word, never using the word 'violence' at all? Then what takes place? You understand? When that feeling arises with which you are all familiar, even the saints I am afraid are familiar with that, when that feeling arises you use a word and by using the word you put it in the framework of the past and by recognition through the past you separate the present by the idea. Now all that is a dissipation of energy. Whereas if you can look at that feeling without the word, without wandering away into abstraction, then you have that dissipated energy collected. And when there is that dissipated energy, which is no longer dissipated, it becomes attention then that feeling completely ends. Are you doing it? As I am talking, are you really following this out and seeing whether you can do it, whether your mind can do this so that the mind is completely free of violence? And to be so free you need that total attention which is religion.

A religious man is free from violence, he has no concepts of non-violence, because a religious man is concerned with 'what is', not with 'what should be'. So can you, take anything, envy, greed, ambition, your fear - we will go into fear another day - can you observe this fact? And so can you observe what is happening around you in the world in the same way? You understand? That is, without plan, without ideals, without the repetition of 'what should be', 'what should not be', how corrupt and all the rest of it, just to observe the fact around you? Which is, can you observe your politicians? That's a good example. Can you observe your politicians? Have you looked at them? Not through newspapers,

not what they are doing, but have you looked at them as politicians, which is yourself? You understand? You are a politician therefore you have elected the politicians. Do you understand what I am saying? The politician is you. Right? Seeking power, position, and holding on to that position at any cost, corrupt, and that politician is you because you want power, you want position, you want to dominate. Now can you look at that politician which is outside of you, who is really inside you, can you look at yourself and observe without moving away into an abstraction? And then will you, if you so look, will you be corrupt? Do you want power, position, prestige? Do you follow? When you give total attention, which is the act of a religious mind, then you have a different quality of energy which transcends every obstacle, every problem.

So thought is not a religious thing. In a certain culture thought means the outside. Thought has divided the world as the outer and the inner, and those people who are religious are pursuing the inner, which thought has created as the inner. Now if thought has divided the outer and the inner, and you are pursuing the inner which is the projection of thought, then what is the inner? You understand, sirs? This is really quite interesting if you go into it. I have just thought of it. I just saw something. Thought has created the outer and the inner, the inner gods, the inner feelings, the inner aspirations, the inner pursuits of divinity, enlightenment and all the rest of that business. And thought has said, the world is not the inward movement, thought has said, the inward movement is higher, and the higher is the highest form of divinity and so on, created by thought. And so there is a battle between the outer and the inner, the temptation, the desire, the pursuit of the outer and the

pursuit of the inner, all within the field of knowledge which thought has created. So I ask myself, is there an inner at all which man is always pursuing? Or there is the inner which thought can never touch, because the moment thought touches it, it becomes the outer and the inner, division takes place, therefore it is a fragmentation. Pursuit of one fragment is not the whole.

So seeing all this, seeing the suffering, the tears that men and women have shed through wars, poverty in this country, the villager with one meal, you know all the horrors that go on in this country. Seeing the brutality, the violence, the inefficiency, each one concerned with himself, having a little more money, a little more job, a little extra corruption, seeing everything that is going on in the world, can you look at it, not aloof, not in abstraction, but look at it with total attention, which is not a practice. You don't have to sit down and meditate to achieve total attention, that's one of those useless exploiting things. You are sitting there and we are describing, knowing the description is not the described, you are faced with this, and don't escape, remain with it, therefore you have this energy to transform the educated, the conditioned mind. And it's only such a mind with its total attention can survive in this world. Right.

Now would you like, would you care to ask any questions?

Q: Why don't you advocate celibacy to bring down the population?

K: Are you asking this seriously? What is celibacy, which you all advocate? What is celibacy? Your saints, your gurus, your sacred literature and all that business says, to reach god you must be celibate. I don't know why but they say so. Now what is

celibacy? To abstain from sex, is that celibacy? Go on, sir, tell me. And while you are abstaining you are burning with it, and you call that celibacy. While you abstain all the pictures, imagination, the erotic movement goes on burning, burning, burning, and therefore you say, I mustn't look at a woman or a man. And so you never look at a tree because that might be beautiful and that means woman, therefore shut your eyes. So you call celibacy an abstinence from sex while burning inwardly with sexual desires. Is that celibacy? And to indulge, as you do, repeat, repeat, repeat, mechanical process, and the contrary to you consider celibacy, suppression, control. You understand all this? Suppression, control, domination, which all result in violence, neurotic thoughts, expression of bitterness, anger, all that goes on.

So is there a way, is there a way of living - please listen to this - is there a way of living in which no control whatsoever, or indulging, repeating? Because control implies a controller, and who is the controller? One of the fragments of yourself. Right? And that fragment assumes authority and says, I must control. And that fragment assumes the authority in the belief that it is the higher self. The higher self is the tradition in order to achieve reality, god, enlightenment, what you like, I don't know what all that means, you have this control, the detective, the guard who says, do, and don't do - he is part of yourself. So what is celibacy? You are following all this? What is celibacy? A mind that is free from the desire of repetition, a mind that is free from all pictures, symbols, erotic feelings, it can see a woman and not be aroused, it can see the tree and see the beauty of the tree. If you destroy the woman you destroy the tree, you destroy nature, and you have done that

marvelously in this country because you have denied beauty - you understand what I mean, beauty? - in yourself, not in the tree, in yourself, you have destroyed everything. Yes, sir? Wait a minute, sir, that gentleman.

Q: Suffering itself is a thought.

K: All right. So what? You suffer, don't you, and you say, 'Well, it's just a thought' and pass it by, do you? Don't you suffer? Physically, inwardly, in every way, don't you suffer? And do you say when you are suffering, 'Oh, that's just a thought'? You see such a question indicates lack of inward perception, lack of attention. You suffer, for god's sake you suffer, solve it, finish with it, don't say, just a thought. Find out if it is possible for a human mind not to suffer, which doesn't mean becoming different. Because if you suffer you can't love, you can't have compassion. And to love and for compassion to be there must be no shadow of suffering, then you can share that thing. But you see you are all so clever, you are full of ideas, of other people's, you are second-hand human beings, you never say, 'Find out, I'll go into it'. So we go on suffering. And you say, it's karma, next life it will all be solved. And so you go round and round playing games with yourself. Yes, sir?

Q: Sir, people believe in god, what is your point of view of god?

K: People believe in god, what is your point of view about god.

Q: God is that supreme entity that we don't know much about. It's the thing that has created something of which we know only a little.

K: Are you asking my opinion about god, sir?

Q: Not your opinion exactly, your concept as such, you seem to

make a harsh remark on god now and then, I don't understand which way you mean to criticize god or the term god. And what's your opinion of the term or what's the conception of the term?

K: It's only fools that give opinions. He wants to know what I think about god. It sounds funny doesn't it - what you think about god. What do you think about god?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, yes, sir, I am going into it. What do you think about god? Do you imagine him like the images you have built? The image in the sanctum sanctorum, put garlands, jewels and all the rest of it, is that what you think god is? The symbols with ten arms, or one arm, or whatever it is, is that god? How do you know, how do you find out? If you want to find out if there is or if there is not, because many people believe, believe, there is no god as you believe there is god, both are the same, the believer and the non-believer, both are the same because they are educated, conditioned to believe or not to believe. But if you really want to find out, if you want to really discover, not what other people have said, that's not god, if god exists at all. So to find out you have to have no belief. Right? You have to negate all the gods which man has put together. Can you do that? The god of enlightenment, the god of virtue, the god of, you know, a dozen gods. Can you negate all that and stand alone, not isolated? When you negate everything that is not true - because those things are not true, they are the fabrications of the mind, of thought - when you negate that you have tremendous energy, which means mind is free to observe. And it can only observe in total attention. Then you will find out. No, you won't find out, there is nothing to find out. There is then



only absolute total silence. Right, sirs.

## **MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 22ND DECEMBER 1973**

Shall we continue with what we were talking about the last time that we met here? We were talking, or rather we were saying that considering what is happening in the world, of which we are a part, it becomes absolutely necessary that the human mind undergoes a fundamental transformation, a deep psychological revolution. And we were saying that the human survival - not mechanically progressing but actual human survival- has become one of the most important things. And within that survival a different kind of energy is required. So we are going to examine together the need of survival and the transformation of the human mind that will give a different kind of energy which will build a totally different kind of social structure. This is what we are going to discuss, talk over together. Each one will interpret that word `survival' according to his particular education, intellectual capacity, or mere self-interest. Survival demands a different kind of action than the traditional action in which we are caught.

Now before we go into all that, will you please bear in mind that we are sharing this thing together, that you are not merely listening to a talk given by the speaker but both verbally and non-verbally we are going to share the thing together, our problems. Sharing implies a mutual interest, you must be interested vitally, as the speaker is, otherwise there is no sharing possible. Sharing implies responsibility on your part, that you share fully, not partially. Therefore we have to understand the meaning of words also. Not the meaning you give to it or the speaker gives to it but

the meaning that is generally understood according to the dictionary. So if that is clear, that we are mutually investigating together into this question whether the human mind can be transformed, whether there can be psychological revolution. And the urgency of human survival, because we are killing each other off, traditionally, in wars, in the division of nationalities, religious divisions, theological divisions, philosophical divisions and so on. Each is seeking his own survival at different levels, not only economically, socially, but also inwardly. And whether this survival of human beings is possible the way we are living. The way we are living now is destructive. Look at your own life, not according to the picture I describe, but at your own life, how wasteful it is, how meaningless it is, though you perform rituals, puja and innumerable - all the rubbish that goes on. As a human being our lives are destructive, meaningless. You can give a meaning to it, which is part of our intellectual equipment, but when you look deeply into it, into our life, we see how we are wasting it, how we are dissipating the energy that is necessary for transformation of the human mind.

So you are not merely listening to a series of words, agreeing or disagreeing, concluding some inferences, or coming to an opinion, because opinion has nothing whatsoever to do with understanding. Opinion is merely prejudice, through prejudice you can't find the truth, whether your prejudice is traditional, rational, educated and so on, it is still a prejudice. And we think through prejudice, in opposition to various forms of prejudices we will find a synthetic truth. So if we are clear that we are sharing together these problems, that means you are listening, not merely to a series of

words, listening to your own reactions, listening to what the speaker has to say. If you disagree then you are not listening, or if you agree you are not listening. If you want to listen to those crows who are going to bed tonight, you have to pay attention to what those crows are saying. In the same way you have to pay attention to find out, to listen. So listening becomes an art. And that is absolutely necessary when two people are in conversation, two people who have got the same problem, the same intention to resolve that problem completely, the same sense of affection, diligent care, a sense of mutual responsibility, all that is involved in listening, and not in agreeing or disagreeing, because we are not dealing with ideas, theories, beliefs, concepts. As we pointed out the other day, idea means, the root meaning of that word is to see, to perceive, not an abstraction of a fact.

So we need a new kind of energy to transform society. And to transform society in which we live there must be a transformation of our whole being, that is the issue. That's what we are going to talk about in the next three talks. There is intellectual energy and physical energy, and emotional, sentimental energy. We will discard sentimental, emotional, devotional energy as nonsensical energy, it is a wasteful energy totally. So there is physical and intellectual energy. In that we are not including the energy which is compassion. That's totally different. The energy of love is totally different from the intellectual and physical energy, which we will go into presently, perhaps not today, tomorrow.

The intellectual energy is mechanical. Please listen to this, you may not agree, don't agree or disagree, but listen, have the courtesy of listening to find out what the speaker has to say. Don't translate

it, what you think the speaker should or is saying, just listen; don't compare what he is saying to what already you know, then you are not listening, you are dissipating the attention that is required in listening.

We have got a problem. Our problem is we need an energy that is not mechanical, we need energy, not the intellectual or physical energy because we have tried all those methods; the intellectual energy has produced a technological world, a world of materialism, a world of commercialism, industrial world which is the Western world, which the Eastern world is being sucked into, the so-called undeveloped countries. I do not know if you are aware of this, you are just following the West. Not that it is right or wrong, we are just looking. You are as materialistic as the West, you may have pretensions of religiosity, of theoretical appreciation of what god or what this or that is, which has no significance whatsoever when we are confronted with a very, very serious problem. So physical energy and the intellectual energy has not solved our problems. Intellectual energy is the capacity to think logically, to understand logically, rationally, sanely, objectively, a scientific way of looking at life. We have tried that, the intellect has made a world of tradition, tradition is the result of thought which is part of the intellect, and that tradition has been handed over from generation to generation. And the mind is caught in that, so it is a mechanical mind, and it has got a great deal of energy for going to the temples, reading books, everlasting rituals, prayers, building temples, talking endlessly about the Gita, the Upanishads, the gods and the interpretations of it, and you think that is religion. And that certainly gives you a mechanical energy. I hope this is clear.

Mechanical energy based on the past and the continuity of that past through the present, modifying the future. That's the whole movement of tradition. And that movement creates a great deal of energy, and that energy has not solved our human problems. It hasn't solved our relationship with each other. It has not brought about an explosive, creative life.

So the intellectual energy is mechanical because it is based on experience, knowledge, and the response to knowledge is thought. Right? So thought is essentially mechanical. And all our structure is based on thought - social, moral, religious, all the temples, all the mosques, all the churches are built on thought, and your gurus too, don't forget them. And that has produced an extraordinary world of confusion, of division, quarrels, fights, you know what is happening in the world. And we are still trying to solve all our problems through thought. Right? Are we together in this? We are not agreeing, we are observing, we are sharing, we are sharing the same food. You will not share the food if you don't like the food.

So we are going to find out what is the energy that is entirely different, which is not intellectual, which is not physical. Energy means work, energy means acting, the doing. There are two different kinds of action: action, ideological action and action which is not based on ideas. We are going to find out what that means. Action based on ideas, on conclusions, on theories, is no action at all. It is a limited action, a fragmentary action, a contradictory action which is what is happening in the world. Human beings live probably at several levels - intellectual level, emotional level, physical level and the psychological levels are divided, divided in themselves; you think one thing, say another,

do another. Right? And all are based on this division of ideas. Are you following all this? We are going together? The ideological action is mechanical action. In that there is a certain security, a repetitive action gives comfort, security, a sense of safety. Right? You are following this? We are together in this? Please, it's your life, not my life, we are dealing with our lives which have become so utterly mechanical. The communists, the socialists, every person who wants to transform society, and society must be transformed because society as it is is totally immoral, totally unfair, economically, socially, in every way, and society needs to be transformed and to transform that society we have concepts, conclusions, either Marx or Mao or your own particular psychologists or philosopher, all are dealing with ideas, theories, conclusions, and carry the conclusions out, if it is possible, either through dictatorship or through democracy - these concepts which are the action based on ideologies. Is this clear? And ideas, theories, are always dividing people: the Indian theory that you are an Indian, that's a theory, that's a concept, a verbal conclusion, and there is the Pakistani on the other side who is equally conditioned by words. Right?

So ideological action is always divisive and therefore in essence it is rooted in conflict. Please do realize this, don't go to sleep. And on that we have lived, that's our life. Ideological actions and therefore dividing, me and you, we and they, national divisions, religious divisions, spiritual divisions, communist, you know, all that is going on in the world. And when you see that, what's going on actually in the world you inevitably ask, if you are serious, if you are really concerned with human suffering, with human

endeavour, human survival, is there a different kind of action altogether. You are following? Am I making myself clear? Is there an action which is not based on ideals, on conclusions, on planning, government planning or your own planning? Is there an action entirely free of the dividing, the dissipation of that division in energy? We are going to find out - find out in the sense not theoretically but actually, that you find that action now in your life, not as a theory but actually. I hope you are working as hard as the speaker is working, not merely listening, your responsibility is to share, therefore you have to be active, not just go to sleep.

Is there an action which is not based on ideas, on ideologies, on traditions, on books, on the say-so of a guru, or the say-so of a saviour? That means is there an action which is universal, not mine or yours. Is there an action which is essentially based on freedom? Is there an action which is non-mechanical because the mind, the brain is mechanical? Right? The brain is the result of evolution, centuries upon centuries of growth, accumulation, all that is mechanical. So the mind and the brain have become mechanical. We are asking, is there an action which is non-mechanical, non-ideological, non-routine, repetitive, non-traditional - and the word 'traditional' also means betrayal. Now we are going to find out. I am not going to find out, you are going to find out, and you can only find out if you listen.

First of all diligent negation of the mechanical - diligent negation of the mechanical gives a certain quality of energy. Right? Are we meeting each other? I deny diligently - the word 'diligent' means with care, with attention, with a deep sense of responsibility, diligence implies an investigation, looking into with



care - looking into the mechanical way of living, which we do now, to negate that. That means you see for yourself how destructive a mechanical way of living is. You see it as you see the danger of a snake, equally you see the danger of a mechanical way of living. Right? Do you see that? Or do you see it because I have pointed out to you? Or do you see that fact in your own life? I don't have to tell you you are hungry, you know when you are hungry. Nobody need to tell you how hungry you are, it has no meaning, but if you accept or look at this mechanical way of living through the eyes of the speaker it is not your understanding, it is not your perception. And to negate that with care, with understanding, with exploration - with exploration, investigation, looking at all the tradition, the prayers, the rituals, the ideologies, the theories, the philosophies that we have invented, which are all mechanical - to see that is to deny it. Now is your mind capable of doing that? Your mind is not capable if you are frightened. Right? So we have to investigate fear. I hope you are following all this.

Look, sir, all our thinking, however subtle, however noble, is based on the past. Thought is matter, memory is stored in the brain and the response of that memory is thought, and all our structure is based on it. Please. Now can my mind see how it has become mechanical, repeating something which I don't know but repeat - there is god, there is no god, Stalin is the greatest dictator, whatever it was - repeat, repeat, repeat. Now can my mind see the mechanical way of its action? Do you see it? And you may not see it because you are frightened. What will happen if I don't live mechanically, as I am living now, which has given me money, position, power, whatever it is, a sense of insular security, to deny,

negate a mechanical way of living is to evoke fear, and which may prevent you from looking. Therefore we have to investigate together what fear is. Right? We are moving together? Are we? Oh, for god's sake.

So we have to go into this question of fear. Can the mind - please listen to it - can the mind ever be free of fear? Not only at the conscious level but at the deeper level of our being, totally free of fear? Otherwise if you are afraid you cannot possibly see directly 'what is'. Right? So what is fear? What are you afraid of? Aren't you afraid? Go on, sirs, it's obvious. You are afraid - losing a job, afraid of death, afraid of public opinion, afraid of old age, afraid of not being somebody, afraid that you will be punished, afraid that you will never get your reward, afraid of darkness, afraid of your wife or husband, afraid of your guru, afraid of the gods - multiplication of fears. Right? Now can the mind be free of that? Because fear destroys any kind of affection, any kind of compassion, love. Fear distorts, fear of being alone, fear of not being loved. Don't you know all these fears? Fear of not being attached to something, it doesn't matter what it is, it might be a tree, a house, a person. So there is fear, both physical and psychological fears. Now how you will solve it? How will the mind - your mind, if you have got a mind - how will your mind resolve this problem? Have you ever applied your mind to this, or do you accept fear as part of life? Fear of death, that's the ultimate fear.

Now let's investigate it together, which means that you are taking the responsibility of looking into it, not verbally or intellectually but actually so that when you get up you are free of

fear. Not only physical fears, fear of a disease that you may have had, pain that you may have had, and not be afraid of that pain repeating itself. We are talking of the whole tree of fear, not one particular branch of that fear, of that tree, or a particular tender leaf but the whole structure of fear, the whole tree of fear, both at the deep unconscious level as well as the conscious level. Now please follow this. Are you going to analyse it? Investigate, analyse, each fear? Analysis implies, the very word 'analysis' means break up. In analysis there is the analyser and the analysed. Right? Come on, sirs, move with me. And that implies a division. And who is the analyser? Who is the analyser investigating, analysing the whole structure of fear which is in you, who is the analyser? A part of yourself, isn't it, right? One fragment of yourself is analysing the other fragments. Go into it, please. One entity, the analyser, assumes he knows more than the other fragments. He has accumulated knowledge and with that knowledge he is going to analyse. So there is division between the analyser and the analysed, that means endless time you need. And it may take a lifetime, and in the mean time the house is burning. So are you going to analyse fear, or is there a way of looking at fear without analysis? Are we moving together?

It is part of our tradition to analyse, and we are saying analysis is paralysis. I know you laugh, it sounds rather good but you will go on analysing, and you have done that all your life and all your tradition is analysis, therefore you are paralysed. Your society, your human beings are totally paralysed because you are repeating like a machine. So is there a way of looking at fear without analysis? Please, you must understand this because when we are

talking about action which is not ideational, to understand that you must understand a way of looking at fear without the observer who is the analytical entity. Is this all too difficult? Too abstract?

Probably you have never thought about these things in this way. So if something new is put before you don't discard it, look at it. We are asking, a mind that is used to analysis and therefore avoiding action - that has become our habit, to postpone, avoid, run away from the fact of fear. Now is there a way of looking at fear which is not an observation with a conclusion? That is, to observe fear without wanting to get rid of it, without wanting to suppress it, to control it, to search a way of becoming courageous, and so on, all those are factors of dissipation of energy, avoiding the fact and running away from the fact. Right? Do you follow this? So can you look at that fear without any movement of thought? Right? Can you look at this tree of fear, which is part of you without the analyser coming into being and just to observe it?

Is not fear the product of thought? I am afraid of the pain that I had and it might happen again tomorrow, I am afraid of tomorrow, losing a job, or not fulfilling, not having capacity and so on and so on. So thought sustains fear. Right? Now thought also sustains pleasure, doesn't it? The repetition of an experience however pleasurable, however gratifying is sustained by thought, thought saying, I must have it again, the repetition. There is no ending of a particular incident however pleasureable, thought is always sustaining it, chewing the cud. Are you following all this? Right, sir? Somebody follow this, for god's sake. I must have some relation with somebody. So thought is responsible for the continuity and the pursuit of pleasure, as also sustaining and

nourishing fear. So the problem then is, can thought when it meets pleasure or fear not give it a continuity? Well, sirs, what do you say, sirs? I must go on. Right.

You see that means one has to understand very deeply the structure and nature of thought. Until you do that you won't solve the problem of fear and pleasure. Pleasure has become again mechanical, sexual pleasure, mechanical, every form of pleasure becomes eventually mechanical: you see a lovely sunset and the brain experiences it and the repetition of it. So can thought observe its own movement and can thought observe itself at all? You are following? If it observes itself it creates an entity who becomes the observer, therefore there is a division in that and therefore conflict. So can you observe fear without any movement of thought? Not control thought, not suppress thought, but to observe it without any movement of thought.

To come back to our point, which is: is there an action which is not ideational? We said, action based on an idea must inevitably bring about conflict, wars, and all the misery that's going on. Action which is non- ideational is to perceive and the very perception is the action. I perceive - listen to this - I perceive the snake and there is immediate action. My action is based on my conditioning about the snake, because generations of people have said, be careful, if they are poisonous don't go near them, and the brain has been conditioned to the snake, to danger and therefore there is instant action. You are conditioned to an action based on ideology, therefore there is no action. You are paralysed, you bring conflict, therefore one is conditioned to the snake and there is instant action, you are conditioned to non-action, the non-action

being action according to an ideology, to a concept, to a formula, and you are educated, conditioned to postpone action. Now we are asking something entirely different: an action which takes place when there is observation. Now we will have to look into that word and see what it means, and see whether the mind can observe without the movement of thought which is the past. Right? Are you all paralysed?

You know that awakens a very interesting question: what is action? Action means the doing, the acting in the present, the doing, not having done or will do. The doing, action is in the present always. Therefore what is the present? You are following all this? Please this is tremendously important to understand if you want to change your society, tremendously if you want to change, totally transform yourself, then you must understand the whole problem of time. Can the mind, the brain, the mind and the brain, the whole movement of the activity of the brain which is thought, experience, knowledge, can that brain understand what the present is? The present is not the past or the future, the present is not this second. So what is the present? And can action take place in the present, as you do when there is a danger, there is instant action, that action is totally in the present. So can the mind which is mechanical, which is conditioned, which has been trained in reward and punishment, fear and pleasure, can that mind which is the result of time, can that mind understand what is the present? And if it does not, then action is ideological and therefore conflicting, and all the rest of it. Therefore it is immensely important to understand the present. And therefore action is always in the present, not in the future or in the past. Are we meeting this?

So I am going to find out what is the present. Apart from the chronological time, by the watch as yesterday, today and tomorrow, the sun setting and sun rising, which is all time, why is my mind, psychologically, concerned with time? You understand my question? Why are you concerned with time, apart from going to the office and all that, yesterday, tomorrow and today, why are you are concerned about time? Aren't you concerned about time? Time to achieve enlightenment, time to practise in order to have the glory of whatever it is, time you must have because you are going to meet your girl friend or your husband tomorrow, time to fulfil your gratifications, time to achieve, time to become, time to die, time. Why are you concerned with time? Which means you really are not concerned with the present at all. So why this tremendous importance to time? Do please share this with me, not agree, you are concerned, that's a fact, why? Which means you are living in the past, that's why time has become important to you, isn't it? Aren't you living in the past? What you were, what you have been, your hurts, your desires, all that is the past. Knowledge is time. I don't know if you see this. Knowledge is tradition, knowledge is the very essence of time, all the scientific world is based on knowledge, accumulated, which is time: I need time to investigate, I need time to find out what the distance is between here and the moon, I need immense time. That means time is knowledge, which is the past.

So we live in the past, in memories, pleasant memories, the remembrance of things past, painful, pleasurable, memories that have hurt very deeply, all that is our daily life. Therefore we are concerned tremendously with time. And therefore action is the

postponement of the present: I will be better tomorrow, I will be good, give me time to be good, I will practise control, thought. Do you follow? So living in the past prevents you from action in the present. Now can you see - please listen - can you see the truth of this, not verbal truth, but the actuality of your life? You know what philosophy means? The love of truth, the love of wisdom, not the speculative philosophy, not the ideational philosophy, but philosophy which means the love of truth and wisdom in your daily life now. Now can you see the truth of this, that you live in the past - your sex, your pleasures, your fears - all the remembrance that you have is your life, which is the past, which projects through the present to the future. So essentially the movement is from the past, and your life is that. Now can you see the truth of it, the actuality of it, as actual as that tree? That means can you see an action, for action is always in the present, which is non-ideational? The idea, the ideational, the concepts are either in the future or the result of the past that will be in the future. You know, sirs, all the sociologists, all the intellectual people want to create a different world. Obviously everybody wants that. And they have conclusions what society should be, they plan according to what society should be, therefore they are not acting now.

So can your mind - please do listen - can your mind, your whole being see the truth of this, this simple truth that action is in the present, not in the future or in the past, is now. And the `now' is not possible, the present action in the present is not possible if you are living in the past, if you are carrying out a tradition, if you are still a Brahmin, a Buddhist, all that. Can you see the truth of it? So perception means the seeing without the observer. And the seeing



without the observer is the action in the present. Look sir: there is poverty in this country, untold poverty, with all the degradation and the horror, the brutality, the violence that poverty breeds, that is going on in this country, you know it is just round the corner, everywhere it is. The governments are concerned, the sociologists, the human beings are concerned, and what do you do? You have plans how to resolve the poverty - the communist plan, the congress plan or your particular bureaucratic plan and so on and so on, plans. That is, that you will carry it out in the future, given the opportunity, through democracy or through tyranny. Which means you are not concerned with poverty now, in the present, therefore you are not acting, you are theorizing, and in the meantime the poor man goes hungry. This is the way we have lived, and probably we will go on living that way because you don't want to live differently. You don't want to be a light to yourself, you would rather accept the light of another. To be a light to yourself you have to stand completely alone, not isolated. That means perception is action in the present, which means you are free of the past and the future, you are completely committed to the present, you are living there.

Therefore there is an action which is non-ideational, and that action is the total revolution of the mind, which is not based on the past. That's enough. Would you like to ask questions?

Questioner: Sir, you are asking us to observe without the observer. How can there be an observation without the observer?

K: All right, sir. You are asking us to observe without the observer, is that possible? Have you observed your wife, your friend, your guru, your minister, have you observed anybody?

Please, I am asking a serious question. Have you observed anybody? Have you observed the speaker? Or you have an image about the speaker, you have an image about the speaker, haven't you? Unfortunately. His reputation, all that bilge. So you observe the speaker through the image you have built about the speaker, therefore you do not observe the speaker. You observe your friend, or your girl, your boy, your husband, whatever it is, wife, through the image you have built. Right? For god's sake be honest to yourselves. So you are looking at the world, looking at your neighbour, looking at your wife, husband, your guru, everything you look at through an image that you have built. That image is the observer. And the machinery that builds the observer is thought. Now can you look at the speaker, at your wife, husband, boy, whatever it is, father, parents, government, everything without an image? To look at a tree. Do please consider this seriously, to look at a tree without the image that you have, the image being the knowledge, the like and the dislike, the prejudice, to look at it. Can you look at the speaker without the image that you have about him? The image that you have about him has been put together by your like and dislike, by the words that you have read, by his sitting on a platform and assuming an authority, which he has not got, but you have assumed an authority. Can you look at him? Can you look at your wife, your husband without a single image, the image that you have built through pleasure, sex, through dependency, oh, a dozen ways, through nagging, bullying, dominating? All that is the image you have about another, can you look without that image? That requires tremendous attention, care, to know somebody. Sir, if you say you know somebody, you don't

love somebody. You understand what I am saying? No, you don't.

Love is not an image, love is not knowledge, love is not pleasure, thought. And when you live in an image and you have dozens and dozens of images, the gods whom you worship, the image made by hand or by the mind is the image in your mind. The image you have of the politicians, the businessman, the priest, the guru, the images you have about yourself primarily, can you live without any of those images? Such a mind is a free mind. Such a mind is a holy mind, not the mind filled with dirty little images.

Now can the mind having an image, having images, resolve them, put them away, and why does the mind build images? It's much safer to have images, it gives you a certain sense of security - it's my wife, I know her, in that, when you say, I know her, you are safe, you are secure, but you don't know her or him. So when you live without an image you live with great humility. Oh, don't shake your head, sir, you don't know what it means. To live without a single image means that a mind is completely free of the 'me', the ego, the self. And because the mind, the brain wants to live in security, in the repetition, in the images it knows, in the tradition it has acquired, in that there is great safety, and that safety is its own destruction. When you say that you are a Hindu you feel terribly safe. And when you call yourself a Hindu you cease to be a human being, you are merely a label. You know you listen to all this, I am surprised you don't throw stones at me! Probably you just accept what he is saying and go on with your old pleasant, ugly ways.

Q: Can I ask a question sir?

K: Right, sir.

Q: As you very rightly pointed out that the gathering here

doesn't throw stones on you when you told them that they should be ashamed of calling themselves Hindu. I have been listening and very frequently you say, even this evening, that prayer, ritual, following the Gita, or Upanishads and all that is rubbish - does it equally apply to the Koran and the holy Bible?

K: Oh, sir, all books.

Q: All books.

K: Including my own books.

Q: One more question, please.

K: No, sir, sit down.

Q: If you don't want me to listen.

K: I will, sir, go ahead.

Q: One more question: you said that it is a mechanical mind which we are going on repeating, repeating which has resulted in the present chaos. And you said, you gave the snake example if we had not been taught that it is very dangerous to go near a snake, I think all the audience here would be going experimenting with a very deadly and poisonous snake. I don't know what the result will be. And also if there has not been the mechanical tuition that when we come here and assemble we should all take our chair and seats, I am sure that there would be only chaos left. So it is a great advantage that there is a tradition set up to be followed, and you know what has happened when you break out of tradition, you can see from the present condition of the students who do not know ...

K: Sir, I think - I have understood sir. The gentleman says you have great respect to the old age and having command of good English and there it ends. I am afraid he hasn't listened to what we have been talking about. He said, tradition is important, the whole

world is bucking against tradition, it had perhaps many centuries ago some importance, a tribal tradition is necessary for the tribe to survive, but we are no longer tribal. At least, if you are nationalist you are tribal. And tradition also means, as I pointed out, betrayal: betrayal of the present. I have explained all that. And if you have not understood I am sorry, perhaps we will talk about it again another day.

Q: Krishnamurti, excuse me sir, suppose we are paralysed, suppose that this evening...

K: No, no sir. Just a minute, sir, don't let's suppose anything.

Q: We are then.

K: Either we are or we are not.

Q: We are. Otherwise we would be not here listening to you.

The question then is does each one of us then find for oneself way not to become paralysed? Or is there a system that you have come to understand that you can pass on to us that we can use as a technique to become unparalysed? That is my question.

K: Make it simple, sir, I can't hear.

Q: You have a technique for us sir? Do you have a technique for salvation, sir?

K: Ah, have you got a technique for salvation - is that it, sir?

Q: Not salvation in the sense that we have come to understand it.

K: Yes, have you a technique to free the mind to live differently - is that it?

Q: Exactly, sir.

K: Right, sir. Have you a technique to free the mind so that it lives in the present. Technique means a system, a method, a way of

living, pointed out by the speaker and you will live according to that. That's the new tradition. And that's what is so deadly in following somebody. We are saying, sirs, please do listen with your heart, with your mind, with everything that you have, that anyone who practises, follows, is destroying himself and destroying the world. We need a different mind, a free mind, not a mind trained in a particular technique, a mind that is free to observe and to act instantly, from moment to moment. That doesn't need a technique, that's a mechanical mind. A mind that is free is the mind that observes the present and acts in the present. Right, sirs.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 7TH APRIL 1973

As there are many problems to talk over together I feel that it is very important that we should, sitting under these trees and blue sky, share together the problems that confront human beings. It isn't an American problem, or European, or Asiatic, it is a global problem, it is a crisis or a great challenge, if you will, that demands right response, and when there is no adequate response to this immense challenge then there is conflict, there is every form of entertainment, every form of degeneracy. And as we are going to deal with these problems together, I think it is important that you should understand the speaker. He is not bringing any oriental philosophy - thank god! - nor exotic ideas, or a new programme or religion so as to amuse you, or to entertain you, or to make you join some kind of absurd cult.

So we have to deal with actual problems, we have to deal with the problems, primarily I feel, at the psychological level, for there and according to our understanding of ourselves, lies the clear answer to the innumerable problems. And if I may suggest as we are sharing together, please listen, though perhaps you belong to some kind of cult and have already committed yourself to some kind of philosophy, follow some kind of guru, or follow your own particular tendency, idiosyncrasy or pleasure. If we could this morning put aside all that and actually listen, not interpret what is being said, or condemn what is being said, or translate what is being said, but listen to find out, not only listen to the speaker but also to your own reactions to what is being said. Listen not only verbally, and the meaning of the word, but also non-verbally - for

communication is verbal and non-verbal, and since we are speaking in English, the words have a definite meaning and if you don't understand the meaning of the words actually but interpret that word according to your particular conditioning then you will not be listening to what is being said. So communication is both verbal and non-verbal. And communication implies thinking together, not agreeing together, not accepting together a certain fact or a certain belief or a certain idea. But sharing together, sharing, thinking together, understanding together the whole problem of life is communication.

So our responsibility is, since you have taken all this trouble to come here and also have travelled a long distance, our responsibility is that we should be terribly serious, at least for an hour, an hour and a half, and together share the problems, and if it is at all possible, their resolution. Sharing implies a certain quality of attention. You can't share something if you are not also interested, if you are not also intense; sharing implies at all levels, not only at the psychological level but also at the intellectual, emotional, almost physiological; sharing implies a total quality of attention. Otherwise you can't.

As we said, our responsibility is not only to ourselves but also to the society in which we live. We have created this society and though we are entangled, caught up in the pattern of society, in its structure, we have made it. Society hasn't made us. It has shaped us because we have contributed to the whole structure; therefore we are responsible to society and society is not responsible for us psychologically. So our responsibility - I am using that word 'responsibility' in the sense of to respond rightly, totally to the



whole structure, and we cannot respond properly, wholly, if we are thinking in terms of America, or of a particular religion, particular philosophy, a particular sect or guru, but as human beings responsible to the whole world, because the whole world is concerned, because we are human beings. And as we have made this world, and the world is us and we are the world, you may accept the feeling that we are the world and the world is us, intellectually and therefore verbally, which has no meaning whatsoever. But if you actually see the reality that you are the world and the world is you, and you have made this world as it is; the brutality, the wars, the various contradictory morality, the division between religions, the nationalistic economic division with all its conflicts, violence; and this structure which we call society is put together by human beings, you and I. We are responsible for it. And being responsible demands a certain maturity, not only in age but a maturity of mind. And to bring a radical revolution psychologically, not merely physically, physical revolution, throwing bombs and all the rest of that kind of stuff cannot possibly bring about a radical change. Revolution, physical revolutions do not fundamentally change the human mind; they may control the mind, shape the mind, put it in a particular category, force it to conform but such revolution fundamentally, psychologically doesn't bring about a totally different kind of human being. And I feel with this global challenge we need to respond totally in a different way.

And if we are at all serious then we have to consider the problems of relationship, the problems of morality, what is love, death and if there is something beyond the measurable, beyond the

structure of thought, which man in different ways has always sought. The truth, beauty and that thing called infinite, the nameless, man has given to it a thousand names, whether any religious activity is neurotic as some of the prominent psychologists maintain, or whether there is something not put together by the mind, not told by another. So please listen to it with certain affection, care, because it is your problem, not mine. And when one has travelled all over the world, except behind the Iron Curtain and so on, when one has observed objectively, non-sentimentally, observed what is going on around you, in you, the activities of the politicians, of the priests, of the psychologists, the scientists and the philosophers, one sees, if one has to be very clear, if one has to understand all this oneself, one must reject all that. Philosophy implies, doesn't it, the love of truth, that is the meaning of that word, the love of truth, not an abstraction, not an ideal, not something that you project out of your background of dissatisfaction or cunning, or contrivance, but it means the love of truth in daily life, what you do, what you think, how you behave. That is philosophy, that is the love of truth.

You know I have spent over fifty years talking about all this and I feel very strongly about all this, it isn't just an intellectual amusement either for you or for me. When one sees the wars and the children being tortured, butchered, maimed for life, the human beings, the divisions in the world not only class divisions but the divisions of status, one really, if one is at all sensitive, if one is at all aware, one feels one must act not in any one particular direction, not along any particular philosophy, or religion or guru, but totally as a whole human being. And therefore one must

understand the words integrity and corruption. The word corruption comes from the root to break up - rumpere, to break to pieces. And our minds are broken up, contradictory, fragmentary. We act in the world of affairs, business, in one way, with the family another way, with our intimate friends another way, and so on - we are broken up inwardly, therefore that is corruption. And integrity implies a wholeness, that which is sane, whole, complete. And it is only in the mind that is whole, sane, rational, logical that can respond to this immense challenge.

It is only to the serious there is life, only to the earnest that living has meaning. But when we are talking about seriousness we translate that word according to our peculiar pleasure, to our tendency. Reaction is not seriousness, but realizing the reaction and going beyond it is to be serious.

So we have these problems and without settling or understanding deeply these problems, merely to enquire what is reality, what is beyond the limited consciousness, or try to expand consciousness through various techniques has no meaning whatsoever; it is an escape from reality, and that is a form of corruption.

So first let us deal with the problem of human relationship, bearing in mind that we are sharing this together. I am not telling you what to do, I am not your guru, or philosopher, or your analyst. You have got plenty of them! Unfortunately! On the contrary, what we are saying is, you must be a light to yourself. And therefore no authority, except the authority of the law which you have made. And if you want to change the law you have to change yourself first. So we are going to deal with relationship, human relationship

because that is society; relationship means life, there is no living without relationship. Relationship means action, movement and without understanding human relationship, the totality of it, we shall always live in conflict with each other however intimate we may be. So that is one of the primary important things to grapple with, to put our minds and hearts to understand. Please see this, see the seriousness of it because without relationship there is no life. Relationship implies action, when in that relationship there is contradiction, division, then there is conflict. And as our life, everyday life in relationship is a series of conflicts between you and your closest most intimate friend, between you and your neighbour, between you and the neighbour who may be thousands of miles away, and when there is a division, whether that division be national, religious, a division brought about by belief, a conclusion, your particular idiosyncrasy then that division invariably will bring about not only conflict but violence, antagonism, aggression, brutality. This is a fact, not a theory, not something invented by the speaker. Look at your own relationship with another. Look at it objectively, not sentimentally, not emotionally but look at it very clearly. To observe it so that you see clearly not only yourself in relationship, but how, in that relationship, you have created an image about yourself and the image about another.

Please do pay attention to this because this is the most basic thing in life. Because if we don't have true relationship with another we live in isolation, whether that isolation be intellectual, self-centred, or ideological, these are all images. And when you have an image that very image, whether it be a verbal image or an

image of imagination, a contrivance, by thought, then that image divides. You have an image about your wife, or your husband, your girl friend or a boy friend, or whatever it is, you have an image, and she or he has an image about you. So the relationship is between these two images, which is not a relationship at all, it is a relationship based on a conclusion or knowledge.

So, when there is knowledge as image in relationship then there is conflict. Is that clear? Can we go on from there? We are sharing this together, I am not telling you anything. I am only pointing out. And if you are sensitive, earnest, serious, then you have to face this problem: whether a relationship can exist between two human beings in which there is no image at all. Then only there is relationship, otherwise there isn't any, it is a relationship based on a conclusion, on a memory, on an idea or an image and therefore it is an abstraction, an abstraction, a thing drawn from a reality, and one lives in that abstraction of images. So is it possible to live with another and therefore with society, and therefore bring a totally different kind of society in which relationship is not based on conclusion, images, knowledge?

Where there is division as Americans and Russians, or Christians and Hindus, or Buddhists, or Muslims, Mohammedans, this very division is conflict. You may tolerate, you may put up with something, but at the core when there is any kind of division, as there is in the world, the national division, we the Americans, we the Russians, we the Maoists, or we belonging to some guru, the Krishna consciousness and the Transcendental Meditationists, all those things that are pervading this country, and you being so astonishingly gullible swallow all this, because you want new

forms of entertainment. And when one sees that division of any kind must breed inevitably struggle, conflict, war, brutality and all the rest of it, then is it possible for the mind and the heart - when we use the word 'mind' we are using that word totally in the sense mind, heart, psyche, the whole human being - can the mind in relationship have no image whatsoever and therefore live a life in which there is no conflict in relationship?

That is one of the challenges, perhaps the greatest. You have images, of that there is no doubt, haven't you? If you are married, you have built an image about her and she has built an image about you; the image of one day or ten years, nagging, bullying, sexual pleasures - you know all the things that the mind accumulates, which is knowledge about another, and this knowledge is the image you have. Can one observe it, not asking how to get rid of the image, we will go into that in a minute, but just to be aware of these images that one has: the national image, the Christian image and so on, dozens and dozens of images that one has built up. Or the image you have about another, because that is near, that you can almost get at, can you observe that image and not try to break it down, or to ask the question, "How to be free of that image".

So one has to go into this question of what it is to observe. Isn't it? We are please sharing this together, we are trying to investigate together. The word 'investigate' means to trace out, to follow the thing right through and not stop in the middle when it doesn't please you to go further! So we are investigating together this question of relationship, which is one of the most fundamental things of life. And without understanding that deeply, you cannot possibly go beyond; you may escape from it, through religion,

through drugs, through sex, through - you know - joining one group after another and all that kind of nonsense that goes on.

So what is it to observe? How do you observe the image that you have about another? You have an image about the speaker, obviously, otherwise you wouldn't be sitting here. Can you observe the image which you have about the speaker, or about your wife, or friend or whatever it is, can you observe it and - we are investigating the word, the meaning of that word 'to observe' - how do you observe? Do you observe the image as an outsider looking at the image? Or there is no division between you as the observer and the observed, which is the image?

When you observe that mountain, or that tree, or the water flowing under the bridge, or the beauty of a bird on the wing, and the light of the morning, how do you observe it? As an outsider looking? Or there is no division between you and the thing you are seeing? When you look at that mountain, do you look at it with the image you have about mountains, or do you look at it without the image, or the idea, or the word of a mountain - so that there is no division, a verbal division between the observer and the observed. Perhaps you can do that fairly easily with regard to mountains, trees and birds, and the lovely trunk of this tree. But when it becomes a little more intimate, it becomes much more difficult. You have an image, haven't you, about your friend. How do you look at it? Do you look at it as though you are outside of it and looking at the image which you have built up? Or do you look at it non-verbally, therefore you and the image are one, the observer is the observed. Tight? That is clear, isn't it? At least the explanation, but the explanation is not the explained. We are considering the

explained, not the explanation. So can you observe the image you have built about another without another image?

And so to observe then implies that you must give your total attention, or total awareness, to that which you see. If you see something which you don't like, or like, in that image then the like and the dislike, which are also another form of image, bring about division. So it is very important, if one may point out, to learn the art of observation. Because in that lies the clue, to observe without any conclusion. Then you will see that between you and the image division disappears, therefore you are the image and therefore having no division the image ceases. Are you following all this? No, I am afraid you are not. Too bad! Because you see you are not used to thinking, I am afraid you are used to being told what to do. Unfortunately everything in this country is organized, and you attend classes to learn to be aware, to be sensitive, how to meditate, what to do. You have been brought up on that: Christians, what to believe, what not to believe, and the Hindus and the Muslims and the Buddhists - they are all just secondhand human beings told what to do. And we are not telling you what to do. What we are trying to do is to share together an immense problem, a problem of relationship. And where there is division there is no love. Love isn't pleasure, love isn't desire, which you have made it into. And that is why you pursue everything in terms of pleasure.

So it is very important to understand this question: what is relationship? Until you resolve this, not according to some philosopher or psychologist, or analyst, or according to your belief or pleasure, but actually in your daily life; if you haven't resolved this problem you are contributing to the corruption of the world.



And relationship means a movement in action with another human being; because life is relationship and if you observe you will see that you are, through daily life, you are isolating yourself. This isolation is self-centred, this tremendous concern about oneself. Aren't you concerned deeply about yourself? Whether you succeed, whether you fail, whether you are happy, unhappy, whether your desires are fulfilled, whether you have achieved enlightenment - god knows what else! And this isolation is the self-centredness of yours and the self-centredness of another, how can there be a relationship between the two? If there is no relationship between the two therefore inevitably there must be conflict. And our society is based on this principle of conflict, which means of having no relationship. You may sleep with another, hold hands with another, have a family, but you, self-centred, ambitious, greedy, pursuing your own fulfilment, must inevitably create a division between you and another. This is a fact. This is a psychological certainty. When a man who really is concerned to bring about a totally different kind of morality, behaviour, a social structure, until he understands and brings about right relationship with another, he is contributing to the brutality, to the violence, to the extraordinary things that are going on in this ugly mad world. Right?

So we have this problem: having created an image, how to prevent the creation of further images and what to do with the past image that one has. You see the problem? Do you sirs? No? Look, I have an image about you - I haven't but suppose - I have an image about you, I have built it up through my interaction with you; there are those images in my mind, and I realize that to be really related with another there must be no image. Now how am I to be free of

those images? That is one point. The second is, how am I not to create images at all in relationship, whatever you do? You understand the two? How am I not to create images whatever you do; whether you call me a fool, flatter me, steal things from me, insult me, hurt me, not to have an image. That is, how am I not to be hurt by you? Right? Let's bring it down to that simple thing, because the hurt is the building of images, as flattery is also building of an image. From childhood we have been hurt, this hurt takes the form of competition, when you are being compared with another - that happens in schools and in families - the hurt has begun. Right? Society hurts us, parents hurt us, your friends hurt you, and war, that is physical, hurts you psychologically, inwardly. We are human beings who are terribly hurt, we may shed tears quietly by ourselves in our rooms, or because we are hurt we become violent, aggressive, self-protective, defensive and all the rest of it.

So how is a mind not to be hurt at all? There are two problems: having been hurt and never to be hurt again. If you can find out for yourself, not because somebody points it out, if you can find it out for yourself whether the mind, that is the total being, can never be hurt, then you will see that we have wiped away all the past images, past hurts. So the question is: how can the mind, your mind, never be hurt at all. Have you got the question? You tell me I am a fool, or you tell me I am a great man - which are both the same. And I listen to you; the one I like and the other I don't like. Can I listen to you - please listen to this - can I listen to you when you call me a fool or a great man, with total attention, so that there is no reaction to your verbal statement? Can you listen to your

wife, or to your friend, with total attention, when he or she calls you all kinds of things, or flatters you? In that total attention, in that choiceless awareness, there are no frontiers, there are no borders. It is only when there is a border, when there is a line that the mind gets hurt. When there is no border as the centre which is being hurt then there is no question of being hurt at all.

What is it that is being hurt? The image that you have about yourself, that image is getting hurt, isn't it? When you call me a fool I have an image that I am not a fool. And I have the conclusion that I am not a fool and therefore when you call me that I get hurt, I get disturbed. That is - please listen to this - when there is no image as the 'me', which means the 'me', the self is not because there is no image of me, then whatever you say, either pleasant or unpleasant is not a response, does not meet the response of being hurt. It is the centre as the 'me' that gets hurt. Now can the mind listen with tremendous attention, care, love, listen when you say something pleasant or unpleasant? What gets hurt is the resistance which you have. If you have no resistance there is no hurt. This is - please - this is terribly important in relationship. One has lived seventy years, or fifty years, or ten years, things happen, incidents take place, and uninvited occurrence takes place, and to have a mind that walks through all this without a single hurt: that is real innocency. The word 'innocent' means a mind that is not capable of being hurt. The real meaning of that word in the dictionary is a mind that is not capable of being hurt. And it will be hurt if there is an image as Krishnamurti, or Mr Smith, or Mr Y. That image puts a limit, a border, a line, which you cannot cross. The moment you cross I get hurt.

So in relationship to live a life, daily life, every moment of it, not just once a week, but every day, in relationship in which there is not a single image. If you can do this, really, not intellectually or verbally, or emotionally, actually do it, you will bring about a totally different kind of human being, and therefore a different kind of society. And such a relationship is love.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 8TH APRIL 1973

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were pointing out how important it is to have right relationship with each other. As we see it now, in relationship there is a great deal of trouble, conflict, bitterness, jealousy, anxiety. And if we apply our minds, our hearts, to bring about right relationship in which, as we explained yesterday very carefully, every form of conflict ceases then in that relationship, which is a movement, which is never static, that relationship when it is really right, clear, not sullied by the images that one has built, then out of that relationship there comes a great deal of creative energy.

I do not know if we have at all thought about or enquired deeply into what we were talking about yesterday, and if you had you would see for yourself how important it is to have this kind of relationship which creates a totally different kind of social structure. For most of us creativity doesn't really exist. It is one of our problems, living in this modern world, that life has lost its meaning, life has no meaning whatsoever as it is lived now. And it is one of our responsibilities, if we are at all serious, to discover for ourselves the meaning of existence. And so we are going to talk over this morning together this question of meaning in life, pleasure and fear.

One can give significance or a meaning to life intellectually, you can invent a meaning, put together by cunning thought but such contrivance has really very little meaning. But if we do not find for ourselves the real meaning of life then we shall escape from the living of daily life into all sorts of neurotic behaviour,

neurotic thought and expressions and activities. We are asking: is life a mere struggle, a battle both within and without, live a few years laboriously, painfully, anxiously and then die? Is that all? And if we do not find for ourselves the meaning of life, not a philosophic meaning, not a meaning invented by a philosopher or a psychologist, but a meaning that has deep significance in our daily living, then if we do not find it inevitably we shall always be in conflict with each other and also we shall form various categories of division and endless conflict with each other. So in enquiring into the meaning or if there is a meaning to life, is it merely a passing shadow with dappled light and movement endlessly groping, searching, struggling and ending.

So what we are going to do this morning if you will permit it, and therefore share it, try to find out for ourselves what is it all about-this nationalistic war, or the economic war which is to come or which is already taking place, the little expressions of individuals who say, I must play, write, the guitar, or my life is dedicated to music, to painting and so on - which has all become so extraordinarily superficial - if that is the only meaning to life then whatever we do socially, morally or religiously has very little meaning. And so it behoves us, being responsible and serious, to find out for ourselves. And in finding out we will share it together. You know when you share something, that which you share, that is neither yours nor mine. I do not know if you have ever shared something with another so completely that you and the other who shares it ceases completely because in that sharing there is no you or I, there is only that quality of mind that is sharing the thing, which neither belongs to you or to another. So in enquiring into

this question what we discover is not yours or mine, it is the whole significance, the meaning of a human being living either in America or in Russia, or in India or in China, wherever it be.

As we said, if our relationship with each other is not based on a conclusion, on an image, then that relationship releases this extraordinary creative energy. I am using that word `creative' not in the orthodox sense that demands expression. Creation doesn't ever demand expression. In the movement of that creativity the `I', the `me' that wishes to express itself in painting, in literature, in music, doesn't exist at all. So creation, this feeling of creativity, this tremendous energy that comes when there is no conflict whatsoever in ourselves and outside of ourselves, inside the skin, as it were, and outside the skin, the significance may be, and probably is, this release of creative energy which is not the product of thought. Therefore we are going to look together, therefore share, this whole problem of what is thought, what is the relationship of thought to creativity. Has it any relationship or can thought bring about this creative energy? So we are going to enquire, if you will, into this question, what place has thought in relationship, for if our relationship is a battlefield between man and woman, between human beings, then our life is committed to constant enmity, constant battles, hatreds, hurts.

So what place has thought and what is the whole structure of thinking? Please, this is very important for each of us to understand because we live by thought. The whole world is based on thinking and its activity. And when we realize the shallowness and the limitation of thought we try to escape from it through all kinds of neurotic activities - the suppression of thought, the denial of

thought, going after or seeking cosmic consciousness, which is utter nonsense when you have not completely understood the nature of thinking. So it is very important to find out for ourselves what place has thought in relationship, in action, and in that thing which we call creativity. All right? May I go on? Am I making myself clear? If not, ask me at the end of it, we will discuss it, we will answer questions. But if you are not interested, it is equally all right. For it's a lovely morning, full of shadows and light, the mountains are extraordinarily clear, and the birds are singing, and the fields and the trees are full of flowers and there is great beauty about us. And if we could look at that so totally and completely and live with that beauty which is to have complete relationship with nature then you have solved all the problems of life. But we cannot live so completely with nature because in ourselves we have lost touch with it because we, in ourselves, have no relationship with another. And because we have no relationship with each other we have no relationship with nature, and therefore we kill animals, pollute the air, all the horrors that are going on in the world.

So it is very important to understand the nature of thinking. What is thought? And what is the measure by which all thought functions? Please, this is not an intellectual thing, it may sound rather highbrow, but it is not because you act, feel, do or commit yourself to a series of actions based upon your thinking. So without understand the whole movement of thought, its relationship to the human being, its relationship to pleasure, its relationship to fear, and whether thought is capable of cultivating or bringing about creativity. Can thought give a full meaning to life? So that is the problem we are going to discuss, I hope you don't mind. It's rather



serious and needs a little bit of attention.

The whole Western world is based on measurement. The Greeks started it-not that I have read history but I have observed a great deal - the Western world is the product, more or less, of Greece, and measurement, which is technology, has been the result of thought. Right? All the world, specially the Western world, is based on thought, on measurement. Measurement between here and there, measurement of distance from here, from the centre to the periphery and so on. Measurement brings about the development of technology, mathematics and so on and so on. All that is thought, based on thought. And if you have observed, if you have gone to the East, there they have tried, at least a few, they said to themselves, measurement is limited and through measurement the immeasurable cannot be found. But they use thought to find the immeasurable. Are you following all this? Does it mean anything to you at all, what I am talking about?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! I am not quite sure that you really understand it, but it doesn't matter. And what relationship has thought to freedom? So first we must enquire into the nature of thinking. What is thinking? Because all our relationship, all our activity, every form of the pursuit of pleasure is based on thought and it has its own energy. So we are seriously asking: what is thought, how does it come into being? Surely thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge. You are Christian, at least you think you are, and you have been conditioned through two thousand years to think along a particular line and your thinking is according to the background, to the conditioning which you have had which is based on experience,

knowledge, memory. Right? That memory is stored up in your brain. That is the function of the brain, to respond according to the data - to use a modern word - that it has and respond according to that. It is a simple psychological fact. Right? I ask you, what is your name, and you very quickly tell me because you already know it by heart and you can repeat it very quickly. But if I ask you something a little more difficult you take time, between the question and the response there is an interval of time in which thought is looking, enquiring, asking in the memory for a right reply. Right? And if the question is still more complex and not wholly in the memory, then you say, 'I don't know'. All that is the process of thinking based upon your memory, experience, knowledge. So thinking is the response of memory. So thought is never new. Right? Thought can never be free because thought is the response of the past and the whole idea of freewill or through thought you can find freedom, has no meaning. So thought cannot be the instrument of creativity. Right? You are following all this?

Please, we are sharing together and it is very important that you and I understand this. Because if we once understood this very simple fact then you will see for yourself that knowledge in relationship as thought breeds conflict. Knowledge in relationship, in human relationship: you have hurt me and that becomes my knowledge about you. And that knowledge interferes in our relationship. So thought in relationship is the source of conflict. Have you understood this, not intellectually, not verbally but deeply, in the very core of your being? If you see the truth of this, which is not a verbal understanding of the intellect, but the actuality, that thought as knowledge in relationship between two

human beings brings about conflict and therefore there is no relationship at all. Then what place has knowledge in life? You are following all this? May I go on? I want to go, if you don't follow, or it's not clear, please, it's up to you.

Questioner: (Inaudible)

K: I am coming to that, sir, I am coming. Have a little patience. What is the function of thought? If it has no place in relationship, and I see the truth of that, because it creates disastrous results in human relationship, then what is the place of thought, what is its function. I see very clearly it has no function whatsoever in relationship. Right? I hope you see this. Then what place has knowledge, or thought as knowledge, what is its function? Its function is to act in the field of knowledge and nowhere else. I know how to ride a bicycle, that's my knowledge, how to drive a car, how to do all the daily things one has to do, how to calculate, you know the whole technological mechanical world, because thought is mechanical because our minds are conditioned, and to act according to that conditioning is mechanical. So thought has a legitimate place but not in human relationship.

Then what place has thought with regard to pleasure? Because for most of us pleasure is the most important thing in life. No? If we are very, very honest, one sees how we pursue pleasure; taking drugs is a form of pleasure, to have certain experience, sexual pleasure, the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of success. There are ten different forms of pleasure and we are pursuing that all the time. Your morality is based on pleasure and therefore it is immoral. You are accepting all this?

Q: Would you please repeat it?

K: I'm afraid I can't but I will put it differently. We are saying that human beings right throughout the world whether they are Christians, Buddhists, communists, whatever they be, are everlastingly pursuing pleasure. Their gods, their saviours, their beliefs are based fundamentally on pleasure. And our social structure is a form of this pursuit and insistence on pleasure. And therefore social morality is immorality. So what is pleasure? You understand, we have to be careful with all these things, this is part of our life and if we don't understand all this then life has no meaning, then we live very, very superficially and die - though in that superficiality there are all kinds of other superficialities. So it is very important to understand the nature of pleasure. What is pleasure? Is it a memory of something that gave you a certain form of delight, which thought picks up and pursues, which becomes pleasure? Are you following all this? That is, you may have had sexual pleasure and you think about it, the thinking about it is the insistence and the pursuit of pleasure. So thought sustains an incident which happened yesterday and that incident has left a mark on the mind, on the brain, and it pursues that incident in the form of pleasure. If it is painful it resists it. You know all this, don't you know all this?

So pleasure is the continuance of an incident which is dead, which is past, and thought insists or pursues that incident which now becomes the pleasure. You are following this? Look, sir, you told me yesterday that I was a very nice chap, it gave me pleasure. I haven't forgotten it, I haven't cut it off. That incident, thought picks it up and says, what a nice person he is, I would like to see him again. So thought pursues an incident that is dead and the

insistence on something that is dead, which is over, thought nourishes and sustains it in the form of pleasure. Right, you have got it?

So our life is based on thought. And thought, as we said, is never new, never free, so we are slaves to the past. Right? Our life is the past and in the past we are trying to seek the meaning to it. So the meaning in the past is a dead meaning, therefore it has no meaning at all. And thought can invent a meaning based upon its pleasure, its experience, its knowledge which is always the past. So when thought gives a meaning to life, it is giving a meaning to life in terms of the old therefore the meaning is dead and has no meaning whatsoever. Right?

Please, all this is an enquiry into what is creativity. Because life lived as we do has no meaning. We are conditioned human beings, the result of two thousand or five thousand years of propaganda, religious, social, whatever it be, capitalistic or communistic, Mao or something totally different.

And from that what is fear? You are following this? Because fear also plays a tremendous part in our life: fear of darkness, fear of what people might say, or do say, fear of not fulfilling, not succeeding, the anxiety, the pain, the sorrow, the innumerable shades of fear in which we live. One may be conscious of it or unconscious of it but it is there, from childhood to the grave this thing is constant. And one can observe where there is fear every form of violence comes into being, every form of neurotic behaviour, one lives in darkness, in utter despair. Probably you know all this if you have had the taste of fear and you are conscious of it. Fear, not only physical fear of pain which you have

had yesterday and you hope not to have it again tomorrow, but also all the many psychological fears. Now how is one, how is the mind to be totally, completely free of fear, not only at the conscious level but deeply? When one puts that question, when you put that question to yourself, how do you resolve it? Or do you say, 'It is inevitable, it is part of life, one must go through fear' and continue? So we get used to fear. That is, we get used to neurotic behaviour.

Now we are going to find out together and therefore share together whether the mind can be completely free, totally, of fear. You know, look at your own fear, if you are sufficiently interested in it. Observe your fears as you are sitting there, you may not have it now but invite it. You may have ten fears or one basic fear of which you are conscious and do not know what to do with it. Is it that one must operate or look at every leaf, every branch, every little branch of the whole tree of fear, or can one look at the very root of fear and therefore not be concerned with the little fears? Have you understood my question? Is this fear in which we live, hundreds of fears, are they to be taken one by one and disposed of, or is it possible to get to the root of it and therefore in the understanding, in coming into direct contact with it, go beyond it? You have understood?

Now first of all, we are not doing a group therapy. Right? That's an abomination, it has no meaning. Nor are we indulging in analysis because analysis implies time, division between the analyser and the analysed, and every analysis must be totally complete and therefore - which it never is - so you can keep on analysing for the rest of your life, which has become the fashion nowadays, and die with analysis. So analysis - paralysis through

analysis. Right? - so analysis doesn't free the mind from fear. And what does not free the mind from fear has no meaning, so you can put it out, actually deny it, negate it. Then what is fear? We are not analysing, we are just observing. Observation is not analysis, just to look at that beautiful oak is not analysis, just to look. But you can look at it and say, 'Well, I've looked at one leaf and a branch', that is not the whole tree. So we are trying to look at fear totally. What is fear?

Q: It is...

K: Sorry, you can talk afterwards, come on the platform and you can take charge, now let me go on. What is fear?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are sharing it together, don't give me explanations, descriptions, because the description, the explanation is not the explained, is not the described. We are concerned with the fact of fear and to look at it totally. One is afraid of the pain that one has had a month ago. Thought thinks about the future of that pain and hopes it will not occur again. You follow? So thought is responsible for the fear that might happen, take place tomorrow because I have known physical pain. So thought is responsible for fear, physical fear. Right? Look, you have had a toothache, haven't you, and you have been to the dentist, and you hope that pain won't happen again. That is, you are thinking about tomorrow while you are not having pain today, and tomorrow is the result of your thinking and you hope not to have it. That's a simple fact.

And there are many psychological fears; what people might say, fear of unsuccess, you know, you have dozens and dozens of fears, old age, ignorance, you know, I don't have to enumerate them.

What is the root of fear? Is it not becoming something, is it not being something, is it at the conscious level expressing itself as success and failure, not being able to achieve a certain position psychologically or physically? And there are all the hidden fears, deep down. Can they all be exposed, looked at and gone beyond? Right?

As we said, thought gives a continuity to an incident which happened yesterday which is over, and thought picks it up and says, I must pursue that. So thought gives, nourishes, sustains pleasure. So thought similarly sustains fear: I am afraid I am going to lose my job, I haven't lost it but I might lose it; I am afraid of not being a success - again in the future; I am afraid of not being able to fulfil, become somebody and all that. So thought is responsible for fear. Got it?

So the problem then arises: can thought not interfere - if one can use that word - with that incident which was a delight yesterday and not pick it up, just leave it. You have understood? Look, sir, I saw something very beautiful yesterday evening, the sun was behind the mountain, and the light was extraordinary, it was a great delight just to see it. But when it is over thought says, 'How extraordinarily beautiful that was, I want to repeat it, I'll go on that walk again tomorrow and have that delight, that experience again'. Thought thinking over the past, which is dead, gives a continuity to that which is dead in the form of pleasure today or tomorrow. In the same way thought creates or sustains fear of what might happen tomorrow. So thought is the basis of fear. Right? Whether that fear is the next second or ten years later. Right? So how is one to deal with thought which is all the time projecting itself? You



have understood my question? Right? Can I go on with it? We are moving together? Or is it too hot?

So my question is: knowing that thought is all the time conjuring up the future pain or picking up the delight of yesterday which is over and desiring to continue in the form of pleasure today. So thought, I see, is responsible for all this movement. And so I ask myself: what place has thought in all this? I live by thought, at a certain level thought is necessary, otherwise I can't function, I can't speak English, I am not able to do anything. Thought at a certain level is absolutely necessary as knowledge, and I see very clearly as long as thought enters into the whole movement of the unknown, that is, the tomorrow, then it either creates pleasure or fear. Thought can only function in the field of the known, it cannot function in the field of the tomorrow, the unknown, and yet it is all the time overflowing into the unknown, the tomorrow. So is there a demarcation between the known, which is yesterday, which is experience, which is knowledge, which is memory from which all thought takes place, and a movement which is not shaped or controlled by thought? And that is creativity, the other is not. Have you understood it, sir. No.

Look, we are always functioning in the field of the known. Right? That's obvious. The known is the memory, the experience, the knowledge which has shaped the mind, the brain, all our activity is within the field of the known. The known is the past and in that there is no possibility of creativity. So thought cannot possibly bring about this release of creative energy. The release of creative energy comes into being only when thought remains in the field of the known, and never moves over. So the known as the

yesterday, the unknown as the tomorrow, must move together harmoniously all the time then creativity takes place. Has somebody got this? Because you see if we are living always within the field of the known, which we are, Christians, communists, Hindus, Buddhists, Maoists, committed to some form of activity which is always from the known, in the field of the known, then we are living mechanically, living always in a prison. And in that prison we are trying to find a significance. And the philosophers, the analysts, and the psychologists and so on give a meaning to that. Whereas we are saying, thought has a legitimate place and it can only function in the field of the known, therefore thought can never bring about freedom, thought is never new. And when one realizes, not verbally, not sentimentally, not ideologically but actually, as the fact, then the mind is free from the known and therefore is free absolutely from fear. And therefore the movement in harmony between the known and the unknown is creativity. And that, to me, is the significance, the meaning of life. And we are going to go into it much more next weekend, further into the problem.

It is twelve o'clock, so please ask any questions you want.

Questioner: Could you go into the question of how loneliness and boredom-society says we never have to be lonely, we never have to be bored - how it drives us in different directions.

K: Could we, the questioner asks, go into the question of loneliness and boredom, which is part of our life. Could we discuss it. All right, sir. Let's take a breath, shall we.

What is loneliness, boredom and can one go beyond them? Right, sir? What is loneliness? Most of us know that feeling of

being completely isolated, though you may be with your friends in a group, or with your family, you feel completely cut off, isolated. And that isolation, that loneliness is rather painful, and being aware of that pain we either escape from it or try to cover it up or rationalize it. But at the end of it the loneliness still remains. Then what is one to do with it? What is this sense of loneliness? Is it the result of our daily life which is so self-centred, so egocentric, so selfish, which is all the time isolating, building a wall round oneself? And that brings about this quality or this feeling of utter loneliness, utter despair in that loneliness. Now if you do not escape from it, and I mean not escape, you can escape by verbalizing about it, you can escape by analysing about why it is there, you can escape by going off, taking a drink or going to church or turning on the television, a dozen ways, they are all more or less the same, but if you don't escape and you see the absurdity of escaping, the fact that running away from it is part of that loneliness, then you have the energy to face that loneliness. You follow? Because we are wasting that energy through escape, verbal escape or actual escape. So when you realize the absurdity, the silliness of it, then you are facing that loneliness.

Now, please follow this a little bit. When you look at that loneliness, are you looking at it as an observer different from that which you call lonely? You understand sir? Are you looking at it as an outsider looking in or the observer is the observed? When you say, I am angry, is anger different from you? Obviously not. You are anger. So when you look at that loneliness when there is no escape but are actually in contact with it, then are you looking at it as an observer looking at something outside or the observer is the

observed? Then when the observer is the observed there is no movement of escape or rationalization and therefore a complete going through with that loneliness, the ending of it. You understand, sir? Just a minute, I haven't finished yet.

Therefore it is very important to understand the relationship between the observer and the observed. Is the observer different from the observed? The observed is loneliness; is the observer different from that thing which he is seeing? He, the observer gives the names to which he sees as loneliness. The observer has experienced that loneliness previously and when the thing comes up again he says, 'That is loneliness'. So he is responding, the observer is responding from the previous experience and therefore separates himself from the new. Whereas if he does not look at it with the eyes of the past then the observer is the observed, then he goes beyond it.

And also what is boredom? Aren't you all bored with life? No? Aren't you? No? I'll show you how terribly bored you are! Because you happen to be young, you have got a lot of years to live, you want to experience new things, get excited, emotional, sentimental, practise this meditation, that meditation, follow that guru. Why are you doing all this? What is the basis of your action? Is it an escape from yourself because you are bored with yourself, because you realize how petty you are, how shallow you are, how meaningless the whole structure is? And so being bored with oneself you do all these innumerable things. So unless you understand very deeply yourself, which is self-knowing, there must be boredom. So the understanding of oneself which is a very, very subtle and complex problem, because knowing oneself is to learn about oneself, not

learn according to somebody, some clever psychologist, or philosopher but know yourself as you are, learn about yourself, not having learnt move, but learning is a constant movement, and therefore in that there is never boredom. Yes sir?

Q: Krishnamurti, some people say that creativity is related to the manipulation of the known in a new combination - some people take that view point. You simply address yourself to a quality of awareness that transcends the known and stops at the anticipation of the future.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Could you elaborate about this with the use of the word awareness, please.

K: Sir, what is it to be aware? Don't practise awareness, don't go to some school or somebody to learn how to be aware. Awareness is actually in the active present. Right? Aware of the trees, of the sky, of that extraordinary colour of that branch, aware of the colours about you. But when you are so aware you say to yourself, 'I don't like that colour', or 'I like that colour, I wish I had that tree in my garden', so you are always in that awareness choosing. And that is not awareness, that is merely a reaction to your conditioning. Awareness choicelessly, to have no choice in the very looking at that oak tree, at that branch, at the light on that trunk, just to look. Now to be choicelessly aware of the fact that thought can only function in the field of the known. It has no other place. It can invent a new place for itself but it is still the result of thought. Right? To be aware of the whole machinery, the whole movement of thought, and also to be aware of a movement which is not in the field of the known. That is, sir, one has to go into this

question of time. Time is always within the field of the known. Right? Time is measurement, yesterday, today and tomorrow. That is the known. And time shapes or modifies the past through the present to the future. Now to be aware of that as one is aware of that trunk of that extraordinary tree with that colour, choicelessly. And if one is totally aware of that then what takes place? Is there an awareness of the unknown? No, that's the whole point. The moment you are aware of the unknown it is the known. I don't know if you see all this. Right, sir? So the movement of the known, and it's a movement, and that which is not capable of putting into words, which is not measurable, has no relationship to thought. So the total awareness of both: awareness of the known and also awareness that says, 'I cannot possibly be aware of the movement of the unknown'. Right? Sir, it's like this: if you are happy the moment you become aware that you are happy it is gone. That's all, it's as simple as that. Truth is that quality of mind which never knows that it is the truth. You understand? Yes sir?

Q: When your physical body ceases where has the spirit gone?

K: I think we had better leave that question for next Saturday because that requires a great deal of enquiry, whether there is a spirit at all or your idea that there is a spirit. We will go into all that.

You have no more questions to ask?

Q: When you take a concept like trying to achieve perfect happiness, it seems a kind of abortion, selfinflicted, is derived from it. If you did not have a theme there to define the pleasure you would eventually just reach that happy state.

K: Sir, we are not trying to achieve a perfect state of happiness.

I am afraid we have not understood what has been said during the whole hour. We are not trying to achieve anything but just to observe. Now, look, when you observe that tree are you trying to achieve anything? When you look at yourself totally, when you are aware of yourself, all the movement of yourself, aware of it, are you trying to achieve something? And who is the entity that is trying to achieve something? Is he not part of that which he is observing?

Q: One time I was asked to ask myself whether I was me when I was being aware, and I was asked not to make up my mind too quickly. And during the time that I tried I came to the conclusion at that moment - I could be wrong - that I was nature when I was aware. I went back to the person who told me ask myself that and I said, 'OK, I think I know, I think I am nature when I am aware', and she asked me, 'Who is nature?' And so I haven't been able to think that far because I didn't understand it.

K: I don't quite follow your question, sir.

Q: Well, I mean, I asked myself what am I when I am being aware.

K: That's good enough. Let's stop there. What am I when I am being aware. What are you when you are being aware? So when you put that question, is the questioner there? You understand? When you say, what am I when I am aware, in that question there is a duality, the one that is aware and the one that says, what am I when I am aware. Then if there is duality then there is no awareness at all.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 14TH APRIL 1973

This morning we will talk about, if we may, the question of order, a little bit about education and the very simple but complex problem of love, and on such a lovely morning we must also talk about death, because we are concerned with the whole of life, not one segment or one fragment but be totally aware of the whole movement of life - the movement of the clouds, the marvellous mountains, the friendly trees, and what the world about us is like with its pollution, brutality and the innumerable explanations that people give of what life is, and also to be aware without any choice of the inward movement, not only at the conscious level but also at the deeper layers of our own mind. We are going to concern ourselves with the whole structure of life, to be aware of it, not only the cause of it but also in that very awareness to act, because action is necessary, but action along a particular line, religious, social, moral, or economic, is only a fragmentary action. We are concerned with the total action of life in which is included death, love, discipline, order and the beauty not only outside of us but also the great sense of beauty inwardly.

You know it is such a lovely morning it seems rather a pity to sit down and talk about all these things, but I suppose one must. But in talking about life we are also talking about the beauty of nature, the clouds, the mountains, the hills, the shadows, and the dappled light among the leaves. First let us consider what is order. Because in our life there is very little order, we live in a state of contradiction, consciously or unconsciously, we are not aware of it. Or if we are aware of it we try to superimpose upon this disorder



some kind of order, some kind of religious order, or impose upon this disorder of our life a conceptual order, order put together by thought, or suppress this disorder and conform. Conformity is the very denial of order. And most of us do conform to a pattern set by another, by a religious or legendary figure, or order imposed by some authority, specially the religious authority, or order induced by environment, which is also a form of compulsion.

As we said the other day, we are sharing these problems together, you are not merely listening to the speaker, agreeing or disagreeing, if you accept what you hear then it becomes merely a conclusion and therefore no reality, but if we share the problems together then it is your reality, the reality is neither yours nor mine, and we can share in that reality. And to share implies that quality of communication in which one is aware of each other and to be concerned with what is being shared. That is the whole movement of communication - the sharing intelligently and acting.

As we said, most of us conform. And to the speaker that is the very essence of disorder. And we conform because generally we want to succeed, success to us is the most important thing in life, success outwardly or success inwardly. Intelligence says, the outward success is really quite absurd because it leads to all kinds of destructive competition and so on. One sees that logically, objectively, quite clearly. But inwardly one conforms to a guru, one has conformed to the church, to the various religious legendary figures because inwardly we are quite uncertain, disturbed, not knowing where we are going, we want to be told by another, to do exactly what the guru or the priest or the philosopher, the analyst or the psychologist say because in ourselves we are confused and

we want to be quite certain. And so out of disorder in ourselves we set up authority both outwardly and inwardly. And the acceptance of authority is conformity and therefore brings about disorder. Now when you see that, not only verbally, intellectually but actually be aware of this whole nature of conformity, both outwardly and inwardly, where it is necessary to conform, like keeping to the left side of the road or the right side of the road and so on, and where it is absolutely to be denied completely, to see this totally and to act on it is intelligence. To see what is false and that very perception is action. The seeing is the doing without the interval of time, and that is the very essence of intelligence.

So we live in disorder. I do not know if you are aware of your own life and see how disorderly it is. You may have perfect order outside, in your room, in your life and so on, but inwardly there is contradiction, conformity, desire pulling in different directions, ambition, and at the same time try to be kind, affectionate. So seeing disorder in oneself and that very perception of that disorder is order. If I see in my life, in my daily relationship and action and thought how disorderly, contradictory my life is, violent and at the same time wanting to lead a peaceful life, aggressive, assertive and humility. We are playing this kind of game all the time. And when I am aware of it and see why I am doing it, the cause, the effect and the very perception of that disorder is action which is orderly. Therefore order is not a blue print, order is not something laid down by society, or by your guru, or by somebody else. Order comes naturally, easily, without effort, when you see in yourself the disorder, and that perception is an awareness of this disorder in which there is no choice. Is this comparatively clear? I hope I am

making myself clear.

Because you see without order there is no virtue. Order is virtue. Virtue isn't something you cultivate, morality isn't something that you practise day by day. Vanity can clothe itself in humility, but when you see what the implications of vanity, pride and arrogance are, when you are aware of it choicelessly, out of that comes naturally humility. And that is a living thing, not a thing put in a framework according to which you are conforming.

So order, virtue, comes out of the understanding of disorder. And that is one of the problems of our education. Why do we get educated at all? I wonder if you have ever asked that question. Here you have so many universities, colleges, schools, all the children going to them to be conditioned - what for? What does all this enormous knowledge mean? To bring about more disorder in the world? More wars? Make the mind conform to a particular structure of a society? And we accept and we never question why we are being educated. And in this peculiar education that one has, that one has been through, our minds acquire certain types of specialization: engineers, scientists, biologists, and you know all the rest of it, and we are never taught how to learn about the whole of life, not just one fragment of life, how to look at life as a whole, but only we are encouraged to be more and more self-centred, egotistic, pursuing our own pleasures. And all this, with other complications involved in it which we have no time to go into, is called education, cultivating that part of mind, the intellect, to store up knowledge. And so knowledge being always in the past our lives become more and more mechanical. We are encouraged to conform whether in the communist world or in the capitalist world.

And when we revolt against this conformity, that revolt is merely a reaction, again to conform in another pattern or to another pattern - long hair, short hair, whatever that be. Right? So that is our education right throughout the world. So in this education we are never creative. Creation is something which comes into being when the self is not, when the 'me' is not.

So that is part of our life, disorder in a life that is supposed to be educated, civilized. And in this life that we live we talk a great deal about love. All right, may I go into it? Don't be angry with me, don't, if I may ask, accept what we are talking about, but just look at it all, just look as you would look at a map. You can't change a map, it is there, the towns, the villages, the bridges, the length of the road and so on and so on, it is there, you can't change it however much you may like to change it. So our life is that and to look at it, to observe it without any choice. And in the observation of it you will discover how you are looking at it, how your own prejudices, our own petty little movement of life, your own anxiety, your own conclusion, distorts the map, and so you never look at this enormous beauty, complexity of life as a whole.

Now we are going to look together and therefore share together at this thing called love. You know all religions have talked about it: love of god and love of human beings. Very few religions have talked about the love of nature, love of animals, don't kill animals. And unfortunately the Christians have accepted that to kill animals and all the rest of it is quite normal, and yet they talk about love of animals. And in investigating this problem, what love is, or what compassion is, there are several things we have to understand. I mean by understanding not intellectually, verbally, but actually in

the very observation of this fact, action goes with the observation, that is intelligence.

What is love? Is love pleasure, is love desire, is love attachment, is love jealousy, possessiveness? Or love, compassion comes into being when we deny all that which is not love. You know most of us are so highly intellectual, or highly sentimental, emotional, that we can never face this problem, and we don't want to face it. And if we will, let us come to grips with it, let's look at it.

We have made love into pleasure, sexual or otherwise. And sex has become an enormous affair in this country, and it is spreading right throughout the world. I don't know why you have made sex such a colossal affair. You think that is the ultimate expression. In that you feel terribly frustrated, important, you know, all the nonsense that goes on. And when you observe it very closely in yourself you will see that you are pursuing pleasure and therefore attachment, and dependency. Where there is dependency there must be fear, and where there is dependency there must be jealousy, anxiety. Just listen to it, you can't do anything about it, just listen. And when you see it, act, don't keep on saying, 'Why shouldn't I be attached, it gives me great pleasure? If I am not attached I will be terribly lonely', be lonely, find out what it means to be lonely, go through it, look at it. And mere analysis of the cause why you are attached, why you pursue pleasure endlessly, whether it is sexually or in the name of religion, in every way we pursue this everlasting thing called pleasure. And with it goes fear, anxiety, jealousy, loneliness, the sense of frustration, and from it the desire to fulfil, the whole movement of this thing called the

`me', which is everlastingly trying to express itself. And that we call love. You may cover it up, you may subtly clothe it in a religious word or most intellectually, or sentimentally. And is all that love?

And can there be in love suffering? Therefore one has to understand what is suffering, why we suffer. And unfortunately we don't give so much importance to the understanding and transcending suffering, going beyond it, as we do to sex. We have accepted suffering, and because we are not able to go beyond it we personify it in a legend, and we think we have understood it, or find some excuse or rationality for suffering and think we have understood it. What is suffering? And we must solve this problem, as we must solve all other problems in our life, not just accept it. So what is suffering? Is it self pity? Is it the incapacity to face actually what is? Is it the image that we have built about ourselves that prevent the actual coming into contact with reality? The incapacity to face ourselves as we are and to go beyond it? Is it that we are so indolent? A polite word for laziness!

Because we have to understand this, what is suffering, if we are to go into this question of death, as we are going to this morning. Is suffering necessary? I am not talking about physical pain. One has physical pain often but to see that pain doesn't distort the mind in action, that pain doesn't make the mind neurotic. So one has to understand not only how to tolerate physical pain without distortion but also one has to understand the psychological pain, the hurts. And when we do suffer we escape, and there are a thousand means of escape - escapes, you know what they are for yourself and they have no value, whether you are a religious person

who escapes into some fantasy of some extraordinary consciousness, of which you know absolutely nothing, or you escape through sex, through, you know, dozens of things. Now, not to escape because you yourself are aware totally that any form of escape doesn't solve this problem. So when you no longer escape you have the energy to meet, to look at this problem. How you look at the problem is immensely important. If you are an analyst you want to analyse the whole thing, like tearing a flower to pieces and seeing what there is behind it. Behind it, in this human suffering, it is fairly simple, the `me', the ego, all that structure which I have built carefully which is the `me'.

And when you don't escape, when you are completely motionless in front of this suffering then you will see out of this suffering comes compassion, and that's love. Compassion means passion for all human beings, for everything, not just for human beings, or for your little child, or become a social worker, passion for everything: for the hills, for the trees, for the animals, you know. And so from that, compassion is the very denial of the `me'.

Then there is this question of death. Do you want to talk about it on a lovely morning? You know, we are concerned with the whole movement of life, being aware of the totality of life. And death is part of life, as love is part of life, suffering, anxiety, technical knowledge and its place, all that is part of life. You can't choose one part and say, `I'll take that and nothing else, because that pleases me'. You are concerned with the whole movement of life, and being totally aware of all that. So death is part of life. It's a rather complex problem and one must go into it hesitantly, with great care, and with intelligence. I mean by that word `intelligence'

not intellectual capacity, not a mind that is cunning, contriving, or a mind that is imaginative, because death is not imagination, is not something that you can contrive to escape. It is there to be faced and asking whether the mind, you, the mind, the human mind, can ever be free from death. Because man throughout the days and throughout the ages has tried to find immortality, to go beyond death and whether the mind can be free from the thing called death. The understanding and the freedom from that is as important as to bring order in life, it is as important as to have compassion - passion, integrity. And so it is a part of life and therefore to be gathered, to be understood, to be faced.

Are you all waiting for me to tell you what to do about it, how to go beyond it? And if you hear what is being said and draw a conclusion from it, and that very conclusion is bringing about a death of a different kind: a mind that is full of conclusions is already a dead mind, it is not a living mind. A living mind is a free mind, learning, never concluding. In the same way we are investigating, therefore learning, never coming to any conclusion, and that is the beauty of this whole movement of life.

So what is death? And can the mind ever be free from it? And what is it that dies? The body, the organism, the way we live, this constant battle, struggle, conflict, inwardly and outwardly, the strain, the tension, will inevitably bring all kinds of disease and ailments to the body, to the organism, and it will soon wear out. You may prolong it, and the doctors are trying to prolong it, I don't know why. Because - I am asking myself why - because the way we live is not a way of compassion, beauty, a way of life in which relationship is non-existent, and yet we want to prolong it



indefinitely, if we can. So apart from the organism, what is it that dies, what is it that we are so frightened of?

In understanding that, we must also enquire into what is time. Apart from the chronological time by the watch, yesterday, today and tomorrow, is there psychological time at all? Is there time to overcome death; or is death always in harmony with life, with love, with pain; or is death something to be put far away, one day we have to face it but not now? And therefore we accept time - please do listen to this - we accept time, the interval between now and that moment which we call death, that period, that lag of time, that interval, is the living. And that living is what we cling to. The living, which is this struggle, the battle, the little pleasures, the conformities, the conclusions, the tortures that we go through life, belonging to this sect or to that sect, dancing in the streets, shaving our head, you know all the absurdities that go on in our life, the interval between now and that moment. That moment when we have got to face this thing, either through disease, old age with all its travail, or to look at it without time so that there is no interval between now, the living, and that.

Because in that interval is fear, fear brought about by thought. Thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, the known, in the known is the `me', though consciously I may not know the `me' totally, the `me' lives in this interval. I wonder if you see. This `me' lives in this interval between now and that which we call death, in that interval is the whole movement of thought in the field of the known. And the known is the `me', the ego, with all its attachments, pain, loneliness, deceptions, deceits, all the religious nonsense that goes on. Now when there is no interval then death is

the death of me. This demands an intensity, this demands a great deal of energy, not to escape but to face, be totally aware, and in that very awareness action, so that the interval doesn't exist at all, so that the living is the dying. I wonder if you get this. And because we cannot face this thing so intensely death becomes something to be frightened of, to be avoided; or if it cannot be avoided then this whole problem of what happens after death arises. The East believes in reincarnation, the `me', the ego, incarnating next life. Please listen to all this, it may be terribly boring but listen to it. You are doing the same in a different way but it comes to the same thing. The `me', the ego reincarnating next life. And what is the `me'? Is it permanent so that it can reincarnate in the next, after death, as the `me', the ego, identified-listen to it - identified with my country, with my house, with my family, with my furniture, with my bank account, you know, all that, that is the `me'. And that `me' will be born next life, and it will have a better opportunity next life depending on what kind of life you lead now. All that is implied in reincarnation. Therefore it matters immensely how you behave now, not next life. So what is important is not the next life but to incarnate now completely in behaviour. You understand all this? So their belief has very little meaning.

Then there is this problem that the vast majority of people, of human beings, never come to the freedom from death but are caught in a stream, the stream of human beings whose thoughts, whose anxieties, pain, suffering, the agony of everything that one has to go through, we are caught in that stream. And when a human being dies he is part of that stream. It is only the man who has understood, gone through the whole of this life totally, completely,

fully aware of all the implications, he steps out of that stream. And the Psychical Research Societies and other societies, when they, through mediums and all the rest of it, when they call upon the dead, they are calling people out of that stream. You understand all this? It doesn't matter.

So that is our life from the beginning to the end. It's a total movement in which there is no fragmentation. But we have made life into fragments, and that fragmentation is corruption. And integrity is the whole, is the sane, is the rational.

What place has religion in all this? I am not talking - we are not talking about the organized religions, or the newly organized religions. What place has religion in life? That's also part of life, though some psychologists say that even the enquiry into such a thing is irrational, neurotic and so on. I do not know if we have time to go into this this morning, but we have to enquire into that too because that is part of life. Either there is a reality which is not put together by thought, or there is no reality but the only the movement of thought. Perhaps we can go into that tomorrow morning and also enquire what is meditation. You know one of the most important things in life is meditation, not the absurd things that are going on in the name of meditation but to really find out very deeply for ourselves what it means. We will do that tomorrow morning. I think that is enough for today. So perhaps you would ask some questions, or not, as you please.

Questioner: Krishnamurti, would you go into the question of belief and hope, and despair.

K: Won't you take a breath? Why do we have hope and belief? What is the place of hope in life? If you had no despair, would you

have hope? If you had never felt the sense of utter futility, the meaninglessness of existence, never felt, never been wounded by this question of despair, would you have hope? Or is hope a reaction of despair and therefore hope is part of despair? Are you following all this? When there is despair, despair, caught in circumstances out of which I cannot escape, I want to get out of that particular circle, environment, from that particular structure, and I do not know how to get out of it, I am caught in it totally, and the desire, the urge to break through and being incapable brings about in different ways and different circumstances this thing called despair: I lost my son, the utter loneliness, the meaninglessness of life, and from that arises the sense of not having any purpose, any meaning, any creative thing in life. And from that there is despair. And that same movement creates hope.

Now is it possible to be free of despair? Is it possible never to come upon such a thing and therefore free from both despair and hope? You are following all this? Am I making myself clear? You see thought, by which we live, unfortunately, thought is never new, is never free, and thought has created this prison, not only in the field of knowledge but also this prison of the 'me' and not being able to get out of that 'me'. So thought which has made the 'me' the centre of the universe sees the futility of itself and is incapable of going beyond. Which is, thought wants to go beyond it, beyond the thing which it has built. Please do see this. It is thought that has made the 'me', the ego, which has become the prison, with all its turmoil, anxiety, fear, jealousy and so on, and thought says, 'I must go beyond it'. And it can invent, contrive, suppose, imagine, but it knows basically the falseness of it. The more sensitive, the more

alive, the more it has integrity, sees the falseness of it, and therefore out of that comes despair of another kind. So thought being incapable of escaping from what it has created then begins to have hope in something which it has projected. So thought is creating all this. So to see that, not verbally, not intellectually, but to see the totality of it, then thought becomes extraordinarily quiet, it has no movement either to go beyond the `me' or to support the `me'. You understand?

Then what place has belief in life? For me, none whatsoever. Why should you have a belief about anything? Which doesn't mean that you become callous, indifferent, brutal and all the rest of it, why should you have belief, about what? Belief about my neighbour? Belief about myself? Belief in the politicians - which is the last thing you can ever have? Belief in god? Belief in your guru, that he has attained enlightenment? How do you know he has attained enlightenment? Because he has got some peculiar feeling, or atmosphere about him, therefore you accept it? So why do you want belief? Look what belief has done in the world, for god's sake. You believe in your nationality, and look what it has done: wars. You believe in some kind of legendary god, and look what it has done: the religious wars, the sectarian conflicts, this group which believes in that and fights for it, wanting you to join it. You know the game that goes on. You fill you mind with belief because it has to be active about something. Whether that activity is concerned with drugs, drink, sex, or with enquiring into new consciousness and super consciousness, it is exactly the same. If you are occupied with your kitchen or with god it is exactly the same. Because what matters is occupation, restlessness. You

cannot have a mind that is completely quiet, full. There is fullness only when there is complete emptiness. You won't understand that.

So what need there be for belief? Again thought plays its part. If you had no belief, no opinion, no judgement, what would you do? If you had no mental occupation, occupied, you know, going round and round with this or that, or something else, what would happen to your mind? This occupation with belief, with non-belief, is part of the movement of thought because thought is always moving, functioning within the field of the known. And in that there is no escape, the known is the prison, and from there to enquire into the unknown is the despair. But to know exactly the function of thought and the freedom from thought so that there is complete harmony, in that there is neither despair, hope nor belief.

Q: Sir, you said that this me, it takes tremendous energy for this me to die and what it is to be aware of this whole movement of why one has to face death. Well, how do you face something if you don't know what it is, and where is this energy to come from?

K: How can you face death if you don't know anything about it. How can you face death if you don't know anything about it. Face what you know, you can't face something you don't know. Face what you know, which is the `me', the `me' with all its activities, conscious, as well as the unconscious layers, which is the `me', that you can understand, that you can face, the `me' you can totally understand by watching, observing its movement in relationship, not by yourself on a hill top but in relationship you can observe the movement of the `me', and that `me' can be known totally. And when there is a complete understanding of the `me', the self, the ego, and therefore in that facing there is the death of me. Then that

is death. The dying to the `me' is death, the unknown.

Q: Could you speak about discipline and how it relates to awareness and to choice. What is discipline?

K: All right, sir. Discipline, awareness and choice. We are sharing this together therefore you are working, not just listening. What is discipline? Is it conformity to the pattern set by somebody, or you have set a pattern for yourself, or conformity to the norm of society, or of a new group, or of the old group? The word `discipline' means to learn. You understand? The word, the dictionary meaning of that word is to learn, not to conform, not to obey your gurus, but to learn. Now what is learning? Learning to acquire knowledge or learning as a movement? For most of us learning is acquisition, having capacity to function technologically in a certain field. And we confine all learning to that, having more and more experience, more and more knowledge, always within the field of the known, and knowledge is always the past. Now learning of another kind is never to acquire, never to accumulate because the moment you accumulate, that accumulation becomes the `me' and therefore it is already in the past, therefore dead. There are two things, aren't there: the learning to acquire knowledge, and learning which thought uses for its `me' so as to acquire through knowledge status. I wonder if you follow all this.

And where you are learning what is there need for conformity? I need to learn a language because I have to go to that country or I like to learn different languages, therefore I learn, accumulate. But I am learning about myself in relationship with you. If I learn in that relationship, acquire knowledge, then according to that knowledge I react in that relationship therefore that is the past. Do

you understand? Therefore the 'me' operates in relationship, whereas there is a constant learning in relationship there is no 'me', and therefore no need to discipline.

And the next question is choice: we think because we have freewill we can choose, choice is synonymous with freewill. Now I question altogether if there is freewill and what is the necessity of choice at all. If you see something clearly there is no choice; it is the man who does not see clearly, he says, 'What am I to do?' But to see clearly you can be obstinate, you say, 'Yes, I have seen clearly and it is so.' That's obstinacy. Lots of people are caught in this, they join different sects because they say, 'I see very clearly, it is so', but they don't enquire what is perception, what is seeing. When there is division between the see-er and that thing which he sees then in that division there is confusion, but when the observer is the observed there is no confusion. I can't go into that all.

So a mind that is very clear sees without distortion, such a mind has no choice because it sees. What is there need for choice when you see things clearly?

Then the questioner asks, what is awareness. All this is awareness. The understanding of the word 'discipline', the suppression, the conformity, the imitation, with all its conflicts, struggles, pains, and the reaction to that which is, I must express myself, I must be myself - and myself is still all that from which I have escaped. See all that very clearly, and to observe the nature of choice, what is clarity, perception, all that, the total awareness of all this is complete sense of attention in which there is no choice. Right, sirs.



## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH APRIL 1973

This is the last talk. We said we were going to talk over together this morning the question of religion and meditation. Of course if you are an intellectual - until you get rather old then you become rather religious, religious in the orthodox sense of that word - but generally the average intellectual turns his back on any idea or concept or religious thought. And if you are sentimental and rather romantic you abandon your particular religion in which you have been brought up and become a Hindu, Buddhist, go after Zen, shave your head, call yourself this or that. All a form of romanticism and sentimentality and you trot off if you have the money and the energy and go to India or Japan and try to find some guru who will tell you or lead you directly to Nirvana or to enlightenment. And you have every kind of religious thought, neurotic, fairly rational and so on. And specially when the world is in chaos, when there is a great deal of trouble and uncertainty one wants some kind of anchorage, some kind of haven to take refuge in. And religions, specially organized, or some exotic guru who comes over to this country, you become his follower, accepting all the things he says, obey - you know all that is happening in this country.

So when you look around the world over what part does religion play in one's life? I am using that word 'religion', as the urge, the intense pursuit of that which is sacred, if there is anything sacred. A symbol can be made into something that is holy, an image, either created by the hand or by the mind, and then you worship it because there is the desire in each one to be absolutely sure, certain

that life, being as it is, full of change, sorrow and suffering and confusion, the mind demands that we seek not only psychological security but something more than that, something that is really sacred. And in the search of that the priests, the theologians, the philosophers, the gurus intervene: they say you can't possibly understand that, you can only go through us, we will be your interpreters, your guide, your friend and your philosopher. And you get caught in their net, pleasant, sometimes rather unpleasant, exhibitionism, and sometimes worthwhile but rarely. And the mind can make anything sacred: a tree, a mountain, the flashing waters of a river, the image that you have in your church or temple, and the worship of a legend, a myth, a story. And out of that we weave something holy, something that we consider most sacred.

When you have observed all this quite objectively, non-sentimentally, without any emotion, which doesn't mean that you become purely intellectual, but rather critical, doubtful, sceptical. And the urge, or the search to find out for oneself if there is anything holy. And this morning, if we may, we will try to find out for ourselves if there is anything sacred at all in life, or is it all purely an imagination, a myth, something that the mind has put together in order to feel that life has a meaning, knowing the actual life that one leads has no meaning at all we want to give it a meaning, and that meaning is, or perhaps, energy.

So having observed all this right throughout the world, what is religion because man has always sought it out. Man has always enquired into the mysterious, into the unknown because he knows that our own daily life has lost its mystery, its romance, the daily life is such a struggle, pain, sorrow, anxiety, with flashes of

occasional joy and delight, and he wants more experience, wider, deeper, everlasting. And it appears religions, whether they are organized, or invented, or the legendary form of it, offer something of mystery, and also it offers wider, deeper experience.

So if we are at all serious, deeply watchful, aware, what is the meaning of this search, what is it that we are seeking, either trotting off to India or Japan or other romantic countries, or seeking through books what others have said - what is it that we are actually, if we are clear, if our own desires are fairly obvious, what is it that we are seeking? And how do you know that when you find something in your search that it is real and not an illusion, not a thing that the mind has projected? How do you know that you have found, or anybody know that they have attained, found enlightenment, or reached the highest form of religious thought, how do they know?

You know we are enquiring into this question together, we are sharing this problem together. It's your problem. And to share something it is important that in sharing, the thing that we share is of the final importance, not who shares it.

Now we are enquiring into this question of seeking, can the mind seek at all and find? Is the mind capable? And can the mind, if it has found what it calls the ultimate, the immeasurable, the nameless, the most sublime - how does it know? Or as it cannot possibly know that which is limitless, unknowable, and which cannot possibly be experienced, all the mind can do is to free itself from all the categories of pain, anxiety, fear, and the desire that ultimately creates illusion.

During the last three talks we have been trying, or rather we

have enquired into relationship. We pointed out how important it is to have right relationship with another in which the 'me' with all its images, is the factor, is the centre which divides all relationship and therefore brings about conflict. If the mind is not clear on that point, has not brought about right relationship with another, mere enquiry into, or the seeking of reality has no meaning whatsoever because life is relationship, life is action in relationship, and if that is not deeply, fully understood and established you cannot go very far. And without that merely to seek becomes a form of escape from the reality of relationship.

And also we talked, or rather we went into the question of fear, pleasure, love and that thing of which you are so frightened, death - we went into that. Until the mind is deeply established in behaviour, which is righteousness, order, which is virtue - which we went into yesterday - search or enquiry into what is real has no meaning because such a mind which is not free from conflict can only escape into what it considers to be real.

So if you have gone through this and really deeply understood and live it, then how can the mind which is so conditioned, which is shaped by the environment, by the culture in which we are born, how can such a mind find that which is not conditioned, how can a mind which is always in conflict within itself find that which has never been in conflict? So in enquiring the search has no meaning, what has meaning and significance is whether the mind can be free, free from fear, free from all its petty little egotistic struggles, free from violence and so on. Can the mind, your mind be free of that? That is the real enquiry. And when the mind is really free then only it is capable without any delusion to enquire if there is or if there is

not something that is absolutely true, that is timeless, immeasurable. Can we go on from there?

You know this is really quite important to find out for yourself because you have to be a light to yourself; you cannot possibly take the light of another, or be illumined by another, you have to find out for yourself this whole movement of life with all its ugliness and beauty and the pleasures and the misery and the confusion, and step out of that stream. And if you have, and I hope some of you have, then what is religion? Because all organized religions are a matter of thought building a structure, a legend round a person or an idea or a conclusion. And we say that is not religion at all. What is religion is a life that is lived integrally, wholly, not fragmented. That which is fragmented is corrupt, and most minds are broken up.

So what is the mind, the brain, that can function in the world in the field of knowledge, and also live in the freedom from the known, because these two must go together in harmony. I hope we are communicating with each other, are we? I am not at all sure. I am not talking to myself, I can do that in my room. I do that in my room anyhow. But we are talking this problem over together. It's your responsibility to share it, not to react to it but to share it. If you react to what is being said because you think it is wrong or right then your reaction makes you more enclosed, more temperamental, you are then following according to your own idiosyncrasies which have nothing whatsoever to do with objective perception, awareness. And in enquiring into this deeply one asks, what is meditation. In this country unfortunately - I am using that word purposely - most unfortunately you have started talking about

meditation, you have formed groups, and you know. But you have never asked, what is meditation. You have been told how to meditate. There are those who practise transcendental meditation, practise Zen, practise every form of exotic, oriental mischief called meditation, but you never ask what is meditation, why should you meditate, what is the point of it all. Why should you sit cross legged, shave your head, breathe in certain ways, do yoga and all the rest of it, what for? Is that meditation? You pay forty or fifty dollars to some teacher who will give you a mantra, a transcendental pill. You laugh but you are doing it in a different way. So let us find out for ourselves why we should meditate, what meditation means, whether it has any meaning whatsoever. To do that you must totally, completely discard what everybody has said about meditation. Can you? Or are you caught in a net, a trap of other people's ideas about meditation? Then if you are caught in that you are merely entertaining yourself, or trying to find the light of another through some practice. I hope you are paying attention. Why should you practise? What does practice do? You practise a piano, you practise how to ride a bicycle, you practise for a while how to drive a car so that you mechanically can operate. And when you follow a system, a method, however subtle, however silly it is, you are really reducing your mind to a mechanical entity, making it more dull than it is. Are you listening to all this? Or are you saying, 'Poor chap, he doesn't know what he is talking about. He is against this or that, therefore he is battling against other people's ideas' and so on.

After all one must use reason, one must use logic, sense, that's part of our life, that's part of our intellectual capacity, you can't just

discard it, and just be driven by our own particular desire. We have to understand our own desires too. So when you practise you are making the mind conform to a pattern set by another. The other is your guru, or your leader, and when he says that he knows what you should do, how does he know what you should do? For god's sake do wake up. When a guru or a teacher says he knows, or a priest, you may be quite sure that he doesn't know; what he knows is what he has been told, the past, the legend, the idea, the conclusion. He cannot possibly know the unknown, you cannot possibly experience the unknown. You can only experience that which you have already experienced otherwise you cannot recognize the new experience. Right? So when you are seeking wider, deeper experiences, those experiences can be recognized as wider and deeper because you have already experienced them, otherwise you cannot recognize them. So you go round and round in circles. That's one point.

So in enquiring into what is meditation, the first thing is, don't follow anybody. Right? Including the speaker. Don't accept what anybody says because you have to be a light to yourself, you have to stand completely by yourself. And to do that, because you are the world and the world is you, you have to be free of the things of the world, which is, to be free of the `me', the ego and all its aggression, vanities, stupidities, ambition.

So what is meditation? How do you find out? One sees it is obvious that to see anything very, very clearly the mind must be quiet. If you want to listen to what is being said you must give your attention to it, and that attention is the quality of silence. Right? If you want to find out, not only the meaning of words, but beyond, I

must listen very, very carefully. In that listening I am not interpreting what you are saying, I am not judging, I am not evaluating, I am actually listening to the word and what lies behind the word, knowing that the word is not the thing, that the description is not the described. So I am listening to you with total attention. In that attention there is no `me' as the listener, the `me' that separates itself from you who are talking, so it divides the `me' and the `you'. So the mind that is capable of listening completely to what is being said and going behind the word, must give total attention. And you do that when you are looking at a tree with that total attention, or when you are listening to music, or when you are listening to somebody who is telling you something most urgent, serious. That state of attention in which the `me' is totally absent, that is meditation. Because in that state there is no direction, there are no frontiers which thought has built around attention. I wonder if you are getting all this.

And attention implies a mind that has no desire to acquire, attain, arrive, or be something, then if it is, then conflict comes into being. So attention is a state of mind in which direction, will - the total absence of any conflict - has no place in it whatsoever. And that takes places when I am trying to listen to you, when I am listening to the sound of a bird, or when I am looking at those marvellous mountains. So in that state of attention there is no division as the observer and the observed. When there is that division then there is conflict. Right?

Now that is meditation, only the beginning of it. And if a mind is really serious in its enquiry this meditation is necessary because life which has lost all its meaning, the way we live, becomes



meaningful, life becomes a movement, a harmony between the known and the unknown.

So meditation is a life, daily life in which there is no control whatsoever. Do you understand what I am talking about? Our life is spent, is wasted, the enormous energy that goes in control and dissipation, wasting and controlling. Have you noticed this? How we spend our days in control, 'I must' and 'I must not', 'I should' and 'should not', suppressing, expanding, holding, withdrawing, being attached and breaking away from attachment, exercising will to achieve, to struggle, to build. There is always in this a direction, where there is direction there must be control. Right? And we spend our days in control. And we do not know how to live a life completely free of control. Are you interested in this? I'll show it to you, follow this, I'll show it to you. You know this is not an entertainment, this is not an amusement, this demands tremendous enquiry, great seriousness to find out a way of living in which there is not a shadow of control.

Why do we control at all? And when we control who is the controller? And what is he controlling, that is, withholding, directing, shaping, conforming, imitating? One observes in oneself the contradictory desires: wanting and not wanting, doing this and not doing that, contradiction, the opposition of duality. Please follow all this. Now is there duality at all, the opposite? I am not talking of the opposite of man and woman, and all that, dark and light, inwardly, psychologically is there opposites at all or only 'what is'? The opposite exists only when I do not know what to do with 'what is'. Right? If I know what to do with 'what is', if the mind is capable of dealing with 'what is' and going beyond, the

opposite is not necessary. That is, if one is violent, as most people are, its opposite which is non-violence and the practising of non-violence has no meaning because being violent and the practising of non-violence, there is an interval of time, isn't there. And during that interval you are being violent all the time, so it has no meaning. So what has meaning is, being violent our concern is to go beyond it, not in the opposite but to be free of it. I wonder if you understand this. I am violent, if I am, I am violent; I don't think in terms of the opposite. So what do I mean by violence? Is it a word - please listen to this carefully - is it a word that provokes the idea of violence, or is it a word that I have used before in the past to give it a meaning, and that meaning is violence? So I recognize the new violence in terms of the past, so I am translating the new feeling which I have called violence in terms of the past, therefore I am conditioning the new experience, new reaction or new quality which I call violence, I have clothed in terms of the old. Got it? Therefore what takes place? I am always translating the new in terms of the old, and therefore I never meet the new with a fresh mind. So the new reaction, the new feeling I have, I translate it as violence because I am looking at it with the ideas, conclusions, words, meanings of the past. So the past creates the opposite of 'what is'. I wonder if you get all this.

Whereas the mind can observe 'what is' without the naming it, without categorising it, putting it into a frame, or wasting energy to escape from it, but to look at it without the observer, which is the past, to look at it without the eyes of the past, then you are totally free of it. Do it and you will see. Have you understood? Need I explain it much more? Yes? All right, let's go at it. I don't want to

turn this into a school.

Sir, have you noticed in yourself there is always the observer and the observed. Right? There is you looking at the thing, so there is a division between you and the thing you observe. Right? You observe that tree, and the observer is the past, he says, 'That's an oak tree', when he says that is an oak tree, he has the botanical knowledge of that tree, that knowledge is the past and that past is the observer. So the observer is different from the tree. Obviously, that must be so. But when we are dealing with psychological facts, is the observer different from the thing observed? When I say I am violent, the observer, the see-er who says, 'I am violent', is he different from that which he calls violent? Obviously he is not. So when he separates himself from the fact as the observer, he creates a duality, he creates a conflict, and he tries to escape from that conflict through various means, so he is not capable of meeting that fact of violence. Got it? You work it out, if you can't I must go on. So to understand this movement of division as the observer and the observed who creates conflict and therefore no relationship, direct relationship with another.

So in meditation life is a total movement, not fragmented, not broken up as the 'me' and the 'you'. In that there is no me to experience. I don't know if you see this. Look: the mind is incapable of experiencing something that it does not know. The mind cannot possibly experience the immeasurable. That's a word, but you can give a significance to that word and say 'I will experience that state of the immeasurable', higher consciousness and all that business. Who is the experiencer? The experiencer is the past and he can only recognize the experience in terms of the

past, therefore he must know it already. Therefore in meditation there is no experiencing. Ah, sir, if you do this you will climb the highest heaven.

So you have not only to understand this whole movement of daily living, which is part of meditation, and in that no control whatsoever, so that there is no conflict, no direction, but a life that is immensely energetic, active, real, creative, but also in meditation the mind becomes completely quiet, silent. You know silence has space. And our minds have no space, they are too crowded, not only with knowledge that we have acquired but it is so eternally occupied with itself - what it must do, what it must not do, what it must achieve, what it must gain, what the others are thinking about it, it is full of knowledge of other people, conclusions and ideas and opinions. So we have very little space in our minds. Have you noticed this? And when you have no space, one of the factors of violence is the lack of space. Right? If you have watched the birds on a telegraph wire of an evening you will see how they keep space between each other. And in ourselves we have very little space, and one must have space. And it is part of meditation to come upon this space, space not invented by thought. Are you following all this? Because when you have space the mind can function totally. Our brains - may I go on into all this? - you know, our brains can function, not that I am a brain expert, I have watched my brain very carefully, I have spent a lot of days in looking at my brain, watching, a certain part of the brain can only function efficiently when it has total order. Order there means security. And when the brain, a certain part of the brain has complete security then it functions logically, sanely, rationally. When there is disorder in the

brain, a certain part of the brain, then it acts neurotically. So the brain is all the time trying to bring about order, even though it may find order in neurotic behaviour, that also is order, security. I don't know if you follow all this. And the space that the brain with its memory, with its capacity to function orderly, creates the space that is necessary for itself. You observe this in yourself and you will see. That is, through dreams - oh, lord, must I go into all this?

Most people dream - I must be very quick, there is lots, I must get on with it. Most people dream. Dreams are a continuation of our daily life, what you are doing, what you are thinking, you know, all that you are doing during your daily life, when you sleep the brain is still active, continuing with what it has been doing. If your life during the day is disorderly the brain tries to bring order while you are asleep, through dreams. That is one of the functions of dreams, to bring order. But whereas if you bring order during the daily life, waking hours, the brain then becomes much more active, not in the sense of bringing about order because you have already brought order, it becomes much more active, it becomes younger because it is renewing itself. Are you following all this? And a brain which is completely in order, absolute order, not relative order, has no conflict and therefore it can move in space. I wonder if you understand this.

So silence, which is really an extreme form of the highest order - do you understand this? No, sir, you don't, don't agree - so silence is not something you contrive, you try to practise, or try to become aware. The moment you are aware that you are silent it is not silence. So silence is the highest mathematical order, and in that silence the other parts of the brain which have not been occupied,

which have not been active, become totally active. So the brain, not being in conflict, having great space, not created by thought as space but an actual sense of space, and that space has no border, so thought - please follow this - thought has no place in this whatsoever. In the describing as we are doing this we are employing thought, using the words which thought uses to communicate. But the description is not the described. So the mind with its brain becomes totally silent and therefore of the greatest order. And where there is order there is vast space. And what lies in this vast space nobody can tell you because it is absolutely indescribable, and anybody, it doesn't matter who it is, who describes it or tries to achieve it through repeating words and all that kind of silly nonsense, is making something holy, sacred - he is desecrating it.

And this is meditation. And this is part of our daily living, it isn't something you do at odd moments, it is there all the time, bringing order in everything that it is doing. And in this there is great beauty, beauty that is not in the hills and the trees and the museums, in the pictures, or in music, because it is a thing that is beauty and therefore love. That's enough.

Questioner: Does awareness remain after the death of the brain?

K: Does it remain after the death of the brain, that is this awareness, this silence, does it remain after death. Find out! You see, this is what I mean, we want to find out from others.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I won't answer that question sir. Wait, sir, half a minute. The questioner says, I understand more or less what you mean by awareness - what you mean, what I mean by awareness - he has not

understood what is awareness, not what I mean by awareness. Right? If you are not aware of the trees, of the birds, of the people sitting around you, aware of yourself, your conflicts, your struggles, then it is not my awareness, it is that you are not aware. If you are aware, it's your awareness. Then he says, does this awareness survive after death. It's really quite an interesting question. Which is, is there apart from the `me', which is too silly even to ask, do I survive, apart from that is there this awareness which is light, which is the beauty, which is immense space in order, does it go on even though this mind has touched it - obviously it must go on, it's there - I won't go into it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: When I watch myself, my struggles, my conflicts, my desires, I seem to be in conflict. The question is: how am I to observe myself as I am, whatever I am, without any conflict? Is that right, sir? Without any conflict, that is, try to change `what is', try to modify `what is', try to go beyond `what is', all that implies conflict. Now can I watch myself without any conflict, seeing that I am angry, violent, jealous, small, petty, narrow, you know all the absurd things that one is, can I observe all this and go beyond it without conflict? Now it all depends how you observe. Now just please listen carefully, I'll explain. I observe myself: I am greedy, I want money, I want the pleasure of success, I am lonely, I am frightened, I want to be somebody - all that is in front of me, I am watching it. First, is the observer, the watcher different from the thing observed? If the thing is different from the observer then there is a division, isn't there: the observer and the observed. Then the observer says, `I must go beyond it, I must control it, I must

shape it, I must suppress it'. But the observer is the observed, isn't it? Then if the observer is the observed he cannot do a thing about it. Right?

Q: Well...

K: Wait, sir, wait, listen to it carefully. As long as there is a division between you as the observer and the thing observed then in that division there is conflict. Any kind of division outwardly or inwardly there must be conflict. And when I observe I am greedy, is the observer different from greed? He is not, he is greed. Now remain with that. You follow? Don't try to change it, go beyond it. If you do you are again divided. Whereas if you observe that without the observer, who is the past, then you will see that you have the energy which has been dissipated in the division, in conflict, you have now the energy to observe. And therefore in that observation with that energy the thing that you have observed is gone. Do it and you will see.

Q: We live by habits, good and bad habits and is it possible for us to be free of habits?

K: That's right, sir. The questioner says we are creatures of habit, good and bad, can we get rid of the bad habits and keep the good habits? Is that it, sir? Or why does the mind function in habits? Isn't it easier to function in habits? Everybody smokes and I also smoke, and I have fallen into the habit of it; and I do so many things because other people do, I believe in nationality, in this or in that because I have been brought up on that. It's much easier to function in a groove, in a habit and so the mind becomes lazy and doesn't want to change habits.

So the question is: can the mind be free of setting habits and



falling into them and then struggling to get out of them, and can the mind always be free in its movement, never falling into a trap of any habit? Is that the question, sir? To do that one has to observe habits. We have many habits, both outward and inward - just to observe it. And in that observation not try to change habits but just to observe them, how the mind always functions in a certain groove, in a certain pattern. And when you give your attention to the observation, attention, that means energy, then the mind frees itself from habits. What's your question, sir?

Q: Can you declare to me who is Christ?

K: Can you declare to me who is Christ. Look, sir, if I may point out, don't let's bring our personal opinions into all this, or bring in people whom you respect and so on. We are concerned with the whole religious thought, with the religious mind, and not of a particular religious mind. Sorry, we can't go into that.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 15TH JULY 1973

As we are going to have seven talks and seven discussions we should go rather slowly and carefully into the very problems, that not only exist outside of us in the world, but also inwardly. What is most important, at least I feel, when you are confronting all these terrible, horrible problems, the real issue in all this is to bring about a total transformation of the mind. That seems to me the chief concern, not to be involved in details at the beginning, but rather bear in mind that to resolve the external and the inward problems we need a totally different kind of mind. And that is our chief concern during all these talks: whether for human beings, as we are, it is possible to bring about in ourselves, psychologically, inwardly a fundamental change. Otherwise we shall have no means of translating, or going beyond these problems.

I hope you and I see the same thing, understand not only verbally but also non-verbally that for these problems, whatever they be - economic, social, religious, personal - we need a mind and a heart that is not put together by thought. Thought is not going to solve our problems, because these problems have come into being through the activities of thought. And to bring about a fundamental, radical, revolutionary, psychological change is our main problem during these talks and discussions.

First of all we are communicating with each other through words. Words have an extraordinary significance: when I use a certain word it creates in you a symbol, an idea, a formula, an image, and you react according to that image to what is being said. If I use the word 'freedom', you have your own idea of what

freedom is, or should be, or ought to be. So when you hear that word 'freedom' you have already created an image, a symbol, a conclusion. And the speaker may have a totally different kind of meaning, so communication becomes impossible. Communication is only possible when you and I are using the same word, with the same meaning and sharing together the meaning of that word. That is really communication; not you having an image and I another image, then it is impossible to communicate. So as we have to use words to communicate with each other, perhaps it may be possible to communicate non-verbally also, but first we have to understand the verbal communication, and that is going to be rather difficult because we are going to concern ourselves first with freedom. I am using that word in the dictionary sense only, objectively, non-personally, non-imaginatively, or speculatively. Freedom implies, does it not, the capacity to observe non-emotionally, non-imaginatively, without any symbol whatsoever, to be able to look. And we are going to look, we are going to observe the world as it is about us, and we are going to look at ourselves as we are. And to be able to observe impersonally, without any opinion, judgement, to observe in such a manner demands complete freedom, otherwise you cannot possibly observe. So let us be clear on that point first.

We are going to look at the world outside of us - politically, what is happening, the economic war that is going on, and the various religious organized sects, the divisions of communism, and socialism and capitalism, the various conflicts between nations - we are going to observe, look at them. And to observe them one's mind must be free from the conclusion or knowledge that you have had previously. And if you have such knowledge or conclusion,

opinion, one is not capable of looking, observing freely. Right?

Can we go on from there?

Can my mind, and your mind, look - not only at the particular problems in Switzerland, or in America, or in Europe or India, but to look at the world's problem, to look at this whole map? Not where you are going, because then if you are looking at the map wanting to know where you are going, then you are not concerned with the whole perception of the map - right?

Do please pay a little attention to all this because this is not an entertainment, you are not here to be entertained by the speaker, either psychologically, politically, or religiously, or intellectually. We are very, very serious, at least I am, frightfully serious because to me what is happening in the world is dreadful, horrible. And we are contributing to it, we have made it. We have created this world out of our desires, ambitions, cruelties, vanities, personal position and so on, it is our responsibility, we have made it, we are the world and the world is us. And any man with a little intelligence, with a little observation, reading the many things that are happening in the world, must feel terribly serious. And I hope you are also feeling the seriousness of it all and not merely spending a morning listening and then be casual, be entertained, be gossipy and all the rest of it. So this is not an entertainment, not an intellectual feast or a group psychological analysis, but being serious together, creating the right atmosphere in which we can communicate, discuss, talk over together the problems of our life. And that requires attention, care, affection, love and therefore all that implies a great seriousness.

So as we were saying, we are going to look at the world not

with your eyes, or my eyes, or with your opinion or my opinion, or conclusion, but look with clarity. And you can only look when you are free to observe; and that is going to be our greatest difficulty, not only outwardly of what is happening, but also to look inwardly at ourselves. If we can look at the world freely and then also look at ourselves without any conclusions, then you will see for yourself that the world is you, and you are the world. You know to realize that, not intellectually, not verbally, not as a theory, but actually realize it, feel it, then you will see for yourself what a human being can do, and must do in a world of which he is a part, which he has created. Nobody has created the monstrous world except each one of us, through our education, through our ambition, through our nationalities, through our violence, brutality, through our search for pleasure, through our desire to be secure, we have created this. And to bring about a fundamental change in this, and that change is absolutely necessary, each one of us must bring about a total transformation in oneself, and therefore in his relationship to the world - right?

I do not know how serious you are. Because it is only two serious minds that can meet - serious people who are concerned, not verbally or intellectually, concerned with their heart, with their mind, with their whole activity. And I don't know how serious your intentions are. You may attend these talks for the next four weeks and you may treat it as an intellectual entertainment, or desire a new kind of experience, or slightly bring about a change in one's mediocre life. That is not serious. That is not being serious at all. Seriousness implies that you be totally concerned with the whole problem of existence, not just one part of it, one's own personal

security, or one's own personal salvation. It is a vast area which you are going to deal with, the area of our whole life; our whole life isn't merely an intellectual concept and living at an intellectual level. Our life is not only intellectual, emotional, affection, love, sex, gathering money, fear, pleasure, pain, sorrow, death, the whole of that is our life, much more is involved in it. And if we are not serious, and I do mean if we are not serious, it isn't worth listening. There is tennis going on there, go and sit there, or go and climb the lovely hills and the mountains, watch the rivers flowing. But if you are here for this purpose, after you have spent money, taking a journey, we must spend time together in seriousness. And there is great beauty in seriousness, it isn't a pain, it isn't something that you must be serious about. Life is serious and it is only the man who is really serious knows how to live, not the flippant, not the ones who are merely seeking entertainment. So please bear this in mind, if I may suggest, that we are here for a serious purpose. And we are going to spend several hours together. Although the speaker sits on a platform, he is sitting there only for convenience so that you and I can see each other, he has no authority and therefore we can share things together. And sharing implies affection. It is only this intense demand of love that brings about transformation. So bear that, if you will, carry that with you throughout the days, and we will talk more about it

So first let us look freely at this whole map of the world - not at the map of your little village and your little backyard and your little mind, but the whole map of the world. You know it is one of the most difficult things not to be prejudiced, not to have some conclusion, not to have an image; and if you want to look at this

extraordinary map of the world you can't have a conclusion, you must come to it freely, happily, curious to find out, to share.

I am sure you must have observed how terrible and decadent and destructive the world is becoming. I happen to go to several countries every year, I have been doing this for the last fifty years, and I see the deterioration, morally, if one can use the word, spiritually, politically, there is so much corruption, at the highest level and also among the poor people who are unrecognized. That word 'corruption' means to break up - the real meaning of that word 'corrupt' is to break up - rompere. And this process is going on, all over the world things are breaking up. You know what is happening politically? Governments are corrupt, some more and some less, but all governments are corrupt. It is not my opinion, it is happening around you if you observe it. And so to look to a politician, or to a government for the human change has no meaning. So the politician, the government, the bureaucracy, is not going to help man - help man to change. It may help him monetarily, socially and so on, outwardly, but that is not going to bring about a radical revolution psychologically, inwardly. So we cannot possibly look to them because they are morally corrupt. Nor can you ask help from the business world - you know that better than I do. Nor from any organized religion. All organized religions are based on belief, dogma, ritual, authority, all of them. Therefore they are sectarian. The word 'sectarian' means breaking up, also. They may be very large, like the Christian churches, immense number of Catholics, Protestants, but they are still sectarian and are not going to bring about salvation or change in the human mind because they are essentially based on thought - right? We will go

into that too. Nor can you look to any guru, to any philosopher, to any book. Philosophy means the love of truth in daily life, not an abstract truth, not a truth invented by a clever, cunning, sophisticated, learned mind.

So you cannot look to a teacher, to a guru, to a priest, to a book, to any authority because all this has produced this world outside of us. So can the mind reject all that, totally deny all that? You understand what I am talking about? Not to look to another for clarity, for clear perception, for understanding. If you do, then you will create authority, and the moment you have authority in any form in your search for truth then you are denying that very truth - right? I hope you see the logic of it at least, the reasonableness of it, because the moment you follow somebody you are perverting yourself.

So that is the world outside of you - wars, corrupt politicians and governments, religious sectarian spirit dividing people, nationalities, communities fighting each other, and amongst all this confusion and weariness and sorrow, there are those gurus and teachers who say, "We know, we will lead you to the truth", "We will help you, we will unburden you of your sorrow" - but they can't. They impose their own kind of formula, they don't take away your burden, they impose their burden on you - right? I hope you all see this so that you never go near any of them, including the speaker! So being free of all that, you can look, otherwise you can't look, otherwise you are not serious, you are playing. It is like going window-shopping, going from window to window. That is what most of you are doing, and you think that is very serious if you go from one window to another window. Whereas if you discard



totally, deny all the windows, then you are capable of standing alone and looking at yourself, and that is what we are going to do. And that is what I mean by being serious.

So having looked at the world - not at the details, there are too many details, the sorrow, the suffering, the brutality, the violence, the communities that are trying to establish a way of life according to a certain pattern, the economic war as well as the actual bloody war, the politicians with their deception and their corruption and all the rest of it, if you can put away all that, then we can look at ourselves. And to look at ourselves requires seriousness, because what you have denied outwardly is what you are inwardly. I do not know if you see that? Because what you have created outwardly is the projection of yourself, because we are very violent, we are deceptive, we have various kinds of masks that we put on, various poses. And we want throughout all this, security. So what we are the world is - right? Do please see this, actually, not theoretically. And it doesn't depress one to realize that the world cannot be changed unless you radically change yourself. That doesn't depress one. On the contrary it gives you tremendous energy to change.

So one realizes in all seriousness what the world is, we are, and we are the world. Then the next problem is: how is the human mind to change - the mind that has been cultivated through millenia, a mind that has been educated, conditioned, a mind shaped by the environment in which it lives, by the culture in which it has flowered? This mind has taken time to arrive at what we are now, ten thousand years or more. That mind is full of experiences, knowledge, images, symbols. So we are asking a question, which is: what place has knowledge in the transformation

of the human mind? You are following all this? We have acquired a great deal of knowledge, both technologically - oh, in so many ways, in so many departments, science, biology, anthropology and so on and so on, medically. And also we have acquired a great deal of knowledge in the field, in the area of the psyche. So we are asking what place has knowledge - knowledge being the past? What is its relationship to the transformation of the human mind? Is the question clear?

I have a great deal of knowledge about myself, why I think certain things, what are the associations of that particular thought, why I react, what are my experiences, my hurts, my anxieties, my fears, my insistent pursuit of pleasure, and the fears of living and dying. I have accumulated tremendous knowledge about myself, I have watched it for fifty years, very carefully, observed all the subtleties, the cunning, the deceptions, the cruelties; when I am talking about myself I am talking about you, don't put that cap on to me, and looking at me and forget yourself. We are talking about you. I have watched, I have listened to dozens of philosophers, teachers, gurus, they give their knowledge, their experience. So during these years, whether it is ten years, or fifty years or a hundred years, or ten thousand years, there is a great deal of knowledge that has been accumulated. And yet I am just a mediocre, shoddy, secondhand, cunning, stupid human being. I react so quickly to violence, to flattery, my vanities and pride are immense. I conform, I battle against conformity. I talk about art, teach a little bit of art here and there, play an instrument, write a little book, become famous, notorious, wanting publicity - you know - I am all that. I have gathered tremendous information,

knowledge, and that knowledge is the past. All knowledge is the past, there is no future knowledge, there is no present knowledge - please listen to all this - there is only knowledge as the past. And knowledge is time - are you following all this? Now I say to myself, "I know this". And also by careful objective, non-personal observation of the world, I see there must be total change in me, as a human being, not only in my relationship with another, however intimate, my relationship with a man ten thousand miles away, my relationship with my neighbour, with human beings, I see there is a battle, conflict, misery, always asserting myself, the selfish activity, the self-centred movement. And that is all knowledge.

Now what place has it in the human transformation which the mind sees also is absolutely necessary? So that is the question. Will future experience gathering more knowledge, not only go to the moon and to various other fields of knowledge, but also the knowledge of myself, gathering more and more and more, taking time, will that bring about change? That is, will time and knowledge - and knowledge is time - will that bring transformation in me, in you? Or quite a different kind of energy is demanded? This is the problem we are going to discuss - right? Are we meeting each other? Because, as we said, we are sharing the thing together. And to share something together you both need a relationship of affection, consideration, enquiry - right? Otherwise you can't share, we must both be interested in the thing we are sharing together. Which means sharing together at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity, otherwise you can't share it.

So I have this problem, you have this problem: we know a great

deal what others have said about us, and what we know about ourselves, and will that bring about change? That means, will thought change the human mind? You understand? Thought being the response of knowledge. Thought has created this world - right? Thought has divided the people as the Christians and the non-Christians, as the Arab and the Jew, as the Catholic and the non-Catholic, the Communist and the Hindu, divided people, thought has done this. Are you aware of it? Thought has divided the world as Switzerland, France, Germany, Russia and all the rest. Thought has brought about conflict between each other, not only religiously, socially, economically but also in our relationships. And we are looking to thought to change us. That is what we are doing, aren't we? We may not be conscious of it but actually that is what we are trying to do. Is the picture clear - not my picture but the picture? That thought, knowledge, time, which are all the same, time, knowledge, thought has brought about this world with all its confusion, misery, corruption, sorrow, pain, out there and also in here. And we say it all must change, serious people say that, but they employ thought to bring about a change - you understand? So I question the whole thing. I see very clearly that knowledge cannot change. Knowledge cannot change my activity, my self-centred movement of you and me, as two separate entities fighting each other. So what am I to do? You understand? Do put this question to yourself in all seriousness. And what is your answer? You see the world, and see yourself as the world, and you see what knowledge is, knowing knowledge is necessary in certain fields of activity, and also asking yourself, can that knowledge, which human beings have gathered for thousands of years about oneself

as time, can that knowledge, time and thought bring about a radical psychological revolution? Now take that thought, look at it. Now how do you listen to that statement? How do you listen to the statement: what place has knowledge in human transformation? How do you listen to it? When you listen to those words, do you translate it into an abstraction? You understand what I mean by abstraction - draw from listening to that statement a conclusion, which is an abstraction, and therefore you are not listening to the statement but listening to the abstraction. You are following this? Are we meeting each other? No I see we are not.

I have made a statement: what place has time, which is knowledge and thought, in the transformation of the human mind, human being? Because there must be transformation. Now how do you listen to it? Do you listen merely to the meaning of words? Or do you listen and in the very act of listening draw a conclusion, and therefore listening with a conclusion and not actually listening to the statement? Have you understood? You see the difference? When you listen to a statement, to this statement, and draw a conclusion, an abstraction, then thought is in action - you follow this? Sirs, I am not being clever, this is not an intellectual thing, but you can observe it in yourself.

Can you think without a word, without an image, without a symbol? Now I am asking you that question, please listen to it: can you think without a word, without a symbol, without an image? If there is no image, no symbol, no word, is there a thinking? Right? Now you listen to that: what do you do with the act of listening? What have you done after listening to it? Go on please. You are trying to find out, aren't you, if there is a thinking without a word.

And you say, "By Jove, I can't think without a word, I must have an image, a symbol, otherwise there is no thinking". So the thinking, the word, the symbol, the image is knowledge. And that is time. And so can that time change the human mind? And all philosophies, all religious structure is based on thinking, which is knowledge, and we are looking to that knowledge to bring about a change. And I say that is not possible, it is impossible. But I must see that very clearly, see it in the sense, be sensitive to the truth of that statement. The truth being that knowledge though necessary in the world of action - how to drive a car, language, the field of science and so on, knowledge is necessary - but knowledge as a means of transforming the human being has no place whatsoever. Do you see the truth of it? And you can only see the truth of it if you don't draw a conclusion from it. You will say, "Then what am I to do?" That is a conclusion. "Then how shall I act, I have lived all my life on conclusions, beliefs, ideas, thought and you come along and say "Look that has no place in relationship, in human change". Then you ask: "What will take its place?" That question is put by thought. Therefore you are still functioning in the field of thought, therefore you don't see the truth of it. I can't put it any more clearly, it is up to you.

You see the chief concern for a serious man is the total transformation of the human mind - total not partial, complete revolution in the psyche - because that is the first movement which can transform the outward environment. Without that radical change mere change from the outward has no meaning anymore, because it creates more and more and more problems. You can see that, how they are polluting the earth, the waters and so on and so

on. And mere reformation there is not going to change. So being serious one asks, if knowledge has no place then what is the energy, what is the flame, what is the quality that will completely change the mind? Right? Now do I, do you see clearly the truth that knowledge is not going to change man? Not because I say it, not because intellectually I am convincing you, not because you feel that is the only way. Do you, irrespective of your environment, irrespective of the speaker, irrespective of any influence, impressions, demands, do you see the truth of it for yourself? If you do then what is the state of your mind? What is the state of the mind that sees the truth of a statement? The falseness of it, or the truth of it? What is your mind that says, "Yes, that is true"? Can you answer it? Is it an intellectual conviction and therefore not truth? Is it an opinion sustained by reason and therefore not true? Is it logical sequence, which you accept and therefore not true? Or is it an opinion, dialectly, which is seeing the truth through opinions and therefore not truth? I wonder if you are following all this?

So what is the quality of a mind when facing this statement, how does it receive it? Is it capable of looking at that statement as though hearing it for the first time and seeing instantly the fact of it?

We will leave it there for the moment. We will continue with this the day after tomorrow. We will leave it there and pick it up the day after tomorrow.

Perhaps this morning - we will have a little more time - you might like to ask some questions, because we are going to have discussions after the talks are over, but perhaps you would like to ask some questions relevant to the things we have been talking

about.

Q: I don't see why knowledge is time.

K: He doesn't see why knowledge is time. Don't you see it really? Look, I don't know how to ride a bicycle but it will take time to learn it. I don't know how to speak Russian, it will take time to learn it - learn the language with all its knowledge will take time. Time to cover from here to there. And I require knowledge to go from here to there. So all knowledge, obviously, there is no question about this, all knowledge is time. And all knowledge is the past - no?

Q: You don't need time at all, you can use knowledge now.

K: Having accumulated knowledge as time you can use it in the present. Is that it? Yes? Now listen to that: having accumulated knowledge, which is, I have learnt English and I use that language, that knowledge in the present - right? Which is obvious, I am doing it.

Q: How can I change my mind?

K: Just a minute sir, I haven't finished this question yet. I have in my relationship with you built knowledge about you - right? And that has taken time and I use that knowledge in my relationship with you in the present. So I use the past to look at you in my relationship. I use the image which I have about you in my relationship, the image functions. So that image, which is the past, divides you and me.

Q: What if you are looking at an individual who is in himself the result of the past, then to see him mustn't you look also at the past because he is it?

K: Of course. To look at myself, which is the past, do I use the



eyes of the past to look at myself. Then if I do use the eyes of the past to look at myself, there is no looking at myself.

Q: They are my only eyes.

K: Wait. I do not look at myself. I can only look at myself with eyes which are not of the past. It is obvious, all this.

Q: How can I change my mind instantly?

K: How can I change my mind instantly. You have put the wrong question sir. You know this requires, to answer that question, this requires that one has to go into the whole question of time. Right sir? And that is an immense question, not for the moment, we will come to it. Can the mind change instantly? That is, can the mind, which is of time, put together by time, put together by knowledge, put together by experience, can that whole mind - the mind being heart, the whole works - can that change radically outside of time? Right? Not instantly - I don't know if you see the point. I say, in all humility, that it can, otherwise I wouldn't be talking about it. I would be a hypocrite if I talked about it, then I would be indulging in ideas, which is stupid.

You know sir, this whole problem of what place has knowledge is extraordinarily intricate, subtle, because you see on one side you need to have knowledge. I have to have knowledge to go to the place I live at, to drive a car, to speak this language, to recognize you, to play golf, tennis, to go to the factory, to do anything, I must have knowledge. And yet I see knowledge has no place - or has it a place in human change? You are following all this? So it requires enormous wide and swift perception of this. Not a conclusion. I can conclude and say, "Well it has a place", or "It has no place" - that has no meaning. But to see the whole field of knowledge, and

to see the whole field and where the knowledge is necessary, where it becomes a destructive thing, requires great intelligence. So is intelligence the product of time? Do listen to it. Don't agree or disagree. Is intelligence personal, yours or mine? Or is intelligence the seeing of this whole movement of knowledge? And to see it you must be highly sensitive, attentive, care, affection, love, you must have, otherwise you can't see the beauty, the swiftness of intelligence.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1973

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the day before yesterday?

We were saying, seeing what the world is about us, and what we are actually not theoretically, what a world we have created, a world of great brutality, division, wars, appalling cruelty, suffering, seeing all this one feels, if one is at all serious, that there must be great change, not only outwardly but specially within oneself. I do not know if you feel the same thing that the speaker does: how very important it is that there should be this psychological revolution, because every other form of revolution, social reform, a little patchwork here and there, has been of no avail, they haven't fundamentally, deeply changed man. And unless man changes himself he always overcomes whatever the structure be, according to his particular conditioning. I think that is fairly obvious, both historically and actually. And if you also feel the urgency, the seriousness of this change, of this transformation, of this revolution, you must have asked: how is a human mind, which has created the outward environment, how can that, not merely structurally, but how can the outward change be brought about in relation to the inward change? That is, if you see the necessity of this deep inward change of the mind, and if you take it really seriously, then the question inevitably arises: how am I, caught in this world, trapped in this peculiar culture and civilization, how am I to fundamentally change, and what is involved in this change? I am sure you must have asked it. The more serious one is the more urgent the question becomes.

Can this change be brought about by another, by a philosophy, by a new kind of social structure, by a new religion, or by a new belief? When you put that question to yourself you have seen whether a new belief has any validity at all. Because all belief, however great, however convenient, is always the outcome of a series of processes of thought. I believe in something, a beautiful ideal, that ideal is the structure brought about by thought, obviously. When you believe in, or have faith in something, it is the result of the process of mentation. Will a new structure, socially, economically, will that change the human mind? Or will it make it more superficial, more convenient, more attractive, more satisfying? And therefore will not actually bring about this change. Will a new authority? Obviously not because any authority however new is still patterned after the old.

So what will change man? And what is there to be changed? If one observes oneself we are caught in a world of knowledge, of a culture, of a civilization which has conditioned our minds. Our conditioning is the result of a culture, of a civilization - the western culture, the eastern culture and so on. That is the result of our conditioning, the culture, the environment, the civilization has produced this mind. I think we all accept that naturally and logically if you observe it.

Now what am I to do? As a human being living in this world, a monstrous world, with very little meaning, what am I to do? How am I to transform myself? How am I to change radically? Because I see I have to change radically because everything about me, the way I live, working, working, working, frightened, violence, wars, insecurity, all the religious structure which has no meaning at all

any more, the political chicanery, corruption, seeing all this how am I to change so that it has an effect on the world and also my conduct, my behaviour, my way of living is totally different? Now is this your problem? If it is not we can't share it. Sharing means to share something together in which we are vitally interested, deeply concerned, totally committed. If we have a motive in sharing then it is not possible to share. If I have a motive, and you have a motive, which must obviously be different, how can we share together a problem? And the problem is: the transformation of the total activity of man.

If you are vitally interested in, seriously committed to the solution of this problem, that is, how can the mind which has been shaped through time, through culture, through civilizations, how can that mind be totally transformed so that it moves, acts, functions in a different way altogether? If that is your problem then we can share it together. But if you say, I have a personal problem which I must solve with my relationship with my wife, with my neighbour, I have a particular disease, I want to have it cured, I hope you will cure it, do this, then we are not sharing the issue, problem. But we will share this problem if you and I are completely interested, totally committed in the solution of this. For me that is the only problem. In the resolution of that problem I will solve all the other problems - my relationship with another, my loneliness, my despairs, my anxieties, fears, pleasures, the solution of death, meditation, reality, everything is involved in this.

So if it is your interest, your serious intention to go to the very end of it, then we can talk this over together, like two friends, quietly, deeply investigating, tracing out, enquiring. And we can

only enquire if you are not committed to any other thing but this. If your mind is not free you can't enquire, you can't investigate. But in the process of investigation of the central issue the other problems which you have will be solved - whether they be economic, social, religious, personal, imbalance and all the rest of it. If that is clear then we can proceed and find out together. I am not laying down dogmatically or hesitantly, but enquiring together, in which there is no authority whatever, neither your authority nor that of the speaker. We are together enquiring, exploring whether the mind can be totally transformed.

This mind that we have, whether it is a European mind, or the eastern mind, with their peculiarities, superstitions, and the western mind with their absurdities, with their technological knowledge, this mind is what we are concerned with. Now what is this mind? If you observe your own mind, which is the western mind - I am not dividing west and east, I am talking here to you who are the westerners, therefore it is for convenience's sake. I do not regard the human mind as the west or the east, it is the human mind. Now this mind is conditioned by culture, by an environment, economic, social, climatic, this mind has been shaped through time, through knowledge, through experience, to face the world, to look at the world in terms of money, power, pleasure, and to be able to kill. Right? Look at it. Probably Christians have killed more people than any other people in the world, including Genghis Khan and all the rest of that gang! So you are conditioned to kill, not only other human beings through scientific warfare, but also to kill animals for your food. And money has become extraordinarily important - the pursuit of money, because having money gives you pleasure,

position, so-called freedom, security. And you have been conditioned religiously to accept an image, transferring all your particular sorrows to that image. Your religion is based on authority, tradition, rituals, dogmas, the infallibility of certain people. Socially you are seeking power, competition is very rampant, and you can compete efficiently when you have great knowledge. So education is the cultivation of memory, so that you have an instrument which is efficient, to kill, to survive. So that is your conditioning, as it is in the east in a different way. I think there is no question about this - right?

That conditioning is knowledge - right? Please, I am talking, but it doesn't mean I am the only person talking. We are investigating together, and in this investigation you see technologically, scientifically, medically, you have advanced tremendously. But also you have destroyed the earth, you have killed thousand and thousands of people, for an idea, or for money or for exploitation of the earth. You call yourselves Christians, you say you love God - and you kill man! This is your heredity, this is your conditioning and as long as there is no freedom from that conditioning there cannot possibly be a transformation of the mind - right?

So transformation of the mind implies total negation of this civilization and this culture. You understand what we are talking about? Total denial of this monstrous culture that has made us what we are, each one fighting for himself. And in this culture we say, we must work, change the world, different values, new structure. Why should I work? You say you must work in order to survive, which means maintain the structure as it is. And the reaction to that is, 'I won't work, why should I work?' I hope you are following all

this. Life has no meaning as it is now. Has it? You suffer, you are constantly in battle with yourself, with your wife, husband, with your neighbour, conflict, conflict. And your ethics say, work, but your ethics doesn't say what is the meaning of life. Unless you find the meaning of life, why should I work? Either to support the structure, or the new structure, or a new kind of self denial - you know what is happening in the world. Why should I work at all? And the culture has given a meaning to life in work, in the Christian gods, a meaning to life in going to the moon, becoming a successful person in the world. Your meaning is out there. And that is losing its significance. These are all facts.

And so seeing all this makes sorrow, one has shed tears, not sentimental tears; one has enquired, searched, looked here and there, none of them give the answer. They say, "Follow me, worship me, accept this pattern of behaviour, work for another, don't work for yourself, be concerned about the society, not about yourself." But all those statements have no meaning because one has not found the meaning of life, the meaning of existence, which cannot be found in any book, in another, in following a guru, an authority, none of them give you the meaning of existence, you have to find it for yourself. That is what we are going to do. The speaker is not telling you the significance or the meaning of life, but together, and I mean together, like taking a journey, a walk together, we will find out. And to find the meaning, not the purpose, purpose you can invent; if you are clever, intellectual, or fairly reasonable, fairly balanced, you can either invent or accept or put together a purpose. The purpose has no meaning. Purpose, the end of life, is totally different from the meaning of existence, the



meaning of life. The one becomes superficial, whereas if one is really enquiring into the deep meaning of living, then it leads the mind very, very far.

So our minds are conditioned from the moment we are born, or previously, until we die. And the transformation is the total freedom from this conditioning. And this conditioning exists through the various movements of culture - artistic, religious, technological, political, economic, scientific, and all that. Can this mind be aware of this conditioning? Can you be aware of it? Aware in the sense, I mean by that word, to observe - please listen to this - to observe without any distortion, to observe your conditioning, that is, your culture, your civilization, all the movements of social reforms, you know all that is going on in the world, of which you are a part, to observe that, to become aware of that. We mean by that word 'aware' to observe without any distortion of opinion, conclusion, without the interference of your tendency, or your particular experience, to be aware of this conditioning without any choice, just to watch. And in the observation of it you will then deny, if you go deeply enough, totally all this culture. And yet you have to live in this world. That is the problem. You understand my problem? I hope you are following all this. You know, to me I am burning with it.

How can I, how can this mind live in this world, which is so appalling, so destructive, so meaningless, and turn my back on it completely? And I mean by turning my back, actually put away all the rubbish it has put in my mind? - their religions, their attitudes, their opinions, their immorality, their sense of monetary importance - you know - the whole of that, the killing. Can I turn

my back on it and yet live here? Not withdraw, run away into some monastery, that has no meaning. I do not know if you have ever played that game of withdrawing from the world - withdrawing into a monastery, or into a room, cutting everything out of it so that you are completely isolated. And if you have ever done it, even for a day or even for a week, you will soon find out that is not the way out. That is again the movement of thought, which in its reaction to this mad, confused, insane world says, "I can only solve it by withdrawing from it."

So my question is: first, can this mind, which is the result of this civilization and this culture, and therefore has very little meaning, can the mind become aware of it choicelessly, observe? And yet I have to live here, I have to do things every day. How is this possible? You are following all this? First of all we must be very clear that the description is not the described - right? What we have described, put into words, is not the thing itself. And second, are you very certain, clear that there must be radical transformation, not have your finger in this social order, or in this church, or in this sect, or in this book, or in this - total transformation? And third, this mind, which is the result of this culture, this civilization, it is the result of that, and to be free of that conditioning, you must totally deny the culture, and yet live in this world - right? Now how is this to be done? Right? I hope you are following all this. I hope I am making myself clear. I have to live in this world with all the madness around me, this madness which has tried to give a meaning to life, and in the observation of it I see it has no meaning, I have to live with this structure and yet not belong to it in any way - right? Now is this possible?

I cannot escape into some fanciful world. I cannot escape through any commune. I cannot escape from it by joining another religion, becoming a Hindu instead of a Christian, or a Buddhist or a worshipper of some ugly little guru - and there are plenty of them! So I am stuck with this because I have pushed away all that. I don't look to anybody - not that I am full of confidence in myself, I have no confidence in myself. If I have confidence in myself I am deceiving myself. What can I have confidence in when the whole of me is the result of this structure, of this civilization, of this culture. So I have no confidence in myself. I have no belief. Please follow all this, I don't look to anybody, to any god, to any image, to any priest, to any structure that thought has put together as religion, whether it is the Christian religion, the Hindu - nothing - because they are the culture which has shaped me, in which I live which has brought about this mad world - the world of insanity, war, brutality, chicanery, deception, hypocrisy - right? So I am left with my conditioning. I have nothing else. I have no meaning to life because any meaning I invent will be out of my conditioning. Any god I project will be out of my conditioning as a reaction to what I have been conditioned. I have been conditioned as a Christian I will reject and react to that and create another. So I have only this left with me. I hope you are following this.

Now how is the mind to free itself from this web, which is very deep, conscious as well as deeply unconscious, how is the mind to disentangle itself and make itself completely free, original, pristine, clear? You have understood my question? Now if this is your problem, not imposed by me, but you have come to it, you have come to it because you have looked round the world, and you have

looked at yourself, you have looked at your struggles, your pains, your anxieties, your fears, and you have observed a new structure socially - it doesn't solve this problem; it may solve some superficial problem, like having a better prison - so if you have come to the same thing, that is, you have observed in your life, not only the way of your life, the conflict, the struggle, the deceptions which you practise on others and about yourself, the sorrow, the irresponsible life that one leads, the meaninglessness of it all, and you have also observed the outward world, the world of the Far East, the world of the Middle East, the world of the European, the American and all the rest. It is all there to be looked at. And if you have really deeply rejected all that, and have only this left, that your mind is conditioned, and any projection from that conditioned mind creates further confusion, further misery, further conflict - right? So the question then is: can the mind free itself from its conditioning?

Now is this possible? Man has enquired, gone into this as far as this and says, "It is not possible, I can't do it" - therefore what he has done is, he looks to an outside agency. Please listen to this. That outside agency is God, is some super human energy, super human consciousness. That super human consciousness, super human energy, super human god is the projection of his conditioning. Are you following all this? So man, being aware of his conditioning, not being able to solve it, moves away from it, creates an illusion and that illusion becomes his reality. But it is his projection, whether in the field of ideology, religion and so on. So there is no outside agency. You understand? I hope you are following all this. What we are doing is, discarding everything that

man has tried, or tried in his search, in his enquiry, discarding everything that thought has put together outwardly. So you are left with this, your conditioning. Whether you are aware of it or not, that is up to you. How deeply, how superficially, it is still up to you. But if you are really, desperately serious, wholly committed to this one thing, then we can take the journey together.

So has the mind the energy - please listen - has the mind the energy to explore without any distortion the whole content of the mind which is conditioned? I need energy, don't I? To investigate anything I need energy. To go up to that mountain, I need energy. And here I need tremendous energy and I will have it in abundance if that energy is not dissipated. You are following? I dissipate that energy when I seek an outside agency. I dissipate that energy when I say, "It cannot be done". Or I dissipate that energy when I say, "Oh, yes, it is quite easy, let us work at it". I dissipate that energy when I want to go beyond it. I dissipate that energy when I look to another, to an authority, to a book. So that energy becomes canalized, vital, immense when there is no escape from the central issue, which is, can the mind be aware of the content of the conditioning only, and not try to go beyond it? I don't know if you follow all this? Right? (Nous sommes d'accord?)

You know sirs, this is the most arduous thing, to be so completely concerned and committed to the solution of this problem. It is like a scientist, not the scientist who is committed to a government, he is not a scientist at all, but like a scientist who is really concerned objectively, without any hypothesis, without any desire to produce a result, observing everything in himself, which is his conditioning, then you have the energy - right? You are

following all this? Not the energy to do more good, not the energy to do more yoga, or to convert others, or to write books. We are talking of a totally different kind of energy; the energy that has been wasted, dissipated, now it is all there, held together.

Now what is the content of this mind, and is the content different from the mind? You are following? I want to find out what the content of my mind is. And is the content different from the mind itself? And is there a mind, consciousness, without the content? Is this all too much, of a morning? Is not the content the mind? The content is not different from the mind. I mean by the mind the totality, the brain with all its memories, the feelings, the heart with its affection, with its care, with its tenderness, the physical organism, all that I call the mind. It isn't just the intellectual mind. The intellect, the capacity to reason sanely, logically, all the feeling that one has, affection, the hurts, the sense of beauty, the sensitivity, the fear - all that. When I use the mind I include all that. Now I am asking myself: my mind is conditioned, obviously, and that conditioning is knowledge, that knowledge is based on experience, whether it is mine or yours or ten thousand people, which is the culture, the civilization. Now is the content different from the mind? Or the content makes up the consciousness, so there is no division between the content and consciousness. Are you following all this? We are together in this? Now this is important. Please bear this in mind. The content is consciousness. Consciousness is the content. Therefore there is no 'me' different from the content. Right? It is a difficult thing for you to see this. Look! I am trying to find an example, but I can't. I can't think in examples. What I am trying to point out is, there are no

divisions in the content as the 'me' different from the thing it observes as the content. Right? Am I conveying anything? Look sirs, I'll put it differently.

The mind is conditioned and I am asking: can the mind be ever free from this conditioning? And in this conditioning there is the observer as the 'me', and the thing it observes as the conditioning - right? So there is a division in this conditioning. The observer who says, "I am different from the conditioning", therefore the observer can change the conditioning, he can shape it, control it, alter it as long as there is the division between the observer and the observed, which is the content. And the observer says to himself, "I am different from the content", "I am the Higher Self", you know all the tricks that one plays on oneself. Which you have in this culture and in the eastern culture in a different way. So consciousness is made up of the content and the content is consciousness. They are one. So there is no division as the observer and the observed. Please see this. Either you see it intellectually, verbally and therefore it has very little meaning. Or you realize the truth of it. Therefore you eliminate altogether conflict. You understand this? That is, when there is a division between the observer and the observed, the observer is something different from the observed; where there is division in this conditioning there must be conflict - right? And that is part of our culture. I am different. I am the will exercising over the content to change it. I don't know if you are following all this.

So where there is division there must be conflict - division between Europe and America, between the Communist and the Socialist and the Capitalist, between the nationalities, the Hindu,

the Muslim and the Arab and the Jew - you are following all this? - where there is division, that is a truth, an atavism, where there is division there must be conflict. If I am divided from you as my wife, husband, neighbour, whatever it is, brother, in that division there must be conflict. And part of my culture, my conditioning is that I am different from that which I observe. I am an Englishman - you follow? I am a Jew, or a Muslim or a Hindu - all that stupid nonsense.

So the content of consciousness is the whole. There is no division. See how the problem becomes much more difficult. Before I solved it, I thought I solved it by inventing the observer different from the thing he observes, and therefore the whole concept of control, which is part of our civilization, part of discipline, control, imitation, conformity on which you have been brought up from childhood, which is part of our culture, which is the conditioning. I wonder if you are meeting all this? And my conditioning says, "I am different from the thing which I observe". Of course I am different from the thing which I observe as the tree, as the mountain, we are not talking of that. We are talking of the total content of consciousness in which the 'I' is different from the thing which it observes. Therefore there is a division as the observer and the observed. Are you getting all this? So I have eliminated the cause of conflict. You understand this? For God's sake do! Because then you will be free of conflict. Conflict exists in duality, me and you, we and they, I am jealous, I must not be jealous, I am violent, I must not be violent. The 'I' is different from violence. That is the culture in which you have been brought up. And we are saying that culture has conditioned the mind to divide



itself, to fragment itself and so the battle goes on endlessly. But when you see the content makes up consciousness, then there is no fragmentation, not one area fighting another area. I wonder if you see this? So we find that any fragmentation is the process of thought - right? I wonder if you see that? No you don't.

Q: Sir you think consciousness is everything, but it is different for everyone, that is the problem. Consciousness is different from everything, it is different from your feelings, from your beautiful body, from your thoughts.

K: You are saying we are different from our body, from our feelings, from our thoughts, and that is part of our conditioning. On the contrary I am saying there is no 'you' different from the conditioning. I wonder if you see this?

Q: How can we turn our backs on this conditioning if we are not different from it?

K: I am going to show it. You see that is exactly it! You are proving actually how you are conditioned. Just let me answer that question sir, it is an important question, please. He asked me, he asked a question, which is: how can I turn my back if I am not different from that which is conditioned? Right? So he assumes that he is different from the conditioning and therefore being different he can turn his back on it. But is he different? Or he is part of that conditioning, thinking he is different. Look sir, please bear with me a little if I labour the point. We have come to this point, which is: that we know that we are conditioned. And not being able to resolve that conditioning thought says, there must be a different force, a different energy, different spirit in me that can say, "I will turn away from it" - you are following this? This they

have done in India in a different way, and as India exploded over the whole of Asia they have caught the Indian spirit, that is, there is a Higher Self different from the lower self, and therefore the Higher Self can control the lower self. They have given it a name and they are pursuing that philosophy endlessly because they haven't been able to solve the central issue, which is: can the mind free itself from its conditioning? And as they have not been able to answer it they invent an entity, an outside agency, a super consciousness which will solve it, which will dissolve the conditioning. And you do it in the same way differently. It is the same issue. Which is: the human mind is conditioned, after centuries and centuries of knowledge, experience, so-called culture, civilization, it is caught in a trap. The trap is not different from the mind itself. The mind is the trap. The content is consciousness. Not being able to solve it we say, "Please, how can I turn my back if there is not a different entity in me which says, 'I will turn'?" The invention of a different me is part of my conditioning, which is the result of a thought confronted with a problem which is insoluble by thought - right?

Q: Then the mind says, "I won't look, I can't look", and then it goes out and not looks any more.

K: You are saying the mind says, "I mustn't look, I won't look, I'll escape, I'll go away from it". But you haven't solved the problem! The mind hasn't unconditioned itself. What I am trying to point out sir is, that any movement of a conditioned mind is a movement away from it and therefore it cannot solve it. The mind has to live with it - you understand? The mind has no escape from it. The mind cannot say, "Well I will leave it alone, something will

solve it." The mind has to be with it, look at it, you know, immovable. I wonder if you understand all this? And because we cannot do it we invent the 'me' different from the thing observed. If you see the truth of this, the logic, the truth, the reason of it, which is the whole of the mind is the content which is the conditioning. Any movement as the observer wanting to change the conditioning is still part of that conditioning. When you see the truth of that there is no movement away from that fact. There is no movement away, or to transform 'what is'. Then what takes place? You understand, that is the problem. We'll deal with it - I'll go into it the day after tomorrow. Please let us see this clearly and then we will come back to it next Thursday.

My mind realizes, after observing the world, the world of Europe, America, Asia, Russia, China, the various systems, the various philosophies, the various teachers, gurus, saviours, the various scientists that are concerned with technology, and the pure scientists, and the medical profession, observing all that, observing the whole of that, in seeing that the mind is aware that it is part of it. That is 'me' and 'me' is that. The world is me and I am the world, there is no difference, therefore I am not fighting the world because I am the world. And this culture, which is the world, this culture with its - you know what this present culture is, historical process, a growth democratic, or so-called democracy, tyranny, all that, that is the culture in which the mind has lived, grown, assimilated and is. That mind is conditioned by this culture. And this culture says, there is in you something different from the culture. And I accept it, as they do in India and in Asia. And when I look at it, when the mind observes it, it says, "There is only one thing, total

conditioning, in which all these fragmentary things exist".

And that conditioning is the result of time. Can the mind observe, live with it without any movement away from it? You can only live with it totally if you do not want to go beyond it, escape from it, change it. And the mind will find it tremendously difficult to live with 'what is'. Either it becomes neurotic, as it generally does, psychologically distorted, or it escapes from it, and so it finds devious ways and means of avoiding actually 'what is'. And to remain with it, without any movement, without any distortion requires great energy. And that energy comes only when you don't dissipate it.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1973

If I may I will go on with what we were talking about the day before yesterday. We said we had two central problems: one, knowing what the world is, which each one of us has created, with all its fragmentation and division, with its brutalities, chicanery, deceptions, violence and wars and all the horrors that are going on, to turn our back against it, away from it, totally and yet live in this world. Can this be done? That's what we were talking about and we shall, if we may, go further into the matter.

I do not know if you have considered how serious all this is. That it is not an entertainment, an amusement, something that one seeks out of pleasure, or out of despair, but rather being aware of the whole situation, the various intricacies in the world movement, both historically, outwardly and inwardly, is it possible to turn our backs away from it, to turn away from it? That is, to turn away from the culture, the civilization, all that man has put together throughout the centuries and free the mind from that conditioning. That is one issue.

Then the other issue is: whether it is possible in the very process of unconditioning the mind, to live in this world, not of it, not be involved in it but yet live in it? I do not know if you saw the other day on the television - I happened to turn it on by chance - people killing baby seals. Man has destroyed nature, exterminated certain species of animals and birds. Man has created the most beautiful cathedrals in the world, and extraordinary mosques and temples, great literature, music, painting. And that is part of our culture - the beauty, the ugliness, the cruelty, the immense destruction of man

by man. That is part of our civilization, of which we are. I do not know if you really realize deeply what is involved in all this, both economically, socially, religiously. If you have examined it fairly deeply, are concerned whether the structure can be changed, the structure that has created this world; and what has brought about this structure; and by merely changing the structure will it change the man? This has been one of the problems of the world: change the outer then man will be changed inwardly. That has always been one of the arguments. But you see that it doesn't work that way. So man has to change and thereby also change the structure.

Now can the mind, your mind, be free from this culture? And what does it mean to be free from the culture? Is it a matter of analysis? Is it a matter of time? Is it a matter of more rational, logical conclusions of thought? Or is it a non-movement of thought? Please go into this with me a little bit, perhaps it may be a little - you may not be used to this kind of thinking, you may not have thought about it at all. So please have a little patience and thereby share together this extraordinary question. Can this conditioning of the mind, which has been brought about through time, experience and knowledge, can this be analysed analytically, dissolved - this conditioning? That is one point. Analysis, the very word means, to break up. The analyser and the analysed, which is the breaking up. And through fragmentation we hope to understand and dissolve the complex problem of conditioning, both at the conscious as well as at the unconscious level. Can this be done through analysis? Of course when you look at the problem of analysis, in it is involved the analyser and the analysed, taking months, years and by that time you will be dead, and all that

involves time. I can analyse myself very, very carefully, step by step, investigate the cause, the effect, the effect becoming the cause, which is a chain in which analysis is caught - you are following all this I hope. And whether the mind can analyse itself and dissolve all its peculiarities, violence, superstitions, the various contradictions and thereby bring about a total harmony through analysis?

As we said, analysis implies time, and what is time? Time is both physical as well as a psychological movement - if you have watched yourself. A movement from here to there physically, a movement psychologically from 'what is' to 'what should be'. Or 'what is', transforming that through an ideology, which is a movement in time. Right? May I go on with it? Please we are sharing together this problem, this question, you are not just listening to me, we are travelling together. We are investigating together, finding out what is true together. You are not accepting what the speaker is saying, that has no value whatsoever, neither verbally, nor in reality. What has reality is when we through investigation, through observation, through very careful awareness, share that which we discover, each one of us for ourselves, then that has validity, then it has substance, then it has meaning. But merely listening to a series of words and translating these into ideas and then putting that idea into action has no significance.

So we were saying, time is movement. Time, movement as moving from here to there, going to the room I live in. That takes time. Psychologically also it is a movement from 'what is' and changing that to 'what should be'. 'What is', is the result of the past which is a movement in time to the present, and 'what should be' is

a movement in the future. The whole movement is time. Right? And thought is always a process in time, for thought is the response of memory, which is the past, which is the knowledge which is the past, and according to that conditioning it reacts, which is a movement. So thought is a movement in time. And analysis is a movement in time, and analysis means time; analysis means the movement of thought examining itself. And if you go into it deeply, our conditioning is to analyse, we are conditioned to that. And we never see that the cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause - right? That is a movement in time. So through analysis there is no freedom from time. Analysis does not free the mind, which is the result of time - right? Oh, do see this. Please if you don't understand this we will ask questions afterwards. Keep your questions if you don't understand it, and I hope we understand this fairly simple thing. It is fairly simple if you observe it in yourself. I am angry, I analyse the cause. And in the process of analysis I come to a conclusion, which is the effect. And that conclusion becomes the cause to the next effect. All that is a movement of thought in time. Thought is time. And thought has built this conditioning. After all, our culture is the result of thought, as feeling, physical responses and so on. So analysis cannot possibly resolve the conditioning of the human mind. I hope it is clear - not the verbal statement but the truth of it, the actual fact of it, not the assertion or the repetition that analysis will not free the mind, that has no value.

So the mind seeing the falseness of analysis discovers the truth that analysis does not free the mind. That is, discovering the truth in the false. Then analysis also implies not only of the conscious



mind but also the deep layers of the unconscious, which is also the result of time. This division between the conscious and the unconscious is artificial. Consciousness is total, we may divide it, we may break it up to examine it, but it is a total movement within the area of time. And the unconscious becomes unimportant when you look, when you are able to look at the whole of consciousness and its content. You understand? We look at ourselves fragmentarily. We look at ourselves through the action of thought. Am I making any sense? No? We'll discuss it a little later, let me talk a while, if you don't mind.

Look sir, my consciousness is a total movement. My consciousness can be broken up as the conscious and the unconscious, as action and inaction, as greed, envy, non-envy, it is a total thing, it is a total movement which can be fragmented in order to examine. And I see that examination of fragments doesn't bring about a comprehension of the total - right? What is needed is to be aware of the total, not merely of the fragments. To be aware of the whole movement of consciousness, which is the area of time - right? Can thought, can I, as thought, explore this consciousness? Won't somebody meet me half way in this? You see what I am trying to say is: I have never personally analysed myself at all. What has happened is to observe and the very observation reveals the total, because there is no intention of going beyond 'what is'. Going beyond 'what is' is the movement in time. Is that fairly clear? I'll go on, you'll get it.

So I see clearly the mind can, without analysis, discover, see, observe, the total movement of consciousness. That is one point. What we are concerned with is: whether the mind can free itself

from its conditioning. We see - I see, not you - I see it cannot free itself from its conditioning through analysis. That is very clear. And logically, sanely, reasonably it is so, if you go into it. All that involves time and through time to dissolve time is not possible. Then can thought dissolve it? Can thought transform, free the mind from its conditioning? Now please listen to this. Thought is movement in time. Thought is movement and therefore time. And the examination by thought of the movement of the conditioning, is still within the field of time, therefore thought cannot possibly resolve the conditioning because it is thought as knowledge, experience, memory, that has brought about this civilization in which the mind has been educated. That is clear. So thought cannot resolve it. Analysis cannot. Thought cannot. Then what have you? You understand? We have used thought as a means of conquering, destroying, changing, analysing, overcoming. And I see thought cannot possibly bring freedom to the mind. So thought is movement. Wait a minute, wait a minute. Non-movement is freedom from time - right? Non-movement of thought is a state in which the mind is free from time. Now I'll go into this, you will see this.

The conditioning of civilization, culture has said, I must be competitive, has taught me to be violent, or rather helped me to be more violent. So the mind is violent, that is 'what is'. Can the mind be free of violence, which is 'what is', without the movement of thought? You have understood my question? I am violent and thought says, "It is necessary in this civilization to be somewhat violent". Thought says, "Overcome that violence". Thought says, "Control that violence, utilize that violence". Which is,

encouraging, controlling, shaping that violence for its own purposes. That is what we are doing all the time. So thought, being a movement, is all the time acting upon 'what is', which is also the result of time and thought - right? Now can thought have no movement at all and only the 'what is' remains, and no interference of thought with regard to 'what is'? You understand what I am saying? Look, sir, I am violent, I know all the causes, how it has come about, I won't go into that, that is fairly clear. It is part of the culture, part of the economic situation, encouragement, education and so on - right? I am violent, that is 'what is'. Can the mind look at 'what is' without any movement? Any movement is time - right? So can the mind observe that violence with non-thought, that is, without time? Have you understood my question? Because my conditioning says, "Use thought; control it, shape it, put it away, struggle against it, fight it, it is ugly to be violent, you want to be peaceful, human beings should be peaceful". So it has all the reasons, justifications, condemnations, which are all movements of thought, and thought is time, and movement is time. And there is only the fact that this human being is violent. That is the only 'what is'. That is clear up to there.

Can the mind look at 'what is' without any movement? And then look at 'what is'? Let us examine 'what is'. The 'what is' is violence - right? And I have used a word to indicate a feeling which I have called violence. I have used a word with its meaning that I have already used before. Right? So I am recognizing the feeling in terms of the old. When I recognize something it must be the old. So 'what is' is the result of thought - right? And the mind meets without movement, which means without time, that which has been

put together by thought, which I have called violence. So when non-movement meets time, thought, which is the movement of time, then what takes place? You are following all this?

Look sirs, my son dies, I suffer a great deal for various reasons - loneliness, despair and so on and so on. Then thought comes along, thought says, "I must overcome it". 'What is', is suffering and the movement of thought is time. And the mind meets that suffering and tries to do something about it, get away from it, run away from it, seek comfort, seances, mediums, beliefs, it goes through all that process, which is all a movement of time as thought. Now to meet that suffering without any movement, then what takes place? Have you ever tried this? Have you? If you have you will see the non-movement completely transforms the movement of time. That means suffering doesn't leave a mark on the mind at all, because non-movement is timeless, and that which we call suffering is time. And that cannot possibly touch that which is not of itself. I must go on. Sorry if you don't understand this.

So the mind being conditioned, through culture, through environment, through knowledge, through experience - all that is the movement of time, and thought is also a movement of time, is time. So thought cannot possibly transform or free the mind from its conditioning, nor analysis. So can the mind observe this conditioning, this educated entity, without any movement? Then you will see, if you do it, that all sense of control, imitation, conformity, totally disappears. Are we sharing this thing together, or not at all?

Q: How do you get there?

K: How do I get there. That is not so important sir. How do you

get there is more important.

Sir, look what I said just now. What is implied in control? There is the controller and the thing controlled - division, therefore conflict, therefore fragmentation. Right? And this movement of fragmentary activity is thought. I have been conditioned, my mind has been conditioned to control, that is, I must not do this, I must control it. And the controller is the past, obviously. And he has been taught to control, to fight, so battle between the controller and the thing to be controlled. Both are a movement in time - right? And both are the product of thought, which is also a movement in time. And through control there is no freedom from conditioning. So I discard totally all control. The mind discards totally all control. Please be careful. This requires tremendous enquiry, intelligence. You can't say, "Well I have learnt not to control" and then go and do what you want, or whatever you want to do. You can't do what you want to do in the world anyhow. But when you see the truth of this, that control has no meaning whatsoever, when you see that, intelligence is in operation.

In the same way conformity - conformity to a pattern, conformity to an idea, conformity to a particular state or ideology and so on. Conformity implies the thing is conforming to a pattern. Again a duality. Again a conflict. Both are the result of the movement of thought and time, therefore conformity. Seeing that conformity will not free the mind from conditioning is the act of intelligence. And that act of intelligence comes through awareness of this fact that the controller is the controlled. Right? And this division is part of our culture. We have been educated round it. And to re-educate ourselves does not need time - right? The re-

education of ourselves - I'll repeat it again - does not require time because this re-education takes place instantly, which is outside the field of time, only when you see the whole movement of thought as time.

Q: Excuse me sir. Is that what you mean by learning in the active present?

K: Yes, I was going to go into that. Just a minute sir. I'll go into it now, I'll show it to you.

Human beings are by nature, through heredity and so on, violent. That is a fact, that is 'what is' - sexually, morally, religiously, in every way they are violent human beings. That is 'what is'. Education has taught me, get over it gradually, fight it, you will at the end of a certain time be free of this violence, through ideals, through control, through conformity, through every form of discipline. That has been my education, the human education. And culture has also told me, educate the human being, you will learn gradually, to overcome it. And in observing this fact I see how false that is. Violence cannot be got over gradually because if I achieve non-violence some time in the future, I am sewing the seed of violence all the time - relatively less or more. But I am sewing the seed all the time until I achieve non-violence. I see the absurdity of it. So learning is going - in seeing the absurdity of it is the act of learning - right? So can I learn, can I observe the fact of 'what is', which is violence, and in the very observation of it act non-violently? I'll explain it to you.

My mind is violent, I observe it. Now why do I observe it? I observe it in order to get over it. I observe it in order not to be hurt by it. So I observe it with a motive. I observe it with a motive

which is the movement of time - of course. So can I observe it without any movement? That means without any motive. And when I so observe it, that very observation is instant action, isn't it? You understand? Are you meeting me or not at all? That gentleman asked: is learning always in the active present - which we have talked about before at other talks? Sir, may I put it this way? I don't want to learn about anything, except how to ride a bicycle, speak a language and all the rest of it. Otherwise I don't want to learn about anything. What I want is to observe only. Observe actually 'what is' - the tree falling down, the waters flowing, the majesty of the mountains, look at myself, my stupidity, just observe. That is, you tell me I am stupid. I watch, I observe, I listen very carefully, very silently without any movement to your statement. I am not learning from your statement that I am stupid, or non-stupid. I am just listening to your statement. What takes place when I listen to the statement that, I am stupid, without reaction? Am I then stupid? I am only stupid through comparison, and I don't compare. That is what education has taught me, to compare. You are following all this? I refuse to compare therefore I am not stupid. (Laughter) No, please, don't laugh. Therefore the mind being incapable of comparison doesn't say it is clever or dull. Therefore attention to what is being said, written, or what you have heard, giving your complete attention, is instant action. I'll take a very simple example. I have a habit, a physical habit of scratching, or whatever it is. You point it out to me. Or I have watched it myself. I see the absurdity of control - right? I have explained that. I won't conform to what is being said - I must not scratch - or do some physical act, habitual. So I just observe without any movement of thought. That

is the central issue, that is the key. I observe the fact that there is a physical habit of frowning, or whatever it is - observation without any movement of time as thought. There is nothing to learn, is there? Why I scratch, what made me do this, what are the causes of it, I won't go through all that, it is too absurd. But whereas when there is total observation, in which there is no movement of thought, then there is instant action. The habit is broken, not through conformity, control, suppression and all the rest of it. Do it and you'll find out.

Now the next question is: can the mind, freeing itself from its conditioning which is the result of time, live in this world, which has been brought about by the intricacies of thought as movement, in time? Right? My question is: can a human being, freeing himself from his conditioning - freeing doesn't mean time - live in this world, earn a livelihood and all the rest of that? I don't know if it is a problem to you. Is it a problem to any of you? Wait sir, let me make the problem clear.

Total transformation of the human mind, the human mind as the result of the past, of time, which has created this monstrous world, this ugly, brutal, violent, insane world and I have produced this world because human beings are unbalanced, vicious, brutal and all the rest of it, occasionally kind when it pays them, and so on - a total transformation of all that. That is, total unconditioning of the mind. Can the mind understanding this, seeing the truth of it, live in this world? You understand my question now? Not after I have unconditioned myself I will live in the world; but in the very act of freeing, not in the movement of freeing which involves time, but in the very act of freeing live in this world? That is, my education, my



culture, my civilization, hasn't given me intelligence. I mean by intelligence, sensitivity, the highest form of sensitivity, it is impersonal, it is not your intelligence, or my intelligence, or the racial intelligence, or the cultural intelligence. Intelligence has nothing to do with country, with culture, with religion, with persons, it is intelligence. Culture hasn't given me that. But in examining, in watching, in being aware of this conditioning, there is sensitivity to the movement of thought, of time and all that. Out of that highest sensitivity comes intelligence. Now that intelligence will operate when I am living in this world, totally transformed from the world. Are you meeting? The mind has got totally a new instrument, which is not the result of time. I wonder if you are following all this? That is, sir, freedom is not from something. Freedom is not freedom from conditioning. Freedom is to see the conditioning, to be aware of the conditioning without the movement of thought, and out of that attention, awareness, comes freedom.

So a mind that has been educated wrongly, through civilizations, and culture, cannot re-educate itself to a new culture, to a new state. All it can do is to see the falseness of this culture. When you see that which is false then there is the truth in that falseness. Right? It is that truth, the perception of that truth is intelligence. I wonder if you get this? Have we travelled together at all this morning?

Q: You are saying, time is 'me', time is thought, time is my mind, so all that is the 'me'. And you are asking me to destroy myself, which is to commit suicide. That is the difficulty.

K: That is, the questioner says, to put it very simply: destroy

yourself as the 'me', as the 'me' who is always concerned with himself and his self-centred activity, destroy that 'me', kill that 'me'. That is the question.

Now, there is no destroyer - right? There is no outside entity as the entity who says, "I must destroy myself". You see the truth of it, therefore there is no division between that which you want to destroy and the destroyer.

Q: All that you are advocating is suicide.

K: No, no. He is saying - that is the real point - all that you are advocating is suicide. I am sorry I am not. If I was advocating suicide for each one of you, you wouldn't be here! (Laughter) One moment. Please see it. The whole of this, this movement, is the 'me', the psychological 'me', the 'me' that is ambitious, competitive, that seeks pleasure, pain, suffers - all that is the 'me'. The 'me' educated through the culture, sustained through the culture, economically, socially, morally, religiously, the 'me' separate from the 'you', the we and the they, and you are saying, "You are asking me to destroy that". I am not asking you to destroy it. I am asking you, if I may, to observe it - to observe it, to observe it without any movement of thought which has built up the 'me'. Right? Just a minute sir. To observe the 'me' without any movement of thought, which has created the 'me'. Can you observe without the movement of thought? That is, can you observe with no thought?

Q: When there is no 'me', is that not the truth, the god?

K: Look I am not going to answer this question because you are becoming speculative, theoretical. That has no meaning. It is like a man who is hungry and you give him a lot of words, he wants food, not words, ideas, suppositions, if's. Just wait.

The first question is: he says, you are asking me to destroy myself, destroy the 'me'. I say I am not asking you to destroy anything. I am suggesting - I am not even asking - I am requesting, I am saying, watch the world. I am suggesting that you look, observe, watch, listen, which are the same thing, without any movement of thought. When you do that is there a 'me'? And when you do that, that very act of observation without the movement of thought, which is time, which has built the 'me', that very act of observation without the movement of time is intelligence.

Now then you ask me further: how am I, who have functioned always with thought, because thought is the only thing that I have, as feeling, as sentiment, as love, etc., etc., how am I to stop, or change that thought which is constantly moving, put a stop to it - right? How am I to do it? Right? There is no way. There is only observation of this movement. Right? Observing the movement of thought - who observes? So what do we mean by observation? Is there an observation if there is an observer? The observer is the past - right? The observer is the educated, conditioned being, who has separated himself as the observer - right? And so he says, "I am going to observe you" - the observer then is different from that which he observes. And I see the falsity of it because I am observing you through the image I have built about you, which is the past, through that image I observe you. Right? So what happens? I see, I observe, that I look at you through the image I have built about you. So the image is the factor of division, the image is the observer. Now can I, can the mind observe without the image? I have to find out. I don't sit down and theorize about it. I want to test it. I want to find out and put it into action, not

tomorrow, I want to do it now. You follow? It is tremendously important. But I have been taught to examine everything through the image, either of the society, or of the State, or of the orthodox religions, or Lenin, Trotsky, or whoever it is, Mao, all of it, the images they have given me, through that image I am told to observe. And I see how absurd it is, how unreal it is, it has no meaning, therefore I see the truth of it. I don't discard it, I see the falseness and therefore the truth of it. Seeing the truth of it, I observe. I observe without any movement of the image, in which there is no control, no limitations, no suppression. Can you do it?

Q: What is that, that we call the mind if there is no thought?

K: What is that, that we call the mind if there is no thought and no violence. Look sir, there is the mind when I go from here to the room where I live. That is part of the mind, isn't it? The knowledge of the road which leads to the house. The knowledge how to drive a car. The knowledge of talking to you in English. All that knowledge must be there, otherwise I become cuckoo! But we are talking of knowledge as the factor of conditioning. The factor that I am an Hindu, with all its superstitions, a Catholic with all its absurdities, or I am the Krishnamurti-ite with all his absurdities. The mind then is free - I have talked about it enough - the mind frees itself through the observation, without the movement of thought as time.

Q: Do you believe in progress in general, and progress of mankind in particular?

K: Progress of mankind and progress of the particular human being. I don't know what you mean by the word 'progress'. I was told the other day the meaning of the word 'progress' - it is rather

interesting - to go forward. I was told originally it meant, be armed and enter into the enemies' territory. You are entering into the enemies' territory therefore be armed when you enter. You understand? That is what was originally meant by progress. Now what do we mean by progress? Probably the same thing really. What do we mean by that word progress, which means to go forward? Are human beings going forward - going to the moon, living under the sea, killing, exterminating species of animals in the waters and in the air, killing each other, miserable, unhappy, polluting the rivers, the air, the water - you know - destroying the earth - is that progress? Having more cars, better bathrooms, discussing at the round table of the United Nations about not to quarrel, but preparing underhand instruments of war? That is one side. And are we progressing, and in particular you? Are you progressing? Going forward? Where to? Where? Self-improvement in order to go forward? Is there improvement of the self? You are following all this sir? Can I improve myself? That needs time.

So looking at all this, what is progress? Or we shouldn't use that word at all. We should only use the word, if I may suggest, 'psychological revolution', so that the human mind is transformed, so it is no longer the 'me' and the 'you'.

Q: Sir, sometimes I feel completely empty inside, losing all my energy. Sometimes it happens that I feel beauty, an awareness of something completely new, and then I am feeling complete happiness. But the emptiness is always disturbing. Do you understand my question?

K: I think I understand. The gentleman says, my question is, that I feel very empty and lack of energy. I feel utterly, you know,

incapable of doing things, thinking. And also sometimes I feel great beauty. Is that it sir? Why shouldn't one feel empty? What do you mean by that word empty?

Q: When I stop thinking.

K: Ah, sir, look, look. I very carefully pointed out that when I stop thinking, when I force myself not to think. We are not saying that - please you are saying something entirely different from what we are talking about. That is merely control, that you have practised for the last ten thousand years. That is part of your culture, which has destroyed, wrongly educated the mind. We are saying sir, why shouldn't we be empty of all the things that man has put together in time? What is wrong with it? If you are so empty then you have abundance of energy. But if you force, drive and control so that you will never think about yourself, that you will never have problems - you follow? - force, control, shape, then you are an empty bag of potatoes!

Q: You say we can observe without the motive to change and yet when we try and observe this way, it is to change.

K: The questioner says, could you observe without any motive - is that it? Why don't you try it? Instead of asking me, find out, please do listen to this, find out why you observe. Because I am telling you? I don't have to tell you when you are hungry. You know you are hungry. So are you observing because somebody tells you to observe? Which becomes the motive. But your own capacity to observe what is happening around the world, and from observing what is happening in the world you observe yourself. It is a natural sequence, without any motive. You can watch yourself, and if you watch without any motive, which is a movement of

thought, you watch with such care, with such delicacy, such subtlety, such swiftness, which is the act of intelligence.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND JULY 1973

We have been talking about the need of a deep psychological change. We have considered, during the last three talks here, how immensely important it is that there should be, in each one, this fundamental revolution in the whole nature of our minds. Because we see what the world is, of which we are, and we have made this world what it is, and we have considered together the manner of this revolution. I would like, if I may this morning, to approach the problem differently.

We said that all the structure of thought, whether it is religious, economic or social, is based on time, and the nature and the structure of the mind is time. And when we last met here we talked about it. And this morning, to come upon it from a different approach, I think we ought to consider what is the meaning of life, and whether we can live in this world, although we are not of it. We talked about it considerably during the last three talks.

Now what is the meaning of life? Because I think if we could understand that, not verbally, not merely intellectually, structurally, linguistically, but seriously go into it and find out for ourselves what is the meaning of life. And then perhaps we shall be able to find out for ourselves how to live in this world, although we may, at least some of us, being serious, have turned away from it.

I think there is a difference between the purpose of life and the meaning of life. One can project a purpose, a goal, an end, depending on one's environment, the culture in which one has been brought up, or one's own idiosyncrasy, temperament, out of one's own background one can project a purpose of life. The intellectuals



have done it, the religious authorities have done it, and our own desire to have a purpose.

Now I think the meaning of existence is different, You can't invent a meaning. You can deceive yourself, you can say to yourself, 'This is the meaning of my life' - again depending on your economic, social, religious background, depending on your tendency, the cultural depth. To me both are utterly meaningless because they do not reveal the real significant meaning of life. And when we ask what is the meaning of life, is it a reaction, because we find that life as we live now has no meaning whatsoever - the daily routine, the office, the factory, the labour, endless travail, struggle in our relationships with each other, the sense of lack of love, loneliness, weary years, and then ultimately die. This existence of life, as it is now, has very little meaning, or none at all.

The religious people throughout the world have tried to give a meaning - saints, saviours, the various gurus who are springing up like mushrooms in this country, in the world, and don't eat these mushrooms, they are dangerous! They have invented according to their particular experience, according to their conditioning, a purpose and a meaning to life. Again based on their rationalization, if you are intellectual, and if you are religiously inclined on their conditioning according to their particular sect, religious belief and so on. As we said, they are essentially based on the whole movement of thought. Thought is knowledge, experience, memory. And whatever the culture in which one has been brought up, and according to that culture and background one can project, invent, imagine, linguistically, emotionally, intellectually a meaning to life. And without finding it out for ourselves, not according to any

'philosopher' - I really don't like to use that word 'philosopher' because the word means the love of truth in daily life, not a clever, cunning, highly educated mind that invents a theory. And such people are called philosophers. Intellectually they may invent, or by their very clever reasoning project or give a meaning to life. And we generally accept such meaning, because we have no meaning to our life, and if there is somebody who says, "This is the meaning of life", we are only too eager, delighted to accept what others have said.

And it is important now to find out, if you are serious at all, and if you have rejected completely the purposes, the meanings which others have given, or you have given out of your own suffering, out of your own loneliness, out of your own feeling that life has no meaning, therefore you have to invent a meaning, if you can reject all that, put aside all that - which is quite an arduous thing to do because we like to cling to our own particular beliefs, to our own particular experiences, to our own desire to find something that has a meaning. Now if one can put aside all that, because they are all illusions, they have no meaning. Verbally they may have a meaning, ideologically, but in substance, in reality, as an actual fact in daily life they have no meaning whatsoever.

Now can you and the speaker together share this question in all seriousness, committing ourselves totally to find out: what is the meaning of life? Has it any meaning at all? And if you are putting that question: has it any meaning? - are you putting it as a reaction because you find it has no meaning? Or are you putting it to find out, to enquire, to investigate? Then if you are investigating, enquiring, then we can share that together. But if you have a

purpose, a meaning, and the speaker or another has no purpose or a meaning, then we cannot possibly share. We can only share that which both of us are aware of, know the significance and the intention of.

So that being clear, let's proceed to find out if there is a meaning to life because it is necessary, absolutely necessary because modern culture, or ancient culture have imposed on us certain values, certain moralities. The religious structures have given us a background of a purpose - heaven and hell - you know, all that! Now a mind that is really very serious, and we are here for that purpose, we are serious, at least some of us, I hope so. As we said, this is not an entertainment, intellectual, verbal, or religious entertainment. The speaker is very serious, and if you are also very serious then we can meet together, talk over together, share together.

Now how are you going to find out what is the purpose of life? Because once you discover it as a reality, not as an idea, as something somebody else has projected, or you yourself have projected, but if you can discover for yourself the purpose, the meaning of life, the meaning, the significance, the depth, the beauty, then it has a relationship with regard to your action, with regard to your relationship with another, with regard to your whole living. So how do we begin to enquire: what is the meaning of life? Will thought reveal it - thinking about it, rationalizing, discussing and trying to find out the truth through opinions, which is dialectic? You may have an opinion of what the meaning of life is, and another may have another meaning, and through exchange of opinions, reason, can you come upon the truth of what is the

meaning of life? You are following? We are taking a journey together into this matter. You are not merely listening to a speaker, to a lot of words, or ideas or imagination. We are actually together sharing this problem, seriously. So through opinions you cannot find it. So you have to discard opinions. Right? Can you discard actually? If you have, then can you find it through very careful analysis? Analysis, as we explained the other day, is a process of paralysis - right? - paralysis through analysis! We went into that the other day. And can you discover it through the movement of time, as thought? Please, are you following all this? Am I making it clear?

Is it a matter of time? That is, investigating through the process of thinking what others have said, or through careful rationalization - which thought can do excellently, objectively. So can thought reveal the meaning of life? Thought, as we said, is the movement within the area of time. Thought is time. And our brain, and the whole structure of our mind is based on time.

So we have these problems, opinions, what others have said, whether it is Mao, Lenin, various saviours, gurus, intellectuals, you accept them or reject them, or through the capacity of a mind that can think very clearly and logically and say to itself, "This is the meaning of life" - can thought do that? - thought being the response of memory, knowledge, experience, which is the past. So can the past reveal the full meaning of life? You understand this? We have got these three things, which are really one, but it doesn't matter. For the moment we will look at them separately. Opinions; what others have said, the saints, the saviours, the teachers, the books; and your own thought. So can you depend on your thought? And

you may not be perfectly balanced, most of us are slightly neurotic. And can you depend on what others have said, it doesn't matter who it is? - the Bible, the Bhagavad Gita, the Indian books and so on and so on. And also can you depend on your own thinking? Have you sufficient confidence - that isn't the word - have you sufficient knowledge which you have put to the test to find out - you have understood?

So we can reject opinions, what others say, what the meaning of life is to you, what others have said. It is only the fools who advise! So we can reject that without too much thought.

Then can you look at your culture, of which you are a part, the culture that says, "The meaning of life is this, work endlessly, in the office, in the factory and bear the responsibility of a family" - and your culture says, whether it is western culture or western culture, it doesn't matter, all cultures are more or less the same, says that you will live in heaven if you are good on earth. And that is the meaning of life, going to heaven! And also your culture says, 'Why bother what the meaning of life is, just live, put up with the ugliness, the beastly existence, the sorrow, the pain, the anxiety, the pleasures, the fears, the utter boredom, the loneliness, put up with it - that is part of your life, you can't go beyond it, therefore enjoy, therefore make pleasure as the main thing of your life' - right? And that is what you are doing.

So we are asking: is pleasure the full meaning of life? And that is what you want, that is what you are seeking, a permanent, enduring, continuous pleasure - right - not only sexually, but also in your relationship with others. So pleasure, which is derived in work, in fulfilment, in becoming ambitious, achievement, success,

in possession, either of ideas or of things - right - so the principle of pleasure is for most people the meaning of life. Right? Please let's be terribly honest. We can so easily deceive ourselves. And in the pursuit of pleasure fulfilment becomes extraordinarily important - sexually, fulfilment of your desires, fulfilment to be somebody important, famous, successful, all that. Now is pleasure the full deep meaning of life? Which is what you want - right? Is that the meaning of life? If you accept that, as you do, that is the meaning of life - the fulfilment, the self aggrandizement, the sexual pleasures, the pleasure of competition, success, wanting to be known, self-important, self-centred activity, all that gives pleasure. If that is the meaning of life then life becomes terribly superficial - doesn't it? And that is what we have done. Follow this. That is what we have done actually. We have made life, in the pursuit of pleasure, very superficial. Haven't you noticed it? You may be very clever, you may be a great artist, pianist, or whatever you are, expert, a good or swindling politician, whatever it is, but it is all on the surface.

So knowing that it is a superficial life, then you ask: is there not a deeper meaning? You follow? After having made life superficial in the pursuit of pleasure, and then as a reaction to that we say that life must have a much deeper meaning. So we begin to investigate the deeper meaning. Which is, joining sects - follow all this - joining groups, investigating into occultism, into telepathy, extra sensory perception - you know, all the things - hoping to give life a deeper meaning - right? Look at yourself in your mirror. And when you are doing that, naturally gurus spring up like mushrooms, and that indicates degeneracy. Then if you are a Catholic, you drop that

and become a Hindu, if you are a Hindu you drop that and become something else, and play this game endlessly, thinking you are digging very, very deeply, but your intention is the pursuit of pleasure.

So is pleasure, in different forms, you understand, not one form, the whole content of pleasure, which expresses itself in different ways, the quality of it, is that the meaning of life? If it is then you will depend on others - right? Sexually you are attached to others, you cannot possibly stand alone. Intellectually you must be stimulated, entertained, you must have companionship, you are afraid of your loneliness; so property, things become extraordinarily important, your houses, your furniture, the property, land. And if you have no land, property, things, then you have things of the mind. I hope you are following all this - your beliefs, your idealism your experiences, the visions that you have. So where pleasure is the principle, the full meaning of life, then you must depend on things and therefore from that comes fear. I don't know if you are following all this. If I depend on you for my pleasure, physically, psychologically, intellectually, or so-called spiritually, in that dependence there is anxiety, there is fear, there is incessant sense of insecurity. Right? Do look at it, for god's sake look at it. And that is your life - fear, the sense of loneliness because you depend on others, which you have covered up through dependence, and when that dependence is shaken you become anxious, jealous, furious, hateful, antagonistic, violent, those are all the issues of the pursuit of pleasure. That is your culture, of which you are, and you are the world and the world is you.

And there is the fear of death, obviously, which we will discuss

at another meeting.

So is that the meaning of life, of the life that you are leading? Then if it is not, or if it is, what are we going to do? You can't discard pleasure, you can't say like the monks did of former days, "I won't have pleasure, and in that place of having pleasure I'll put the image which I have created by my mind in its place", whether it is Jesus or Krishna or Buddha - you follow? Oh wake up! For god's sake wake up!

I was once walking behind a group of priests and monks, high up in the mountains. It was the most beautiful country, the lakes, the water and the trees, in the spring time, the birds were full of enchantment, the sky was clear bright blue, everything was singing. The waters were playing, dreaming, rushing over rocks. And these monks and priests, about a dozen of them, never looked at the sky, never looked at the beauty of the land. They were so immersed in the image of their own salvation, of their own ideas, of their own meditation, they never looked. And it was their pleasure. And because they were monks they had given up the world, sacrificed, they were respected people, but essentially they were pursuing pleasure. And remove their image, take away from them their ideas, their sense of what enlightenment is, they are lost, they are frightened, therefore they cling, as we do.

So can pleasure be discarded? Say, "I won't have pleasure", as the monks do and because they have said it, and because they want it, they are breaking all that up, getting married and all the games are played. But holding on to their particular ideas of salvation, saviours and all that.

So pleasure cannot be denied. When you look at a mountain, a



lovely tree, when you listen to the waters, or when you see a beautiful face, you can't deny pleasure, there is beauty. But the demand for it, the pursuit of it, the desire to continue, there begins the mischief. You are following all this?

Audience: We can't hear.

K: You can't hear? Why tell me after nearly an hour that you can't hear? Isn't it very strange? I have been talking for nearly an hour and you are telling me at the end of an hour that you can't hear. You are a rummy crowd! I'll speak a little louder and keep near the microphone. Can you hear better now sir?

So we have to understand how pleasure arises, what place it has in life, and why the mind pursues, demands, insists on pleasure. If you understand that, really, not verbally, but in your heart, in your brain, in your whole structure, then all the complex results of the pursuit of pleasure come to an end. How does desire, which becomes pleasure, how does it arise? Right? I hope you are asking the same question. I want to find out why the mind, and of course the brain and all the rest of it, why does the mind insist on and pursue pleasure? Why? We know it is part of our culture, it is part of our background. We are educated from childhood to pursue pleasure, in schools, competition, copy, imitation, we are educated to the pursuit of pleasure. And what is pleasure? Why does the mind insist on it? Right?

So I have to ask what is desire? Because desire is closely related to pleasure - right? I hope you are following this. So we are enquiring into what is desire. We are not saying that desire must be killed, or that pleasure must be denied, and replaced by something else. We are enquiring into the nature of pleasure and into the

nature of desire. If the mind can understand it, non-verbally but actually, then I will see the meaning of pleasure. So what is desire? How does it come about? And can it be controlled? And why should it be controlled? You are following? So I am going to find out, we are enquiring together, sharing together, what is the movement of desire which turns into pleasure - right? Are we going together?

First of all there is visual perception, the seeing with the eyes: you see something, a beautiful object, the perception creates in one, it stimulates, from that stimulation there is sensation - watch it in yourself, I don't have to tell you if you watch it - you see something beautiful, there is sensation, then you want to touch it, then you want to own it, then you want to possess it, take it. So there is perception, sensation, contact, desire. You see this? The seeing stimulates sensation, sensation then becomes the desire; sensation, contact, desire. Now can the mind stop there, not say, "I must possess it, I must have it" - I wonder if you are understanding this? The moment the mind says, "I must have it", it has become pleasure. Are you following this? I see a beautiful picture, a lovely statue - I have seen so many lovely statues in the world, in the Louvre, in India, in all the various dead museums - you see it, sensation, the lines, the shape and the movement, and the depth and the quality of it. Then you want to hold it in your hands, you want to feel it. Then you want to take it home, put it in your room and look at it. So can the mind observe, see, the sensation, the contact, desire, and end there? You understand what I am saying? The moment it goes beyond it has turned into pleasure. I wonder if you get this? If you see this, not verbally, but actually feel this then

there is no control of pleasure. I see the beautiful sunset, or the lovely moonlight, clear, a tropical moonlight, stars so close that you can almost touch them. And - listen to this - you see it, that very experience has left a mark on the mind, then the mind says, 'I must have it the next day'. And the demand for that experience for the next day is the pursuit of pleasure. Whereas to see that moonlight, or the clear evening star, see it and observe it totally, and completely end it so that it has no movement as pleasure, as tomorrow. You understand all this? That requires tremendous attention, an awareness of the whole movement of desire. The movement of desire as pleasure is the movement of thought, which is time.

So if you can have this complete attention, when you observe, then you will see for yourself that fear, which dogs most of us, which is part of our culture, part of our consciousness, then you may be able to investigate fear in terms of pleasure. And without understanding pleasure you will never be free of fear. I wonder if you get this.

So is pleasure, we haven't finished the whole problem of it yet, perhaps we will do it on Tuesday, is pleasure the meaning of life? Because we must settle that, you follow? We must find out for ourselves what is the meaning of life, because when one has found that the whole meaning of relationship, which is love, has quite a different meaning.

So if you have put away opinion; what others have said the meaning of life is, it doesn't matter who it is, your saviours, your gods, your priests, your books; and also you have put away all the imaginations, contrivances, the cunning speculative thought, then

you come to the basic issue, which is pleasure. And is pleasure the meaning of life? And if it is then you will make the world what it is now, a monstrous superficial meaningless existence, a commercial consuming society destroying the world. Then what is the meaning of life - knowing that you are not discarding pleasure? How can you discard the beauty of the earth, the seeing of it, the beauty of a bough, a tree, or the beauty of a line? So if you understand really the full meaning of that, then what is the meaning of life? You have understood? Are we together so far? If you are not, sorry, I am awfully sorry if you are not. What am I to do, I have talked enough about it.

Then what is the quality of your mind when opinion has no place in it, belief has no place in it, when others or what the culture says has no place in it? And also you have seen the meaning, the structure and the nature of pleasure and desire, what is the quality of that mind - the quality of that mind that has seen this, seen the whole movement of this, not just one particular part of this, but the whole structure, the nature, the inwardness of all that? What is the quality of that mind?

You know when you empty any vessel, then the vessel becomes extraordinarily important because it can contain something new. You understand? Are you following? Please just listen to this for a moment. What we have said is really the emptying of the mind of its content. The content is the past, the past is knowledge, experience, memory, out of which comes, as a reaction, thought, which is movement in time. All that is the content. What we have done this morning and previous talks, is to see the content and the very observation of that content is the emptying of that.

Now the mind is always seeking something permanent - permanent in your relationship with another, permanency of your position, of your character, of your status, permanency of your house. And is the pursuit of permanency the meaning of life? - permanency in your relationship with another, wife, husband, boy, girl and all the rest of it. Again based on pleasure. Attachment in the hope of having a complete permanency. Right?

So can the mind realize that there is nothing absolutely permanent? Which doesn't mean irresponsibility in relationship, which is what you are doing now. I have lived with a woman for the last two years, I get bored and so we get divorced and go off with somebody else. And if that doesn't come off, go off with somebody else - permanency as pleasure. And is there anything permanent? Your very cells are changing, every seven years or so the cells of your body are changing. There is nothing permanent. But the mind keeps on wanting something permanent. And that is why property becomes extraordinarily important, money, at least there is permanency. That is why knowledge becomes extraordinarily important, books. So can the mind see this? The very perceiving of that which is false releases it from the false. So.

And the mind also wants something sacred in life. I used to know a man and one day he was walking in the woods and he picked up a piece of branch, shaped like a human face. He said it was the most beautiful thing he had seen, carved by sun, rains, winds and friction. He took it home and put it on a mantelpiece. And it became more and more beautiful. He saw more things in it. And one day he picked up a flower, and put it beside it. And every day he used to put a new flower, a fresh flower, with greater

perfume. Until gradually at the end of time it became the most sacred thing in his life. That is what we are doing. That is part of our culture. The image created by the mind or by the hand. All your churches are filled with it, temples. And that is what we call sacred. Sacred books, sacred people - you follow? - images. And to find out, apart from all this rubbish, to find out if there is something really sacred, not imagined, not put together by thought, or what some saint or somebody else says is sacred - put aside all that totally, and to find out for oneself if there is anything sacred - anything. That required a mind that is fresh, empty of everything that people have said of what is sacred.

So if you can do all this, and you have to do it if you are serious, if you want to live a different kind of life, a different kind of existence, a real revolution in one's own actions, one has to empty the mind - the mind must empty itself from all its content. Then what is the purpose of existence? Then what is the meaning of living? Is it suffering? Is it this constant battle within oneself and with another, this competition, this success, this desire to fulfil, this desire to identify oneself with something, or with oneself? Then if you can be empty of all this, then you will find out. That demands real attention, great perception, subtlety, real denial, not verbal denial. Then you will find out - which is not a verbal statement of a fact but the actuality without the description. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 24TH JULY 1973

We were talking about the meaning of life the last time that we met here. I do not know if you have really understood, not verbally or logically, but seeing directly for oneself the full meaning of what life is, and if it has any significance, and if it has what is that significance? That is what we were talking about the day before yesterday.

The meaning of life is also the meaning of action. Life is action. And if one has understood or realized or come upon that quality of mind that has grasped the full significance, the meaning of life, from that naturally grows the question: what is action? What is action in daily life? That is, what is the relationship between action and the realization, or the truth, of the meaning of life? They are really synonymous, they go together. And what is the daily action in our life when one has realized the beauty, the nature, that extraordinary quality of a mind that has seen the truth of what the meaning of life is?

So we will, if you don't mind this morning, go into this question of what is action in daily life in relation to the understanding of the meaning of life. You cannot separate the two. And in enquiring, what is one to do, what is the action? We have to go into the whole movement of the activity of a mind that has realized the nature of the 'me'. I think we can see various kinds of action - the action of will, the action of an ideology, the action of a mind that is pursuing a particular pleasure or fear, or a mind that has committed itself to a particular activity - political, religious, social or what you will. That is, there are different kinds of activity in our life in which we

are involved. There is the action brought about by will. Will is resistance, and that resistance has its own action. I determine to do something, the determination, the decision is born out of choice. And choice is the discrimination between this and that. And I choose that and therefore resist this. And that action, born out of choice and determination, is a distorted action. It is distorted because action is a movement, a movement which is distorted, twisted according to a choice that is based on my pleasure, fear, or a pursuit of a particular end, therefore that action is distorted. Therefore any action born out of will is not only resistance but also a factor of conflict.

Please we are sharing this together. This is not an entertainment. This is not something intellectually you accept or reject. It is the examination, investigation of what action is. Together we are enquiring, therefore sharing, therefore together we are serious. And being serious, not only now during this hour and a half, but also throughout life, we have to find out what is action which is not distorted, which is a free flowing action, an action without any kind of conflict involved in it. And that requires great attention, great seriousness, because our life is a series of battles, a series of conflicts, miseries, suffering, every form of neuroticism. And to discover, to live sanely is to discover the full meaning of life. And in the realization of that meaning of life, we are asking, what is action? We see that any action born out of will, in which we are educated, is not only a factor of distortion, conflict, resistance and the sense of exclusion. Are we moving together? Therefore there is the perception of the truth that will in any form, born out of choice, determination and the effort involved in domination, is an act of



distortion - right? So the exercise of will has no place in action.

We are going to find out then gradually, we are going to investigate what is action - please listen to this - what is action which is total inaction? I don't know if you see the beauty of this? But to find out what is action which is total inaction we have to investigate the various kinds of activity and action, in which the mind has been educated, conditioned, and in the perceiving of what is false the reality comes into being. Therefore the exercise of will is false. Can the mind see the truth of this, and therefore never, under any circumstances, resist, and therefore choose, discriminate between this and that, evaluate? All that implies choice, resistance, will. Now can the mind be free of this conditioning, which is the result of our culture, and this conditioning starts from childhood, through school, college, the whole of our life, the determination, the act of will, resistance - right? That means - please this isn't a verbal description, but an actual fact, therefore the mind must be free of it to find out something new - a way of living in which there is no movement of resistance whatsoever.

Then there is the activity of ideology or belief. And for most of us, being educated in ideologies, or an ideal, a concept, a belief, from that arises various forms of activity. When you have an ideal, that is, a formula put together by thought, and act according to that formula, that concept, that ideal, then there is 'what is' and 'what should be'. Right? And therefore conflict. The mind is always adjusting its activity according to the conclusion, to the ideal, to the belief it has projected, adjusting 'what is' to 'what should be' - don't you do this? All our life is based on this. We function, we act according to a concept. Please observe it in yourself. And therefore

a mind that is investigating what action is, has to find out for itself why conclusions, beliefs, ideals have become so extraordinarily important. You have ideals, unfortunately, that is part of your conditioning, part of the culture, the ideal state, according to Marx or whatever it is. And the few that understand it get power, and twist the human mind to conform to that pattern. This is what is happening. And we do the same on a much lesser scale. We have ideals, conclusions, beliefs and try to conform all action to that. And therefore out of that activity comes conflict because there is this wide gap between 'what should be', and 'what is'. And the comparison between 'what is' and 'what should be' is the imitation of 'what is', the imitation of 'what should be', and transforming 'what is,' is the process of our conditioned, educated, cultured mind. Right?

So can the mind, which is investigating what is action in which there is no conflict whatsoever, because any form of conflict is a distortion of action, as will is a distortion of action, so belief, concept, ideals are a distortion of action - can the mind see the truth of this and instantly be free of it? Can I, you, observe ourselves, see that we have quantities of ideals, which are a dreadful burden, see them, what is involved, what is the meaning of this whole structure of 'what is' and 'what should be', and see the truth of it and therefore let it completely whither away? So the mind is then free of will. You understand this? This is real revolution - you understand sirs? Free of will, therefore all resistance, all sense of choice. Choice exists only when there is no clear perception. When there is clear perception there need be no choice at all. And the more we choose the more confused. So can

the mind see the truth of this and be free of every movement of determination, the will, the 'should be', the 'must be'? And can the mind be free of any conclusions, the ideal? As you are listening, and I hope you are listening seriously, as you are listening do you translate what you hear into an idea, which is an abstraction, and try to live according to that abstraction, which is 'what should be'? Or are you listening, seeing directly now the truth of this, and therefore the ending, now - right?

So the mind is free from the activities of will and the activities of belief, concepts, ideals. Right? Then there are all the activities of one's tendencies, idiosyncrasies - right? What are tendencies, idiosyncrasies, characteristics? Why should we have these tendencies, idiosyncrasies and characteristics? Does that bring about individuality, of which you are so dreadfully proud? Are you following all this? Am I making the thing clear?

Now we are enquiring together into this question of tendencies, idiosyncrasies, characteristics, and from that various activities take place. My character is this and I must act according to that. My idiosyncrasy is to climb a tree and I act according to that. You follow? So are not the tendencies, characteristics, idiosyncrasies, the reaction to my conditioning? Follow this please. This mind is brought up in a culture and so conditioned and every response is according to the circumstances, environment, it responds as character, as an idiosyncrasy, as a tendency. And all our activities revolve around that. Therefore we divide life into the artist, the business man, the politician and so on. Each has his own particular activity separated, fragmented according to his tendency. And so we break up life into categories and lose the whole significance of

action - right? Now are you functioning, acting according to any characteristic that you have, any tendency? Please this is really important because we lay such emphasis on having a character. And if you see this, the truth of this, then it disappears. So you are free of the activities of will, of ideologies and tendencies. See what is taking place? You will see it presently for yourself.

Then of course there are all the activities of pleasure, which we talked about the other day, including fears. Now all these activities are fragmentary, therefore disorderly. Right? Please go on with me! I act according to my tendency and you act according to your ideals, and somebody acts according to his will, and in our relationship naturally such activity must create disorder. And we try to overcome this disorder by having a super ideal, which is imposed on us by the church, by the guru, by some idiotic phrase.

So you see for yourself the fragmentary activity of pleasure, with its fear, the activity of tendencies, idiosyncrasies and character, the activity of belief, ideals, conclusions, and the activity of will are fragmentary. And where there is a fragmentation there must be disorder. So all our activity is creating disorder. I wonder if you get this? I am afraid you won't agree to this, you have all your reservations! Because if you really see this then you will really have to face the problem that your whole life is disorderly, fragmentary, and the mind is unwilling to see that. And so you prefer to live in disorder. And that is part of our culture. And so what happens? When the mind is living in disorder, your whole life, the brain which can only function when there is order efficiently - please follow this a little bit - has to bring order otherwise it can't function properly. So a disorderly life, the brain

demanding order because it needs order to function healthily, so conflict grows all the time. And out of that conflict a neurotic activity takes place, which gives security to the brain - you are following all this? Right? You understand what I am saying?

I lead a disorderly life. I exercise will, my impulses, my intentions are based on my idiosyncrasies, character, on belief, pleasure, they are all contradictory. I live a life of contradiction and disorder. But the brain needs order to function efficiently. I'll go into that a little more presently. So there is a battle going on between the activities and the brain demanding order. And there is conflict. Out of this conflict something breaks, something has to happen. And generally a neurotic action takes place. And in that neuroticism, thought, the brains says, "I will have security there, at least". And most of us have this neurotic security. I wonder if you get all this? Wait, wait.

Q: What does neurotic mean?

K: What does neurotic mean? Non-sanity! A sane mind is a whole mind. The word 'sanity' itself means whole, complete, healthy, and also it means H-O-L-Y - holy. A sane mind is a holy mind, an insane mind is not a holy mind, it is a disorderly mind. See what has happened. So my activities are producing conflict and disorder, and out of that disorder the brain tries to find order. Therefore it joins something else, a new cult, a new system, a new philosophy, new ideology - you follow? And again caught in the same pattern.

So our life is disorderly, contradictory, and where there is effort, contradiction, disorder, there must be an action which is not sane; and it is only in sanity there is security for the brain. But as it

cannot find it, it chooses one action which it hopes will give security. Haven't you noticed all this? Probably not, you have not gone into this sufficiently deeply.

So order is absolutely necessary for a sane mind, and that order comes only when there is no will - please watch this - when there is no ideology, when there are no activities of idiosyncrasy. Therefore there is no sense of fulfilment, or identification with myself or with something. Right?

So what is order? I know what is disorder. The disorder of the outward world - haven't you noticed the disorder of the world? My god! And that disorder exists in us also. And somehow we seem to be satisfied with it, we live with it. And out of this disorder we commit ourselves to various kinds of activities. We become sociologists, climbing Everest - you follow - going to the moon, god knows what else! Or going off to Japan or the east to meditate! You know there is a lovely story of a boy of fifteen who leaves his house in search of truth. He goes all over the place, wanders through every jungle, through every forest, crosses every river, seeking, asking every teacher to teach him what is truth. At the age of eighty, or seventy or whatever it was, he says, "I haven't found it. I had better go home and die peacefully there". So he returns and strangely his house still exists. And he opens the door and there it is! You understand? It is there. And he realizes that he need never have gone all over the world to find truth. You understand all this?

So what is order? How is the mind to come upon this order which is not the order of belief, the order of will, the order of pleasure, the order of character? I see they are all contradictory, confusing and disorderly. So what is this order which is not related

to that? Right?

So let us look at it. Let us approach it differently. Have you noticed that before you go to sleep, if you are at all aware and serious and not drunk, or drugged by alcohol, tobacco and all the rest of it, that you generally take a stock of what you have been doing during the day - haven't you done it? Why do you take a stock of what you have done? You says, "I didn't do that rightly, I shouldn't have done that. I got hurt, which was silly of me. I should have been more polite to that man. I shouldn't have overeaten. I should have been more kind, more generous, not get angry about some silly thing" - don't you go through all this? Why do you do it? You do it because you try to bring order. If you don't bring order consciously, then the brain tries to bring order while you are asleep because it must have order. And while you are asleep if you have not brought about order during the day, the brain must inevitably make an effort to bring about order. But if you have brought order in the sense of which we are talking about, which is not the order of a mechanical order, then the brain has not to make order, therefore it is free to renew itself. That is, to make itself function easily, to put away everything that distorts it, that brings hurts, so that it is fresh, young, new when it wakes up. Haven't you done all this? Oh, for god's sake!

So order is a state of mind in which every activity of conflict ends. And this is necessary because we are going to find out what is action which is totally inaction? This is probably something new to you. It is also new to me, in the description of it. I am going to find out. I know what is action of pleasure, in terms of pleasure, character, belief, ideals, will. I know that very well. And I see that

too, in that there is contradiction, fragmentation, effort, great strain and stress. And all that activity is disorder. I see that very clearly, and seeing that very clearly I have finished with it. Then I also see out of this disorder there must be order. And that order cannot be projected by thought, because it is thought that has created this fragmentation. Therefore order is not the product of thought. So what is this order which is not the product of thought? So I am going to find out and I say, "What is action? Is there an action which has none of the qualities of disorder, of pleasure, character, belief, will? Is there an action which is totally unrelated to all that?" - because that inevitably breeds disorder - right? Are we meeting each other? Or am I trotting off by myself?

Now how shall I find out? I have known only the activity of disorder, and I have seen the truth of how disorders arise. That is, out of my system, blood, brain, everything, it is out of me completely. Then what is order? And what is action? I have got it.

Pleasure, fear, with its activity, conscious as well as unconscious, the activities of belief, conscious as well as unconscious, the activity of character, conscious or unconscious, will and so on, are the very essence of the 'me'. Right? They constitute the 'me', the 'I', the ego, the sense of separate action, the self-centred activity is all that. When I deny all that, when the mind sees the falseness of all that, is there a 'me'? I have known the action of the 'me' in those terms, and when I deny, when the mind sees the truth of the falseness of all these activities, the 'me' is non-existent, because it is identified with that. Therefore there is no longer the action of the 'me', therefore there is no longer the action of disorder. Then I have only known action in terms of the 'me', the



mind has only known action in terms of I, the 'me'. When that is not there, there is inaction, isn't there? No? The inaction which I have never seen before because I have only seen action in those terms. Now when the mind sees the truth of all that, action then is total inaction. I wonder if you get this?

Now can I live in this world, having understood the meaning of life, with total inaction? That is, never expressing action in any of those terms. Never. You have understood? Inaction is the expression of the non-me. And the 'me' is disorder. Therefore what is the action of the non-me? Right? What do you think it is? Don't please tell me, because you won't know it unless you have worked, gone into this very deeply. What is that action which is total inaction? We will use a word to convey it, but the word is not the thing. We use words to describe, but the description is not the described. And we may use the word which is so heavily loaded, and we are using that word without any load. So what is the action which is non-action? Right? I would call it love. Don't get sentimental! It has nothing whatsoever to do with sentiment, romanticism, with any sense of idea, a verbalization. I do not know if you have not noticed when you have understood pleasure and fear, then you realize that love has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure. Have you ever seen this, felt it?

So where there is that love, there is total inaction in life. And that has its own activity, which is not regulated by thought. You know all this takes tremendous meditation - you understand? The word 'meditation' means to think about, ponder upon, to investigate, to feel one's way into the whole problem of action, not according to your idiosyncrasy or mine, or your conclusion or

mine, but to investigate it, open it up. And therefore the mind must be free to investigate. And then you come upon this strange thing called love, which has nothing to do with any church or any god, with any saviour, with any symbol, with any projection of thought. It is totally unsentimental, unromantic, and therefore that kind of love is a movement in the present, transforming 'what is'.

Now you have listened for an hour, I wonder what you have got out of it. Because what we are concerned with seriously, is the transformation of the human mind. Because when the mind is transformed really deeply, profoundly, when there is a deep revolution in the mind, then it can create a different relationship with the world because we are the world, and the world is us. I am the world, and the world is me. That is an absolute fact. And to feel that, not verbally, not as an idea, actually, then when there is this transformation in the whole being, then our relationship to the world changes. Our relationship to each other changes. And that change is a total inaction. I wonder if you get this? You know that word 'inaction' is generally taken for passivity, a sense of vegetation, letting go. On the contrary when the mind is not in disorder, and therefore order, it has got tremendous energy, naturally. And this energy, which is really inaction, can act from the sense of non-me all the time - 'all the time' in the sense of every day of our life.

Would you like to ask any questions? We have got two more talks, haven't we? Thursday and Sunday. We will talk further about love and death and meditation. So what would you like to ask now? Or you have had enough for this morning?

Q: Would you go into the problem of earning a living and so on.

K: Yes sir. Would you go into the question of earning a livelihood because that requires capacity, that requires thought, that requires knowledge? Would you go into that.

As the culture and the civilization exists now, of which you are part, we are brought up to work for our life, work, work, work, all day long. Right? What a horror it is! To be told, to be under somebody, to be directed, to be insulted, to be beaten down. That is the culture in which we have grown, in which you have been moulded. And to the formation of that mould, conform to that mould, we are educated. We are educated mainly to acquire knowledge, to cultivate memory so as to earn a livelihood. That is the primary function of education, as it is now. And therefore in that education there is conformity, competition, imitation, ambition, success. Success implies more money, better position, a better house if you are a communist, and so on and so on. That is the structure in which we have been brought up. Knowledge has become tremendously important to function in this field, therefore the cultivation of memory. And you discard totally the rest of it, the rest of existence. That is a fact. Now you say, "How am I to earn a livelihood, though I need knowledge and yet I see the limitation of knowledge" - right? I need to earn bread and butter, I need to have food, clothes and shelter, whether the State supplies it, or I work for it, but it is the same thing. But I have to work for the State to offer it to me. So that is a fact.

I have heard you talk about it. I have heard you say to me knowledge is very limited, it is mechanical, and being very mechanical we try to escape through religions, through sex, through idiosyncrasies, through neuroticism, through the desire to

fulfil ourselves in something apart from this world. I have heard you say that and I see the truth of it. But yet what am I to do? How am I to live in harmony - please listen to this - to live in harmony, having knowledge, functioning in knowledge, and also freeing the mind from this mechanical process of learning, so that the two run together? You are following? So that the mind lives, going to the factory, working without competition, because it is not concerned with achieving a position. It is only concerned with achieving a livelihood. I don't know if you see the difference. And also it sees very clearly the freedom from the known - right? Which is the knowledge, which is the past. Can these two streams move together harmoniously all the time? You are following your question sir? Am I answering your question? That is our problem. Not the problem of earning more, more and more and more, which society wants, which is the consumerism, which is the commercialism, which is buy - all the tricks they are playing on the mind to make you buy, buy, buy. I won't. I see the falseness. And I see at the same time the freedom from the known, which is knowledge. Can these two work together all the time, so that there is no friction? You have understood my question?

Now what is harmony? You understand, that is the problem. I see I must earn a livelihood. I won't fight, I won't compete, I will work because I have put my brain, my capacity into it, therefore I work very efficiently because I have no psychological problems to work, I will not compete with anybody, therefore my capacity, my energy, my way of writing, producing, whatever it is, is complete, therefore there is no conflict, there is no wastage of energy - right? I hope you see this.

And so I am asking: what is harmony? You understand? I say there must be harmony between the two. Now what is this harmony? Can harmony, this sense of balance, this sense of sanity, this sense of feeling whole - work, knowledge and freedom from knowledge - that is the whole - can that sense of wholeness be brought about by thought, by investigation, by reading, by searching, by asking? Or does this wholeness, sense of completeness come about through thought? Thought cannot bring it obviously. So seeing - please see this - seeing that thought cannot bring it about, seeing that I can work efficiently, with full energy, because I have no psychological problems - you follow? - and therefore I am only working to earn a livelihood for self sufficiency, and I see the whole thing must work together. And it can only work together when there is intelligence. So intelligence is harmony. Are you getting what I am talking about? Wait a minute, I haven't finished. I am just searching myself.

Look sir, it is intelligence that says: work only for a livelihood, not for ambition, not for competition, not to succeed and all the rest of it. Work. That is life. It is the intelligence that has told me, not a conclusion. And also intelligence says to me: freedom is necessary. So intelligence says there must be harmony. So intelligence brings about this harmony - not an outside agency brings about this harmony, or thought. Now - I don't know if you have noticed sir, thought is always outside. Right? Thought is always from the outside. I was told the other day that in the Eskimo language thought means outside. Right? So thought cannot possibly produce harmony, balance, this sense of wholeness, because thought is outside. But what brings about this total sense of integrity, this

sense of sanity, wholeness? Intelligence - the intelligence is not the intellectual acceptance of an idea, it is not the product of reason, logic, though reason and logic must exist, but it is not the result of that; it is the perception of truth from which arises wisdom, wisdom is the daughter of truth, and intelligence is the daughter of wisdom - right? I have got it. Do you see it? Sir do work at this. You understand sir, just look at it, drink it. And then it is there, you don't have to struggle, read books and go through all the tortures of life.

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 26TH JULY 1973

We have been talking, and I hope sharing together, many of the things which concern human beings. And I think this morning we ought to talk over together sorrow, love and death. These are the problems or issues which concern most of us, whether we are young, middle aged, or old. We will go into it, sharing together, what it means - suffering, and whether it can ever end, what it means to love without all the tortures of love which human beings are so well aware of, and also whether the mind can ever be free from death. It is a very complex problem, that needs great scrutiny, deep enquiry, and a very serious intention and activity.

These are the problems that most of us have to face, or are facing. We deal with them rather superficially, trying to find an easy answer, an easy escape, or conform to certain slogans, to certain conclusions, hopes and so we never go beyond the superficial level. Whether the mind can ever be free from sorrow, and it is a great thing to enquire into it, and discover for oneself whether the human being, man, woman, doesn't matter, child, the agony, the loneliness, the despair, the anxiety of suffering and can we be free of it.

And also we ought to consider very deeply what is the meaning of love. A word that we use so easily, a word that is so loaded, destroyed by the politicians, by the priests, by the man who says he loves his girl or his wife, and the love of a super human entity, called, a convenient word on which you hang so many things, god.

We will go into them rather hesitantly and delicately because you need a very subtle mind, a sensitive mind because these

problems, these three problems have been with human beings from the beginning of time. They have given many explanations, both intellectual, psychological and super human explanations. But explanations do not solve the actuality, the 'what is'. You may describe most beautifully, using good words, literary, linguistic, semantic meanings, and description is never satisfactory because what you describe is never the real. So bearing that in mind we will, in the allotted time given to us this morning, go into this.

First of all I feel it is necessary to find out what it means to listen. We are going into something together that requires your attention, not intellectual attention but the attention to listen, not only to what is being said but also listen to what is actually going on within yourself. Listen so as to observe, observe actually the quality of your mind that is confronting these very complex problems of existence. You not only listen, which means not interpreting, then you are not listening. Listening is an action of attention in which there is no interpretation, in which there is no comparison, or remembering those things which you have read and comparing. Or comparing your own experience to what is being said. Those are all distractions. Whereas if you actually listen, without resistance, without trying to find an answer, because answers do not solve the problem, but what does resolve the issue wholly is to be able to observe without the observer, which is the past experience, memory, knowledge, just to observe. With that we can then proceed to find out what is sorrow and whether the human mind can ever be free of it. And this is a very important question to actually, not verbally, not intellectually, not romantically, or sentimentally, but actually find out for oneself whether sorrow can



ever end. Because then the mind, if it ends, is free of a colossal burden, and that freedom is necessary to enquire into what is love and death.

So what is sorrow and is there ever an ending of it? It is really quite a deep problem, I do not know if you have applied your curiosity to it, whether you have seriously undertaken to find out what it is, and whether the mind, your mind, that is, the human mind can ever go beyond it. When we are enquiring into sorrow we have to find out what pain, grief and sorrow are. Pain is both physiological as well as psychological, suffering pain in the body, in the organism and the great complexity of pain and grief and sorrow inwardly, inside the skin as it were, psychologically. There is the physiological as well as psychological and psychosomatic pain - right? We are meeting each other? There is physical pain - all of us know it - a little or a great deal, and we can deal with it medically and in other ways. You can observe pain with a mind that is not attached, with a mind that can observe the bodily pain as though it were from the outside. You are following this? One can observe one's toothache and not be emotionally, psychologically involved in it. And when you are involved emotionally and psychologically with that pain in the tooth, then the pain becomes more. You get terribly anxious, fearful. I do not know if you have noticed this fact.

So to be aware of the physical pain, physiological, biological pain and in that awareness not to psychologically get involved with it - you understand? Be aware of the physical pain and the psychological involvement with it which intensifies the pain, bringing about anxiety, fear, and keeping the psychological factor

entirely out. Are you following this? That requires a great deal of awareness, a certain quality of aloofness, a certain quality of unattached observation, then that pain doesn't distort the activities of the mind. Then that pain, which is physical, doesn't bring about neurotic activity of the mind. I do not know if you have noticed that when there is a great deal of pain, how the mind not being able to resolve it, gets involved with the pain and all its outlook in life is distorted - and to be aware of this whole process. And that awareness is not a matter of determination, a matter of a conclusion, or saying that one must be aware in order not to - then you create a division and therefore more conflict. Whereas if you see intelligently, we went into that word very carefully the other day - when you observe intelligently the movement of pain and the psychological involvement with that pain, then there is a distortion in the action, in thought - to be aware of this. Then physical pain can be dealt with, or acted upon, fairly reasonably. That is one point. And that is comparatively easy.

But what is not easy and rather complex, is the whole field of psychological pain, griefs and sorrow. That requires much more, much clearer examination, closer observation and penetration. From childhood we human beings, wherever we are, get hurt. We have so many scars, consciously or unconsciously, there are so many forms of being hurt. We have shed tears quietly or openly and out of that hurt we want to hurt others, which is a form of violence. And being hurt we resist, we build a wall around ourselves never to be hurt again. And when you build a wall around yourself in order not to be hurt you are going to be hurt much more. I do not know if you have noticed all this.

And from childhood through comparison, through imitation and conformity, we have stored up these great many hurts. And not being aware of them, all our responsive activity is based on these hurts - right? We are going together? You are not merely listening to what the speaker is saying, but you are using these words to see yourself, then there is a communication between the speaker and yourself.

So can these hurts which produce all kinds of activity, of imbalance, neuroticism, escapes and so on, can these hurts be wiped away, so that the mind can function efficiently, clearly, sanely, wholly? And that is one of the problems of sorrow. You have been hurt, and I am pretty sure that everyone here has been. It is part of our culture, it is part of our education, when in school you are told you must be as good as 'A', get better marks; you are not as good as your uncle, or as clever as your beastly grandmother. And that begins, you are getting more and more, through comparison, brutalized, not only outwardly but very, very deeply. And if you don't resolve those hurts you will go through life wanting to hurt others, or becoming violent, or withdrawing from life, from every relationship, in order never to be hurt again. And as this is a part of our suffering, can the mind which has been hurt become totally free of every form of hurt and never be hurt again? A mind that is never hurt, and can never be hurt again, is really an innocent mind. That is the meaning of that word in the dictionary: a mind that is incapable of being hurt and therefore incapable of hurting another. Now how is it possible for a mind that has been hurt deeply, or passing by, to be free of this hurt? I do not know if you have ever put this question to yourself? I am putting it to you. Now how do

you answer that question? How do you find out, knowing you are hurt, to be free of that hurt? Because if you understand one hurt totally, deeply, completely, then you have understood all the other hurts - right? For in the one all are included. One hasn't to go chasing one hurt after another.

So why is the mind hurt, knowing that all forms of education, as it is now, is a process of distorting the mind - through competition, through conformity - brings this hurt, not only in the family but in the schools, in all our outward relationships? To determine not to be hurt - please listen to this - to be determined not to be hurt is a conclusion of thought and thought being time, being a movement, thought, which has created the image that it should never be hurt, has not resolved the problem of being hurt. You have understood? So thought cannot resolve the hurt. Just listen to it, listen to what the speaker has to say. Imbibe it, drink it and find out. So thought cannot possibly resolve these hurts, and as that is the only instrument that we have, because that is the only instrument that we have so carefully cultivated, and when that instrument is not brought into action, you feel lost. Right? But to realize for yourself that thought, the whole machinery of thinking, will not in any way solve this problem of hurt, your intelligence is in operation. And that intelligence is not yours or mine, or somebody else's. And analysis will not resolve the hurts. We went into that question the other day. Analysis is a form of paralysis and it cannot solve the hurts - right? So what have you? You see very clearly that you are hurt. And the thought cannot resolve it, nor analysis. Then what takes place in the mind that has seen the truth of the process of thought, with all its associations? You understand? Thought has

created the image about yourself and that image has been hurt. Are you following all this?

So when the mind realizes the activities of thought with all its images, analysis, movements, cannot resolve it, then the mind without any movement observes the hurt. And when it observes it totally, in the way we are describing, then you will see every form of hurt is totally gone because the hurt is the image you have about yourself, and that image has been created by thought. And what is hurt is the image, and that image has no reality. It is a verbal structural, linguistic image, which has been fed by thought, and when the energy of thought is not active then the image is not. I hope you are following all this. Then there is no possibility of ever being hurt. Got it? Test it. Apply it - not tomorrow, now.

That is one of the causes of our sorrow. And there is the sorrow of loneliness, the sorrow of not having a companionship. Or if you had a companionship, losing that companion, or the death of someone whom you thought you loved, who gave you physical, psychological satisfaction, both sensory satisfaction and psychological fulfilment, when that person is gone, that is, when that person is dead, or turned away from you, all the anxieties, the fears, the jealousies, the loneliness, the despair, the anger, the violence, burst in you. That is part of our life. And not being able to solve it, the Asiatic world says, "Next life my friend we will solve it. After all there is always the next life, then I will know how to deal with it." And in the western world the sorrow is invested in one person, or one image whom you worship; suffering of man invested in one individual. And there also you escape through that, but you haven't solved this problem. You have postponed it, you

have put it away on an image, on a cross, in a church. But it is still there.

So sorrow can end only with knowing the movement of yourself, how you want to escape from it, how you want to find an answer to it, not being able to find an answer, resort to beliefs, to images, to concepts. That is what human beings have done throughout the ages. And there are always the priests, the in-betweens who will help you to escape. So if you observe all this within yourself, which is knowing oneself, not according to any psychologist, modern or ancient, but just to observe yourself - the hurts, the escapes, the loneliness, the despair, the sense of agony, of never being able to go beyond 'what is'. Just to watch that without any movement of thought. That requires great attention, in that attention that attention is itself its own discipline, its own order.

So when you observe loneliness, which is one of the factors of our sorrow, or the feeling that you must fulfil in something, and not being able to fulfil, being frustrated, and therefore sorrow, just to watch all that without any movement of thought verbally or with the desire to go beyond it.

Look sirs, let me put it differently. I lose my brother, my son or whatever it is, he dies. I am paralysed with the shock of it for a few days, and then out of it, at the end of it, I am full of sorrow, pain, loneliness, the meaninglessness of life, I am left with myself. And to remain completely without any movement - you understand what I mean by movement? Without any movement of thought which says, "I must go beyond this, I must find my brother, I must communicate with him, I feel lonely, I feel desperate" - just

without any movement of thought, just to observe. Then you will see out of that suffering comes passion, which has nothing whatsoever to do with lust, which is energy completely free of the movement of thought.

So through - no I won't use the word 'through' - so being aware of the whole movement of the 'me', which is the product of thought, which is the movement in time, being aware of this nature and the structure of the 'me', conscious as well as unconscious, and in that awareness there is an ending of sorrow. You can test this for yourself. If you don't test it you have no right to listen to it, it has no meaning.

So through self knowing there is the ending of sorrow and therefore the beginning of wisdom - right?

Now let's go into the next question and consider what love is. I really don't know what it is. One can describe it, one can put it into words, into the most poetic language, using very beautiful words, but words are not love. Sentiment is not love. It has nothing to do with emotions, patriotism, with ideas. That we know very well, if you go into it. So we can brush aside completely the verbal description, the images that we have built around that word - patriotism, god, work for the country, the Queen, you know, all that tommy rot! And also we know, if you observe very carefully, that pleasure is not love. Can you swallow that pill? For most of us love is pleasure, sexual. For most of us this pleasure has become extraordinarily important - the magazines, the absurd naked people, everything is revolving in the western world, and now it is pushing towards the eastern civilization, this sense of sexual, physical pleasure. And when that is denied there is torture, violence,

brutality, extraordinary emotional scenes - you know what is going on. So is all that love?

The pleasure of the sexual act, and the remembrance of it, chewing the cud over it, and wanting it again. The repetition, the pursuit of pleasure, and that is what is called love. And we have made that word so vulgar, meaningless - go and kill for the love of your country! Join this group because that loves god! So we have made that word into a terrible thing, an ugly, vulgar, brutal thing. So what is love? What place has it in human relationship between man and woman? Are you interested in all this? I am afraid you are! (Laughter) Probably that is the only interest you have! That is only part of it. Life is much bigger, vaster, more deep, than mere pleasure. And this civilization, culture, has made pleasure as the most dominant, powerful thing in life.

So let us consider what is love in human relationship. When you look at the map of human beings - man, woman, man and woman in relationship with their neighbour, with the State and all the rest of it - what place has this thing called love in relationship? Has it any place at all in actuality? Because life is relationship, life is action in relationship. Right? And what place has love in that action? Are we sharing together all this? Please do. It is your life. Don't waste your life. You have few years and don't waste it. And you are wasting it. And it is a sad thing to see this happen. So what place has love in relationship? And life is action in relationship - right? What is relationship? What place has love in relationship? And what is relationship - to be related? That means to respond adequately, completely to each other. The meaning of that word 'relationship' is to be related. Related means direct contact with



another human being, both psychologically as well as physiologically, direct contact. Are we related at all with each other? I may be married, have children, sex and all the rest of the business, and am I related at all? And what am I related to? I am related to the image that I have built about you, or her. Please watch this. Do watch it. And she is related to me according to the image that she has about me - right? So these two images have relationship. And that imaginary relationship is called love! Right? See how absurd we have made the whole thing. That is a fact. That is not a cynical description. I have built the image about her through the years, or ten days, or a week - or one day is enough. And she has done the same thing. And the cruelty of it - you understand? The ugliness, the brutality, the viciousness of these images about each other. And the contact of these two images is called relationship. And therefore there is always a battle between the man and the woman. The one trying to dominate the other, having dominated a culture is built around that domination - the matriarchal system or the man system - you know all that is going on. And is that love?

Then if it is, then love is merely a word that has no meaning. Because love is not pleasure, jealousy, envy, division between the man and the woman, one dominating the other, one driving the other, possessing the other, attached to the other. That certainly is not love, it is just a matter of convenience and exploitation. And this we have accepted as the norm of life. And when you observe it, really observe it, totally aware of it, then you will see that you will never build an image whatever she or you do. There is no image forming. And therefore perhaps out of that comes an

extraordinary flower - the flowering of this thing called love. And it does happen. And that love has nothing to do with 'my' or 'yours'. It is love. And when you have that then you will never send your children to be killed, to train in the army - you understand all this - then you will produce quite a different kind of civilization, a different culture, different human beings, man and woman.

Now there is the other problem, death. You know really suffering, love and death and living are one thing. They are not separate, fragmentary things. I do not know if we have time this morning to go into this really. Also I want to talk next Sunday on meditation, which is another thing. I'll go into death as deeply as possible, and briefly and I hope your minds are not tired.

You know death has been a problem with man: ever since man has come into being he has tried to solve death in different ways - in after life, new life, reincarnation, resurrection, and always fighting, frightened, avoiding that very word and putting it as far away as possible. Right? And in it is involved great fear. So there is this extraordinary thing called death. I don't know how you look upon it: as something inevitable and therefore to be accepted, reasoned with, find a conclusion, logical, reasonable conclusion that will give you satisfaction; or you come to a conclusion that life is not just these brief years, and also you will continue in the next life, with a different name, with a different culture, with a different environment. The whole Asiatic world believes that. And here you have also your own form of belief. If you haven't that you say, "Well everything dies, why shouldn't I die too, and let's make the best of it. If it is a stupid life it is a stupid life but let us have a joyful, jolly good old life". And that life is a constant battle with

yourself, with your neighbour, with your government, in your office, in your factory, in your relationship with your wife and children, everlasting travail, everlasting pain. We cling to that rather than to the thing that we don't know, which is death. These are all facts, not my invention, they are just observable daily facts.

So there you have the desire to live, the desire to live in the life that one knows, however ugly, however stupid, shallow, however meaningless, trying to imitate, conform, admiring the intellectuals, the scientists, hoping someday you will have plenty of money to enjoy yourself, greater number of holidays, and all that. And that you call living. Right? And that is part of your life. And that you know, because that is the only thing that you know. You don't know how to change it. You hope some politician, some revolution, some kind of leader will come along and change a little bit here and there, a new scientific invention that will alter the whole circus. But that you know, that is your habit, your knowledge, experience, within that area is what is called living, with its violence, brutality, anxiety, the sense of utter loneliness, despair, tears, agony. And there is at the end of all that the thing called death. And you push that away, as far away as possible, never look at it, never say, "What is it all about?" Right?

Now can you invite that thing, which you have pushed far away, into your daily life? You understand? What does that mean? What does death mean? That is, please do listen to this, one's life is this, what one has described, which one knows amazingly well, which we have accepted, with which we live and we don't know what to do with it, but we carry on. We live with the known and we don't know what death is. We keep a great width, it is a great divide

between living and death. This we know, and that we don't know. Any form of escape from it is childish, whether through reincarnation, through belief, through resurrection, those are all beliefs, conclusions, hopes, therefore they have no value whatsoever. Please listen, because I have gone into this very, very deeply, and I have done it, it is not just a lot of words. Can the unknown, death, be brought into the field of the known - you understand? So I must find out what death is, what it means. The body will die, the organism will live as long as it has been carefully looked after, and it is being used, like any machinery that is being used, it will wear out. If it is used properly it will last longer. But you don't use that machine properly - right? You don't use it because you indulge - you overeat, you eat every kind of dead animal - oh for god's sake! - drink, smoke. You know. Your life is dictated by your tongue, by the taste, so you are gradually, or quickly, wearing out the organism. And like any machine it must come to an end, though it can be postponed - the doctors or scientists are trying to prolong it, I don't know for what reason, but they are trying to prolong it.

Then what does death mean? Dying of what? Dying to, ending my attachments, ending of my possessions, my bank account, the ending of my friends, my wife, my children, ending. You understand? Ending the 'me' that's attached to the piece of furniture, the knowledge that I have acquired, the book I have written, the painting I have done, and through painting I have become famous, had lots of money, I am envied. So the ending of all that is death - right? That is what we call death. So can't I die - listen to this - to all my attachments, ending all my attachments

while I am living? - to the beastly little book I have written, to the image that I have built about her? Are you following all this? So can the mind die to everything that it has built, to everything that it is attached, to the knowledge, to the experience, to the hopes, to the conclusions, to its gods, to its pleasures? That is death - right? And that is what is going to happen. You understand? So why not die to everything that you have known? Then you incarnate differently now. I wonder if you understand this? Do you understand all this?

If the mind dies to yesterday, which is the known, which is the time, which is the pain and anxiety, if it dies completely to all that then it incarnates, that is, reborn anew, fresh. Can the mind do this - not theoretically, not as an idea, but actually in daily life? That is, you see a sunset, lovely, with all the glory of light and colour, look at it, delight, and with it die to that sunset - you understand? End it there, not carry it over. And to observe your attachment and finish with that attachment. You do something, a piece of work, at the end of the day it is over. So to die to everything at the end of the day, all that you have accumulated. You understand sir? You can do this. You can test this out without much elaborate practice, effort and all that nonsense, you can just do it so that you live a life, dying and therefore a fresh, new young life anew. You understand sirs?

You have heard this morning, all this, the way of sorrow, and the ending of it, the love that we have besmirched, spat upon, and the real meaning of it; and you have heard how the mind frees itself from death. Now you have to test it. You have to do it, not merely everlastingly listen, listen and not do. That is like ploughing a field and never sowing. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 29TH JULY 1973

This is the last talk and there will be a discussion on Wednesday morning.

During all these talks here for the last fortnight I hope we saw the tremendous importance of the human mind undergoing a radical revolution because we are the world, and the world is us. This may become a slogan! And it would be unfortunate if it became merely a verbal intellectual concept. You know when you hear a statement of that kind you really don't listen, you translate it into an idea, and then you try to conform yourself to that idea. First when you hear a statement of that kind, verbally, intellectually you understand. The understanding is in terms of an idea, a verbal concept, and then you will find it very difficult to approximate your life to that concept. So you have a difficulty when you form a conclusion from a statement. And then you will say to yourself, "What am I to do? How am I to live in a world in which I know intellectually that I am the world, and the world is me, how am I to live that?" I think such a question is a wrong question because first you have really not listened to that question, to that statement, at all. That means you have not seen the truth, the perfume, the beauty of that statement, actually seen it. If you do then it is like breathing a perfume, it is there. And that perfume is going to act, not what you should do with that statement.

I hope this is clear, because we are going this morning into something that requires, if you are at all serious, your non-verbal attention. There is a verbal attention, and a non-verbal attention. The verbal attention is conceptual, ideological, fragmentary.

Whereas the attention which is non-verbal, you listen without forming a conclusion, an abstraction. And that very act of listening produces its own activity. One hasn't to do something about that statement. The very listening to that statement brings about a clarity, a perfume, which acts independently from your conceptual activities.

We are going, this morning, to talk over together, and therefore share together, what is religion, what is the meaning of religion, and what is meditation? Because in a degenerating world where there is really quite chaos, religion has become meaningless, religion has become a series of repetitive rituals, in a marvellous setting, in a cathedral with lovely colours and windows, and the priestly robes, all the marvellous setting is there without any content - a verbal rigmarole that has lost totally its meaning. And it is the same right throughout the world, whether you go to a temple in India, very, very ancient temple with a great deal of feeling around it, the beauty, the quietness, the darkness, gives a mystery; and there is the chanting of the priests and the incense and all the flowers, and the kneeling and the genuflecting and so on and so on and so on that goes on in the east; and also in the west here, it is all so beautifully organized. Everybody is driven through propaganda of two thousand years to go into a church in the morning, sit around, look at people's hats and the new dresses and all that goes on with the rituals and the mass, which has nothing to do whatsoever with our daily living. And the influence, the ritualistic propaganda has lost its meaning. And in its place, in the west, the gurus from the east have stepped in, with their authority, with their demand for obedience, acceptance, shaving their heads and putting

on robes, and dancing in the streets, transcendental meditations for so much money, and so on and so on. Where there is a vacuum, emptiness, something has to be filled, and India apparently is filling it with their rubbish! And this is not religion. Religion has nothing whatsoever to do with belief, because belief inevitably divides people, as nationalities, economic states, social division and so on, beliefs divide people, separate and therefore where there is separation, division, either through belief, nationality or any other form of division, it must inevitably bring about conflict. Where there is conflict there must be violence.

So religions throughout the world have no meaning whatsoever any more. On the contrary, through their persecution, torture, excommunication and so on and so on, they have divided, separated man. This is a fact. So when you put aside all that, not only verbally, logically, intellectually, but put it away completely, so that the mind is free to enquire, it is no longer driven by propaganda, by threat and punishment, on which the churches, the temples, the mass have survived.

So when the mind is free from belief, from punishment and reward, actually free, not ideologically free, then we can begin to enquire, investigate together, what is religion. Because man, from the ancient of days, has enquired into this. He sees the world transient, painful, sorrowful, a life of continuous struggle, pain, all the absurdities and the trivialities and the pleasures, all those are passing, they disappear. And so man, or woman, human beings have enquired into this question. They have taken vows of celibacy, obedience, charity, they have tortured themselves physically, psychologically, they have denied the worldly things and have



married themselves to an idea, to an image, to a concept. They have tried everything, fasting, withdrawing from the world, isolating themselves and never really finding out for themselves what is the meaning of religion.

And we, this morning, if we are serious, then we can begin to enquire very deeply, what is sacred, if there is anything sacred at all, what is a mind that is not caught in time, and if there is anything timeless, something that has not been put together by the mind, by thought. That is what our enquiry is. And in the process of this enquiry we will find out for ourselves what is meditation.

Are we together? Are we journeying together into this question? First we are trying to enquire into what is not only the meaning of life, but also if there is something that is beyond time, something that is not nameable, something that thought in its devious ways in its search for its permanency, has put together. If there is something beyond all this.

So to penetrate deeply into these questions: what is religion, if it has any meaning in life, and what is meditation, if it has any significance in one's living? And in the enquiry, if we are serious, dedicated, completely committed to such enquiry, then we shall be able to find out the whole movement of a mind that is not caught in the trap of time.

I don't know quite where to begin, because it is very complicated, and if we could all together, not as separate human beings, man, woman, with a name, with a particular problem and so on, together enquire into this, it would be a marvellous thing. If we put aside our particular temperament, our particular committed activity, our particular demand for the solution of our little

problems, if we could for this morning put aside all that and together, and I mean together, like building a house together, like putting a very complex machinery together, then in that feeling of togetherness which can only come about when we are serious, really deeply concerned with this enquiry, and when there is affection, then the feeling of togetherness comes about. And it has immense meaning because we are not separate human beings, we are related to each other. You may build a wall round yourself and another round himself, but when we are enquiring, suffering, anxious, feeling guilty, ambitious, all the rest of it, then we are together, because human beings all over the world have the same problems, whether they live in India, Japan or in Russia, China, America and so on, they have the same problems. They think they are separate problems, individual problems and they want to solve it by themselves, but we are all related to each other, you can't exist without me and I can't exist without you. We are the world and the world is us. That is not a concept, it is an actuality. And to feel that actuality, then this feeling of togetherness, sharing things together, the feeling of being together, which then only occurs, takes place when there is affection, when there is enquiry, when there is seriousness.

So we are going to enquire together in that sense, what is the whole religious movement, apart from the organized absurdities, apart from the priests and their propaganda and their images, and your own particular image, apart from all that, what is the religious enquiry, what is the religious life, and why should we look to religion at all? And to really go into it one must approach it through meditation, because you can give any meaning you like to

a religious life. You can interpret religion according to any particular feeling, idiosyncrasy, environmental influence, ecology and so on. You can translate a religious life according to your particular conditioning, but that is not a religious life. So in enquiring into what is meditation then perhaps we'll come upon what is a religious life - right? Can we go together from there?

Unfortunately there are many, many schools of meditation. They are popping up all over the world like poisonous mushrooms; and people being gullible as they are, fall into these traps. And if you don't fall into any of these traps, then what is meditation? If you don't belong to any group, as I don't, if you don't belong to any school, as I don't, if you don't do any particular practice or follow a guru, with all that nonsense that is going on, then what is meditation? And why should one meditate? The word 'meditation' means to ponder over, to think over, to delve deeply into the meaning.

So having discarded any practice - please listen to all this - having discarded any practice, any discipline, any following of anybody, including that of the speaker, most emphatically of the speaker, not to obey because the mind must be free at the very beginning, not at the end. The first step is the last step. And if the first step is not free then the last step will also not be free. So having totally seen the falseness of all this because when you practise a system in order to achieve a result you already know what the result is. So you have projected the result from your conditioning, as a reaction or as the opposite. And when you practise you inevitably bring about a mechanical process of thinking. So one must totally deny the whole sense of practice.

And following somebody with a beard, with a new kind of set of words instead of the old set of words, you know all that is going on, following anybody is the most destructive process.

So if you are not following anybody, not practising anything, practising in order to achieve enlightenment, bliss and god knows what else, if you have put aside all that, then let's enquire together what is meditation.

You see if you had never heard of that word it would be marvellous! Then you would come to it afresh, then you would listen very, very carefully, because then you would begin to learn, observe, watch, listen. But unfortunately you have already heard of that word, followed some book and so on.

So one can see very clearly that where there is the activity of the self, meditation is not possible. Right? Please understand this. This is very important to understand, not verbally but actually, into which we are going. We said, just now, that meditation is a process of emptying the mind of all the activity of the self, of all the activity of the 'me'. If you do not understand the activity of the self then your meditation only leads to illusion, your meditation then only leads to self deception, your meditation then will only lead to further distortion. So to understand what meditation is you must understand the activity of the self.

Now we are going to find out the activity of the self. One of the activities of the self is to demand experience - right? Because it is dissatisfied with the experiences it has in this world with all its pain, pleasure, punishment, grief, guilt, it has had a thousand experiences, worldly, sensuous, intellectual experiences, it is bored with them because they have no meaning. So the demand for

greater experience is the activity of the self - right? Please understand this very clearly because this desire to have wider, more expansive, transcendental experiences, the desire is part of the 'me', the self. When you have such experiences, or visions, you must be able to recognize those experiences, or those visions. When you can recognize them they are no longer new, therefore it is projection of your background, of your conditioning, in which the mind delights as something new. And you say, "Yes, I have had a marvellous experience" - whether through LSD, through various kinds of self-hypnosis and so on. So one of the activities of the self is the demand for more experience. Don't agree with the speaker. See the truth of it, then it is yours.

And one of the demands or the urges, or the desires, of the self is to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. Because it doesn't know what to do with 'what is', it cannot resolve 'what is', therefore it projects an idea of 'what it should be', which is the ideal. Please carefully listen to all this. So the mind, the self desires to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. The 'what should be' is the projection, or the antithesis of 'what is'. And therefore there is a conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', and in that conflict, that very conflict is the blood and the breath of the self. Do you understand?

Also one of the activities of the self is the will - the will to become, the will to change. Will is a form of resistance, in which we have been educated from childhood. Will, to us, has become extraordinarily important, both economically, socially and religiously. Will is a form of ambition. And that is one of the activities. And from that will arises the desire to control. Please

follow all this. To control - control one thought by another thought, one activity of thought by another activity of thought. "I must control my desire" - the 'I' is put together by thought, a verbal statement as the 'me' with its memories, experiences. That thought wants to control, shape, deny, another thought. And one of the activities of the self is to separate itself as the observer.

Please if it gets a little complex tell me and I'll stop. We are travelling together, if you get tired let us stop. Let's listen to the stream going by, or look at the sunlight and the deep shadows, and see those mountains with the light on them, then we will stop so as to come back to it afresh. If you are not tired we will go on.

As we said, one of the activities of the self as the 'me' is the observer, the observer is the past, with all the accumulated knowledge, experience, memories. So the 'I', the 'me' separates itself as the observer, and the 'you' as the observed. 'We' and 'They' - we the Germans, the Communists, the Catholics, the Hindus, and they the heathens, and so on and so on. So the activity of the self is the 'me' as the observer, the activity of the self, the 'me' as the controller and the controlled, the activity of the self as will, the activity of the self demanding, desiring, experience - right? As long as any of those activities exist, meditation then becomes a means of self-hypnosis, escape from the daily life, escape from all the misery and problems. And as long as that activity exists there must be self-hypnosis, deception and so on. If you see the reality of that, not verbally, but actually, that a man who is enquiring into meditation, who wants to see what takes place, then he must understand all the activity of the self. You may sit for an hour very quietly, close your eyes, breathe rightly, put your head over the - god knows where! -

and hoping, thinking that you are meditating. You are not meditating. You are playing games.

I was walking one day in New Delhi, among the ancient tombs of the Muslims, and I saw a man come on a bicycle, a poorish man, lean the bicycle against the tree, sit cross-legged, shut his eyes and he thought he was meditating. And I watched him for some time. He was very quiet. And then he stopped meditating, got up, lit a cigarette and went on! But he spent a long time. I came back after taking a long walk, and there he was, still sitting very quietly! And there are all those people who are practising awareness - awareness according to Zen Buddhism, or according to some professor, some writer of Zen, and all those things that are going on and on and on. The Sufis, the Krishna conscious crowd - you know - to which you all belong. You may remember that story of a man coming to a teacher and sitting in front of him cross-legged, closing his eyes and saying to the teacher, "I am going to meditate in order to reach the highest form of consciousness". And the teacher said, "All right, go ahead". And the teacher presently picked up two stones and rubbed them together, and kept on rubbing. And presently the man opened his eyes and said, "Master what are you doing? You are disturbing me. What are you doing?" "Oh", the Master said, "I am rubbing these two pieces of stone in order to make a mirror out of them, at least in one of them there will be a mirror". And the man said, "Master, you can do that for the next ten thousand years, you will never have a shiny pebble". And the Master says, "You can sit like that my friend, for the next ten thousand years...!"

So meditation is the emptying of the mind of the activity of the self. And you cannot empty the mind of the activity of the self by

any practice, by any method, or by saying "Tell me what to do". Therefore if you are really interested in this, concerned, you have to find out for yourself your own activity of the self as the you - the habits, the verbal statements, the gestures, the deceptions, the guilt which you cultivate and hold on to as though it were some precious thing instead of throwing it out, the punishment, all the activity of the self. And that demands awareness. Now what is being aware? Awareness implies an observation in which there is no choice whatsoever. Just to observe without interpretation, translation, distortion, and that will not take place as long as there is an observer who is trying to be aware - right? Are you getting all this?

So can you be aware, attentive, so that in that attention there is only observation and not the observer? Now listen to this. You have heard that statement: awareness is a state of mind in which the observer is not, with its choice. You hear that statement. You immediately want to put it into practice, into action. You say, 'What am I to do? How am I to be aware without the observer?' So you want an immediate activity set going - right? Which means you have not really listened to that statement. You are more concerned with putting into action that statement, rather than listening to the statement. It is like looking at a flower and smelling the flower. The flower is there, the beauty of the flower, the colour, the loveliness of it. You look at it and pick it up and begin to tear it to pieces. And you do the same when you listen to this statement, that in awareness, in attention, there is no observer. If the observer is, then you have the problem of choice, conflict and all the rest of it. You hear that statement and then the immediate reaction of the mind is, "How am I to do it?" So you are more concerned with the



action of what to do about that statement, rather than actually listening to it. If you listen to it completely, then you are breathing the perfume, the truth of it. And the perfume, the truth acts, not the 'me' that is struggling to act rightly. You have got it?

So one has to understand, if you want to meditate, if you want to find out, the beauty of meditation and the depth of it, you have to enquire into the activities of the self, which is put together by time. So you have to understand time. Time, as we said, is a movement. Please listen to this. Listen. Don't do anything about it. Just listen. Find out if it is false or true. Just observe. Listen with your heart, not with your beastly little mind. Time is movement, both physically as well as psychologically. Physically to move from here to there, that needs time. Psychologically, the movement of time is to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. So thought, which is time, thought can never be still because thought is movement - right? And this movement is part of the self. And all meditation, as one observes, and people have come to the speaker from every kind of group of meditation, always they are concerned with this problem, control and time. We are saying thought is the movement of time. Thought is the movement of time because it is the response of knowledge, experience, memory which is time. So thought can never be still. Thought can never be new. Thought can never bring about freedom.

So when one is aware of the movement of the self, in all its activities as ambition, fulfilment, in relationship and so on and so on, out of that comes a mind that is completely still, not thought is still - you understand the difference? Am I making myself clear? You understand sir, most people are trying to control their

thoughts, and so hoping thereby to bring quietness to the mind. I have seen dozens of such people who have practised - god knows - for years trying to control their thoughts, thereby hoping to have a mind that is really quiet. But they don't see that thought is a movement. You might divide that movement as the observer and the observed, or the thinker and the thought, or the controller and the controlled, but it is still a movement. And thought can never be still, if it is still it dies, therefore it cannot afford to be still - you understand? So if you have gone into all this deeply, into yourself, then you will see the mind becomes completely still, not enforced, not controlled, not hypnotized. And it must be still because it is only in that stillness that a totally new, unrecognizable thing can take place. You understand sirs? If I force my mind to be still, brought about through various tricks and practices, shocks, then it is the stillness of a mind that has struggled with thought, controlled thought, suppressed thought - right? That is entirely different from a mind that has seen the activity of the self, seen the movement of thought as time, and being aware of all that movement, that very attention brings about the quality of a mind that is completely still, in which something totally new can take place. Are we anywhere near together? Because you see our life is routine, both sexually, daily life of habits, office, labour, it is a constant routine, a repetition, a habit, and in that area nothing new can happen. And man is always searching within that area for something new - the new non-objective painting, the new play, the new technology, always within that area of the known. And within that area nothing new can take place. Although human beings struggle, struggle, struggle - new ways of expression, new kind of literature, new kind

of painting - and in that there is nothing new because all that is the activity of thought, and thought can never produce, create something totally out of time.

So is there anything new? You are following? Or is it always that there is nothing new under the sun? So a mind that is enquiring, really serious, must find out if there is anything new. New, not in the sense of the old and the new. The new not the opposite of the old, but something completely unnameable, that cannot be put into words and utilized to create a book, or write a poem, or paint a beastly little picture. I don't know if you have ever thought about it. Creation and expression may not always go together. We all want to express in so many different ways. To us expression has become extraordinarily important. If you feel something you must put it down. If you see a beautiful tree, the breeze among the leaves, swaying the boughs, and the depth of light and shade, if you are inclined to paint you want to express what you feel. And perhaps sell it and get some money out of it. Does creation demand expression? You understand? It may not need expression at all. Why should it? Why should I want to express - please listen to this - something new, totally creative, energy, into words, into pictures, into a stone, why? To communicate to you what the new is? And can that which is new ever be expressed at all? And when there is the expression of that, is the expression, the symbol, the word, the painting, the real? You are following all this? Therefore creation may have no expression at all. You understand? And there is great beauty in that, because that new, that creative thing, is timeless, is the summation of all energy and why should that energy be expressed in a little painting

- whether it is by a great painter or a little painter, why should it? Why should that be communicated to you through a painting? Why can't you find it for yourself? - which is much more important than my expression of that in a painting. You understand? I wonder if you have got it?

So that absolute reality can never be put into words. It can never be said that one has known it, or one has experienced it. That is all nonsense. The moment you have said, "I have experienced it", it is not that. Or when you say, "I know it", it is not that, because knowledge is the past, dead, and that thing is a living thing.

So meditation is the emptying of the mind of all the activity of the self. Now will it take time? You understand? Will the emptying - or rather I won't use that word 'emptying', you will get frightened - can this process of the self come to an end, through time, through days, through years, or is it to end instantly? And is that possible? You are following all this? It is part of your meditation. When you say to yourself, "I will gradually get rid of the self", that is part of our conditioning - right? Because when you introduce the word 'gradually' that involves time, a period, and you enjoy yourself during that period - you understand? - all the pleasures, all the feelings of guilt which you cherish, which you hold on to, and the anxiety which also gives you a certain sense of living, all that, and to be free of all that you say, "It will take time". And that is part of our culture, part of our evolutionary conditioning and so on. Now will it take time? Time being psychologically putting an end to the activities of the self, will it take time? Or it doesn't take time at all, but a new kind of energy must be released - please listen to this - a new kind of energy must be released which will put aside all that

instantly - you understand my question?

Look, I know myself, I am greedy, envious, I have got enormous guilt about some silly thing which I have done and I cherish that guilt because I have nothing else to hold on to, and I am ambitious, all that. Now to be aware of all that, both conscious as well as unconscious, it looks obviously that I need time, to peel off layer after layer and go through all that; my mind which has been conditioned says, "I need time. That is obvious, I need time. So I am going to take many years over it, gradually." That means I may die never putting an end to the activity of the self. So I see there is something very false in it - right? So what is to be done? Do I - does the mind actually see the falseness of that proposition: that you need time to dissolve the activities of the self? Do I see clearly the falseness of it? Or intellectually I see that it isn't quite right? And therefore I go on with it! If I see the falseness of it actually, then it has gone, hasn't it? Time is not involved at all. Time only is needed when there is analysis, when there is inspection or examination of each broken piece which constitutes the 'me'. All that requires, if I allow time, analysis and so on and so on. When I see the whole movement of this as thought, it has no validity, though man has accepted it as inevitable, then because the mind sees the falseness of it, it ends. I wonder if you see this? Look sirs, if you saw a precipice, when you are near a precipice there is no question, unless you are rather unbalanced, insane and then you go over. But if you are sane, healthy, you go away from it. The movement away from it doesn't take time, it is an instant action because you see what would happen if you fell, if you fall. So in the same way if you see the falseness of all the movement of

thought, the analysis, the acceptance of time and so on and so on, then there is instant action of thought as the 'me' ending itself.

Now you see what meditation is. What relation has meditation with that which we called religion? We said religion is not under any circumstances the worship of another. The worship of a saviour, the image, the belief, the dogma, the priests, all that is not religion. Any intellectual human being accepts that logically, but at the moment of death he says, "Yes, I am a little frightened, I'll accept all that". You have watched that, haven't you? So religion is not that for that is based on fear, punishment and reward.

Then what place has meditation in a religious life? We have accepted a religious life as poverty, chastity, obedience to an image created by thought, whether it is the image of two thousand years or ten thousand years, the image made by hand, or by the mind. And that is not religion. A religious life then is a life of meditation, in which the activities of the self are not. Right? And one can live such a life in this world every day. That is, one can live a life, as a human being in which there is constant alertness, watchfulness, awareness, an attentive mind that is watching the movement of the self. And the watching is watching from silence, not from a conclusion - you understand? Because the mind has observed the activities of the self and sees the falseness of it and therefore the mind has become extraordinarily sensitive, and silent. And from that silence it acts. You understand? In daily life. Have you got it? Have I conveyed anything of this - not 'conveyed' - sorry. Have we shared this together? Because it is your life, not my life. It is your life of sorrow, of tragedy, of confusion, guilt, reward, punishment, all that, it is your life. And if you are serious you have tried to

untangle all this: you have read this book, or followed that teacher, or listened to somebody, and the problems remain. So we are saying these problems will exist as long as the human mind moves within the field of the activity of the self. And that activity of the self must create more and more and more problems. And when you observe, when you become extraordinarily aware of this activity of the self, then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, sane, healthy, holy. And from that silence our life in everyday activity is transformed. So religion is the cessation of the 'me' and action born of that silence. That life is a sacred life - you understand? - because it is full of meaning.

Do you want to ask any questions about all this?

Q: What is the difference between awareness, observation and meditation?

K: I am aware of you sitting there. I am aware of the colour of your shirt, the glasses that you wear, the colour of your hair. In that awareness there is no choice - I don't like your shirt, I'd prefer you to put on a red shirt. So there is no choice in that awareness. That is one factor. Then what is observation? Does observation exist when there is the observer? The observer is the past, obviously, the 'me' who says, 'I observe' - the 'I' is put together through time, experience, knowledge, memory. If there is an observer then there is no observation because the observer then is translating everything he has observed according to his conditioning, and such observation is not observation. Then what is meditation? Have you followed? Awareness, observation, now what is meditation? Meditation is a state of mind in which there is neither observation nor awareness, but not a state of unconsciousness. There is

absolutely no movement of time, nothing.

Q: Is that a state of passivity?

K: He says, "Is that a state of passivity?" Certainly not.

Passivity implies it is the opposite of activity - right? We know only activity, going round and round and round, the same circle, in the same field, everlastingly. And anything opposite to that you call passivity. What we are talking about is not a passive state. We said it is the summation of energy. And when you look at that energy it is nothing. I won't go into all that because that is mere description and one has a horror of description of these things.

Q: Is love the activity of the self?

K: When love becomes pleasure then it is the activity of the self - right? Pleasure implies punishment, pleasure implies fear, pleasure - activity of the self is pleasure, is fear, is the memory of that pleasure. And surely love is not pleasure, love is not pain. Sirs, if you understand this, that love has nothing to do with all this then something marvellous comes out of it. But you always compare - is pleasure love, mustn't I know jealousy in order to love? I heard one day a rather intellectual lady, highly educated, and highly sophisticated, say, "If I am not jealous, I don't know what love is"! Right?

Q: Why is it so difficult to empty one's mind?

K: Now just listen to that question - it must be the last question. Why is it so difficult to empty the mind? Listen to this. The speaker stated: meditation is the emptying of the mind of the activity of the self. You heard it. You have drawn a conclusion from it, saying, "How am I to do it?" - and in the very doing of it, it has become very difficult. So you ask the question, "Why is it so



difficult to empty the mind?" That is, you haven't listened to the statement at all. You have drawn a conclusion from that statement saying, "I'd like to do that, but by Jove, how difficult it is" - you have understood? If you listen to it and not draw an abstraction from it, that is, "I must empty the mind", then "How am I to do it and how difficult it is", then you have an immense problem, you can't empty the mind, do what you will you can't empty it, because the desire to empty it is part of the activity of the self. But if you listen to it, listen to the statement, knowing you can't do a thing about it, just listen to it - look sirs, I listen to that aeroplane, listen to it. Listen to it without any resistance; listen to it saying, "I am trying to understand what he is talking about, how can I listen to that aeroplane, I want to listen to him" - you follow? Whereas if you just listen to that aeroplane without any resistance, then what takes place? You are just listening. There is no difficulty. But whereas if you listen to the statement that meditation is that, then you go into all kinds of tantrums, see all the difficulties, say, how can you do this living in this beastly world and so on and so on. Whereas if you listened totally and completely then that very act of listening has produced in the mind a movement which is not the activity of the self. And that movement operates in daily life without any difficulty.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 1ST AUGUST 1973.

This is not a talk by me but a dialogue between us. A dialogue is a conversation between two people who are interested in the same thing, and fairly serious, and who are not merely expressing their opinions, but rather penetrating much more deeply beyond the mere casual opinions. I think that is the meaning of that word 'dialogue'. I think that word is better than discussion.

You know, if we could during these seven days investigate and penetrate much more deeply, in detail, any of the issues that we have. And that needs a seriousness, not a casual, superficial interest. So what shall we talk about together this morning?

Q: Sometimes there is a conflict between emotions and the intellectual reasoning.

Q: Could we talk about the meaning of life as action and relationship?

Q: I would like to talk about jealousy. Jealousy seems to be related somewhat to love and if there is no jealousy how do we come upon that thing called love?

Q: As we generally observe with the observer, how can we observe without the observer?

Q: Some people say they find reality, or that strange thing, through drugs.

K: Now what shall we talk about after all these questions? Which do you think is the most important? We have had: conflict between reason and emotion; what is the meaning of life and its relationship to action and relationship; what is it to observe without

the observer because we always seem to observe with the observer; is the experience that one has through drugs the same as the experience of reality? Now which among those - did I leave out one, I think I did. We know jealousy is related to love, and without jealousy what is love? Now which of these do you think is most important so that we can discuss it, talk it over?

Q: Learning how to look.

K: Do you want to talk about that? Yes? Right. Sorry madam, we will perhaps answer your question later.

How to observe without the observer, what is the relationship between the observer and the observed, and what is the structure and the nature of the observer? Right, that's what we are going to talk over together. How does one observe? How do you listen? Let's begin with that very simply. Here you are sitting there, and the speaker here, and when you hear a question of this kind, what is your reaction to it? How do you hear that question? Please, let's go into it a little bit. How do you listen to this question? The question being, the observer, the observed, what is the relationship between the observer and the observed, and what is the observer? That is the question. Now you listen to that question and what is your reaction to it? How do you listen to it? Do you listen to find an answer; do you listen to see if you are observing anything as an outsider who is looking in; and do you interpret that question according to your knowledge? So how do you listen to that question? Please just give a little attention to this.

I heard that question: and I had no reaction to it. I have just heard it. Then I am going to investigate it. I don't hear and then form a conclusion and according to that conclusion investigate. Do

you see the difference? Please, I am not talking. During these seven days I am not talking. We are, as friends, going into this matter amicably, intelligently exploring. Most of us when we hear a question of that kind are apt to translate that question and draw an abstraction from that question - an abstraction being to abstract, to draw a statement, a factual statement into an idea. The idea is an abstraction. Most of us are inclined when we listen to a question of this kind to draw a conclusion which is an abstraction. Or you merely listen without any conclusion, then the mind is capable of investigating further. But if you draw a conclusion, an abstraction, an idea, you block yourself from further investigation. Right, is that clear?

So what are we doing? Are we saying, "I don't understand, this is an impossible question, what does it mean?" - so one has to hear that statement very clearly. The statement is: what is the observer, what is the relationship of the observer to the observed, and is it possible to observe without the observer? Those are the things involved in that question. If I say to myself, "No I can never observe without the observer", I have blocked myself. So I must listen to that question without any reaction. Right? Just listen. Then let's proceed.

What is the relationship between the observer and the observed? What is the observer? So let's begin investigating what is the observer. Right? Go on sirs, what is the observer? I think your question, madam, will be answered about, what is the meaning of life and its relationship to action, and the relationship between people. It comes to the same thing. Which is, who is the observer that is always watching, always listening, always translating,

asserting, dominating, choosing, discarding, aggressive? Who is this observer?

Q: The 'me'.

Q: The memory.

K: Let's go slowly into it. Otherwise we shan't penetrate very deeply. You say it is the 'me', memory. What do you mean by memory?

Q: The brain.

K: You have a memory, haven't you, of being hurt, or the memory of guilt, the memory of failure, the memory of frustration, the memory of jealousy. Now what is that memory?

Look, sir, you call me an idiot. I won't call you, you call me! Now what has taken place? I hear those words, I translate those words, and the memory, or the image I have about myself, that image is hurt, isn't it? Right? That image has been created by me, by a series of incidents which has given me the image which says, "I am a great man", or "I am this". And you call me an idiot and I don't like it, I am hurt. The image is hurt. Right? And that hurt is part of the image which is created by thought, that thought is the response of memory. So the memory says, "I have been hurt". The image, the memory, the greater image of myself as being somebody, and that image has been hurt. That has left a mark on my mind. So when I meet you next time you are my enemy, I don't like you. Right? So when you say, memory, there are a thousand memories we have - conscious as well as unconscious memories. So memory is the past. There is no memory now, or in the future. The memory that operates now is the memory of the past. That memory of the past acting now in relationship distorts observation.

Right? Please, is this clear? I am not talking, we are discussing. I must keep this always in mind, otherwise I will talk, which I don't want to do.

So the past, the memory, the image, the hurt is the observer. Right? Do please. I am a Hindu, or a Catholic, or a communist, or whatever it is, and that has been drilled into me from childhood, that has become a memory. And that memory, that conditioning is the past. That past dictates or reacts to any incident in the present. That's all. Now, sir, what do you object to?

Q: Are we sure that memory is the past?

K: Are you sure? Sir, if you had no memory of the past what would happen? If I didn't know my name, where I lived, I had lost my passport, what would happen? I would be in a state of amnesia, in a state of blank. Memory is the result of experience, and knowledge. So memory is knowledge, experience, which is obviously the past. I met you yesterday, you were introduced to me, your name has been told to me. So I meet you today and I recognize you. The recognition is born out of the memory which remained when you were introduced to me. That's simple enough, isn't it? Are we sure that memory is the past? I have been hurt by you, the hurt is the past, which is the memory of your saying something to me which displeased me. This is fairly clear.

So the observer is the conditioned entity of memory, tradition, knowledge, experience. So my conditioning as a Hindu, Buddhist, or Catholic, capitalist and so on and so on, my conditioning by the culture in which I have lived, that becomes the observer. And that observer is watching everything. So the past is choosing, discerning, translating, acting. No? It's not what I say, please. It is

reasonable.

Now what is the relationship of that observer to the observed? Right? Now what is the observed? Is there such a thing as the observed different from the observer? Please go with me a little bit. I am asking what is the observed - is the observed independent of the observer? You discuss, I'll listen for a while.

Q; It is the same thing.

K: You say, it is the same - how do you know?

Q: Because I have observed it. (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, look. I am asking you, what is the relationship between the observer and the observed, and is the observed different from the observer? Because this is very important to understand. I'll go into a little bit and you will see. It is very important to understand whether the observer is different from the observed, what is the relationship of the observer to the observed, if there is a division between the observer and the observed, then there must be conflict, because any division produces conflict. So out of that conflict violence, all the rest of the things follow. So I must be very clear in the understanding of this fact, whether the observer is different from the observed, and if the observer is not then what is the observed?

Now, let's begin slowly. What is the observed? Is it different from the observer?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is, when you look at the mountain, the mountain is obviously different from you. I hope so! When I look at that microphone, obviously that is different from me - and the tree and so on and so on. When I look at you, you are obviously different

from me - you have brown hair, red hair, whatever it is, physically you are different. Now let's go a little deeper. When I observe my jealousy, is jealousy different from the observer?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We have said that madam, we have been through that. When I look at the mountain, the mountain is not the observer, when I look at the tree, the tree is not the observer, when I look at the flowing water, the water is not the observer. You are different from the observer, the 'me' who is looking at you, obviously. Now the next step: I am jealousy. Now is jealousy different from the observer?

Q: No.

K: Be quite sure. This is really important, please. Don't casually say, no. The whole structure depends on this - the structure of living a totally different kind of life depends on it.

Q: The moment I am aware that I am that jealousy, then jealousy ceases.

K: But I am not asking that question. I am asking, is jealousy different from the observer. The observer, I said, is the past. The observer is the experience, is the knowledge, which says, "I am jealous". Right? So I am asking, is jealousy different from the observer?

Q: Jealousy is included in the observer.

K: So you are saying, jealousy is part of the observer. Is that right? Don't be shy about it. Don't always be right, wanting to be right, I may be wrong too. So I am asking, the observer says, "I am jealous", is that jealousy different from the observer, or the observer is the observed in this case? You understand? So the



observer is jealousy. So there is not a difference between the observer and jealousy. Now wait a minute, stop a minute there.

Q: There is a difference but no division.

K: There is a difference but no division.

Q: The whole is the part. The part is the whole.

K: So, you are saying, the whole is different from the part.

Right? Is that so? The whole is different from the part. What is the whole?

The whole image of me is brought about through memory, and memory tells me I have been jealous, and now I recognize it as jealousy and therefore through the process of recognition the present experience of jealousy is translated into the past. Look, he is saying, the whole is different from the part.

Q: Not divided.

K: The whole is different from the part and yet not divided. The whole is jealousy, envy, greed, anxiety, guilt, the feeling of ambition, loneliness, the lack of love - the whole is made up of all this. Right? So you take one part, which is jealousy, and look at that jealousy with the rest of the parts. So what are you doing? You look at one fragment with the many other fragments. Wait a minute, you are discovering something. Fragments make up the whole. Wait, sir, wait. Discover it, find out for yourself. The fragments of jealousy, envy, greed, deceit, lying, fear, pleasure, guilt, all that are the various parts of the whole. The whole is made up of these many parts. Just a minute. The whole is the content of these. The whole is being made up of these many things, is that the whole?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's all sir, quite right. So we put names or labels, we give names or labels to many parts. I say, look what you are doing. By naming it as jealousy, by naming it as envy, by naming it as guilt, the name has become important, not the fact. Are you following this? Now why do you give names at all?

Q: Because...

K: Wait, sir. Do enquire into it, don't jump. Why do I - just listen - I feel guilty, why do I give it a name, guilt?

Q: So that when it happens again I will recognize it.

K: Why do I do that?

Q: Because you want to push it away when you see it again.

K: Please just listen. I feel this thing called guilt because I have done something and so on and so on, and I feel guilt. Now why do I name it? Why can't I look at it without naming it? But why do I name it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, sir you are going too fast for me. Let's go slowly.  
Why do I name it?

Q: I give a name to it to put it away from me.

Q: By naming it I deny it.

K: By naming I separate it. No, you are not answering.

Q: It's a habit.

K: All right, then that doesn't answer any of my questions.

Q: It's conditioning. Some people have been conditioned that way and some have been conditioned another way.

K: I am not talking about other people all the time, or some people, not all the time.

Q: We have been taught to do so.

K: We having been taught, living in this culture to do so. I am asking why.

Q: Because...

K: Just a minute, let's go slowly. I feel guilt, I name it. Why do I name it? I name it instantly, don't I. Immediately. Why?

Q: The observer arrives at that moment.

K: You are not going into this sufficiently deeply. Look sir, give me two minutes.

I feel guilty because I have done something and so on. Why do I name it? What is the process of naming it? Go slowly.

Q: I...

K: Two minutes. Give me a minute sir, I am talking, if you don't mind. Two minutes and then you have the floor or the platform or whatever you want.

I feel guilt, why do I name it? I name it instantly. The naming of it is the recognition of it, therefore I have had that feeling before. Right? And having had it before I recognize it now. Through recognition I strengthen what has happened before. Right? You are following this? No? I have strengthened the memory of the previous guilt by saying, "I feel guilty". So see what has happened. Every form of recognition strengthens the past. And recognition takes place through naming. So by and through recognition I strengthen the past. Why does the mind do this? Don't answer me please. Why does the mind do this, why does it always strengthen the past by saying, "I have been guilty, I am guilty, it is terrible to be guilty, how am I to get rid of this guilt" - why does it do it? Does it do it because the mind needs to be occupied with something? You understand? It needs to be occupied, whether with

god, with smoke, with sex, with something, it has to be occupied, therefore it is afraid not to be occupied. Right? And in occupation with the feeling of guilt, in that feeling there is certain security. At least I have got that thing, I have nothing else but at least I have got that feeling of being guilty.

So what is happening? Through recognition, which is the naming, the mind is strengthening a past feeling, which has happened before, and so the mind is constantly occupied with that feeling of guilt. That gives it a certain occupation, a certain sense of security, a certain action from that which becomes neurotic. So what takes place? Can I, when the feeling arises, observe it without naming it?

So I find when I do not name, the thing no longer exists. And I am afraid - listen to this carefully - the mind is afraid of living in a state of nothingness. Right? Therefore it has to have a word. The word has become tremendously important - my country, my god, my Jesus, my Krishna - the word. So the word - listen to this - the word is the past, the word is the memory, the word is the thought. So thought divides. Now I am getting too complicated. You see this?

Q: Is it more and more difficult when the word strengthens the past?

K: Yes, after so many years - I have felt guilty for years. And I realize now what I have done. Now does that take a lot of time to get rid of? Is that the question sir? Does a well-established habit take time? This is a well-established habit of feeling guilty all the time.

Q: Even animals have memories. Why should we get rid of

memories?

K: I never said we must get rid of memories, madam. Look, I must have memory in order to go to my house. I must have memory to talk English. I must have memory to come here and sit on this platform. I must have memory for the language that I use. I have memory of riding a bicycle, or driving a car. So memory is absolutely essential, otherwise I couldn't function. Memory is knowledge, we must have knowledge. And that knowledge - listen to this, what takes place - that knowledge is words. Right? Now I have had the knowledge of previous guilt. When I call the present feeling guilt, I have strengthened the previous knowledge. And that knowledge is the observer. So the observer looks at that feeling which I have now and calls it guilt. And therefore in calling it guilt the knowledge of the past is strengthened. It is fairly simple and clear.

Q: Who is the observer? Is the observer different from the many fragments?

K: He is one of the fragments, isn't he?

Q: What does he do?

K: Wait, sir. We haven't come to action yet. We have just come to the point, what is the observer. That is all we have talked about so far. We have said, the observer is the conditioning, the conditioning is the culture in which they have been brought up, with all the memories, knowledge, experience. And that culture has educated me in guilt. And the observer, we say, is different from the feeling of guilt. And we are saying, is the observer different from the thing which he calls guilt, or are they both the same? Of course they are both the same when you give it a name.

Now let's proceed. What is the observed without the observer? Right? Now what is the relationship between the observer and the observed? Does this all interest you? You are quite sure I am not boring you? Because you see if you go into this very deeply you will find that you eliminate conflict altogether, completely. And that's part of our culture, to be in conflict perpetually until we die. Now we are pointing out something which will totally eliminate conflict altogether. So we are asking, what is the relationship of the observer to the observed? What is the relationship of the observer when he looks at the mountains?

Q: Generally the relationship is coloured by prejudice.

K: The observer looks at that mountain. He recognizes it as a mountain. So he calls it a mountain. The relationship between the observer and the thing called mountain is based on the image which it has through education to call it a mountain. He has an image what mountains are, and when he sees that mountain he calls it a mountain. So the image, which he has built through knowledge, recognizes that thing and says, that's a mountain.

Q: He says it is beautiful.

K: Yes, he says it is beautiful, it has got snow on it, I want to be at the peak, and so on. So the relationship between the observer and the thing which is so high, he recognizes it because he has been instructed to call it mountain, educated to call it mountain. Now I see I always look at things through the images which my education and culture have given me - man, woman, we and they, and so on and so on. So can the mind observe without the word, without the image, without the conditioning? I see very clearly that when I observe, I observe through an image - the image or the

symbol or the word put together by thought. The thought has created the culture, and that culture has shaped my mind, and the mind says, when it sees that thing very high, it calls it a mountain. Now can the mind observe without the image?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, we are not talking about dreams, please. Don't complicate the thing, it is complicated enough. Just go step by step.

I am asking - must I go through it again? - can you observe that thing very high without the word, without the image?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait a minute. I am asking - we will make it a little more complex a little later. Can I observe that mountain without the observer who is the past? The mountain is the present, can I observe that without that without the image which is the past? Come on!

Q: Yes.

K: You can. When you observe that way, is it an identification with the mountain? Obviously not. You are not the mountain - thank god! Or you may be, I don't know.

Q: Can the word be a new one, we are always using something old.

K: Call it any name. I said sir, can you observe it without the word, without the image - it may be a past image or the present image, just to observe without the image and the word. That's fairly easy. Now can you observe me, or your friend, your wife, your girl friend, and so on, can you observe without the image that you have about her or him?

Q: A child can do this.

K: But we are not children. We are not babies. Please, don't let's go back to the baby. I am asking you, can you observe - please listen - can you observe the speaker, your neighbour, your wife, your husband, your girl friend, your boy, without the image?

Q: Normally we cannot.

K: So wait. Normally we cannot. Generally we cannot. So we look at another, however intimate, through the image we have built about the other. Right? Now why does the mind do this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: It is the same thing as before. Why do I create an image about you, and why does the mind do this all the time?

Q: It is my security.

K: Just listen. Don't deny, look at it. It is my security. If I had no image of you, my relationship with you would be uncertain. Right?

Q: It wouldn't.

K: No, madam, you suppose that.

Q: No.

K: You may, madam. But most of us don't feel that. So have a little patience with us. I have built an image about you because you have hurt me, you have given me pleasure, sexual or otherwise, you have been a companion, you have nagged me, you have bullied me, you have dominated me, I have built a picture about you. That's a reality. And that image is the past. And I look at you through that image. Now why does the mind do this all the time? You tell me I am a fool, immediately an image - you follow. Why does the mind do this all the time?

Q: It's the way you defend yourself.

K: So, wait a minute, you are saying the image building is to



defend oneself. What is the 'oneself'? Is that not also another image? So you are defending one image by another image. Right? Now why does the mind do this all the time?

Q: It doesn't all the time.

K: Not all the time, most of the time.

Q: Because it is afraid.

K: So you are saying it does it because it is afraid. What is it afraid of?

Q: Of not being.

K: Wait a minute, sir. You say, of not being. We are not discussing, having a dialogue verbally, actually we are experiencing, you know, going through this, not just words, words, words. You say, the mind does this because it is afraid, it is afraid of not being. Now, what is it that wants to be?

Q: I don't know, sir.

K: Wait, sir we are going to find out.

Q: The feeling is there.

K: I know the feeling exists. Now what is this thing that is protecting itself by saying, "I must be" - the being?

Q: I don't know.

K: We are going to find out, sir. I am not questioning. I am asking, sir. The gentleman said, we are afraid of not being. And I asked, what is this fear based on? What is this fear of not being? What is it that wants to be? You understand, sir? What is it that wants to be and not being it is afraid, therefore what is it that says, "I must be"?

Q: Life.

K: Does it mean life, daily living? Bread-and-butter, security,

shelter, is that what it is afraid of not being, not getting food, clothes and shelter? Surely not, that is part of it. So what is it afraid of not being? Don't say, mind, memory. Please investigate it.

Q: Of having no identity.

K: Now when you use the word 'identity' you must use the word 'with'. Identity with what? Please, just listen. I want to identify myself with my country - I see that is too absurd - with the flag - that's too absurd - with the church - that's too absurd. But I want to identify myself. Now what is myself and what is it to be identified with myself? Is there a myself, or is the myself a series of words, images, which thought has put together calling it myself? And with that I want to identify. How silly I am!

Q: But the feeling of myself is there.

K: I know it is there. That is the illusion. Wait sir. That is our culture, that is our verbal statement, that is the way we live. We say, "I have identified myself with my country, with my god, with my flag, my politics, and so on" I have been identifying with all those and I say, "How stupid of me, that has led to a lot of mischief, now I want to identify with myself". You see I have discarded all the identifications outside of me, now I want to identify myself with myself. What is myself? It is obviously a lot of images and words. And so I say, look what I am doing. I am always trying to establish a fact which becomes a non-fact. Always trying to defend itself with an idea, with an image, with a conclusion, and those are all words. That you discard. So the mind is afraid of being completely empty. Right? Therefore it says, "I must be". Now the mind never finds out what takes place if it is really empty. You follow? It is so afraid of being empty, therefore

it must be occupied with the kitchen, with my sex, with god, with politics, with Mao, with a dozen things, because it is so afraid to be completely empty.

Now we must come back, sorry. The observer is the past, and the observed is the present. Right? The mountain is the present. The feeling of jealousy is the present, but I identify it with the past. Now can the observer observe without the past, only the present? Which means, not naming jealousy, and if you do not name it does jealousy exist? Wait. Look, sir, I am jealous because you have got a nicer car than I have, or more money, you look better, you look nice, you are smart, you are frightfully bright, intelligent, and all the rest of it. I am jealous of you. That's a fact. The feeling is there. And I have given it a name, I have said, "I am jealous", and I see by calling it jealousy I have strengthened the feeling. And I say to myself, how silly, I realize this. Now can the mind observe without naming the feeling which is the present? Right? Then what takes place? I have not named - the mind has not named jealousy, it sees the reason of it, the logic of it, the intelligence of it, and it says, "I will not name" - not as a will, it is finished. Then what takes place?

Q: Duality comes to an end.

K: He says, duality comes to an end, therefore there is only the present. Right? I have not named it, the mind has not named it, therefore what takes place? You haven't done it. If you had done it you would see it.

Q: What does naming imply?

K: Naming means comparing, conforming to the past, strengthening the past and therefore creating a duality as the past and the present, which is jealousy, all that is involved in naming.

Now when the mind doesn't do all that, what takes place?

Q: There is only 'what is'.

K: Now you are guessing. Now I'll put the question differently. What is the relationship between me and you, my wife, my husband, my daughter, my son, etc., if I have no image? What is my relationship with you if I have no image about you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, you have to find this out, you can't answer this. Look, sir. I have lived with you and all the troubles, the travails, the anxiety, all that has built an image in my mind. Now I have no image and what is my relationship with you when I have no image about you? You can't answer this question, can you? If you are really honest you can't answer this question. You can only answer it if you have really no image at all. And that is one of the most radical things in life, not to have an image about the mountains, about you, about the person I live with and all the rest of it, not to have a single image, about the country, nothing. Image means opinion, idea, conclusion, symbol, the thought that builds up all the images. Then what is the relationship between you, who have an image, and the person who has no image? Don't answer me. This you have to find out. That is love. The other thing is not love. Right?

So is the observer different from the observed? Outwardly yes. Inwardly the observer is the observed. Therefore there is no duality, and when there is no duality what is left? Actually what is. Right? Actually what is. Can the mind observe 'what is' without giving it a name - name means symbol, imitation, conformity, recognition - just observe 'what is'.

Q: Why do we need memories?

K: We need memory in order to ride a bicycle. I need memory in order to talk an English and so convey something to you, if you are interested in what I want to communicate. I need memory to function in a factory, in a business and so on. But that memory is the image in relationship. Right, sir? Now that memory in relationship is the image. I have built an image about you, and you have built an image about me, therefore our relationship is between these two images. And that is what is so important to us - the image I have about you and the image you have about me, and we live with these images. This relationship is called love, in this relationship there is attachment and all the rest of it, and we cling to it, the image. And we say the mind does it because it feels secure in having something, in having an image. If it has no image it is empty, and we are afraid of being empty and therefore we say we must be something.

So can the mind observe the present, the 'what is' without the memory, the image, the conclusion, the opinion, the judgement, the evaluation of the past? Just to observe 'what is'. Sir, let me put it round the other way. Go much deeper, very much deeper. I love my brother, my son, my wife, my girl, my boy, and he dies. The fact is he is dead. That is 'what is'. Right? Can the mind observe 'what is' without any movement of thought which is the past? You understand?

Let's go on. Look, my son is dead, that is a fact. Then what takes place? The image I have built about my son through the years makes the mind feel empty, lonely, sorrowful, self-pity, and the hope that I will meet my son next life, go to a medium, a seance,

get in touch with him, all that business. Which is, the mind doesn't observe, live completely with 'what is'. Without the image. Then what takes place? You understand? Come on sirs. I have no self-pity, I don't say, "Oh, I wish my son had lived, he would have been such a marvellous human being because..." - you follow? I have no movement of thought at all. The mind lives only with the fact that my son is dead. Then what takes place? Have you ever done this? Yes, or no?

Q: My mind becomes quiet.

K: No, sir I am not talking of quietness. Look, sir, this happens to every human being, living: death is there - the birds, anything. What takes place in you when you look at the fact without a single image? I can't tell you unless you come to it.

Q: You see what actually is.

K: Yes, sir, I said that. Living, being with actually what has taken place, not deviate, run away, let thought say this and that, nothing.

Q: It is quiet now.

K: You will find out. I hope nobody dies whom you love, or you think you love, I hope you will never suffer but when you come to that, which inevitably comes to everybody in the world, not only those people living in Vietnam and Cambodia but every day it is happening around you, then you will find out what it means to live with 'what is' completely, without a single image. I insult you, I say terrible things about you, can you listen to me without the movement of thought which creates an image which hurts, can you listen? Try it. Do it, and then you will see what an extraordinary change takes place. A change in which there is

complete negation of every form of image, therefore the mind is never burdened with the past. It's like having a young mind, you understand. All right, tomorrow we will continue.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 2ND AUGUST 1973.

I am sorry you are having such bad weather! What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: You said the other day that will is a form of resistance, it is the outcome of choice between this and that, and how can we live in this world without choice and without will and resistance, and not be influenced by the world around us?

K: Any other questions you want to discuss?

Q: Do attention, understanding and love go together?

Q: What is the origin of emptiness in us? And how does comparison arise, does it arise out of a wound, out of a hurt?

Q: Do you call energy compassion?

Q: What will make us see or act with regard to what you are talking about?

K: Sir, can't all these questions be answered - I think they will - if we take the first question, which is: how can we live in this world without choice, out of which comes the activity of will, and live in this world without being influenced by the environment, by the culture in which one lives? Could we take that question, and I think all the other questions probably will be included in that? May I? Is that all right?

Why do we have to choose at all? That's the first thing. Second, what is the substance and the structure of will? And what is action which is not influenced by the environment, the culture in which we live? Right, sir? That is the question. Now why do we have to choose at all, what is choice - to choose?



Q: It is a reaction.

K: No, the word to choose. Why do we have to choose? Is it part of our conditioning, is it part of our culture, which has been put into the mind, that life is a process of choice, that is, to discriminate between the real and the false, between the foolish and the wise, between right and wrong, between the good and the bad, between a good substance, material, and bad material - the whole structure of choice. Is it part of our culture that you must choose? And why must we choose? And when does this demand to choose arise? You are following all this? Why do I, or you, have to choose at all - choice being between this and that, the good and the bad, the active and the inactive, you know, choose between the two, why?

Please if I may suggest, let us not indulge in theories, in ideologies, in speculative thinking, but actually observe in ourselves when does this process of choosing arise. Do you choose between that road and this road when you know exactly where you want to go and this particular road leads to that, then there is no choice is there? It is only when I do not know where I want to go, or when I am uncertain between this and that, then choice arises. I have to ask, I have to find out which road to take; but when I am very clear in my direction, is there choice at all?

Outwardly when I know where I live, where one lives, the house, the road, the path to it, there is no choice involved in it at all, you just go. It is a direct action without the confusion of choice. Right?

Q: Unless the road is blocked.

K: Oh, of course, if someone blocks the road you stop the car

and go round it and go on, or go some other way. But there is no choice there - the blocking the road, or the police putting a barrier, is just another form of not thinking directly about something.

Next: inwardly I don't know what to do. I don't know whether this is right or that is wrong. I am confused. Right? So where there is confusion there must be choice. No? When I am very clear then there is no choice. Either the path I take, or the act which I have to do comes very clearly when there is no confusion. When the mind is confused I have to choose. I think that is fairly clear. So choice arises when there is confusion. When you have to vote for somebody - between Mr.Smith and Mr.Brown - then the trouble arises. Then you enquire about Mr.Smith and Mr.Brown, and go into all that business, and then choose, that you will vote for somebody, not Mr.Brown. But inwardly when one is confused, and one is confused - whether god exists or not, whether you should join a particular sect, whether you should belong to a particular political party, the economic system, the capitalist or the socialist, and so on. When there is uncertainty, when there is no clarity, when there is confusion then choice arises. Right? I think that is fairly clear.

Q: There is another form of choice when you choose between a pear or an apple.

K: Yes. It comes to the same thing, sir. Eating an apple or having beer, if you like beer you drink, if you don't like an apple, you don't, there is no choice about it. Your tongue or your tummy dictates what you should eat.

So as far as one sees where there is confusion there must be choice and being uncertain the choice gives you the direction, and

to follow it you must resist every other form of influence. Right?

Now why are we confused? Let's start from there. What is the reason, why is the mind so extraordinarily confused, about everything - you understand? About whether I should smoke, or not smoke, drink or not drink, take LSD or not, whether I should do this or that, inwardly, outwardly, why is the mind so deeply confused? Are you - I am not talking to you personally, but asking generally - are you aware that you are confused - aware in the sense, know, be cognizant of, feel that you are very confused, both at the conscious level as well as the unconscious level? Is one aware of that. Whether you should become a doctor or a scientist, whether you should follow that particular guru or that particular teacher, whether you should take up economics or philosophy - outwardly. And inwardly you have found you cannot rely on anybody, anything, on any idea, and so the mind is confused. Right? Is one aware? Go on sirs, let's talk. I am not giving a talk.

Now if one is aware that one is confused - let's go very slowly - how do you know you are confused? Is it because you see somebody not confused, very clear, or thinks he is clear, and you envy that person, and say, "I wish I could be like that", therefore in comparing yourself with another you realize you are confused? Have a little patience. Is that why you are aware that you are confused, through comparison?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please just listen. I am asking a question, let's answer directly. You ask me if I am confused. I really don't know. I haven't thought about it. Now I am thinking about it. That is, I am becoming aware that I am confused. Does the knowledge of that

confusion arise through comparison, because I see somebody having a very clear mind, directed, purposeful, and comparing myself with that person, or with that group, I see I am confused. Or without comparison I am aware that I am confused because I have to choose, I am all the time uncertain, going from this to that, to that. Now which is it?

Q: Both.

K: Both? Go slowly. Both. Are you aware that you are hungry because someone is well fed? Yes, you know you are hungry, you don't compare. You don't go to a restaurant and read the menu and say, "By Jove, I am hungry" - you are just hungry. So one is aware that one is confused. Now what is the process of this confusion? What do you mean by confused? Let's examine it, please. What do you mean, "I am confused"?

Q: I don't know what to do.

K: You don't know what to do because there are so many values between this and that. Is that the reason you are confused?

Q: I lack clarity.

K: The same thing.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, examine it in yourself. I wish you would. Look at yourself and see - this is not a group therapy and all that business, I am just asking; I have a horror of that - I am asking you to observe, look at yourself and find out if you are confused. Are you confused partially, and not wholly? And the mind that is not confused says, "I am confused". One fragment of the mind says, "I am not confused, I know exactly what I want. I see very clearly", but the rest of the fragments are confused. Right? Is that what you call

confusion? Or, you are just confused right through? By confused, we mean, uncertain between this and that, between this value and that value, between what you should do, which will be right, which will not bring great suffering, which will not bring about clutter and so on and so on. Can one say to oneself, is the reality, the actuality, that one part is not confused and therefore says the rest is confused, the rest of the fragments, or do you say, I am really deeply confused, because the culture in which I have been brought up says, conform, the culture in which I have been brought up says, be ambitious, fight, struggle, be violent, accept this ideology, or that ideology; and that culture has imposed on the mind certain definite activities. Now the mind sees what this culture has done - wars, appalling violence, destruction of nature, pollution of air, everything this culture has absolutely destroyed, nearly. And I reject all that, the mind rejects all that and I don't know what to do, and I am confused - you follow? Now which is: partially confused, physically you know you are not confused, you want your sex, you want your food, shelter, clothing, there there is no confusion. If you can't get what you want you get violent and all the rest of it. Or throughout your whole activity of the mind there is confusion.

Q: We are in contradiction.

K: Of course, that is part of our confusion. So what do you do - there are two things: when I am partially confused, that is, there are many fragments, layers, areas in my mind where there is confusion. There are other parts where the mind is very clear. Then there is a contradiction between that. See what happens. When there are certain areas where there is confusion, and certain other areas where there is not confusion, then there is a conflict between

the two. That indicates, that very conflict indicates a division and therefore a conflict. Conflict means confusion. Right? Please. Or the mind is totally confused. The mind doesn't know where to turn, it has turned in various directions - faith, accepted the authority of the State, the politicians, the priests, the books and so on, and suddenly feels that doesn't lead anywhere. So it is faced with complete blank, you understand, confusion. So there are these two states: the one that is aware that it is partially confused in certain areas, and the other part is not; and the other is a total sense of confusion. Right? Now which is it that you are?

Q: Both may happen.

K: All right, then what do you do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Both can't happen at the same time. Listen to what I have said, sir. You can't have two thoughts at the same time. You can't have at the same moment, the same instant the one which is the area which is confused and the area which is not confused, and the total confusion, you can't have them at the same time. You may get it a second later, or a few minutes later. So which is it in your mind, the areas that are confused and the areas that are not confused; or total confusion - because each of them have a different action?

Q: I only see partially.

K: Why? Why does the mind here, this mind, why does it see partially. When the picture is presented to you why do you see it partially? Are you blind? Or you don't want to see? Or you think there is a very deep, inward life that will clarify this whole confusion. You understand? That is one of the tricks that the mind

has played upon itself, saying, there is a higher self - you know, all that. My mind rejects all that because all that is invented by thought. So I am faced with these two facts, and I know, I am aware, that each fact brings about a totally different kind of action.

Now let's look at the area that is confused and the area that is not confused. Therefore in that there is a self-contradiction, in that, as there is a division, there is conflict, tension, and all the ugliness that comes out of conflict, and from that there is action. That is the action we know. Most of us know that kind of action - an action born of self-contraction, one fragment fighting other fragments, the division, and out of that conflict and division comes an action which is always breeding further misery, further activity of confusion. Right? Does your mind see that - not verbally but actually see the truth of it? If the mind sees the truth of it then what takes place?

Q: There is no authority.

K: Of course there is no authority and all that, I understand that, sir. Now go a little bit further: what takes place when the mind sees, has an insight into the nature and structure of this question, which is, areas that are clear, areas that are confused? And out of that confusion choice, will, action. The mind sees the truth of it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are so quick in answering this. You haven't really investigated. Go into it and you will see for yourself. Now how does the mind see the truth of this statement? When you say, "Yes, I understand, I see there are areas in me that are confused and areas in me that are not confused. And one area that is not confused says, 'I must bring the other areas into clarity, I must do something about

it". So there is a contradiction, there is struggle, there is division, there is conflict and so on and so on. Out of that arises an action which breeds further confusion. Now you see the truth of it. Right? What do you mean when you say, "I see the truth of it"? When you say, "I understand it" - not verbally but deeply.

Q: I recognize it.

K: No, please. Recognition implies having been recognized - you know, it has happened before therefore you recognize it. Cognition is a fact of the moment. Recognition is the fact of what has happened before. You see the difference. Cognition and recognition.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking a question, sir, do listen please. We have made that statement; somebody says, "I understand that very clearly, I see the truth of it". What is the quality of the mind that says, "I understand, I see the truth, I have an insight into it" - what is the quality of that mind?

Q: I have been told I am free when I have so many choices, a whole field of choices and because I can choose I have been told I am free. You come along and say, because you choose you are not free.

K: All right, sir, we will come to your question presently. But let's come back to the original question which I am asking. When you say, "I understand, I have an insight, I really see the truth of the whole process of the area confused and the area not confused. I see the whole thing very clearly", now what is the state of the mind, or the quality of the mind that says, "Yes, that is the truth"?

Q: One is attentive.



K: No, sir don't quote back at me. Enquire as though for the first time.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I said, what is the quality of the mind that says, yes, that is the truth?

Q: Nobody can reply to that question when you really see it and it is a fact to you.

K: Look, somebody comes to me and points this out. I listen. I am not frightened of him, he is telling me, look. Look at this, an area that is confused and an area that is not confused, which makes up your whole mind. Look at it. Listen to what I am saying. And I listen. I don't resist, I don't fight him, I don't say, you are right, or wrong, I want to find out. So I listen to discover and observe. I observe that is a fact: parts of me are confused, parts of me are not confused. That's a fact. And he says to me, look first. That is, is that a fact or an idea that you are confused, part of you and part of you not, just an idea and not 'what is'? You are following all this? So I have translated - please do listen - I have translated what he has said into an idea, and the idea says to me, "Yes I am confused, that is so", the idea tells me but not the fact. You see the difference? I have drawn a conclusion, an idea from what he has said, and the idea says, yes, you are right. Therefore that idea has no validity in action. What has validity in action is not to draw a conclusion from what he has said but to observe. Right? Now can my mind observe that statement, listen to that statement without drawing a conclusion, or making an idea out of it. I say, I can do it, therefore I will watch. And when I watch I see how absolutely true it is, absolutely, there is no doubt about it. It is so. Then what takes

place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Then what takes place? I'll show it to you. Who is the entity that says, "This area is confused, this area is not confused"? You are following? That is a fact. I see in myself these two areas. Who is the observer that says, "Yes, this is a fact"? Are you following all this? If there is an observer, which we discussed yesterday, if there is an observer then he says, "What am I to do faced with these two facts" - right? If there is no observer but merely observation there is only then 'what is'. Now what takes place? Leave it there for the moment, we will come back.

The other statement is: I am really confused, I don't know what to do - right through, there aren't parts of me that are clear and other parts that are not clear, I am right through confused. In my relationship I am confused and because I am battling with my wife, or with my husband, or girl or boy - battle. I depend on him, I am afraid of him, I feel jealous, anxious, guilty. All that is an indication of confusion, obviously. So I say to myself, yes that is perfectly true, I am right through confused. Right? Which is it you are in? Come on sirs, this is fun!

If I am totally confused, not which road I take, we have left that, if I am totally inwardly confused what to do, then I have to ask, what is this confusion, how has it arisen? Now, just a minute. When I ask that question I am not asking in order to analyse. I have explained before that analysis is paralysis. Now I am asking that question, why am I confused, what is confusion? And I am asking that question and therefore observing, not analysing. I hope you see the difference. Right? Are we proceeding? Do we see the

difference between analysis and observation? The word 'analysis' means to break up, the meaning of that word in a dictionary means to break up. Observation is looking without breaking up. Right? So the two are entirely different: one leads to paralysis, as we pointed out, the other to a totally different kind of action. Now when I say, why am I confused, I am not paralysed, I am not analysing, but am just observing. Because I observe the thing comes out. You understand? The whole thing is revealed. I wonder if you understand this. Am I making myself clear? Somebody say yes, or no, for god's sake.

Q: One is confused.

K: That's right, sir. We have gone into that. What is this entity that analyses, that observes, that puts things into words, into images, into symbols, into conclusions? We have said the observer is the past, the observer is the outcome of knowledge, experience, memory, words. That's the observer. The observer then can analyse. You follow? And gradually paralyse himself into inactivity. Or mere observation without the observer, which we went into yesterday. Therefore in that there is no analysis whatsoever. When you look you see everything, everything is revealed, you have insight, you see very clearly all the details. But in observation it is total.

I see in analysis it is the thinker, thought, but in observation there is no thinker. That's our difficulty. I observe without a single thought, knowing the thinker creates all the process of thoughts, analysis, all that. So I say, that is false. Here I am, I want to look - not I. There is only observation, not, I observe. Sir, this has happened to one dozens of time, don't make a mystery out of this.

You look at a map, just an ordinary map, and when you look at it very closely it reveals the whole thing, doesn't it? Where the cities are, how many miles between this and the village, the narrow road, the main road, the autoroute and so on, it shows everything, doesn't it? It reveals everything. In the same way, look at it. But if you want to go in a direction, a particular place, then you are only concerned with that road. Here there is no direction, you are just observing, therefore it reveals the whole thing.

Q: When I observe, as you are suggesting, I am not confused, but yesterday I was confused. And that confusion is going to come when I leave the tent. At the moment I am not, but it will come back in a big way and therefore I am caught in it.

K: Sir, when you observe both the past confusion, everything is shown when you observe. Wait a minute, let's go back.

I know, my mind knows, this mind knows - when I use 'I', please - this mind sees very clearly there are certain areas that are confused, and other areas that are not. And by observing that very closely, without any choice, by observing that very closely I see what is involved in it - the conflicts, the decisions, the choice, and the action, and more confusion, and so on. I see that very, very clearly. Therefore clarity of perception has dissolved that. Clarity of perception, the light of perception has dissolved that. But I am confused right through. And if I am so confused right through, the mind is confused right through, then to observe it without any movement of thought - is that possible? Because most of us don't like to be confused, or even admit that we are confused, therefore we fight, we are seeking clarity. Which is out of confusion you are seeking clarity, therefore that clarity must be confused. I don't

know if you see all this? Therefore the mind is not seeking clarity at all, or wanting to get out of this confusion, it just observes 'what is'. Now what takes place? It is the movement of thought as desire that says, "I must get out of this", that creates more confusion. Obviously. But when there is no movement of thought at all but only an observation, is there confusion? Don't accept what I am saying please. It is your bread-and-butter, not mine.

So, see what one has found if you go into it very closely: the mind sees the truth of this, the truth of the areas of confusion and the areas of not confusion, the whole nature, the structure of it, the activity involved in it, sees the whole picture, and has an insight into it, therefore sees the truth of it. Seeing the truth of it, out of that comes wisdom - you understand - and also it says, "I am really confused", and not wanting to escape, not wanting to overcome it and all the rest of it, it remains completely with the fact, with 'what is'. So it sees that inaction, that is not action, is the state of complete release from confusion. Is this Greek?!

Look: I never realize I am totally confused, I have pretended to myself that I am not confused, but when I am forced to the wall by logic, reason, action, I say, yes, I admit honestly I am really deeply completely confused. But I have to live in this world, therefore being confused I do all kinds of things, and this action produces more conflicts, more confusion. That activity is what we call living, that's what we call positive action born out of confusion. The mind sees that very clearly, that is the truth of it, that is the wisdom. And thought moving away from this confusion is an escape, is an action, a positive action. Right? So inaction, not action, when there is total confusion, is complete action. I wonder

if you get this. Do you understand? The mind does not act out of confusion. Right? Which means what? As long as there is deep confusion it will not act. So I have to live in this world therefore I have to act. So what is action which is not the outcome of confusion? You are following all this? Therefore action is a movement which is the outcome of the perception of that truth and the action comes when there is the intelligence out of that perception. I wonder if you see this. It is this intelligence born out of wisdom that acts, not confusion.

So one has to live in this world. I have passed through areas of confusion, areas of non-confusion, the mind has realized the full meaning of all that. And the mind also realizes the state of complete confusion, and sees the truth of that. So perception has revealed the truth and out of that perception wisdom comes. Obviously. And intelligence is the action of that wisdom in daily life.

Q: Is wisdom...

K: No. Am I to go through all this again. No, sir. Let's put it differently. The culture in which the mind has grown, been cultivated, educated, has accepted confusion as the standard of life. It says, yes, I am confused and let's get on with it, don't make a lot of noise about it, let's get on with it. And one nice day I realize I am really confused, parts of me, parts of me not, and so on. The culture has brought me up in this, has educated this mind, educated it to live in confusion and disorder. And it has brought a great deal of sorrow, misery, and the mind says, there must be a way out of all this. And it begins to learn to look at itself. It realizes it can only look at itself when there is no movement of thought, because

thought has created this mess, this culture, so it realizes it can only observe clearly when there is no movement of thought. Is that possible? So it tests it out. It doesn't accept it, it says, I am going to test it, find out if it is possible. So it looks at things, the mountains, the hills, the rivers, the trees and the people. It can look outwardly comparatively easily, without the interference of thought. But it becomes much more difficult when it looks inwardly. The inward perception is always with the desire to do something about that which it perceives. And so one realizes it is again the activity of thought. So it regards everything, observes, and realizes as long as there is an observer this process of choice, conflict must exist. So is it possible to observe without the observer, which is the past, experience, all that. Observe without the observer. That demands great attention. That attention brings its own order which is discipline. There is no question of imposing an order. That very experiment, that very testing of observation without the observer brings its own order, its own sense of complete attention. And the mind observes without the observer, and remains totally unmoving, immobile with regard to 'what is'. Right? Then what takes place?

See what the mind has done: it has not been able to resolve 'what is', so it has wasted its energy in trying to escape from it, suppress it, analyse it, explain and so on, wasted its energy. When it has not wasted its energy, to remain completely with 'what is' the mind has all its energy. You understand? Not a spark of energy wasted - there is no escaping, there is no naming, there is no trying to overcome it, suppress it, make it conform to a pattern and so on - all those are a wastage of energy. Now when that energy is not wasted the mind is full of this energy and is observing actually

'what is'. Then is there 'what is'? Then is there confusion? And to see all that is not only the truth but the wisdom of it. And out of that wisdom comes intelligence which will operate in daily life, which will not create confusion. You understand? At the moments of negligence it may do something, it will correct it immediately. You follow? So that intelligence is all the time in operation - which is not my intelligence or your intelligence.

Have we take the journey together - a little bit at least?

Q: In such kind of action there is no actor.

K: Now what is the action of that intelligence in relationship? You understand? I am moving away from it. Life is relationship - between man and woman, between nature and man, or woman, between human beings. And so I am asking, what is the action of that intelligence which is born out of wisdom, which comes out of the perception of truth, what is the action of that intelligence in human relationship - because I have to live in this world? Right? I have a wife, children, family, the boss, the factory, shop and so on and so on, so what is the action of that intelligence in my relationship with another? Come on sirs, ask.

Q: How can you say beforehand what will happen?

K: How can you say what the action of intelligence will be beforehand. I don't know what the action of intelligence is beforehand but we are enquiring now, what is the action of that intelligence in relationship? I am related to you, I am actually related to you because you are sitting there and I am sitting here, you are listening to me, we are sharing this together, we are observing this thing together, 'cooking' it together, therefore we are related - not in the sense of being intimate but as human beings we



are related because it is common problem, it is our human problem. So we are asking: we are related, how does this intelligence act in this relationship?

Q: It must be love. Out of that intelligence comes love.

K: I don't know. That's an idea. You see, sir, my mind will not accept a theory, an idea, a conclusion, speculation. It will only - my mind, not yours - this mind will only move from fact to fact, from 'what is' to 'what is', and nothing more.

Q: We must use words in this dialogue, and the moment we use words we are concerned with ideas, but the kind of dialogue you are insisting upon is almost impossible for most of us.

K: Sir, look: there is communication through words and communication through non-words, non-verbal as well as verbal communication. If I know how to listen to you, to the words that you are using, to the meaning of the words that you are using, which is common to both of us, if I really know how to listen to you verbally, then I also know how to listen to you non-verbally, because I can pick it up.

I am asking a very simple question which will lead to a great deal of investigation, which is: what is the action of that insight which has brought about this quality of intelligence in my relationship with another human being? Until I solve this my relationship must create misery, not only for you but for me also. So I must apply my whole being to find out, it isn't a casual, superficial investigation, because my life depends on it. I don't want to live in suffering, in confusion, in this appalling mess that civilization, culture, has put me in. Therefore my intelligence says, find out. Because you cannot live alone, there is no such thing as

living alone. There is only isolation, which this culture has encouraged - in the business world, in the religious world, in the economic world, in the artistic world, in every world, in every sphere, it has encouraged me to be isolated. I am an artist, I am a writer, far superior to everybody else, I am a scientist, or I am the nearest to god.

So I know very well what isolation is, and to live in that isolation and have relationship with another means absolutely nothing. So my intelligence says, that's absurd, you can't live that way. Therefore I am going to find out how to live in relationship and what the activity of that intelligence is in that relationship.

Shall we go on with this tomorrow?

Q: No, now.

K: You want to go on with it now? You see I am doing all the work and you are merely listening.

Sirs, I want to know, please, test it out for yourself and ask yourself this question: you see what this intelligence is, it is the outcome of having an insight into the reality of 'what is', and the observation of that is wisdom and the perception of it is truth. Truth and the daughter is wisdom, and the intelligence is the daughter of wisdom. I have seen that. Now I am asking myself what is the action of that intelligence in relationship? In relationship has it any image, is my mind building an image about you who live in the same house as I do? You may nag me, you may bully me, you may threaten me, dominate me, you may give me sexual pleasure and so on - does the mind build images?

Q: No.

K: Don't ever say, no, sir, find out! That requires great attention,

doesn't it, you can't just say, yes, or no. It requires complete attention to find out if you have an image, and why the image comes into being.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, sir. I have no image. Just listen, sir. I am stopping you from saying, yes, or no. That's all. Let's investigate. Let's share this problem together. When you say, no, or yes, you have stopped it. But if you say, look, let's find out, let's enquire, what is involved in this. In that I haven't created an image about you at all, I have said, please stop, look what we are doing.

Am I - is the mind, my mind, this mind, creating an image? If it is then it is not the activity of intelligence because it sees how images divide people, as nationalities have divided people, religions have divided people, gurus have divided people, the books, the Bible, the Bhagavad Gita, the Koran, and that book, have divided people. So the image, symbols, conclusions divide people. Where there is division there must be conflict. And therefore an action born out of conflict is a non-intelligent action. So intelligent action is an action which is without friction, without conflict. And when I am related to you and I have an image, it is a stupid action, an unintelligent action. So I see that. Am I creating an image about you when you call me a fool, when I depend on you for my physical pleasure, or depend on you for my money, for your support, for your companionship, for your encouragement? So dependence is an action of a mind that is not intelligent.

So I am beginning to discover, learn, what relationship is when intelligence comes into being. You are following all this? It is so astonishingly simple, really simple.

Q: It is simple but not easy.

K: What is simple is the easiest thing, most practical. Not all your complicated things, they have lead to impracticality, to all this mess which is the result of utter futility. What is simple, look: to see the truth that images divide people. That is simple, isn't it? And seeing the simplicity of it is the act of intelligence, and that intelligence will act in my relationship with you. So I am watching how that intelligence is going to operate. You understand? I am related - you are my wife, my mother, my sister, my girl, whatever it is, I am watching. I am watching to see how that intelligence operates. You understand, sir? And it sees the moment you create an image you are back into the old world, you are back into the rotten civilization. And the mind is watching, learning, and therefore intelligence opens the door to a life that is completely simple.

## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD AUGUST 1973.**

I am sorry for this foul weather, but there it is! Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday? I don't think we finished it.

We were talking about human relationship. We were having a dialogue between us about human relationship. A dialogue is not a one-sided affair but both of us are taking part in the discussion, in the exploration, in the understanding together. And again, if I may point out, what we are talking about demands a serious mind, a mind that is really committed to the finding of a life, a way of living that is totally different, that has real meaning for living, and so on. So we were yesterday morning talking about human relationship, and what is involved in it, and what place has intelligence in relationship? That is what we were trying to explore together yesterday.

Most of us - I am not talking, I am just laying the cards on the table first - most of us in our relationship depend a great deal on another, depend for our physical pleasures, sexual as well as physical comfort, and also psychologically, inwardly, depend on others. What is the relationship of a human being who is not at all dependent? We are going to investigate it together, this question, because if we depend on each other psychologically, then there is the sense of possession and domination and acceptance of status quo - not wanting to change anything, a relationship in which there will be no disturbance whatsoever, each accepting the involvement, the dependency, the inward satisfaction of ownership - I own you, you own me. And is it possible for a human being not to depend at

all and therefore be completely psychologically self-sufficient?  
And if that takes place what then is the relationship? So that is  
what we are discussing, talking over together this morning.

First of all let us not, if I may suggest, talk about it abstractly, as  
an idea, but take it actually as it is. We do depend, don't we? One  
depends on another psychologically - why? Please, I don't want to  
give a speech about it, please. Why do you, or another, depend  
psychologically on another? We know we depend, we have to  
depend on another outwardly - when the milkman brings the milk,  
you know the outward dependence is absolutely necessary. We are  
talking of inward dependence. Is one aware of this dependence?  
And what is involved in this dependence, and why does one  
depend on another inwardly? Go on, sirs. Is one aware that one is  
dependent psychologically? Yes? No? Let's be a little bit frank  
about this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, we are not saying what happens if you don't depend. Are  
we aware, do we know, are we conscious, or cognizant, that we are  
dependent on somebody inwardly?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, don't you know, this is a very simple fact. Do I  
psychologically depend on you - for comfort, for encouragement,  
for sex and all the rest of it, you know, feeling that I need you, and  
you encourage me in my need because you also need me. Surely  
we are aware of this simple fact, aren't we?

All right, now let's go to the next step. Why do we have to  
depend, what is the drive that makes us depend on another? We are  
not saying it is right or wrong, we are just examining, observing.

Why does one have to depend on another, what is the motive, what is the drive, what is the action that forces you to depend on somebody?

Q: I do not feel fulfilled, therefore I depend.

K: What do you mean by that word 'fulfil'?

Q: I do not feel whole.

K: You feel isolated, broken up and therefore you feel when you have a relationship of dependency that helps you to fulfil. Is that it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't know sir, we are examining. We want to know what do we mean by that word 'fulfil' - fulfil what?

Q: Pleasure.

K: I am whole depending on you? You together make each other feel whole, sane, healthy? Is that it?

Q: It seems that way.

Q: It is that way.

K: That is, by myself I am isolated, by myself I am a fragment, a small part. And to make myself whole, sane, complete, you are necessary. That is the relationship which we have accepted, in which we live, that is 'what is'. Right?

Q: It is necessary for the expansion of consciousness.

K: That is, I depend on you to make me feel whole, and that helps to expand my consciousness. Right? Does it? What do you mean 'expand your consciousness'? Sir, we are using a lot of words, throwing them out, to see if some of it is right, somewhat. Don't let us reduce this to 'Watergate'!

Q: We feel separate from our innermost self.

K: Let's be simple about this. I'll go into it, step by step.

I depend on you for various reasons. And I am aware that I depend. Now I am asking myself why is it that I accept this dependence. I don't say it is right or wrong, it's beautiful, ugly, or this or that. I say, what is it that makes me depend, what is the motive?

Q: Fear.

K: Is it fear, is it expansion of consciousness - whatever that may mean - is it a sense of insufficiency therefore I need you to make me feel sufficient? I am just asking, madam, step by step. Then what is it?

Q: Desire.

K: Then what is it? Sir, do you know you depend on somebody - on your wife, husband, girl, boy, whatever it is, do you know, are you aware that you are dependent?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. Why? Ask yourself, don't explain, find out why are you dependent.

Q: If you know you depend, you know you depend. The difficulty is to verbalize what you feel.

K: Sir, what is the difficulty in this: I depend on you because I am lonely, I am insufficient, I am frightened, I need a companion, I need to hold somebody's hand, I need you to love me because I don't know what love is, I am asking out of my emptiness that I be loved, and so on and on. Right? Now all that makes me depend on you. Then what happens in the process of this dependency? I know why I depend on you. I have found all the motives. Now what is the result of this, or results, of this dependency?



Q: How can you know that you have found all the motives?

K: Oh, no I don't have to go into all the motives. I am taking some of them, sir, that's good enough. I take some of them, at least one is enough for me because if I understand one motive completely the rest I have understood. I don't have to collect all the motives and then discuss what they are, and dispute, this is not enough, that is enough - one motive is enough. I am lonely. I'll take that. And out of that loneliness in which is involved, "I must be loved, I need to be loved and I am afraid, I have a sense of emptiness, I have no meaning in life, by your companionship, by my dependence on you I feel I am becoming whole." That's enough. Now what is the sequence of this dependency? You understand, sir? Psychologically I am frightened and to assuage that fear, to allay that fear I must have a belief in something, and that gives me great comfort. Similarly I depend on you, what are the consequences of that dependency?

Q: Conformity.

K: Haven't you noticed that you are dependent? And don't you notice what the next thing is? I must possess you, you must be mine - legally, morally, physically, I must have you round me. I can't afford to lose you because in myself I am lonely, desperate, therefore I must possess you - no? So it is legalized in heaven and I marry you. And in that possessiveness what goes on?

Q: Fear grows.

K: Obviously. I must possess you because I am lonely and I am afraid to lose you, therefore I safeguard my possession. You are following all this? For god's sake, it is so simple. I possess you, therefore I must safeguard, you are mine: you are my wife, my girl,

and therefore in that possession, in that possessiveness I am afraid to lose you, I am anxious, I become angry. No? Violent. And I ensure that I don't lose you, by legal marriage, vows, by all kinds of stratagems to hold you - I flatter you, play with you, yield to you. Don't you know all this?

Q: I don't find it like that.

K: You may be the exception, madam, I am talking of the average person, all of us.

So what takes place in this relationship in which I depend on you, I possess you, what takes place actually?

Q: Conflict.

K: Obviously, conflict. Conflict, division - I go off to the office, there I am ambitious, greedy, envious, all that, I am isolating myself, and also I am isolated with my wife. So I have now an image which I have created about her and she has created about me, and our relationship is between these two images. Right. Let's move. Let's proceed.

Then what happens in our life? Dependency, possession, jealousy, anxiety, fear, violence, the demand of more and more pleasure, sex and so on and so on. And that's what we call relationship. Right? And that is what we call love. Now why does the mind, feeling so completely lonely, why can't it resolve that loneliness and not proceed to be attached to something? You follow?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look: I am lonely. You know what that means, don't you. I am lonely. What would happen if I resolved that loneliness? Would I depend on you psychologically, and all the sequence of all that

dependency? So my question is: is it possible for the mind to understand this loneliness, not verbally but actually deal with this loneliness, go beyond it and find out then what is relationship? You understand? Now is it possible for the human mind, which feels so empty and therefore depends, so lonely, and therefore asks to be loved, can that loneliness ever be filled? We do it. We actually do it. With the image of you I try to fill it, with the image of the religious figures, with politics, with every kind of activity to try to cover it up, or run away from it. Right? Now I won't run away from it because it is stupid. Now I have got this loneliness, I can't move away from it, so what am I to do? Please, discuss with me. What am I to do, what is the mind to do with this loneliness which it feels?

Q: One should not escape from it.

K: Why not, sir? When you say, "I should not", it means you are. No?

Q: Try and resolve this loneliness.

K: Who is to resolve it?

Q: Do my best.

K: Who is 'me' to do my best? Sir, please do give a little attention to this. One feels terribly lonely. This loneliness means isolation, doesn't it? Complete non-relationship, no relationship with nature, no relationship with human beings. I may have - the mind may have relationship with ideas, that is very easy. So what am I to do - what is the mind to do with this loneliness? Observe it, go beyond it, try to fill it?

Q: Resolve it.

K: I have it, it is there! Now wait a minute. What has brought

about this sense of loneliness? You understand? What has caused it, how has it come about?

Q: Lack of love.

Q: Thought.

Q: Isolation is the law of nature.

K: Is it? This is a new idea! Sir, look, I want to find out how this sense of loneliness comes into being. Is the mind creating it, or the culture has created it, the environment and so on? How had it come about? May I go into a little bit, will you just listen?

When I am ambitious, I am isolating myself. No? When I am competitive, I am isolating myself; when I want to be superior to you, I am isolating myself; when I am seeking, pursuing pleasure, I am isolating myself. I don't know if you see all this. Right? So this loneliness is a form of isolation which the mind has cultivated through ambition, through competition, through the desire for success, through the pursuit of pleasure, and this has brought about this sense of complete isolation, loneliness. Right? What do you say?

Q: It is very difficult.

K: There it is sir, it is not difficult to understand the reason. I am pointing out how this loneliness takes place. If I don't understand the reason for this loneliness, merely to escape from it, merely to cover it up, merely try to fill it, has no meaning, therefore I must see how this has come about. And I see ambition has made this - obviously. I am ambitious in the factory, in the office, and I am not ambitious at home - there I am very affectionate, friendly with my children, wife, but I am ambitious outside. So you see what is taking place: so gradually I am

isolating myself all the time.

Q: What is the reaction which creates this loneliness. Each reaction varies according to each person, and what is the reason, the basis of this reaction?

K: Is it not partly our conditioning, partly our culture, partly education, and all the attractions of modern civilization. So, sir, I see the reason, the cause of this loneliness, the struggle, the competitive spirit, the desire to be greater, to become something, all those are activities of isolation. I am not aware of those activities but I am aware of my loneliness. Then I try to do something about that loneliness, not about the cause that has brought this about, but I say, "It is terrible to be so lonely". So I escape. The escapes are an illusion from 'what is' because I have not found out the cause of it. When I discover the cause of it then what am I to do? You understand sir? Please go with me a little bit.

What am I to do, living in this world, having to earn a livelihood, which means clothes, food and shelter, and leisure, what am I to do, knowing the cause of this loneliness, which is, let us say, ambition, competitive spirit, how am I to live without ambition, without this competition in this world? Come on sirs, this is your life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, I have pointed that out. What am I to do sir?

Q: Say you don't know.

K: No, madam, you haven't understood.

Q: What is the quality of seriousness?

K: Sir, I am asking something, you answer something else. I am asking how am I to live in this world, earn a livelihood and yet not

be ambitious, not be competitive, not conform? How am I to live because I feel terribly lonely and I see that loneliness has been brought about by competition, ambition and so on. That is the structure of society in which I live, that is the culture, what am I to do?

Q: I must see my real needs.

K: Not 'must', sir. Then you are talking of ideas. Have you solved the problem of ambition by having your needs? I need four pairs of trousers, half a dozen shirts, and half a dozen shoes, or whatever it is - I need. But I am still ambitious. Move away!

Q: How am I to change my action?

K: I am going to show it to you. Have a little patience, go with the speaker step by step, you will find out for yourself. Look sir, I am going to repeat the question again. I am lonely, this loneliness has been brought about by self-centred activity, and that self-centred activity - one of its forms is ambition, greed, envy, competitiveness, imitation. I have to live in this society which makes me conform, be ambitious, encourage hypocrisy and all the rest of it. How am I to learn a livelihood and yet not be ambitious, because ambition is a form of isolation? I am lonely - you understand - therefore how am I to live without ambition in this world? And all of you are ambitious.

Q: Live alone.

K: I can't live alone - I need food, somebody has to give me food, somebody has to give me clothes.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Partly, sir, but tell me what to do.

Q: Give all you mind and energy to understand it.

K: I give up! You don't apply, you don't say, look, am I ambitious - I am ambitious in ten different ways - spiritually, psychologically, physically, and so on, I am ambitious. I have created this society through ambition, and that ambition has brought about this sense of isolation, which is loneliness, and I have to live in this world, and I don't want to be lonely. It doesn't mean anything. Therefore I am asking, how am I to live in this world without ambition, live amongst you who are ambitious and I don't want to be ambitious, how am I to live with you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't you know the danger of ambition?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: This is such a lovely world!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am showing you that you are ambitious. You don't face that question, you go all round it.

Q: What is ambition?

K: Sir, what is ambitious - trying to be something other than what you are. Just listen. I have said ambition is to transform what you are into something which you are not. That is one part of ambition. Ambition is try to achieve something which you think is desirable, something which you think will give you power, position, prestige. Ambition is to write something and hope that it will sell a million copies, and so on and on and on. And that is the society in which I am forced to live. And I realize that has brought loneliness to me, and I see how tremendously destructive this loneliness is because it prevents my relationship with another. So I see the destructive nature of it, then what am I to do?

Q: Find a person who is not ambitious.

K: Aren't you ambitious, have I to go out and find somebody else. What are you all talking about. This is not serious. Sorry, I must go on.

I am asking myself: I am lonely - ambition, greed, competition has brought about this loneliness, and I see the destructive nature of this loneliness; it prevents really affection, care, love and to me that is tremendously important. Loneliness is terrible, it is really destructive, it is poisonous. Now how am I - please listen - how am I to live with you who are ambitious, because I have to live with you, I have to earn my livelihood - what am I to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You don't understand. I am boiling. You understand, sir. I am passionate to understand this problem. It is burning me up, because that is my whole life and you are playing with it. I am lonely, desperate, and I see how destructive it is, and I want to resolve it, and yet I have to live with you, live with this world which is ambitious, greedy, violent, what am I to do? I will show you. But showing is not the same thing as you doing it. I'll show it.

Can I live in a world that is tremendously ambitious, and therefore deceitful, dishonest? Now how am I to live there, in that world, because I don't want to be ambitious, I see what the result of ambition is - loneliness, despair, ugliness, violence and all the rest of it. Now I say to myself, how am I to live with you who are ambitious? So I say to myself, am I ambitious? Right? Am I ambitious - not somebody else, not the world, because the world is me, I am the world, and that's to me a burning reality, not just a phrase. So am I ambitious? Now I am going to learn. You



understand, sir? I am going to observe, learn and find out if I am ambitious, not just in one direction, my whole life. Right? Not the ambitions to have a bigger house only, the ambition to be successful, the ambition to achieve a result, money, and also ambitious to achieve or transform 'what is' into the perfect state. I am ugly and I want to transform that into the most beautiful state. All that and more is ambition. And I watch it. I am going to watch it, that's my life, you understand, sir, I am going to watch it with passion, not just sit down and discuss it. I am watching it night and day, because I know, I have realized the truth that loneliness is the most terrible thing because it is most destructive in relationship. And human beings cannot live by themselves, life is relationship. Life is action in that relationship. If in that relationship there is isolation there is total inaction. I realize that, not verbally, but, you know, a burning reality. Now I am watching. Am I ambitious to transform 'what is' into 'what should be', the ideal? You understand? That's a form of ambition to change what I am into what I should be. Right? Am I doing that? That is you, are you doing that? When I say 'I', I am talking about you. Don't just escape. I am talking about you when I talk about me, because you are me. Because you are the world and I am part of that world.

So I watch. And I say, yes, I want to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. And I realize how absurd that is. It is a part of ambition given to me by education, culture, tradition, in the school - 'A' is better than 'B', copy 'A' - you know all that business. The religions have said, change from what you are to what you should be. So I realize that, the falseness of it, and I totally discard it. Right? You understand what 'discard it' means? I will not touch it. So I accept

'what is'. Wait a minute. I see 'what is', and I see 'what is' isn't good enough. Right? So how am I to transform it without the ambition of changing it into something? Are you following all this? I know you will, but later on when I ask you, you will...

Now I see what it is, I am greedy. I don't want to transform it into non-greed. I am violent; I don't want to transform it into non-violence. But that violence must undergo a radical change. Now what am I to do with it? You are following all this? What am I to do, what is my mind, which has been trained, educated, disciplined to be ambitious, violent, and I realize to change that into something else is still violence, so I won't proceed along those lines. And I am left with 'what is', which is violence. So what takes place? How am I to observe it, how is the mind to observe it without wanting to change it? You understand what I am saying? Leave it there for the moment.

How is the mind to change this educated, sophisticated ambition, give it complete change so that there is not a breath of ambition? And I watch it, I observe it, all day. All day I am watching how my ambition is active. Because I am very serious, because the loneliness is a terrible thing in relationship, and man can't live without relationship. He may pretend, he may say, "I love you", and fight each other. So how is the mind to transform totally the thing called ambition? Any form of exercise of will is still ambition. Right? I am observing. All this is observation. I see any form of exercise of will to transform 'what is', violence or ambition, is another form of ambition. Right? I have discovered that. So the discovery of it has given me energy, so I can discard will. The mind says, no, that is finished, I will never under any

circumstances exercise will - because that is part of ambition.

And I see conformity is one of the educated reactions of the culture in which I live - conform, long hair, short hair, short trousers, short skirt - conform, outwardly and inwardly conform; become a Buddhist, a Catholic, a Muslim, conform. And I have been taught from childhood to conform. In the class I am made to conform - 'A' is better than you, you must be like 'A', get better marks than 'A'. Right? So I am forced, educated, compelled to conform. What takes place when I conform? What takes place, sir, when you conform?

Q: You...

K: No, what takes place when you are conforming? Struggle, isn't there, conflict - I am this, and you want me to be that. So there is conflict, there is the loss of energy, there is fear that I am not what you expect me to be. So conformity, will, desire to change 'what is' is all part of ambition. I am observing this. So during the day I observe and I say, "I will not conform" - I understand what conformity is. I am conforming when I put on trousers. I am conforming when I keep to the left side of the road, or the right side of the road. I am conforming when I learn a language. I conform when I shake hands - in India they don't shake hands, they do something else. So I am conforming in a certain direction, at certain levels, and at other levels I am not conforming - because that is part of isolation. So what has happened? What has happened to the mind that has observed the activities of ambition - conformity, will, the desire to change 'what is' into 'what should be', and so on, those are all the activities of ambition, which has produced this sense of desperate loneliness. So all kind of neurotic

activities take place. And as I have observed it, watched it, without doing a thing about it, then out of that observation the activity of ambition has come to an end because the mind has become extraordinarily sensitive to ambition. It is like it cannot tolerate ambition, therefore becoming very sensitive it has become extraordinarily intelligent. Therefore it says, "How am I to live in this world being highly sensitive, intelligent, therefore no ambition?" Right? Are you following all this, or am I just talking to myself?

How am I to live with you who are ambition? Have we any relationship with each other? You are ambitious, and I am not. Or you are not, I am - it doesn't matter which way. What is our relationship? Come on sirs.

Q: There is no relationship.

K: Therefore what am I to do? And yet I realize living is relationship. Follow this, sir, carefully. You understand my question. You are ambitious, and perhaps I am not. And I see we have no relationship because you are going that way and I am going there, or I am stationary and you are moving away. What is our relationship? And yet I cannot live by myself. You understand, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, wait. Look at, look at it, absorb it, smell it, taste it, and then you will answer it. What am I to do living in this world, the world which is made up of ambition, greed, hypocrisy, violence, trying to change this into that, you know all the things they are doing in the churches, you know all that is happening. And I see that all leads to loneliness and that destroys relationship, and you

are ambitious, and perhaps I am not, then what takes place?

Q: It is an impossible situation.

K: It is not. I am going to show it to you.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, I have far beyond all that: if I should, when, must - all suppositions. I have gone beyond all that. I have come to the point, the mind has come to the point when it has to face a crowd, a civilization, a world in which ambition is rampant, the poison of ambition is rampant. And this mind will not tolerate both medically, psychologically and physically any form of ambition, and yet it has to live here. Right? What is it to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, here you are, look you are sitting there, I am sitting here. I am asking you. You are ambitious - all right, I'll say, I am ambitious, you are not ambitious, what is our relationship?

Q: There is no relationship.

K: There is no relationship, what takes place?

Q: Complete isolation.

K: Wait, wait. He says, complete isolation. Go into it, sir, look into it a bit more. This mind is not ambitious, that mind is ambitious. This mind, is it isolated because it has no relationship with you who are ambitious? Don't answer it because you haven't eaten this food.

Q: I don't know.

K: That's it. Find out. You have missed the point, sir, which is: when the mind has observed the activity of ambition - conformity, the exercise of will, changing, and so on and so on - when the mind has observed all this and seen the falseness of it and therefore the

truth of it - to see the falseness you need a good observing mind, a mind that is sensitive, a mind that has to follow swiftly the movement of ambition. So the mind becomes very sensitive to see all the currents of ambition. Therefore the mind is intelligent.

Right? The mind has become intelligent in the sense that through observation of ambition, the current of ambition, the subtleties of ambition, the hidden, all that, the mind has become extraordinarily alert to ambition, and realizes ambition is poison. Therefore the mind being highly sensitive to ambition, therefore watchful of ambition, and therefore intelligent, has to live with you. It has got to live with you, it can't isolate itself. Right? Because it sees isolation has brought this mess about. Now how is it to live with you? You are going that way, and the non-ambitious person may not be going that way, or going in any direction.

Such a mind is not isolated, is it? You understand, sir? Isolation takes place, which is loneliness, when there are all the activities of ambition. When there are no activities of ambition there is no loneliness.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, sir. The activities of ambition have produced loneliness. Right? We said that, you saw that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I took one example of the cause of loneliness. If I understand one cause of loneliness I have understood all the other causes. Because all the other causes are included in this one cause, because in this one cause is included conformity, in this one cause is included will, wanting to change this to that in order to become something, in order to be something - greater, nobler, wiser, more

rich, more etc., etc. - all that I discover in this one act of ambition.

Q: Sometimes I feel very serious about what you are saying...

K: Not what I am saying.

Q: I recognize it as truth but yet loneliness still goes on.

K: Because sir, I'll show you why. I understand it very well, sir. You say, I have understood what you are talking about, ambition, but yet loneliness goes on, why. Because - just listen, sir, please just listen - you have translated what I have said into an idea, haven't you. I'll show it to you in a minute. I say to you, ambition with all its activities is the cause of loneliness. Wait, wait. I say that to you. What do you do with that statement?

Q: I see that...

K: Do listen to this. Please listen to this, sir. I make a statement that ambition has brought about loneliness.

Q: How?

K: I have explained it, madam, ten times, don't say, 'how' now. I say that to you, how do you translate that, how do you listen to that, what takes place in your mind?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Now sir. Sir, listen, sir. I say to you verbally and non-verbally that the activities of ambition, which I have explained, have produced this sense of desperate loneliness, the pain of it. You listen to that because you understand English somewhat, and you listen to that. What takes place after you have listened to that? Is it an idea? You say, yes, intellectually I understand, verbally it is very clear. So you have not seen the truth of it but have understood verbally the statement. You haven't felt the depth of that statement but you have caught the meaning of the word only, and hence you

are still feeling lonely. And that's what we do. We translate what we hear into an abstraction as an idea to be carried out.

Q: We don't know anything else to do.

K: I am showing it to you, what to do. Don't translate into an idea, just listen. I say to you, it is an awful day, and you translate it as - a terrible day, I can't do this, I can't do that, I have no clothes. You follow? You translate what I have said into an action. You haven't listened. You understand, sir? So I say, just listen first, the action will come later. But first listen. Don't say, what am I to do? "What to do" is an idea. Right?

So I am saying to you the activities of ambition, there are many forms of it, has brought about this pain of loneliness. You listen to that statement intellectually, verbally, you don't listen passionately. Right? You don't say, "My god, I must solve this problem". You say, "Well, very nice, I will go on my way of being ambitious. It poisons me, but I don't mind." But I do mind; to me it is an appalling thing to be ambitious, I have realized it, and I see the ugliness of it, the falseness of it, not verbally but actually. Therefore what takes place? It is like seeing a precipice which is not an abstraction, and when I see a precipice I move away from it - if I am sane. And I see the activities of ambition, and I move away completely from it. Now, wait. Then am I lonely? Of course not. Therefore I am self-sufficient. You understand? My relationship with you then is a man who is self-sufficient and you are not, therefore you are going to exploit me. Right? You are going to use me, because you are going to use me to satisfy yourself, and I say, 'Look, don't do it, it is a waste of time.' So - if I may put it, listen carefully - relationship based on loneliness is one



thing. Right? Relationship based on non-loneliness, complete self-sufficiency is another. You understand, sir?

Now, sir, let's finish this. We have come to a marvellous point. Relationship born out of loneliness leads to great misery. Just listen to it. Don't say, "I must live that way" - it's like smelling a flower, just smell it, sir, you can't do anything about it, but you can't create a flower you can only destroy it. Therefore just smell it, look at it, the beauty of it, the petals, the delicacy, the extraordinary quality of gentleness, you know what a flower is. In the same way just look at it, listen to it. Relationship born out of loneliness is one thing. Relationship born out of non-loneliness, therefore complete self-sufficiency is another. Relationship out of loneliness leads to conflict, misery, divorce, fight, wrangles, sexual insufficiency - you are sexual, I am not, you know all that ugliness that goes on, or the beauty or whatever you like to call it. Out of that loneliness all the misery comes, in relationship. Then what takes place when there is no loneliness, when there is complete self-sufficiency, no dependency? Right? You understand? When there is no dependency what takes place? I love you, you may not love me, I love you - that's good enough. You understand? I don't want your response that you love me also, I don't care. Like the flower it is there for you to look at it, to smell, see the beauty of it, it doesn't say, 'Love me' - it is there. Therefore it is related to everything. You understand? Oh, for god's sake get this. And in that self-sufficient - not in the ugly sense of sufficient, in the great, depth and the beauty of sufficiency - in which there is no loneliness, no ambition, that is really love, therefore love has relationship with nature, if you want it, there it is, if you don't want it, it doesn't

matter. That's the beauty of it.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 4TH AUGUST 1973.

What shall we talk about this morning? For a change it has stopped raining!

Q: Education.

Q: What is responsibility in relationship?

Q: Compassion and expenditure of energy.

Q: Many people depend on me financially and what is the intelligent, right way of living, and a livelihood?

Q: You have divided dependency as the outside and the inside, and most often we find excuses for depending on the outside and disregard the dependence inwardly.

Q: I would like to ask a little bit more about education. Who will educate the educator?

Q: As long as we come with our own particular problem we are not capable of listening to what you are saying.

K: He's a politician! Now which of these shall we take: fear, education.

Q: Fear.

K: Do you really want to go into the question of fear?

Q: Yes.

K: You know it would be rather interesting in discussing this question of fear, not only going into it very deeply, both at the conscious as well as the unconscious levels, but when we leave this tent, or this gathering, to be really deeply free of it - to be completely free of fear. And let us talk over together to see if it is at all possible to be free completely, absolutely of fear. It would be

rather interesting if we could do that.

So there are two things involved in it: first freedom, and fear. What is freedom? Please, this is not a talk by me, therefore it is a dialogue. What is freedom, because our mind, our whole being demands freedom? Or freedom only in certain things, freedom from pain, sorrow, anxiety, guilt and all that, but not from pleasure. We want to keep our pleasures and be free of those things that give us pain, make us feel inferior and so on and so on. Now I think it would be right, or beneficial if we could discuss this morning both these points: what is freedom, when you say freedom from fear, what does freedom imply? Is it just from fear, or is freedom something much greater than from a particular annoyance, from a particular fear, from a particular anxiety, guilt and so on and so on?

So shall we discuss, talk over together first fear and then freedom, or the other way round? Or do they both go together? I think they both go together. So let us concern ourselves if the mind can be really very deeply free of this thing called fear. Are you really interested in this, are you sure you are interested in it? Because if we go into it very deeply we have to investigate so many things which are involved in fear. And to investigate it one's mind must have no opinions, no conclusions - whether one can be or cannot be free from fear, you must come to it afresh if that is possible.

What is fear? And at what level does fear exist? Does it exist only at the unconscious level, or is fear part of our physiological nature - the fear to survive, the fear of not being able to acquire enough food - the whole biological, physiological fears? Then there are all the psychological fears, and can these fears be

eliminated one by one, or can the mind cut at the very root of fear so that it is dead, gone, finished? So that is what we are going to discuss this morning.

What is fear, and what is it that we are frightened about? One may be frightened of loneliness, one may be frightened of not having a good position in the world, one may be frightened of not achieving something that you want. One may be frightened of death, one may be frightened of illness, one may be frightened of not being able to carry out what you want to do, however ignominious, or great, or neurotic, fear of not being loved, and when you do love fear of losing; fear, the racial fears, the fears inculcated into us, or rather educated fears of heaven and hell. So there are all these various forms of fears, and most of us, I think, have some of these fears, or most of them. Now shall we take one by one of these multiple fears, or shall we find out the root of it? You understand? Go to the very root of it, and perhaps in the understanding, having an insight into the truth of it, the thing withers away, you don't have to fight it, you don't have to have courage, you don't have to resist fear. Right? Shall we do that?

That is, you may have a particular fear, a very neurotic deep rooted fear of something - darkness, or precipice, or living alone, and so on, and if you want to resolve that one particular fear now, and you are only interested in that, then it would be futile to discuss the elimination of all fears. You understand what I am saying? So you must be very clear, if I may point out, what it is you want, what it is you think is important: to eliminate one particular fear in which your mind is caught; or to eliminate altogether absolutely fear? Right? If I had to face that problem I

would want to root out fear, not one fear, one particular fear, but I would want to be completely empty of fear, of all fears. Now which is it you want?

Q: We are not generally concerned with the riddance of all fears but the fear that happens at the moment - the tent might fall down. I live on the banks of the river and there might be a colossal storm and wash that house away. It may be only the fears that happen incidently, everyday of our life.

K: All these are included - the immediate fears and the hidden fears, which the mind has never discovered, and the fears that the mind has, or has had and is afraid that it might have again tomorrow. Or the fear of death, which is in time, in the future. We are including all those fears, not one type of fear.

Q: Why shouldn't we live with fear, it is part of us? Why do we ask that we should be free of fear?

K: Yes, sir, I understand. It is part of us, we have been brought up, we have been conditioned, from childhood, from the animal, from the higher form of apes and so on, who are always constantly living in fear, and we have inherited those fears, it is part of us, why bother about it, live with it. I think that is fairly clear. What does fear do?

Q: Fear may help you to protect your life.

K: No, sir, look what happens when you have fear. We are going to find out, we are going to go into it, but if you say, please I am only concerned with the incidental fears, that is the fear that tent may fall down, I may walk out and break my leg, casual fears, I am only concerned with that and not with all these complicated deep rooted fears, I am not interested. Either that, or you are

interested, you want to find out, you want to investigate into this whole question of fear, both physiological as well as psychological, both the fears of the past and the future, the fears that lie very, very deeply hidden in the deep unconscious. I include all that, both the biological, physiological as well as psychological fears. The fears that may help me to survive, physically to survive, the fears that may - not 'may' - that do prevent clarity, that bring about total darkness, a sense of utter helpless inaction. We include all those fears. May we go on from there?

So we are trying to discuss the nature and the structure of fear both outside the skin and inside the skin, both the outward forms of fears and the undiscovered fears, the totality of fear. Now how do you set about it? How do you set about discovering fear? Have you any fears, or are you free of them? So how do you investigate this question?

Q: Look at what you are afraid of.

Q: Try to see the fear in yourself and look at it.

K: How do you look at it? I am afraid - suppose one is - suppose I am afraid of public opinion, how do I look at it? What is the reason that makes me look at it? Please go with me into this. What makes me look at it and what is the reason why I should look at it? Why?

Q: I want to get rid of it because it is painful.

K: Is that the reason you look at it, because it gives you pain; but would you look at it if it gave you pleasure? Please do consider what I am saying. Because it gives you pain therefore your motive is not to suffer, not to be entangled, not to be caught, not to live in this terrible fear of something. So your motive is to get rid of it.

Right? Are you following? And when you have a motive doesn't it distort your observation of fear? What do you say, sirs? I have a motive. My motive is to get rid of fear because I see that it causes pain, when I am frightened I am paralysed, there is no action, it's living in a darkness and it is very painful, and it is a kind of desperate isolation, a feeling that you have nothing to rely on, nobody to go to. And it causes great disturbance, pain, and the motive then is to get rid of it - the natural, instinctual motive is to push it away from you. When there is such a motive is it possible to observe fear? I see as long as I have a motive to get rid of it, to hold it, or to overcome it and all the rest of it, any form of motive must distort the observation of anything. Motive is a movement - the meaning of that word is to move - move in a particular direction. I don't know if you see this. The moment I want to get rid of fear I am moving in a particular direction. And fear is not just one kind, it is a tremendous thing, it's very complicated. Therefore I must observe without a direction, without a motive, without a purpose. Please, I am just going step by step.

That is, I want to look at fear because if I can look at it very clearly, freely, observe it without any movement, that is motive, a direction, then I am capable of looking. And I have a motive - my motive is, I do not want to have fear because it brings catastrophe, pain, I want to get rid of it. So my mind is only concerned with getting rid of fear, not with the investigation of fear. That's all. You can keep your motive but you won't be able to investigate fear.

Q: How do we get rid of motive?

K: We are doing it, sir. We are doing it. I am saying as long as I have a motive, a direction, if my observation is directed in one



direction, in one particular point, then I am not observing. That's all I am saying, nothing more. And if you see that then we can investigate very, very deeply. Not how to get rid of the motive, but see how motives prevent investigate. That's all. Right?

Now fear: there is physiological fear and psychological fear. The physical fears are, I may not have enough bread-and-butter, I must go and work, I might lose my job, I must have more money, all these physical demands which bring about a sense of fear, of not being able to survive. Then there is the other problem, psychological fears, which are much more complex, much more diversified, much deeper, which may control the physical survival. You understand? If I am not concerned about physical survival, I am only concerned with achieving the highest form of liberation, I am not bothered whether I live physically or not, my whole direction is there, therefore I am not afraid. One meal a day is good enough. Have you tried all that? That is, not be frightened of the physical survival, but only trying to find out the highest form of freedom. And therefore you kind of don't pay too much attention to the physical.

Now, which shall we deal with first: the physical survival with all its fears, or the psychological fears which prevent the physical survival? I'll show you just one example: nationalism, which is so rampant now all over the world, is preventing actually the physical survival of human beings. Right? The nationalism, which is my country, my god, you know, the spirit of nationalism is preventing the survival of all human beings, not of a particular group, or a particular individual. Now nationalism is a psychological product. Right? Take a country like India: it never existed before, nobody

talked about nationalism, now they are wallowing in it, and so they are creating wars and all the rest of it. Not only India, but every country is doing it. Psychological fears dominate the physical fears, they prevent the survival factor of human beings, not one group of human beings, of total human beings because psychologically I am attached to an idea of my country, to a flag - the Jew and the non-Jew - and they are preventing survival. So I see - if you correct it, I would be delighted if you correct it - that the emphasis or the investigation of psychological fears will bring about the survival of the physical and eliminate physical fears. Right? Don't agree with me, please. Think it out.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Aren't you afraid of losing that which you possess emotionally - no? There it is. Now can you investigate that fear - taking that one fear of losing psychologically something you hold dear, either a person, an idea, an ideology, a belief, a conclusion, an historical fact, all those are psychological possessions of your mind, you are a German, and all the rest of it. Now aren't you afraid of losing that? And can't you investigate it? Of course one can investigate it. I am afraid - suppose - I am afraid of losing my nationality - terrible isn't it! I am afraid of not being a Hindu. I can investigate it very, very carefully. I can investigate it because I want to find out the truth of it - what lies behind the fear of this idea of not being a Hindu.

Q: These are psychological fears, but there are physical fears too.

K: Yes, madam. You see you are all discussing one particular form of fear, and therefore we don't proceed any further. I want to

deal with the whole factor of fear, not just one fear. And you keep on breaking it up and saying there are physical fears, there are psychological fears and so on and so on. And when you are tremendously afraid you can't investigate.

Now while you are sitting here you are not tremendously afraid, you are not in a black cloud, so you can now investigate that black cloud. How shall we deal with it? You all have different points of view, you all have different opinions about fear - how to get rid of it, or how not to get rid of it, that you cannot or can investigate - now how shall we all meet together and investigate this thing together?

Look sir, I am tremendously interested whether the mind can ever be free of fear - fear of every kind, physical, psychological, known and unknown - I want to investigate it, I want to find out whether the mind can ever be free of it, or must it always live in some kind of fear - live in a certain kind of fear so as to force it to behave in a certain way, force it to accept certain forms of economic society, force it to accept certain beliefs? I want to deal with all of that. And I say it is possible to investigate, not as something outside but as part of my life, of my daily existence. Can we do that together? Don't agree and then pick it up later on and say, "What about my grandmother dying?"

Now what is fear? I have know it, you have known it. How does it come, what brings fear? I was ill yesterday, it caused me great pain, and today I am free of it, and I hope to goodness that it won't come tomorrow. Just watch this. Pain yesterday, physical pain yesterday, no pain today, tomorrow pain - might be. What 'might happen', that is in time, is one of the factors of fear. Right? Last

week there was pain, and this week there is no pain, but the remembrance of that pain of last week, the remembrance of it and hoping it will not happen next week, the interval between last week, this week and next week, which is in the field of time, so time is one of the factors of fear. Right? Do please, look at it, just don't tear it to pieces, just look at it first. Time as movement of thought, which says, "There was pain last week, there is no pain this week, I hope there will no pain next week." Thought remembers the pain of last week, thought being the memory of that pain, the memory which has left a mark on the brain - please, don't be bored with this, listen to it - there was pain last week, the remembrance of it is the memory of that pain. That memory is stored up in the brain, then that memory acts as thought and hopes next week there will no pain. Right? That's fairly clear and simple. That is, thought in movement, in time, is one of the factors of fear. Wait. Just listen to it.

Now psychologically it is the same thing. I possessed - the mind possessed that idea, is afraid to lose that idea, is losing that idea and is afraid what might happen if it loses that idea. Thought again is movement in time, which is fear. You see you are not listening, you are not interested. I can see. Look sir, you ask questions and then look somewhere else. This is tremendously important if you understand this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, look, I said to you just now, please, we are dealing with the whole of fear, including that gentleman who said, "I am afraid to get up and speak".

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, I am going to do it. You see you have already come to a conclusion. We want to deal with the whole nature of fear. Now why is that gentleman, or lady, afraid to speak here?

Q: I don't know.

K: Don't say, you don't know, find out. Let him find out. Why is he afraid of speaking in the tent? Look, why is he afraid - I am not saying it is so. He is afraid because probably he can't put it into words, he is shy, has never put it into words in public, and he may state what he wants to say wrongly, and may be corrected by another, and therefore he is shy.

Look, madam, either you deal with small petty little fears, or you deal with fear. If you deal with the totality of fear then you can deal with the petty little fears. But if you begin with the little fears you never come to the big fears, or understand the totality of fear.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, did you hear what I said? Did it mean anything to you?

Q: Yes.

K: Then why do you ask that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I said, sir, movement of thought, movement of thought, which is pain a week ago, no pain, next week there might be pain, a movement of thought in time is one of the factors of fear.

Q: Another one is...

K: Wait, wait. You are only concerned verbally to understand it, aren't you, because you haven't understood this thing, you have already jumped to something else. I am saying, if you see this one factor we can go to the next factor. But absorb this, see whether it is false or true. If it is true, drink it; if it is false, put it away.

Q: One of the factors...

K: Wait sir, have I understood that factor? Verbally?

Q: Not only verbally.

K: That means you have the movement of thought from the past, to today, to tomorrow, that movement being a factor of fear, that movement has stopped. That is understanding, not verbally, playing with words. If you had really done that you wouldn't have stated the next statement, another factor. Because you haven't fully grasped this thing, because that means the mind is completely motionless, out of time. Oh, you don't see this.

Now let's go back. I want to deal with one factor at a time, not all the factors. This may contain all the factors. This one factor, if I really understood the depth of it, may resolve all the other factors, and may bring about complete cessation of fear. But you don't even give it a chance to flower, you say, "No, there are other factors. Let's drown this and take up a newer factor."

So please consider this factor, not intellectually, not verbally, consider the factor as it is, how the mind works. Having a pain a week ago, today there is no pain, perhaps there will be pain tomorrow. The "perhaps there will be pain tomorrow" is fear of the past pain, which is the reaction of a memory, which is all the process of thinking. So thinking is the factor, is the only factor of fear.

Q: I am free of fear because I don't think.

K: You see, that is just a joke with you. You just repeat that. Is it so with you? You are free of fear because you don't think. That is just a superficial answer, it is a game with him, a verbal game. And I am not free of fear because of your words. You say, take a

tranquillizer and you will be free of fear. What kind of an answer is that to a serious man?

I want to find out whether fear can end - fear of death, fear of survival, fear of physical pain, fear of not being able to talk in public, fear of losing my wife, my children, job. It is part of my life, it is not a joke with me. It is something dreadfully serious because when there is fear there is darkness, an absolute sense of non-action, a kind of paralysis. And if you like to live in a paralysis that is your affair, and play with words and try to be clever, that's your affair, but if you are a very serious man the question of fear is tremendous; and seriously ask whether it is possible to end it at all. Therefore you investigate it, say, what is fear, how does it come. I see how it obviously comes in a very simple form - the past, through the present to the future. And that is the movement of thought. And somebody says, "Take a tranquillizer and you will be free from fear". I say, for god's sake.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So either you are serious in your intention to be free of fear, really completely, or you are not, you just want to play with words. If you want play with words, please play somewhere else. Now if you are serious I am suggesting that you look at this fact: that thought as movement in time may be the real cause of fear, all fears, not just one fear. Is that the truth? Is that a falsehood, or merely a verbal cunning clever statement? It is not a clever cunning statement but it is a fact, it is an obvious fact. That is what is taking place in each one of us, this movement: I have possessed you, you are here, I possess you and I may lose that possession. The thought of the future and the thought of losing, having

possessed, is a movement in time which is thought. So I say to myself, I see that very, very clearly. Is all my life based on this, on this principle, on this truth - I have a job, I had it and through competition, through all this civilized structure of society I might lose it, I might fall ill, and I have responsibilities. So the movement of thought in time. I am ugly, I don't know how to behave properly, I will learn to behave tomorrow. It is the same movement of thought recognizing the factor of unrighteous behaviour, then looking at it and projecting the idea of righteous behaviour - again the movement of thought in time. I am violent, I am violent because society is violent, the world is violent of which I am. I have been educated to be violent, violence is part of my inheritance from the animal, from the ape. And it is abiding in me, it is part of me. And intelligently I observe it and I say, I must be non-violent, that is tomorrow. Again the process of time, thought through time.

So the movement of thought, which is time, is perhaps the greatest factor of fear. I see the truth of it, it isn't a verbal statement, it isn't a clever cunning adjustment of words but it is an obvious fact. Now what is the mind to do with this habitual movement of thought? You understand? I have been brought up to accept public opinion; one day I discover how stupid it is, then I am frightened - again the same thing. So I say to myself, what am I to do? What am I to do when this is a fact? Unconsciously there have been stored up all the racial fears - I am a Jew, you know, persecution, all that, or I am a Protestant, persecution, I am a non-Brahmin, persecution. So there is all that racial traditional fear stored up in the unconscious. In the unconscious there are fears of not succeeding, fears of not - and so on, it is all there stored up.



Now what is the mind to do with all that? How is all that to be exposed to the light? You are following all this? Does this interest you? How will you expose all that? Through analysis, tearing off peel by peel, looking, looking, observing, analysing, all that involves time. How shall I do it? Come on sirs it is your job to discuss this thing, it is part of your life.

Q: Look at the fact when it happens.

K: And looking at that fact when it happens may take a long time. So what shall you do? You understand sir? I am hungry, I want to be fed now, not tomorrow or another day. I want to have my meal now. And there must be freedom from fear completely now, not tomorrow.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Therefore what am I to do?

Q: First you must stop all movement of time.

K: How am I to do it?

Q: Stop thinking.

K: Time is thought, time is not separate from thought. Time is movement in time. So time is thought in movement. So don't separate it.

I am pointing out to you what am I to do with this fact?

Q: Observe it in yourself.

K: Right, sir. Now I say to myself, I have observed this in myself, I have observed this movement of thought as time, and that brings fear. It is very clear. That's a fact. Now what am I to do?

Q: We don't know what to do with it.

K: Now who will answer your question? You understand my question, sir? You say, I really don't know what to do, then who

will answer it? Me? I am asking a very serious question. You are confronted with this, right, with this fact. Whom will you ask what to do?

Q: Nobody can answer it therefore let things go on as they are.

K: Wait, sir, look what you are saying. I understand that very well. Look what happens, sir. What am I to do with this fact? I don't know what to do, shall I ask somebody? He can't answer it, he will quote me some book, or say, believe in this and you will forget this, or go to church and pray - you know all that. I say, for god's sake there is nobody to answer me. I can't answer it. Wait. You are missing my point, sir. You are confronted with this fact. And you have nobody to ask what to do. Then what will you do? Just accept the fact, just going on living as you are?

Q: Fear has now gone.

K: Fear is gone - has it completely? I want to find out for myself. I am not saying you are not free, you may be. I want to leave this tent - I, I am talking I - one must leave this tent being completely free of fear. You may be for the time being, but when you go outside and you go back to your home, the whole thing begins. The mind says, I must end all that so that I can live humanly, intelligently, sanely, not just verbally. And I have come face to face with this fact, a fundamental fact, now what am I to do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, what am I to do? Just ask this question, nobody is to answer it, because you have to find the answer yourself. That is where you need energy, passion to find out - not just talk, talk, talk.

Q: I can't do it.

K: I'll show it to you. You see again you are waiting for somebody to tell you.

Look, sir, I realize, this mind realizes fear is a dreadful thing, it paralyses you. It makes you ugly, it brings about violence, physically, inwardly, you become superstitious, you accept any illusion, you will run away from it at any price. So fear in any form is a most deadly thing - not verbally, but it is like taking a poison, seeing how destructive that poison is, and realizing that poison. In the same way fear is that, not verbally, but actually when you have faced this fear you know what the whole thing is. So I see that very, very clearly, what a deadly thing it is. Then I say to myself, what is fear. I don't want replies - you follow? I don't want opinions, or people saying this, I want to find out because I don't read books, I don't want to read books about all these matters, I don't want to listen to anybody to tell me what fear is, I want to find out. I don't want to suppress it, I don't want to put it away, I don't want to overcome it, I want to understand it, look at it, have an insight into it, feel for it. So the mind asks, what is fear - the little fears, big fears, fears of death, fear of losing somebody, fear of what my neighbour might think, all kinds of fear, including fear of getting up and wanting to talk and afraid of talking in this tent. So I say, what is fear, basically, both the racial, inherited, the fears that have been acquired, the fears that are deeply laid in the unconscious, in the layers of my consciousness, the whole content. I want to find out, I don't want to be told, because somebody telling me has very little meaning, if somebody tells me then I make that into an idea and then conform to that idea, hoping to get rid of fear. That means conformity which is another form of fear. So I see all

that.

So my mind being serious, not merely caught in words, seeing what fear does, my mind is now capable of looking. The mind then says, what is fear, the basis, the basic movement of fear, which produces so many deadly flowers, in all its corrupt branches, flowers that are ugly, what is the root of it? Is it thought? So perhaps I investigate thought, the mind looks at thought. Thought is memory, the response of memory is thought. Thought, memory is experience. I am watching. Watch it in yourself please. Memory, experience and the accumulated knowledge - or rather experience, accumulated knowledge, which has become memory, which is the conditioning factor, from that any reaction is thought, all reaction from that is thought. Right, that is simple. Everybody knows this.

Now thought thinking about the pain last week, not having pain this week, hopes it will have no pain next week. The memory of last week, remembering that and hoping it will not have pain next week and fear begins. I see that very clearly. It is part of me, not verbally, it is absolutely a fact, like a precipice, like a poison. So thought, I see, is a movement. Please listen to this, thought is a movement so thought can never be still. I have discovered that. The very movement is thought. So thought cannot be stopped. It can only be stopped by another thought, suppressing one thought by another thought, and the other thought is still a movement. So I see thought can never come to a standstill. Right? So thought is a movement of time, so thought is time. Right? That is burning into me, that's a reality, not a verbal statement, it is part of my blood. And thought can never be stopped. Right? But the mind says then, how is thought, which breeds fear, how is that to stop? You are

following? So the mind says there must be other means of stopping thought - controlling it, giving the direction and so on.

So when the mind realizes, actually realizes, that thought cannot be stopped, then what takes place? You are following all this? That is, I see, the mind sees very clearly that thought is movement, therefore movement is time. Movement is time, going from here to there physically is time; psychologically changing from 'what is' to 'what should be' is time. Any movement of thought is time. And any movement of thought except with regard to technological knowledge and so on, must inevitably breed contradiction, fears. That is as absolute fact as breathing. The mind says then, what am I to do with this terrible thing which is always moving, moving, moving, moving? It cannot be stopped. And the mind says, time must have a stop. You are following all this? Otherwise I am caught always in this movement. So it realizes all this, so what has happened to that mind?

Q: It questions.

K: It has questioned all along this morning, for the last hour and a half. What has happened to the mind that has realized the truth of all this - the truth, not the verbal statement, not the description, but the thing itself?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, just look at it. Have you come that far? Sir, have we come that far together, at least taken the journey together, shared the thing together - no? That all movement of thought breeds fear, whether little fears or big fears. The little fear of not being able to get up and talk here, in this tent, the big fears of death, the big fears of losing that which you possess, either money, the wife, whatever

it is. All that is the movement of thought that must inevitably breed fear. So time breeds fear. Time is thought. The mind says, yes, I see that. Now, do you see it? Right? Is it mere observation of an idea, and therefore it is a motive, a distortion, or do you see it as you see sunset, sunrise? If you don't, why don't you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you, sir. Please, why don't you? Why don't you see this thing as a tremendous reality as you see a precipice, as you are aware if you lose your job, or something you possess, lose it, why don't you see that as vitally, as something that is so burning? What's wrong?

Q: I think we see this fairly clearly, perhaps not so intensely as you point out, perhaps even so, but there is something behind which says, "Oh, I can't do it".

K: There is no question of doing it. You see how you have translated what we have said into some kind of action. I am not talking of action. Action comes much later, but your instinctual response is, what am I to do. It is not a question of doing something, first look. You don't ask that question when you are standing on a precipice, "What am I to do?" I say, first look, is this a reality to you, a burning, vital, intense thing that you have got there? And if you haven't, what's wrong? Don't you hear words? Doesn't fear mean anything, or you say, I'll put up with it, all my life I have put up with it, now I'll go on putting up with it. Then you and I have no relationship because one man is burning, he says, 'For god's sake I must be free of this thing, this burning'. And the other says, "Well my dear chap, go off by yourself and solve it, I am not really interested".

So what takes place in the mind that has seen the truth of this, the truth, not the details, the truth of this fact, movement, time, thought, sees that - you know, you cannot erase it, wipe it away, it is there? Now what happens to the mind when it sees the truth or the falseness of this statement? What is the quality of that mind that has seen this?

Q: Sometimes we see this clearly and at other times we don't.

K: So you are saying, we see this thing clearly at moments and the rest of the time we don't, we lose it. Do you do that when you are walking along a high dangerous mountain, and there are precipices, you lose it? No.

Q: There are moments when there is no thinking.

K: The lady is saying moments arrive when there is no thinking at all. We are not talking of that. It is not a question of not thinking. I said just now thought cannot be quiet, thought is movement.

Look, sir, I'll put it to you: the whole problem of control, which is part of our culture, part of our religion, part of our education, part of the family system, part of your whole background, control. That is, control thought. That is, one thought controlling another thought. That is the whole idea of control. Right? And to me such control is movement of thought, one thought dominating another thought, but it is still movement, and therefore thought can never be eradicated, put an end to. And our whole system of thought is to control, put an end to. I don't know if you see this. It is contradictory what is being said, what one has accepted.

Q: One is tired at the end of this long talk. The mind is tired, I can't absorb anymore.

K: I think we had better continue tomorrow morning.

Q: You have not talked about freedom.

K: Freedom, madam, is the ending of time. Swallow that!

By just listening in this tent you are not going to solve this whole problem, you have to work at it, you have to watch it. I think we had better to stop today and we will continue with this tomorrow because it is really a very, very complex problem, and it demands that you must know how to look. Please look! If you know how to look into yourself it is all there. You understand? You don't have to read any of the psychological or philosophical books, it is all there. You may read all the technological books, scientific books, mathematics and so on, that one must. But to understand this whole question of fear one must go into it in oneself, and therefore one must know how to look at oneself. And that is our greatest difficulty, to look with clear eyes, never distorting 'what is', never distorting 'what is'. You understand? Just to look at 'what is', and then it unfolds, everything comes out, all your unconscious, everything boils out if you know how to look. We will do it tomorrow.



## **SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 5TH AUGUST 1973.**

Shall we go on discussing, or rather talking over what we were discussing yesterday morning? We were talking about fear, and whether the mind can ever be free of it, because fear is a dreadful thing, it really paralyses one, and from fear all kinds of neurotic behaviour and action takes place. And we went into the question of what is fear, what is the nature of it, and if one could not merely verbally but really realize the intricacies of fear, not the many branches of it, the varieties of fear, but actually the root of it, the basis of it, the radical source of fear, then perhaps if one has given complete attention to it then one sees, as we discussed yesterday, that fear is a movement of thought and thought as time. I do not know if one has really realized it, if one has deeply felt the truth of it, and if one had one would have seen that possession is a form of fear, and non-possession is another form of fear, which is the movement of thought which says, I must possess and then through pain it says, I must not possess, it is still the movement of thought. And there are various expressions of fear.

And it seems to me if one could really go into this question of the whole problem of whether the mind can suppress thought, whether the mind can put an end to thought, put an end to time, and whether it is at all possible to be free of the movement of time as thought and, also know, or realize thought has its place, its function, and when it moves out of that area then fear and all the complications begin. I think we more or less touched on that.

And we said yesterday morning we would go into this question

of total observation. I think that is where more or less we left off. Shall we go on with that? Please, if you have some other question or some other thing you want to discuss, please say so because I don't specially want to go on with my own.

Q: Would you please explain why you said yesterday, thought cannot be arrested, stopped. There was a contradiction in what you said yesterday that thought is a movement, and that movement can never be stopped. That seems to be a contradiction.

K: Can thought be stopped, arrested, put an end to, and who is it that wants to put an end to it, that desires, seeing all the complications of this movement in expression as fear, as attachment, detachment, as escape and non-escape, and all that movement, what is the entity, or the energy, or the outside agency that will put an end to this movement? Surely it is another fragment of thought. That's fairly clear, isn't it. So thought can't come to an end. Please, to realize that, to realize thought has its function, obviously. When we are talking together it is the function of thought because it uses language, the language which has been learnt, memory, stored up and it is the movement of thought in time. Obviously, that must go on. But we are saying the moment the thought leaves that area then all our problems begin - the problem of possession, non-possession, fear, pleasure, and the pursuit of pleasure, achievement, competition, you know, the whole psychological complexities begin. Now can the mind keep the two things separate, but yet harmonious - like two rivers running together?

That is only possible when we understand the structure and nature of ourselves. Whether one can know or understand the

extraordinary thing that we call ourselves, the 'me', the 'I', this battle that is going on all the time in us. Because life is after all living, earning a livelihood, love with all its fears and its tenderness, and the question of death, and also if there is anything beyond all this, which the religions have asserted unfortunately through priests and beliefs, and dogmas and worship of symbols and all that, which becomes so utterly meaningless, whether there is something totally sacred. One can understand all this as a total movement, not of time, as a living thing, if one can know about oneself. To observe oneself and to go beyond oneself, can we discuss that this morning? Do you want to discuss that?

That is, we have discussed for the last four discussions, and the last time we met here, yesterday, we talked about fear, and we went into it fairly sufficiently, and this morning if we could go into this question whether the mind can know itself, its activities, its verbal structures, and non-verbal structures, its despairs, its pleasures, its continuous demand to be - if we could go into that and go beyond that, we might be able to come upon something which is not put together by thought as movement in time - something that may be not permanent, that has nothing whatsoever to do with time. Right?

Now I want to know myself. Please this is a discussion, not a talk by me. I want to know about myself. I behave very strangely, I am antisocial, I dislike my fellow human beings, or I have got peculiar tendencies, both sexual and otherwise, I have all kinds of urges. Now can this mind know all that? Or shall I blame my parents - my parents who quarrel, who don't get on well together, who have bitterness, anger, you know all that goes on in a

restricted family when they are not properly responsible in their relationship. All that and the environment - shall I put it on the environment, on the parents? There have been a lot of books written about it, the far deep cry, and blame - they have gone into even the crying in the womb, and the Asiatics have gone much beyond that, they say it is the past life. So your present state, the psychologists and others blame on the environment, parents, and the indefinite past; and they have written volumes about all this. The latest volume is much the best! And you get terribly excited about it. But the fact remains we are what is actually going on. It is no good blaming the parents and the environment, it is finished, they have produced you and me, whether they wanted it or not, here we are. And we must obviously, which is most reasonable and sane, start from 'what is', not go back and say, 'This is the result of my mother and father who didn't put me on the pot rightly'. Right? "Who didn't behave in front of me rightly", and so on. I think it is all so useless, because I have to take what I am and deal with it, which is practical, sane and objective. And that can produce immediate action. But if I keep on blaming the environment, and my parents, and you know, the past, I can go on playing that game everlastingly, and never change 'what is'. Right?

So can we in this talking over together stop all the blaming, or saying the environment, the parents, the past, has made you this. All right it has made me this, I want to start from here. Right, can we do that? So I want to know what is going on now, not what has produced it. I don't have to go to Africa to study the gorillas and the apes in order to understand myself. I can start with myself because myself is the result of the culture, the environment, the

parents, the society, the tradition, all the superstitions, the beliefs, the propaganda of two thousand years, or ten thousand years, I am the result of all that. Right? And therefore I am the world and the world is me. That's not a verbal statement but an actual fact. And I feel that most urgently. Now can we start from there?

So you are not blaming the parents. Please see the importance of it. You are not blaming anybody for your actual behaviour, for your neurotic thoughts, for your antisocial or neurotic activity; it is there. Now the problem from that arises: what is the mind to do with 'what is', how is to go beyond 'what is'? Right? Am I - when I talking about 'I' it is quicker - is the mind aware of its neurotic behaviour, aware of its sexual demands, perverted or otherwise, its ambitions, its crude violence and subtle forms of violence? Is it aware of its gestures, words, drive, instincts? Is one aware of it? Are you aware of it? Come on sirs, let's discuss this. If one is aware of it, what is one to do? You understand, sir, this is the major problem in life, not being able to solve this we then look to extraneous outside agencies to solve this, blame it on the environment, on education, on the parents, on the culture, wrong education, all that arises.

So what is one to do with 'what is'? And does the mind know what is actually going on? Is the mind aware when I make a gesture? Is the mind aware of its occupations - whatever they be, sexual, religious occupations, Jesus, Krishna, or whatever it is, its ambitions, corruptions, you know, is it aware of this? Are you aware of this? If you are not, what is going to make you aware? More experience? Please come on, discuss with me.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are saying, are you aware of all this? And if you are not, what will make you aware of it? More suffering?

Q: How else? Suffering makes you aware. If everything goes well one doesn't observe yourself. When there is suffering then you observe yourself.

K: So you need more suffering, is that it? You need somebody to goad you, is that it? So what is your mind going to do if it is aware of itself with 'what is'? And if it is not aware of itself, will any form of outside incidents, accidents, happenings, sorrow, disease, will that make you more aware? As that gentleman pointed out, suffering will do it; if everything is going smoothly we won't be aware. It is only when we are suffering that the sudden shock of it and the paralysis of sorrow and the coming out of it, then escaping from that, finding reasons and the cause and all that business, why you suffer, does that make you aware?

So what makes one aware? What makes one aware of what is going on within and without?

Q: When you come to yourself.

K: Now, I haven't come to myself, but what is going to make me? Please understand this problem because we are all in it. We are either being forced by environment, by another, by a book, by something or through something or other we are being forced to be aware. Right? Therefore what does that do? When I am forced to be aware - you understand - what happens to my mind, what takes place?

Q: You become aware of...

K: No, sir. Please watch yourself. When you depend on external stimuli to be aware what takes place?

Q: I get blocked.

K: When your awareness depends on a stimuli what takes place in your mind? Do examine it, sir, don't answer me. I am forcing you now. Right? I am forcing you, I am stimulating you, I am urging you. What takes place?

Q: I depend on the stimulation.

K: That means what? When there is a stimulation from outside what takes place? You are saying you depend on that stimulation. Right? So you depend on the priest, on a book, on a belief, on a person, environment, culture, and because you have depended on the environment, culture, people, and so on, what has taken place? Listen, what has taken place? You are not aware. Isn't it very simple? So you have discovered something, which is, when you depend on a stimuli, on pressure, influence, threat, punishment, reward, then you depend on it and that very dependence causes fear and so gradually you are totally unaware.

Q: When the mind says, I must not depend...

K: Wait, wait. I am coming to that sir. Just look what has happened. I have depended on you to be stimulated, to be aware - whether you, the symbol, the church, whatever it is - I have depended on you. And therefore I become attached to you, I must possess you. Right? And the possession becomes much more important than being aware. Just a minute, sir I'll finish this. So at the end of all this I am totally unaware. I accept because I have been educated, my culture says depend on stimuli and so on, so at the end of it all I am a dull, unaware person accepting things which others say is right, including the politicians, including all the rest of it. Yes sir?

Q: Isn't it a paradox of our relationship to fear.

K: It comes to that, sir. So what am I? And am I aware of what I am independent of any stimuli? Because the moment I depend on it I am lost. Right? That's clear.

Now why am I not aware? Aware of what is going on within me, all the intricacies, the explanations, the cause, the descriptions, I am aware of this area. And if you are not, who is going to do it. If you depend on it you are destroyed. So do you see all this? Do you realize what is happening to the human mind? Instead of education making you much more aware, more alert, more observant, on the contrary it is destroying you - except in a certain area. Religions, all that, are making the mind accept, imitate, conform, and not be aware. Now do you see that? When you follow an authority that is exactly what is going on - right - the authority of the church, temple, whatever it is, the book, including the speaker's authority. Are you aware of it, aware of what is happening to you when you depend on alcohol, LSD, pot, and so on and so on?

Now not being dependent on stimuli then what is the quality of awareness? You understand? It is not dependent on sorrow because again that is an incident outside, it is not dependent on any stimuli, but it is aware, it is aware of what is going on. What is the quality of that awareness?

Q: Curiosity.

K: It is really very interesting this, if you go into it. We have depended on outward or every kind of stimuli and that has made us unaware. That's a fact. The more I drink, the more I become unaware. But at the beginning it kind of stimulates me and I gradually - you know what takes place. Now what is the quality of



awareness that is not the result of any stimuli and is that possible?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, if I may most respectfully suggest, don't just use words, find out! So I must first realize that so far I have depended on external stimuli to become aware, to find out why I suffer and so on and so on, and I see the absurdity of it, the foolishness of it, what it does to one, therefore it falls away from me, completely falls away from the mind, it is no longer dependent.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, just examine what takes place. You are dependent, aren't you? You go to church, you read a book, you are sitting there listening to this poor chap talking, you are stimulated by music, cinema. And I am asking you if you are not stimulated by an outside agency then what is the quality of this awareness - which means you must be totally free of the external stimuli - are you?

Q: No.

K: Therefore are you aware - please proceed - are you aware that you are dependent on external stimuli, and do you realize the destructive quality of it - non-verbally, but actually realize it, as a poison you realize it? And when you do it is finished, isn't it?

Q: Sometimes.

K: Not sometimes, for god's sake.

Q: Most of us have got an image of you and are dependent on it. What are you going to do about it?

K: I am destroying that image. I can't do anything about it, but you can do a lot about it. Because to me authority in any form in this field is poisonous, therefore I won't go near it.

Q: But you are stimulating us.

K: Therefore I am asking, sir, are you aware that an outside agency is stimulating you? Is all life - please listen, not only now in this tent - is all life a movement of stimulation and response to that stimulation?

Q: Yes.

K: Find out, please. Then what takes place? Then we are merely entities of chance, isn't it, of happenings, of incidents, of words, of ideas, which are all just meaningless. Are you aware of this? Look sir, if you are dependent on the speaker to be stimulated to think whatever it is, stimulated, what takes place? You depend on the speaker, the speaker becomes the authority, you create an image, put a candle in front of him, or do whatever you want to do, and you are stuck, you are crippled, you are destroyed. Therefore are you aware of this?

And from that I am going to ask another question: is all life, living, dependent, like this - stimuli, reaction, and from that reaction other series of causes and effects, and therefore just endlessly moving in a vicious circle without an ending? I don't know if you follow all this?

Q: That is our life.

K: Now what are you going to do about it? To me - I wish I could talk about myself, I don't, it's no good. To depend on an external stimuli does not bring a quality of awareness that is clear - you understand? - that is sharp, intrinsic, in itself it is like a blossoming of a thing without any roots. You understand? So are you aware that you are being stimulated by the speaker to think differently, to act differently and therefore gradually be becomes the image, the symbol, the perfume, the goal, and therefore you are

just like another group of people stimulated by another beastly little guru, or another priest. That's all.

So I am asking, are you aware of this? And if you are, then you are no longer stimulated, therefore what is the quality of that awareness that is not the product of a stimuli? You understand? Come with me please, I want to move.

Q: I am aware of external stimuli off and on, then I say I must be aware.

K: No, not, "I must be aware". Are you aware, sir, of that noise of the aeroplane? You don't say, "I must be aware". Are you aware of the song of that stream? Are you aware of the shirt, or whatever the lady has put on, of the colour of it, of that person sitting next to you - what she looks like, what he looks like, whether they are suffering - are you aware of all this? Not, "I must be aware", that has no meaning.

Q: I am attached to myself.

K: Sir, look, you mean to say you are not aware of those hills and mountains?

Q: I am aware of them.

K: So you say, I am not aware because I am attached. However much I am attached to myself I look. Don't make this so childish for god's sake. All right, I see you can't run with something that is so good.

So instead of blaming the past, see that education, that society, the economic condition, the culture, the whole educational system has made our minds astonishingly dull and unaware. Right? Because it has said, depend, read books, go to - you follow. Now being aware of it naturally it drops off, if you are interested in it.

From there let's proceed.

Without blaming my parents or the past I see what I am. Now the problem then is: what am I to do with 'what is'? You understand? What am I to do with my neurotic thoughts, habits, with my superficial verbalization of life, my suffering, my inanities, my absurd trivialities, my angers, jealousies, greed, what am I to do, how am I to go beyond it? You understand, sir? Now tell me what to do.

Q: Nothing.

Q: Look at it.

K: The gentleman says, nothing. You say look at it. What do you mean by 'nothing'? Just accepting things as they are?

Q: Really look.

Q: Just be aware that you are not aware.

K: I was told yesterday that I was terribly patient! I can't be otherwise, I wish I could be otherwise with people who won't even look at what is put in front of them. Now what am I to do with 'what is'?

Q: Why does one ask the question of what to do if one is aware?

K: I am not aware, sir. Look, sir. Just listen. I become aware that I am violent, sexually, inwardly, my thoughts are violent and I am really an extraordinary bundle of angers, fury, jealousy, hurts - you follow? I see all that. Through awareness I see that. Now what am I to do with that?

Q: You can't do anything.

K: That's what the gentleman says here, you can't do anything. Therefore I accept it, I just go on being violent, and all the rest of it? Which is what you are all doing. This is what you are doing,

more or less, but that's the pattern. Now when you say, 'do nothing', what do you mean by that? You may have some truth in it when you say, do nothing, so let's examine it. What do you mean, do nothing?

Q: Make no effort.

K: You are telling me, don't make effort, are you?

Q: If you see the point of awareness then you are aware, and you avoid violence.

K: I can't avoid it, it is there. And it is making me behave - not me - behave, because it is there I behave violently. Please, sir, you haven't understood. May I explain? Through awareness I realize I am violent. Right? Now that is what is left with me through awareness. You understand? Now how am I to go beyond that violence? How do you answer it, sir, don't look to him, how do you answer it?

Q: You are that violence.

K: So what will you do?

Q: You see it is not separate.

K: So what will you do after you have seen violence is not separate from you, you are violent?

Q: Violence goes.

K: Then what sir, you can't just leave it there.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you doing this, or just verbally stating it? Yes sir?

Q: I wanted to ask first what is it to be aware?

K: No sir, we have been into that but perhaps you were not here before.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So, sir, what does it mean to be aware? Who is it that is aware? Is awareness something different from the observer? We went into that the other day very carefully. The observer is the past. When the past is aware it is still of the past. So in awareness, if you have gone into it, if you have enquired, if you have made the research, seen the beauty of it, in that awareness there is no observer at all because in that awareness there is no choice. That is something which you haven't found out and you will accept it and try to imitate it, but if you come to it, discover it for yourself, then how will the mind - please listen to this for a few minutes - how will the mind which has become so extraordinarily conditioned to violence - I am taking that as an example - how will that mind, or that 'what is', how will that deal with it? You understand?

Q: Violence is only when you are not aware, if you are aware it is not there.

K: Are you aware, really, of your violence without the observer? And you never say, "I am violent" - you understand. There is only violence, not, "I am violent". Are you in that position? Or there is violence and the entity who observes that there is violence? And I am afraid that is the fact. So there is a division between the observer and the observed, and you never realize the observer is the observed. And that can only take place when there is an awareness in which there is no choice, just observe.

Q: What can you do with that?

K: I am coming to that, sir. You understand, sir, every scientist has come to this point, 'what is', both human and otherwise. He says, "How am I to go beyond it?" You follow? This has been the

everlasting problem from time immemorial: I know I am violent, what am I to do, how am I to go beyond it? Not being able to go beyond it - please listen to this - they have invented an outside agency. You understand, sir. You say, god, society, compulsion, law, you know, all that. And if you see the absurdity of all that then you have the problem: there is violence and the entity who is violent. Right? So there is a division between the entity who is violent and what he calls violence. You follow? There is a division, the observer and the observed. And that has been a battle between those two, conflict. Now is the observer different from the observed? Find out, sir. Is the observer different from the observed which he calls violence, or are they both the same? What do you say sir?

Q: There is one part of myself which is violent and aware of it.

K: So one part is aware and the other part is not, and the one part that is not is aware of the other part which is violent, so there is a division, which is the observer and the observed. Put it ten different ways, it comes to the same thing. I see you can't go beyond it, so you are stuck with it.

Q: What can we do?

K: I will show you what you can do. For god's sake. I must be patient, I am usually patient but...

Look sir, I'll go into it if you don't mind. One has depended on outside stimuli to become aware - suffering, accidents, pain, books and so on. And I see - this mind sees what that stimuli has done - it made it dependent. Where there is dependence there must be possession and therefore more fear. If you depend on alcohol, LSD and so on you must have more of it, you know the whole

dependency. So I see where there is a dependence on a stimuli the mind becomes dull, utterly unaware, I see that. And therefore seeing it, seeing the truth of it, it goes away. As I see poison in a bottle I never touch it because I see the reality of it, as when I see a precipice I don't jump, I run away from it, or move away from it. So it is finished. Then through awareness it has been put away. Now I have become aware of myself, of my whole movement of myself, the activities of myself. One of the activities is violence. I realize I am violent. Is violence different from me? Or I am violence? Is this an actual fact, or a theory, or a verbalization of what I would like it to be? You are following all this? Or are you going to sleep? I'll shut my eyes and go on.

So what takes place? I am now questioning whether the observer is different from the thing he observes, which he has called violence, are the two, the observer and the observed, or to put it differently, the thinker and the thought, are they two different states, different entities? Obviously they are not. The thinker is the thought. Without thought there is no thinker. Without the word, which is necessary for expression is there a thinking?

Q: (In Italian)

K: No, no. He says - must I translate that? Look, sir, is the observer different from the observed? Let's stick to that, not introduce the word 'mind'. That is what he is objecting to. I have introduced the word 'mind', so I will take away that word. Is the observer different from the observed? I am questioning this, you understand. I have been aware of external stimuli, I have rejected it, now I am asking, I am aware and I have the problem of violence, and I am asking is violence different from me, from the



observer, or are they both the same? If they are different there will be conflict, one trying to overcome the other, trying to pacify the other, trying to become peaceful, and all that. So where there is division there is conflict. So I see that - between nations and so on. I see that. Therefore from that perception, insight, from that realization, the two are one, both logically, objectively and the realization of it is the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought. Now that is what I have realized, so what takes place? The observer is the observed, the experiencer is the experienced - I am changing it. Now what shall I do, me, or the mind, the fact that I am violent, in that there is no division. What takes place?

Q: Violence ceases when you realize you are violence.

K: So when you realize you are violent violence ceases. Is that a theory, is that an idea, or is a fact that you, who have listened to this thing, and have realized the experiencer is the experienced, the observer is the observed, therefore the observer, being violent himself, what takes place? Does violence cease?

Q: Violence ends.

K: I understand sir. Then violence dies, then violence ends.

Q: If you are violence and are aware of it, it ends.

K: Is this an idea, or a fact?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you sir. I am putting it in front of you. Just a minute, sir. Therefore I am asking you, are you translating what is being said into an idea, and then making that idea a reality and therefore the mind conforms to that idea, or do you see the fact, the truth of it, that the observer is the observed, the violence is the observer? Wait a minute. What takes place then? Watch it sir,

watch it. What takes place when there is a perception, clear, pure perception, unadulterated by thought, when there is a perception that the observer is the observed, violence - put it over there - realizes the observer in himself is violence. Then what takes place, non-ideationally but actually? I am only concerned with violence, what has happened to that violence?

Now may I go into it a little bit? Suddenly I get angry for some reason or other. And that anger has been remembered previously. I have known that anger previously, because I have known it, it names it as anger, the present anger. Please follow this a little bit. It names the present anger from the past memory. It does it because it is a habit, also in doing that it strengthens the past, it does it because it doesn't like something new, therefore it feels secure in the past, therefore by naming it as anger it gives to the mind, to the observer more security. So the present anger is absorbed by naming it into the past. The past is the observer, and the observer next time he is angry says, "Yes, that's anger again". So the observer is always keeping himself divided from the present, and that division brings conflict - I must not be angry, why shouldn't I be angry, it is reasonable to be angry under these circumstances, righteous anger and all the rest of it. And this division gives a certain occupation to the mind. So he sustains the observer. The observer sustains himself by recognition of the present by naming it. So the observer becomes stronger and stronger, healthier, more secure. And the battle goes on, in which we are educated, which we have accepted, to which we say, "That's right, always overcome anger, suppress, control it, shape it, use that energy in doing something else, in running up and down the street, do anything but

anger" and so on.

Now one sees all that by observing, by being aware, watching, one is aware of all this. Then out of that awareness you see there is no division between the observer and the observed. It is a trick of thought which demands security. And by being aware it sees the observer is the observed, that violence is the observer, violence is not different from the observer. Now how is the observer to end himself and not be violent? Have you understood my question so far? I think so. Right? The observer is the observed, there is no division and therefore no conflict. And is the observer then, knowing all the intricacies of naming, linguistically caught in the image of violence, what happens to that violence? If the observer is violent, can the observer end, otherwise violence will go on? Can the observer end himself because he is violent? Or what reality has the observer? Right sir? Is he merely put together by words, by experience, by knowledge? So is he put together by the past, so is he the past? Right? Which means the mind is living in the past. Right, obviously. You are living in the past. Right? No? As long as there is an observer there must be living in the past, obviously. And all our life is based on the past, memories, knowledge, images, according to which you react, which is your conditioning is the past. And living has become the living of the past in the present, modified in the future. That's all, as long as the observer is living. Now does the mind see this as a truth, as a reality, that all my life is living in the past? I may paint most abstract pictures, write the most modern poems, invent the most extraordinary machinery, but I am still living in the past.

So can the mind understand the danger, the destructive nature of

living which has become the past? That is the observer. When the observer is not, then what is there? Is there 'what is'?

Q: Yes.

K: The gentleman says, yes. Please sir, the observer is the observed. Right? We have made that perfectly clear. When the observer is the observed, the observer being the past, and when the observer is not, what is?

Q: The present.

K: What do you mean by that word 'present'?

Q: Something new.

K: What do you mean by the present? Is that just another invention, another verbalization of non-reality? Do you live in the present?

Q: I don't know.

K: Then why use the word 'present'? If one doesn't live it, it has no meaning. What does it mean to live in the present? The total understanding of the truth of the past, and that insight into the past which is so complex and yet which is so terribly simple. Then time as the past, time as the present, which is time as the past going through the past, modified in the future, that time element comes to an end, then the present is not present. You understand? It is something totally different.

Now, is there violence when the observer is not? Right, sir? So I have to understand myself as the observer. Right? Myself which is the result of time, age, thousands and thousands of years of experience, knowledge, the past, which has conditioned the mind, evolved to become what it is now, dependent on stimuli, running away from sorrow, battling within himself and outside, killing. I

saw a picture on the television the other day of the result of a bombing. There were children writhing in pain and the mother crying. Somebody's leg had been torn away, bleeding to death. You have seen it, I am quite sure. And that's our civilization, our marvellous culture - we paint pictures, build lovely cathedrals, and all the rest of it. And that's our life, that's our daily living moment. And as long as the observer exists which is the past we will have all this going on. Right?

So a mind that seeks truth must be free of the observer. Right? You listen to it, don't make a picture of it, don't make the speaker into an authority, or a stimulant, but see the fact for yourself. See it actually as it is. Then out of it comes a marvellous flower - a flower that blossoms in goodness, in an extraordinary movement of love, which is not emotionalism.

You know tomorrow if you are so inclined let us talk about a much more complex thing, of which you are all so frightfully frightened - the future and death. Right? Because to understand it, see what is involved in it, does bring freedom from death. We will go into tomorrow morning.

## **SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH AUGUST 1973.**

We said we would talk about this morning - and a lovely morning it is - about the question of love and death. Right? I think that is what we said we were going to talk about. I would like to talk about it, discuss it with you, as two persons involved in a very serious matter. Both of us are really deeply interested in this question, and find out the reality of it - not the verbal statement, not as an intellectual idea, something that you spin out intellectually, but actually find out if these things can be lived in daily life. Otherwise it has no value at all. So I would like to talk about it, discuss with you in that way.

I have never considered that love and death are two separate things. And for most of us death is the ending of life, or the ending for a new beginning. And to find out for ourselves whether the mind can ever be free from this thing called death and incarnate each day anew. And that is what we are going to discuss, if we may, this morning. Perhaps you think it is rather a gloomy subject to discuss on a morning when there are plenty of shadows and sunshine and shining leaves and sparkling waters, clear blue sky; but I don't think that it matters because it is part of existence, it is part of our daily life.

So how shall we talk about it? What does death mean to you? Have you ever considered the question at all? Or merely postpone that dreadful event and carry on, knowing all around you there is death. When you see all those victims of the recent wars, in the Far East - whether the Americans have perpetuated them or not, that is

not the point, because what the Americans have done it is our responsibility, it is not America, it is our responsibility because we are contributing to war all the time, to destruction. In buying whatever one buys you are contributing to war, the tax, each nation is supporting war and therefore we are all responsible for it. And when you see all that appalling suffering, misery, destruction, destroying marvellous trees by a bomb, and the poor child not knowing what it is all about, crying on the roadside, when you look at all that, what is death? You must have considered it, you must have thought about it. For most of us does death mean the ending of life - is that what we are frightened about? And what is our life, of which you are so frightened, what is our daily life to which we cling to so enormously?

Please do let's talk it over, don't let me make a long speech.

Q: Death is the cessation of desire.

K: Cessation of desire. Does that mean death to you, sir?

Sir, look, may I ask you, have you thought about it at all, have you enquired into it, have you made research into this enormous problem which has confronted man from the beginning of time? And you are confronted with it when you see a death in a coffin going down the road, there is death; when you see a brutal film and a man is shot, and that is death; and all the deaths that have happened in the wars. You must have looked at it all, history is full of deaths. What does it mean to you?

Q: As you have pointed out, we cling to this life, this life of some pleasures and great suffering, fears, anxieties and all the rest of it, and that is all we know. And we want to find something more.

K: Look, please, do consider it this morning: what does death mean to you - to you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Not only the ending of the body, what does death mean to you? Don't you know what death means?

Q: Death is the ending of what we are.

K: I am so sorry you don't know what death means. Sir, you see somebody die, put in a coffin, lots of flowers, put in a hearse and taken to the cemetery. You look at it. Have you ever looked at it, have you ever observed it? What does it mean that man dying, or a woman, in a coffin, don't you react to it? Don't you say, "What does it all mean, what does living mean, and what does dying mean?" Don't you ask that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are doing both sir. You see that death - your friend, your son, my brother, my uncle, whatever it is, I see death, a friend dying. And what does it mean to me, to you, somebody dying, a man killed so brutally and uselessly in Vietnam, what for? And what is living? What is life? Don't you ask this?

All right sirs, let's begin. What does living mean to you? The actual living, the daily living - the office, the factory, the quarrels, the ambitions, the everlasting struggle in relationship, the brutality, the violence, the hopes, the distractions, the pleasures, fears, all that is living, earning a livelihood. No? You agree to that?

Q: That is part of it.

K: Partly. What is the other part?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are dealing with what actually is going on - the



intellectual reasoning, the technology, the great immense progress that science has made, medicine, anthropology, and my daily living, sorrow, endless conflict, with occasional joy and pleasure, vast memories, remembrance of things that are gone - all that is my life, isn't it, sir? All that can be said is: I always live in the field of the known, in the field of the past. That's our life, isn't it? Not only partly, put everything in that area - your ambitions, your frustrations, your desire to be identified with something, your struggles, your conflicts, having no love, wanting to be loved, loneliness, the expression of your technological knowledge, whether you can do it better, your relationship with your wife, husband, girl, whatever it is, the immense fears, the things that are hidden, which you read about in books, and try to identify from the books what is happening to yourselves. Isn't that all your life, no?

Q: Life is time, and death perhaps is going out of time.

K: I don't know, that's your idea.

Q: I am asking.

K: We are going to find out madame. The moment you say, "perhaps life is time and death is going beyond time", it is like saying, the grass is green. Let us begin please. How we try to avoid facing facts.

Your life, and the life of human beings throughout the world, is a constant struggle, to earn a livelihood, to stay alive, disease, pain, trying to be moral, trying to behave properly, and rejecting behaviour and trying to do something totally different, worship this god, or that god, or be an atheist, or communist, socialist - that's all our life, isn't it, the whole field of it? And we cling to that, don't we - no? Because that is the only thing we know. Everything is a

speculation, isn't it.

So the mind avoids death because basically it doesn't know what is going to happen; basically, radically it says, "I know the living" - which is however troublesome, however painful, however pleasurable, however agonizing, destructive, that is all I know. And I hold on to that. I don't know the other: I can speculate, I can invent, I can rationalize, I can have marvellous beliefs about it, but the fact is I cling to the known. No? My furniture, and I am the furniture when I identify myself with that piece of furniture when I say, "It is mine", I have identified myself with that furniture, and therefore the furniture is me. No? When I have identified myself with my house, that house is me, and so on. So the mind is always seeking security - right - in relationship, in something permanent. Land is permanent, realistic, having a house, having a piece of furniture, calling that person my wife, or my husband, this sense of stability, security. The mind is always demanding it and that security is within the field of the known - right - the known being knowledge, experience, memory. Are we together in all this?

So one can say, by observing, that living is a great travail, with occasional flashes of something else, and death is the unknown. And so there is a battle between the living, the known, and death the unknown. Can we proceed, please. The ancient people, Egyptians and others, tried to carry over into the other world which they believed in, all their pieces of furniture, ivory, beautiful masks, lovely jewelry and everything, slaves, paintings. The Asiatics, including India, said, there is a permanent entity as the 'me', the soul, that will through righteous behaviour in the present, improve itself in the future live, so they believed in reincarnation -

next life. And by that they meant a better life - always a better life. And though they believed that, they said, what you sow you will reap in the next life. But all those were just words because their behaviour in daily life was just ordinary, brutal, envious, you know, all that. So the belief didn't matter a hoot. What mattered was their enjoyment, or their pleasures, what is in the field of the known. Now when you observe all that, from the ancient of time to the present day, those who believe in the resurrection, and those who believe in reincarnation, those who only worship the present, whatever that may be, or worship the State and so on, are always living in this life which is the known.

So let's begin with that. What is it that is known, to which we cling? You are following, sir? I cling to my life, why, what for?

Q: Because I am afraid of emptiness.

K: Do you know what that means, or is that just a lot of words? Are you clinging to that? Look, sir, why does the mind cling to the known and avoid that thing which is called death? The doctors, the medicines, can keep the body going for another fifty years, drug it when it is terribly painful, cancerous. And they can keep the body surviving much longer, with the agreement of the patient, or with the agreement of the relatives. Now why does the mind, your mind, your desire, everything, why does it cling to this?

Q: I think I enjoy my life.

K: Is that the only thing you have, you just enjoy your life and therefore you cling to it?

Q: I realize there is also pain.

K: So you realize there is pain, there is frustration, there is everything including enjoyment, so you cling to that. What makes

the mind cling to something which is so transient? You follow sir? I might have pleasure today, and out of that pleasure the pain comes tomorrow, and I know this enjoyment is so fleeting, gone, but yet I cling to it - why?

Q: It is the only thing I know.

K: Why does the mind cling to something that is so transient?

Q: It is the only thing we have got.

K: What have you got? You don't examine it even, you just state it. What is it you have got - old age, all the trouble of old age, disease, pain?

Q: It is the only thing we know.

K: I know that very well, sir. I am asking, why the mind, your mind, clings to something that you call the known, with all the bubbles, with all the pain, with all the fury inside that? Is it because the known gives it security?

Q: It is life.

K: So you call life this battle, this process, is that it?

Q: We do.

K: Yes, sir, I know we do.

Q: Your question is impossible to answer.

K: No. No, sir. If in death you found something permanent, secure, you would love that too, wouldn't you? So the mind wants security, however fleeting, however painful, however destructive, violent, enjoyable, all that, in that there is some security, some sense of survival, some sense of knowing. The known gives to the mind a sense of safety. Right? That's obvious, no? And so the mind clings to it. Now, wait a minute, can you know death in the same way as you know living, to which you cling? You understand?

Q: That is the problem. First we don't know death...

K: Just listen to what I have said before you ask that. I know what living is, I have lived it for thirty, forty, or eighty years. I know all the content of it, the beauty of the hills, the meadows, the movement of the leaves, the tranquil seas, I have known all that, seen everything of it, I know it, I have felt it, I have lived it, I have suffered, I have been through all kinds of experiences, moods, pleasures, pain. I know that very well, so I cling to that. Can I also know in the same way as I know this area, this thing called death, can I know that too? Then, you follow, if I know both then there is no problem. You understand what I am talking about? Have you understood what I have said, sir? Wait. Listen. Can I know as I know living, what it means - death? You understand my question?

Q: No.

K: Don't say, no. I know what living is. Right? We all know it. And can I also know this thing called death? I don't know, I am going to find out. I have never said, I will find out what living is, I have accepted it. You understand, sir. I have accepted it, with all the pain, with all the dirt, with all the squalor, with all the brutalities, fasting, starvation, everything, I know what all that means. Now can I also know this enormous thing, and mysterious thing, called death? Can I know it? And by asking that question I am going to find out. Right? I am going to enquire. Are you following? I am going to enquire. Now let's enquire. You understand, sir? I have really never enquired into living, into this whole process of existence, I have accepted it, I have suffered in it, I have gone through hell with it. And can I also know this thing called death, investigate it, because I have never investigated

living, only I have accepted it, and I have accepted death and never investigated it. You understand, sir? You see I have a problem: I have not investigated living, what it really means, I have not investigated what death means. Right?

So we are going to investigate both. You understand? The living and the dying. Is all existence, is all living this battle - battle means pleasure, pain, all that? In enquiring, you understand, I see that is not living, that is a terrible state to be in. Right sir? Oh, for god's sake, come with me. I have investigated it, I have explored it, I say, why should I live, why should human beings live this way, this is so totally wrong? And I will find a way of living entirely different from that. My investigation into the living, into existence has shown me the way that one lives, the way that one thinks, has no meaning. And by investigating very, very deeply, I find out that there is a meaning entirely different. I find out for myself, I have gone into it. And I say death, I must also enquire into it, I must find out what it really means - not be frightened, not put it away, not have explanations, say there is incarnation - nothing. I am going to enquire, find out. Right sir. Are you following what I am saying? It's too hot to repeat all this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. I said a few flashes of something else, which is joy, pleasure, enjoyment, delight, kindness, generosity. I included all that, it is not something else outside. Must everything be explained. Look sir, let's proceed.

As a human being, living in this world, one has investigated into what is so-called living. This living is a constant pursuit of pleasure, avoiding pain, laborious work year after year, the

responsibility of a family, sexual pleasures, the pain, the birth, the frustrations, the agonies, the despairs, the repentance, the forgiveness, all that is what we call living. And I won't accept that as living. We human beings have accepted it, go with it, but I say, this is not living. So I have investigated it, gone into it, found in investigating my mind has kept without any motive, therefore no direction, therefore it has found a meaning - whatever that meaning is - leave it for the moment. And I have been frightened of death because I have never enquired into it, gone into it, found out what it means. And I want to find out, and I have gone into it. You follow? Now my mind, this mind, has enquired into the living, and what it means to die. So it says, both living and dying are the same. I say that, not you. Right? So let us enquire in both fields - the living field, the living area and the dying area. You understand now. Don't let's go back and forth. Have you understood my question, please?

Have you enquired deeply into the meaning of living? I know you have accepted living as pain, you know, all that. Is that living?

Q: You have to die to it.

K: No, sir, don't die to anything, just watch it sir. Enquire, find out. You have got a mind, you have got a tremendous experience, you have got all kinds of knowledge, find out whether this is living - going to the office, you understand sir, this terrible thing man has made of life. That is not living. And you can find the meaning of living only when you discard totally the structure which man has put together - man, woman, all that. Right? Oh, come on. So unless you find the meaning of living deeply, and therefore merely accept existence as it is, then you are incapable of enquiring into death.

You follow what I am saying? Because in the enquiry of living you will find how to enquire into death. They are not two separate things.

Q: We don't put passion into all this, into this enquiry, as you do, we just play with it. How do we get that passion?

K: Sir, you are missing the whole thing. Listen, sir, please listen. Don't ask what to do, don't say, I must reject, I must accept. The life that you lead, is that a living? Is that a way of an intelligent, sane, human being, is that the way to live? What do you say? Why don't you answer that?

Q: It is not living.

K: All right, if it is not living what are you going to do about it? Do you accept this way of living? If you don't, what is the next step?

Q: Dying to living.

K: Don't quote me please.

Q: I want to find out another way of living.

K: How do you find out? If this is not the way of living, and you want to find another way of living, how do you find out? You can only find out by enquiring, can't you? Through enquiry, which means a mind that is capable of looking without any direction, that means without any motive. When you have a motive it is directed, and therefore distorted. Right sir? So that mind must enquire into the living and say, this is a terrible way to live, it is a meaningless life that one leads, to enquire into that you must have a mind that says, I have no motive in my enquiry, therefore I am free to enquire. Right? Like a scientist, he looks through a microscope or whatever he does, and he doesn't come with a motive, he is only



looking at what is taking place under the microscope, or whatever he does. So similarly I have this problem. I will not accept this way of living under any circumstances. I don't want to live that way. Therefore my mind says, how am I to enquire into this, is there a different way of living? To find a different way of living, and therefore a different meaning to existence, I must come to it with a mind that says, I am not prejudiced, I am not frightened, I don't know what is going to happen, but I am going to find out. That means a mind that has no fear what it is going to discover. Right?

So in the same way the mind has to enquire into death. And if you are frightened you can't enquire. Right? If you say, "Oh, I must survive, I must have a next life to write a beastly little book", or become a little better - it has no meaning. My mind - please listen to this - to enquire into these two aspects of living it must be capable of enquiring without a motive, it must also be capable of looking, enquiring, making deep exploration, there must be no fear. Right, sir? So that is the primary importance in enquiry - no motive and no fear. Right?

May I go into this a little more? Don't accept a thing that the speaker is saying. He has no authority. He is not your guru. You are not his followers. Right? We are enquiring.

The way we are living has no meaning, and I want to find out what is the meaning of living, if there is a different way of living. I see there is a different way of living when there is no division in action, in thought, in the observer and the observed. You are following all this? When there is no division, I am not a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Jew, or an Arab. Right? I won't belong to any sect, any group, or commit myself to any action. Right? So what do I

do? I live somehow. Living, earning some money, having some clothes, some shelter becomes irrelevant, I will somehow find it, I won't make that into the most primary thing. So I begin to enquire. I see the truth that where there is division in myself, in my action, in the division of tradition, of nationality, governments, there must be conflict. That is an absolute truth - right - not as an idea, in myself. Thinking one thing, doing another, that is a contradiction, division, therefore it will inevitably produce conflict. And that's our whole life - different varieties but that is the whole pattern. Now I say to myself, I enquire, why does this division exist, is it artificial, inherited, traditional, reasonable, logical, or is it something godgiven? I see it is none of that. Thought has created this; thought has created this division, both outwardly and inwardly. So I say thought. Right? You are following all this, please. Thought: man has lived by thought, and thought has created it. Thought has put together all this terrible world, with their priests, with their gods, with their social structures, you follow, the whole thing.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I include all that, the whole thing. Of course. I may have a feeling, unless I recognize that feeling there is no feeling. I won't go into that for the moment.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is there?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the tiger kills the deer, that is its way of living. The deer may object to it. That is the natural way of living for the tiger. Right? Please, watch this in your life, not tigers and nature, look at

in yourself.

So I see thought has bred this world, made the world what it is, and I am part of that world, and that world is me. And thought is responsible. So I am concerned now with the investigation of thought. I see thought is necessary otherwise I can't speak, thought is necessary to drive a car, thought is necessary to function in a factory or in a business, thought is necessary in the employment of the knowledge which I have acquired. I see in that area thought is necessary. I see thought is totally unnecessary in relationship, with its image. Therefore is it possible to live with thought functioning in a certain area, and thought not functioning in relationship, because thought is not love? Right? Oh, come on, I must move.

I see all that so I have found something. I have found a deep meaning, I have found a way of living where thought functions normally, objectively, logically, sanely, and there is no psychological movement at all - the psychological movement as the 'me', which is put together by thought, by words, by experience, by knowledge. So the psychological entity is not. So I see that is the way to live. I am not telling you how to live. That is the way to live, for knowledge to function efficiently, and it cannot function efficiently when the psychological element is projected in the field of knowledge. And there will be battle always as long as there is the 'me', the self. The self is put together by thought - the word, the remembrance, the attachment, all that is the basis of thought. So I see yes, I have discovered that, that is the way to live, not as an idea, but as an actuality. Right? Not for you. If you have lived that way, if you have enquired, gone into it profoundly, it is yours, then we have relationship, then it is real fun, great delight to discuss,

talk over the real thing.

In the same way I want to enquire what is death. I don't know what it means. I know what people have said about it. My son has died, my wife, husband, boy, girl, I know that. I have shed tears, felt lonely, the misery, the appalling sense of wastage of life. Right? So I am going to find out what death means. Can my mind enquire into something that it doesn't know? I don't know what death means. I have seen it. I have seen death touch every life from the poorest to the most famous, from the most indulgent, stupid, superficial to the man who thinks he is very deep, death has touched everybody, everything. Right?

So I am going to find out, my mind says, what is death? I have seen death, I have lived with it, I have watched it, I have seen my son, my brother, die with disease, or killed by a bomb. I have lived in the same room, I know what it means for another to die. Right? I am not frightened. That is the fundamental thing in enquiry. Are you coming with me? Of course you can't. I am not frightened. And having no fear I have no beliefs, whether the entity lives or doesn't live after dying. I am going into it. The 'me', who is so afraid of death, the 'me' is the known. The 'me' is the known when it is attached to the furniture, to the house, to the family, to the name, to a country, the 'me' is the known. And that 'me' is frightened when it enquires into death because it sees it might come to an end. I don't mind my body coming to an end, but that inward sense of the 'me'. And I have given lots of names to it, the soul, the atman, and so on and so on. All put together by thought. Right?

So the mind is not frightened because it has seen that there is

nothing permanent. Right?

Q: I see all this intellectually, I see it but fear exists.

K: Therefore what does that mean? You don't see it! Obviously, sir. You don't say that: I see the precipice and I will jump. You don't say when you see a danger, "I see danger" and go on with the danger, do you? Come on sirs.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, may I say something to cover your point. When you hear a statement you translate it into an idea, which everybody does, and then there is a division between the idea and 'what is'. Right? Now if you could listen without the formulation of an idea, or a conclusion, then there is only 'what is'. You understand, sir. Can you listen without forming a conclusion?

Q: It is very difficult.

K: That is real active enquiry. So I see, the mind sees the 'me' is not permanent, it has just been put together by transient thought. The 'me' is just a series of words, memories, which have no substance, reality. The mind now is not frightened, it is going to enquire what death means.

What does death mean? Dying to the known? And if I don't die to the know what happens? You understand, sir, my question? What happens when the mind doesn't die to the known? The known is the 'me', with all the nature and the structure of the 'me', with all that. If it doesn't die to that known what happens? It goes on, doesn't it. Like a stream - please listen to this - like a stream that is going on. In that stream all human beings are caught. Right? Are you following this? But they never said there must be an ending of the known. They accept it. They can't entirely get out of

it - they try to put one foot out of it, one foot in it, but they are all caught in that stream of so-called life, which continues because the mind has never pulled itself out of it. So - please listen - when there are the seances, the mediums, when there are manifestations of your husband, wife, children, and all the rest of it, it is from that stream. Are you following all this? Are you swallowing all this? You see what I am saying and you are so easily accepting. As long as you are caught in - and you are caught in that trap, in that stream, you may die, but that stream is the world and the world is you, and when you get in touch with your elder brother when he is dead, it is there, from that stream. Therefore a man who is free of that stream, he can never be caught by a medium. You understand? Yes, sir, think it out, go into it, you will see the truth of it.

Now what does it mean to die? Because I have seen death. I know I will die - disease, old age, and all the trouble of old age. All that, dying. The organism, misused for so many years through drugs, drink, indulgence, the misery of disease, pain, and ending up in being drugged, kept alive for a few years longer. What has happened? And that is what you call death. I say to myself, that is such an absurd way of dying. Right? I know the organism will die, keep it as healthy as possible, you know, all the rest of it. I know it is going to die. Is that what the mind is frightened about? What is it frightened about? Frightened about losing the identity with the furniture. Right? The furniture is the wife, the book, the photograph, the money, all that, which is the embodiment of furniture. Are you following all this? So the mind asks, what am I attached to the furniture for? You understand sir, furniture includes the whole of it. I am using that one word to convey the whole of

the urge to possess, attachment, domination, all that is included in that word, it is a very good word, furniture. I do not know if you have not friends who are terribly attached to a piece of wood, beautifully shaped, handed down from parent to parent, an old antique. You are that. Or the beautiful car which you have just bought. So why does the mind identify itself with that? And therefore being identified with that, that is the mind. Right? Is that what the mind is frightened about, losing the furniture? Enquire, sir, enquire.

Why does the mind desire identification with something - with my wife, with my girl, with my boy, with my house, with all the things that I have remembered, the pleasure, the pain - why is the mind so identified with it, and therefore the mind has become that - why? Don't throw up your hands, we are going to enquire, find out. Is it because it has to be occupied with something? You are following? Occupied with the house, with sex, with knowledge, it doesn't matter what it is, it has got to be occupied, because if it is not occupied what takes place? You are following all this? I am occupied with that furniture, I keep it polished, I look after it, it is mine, nobody must touch it, you know all the rest of it, it is occupied with that - it may be occupied with sex, or with cooking, or with god, with the State, they are all the same, occupation of every kind is the same. There is no noble or ignoble occupation. We are just discussing occupation. Ignoble occupation may produce one result, and noble occupation may produce another result. We are not talking of the results, we are talking about why the mind needs to be occupied. You see when it is occupied it feels it is alive, it is moving, it is working, it has a sense of reality.

Right? It's a dialogue on my part, with myself. And I say, why is it occupied? Because it says, when I am not occupied, what happens?

Q: It doesn't exist.

K: Wait. You are saying the wrong thing. He says it doesn't exist anymore. You are saying the wrong thing. You haven't explored it, you have already come to a conclusion. Why is it occupied? It sees it is occupied because if it is not occupied what happens? You see the answer? It deteriorates, because you are occupied your mind is deteriorating. You understand? There is nothing fresh in that occupation, therefore your minds, because they are occupied so everlastingly, are deteriorating, becoming dull, soft, not active, vital.

Q: Non-occupation is...

K: Sir, I didn't say non-occupation. Please listen. He put it that way and you are taking him up. It is a wrong answer. I said the mind is occupied. I know that. I see every mind around me is occupied. I must be aware, I must think of god, I have become a Catholic, I must begin from morning until night to do this, that and the other thing, I am a Hindu I must - you follow? I am a socialist. I am occupied - earning a livelihood and so on. Now why is the mind occupied? What happens to the mind that is not occupied? Have you found that out?

Q: It sees.

K: Have you found out for yourself what happens to a mind that is not occupied?

Q: It is empty.

K: How do you know?

Q: I know.



K: You know it.

Q: It is empty when it is not occupied.

K: All right. What is wrong with that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh, you people just throw out words. Sir, what happens to the mind that is not occupied? Look sir, you are not answering my question because you are dealing with ideas, not with reality, not with actuality, which says, "I have explored it, gone into this thing, what happens to a mind that is occupied, what happens to a mind, life that is occupied with pain, pleasure, with success, with boredom, with loneliness, problems." If it is not occupied with problems, is it an empty life? If it is not occupied with pain, pleasure, with your gods, and all that, is it a deteriorating life?

Q: No.

K: Don't say, no, you don't know about it. You are just indulging in words. Therefore when the mind is not occupied is that an empty mind, a dull mind, a deteriorating mind? Find out! Test it for yourself. Put it to the test: say, I am occupied with what, money, or sex, or pleasure. If you are not occupied what happens with money? Then it picks up another occupation, doesn't it. And it says I want to find out never to be occupied, what takes place?

Q: It is filled with love.

K: Who fills it? You know, sir, or lady, somebody wrote me a letter the other day saying that when I talk about sir, I am only concerned with man, and therefore I am not a feminist. And I must be a little odd because I am always referring to man. So crazy the world is, isn't it!

Look sir, or lady, my life, your life, one's life, has been

occupied with the kitchen, with the furniture, with the husband, with sex, with children, earning a livelihood, pain, pleasure, anxiety, dread, disappointment, hurt. That's occupation. You have never said to yourself, all right, I know it is occupied, what happens if I am not occupied about anything?

Q: I don't know because I have never thought about it.

K: Why haven't you? So you are occupied and you die being occupied. And that is all you call living, therefore dying and living is occupation. You never say, all right, I know I am occupied, I will find out what it means not to be occupied. You are occupied because occupation is one of the activities of the mind which is the 'me'. Right? I am occupied with my god, I am occupied with my State, with my - all the rest of it. That occupation is a form of identification of myself with that, and that gives me the feeling that I am alive, the 'me' is fully active. Now I see and I have looked at it, and I have seen what a terrible thing occupation is. Right? I have seen it, not just verbalized it. Therefore what happens to a mind that is not occupied?

Q: I don't know what happens to a mind that is not occupied.

K: It's a lovely day, isn't it.

Q: Perhaps something new.

K: Just words. Sir, I am hungry and you give me words to eat. So I don't want your words, I want food. You are not hungry, therefore you are filling your hunger with words. I want to find out what happens to a mind that is not occupied ever, not just one occupation, no occupation.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I give it up. I want to share this with you, because it is only

sharing together that we discover. But you don't share. You are already full of ideas therefore you have nothing to share. If you are somewhat enquiring, somewhat empty, somewhat searching, then you will share. But you are not unfortunately, therefore you are throwing out words, words, words.

So I ask myself what is a mind that is occupied, and what happens to it if it is not?

Q: If you cut out occupation what is there left?

K: I did not say, cut off occupation. You see how you have translated it. Sir, I very carefully went into all this. I am not going to go over it again for your inattentance.

Q: When my mind is aware there is a feeling.

K: What happens to a mind that has enquired into life - the living - the living which has been so occupied from morning until night, and at night dreaming and the interpretation of those dreams. It has been occupied endlessly. There is never a moment of non-occupation. And it is also occupied with death - what will happen, and therefore there too there is never a moment of non-occupation. So the enquiry is what happens when the mind is not occupied at all? What takes place? Is it emptiness? That emptiness, is it degenerating? Is it emptiness at all? Or there is only observation and nothing else? And that observation is not the occupation of the observer occupied with the observed observing. What is there? If there is only observation then what takes place? What is there to observe? The trees, you, me, what is there to observe? Is there anything to observe? Or only there is absolutely nothing. And that is the fear of everybody, to be absolutely nothing. And because you want to be everything you are occupied with everything. And all

your problems arise from that - the total of not being, nothing.

Now if you have gone into it with the speaker, and shared it, then you will see that life and love and death are the same thing.

And the understanding of it is the understanding of that extraordinary thing called life, the living - not this living but living entirely differently, living without occupation, therefore no conflict. And a mind that is not in conflict is free from death.

That's enough for this morning, I have talked as usual.

## **SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 7TH AUGUST 1973.**

This is the last dialogue and I suppose you have had enough of it too. So what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: Can we talk about the world is you and you are the world?

Q: What is the responsibility in relationship?

Q: And our responsibility for society and education.

K: I thought we had been through all that. I thought we went into all this not only during these discussions, dialogues, but also in all the seven talks that we have had here - didn't we.

Look, sir, this is the last dialogue, at least for this year. But I go on with the dialogues all over the world, you won't. Now what shall we discuss this morning which we have not gone into thoroughly and deeply?

Q: Would you go into the question of what is occupation? What do you mean by occupation, the totality of it.

K: But I went into it the other day.

Q: Can we keep silent for some time?

Q: Can we go into this question of observation, awareness, and meditation? And could we go into it much more deeply and widely.

Q: Could we end up with creation?

Q: What is a serious mind?

Q: Could we talk over the danger of putting questions from an intellectual level?

K: We have got it all now.

Q: I want to understand why when this world is so rotten, that science and art, yoga and all that danger is taught in the schools in

which K's name is mentioned.

K: What is it really you want to discuss this morning?

Q: Could you discuss the question of livelihood, which we have not completely understood?

Q: It is only through the transformation of the present mind, creating a new human being, that will bring about a new society.

K: We have been through all this, haven't we.

Q: Laughter is a way out of the trap in which we are caught.

K: Now what shall we discuss?

Q: What is true love?

K: I give it up! We have been through all this more or less, pretty widely and deeply in all the talks and discussions, and at the last discussion you say, what is true love.

Q: You have used the word wisdom, can't you use the word happiness, and what is happiness?

K: I give it up!

Q: The other day you talked about freedom and fear, and I would like to go much more into freedom in relation to fear.

Q: I would like to know what real insanity is.

K: I don't think one has to go into that, you can watch it!

Now, sir, just a minute. Can we discuss relationship with regard to behaviour, which includes all this, what is behaviour, and what value has orderly behaviour in our life and therefore expressed in the outer world. That is one problem. The other is, to find out if there is something really sacred in our human living. And it was also mentioned, what is the mind that is capable of living in the world, with all its problems, livelihood and so on, and also keep one's total sanity, and discover for ourselves if there is something

really transcendental. That includes, I think, all the questions.

Right? And that includes what is a serious mind.

So what is behaviour in relation to the world, and in relation to our immediate relationships, and what value has this behaviour? Does behaviour come, flower, out of order? That is one problem we are going to discuss. And the other is, what relationship has this order in ourselves, if we have that order, with regard to the world outside of us? What is the interaction between the man who is bringing about order within himself and with regard to the world in which he has to earn a livelihood, in which he has to do all kinds of things, what relationship has this behaviour, which is order, in that? And can the human mind ever find out, or come upon something which is not transient, which is not put together by thought, which is something totally sacred? And in the understanding of order, coming upon that, may be the way of meditation. Now would that include all your questions? Don't shatter it all at once. Do we all agree to that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Right, let's proceed. No? What is behaviour? Is it the outcome of virtue? Is it the outcome of a mechanical order? Is it the outcome of a trained mind which has understood punishment and reward and therefore behaves? You have understood my question? We are enquiring together, talking over together as two friends concerned with this question of behaviour. We realize that there must be order in the world, and that order born out of our order because we are the world. Now is that order a mechanical process? Right? Mechanical in the sense a practice, a pursuit of a pattern, pursuit of an idea, pursuit of a slogan, and in conforming

to that pattern, slogan, sanction and so on there is a mechanical order, and out of that mechanical order behaviourism becomes very superficial. And is that order? You have understood my question? So let us talk about it a little.

Most of us live a very disorderly life. And to us an orderly life is the persistent, consistent following of a particular pattern. Right? And I say to myself, is that order. That is, does order come about, out of which behaviour, through a mind highly disciplined, highly conforming to an idea, to a conclusion, is that order and behaviour? Please, won't you join me? Don't say, no, or yes. Most of us behave within a certain pattern, a framework, and one sees that is not order, that is mere mechanical repetition. So what is virtue in relation to behaviour? Right? And is virtue a mechanical thing? One is vain, one practises not to be vain, one endeavours through time, or days, to cultivate humility. And one hopes through that a certain form of behaviour will come. Is that order? You are following all this? Is virtue a repetitive pursuit of a certain idea?

Q: Ordinarily it is so.

K: And is that really virtue? And if it is a mechanical thing, then our behaviour will also be mechanical and therefore superficial. And therefore our relationship to the world, and the world's relationship to us is inevitably superficial. Right? So one must find out if one's behaviour, one's behaviour, is mechanical, in the sense we have described it; or is that behaviour - I mean by behaviour conduct, conduct in our relationship, conduct economically, socially, conduct which is the outcome of a totally different kind of order, which is not mechanical. Right? That's what we are discussing.



As that gentleman pointed out, most of us behave automatically - right? - behaviour being for most of us a reaction, and action out of that reaction. Right? And is order a disciplined conformity to a pattern of idea? Please, discuss with me, I am talking to myself.

Sir, may I put it this way. What to you is order? What is to you disorder? You understand? What is order, and what is disorder? What is disorder to you?

Q: Lack of permanency.

K: Sir, you are entering into theories again. What is disorder to you in your life, are you aware of disorder in your life? And what is that disorder? Are you aware that you live in disorder? Yes?

Q: Yes.

K: I am glad. Now what is that disorder to you, what does it mean?

Q: Self-interest.

K: Please stick to one thing. Are you aware that one's life is disorderly? And what do you mean by that word disorderly? Sir, it is no good discussing this thing theoretically, abstractly. It would be worthwhile to discuss directly, taking ourselves, and looking at ourselves and seeing for ourselves what our life is. And you say, our life is disorder, and what do you mean by disorder?

Contradictory desires? Contradictory actions? Contradictory beliefs? Contradictory endeavours, purposes? Would you call all that disorder, which is contradiction - let's keep to that word, contradiction - within oneself? Having a contradiction in our desires, in our thoughts, in our purposes, in our resolutions, you say that is disorder. Right? Do you go along from there?

All right, what is order then?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sweeping everything under the carpet, is that order?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, sir, you have told me disorder is a way of living in which there is contradiction, in action and so on. Then I am asking you, what is order. Is order sweeping everything which you think is disorder, putting it in a drawer and closing it, and seeking order? You have understood my question? Sweep it under carpet and then go out and find order.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir that is what we are saying in different words. So we say that is disorder. Then what is order to you, is it the opposite of disorder?

Madame, would you mind stopping taking notes because this is application to yourself and not to somebody else.

Now what is order? The opposite of disorder?

Q: The ending of disorder.

K: Now how do you end disorder? I agree with you, sir, I think it is. Order comes about naturally when there is no disorder. Now how do I, who live in disorder, end that and not create a conflict, an opposite, which then becomes the contradiction, all that, not to enter into another trap of disorder? Now how am I to be free of disorder?

Q: Face it.

K: Are you doing it? Don't, please, theorize. Are you facing the disorder that you live in your daily life now? Then how do you face it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you doing it?

Q: Trying to.

K: There is no question of trying. You see you are all so easily pushed with words. I live in disorder. I am fully aware of it. And you tell me, look at it, observe it, get familiar with it, know all the intricacies of disorder, learn about disorder. Right? So I am learning. That is, I learn by observing disorder, and I must find out what I mean by learning, otherwise - please listen to this - otherwise what I have learnt I will then try to apply, and therefore that breeds disorder. Right, you are following this? So I must learn about disorder; learning must be a constant renewal of observation, without the accumulation of observation. Have you understood this? Have I made this clear? No. I'll repeat it in a different way.

We are now talking about what is learning. I want to learn, the mind wants to learn about disorder. It observes. And from that observation it has learnt something, what it has learnt becomes the knowledge, and - please listen - it has become knowledge and with that knowledge next time it observes. So it is observing from the past. Therefore it is not learning. Therefore learning means a constant renewal of observation without a conclusion. Have you got this?

Q: I have understood this very well. I have understood it intellectually, and there I am, left with what was before.

K: Now why do you do that? Why do you translate what is being said intellectually as an idea, why do you do that? Why can't you listen to what the poor chap is saying? Why don't you listen to find out, not intellectually come to a conclusion? That requires attention, that requires a certain order in your mind, to say, "Look,

I am going to listen. I am not concerned with a conclusion, I want to find out what he is talking about." But if you draw a conclusion from what he is talking about you are not listening. That is simple. That means you are not listening. We have known each other since 1940, so we can go on.

Look sir, it is very important to find out what it means to learn. Either it is a learning in order to have knowledge from which future action can take place. That's simple. Or there is a learning which is never accumulating. I want to learn about disorder and there are so many disorders I have in my life, there are so many contradictory desires, purposes and so on, I want to learn about them. So I must find out what it means to learn about a thing that is constantly changing, constantly in movement. As it is a living thing the mind must come to it and look at freshly, mustn't it. If it is a dead thing I can look at it with dead eyes, but if it is a living thing the mind, or the observation must constantly be moving with the living thing. Right?

So I have found out one thing: learning means constant observation about a living thing and therefore if there is a conclusion then observation is limited. Right? I have said this, now you chew on it, find out.

Now I am learning, I am learning about disorder. I observe it, I see that I say one thing, do another, talk about helping and I am lazy, and a dozen activities of disorder. And in the observation of disorder I see without any motive, or without any intention, slowly the flowering of order takes place. That is, I have observed very carefully what is disorder in my life. I have observed it without drawing any conclusions, without any desire to store up a memory

from which I direct the learning. So my mind is free to observe disorder; in that enquiry order comes naturally. Now what is that order which is really virtue because it is a living thing, what is that order? What is the relationship of that order to the world about me? Can I go on, have we understood so far? Are we sharing this at all, a little bit?

Q: Yes.

K: I am asking if there is order. My mind now has really lived in order and I say, what is the relationship of that order to the world - the world in which I have to earn a livelihood, the world in which I have to act, acquire money and so on, what is the relationship of that order which has come about naturally in the mind, how does it act in the world? Right? That is what you are talking about in earning a livelihood. Right? Are you following all this? Now what is the relationship, what is the action of that order in this world?

Q: We can't know until we do it.

K: Aren't you doing it now? Please, what is the action of that order?

Q: Understanding what is happening at the moment.

K: Now at the moment, this is the moment, not at the moment there. This is the moment. What have you understood at this moment, how to act, or what is action when there is order, when there is the cessation of disorder and therefore order, and therefore a sense of great intelligence in operation? So I am finding out in intelligence there is no disorder. Where there is intelligence there is order. Now what is that intelligence to do, or how does it act in this world? I have found out this intelligence, this intelligence has

come about. Now I have to go out and earn a livelihood, what does that intelligence tell me to do? You understand, I have to act, I have to have bread, butter, I have to clothes, shelter, how does that intelligence operate?

Q: It is sharing.

K: Look sir, I have learnt, I have observed and I am learning what intelligence is, which is order, which is the highest form of virtue. It is a marvellous thing, if you understand it. And that intelligence has to earn a livelihood, it has to go out and earn. What will it do? The intelligence will dictate what action must take place, mustn't it? Intelligence will tell me what to do - not disorder. I wonder if you have understood this.

Q: I think we have divided the world into the mental world and the technological world.

K: Sir, I have said - I won't go back to it, if you don't mind, we have been through all that - we said the world with all its technology, art, science, colleges, universities, the world, all that world is me. I have created that world. That world is me, we are that world and that world is us. Don't let's go back.

I am observing the disorder. Order comes with its intelligence, and that intelligence has to function in this world. Now how is that intelligence going to earn a livelihood, earn a livelihood in which there is no competition. Right? It won't compete, it is not ambitious, it is not seeking the pleasures of possession and money. But it has to have money, it has to have shelter, clothing. So can you eliminate the causes of disorder which are competition, envy, the desire to be successful, you know, the whole activity of disorder? Are you getting it?

Q: You might find something that you want to do because you want to do it and for no other reason.

K: You and I are talking of two different things, sir. The question is, find out what you like to do and then there will be no disorder. What an easy way out, isn't it? Can I find out what I want to do? And what is it that I want to do? Write poems? Paint pictures? Go round the world begging? I want to write a book, paint. I want to write a book: what is my motive for writing a book? To earn a livelihood? So what is my motive which tells me I want to do this?

So let's proceed. What is important is whether your enquiry, your observation of this disorder has brought about this intelligence, and that intelligence then will function in this world intelligently which will not create disorder. You have understood? If you haven't that intelligence then you are bound to create disorder, whatever you do - not only in yourself but in the world.

So behaviour then - behaviour, conduct, behaviour means conduct, conduct from a self-interested, self-centred activity is one thing; conduct of a mind that is really intelligent is another. Right? For most of us conduct is self-interest, or conduct is the activity of the self in relation to another, which must inevitably create disorder. So I have found this out. And I mean that I have found it, you understand, like finding a marvellous jewel. And then I have found out what my action is in life. And that intelligence in action is never contradictory. That is one thing.

The next is, the next question is, as we talked about: is there anything sacred in life, in life not only in the living of daily life but beyond it, is there anything that is really holy, untouched by the

human mind? Aren't you interested in this - are you really? I don't know. I want to find out, not caught up in an illusion, not in a vision, not in some kind of marvellous experience which then I would call sacred, but I want to find out. I want to find out not according to my temperament - please listen to this - not according to my temperament, my idiosyncrasy, my wishes, my desires, because they are the outcome of my conditioning, and if any of those activities exist they must inevitably lead to illusion. Right? So I must be astonishingly - the mind must be astonishingly sensitive to illusions and visions, experience. And I see very clearly the danger of it.

So my enquiry is based on a freedom which will not direct my enquiry in any direction. Right? Have we understood each other? Are we going along with each other? Because the mind can so easily deceive itself. I was told the other day by an Italian scholar that in the old days of Mesopotamia where St Paul wandered about, he saw a great vision, and this scholar said, "You know in those days when you had a sunstroke it was considered a great blessing because the sun blessed you. All life came from the sun". So this gentleman, St Paul, had a sunstroke and saw this marvellous vision and that converted him totally to Christianity and all the rest of it. You understand what I am talking about?

So one has to be extraordinarily alert to every form of deception. In the enquiry if there is anything sacred, holy the mind must be so sensitive to any deception. Right? Because one can invent so many things, one can have visions galore. One can have experiences multiplying by the thousand, but they are all based on a conditioning of the mind. So the mind says, I am going to watch,



I am going to observe very closely and never be deceived, therefore tremendous honesty. You understand? Right?

Then is there anything sacred? People have said there is, and there is nothing, just live for this life and make a good thing of it, if you can't bear with it, or identify yourself with the State, with the leader, with the big brother, you know, all that. The mind is also very alert to all that. Right? Then it says, now I want to find out because without coming upon that life has very little meaning, because life then becomes a transient, meaningless thing - being born, suffering, joy, passing pleasures, anxieties, you know all that, and death. And without finding out what is really sacred, if there is such a thing, life has no meaning whatsoever. And in the finding of it, that may be the unifying factor of all life. You understand?

Unifying factor of all life - the life of nature, the life of animals, all living things, that may be the one unifying factor which will bring human beings and nature and all of us together. You understand?

So my enquiry must be total - you understand? It must be total, that is, my enquiry into behaviour, order, virtue, disorder, relationship with the world and with my wife, husband, girl, boy. It must be an enquiry that includes the whole of my living, not just part of it. So I have enquired into my relationship with you who are my wife, my child, my son, my brother, my husband, and that enquiry lead to relationship with me and the world, and therefore enquiry has revealed that the world is me, and me is the world - the reality of it, not just the verbal statement of it, because the description is not the described.

So I have enquired into behaviour because that is very important, how the mind behaves in every direction, in the world

of science, in the world of business, in the world of labour, in the world of writing a book - conduct, whether it is self-centred conduct, self-interest, or conduct based on identification with something greater. This activity of the self brings about disorder. So I have seen it, understood it, and my enquiry now is, having enquired into all this, my enquiry says, is there anything sacred?

I also have enquired what it means to love, and the mind finds that love isn't pleasure, love isn't mere desire, love isn't merely the pleasures of sex, or the pleasures of imagination, the pleasures of ideas. That has led to immense disorder. And also you enquire into this extraordinary thing called death - we went into that the other day.

So I have enquired into the whole field of existence so I am not deceived. The mind is very clear about all this, not as a conclusion, not as an idea, but actually. Then it moves into the field where man has enquired and been caught in various forms of illusions, substituting images and making the images sacred, the symbols instead of reality and worshipping the symbols and forgetting the reality, building around the symbol, the image, great and marvellous cathedrals, temples and mosques. I see all that. And the cropping up of these innumerable gurus with their systems, with their crazing for power, money, the degradation of their activity. I see all that. So the mind is going to be caught in any of this. Right? Are you following all this? Are we together?

It now says, what is there sacred? And it starts with the enquiry not knowing anything that is sacred. You understand? The moment you say something is sacred it is already conditioned. If you say love is sacred, if you say my vision, Krishna, Buddha, Christ, that

is all conditioning, tradition. So I start - the mind starts with the enquiry not knowing a thing about what is sacred. Right? Can we do it?

Q: Yes, you start with nothing.

K: Good luck! You know what it means, madame, to start with nothing. You understand what it means? No motive, no will, no 'me' with all its complex activities, to start with absolutely nothing. Can you do it? You understand - no attachment, a body, an organism that won't distort perception. You understand? Because the body reacts, and acts on the mind, and the mind acts on the body, so unless the body is extraordinarily quiet, sensitive, so that it is completely in order. You understand what it means? Are you following all this?

There is no distraction of the body, no distraction of thought, or any motive engendered by thought, no purpose, no intention, no knowledge - knowledge must exist in a certain field, in the enquiry into if there is anything sacred knowledge has no place. So the mind is completely empty of everything that thought has put together. Right? And when it is capable of saying, "I really know nothing", that state of complete emptiness which is complete disassociation with the world, and all the world which has made the 'me'. Are you following all this? Then that nothingness is the most sacred thing.

Intelligence is nothing. You follow? Now in the discovery of that then it operates, it functions in the life of everyday. When I am not a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian, nothing. You understand all this? And this is meditation. You understand? A meditation because in the enquiry of this, not the search, in the enquiry, there

is no leader, there is no teacher, there is no guru, there is no salvation, saviour. The first thing is, learn never to follow anybody in this field. You can follow a doctor, he will teach you, a surgeon, he will teach you, there you have to observe, learn from somebody; here there is nobody from whom you can learn. Therefore nobody, including the speaker sitting here, he has nobody. Therefore the mind in meditation is intelligence in action. Have you understood this? That means the body must be completely still, you understand, be aware of its gestures, its movements, its fiddling about, be aware of all that. Have a good body, even though one may have a disease, be crippled, that pain mustn't interfere so that the mind is not distorted by pain. Food matters enormously, what you eat, and so on and so on.

So all this is the process of meditation - not the systems, not the leaders, not those who give you mantras for thirty-five dollars, and all that tommy rot. And one must give one's life to this. Every other form of life is a wasting of life. You have a short life to live, don't let's waste it. Now sirs I have talked enough.

# **SAN FRANCISCO 1ST PUBLIC TALK 10TH MARCH 1973**

I can't see you but I hope you can see me. I think most of us are used to being entertained, through literature, through cinema, poetry, and various forms of expression in the arts, and unfortunately we also want to be entertained religiously. We look to somebody to tell us what to do, to give us greater experiences, to help us to touch something that is beyond time. All these forms of entertainment are mere stimulation leading nowhere. And if we may point out, this is not a gathering either intellectual or sentimental but rather a gathering where we are going to walk together, share together, think together, and find out for ourselves what is true and what is false. And see the truth in the false and remain, if we can, with that which is. So this is not any form of entertainment whatsoever. We are serious. And together we are going to investigate, and I mean together, and therefore it is very important to find out for ourselves not only why we are here but also what is it that we are seeking.

And we must establish between you and the speaker the relationship in which communication is possible. I mean by that word `communication' not only a verbal explanation, verbal communication, but also a non-verbal, which is perhaps much more important than the verbal understanding of words. So communication means sharing together, thinking together and perhaps transforming ourselves as we are now into something totally psychologically different. And that is the intention, serious intention of the speaker, that together we are going to understand

this mad idiotic world, the horrors that are going on, the brutality, the violence, the national divisions, wars, and the religious divisions. Together we are going to investigate these problems: violence, fear, pleasure, what it means to be religious, and what are the implications of meditation.

So from the beginning I think we should understand that we are not dealing with any philosophical system. Philosophy, if one looks up a dictionary, means the love of truth, not an abstract truth invented by the intellectuals and the philosophers but the truth that is expressed in daily living. So we are concerned not with exotic or oriental mysticism, religion, but rather be totally committed to find a different way of living, a way that is true, that is harmonious, that has in it the quality of a mind that is truly religious.

So all this implies, doesn't it, that one must be astonishingly serious. Which means that every form of entertainment, every form of being told what to do, or given a new system, or try to find out through the speaker some reality beyond time and so on, if you are expecting any such form of entertainment I am afraid you will be disappointed because we are going to concern ourselves with 'what is' actually, what is now, and see if it is possible to transform totally, psychologically, inwardly, the whole structure of our conditioning. If that is clear, I think every serious person is concerned with this problem, how to bring about a psychological revolution in the very structure of the psyche, in the very structure of our thinking, in the whole process of our acquiring knowledge, and whether the human mind, that is, your mind, the human, the every day mind, not a mind that is super conscious and all the rest of that business, but the mind that is working, struggling, is in

battle inwardly, in sorrow, in pain, in fear, and a great sense of insecurity and anxiety, whether that mind can be transformed, not through time, not through a period but transformed without the process of time altogether. I hope all this is not too serious and if it is, I am sorry. Because you see I have been to India, Europe, here, for the last forty years or so, perhaps more, and one sees if one is observant how everything is deteriorating, not in the technological world but in the world of human relationship. One sees over population, starvation, war, the appalling destructiveness of politicians, the economic inequality and so on, and the spreading of violence right through the world. There are many explanations, every philosopher, every intellectual person is trying to find out why this exists, why human beings not only in this beautiful land, and it is a beautiful country, America, every country is beautiful, but the people in it are rather strange. The people in it are violent, superstitious, full of their own prejudices, opinions, inventing new systems of government and philosophies and religions, battling with each other, competitively, ambitiously, destructively.

Wherever one goes this is a fact of daily conflict inwardly and outwardly, daily suffering, pain, anxiety, insecurity. And from this insecurity violence, and so on. And observing all this, our education only conditions the human mind to conform to a pattern that already exists, to the structure which the past has established.

And religions throughout the world have lost their meaning totally. And trying to escape from all this, there are the innumerable gurus from India with their fanciful dictatorial regime. You know what is happening in this country perhaps better than I do.

Now these are facts. What can the human mind, your mind, do with all this? The confusion, the misery, the appalling selfishness of people, the narrowness, pettiness of a mind that is full of knowledge, that has been educated technologically to function in a pattern, in a structure of the present society, how can that mind transform itself so that a different kind of culture is born. Because we are not cultured people at all: you may know many languages, you may have read a great deal, you may be a great scientist, or trying to become a great scientist, you may be religious for the weekend, go to the church, but in daily life, in the life of every day we are totally uncultured. And observing what is going on in the world, a new culture must come into being, not European or American or the Asiatic culture but a world, global culture. And that culture can only come into being when there is totally a different kind of religion. Without religion there is no culture, for religion is the unifying factor, not belief, not a personal worship, but a religion that is based on behaviour, relationship, a mind that is totally free of fear and not incessantly pursuing pleasure, a mind that is capable of perceiving, living, a quality of mind that is totally attentive of what is true. We will go into all that during these four talks, if you will.

So let us begin to understand relationship because it seems to me that it is one of the most fundamental issues because if we don't understand, live in a right kind of relationship there must be conflict between man and woman, or between man and his neighbour and so on. So relationship is of the highest importance because this relationship creates a society. If our relationship is based on conflict, as it is now, if our relationship is based on



pleasure, as it is now, if our relationship is based on mere duty, or mere responsibility, then in that relationship there must be incessant conflict both outwardly and inwardly. Conflict exists only when there is division.

Please, as I said at the beginning, we are sharing this together. You are not merely just listening to what is being said, agreeing or disagreeing, we are not dealing with ideas, with organized thinking, we are dealing actually with what is and see whether that which is can be transformed. So we are together investigating and therefore taking a journey together, investigating, through the verbal explanation of the speaker, yourself. So we are actually tracing out the actual state of our being, of our daily life, and if that is not totally changed your investigation into that which is beyond time, or to try to meditate, has no meaning whatsoever.

So please listen, not merely to the words, to the verbal explanation, but also learn to look and observe between the lines. We said that wherever there is division there must be conflict. There is division nationally-the Americans, the South Americans, the communists, the Russians, the whole gamut of political, national divisions, and also there are the economic divisions, the injustice, the unfairness, the appalling poverty of the present social order. Wherever there is division there must be conflict. Have you observed this in the religious field? So this is a basic factor that where there is division there must be conflict not only outwardly but also inwardly, inside the skin as it were. Where there is division between you and me, between us and they, we and them, there must be conflict.

In our relationship of daily life there is this division between the

two images that you have created for yourself and for another. Please, look at it dispassionately, look at it as though for the first time you are trying to learn about yourself. We are not indulging in analysis. Through analysis perhaps you become paralysed, but we are merely observing `what is', and if you observe, see `what is' then analysis is not necessary.

So one has also to find out what it means to observe. To observe your relationship with another however intimate, however close, or however distant. Observation implies total attention. Please, do this as we are talking, not as a group therapy which is a horror, or some kind of group entertainment which is absurd, but to observe actually `what is' so that there is no distortion, so that prejudice, tendencies, various forms of inclinations don't enter into it. Pure observation without distortion, and that means attention. This attention comes naturally, you don't have to go to college, or practise or all the rest of the absurdity that is going on, this attention comes when you are really deeply interested. If you are not then there is something radically wrong; when the house is burning, when there is so much catastrophe going on, not to be interested, not to be totally concerned or totally committed to the resolution of the problem indicates a mind that is totally dead. And to observe this relationship and to transform it. Transformation takes place in relationship - in which there is division and hence conflict, jealousy, anxiety, insecurity, violence and all the rest of those things that are born out of division - to observe it. To observe what goes on. If you observe you will see that your relationship with another is based on knowledge - knowledge which is the past, knowledge which becomes the image about another. You, listening

to the speaker, have an image about the speaker, which is obvious otherwise you wouldn't be here. Your image of the speaker is based on reputation, propaganda, books and all the rest of it, but you actually don't know the speaker at all, but you have an image about the speaker. Therefore that image divides. You have an image about your wife, your girl friend, boy friend, all the rest of it, that image is built on knowledge of past events, happenings. And this image which is born out of knowledge in relationship brings about division. That's a fact, we don't have to go into it, argue or analyse, it is so. And these images, verbal, structural, romantic, intellectual, emotional and so on, all this brings about a basic fundamental division. You have an image about yourself, that you must be this or that, and you have an image about the other; so your relationship is between these two images and therefore there is no actual relationship, and hence conflict.

Now can that structure of relationship be totally changed, radically transformed, then we will create a totally different society. And it is only possible when we are sharing, thinking, creating together. Therefore in this there is no authority whatsoever because you are observing your own self, your own image of yourself and the image which you have created about another which creates division.

Then the question arises: how is it possible not to create images at all? You understand? I hope we are following each other, are we? Tant pis, if you don't I am sorry, my time is limited so we must go on. Is it possible for the mind which has been cultivated, which has acquired tremendous knowledge through experience, which is the past, this mind which has so many images, so many

conclusions, which is so heavily conditioned, can this mind be free of all images? If it is not then life becomes a constant battle. Right? Is this question clear?

Knowledge in relationship creates division. That is, when you have a relationship with your husband or a girl or whatever it is, in that relationship gradually knowledge enters - knowledge being what you have acquired, remembered, experienced in that relationship. So knowledge becomes a barrier in relationship. Right? Are we taking a journey together?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! Or am I walking by myself? Do you know this is really very important because to take a journey together with somebody we must have that quality of affection which shares, which isn't merely listening to a verbal description. The description is not the described, the word is not the thing. If you are merely following it verbally then we are not journeying together, then we are not walking clearly in the investigation that is so essential. So you are not following the speaker. If you are following the speaker then the speaker becomes the authority and you have got sufficient authority in the world already, don't add another. It is freedom from authority that is necessary. Authority means the authority of someone to tell you what to do, and therefore you depend on somebody. And then in that all the problems of authority arise. Whereas if you learn how to observe, how to be completely committed to attention in relationship and this you cannot learn from another, and this is to be learnt as you go along. And you cannot learn this from a book. So if I may suggest, use the speaker as a mirror in which you see yourself. And when you learn to see

yourself in that mirror then break the mirror so that you are free from the speaker, so that you observe yourself what actually is going on.

As we said, we have got a great many images, conclusions and so the mind is never free to observe. Having accumulated these conclusions through education, through relationship, through propaganda, in a thousand different ways, can the mind which functions with conclusions, therefore mechanically - and relationship is not mechanical though we have reduced relationship to a routine, to a mechanical process - we have to understand very deeply the meaning of that word 'knowledge' and the freedom from knowledge in relationship. Knowledge is necessary, otherwise you and I could not possibly communicate verbally, because you know English and the speaker knows English. To do anything functionally knowledge is necessary-how to ride a bicycle and all the rest of it, technologically - to function efficiently, objectively, rationally, knowledge is necessary, but we use function to achieve status. And when there is the pursuit of status in function there is division and hence conflict between function and status, which is part of our relationship with each other. When you are seeking in function status, then to you status is far more important than function, and hence in that there is conflict inwardly as well as outwardly. And to observe this, to observe how the mind works in relationship, that through function it is seeking status and therefore in relationship there is conflict, as well as there is conflict where there is division between you and another, between you have knowledge about your husband, your boy, girl, all the rest of it, then that knowledge acts as division. Therefore it is only when the

mind is free, or rather, is aware of the function in knowledge and the necessity of knowledge and sees the danger, the poison of knowledge in relationship. I hope this is clear. Look, if I am married to you - I am not, thank god! - if I am married to you and I have lived with you, I have accumulated a great deal of knowledge about you in that relationship. That knowledge has become the image of you, you have given me pleasure, sex, insulted me, nagged me, bullied me, dominated me, saying 'Women are more important than men' - you know all that is going on in the world. How childish all this is. How utterly immature. I have built an image about you, it may be of one day old or ten years old, that image divides me from you, and you have an image about me. So our relationship is between these two images and therefore there is no relationship at all. And realizing this, is it possible to live in a world, in this world, with knowledge which is absolutely necessary, and the freedom from that knowledge in relationship? Because when there is freedom from that knowledge in that relationship division ceases and therefore conflict in relationship comes to an end. Because as one observes in the world more and more conflict is increasing, misery, confusion, sorrow, is everywhere. And then the mind is in anxiety in relationship, when the mind is only concerned with knowledge and not with wisdom. And wisdom comes into being only when there is an understanding of knowledge and the freedom from the known.

So our question is: can the mind which functions with conclusions, with images, can that mind be free, not tomorrow, not within a given period of time but be out of this conflict altogether? And that is only possible-please listen to this - that is only possible

when you can learn how to observe, how to observe yourself and another. It is far more important to observe yourself and not the other, because what you are the other is, you are the world and the world is you, the two are not separate. The society which you have created is you. This society, the ugliness, the brutality, the extravagance, the pollution, all the things that are going on are the result of your daily activity, so you are the society, you are the world and the world is you. This is not a mere verbal statement but an actual fact. But when you observe this - and to observe the mind must be free to look, and to observe so that there is no distortion, and distortion exists because you have opinions, conclusions - so that the mind is always fresh to look, learn.

You know there is a difference between learning and acquiring knowledge. Most of us through college, university and so on, are very good at acquiring knowledge, to us that is learning. That is, to accumulate facts, correlate with other facts, data, our minds, our brains are full of knowledge, of the past, knowledge is the past, and we are all the time adding to that knowledge. And it is necessary when you function, to be an engineer, or a scientist, when you drive a car, or speak a language. But learning it seems to me is something entirely different. Learning is a constant movement, a constant movement in learning so that there is never an accumulation. For the accumulation is the `me', the `me' that separates you and hence conflict. Wherever there is `me' there must be conflict because it is the very core of division.

And love cannot be learnt, knowledge cannot acquire neither wisdom nor love. And therefore it is very important to understand this whole structure of relationship because that is the basis of our

life. From that all action takes place. If action is merely the continuation of knowledge then it becomes mechanical. And our relationship becomes mechanical when it is based on routine and knowledge. Therefore when there is freedom from the known then relationship changes totally.

We have talked more or less for an hour and perhaps you would like to ask questions. To ask a question, or any question relevant, is important, but to put the right question is still more important. And when you put the right question who is going to answer it? And do you when you put a question wait for an answer from the speaker? Or you put the question in order to investigate together so that together we understand the question? For in the question is the answer. All this doesn't mean that the speaker is trying to prevent you from asking questions. Please, if I may ask, don't clap, don't applaud. If you must applaud do it when the speaker is not here. Yes sir?

Questioner: Krishnamurti, the awareness that you speak of seems to be a direct awareness, which seems to be the most sensible, intelligent way of being aware. I have encountered many other forms of indirect approaches to awareness and possibly these also arrive at direct awareness. I have in mind particularly Zen, which uses a heavy discipline, it lays great emphasis on this, and yet many people seem to break through...

K: I understand, sir.

Q:... in this discipline and this self anguish and suffering, they seem to break through into direct awareness. Is this at all the same awareness that you are speaking of?

K: I'll tell you, sir, I'll tell you. You know the word `discipline'



means to learn, not the meaning that we give generally to it - which is conformity, imitation, suppression and various forms of control and conflict. That's generally what is implied in discipline. That is so. Awareness, attention has nothing whatsoever to do with discipline, with practice, or with the intention to be aware. Either you are aware of those flowers or you are not aware of those flowers. But why aren't you aware of those flowers? If you put your mind to it, give your mind, your heart, your whole being to observe those flowers then you have total attention. That needs no discipline, only that you have to look. But if you look with a verbal statement, 'how beautiful those flowers are', or 'is it a chrysanthemum', 'I like others flowers rather than that flower' - those are all verbal descriptions and escapes from the actual fact of observing. If you observe without a verbal statement then you are completely attentive, and that attention perhaps you can maintain for a couple of minutes or a few seconds, but when that attention wears off, moves away, then you become aware that you are not attentive. And then you proceed to be attentive. Then you say, 'How am I to acquire continuous attention?' - that's a wrong question. There is no such thing as continuous awareness, continuous attention. Please listen to this, do listen and then you can question. When your attention wanders off, be attentive to that wandering off. You understand? Be attentive to the state when you are not giving attention, then you are attentive. But when you say, 'I must be constantly attentive' then you are introducing a factor of time. And when there is attention there is no centre as the 'me' or time, there is only a state of attention. Have you understood this? It's fairly simple.

Q: Well...

K: Wait, sir, wait. Just a minute. There are a great many schools in Asia and here, most unfortunately, that are teaching you how to be sensitive, how to be attentive, how to be aware. They are making awareness, attention, sensitivity into a system. While you have a system it is no longer possible to be attentive. Be attentive why the mind wants a system. You understand? When you are free of systems you are attentive.

Q: My question was that the system is seen as absurd, and if seeing the absurdity of the system is clear, non-verbal awareness becomes - it is; and yet they go to it by indirect methods of varying disciplines and when they see through that, then they have attention.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: It is the same awareness.

K: Look, sir, do look at that flower. Do look at that flower. And can you look at it non-verbally, non-botanically, without having an image, just to observe without the centre as the knowledge, the 'me' who is looking as the observer, just to look. Look at your wife, or your girl friend or boy friend, look at the mountains, the rivers, the streams, the trees, without the verbal description. Then that state is attention, and when the mind wanders off, know that it is wandering off and be attentive to the wandering. Be attentive to inattention. That's all. It's so simple when you see it. You don't have to go to schools, you don't have to go to gurus and all the rest of that business.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, sir. Is one attentive to our relationship? That's what

we have been talking about, not about flowers and the clouds. Are you aware deeply, non-verbally, without conclusions, aware of your relationship? Or are you afraid to face your relationship, or afraid to look, because when you do look it will bring up all kinds of things, therefore one would rather avoid it. So attention is not something specifically given to a particular problem. Attention is a state of mind that is totally committed to find a way of living in which conflict of any kind has come to an end. Because if that conflict in human relationship ceases then we will bring about a totally different kind of culture.

Q: Sir, I wanted to ask you about the relationship of pain. I mean if I observe, my observation is distorted by pain. And...

K: I understand, sir. Are you asking, sir, if I may interrupt you, are you asking how can I be attentive when I have physical disorder, when I have physical pain - is that it?

Q: No, sir. How do I remain in that state.

K: Yes, yes, sir. You are asking - please, we are sharing this together, you are not merely listening to that person who is putting that question, or to the answer of the speaker, but this is our human problem, your problem, not his particular problem - when there is pain, physical suffering, how can the mind be attentive and what is the relationship of attention to pain - isn't it, sir?

Q: It helps.

K: Yes, sir. What is the relationship of attention to pain so that pain is understood. Let's put it that way. That's it.

Q: Sir, when I hear that pain is something to be avoided I am reminded of something that was once said, 'Oh, lord, bring me more pain'.

K: Sir, look, sir, not more pain, good lord! It's quite funny. What is the place of pain in life? Right? What is pain, physical pain, we are not talking of psychological pain, we'll do it another day, what is the place of pain in life? That is, how can the mind meet pain in life? We have all got pain of different kinds, serious suffering, serious pain, or superficial pain, serious disease with all its pain and superficial pain-what is the place of pain in life and how to meet it. Right, sir? Wait, sir, let me finish the question, sir. You see first of all we lead such unhealthy lives, that's obvious. The air is polluted, water is polluted, and we eat dead animals, yes sir, wait a minute, you laugh but you go out and eat meat afterwards. I am not saying you must become a vegetarian but see all the implications of it. We live such unhealthy lives, over eat, over indulge, so our body which has its own intelligence is destroyed by the pleasure of taste. It's so obvious. So pain is one of the results, disease is one of those results. And how to meet pain in life. And is it possible to observe pain without identifying ourselves with pain? You understand what I am saying? If one has a toothache, to observe it, to be attentive without the centre of 'me' who has pain and therefore create anxiety. You follow this? Do you understand this, what I am saying? Can you observe, be attentive of your physical pain without the 'me' as the centre which doesn't want pain, or is afraid of having pain when the pain has come to an end, again? You are following all this? What is the place of pain in life? Is it a reminder that you are living unhealthily? And if it is a reminder then we don't accept what it calls your attention to but rather suppress it, escape from it, go on with our pleasure of eating or drinking or whatever it is, and when

you have again pain take some pill to get rid of it.

Therefore pain has an importance in telling you how to live more correctly. And pain also indicates that it has value in reminding you that there must be harmony between the mind, the heart and the body, a total harmony, which we have not. And pain, physical pain, has also its importance, not as a punishment and therefore 'give us more punishment so as to become more pure' which is absurd, but it is an indication that we are preventing the normal intelligence of the body from functioning. And to be attentive of all that and not come to any conclusions, just to be attentive.

Q: Sir, how do we...

K: Sir, look, if I may point out - we will have to stop because I believe we must clear out of the hall by half past twelve, it is nearly that so we must stop-look, sir, there is no 'how', there is no system, please see this. We will go into it another time, but see this. Don't ever ask of anybody 'how' - how am I to become intelligent, how am I to become aware, how am I to become attentive, because the 'how' implies a system, when you have a system the mind which practises that system becomes mechanical. What we are trying to point out is, intelligence is not mechanical, where there is freedom intelligence operates. And when one has physical pain it indicates so many things, as we have tried to point out, some of them, and to be aware of all this. Then you will see for yourself if you have gone into this that pain unfortunately, because we live so wrongly and also one is getting older, pain is part of existence. And to see it without allowing that pain to distort the mind. I must stop.

## **SAN FRANCISCO 2ND PUBLIC TALK 11TH MARCH 1973**

It's a lovely morning, it's a pity to sit indoors, but there it is!

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying how important it is that we establish in ourselves right relationship with others, whether it be an intimate relationship or a relationship with a neighbour who might be next door or a thousand miles away. Because relationship without a conclusion, an image, brings about naturally right conduct, and behaviour is righteousness. And if one wants to have this quality of relationship with another in which the yesterday with all its memories and insults and hurts have gone, then obviously we should bring about a totally different kind of education. If you observe now right throughout the world our education conditions the mind to conform to the pattern which is already established, and to continue a life in which there is constant battle both within and without. If you observe what happens to our children when we have no right relationship with each other, you can observe it in the streets of New York or here or anywhere else, in Bombay, the corruption, the violence, vandalism and brutality, because at home each one is concerned with his own ambition, with his own pursuit of pleasure, with his self-importance and a position in society. And obviously when there is no right relationship with another - and we mean by right relationship, a state of mind and heart in which all the machinery that builds the image has come to an end so that there is complete harmony not only within oneself but with another. Then we should be really concerned with the right kind of education, not

to condition the mind, and be concerned with the whole development of man, not only intellectually, as it is being done now, but also that quality of mind that is compassionate, that is concerned with the total non-fragmentary way of living. And it seems to me that unless this kind of relationship is established, which is not a theory, a speculative abstraction, but which can be brought about every day if we are sufficiently aware of all the things that are happening in the world, then this relationship naturally comes into being. That's what we more or less talking about yesterday. And if we may continue we will go on from there.

I wonder if you have ever considered how we waste our life, how we dissipate our energies, how intellectually we are secondhand people, there is nothing but routine, boredom, loneliness, suffering, either physiologically or psychologically. And our life as it is lived now unfortunately has no meaning whatsoever, except to earn a livelihood which is obviously necessary, but besides that our whole life is fragmented, broken up, and a mind that is broken up, fragmented is a corrupt mind. The word 'corruption' comes from the Latin word 'rompere' which means to break up. A mind that is fragmented is a corrupt mind. And if you observe and are serious enough in your observation, not trying to alter what you see, but to see 'what is' and be with it entirely, then you will see how wasteful our life is. What is it that we want, what is it that we have achieved, what is it that we have become? For most of us life is a travail, a strife, and given a particular society, as this is, to be successful in it, to make money, either seeking power, position, prestige, or living a life of the bourgeois, a narrow, shallow, empty life, filled with all kinds of

opinions, judgements, beliefs. And it seems to me, if I may point out, and if you are willing to listen, all that seems such a wasteful life, we are never happy - we are happy in the sense of the pursuit of pleasure, we deny a certain sense of enjoyment, a certain sense of gratification, satisfaction. But when you examine a little more deeply into ourselves, don't you find apart from what you have learnt from books, what you have learnt from the reactions of the country in which you live, haven't you found that there is absolutely nothing inwardly, except what you have put into it. What you have put into it is the fabrications of thought. And thought doesn't bring about the total action of a human being. It's only a partial, fragmentary.

And realizing that our life as it is is empty, rather shallow, and of sorrow, we escape into various pursuits of pleasure, whether it be religious pleasure or so-called worldly pleasure - money, greater enjoyment, greater pleasures, buying more things, maintaining a society of consumerism and ultimately ending in the grave. That's our life. There is nothing sacred, there is nothing really religious.

And so observing all this one asks, and I hope you will ask with me too because we are sharing together, we are journeying together, for this is a very serious matter, life is serious, dreadfully serious, and it is only those who are really deeply serious live; and those who are flippant, want to be entertained, seeking the entertainers, whether they be gurus, or the priests, or the intellectual philosophers, they become our life, words without substance, description without the described.

So one asks: what is the place of thought in our life? Because all our civilization, our culture is based on thought. Your religions are



the product of thought, your behaviour, the conduct, the business world, relationship, the accumulation of armaments, the army, the navy, the airforce, the whole thing, the thing that we call culture, civilization, is based on thought, whether that thought is reasonable or unreasonable, logical or illogical, sane or neurotic, our action is based on thought-thought as an idea, thought as an ideal, because we are all terribly idealistic, most unfortunately. The ideal is not `what is', the ideal is something invented by thought as a means to overcome `what is'. And therefore in that ideal and `what is' there is division and so conflict. I hope you are all following this, not merely listening to a series of words but actually observing the whole movement of your own mind so that you and the speaker can establish a relationship, a communication so that both of us understand what we are talking about, without agreement or disagreement, but merely observing actually what is.

So one must go into this whole question of what is thought and what is thinking. You know it is one of the most extraordinary things that the whole of Asia considers thought as a child of barren women, and they say, thought is measure, and to find the immeasurable, that which is beyond time and measure, thought, one must pursue the suppression of thought. Whereas the whole of the Western civilization, culture, is based on thought. Thought is measurement. May I go on? I hope you are all following this, if you are not, it doesn't matter! (Clapping) Don't bother to clap, it's not worth it. As I said, this is really very, very serious and it requires great subtlety of mind to go into this. And I hope you are prepared on a Sunday morning with a beautiful sky and lovely clouds to investigate this question so that the mind is free from

measurement, so that the mind knows vast space and silence, which is not measurable, which is not put together by thought.

As we were saying, the culture of the Western civilization is based on thought, on measurement. And from that measurement has grown the whole technological world, and from that measurement the art of war. And there too religion is a matter of belief, acceptance, propaganda, saviours, and so on. Observing this phenomenon, both in the East and in the West, in the East they use thought to go beyond thought, and in the West they have accepted measurement, progress and a way of life that is based on technology, acquiring more and more and more enjoyment and having great pleasure in possessions, with their literature, poetry, you know, all the rest of it.

So a serious mind must ask this question: what place has thought in life? What is the function of thought? That is, thought either sane, logical, reasoned, or thought which has perverted life, giving importance to things, to property, to money, to pleasure. And thought which has accumulated so much information, both outwardly and inwardly. So I hope you are asking with me, with the speaker, what is the place of thought and what is its relationship to action. Because life is action, relationship is movement in action. And is there an action which is not bound by time and thought and measure? So we are going to go into this because it seems to me very important because our life is action, to live is to act, whatever we do is action, and if that action is time-binding, that is, bound by the past or the past through the present to the future, which is time-binding, then action is never liberating, then action is always fragmentary. And such action is corruption.

All right, may I go on?

So what is action? And what is its relationship to thought? Thought is the response of memory, as knowledge and experience, stored in the brain. You don't have to read neurological or scientific books, you can observe it in oneself if you are deeply interested in it. Without memory you cannot act, you cannot remember words, you then become in a state of amnesia, complete confusion. So thought is the response of memory, knowledge, experience stored in the brain. And thought responds to any challenge according to its conditioning. Right? If you are a Christian or a Hindu or a Buddhist or a communist or a capitalist your mind is conditioned and you act according to that conditioning. That conditioning is the memory, the experience, the knowledge of that particular culture or society in which you live. That's fairly obvious, isn't it? And so thought in action is separative, fragmentary, and brings about conflict. Right? Are we following all this, or am I talking to myself? Because sir, look, we must understand this question very, very seriously and very deeply because we are trying to find a way of life in which there is no conflict whatsoever, a way of life in which there is no sorrow, a way of life that is total, complete, whole, harmonious, sane. And thought may be one of the factors that brings about fragmentation and therefore corruption, therefore one must find out what is the function of thought and what place has thought in human relationship.

One can see very clearly that thought in the field of technology is essential, in the field of knowledge thought can function logically, sanely, objectively, efficiently, but that efficiency, sanity, objectivity becomes polluted when thought seeks through

technology status. Right? And therefore there is conflict in that, and therefore corruption. When the mind seeks through technological function status then inevitably there must be conflict and therefore corruption. That's obvious. But you will go on seeking status all right, though you hear what is being said your conditioning is so strong you will pursue in spite of logical, sane, rational thinking, you will pursue status and therefore continue with conflict and therefore corruption. Corruption isn't merely taking money from another, or doing ugly things, but the deep cause of corruption is when thought breaks up action into fragments - intellectual action, emotional action, and physical action or ideological action.

So from that: is there an action which is not fragmentary but whole? An action which is not controlled by thought or by measurement or by the past in human relationship? Right? Are you following all this?

Questioner: What do you mean by action?

K: I am going into that, madam, you are too quick. Action is when you say a word, action is a gesture of contempt or of welcome, action may be going from here to there, action according to a formula, action according to an opinion, action according to an idea, an ideal, or action based on some belief, neurotic or rational. That's action. You know what we mean by action. Either acting according to the past pattern, or acting according to a future abstraction, or the movement of action which is always present. And is there an action in human relationship, because that is the most fundamental thing in life, relationship, from which behaviour, virtue, conduct, society is born. And what place has thought, which

is, thought being measurement, conformity, acting according to a particular conclusion, knowledge which is always in the past, what place has thought in human relationship, or has it no place at all? If it has a place in human relationship, which is action, then thought limits, controls relationship, and therefore in that relationship there is fragmentation and hence conflict. I wonder how I can make it much more simple.

Look, sir, all right, let's proceed: there are two principles on which our life is based, are there not? Pleasure and fear. Please observe it in yourself. Pleasure has become tremendously important in life. The various forms of pleasure: sexual pleasures, intellectual pleasures, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of money, the pleasure of power, prestige and so on, the pleasure of self-importance, the pleasure that you derive when the 'me', the ego asserts itself, through domination and so on, or accepts tyranny as a means of achievement of a different kind of pleasure. So there are different forms of pleasure. And in relationship that pleasure takes the form of dependency. You depend on another in relationship, psychologically. Where there is dependence there must be fear of losing, and therefore greater attachment. And the insistence and the pursuit of pleasure; the pursuit of pleasure sexually is fairly obvious, and most extraordinarily this pleasure has become the most important thing in life. And the pleasure of dependence, depending on another psychologically, because in oneself one is frightened of being alone, lonely, desperate, not having love or not being loved and so on. So there is the pursuit of pleasure and the constant avoidance of fear. And thought sustains both: you think about the pleasures that you have had yesterday,

and you hope to have it again today, and if you don't have those pleasures continued you get violent, anxious, fearful. Observe this in yourself.

And there is this whole question of fear. A life that is lived in fear is a dark ugly life. And most of us are frightened in different ways, and we shall examine that, we shall investigate this whole question of fear, whether the mind can be totally free of fear. Nobody wants to be free of pleasure but you all want to be free of fear, but you don't see that both of them go together, they are the two sides of the same coin, sustained by thought. That's why it is very important to understand thought. Oh, lord, there's so much to talk about in this. You know we have fears, fear of death, fear of life, fear of darkness, fear of your neighbour, fear of yourself, fear of a hundred things, fear of losing a job, insecurity, seeking security, and the deeper unconscious layers of fear hidden in the deep recesses of one's own mind. And is it possible without analysis - and please listen to this carefully - is it possible for the mind to be free of fear without analysis totally so the mind is really free to enjoy life, not the pursuit of pleasure but to enjoy life. And that's not possible as long as fear exists. And will analysis dispel fear? Or is analysis a form of paralysing the mind from the freedom of fear? Paralysis through analysis. I know you laugh, I thought you would, but you don't see the implication of it because you are used to analysis, that's one of the intellectual forms of entertainment. Because in analysis there is the analyser and the analysed, whether the analyser is a professional one or you yourself become the analyser. So when there is analysis there is the division between the analyser and the analysed and hence conflict.

And in analysis you need time, you take days, years, therefore it gives you an opportunity to postpone from action. You can analyse indefinitely the whole problem of violence, seeking its cause, explanations of different professionals, what the causes of violence are, reading volumes about the causes of violence and analysing it. All that takes time, and in the mean time you can enjoy your violence.

So analysis - please apply this, for god's sake work at it - analysis implies division and postponement of action, and therefore analysis brings more conflict, not less. And analysis implies time. And so a mind that observes the truth of this is free of analysis and therefore is capable of directly dealing with violence, which is `what is'.

Q: Sir...

K: Wait, wait, I haven't finished, sir. You are going to ask questions after I have finished.

Whereas if you observe violence in yourself, violence brought about through fear, through insecurity, through the sense of loneliness, dependency, the cutting off of your pleasures and so on, if you are aware of that, observe it totally, without analysis then you have all the energy which has been dissipated through analysis to go beyond `what is'.

And fear, the deep rooted fears given to us by the society in which we live, inherited from the past, they are there, and how can they all be exposed so that the mind is totally completely free of this terrible thing called fear? Will it come about through dreams? We saw, at least one sees clearly the absurdity of analysis, and also are dreams necessary at all. And through dreams will you be free

of violence? I am taking that as an example. And why should you dream at all, though the professionals say that you must dream otherwise you go mad. Why should you dream? When the mind is constantly active both during the day and night, it has no rest, it doesn't acquire a new quality of freshness. It is only when the mind is completely quiet, asleep, utterly still, then it renews itself, but if you dream and through dreams you hope to overcome all the fears, or is it another of those fallacies that we accept so easily? Dreams are the continuation of our daily activity through sleep, but if you bring about order during the day, not order according to a blue print, not order according to an established society, or order according to the religious sanctions. I don't mean that, that's not order, that's conformity. Where there is conformity, obedience, there is no order. Order comes only when you observe your own life during the waking hours, how disorderly it is, how confusing. Through the observation of disorder order comes. And when you have such order in daily life then dreams become totally unnecessary. So can one observe the totality of fear, or only the branches of fear, not the very root of fear, the cause of fear? Can the mind observe, see, be aware, give total attention to fear, whether it is hidden, put away deeply in the recesses of one's own mind, or the outward expressions of daily fears as the fear of pain of yesterday coming back again today, or coming back again tomorrow? The fear of losing a job, the fear of being insecure, outwardly as well as inwardly, the fear, the ultimate fear of death. There are so many forms of fear. Should we break each branch, cut away each branch or tackle, come to grips with the totality of fear? And is the mind capable of observing totally fear? You are



following this? We are used to dealing with fear by fragments: I am afraid of this, or afraid of that, I am afraid of losing a job, or afraid of my wife, or my husband, or whatever it is, and we are concerned with fragments and not with the totality of fear. And to observe the totality of fear is to give complete attention when any fear arises. You can't, sitting there, invite fear now, but you can invite it if you want to, look at your fear completely, wholly, not as an observer looking at fear. Do you understand this?

You know, we look at anger, jealousy, envy, fear, or pleasure as an observer wanting to get rid of fear, or pursuing pleasure. So there is always an observer, a see-er, a thinker, so we look at fear as though we were outside looking in. Right? Now can you observe fear without the observer? Please, just stick to that question: can you observe fear without the observer? The observer is the past, the observer recognizes the reaction which it calls fear in terms of the past, he names it as fear. So he is always looking from the past at the present and so there is a division between the observer and the observed. Do you understand this? So can you observe fear without the reaction to that as the past, which is the observer?

Have I explained it, or not? Look, sir, I look at you, well known, I met you, you have insulted me, flattered me, you have done a great many things for me and against me - all that is the accumulated memory which is the past. And the past is the observer, is the thinker, and when he looks at you, he is looking with the eyes of the past, he doesn't look at you afresh. So he never sees you properly, he only sees you with the eyes which have already been corrupted, that have already been dulled. So can you observe fear without the past? That means not name the fear, not

use the word `fear' at all, but just observe? You have understood?  
Tant pis, I can't help it.

So when you do that, when you observe totally, and that totality of attention is only possible when there is no observer, which is the past, then the whole content of consciousness as fear is dissipated.

Q: Is the fear from inside or outside?

K: I explained, madam, there is both fear from outside and fear from within. Fear of my son getting killed in a war, war is external, the invention of technology which has developed such monstrous instruments of destruction, and inwardly I cling to my son, I love him, and I have educated him to conform to the society in which he lives, which says, kill. And so I accept fear both inwardly and the destructive thing called war which is going to kill my son, and I call that, my love for my son. That's fear. When I lose my job - I won't go into all that. We have built a society which is so corrupt, which is so immoral, it is only concerned with possession, more and more, consumerism and so on, not concerned with the total development of man, of the world, human beings.

You know, we have no compassion, we have a great deal of knowledge, a great deal of experience, we can do extraordinary things, medically, technologically, scientifically, but we have no compassion whatsoever. Compassion means passion for all human beings, and animals, nature. And how can there be compassion when there is fear, when the mind is constantly pursuing pleasure? So you want pleasure, fear, to control fear, put it under ground and also want compassion - you want it all. You can't have it. You can have compassion only when fear is not. And that's why it is so important to understand fear in our relationship. And that fear can

be totally uprooted when you can observe the reaction without naming it, and the very naming of it is the projection of the past. So thought sustains and pursues pleasure, and thought also gives strength to fear - I am afraid of what might happen tomorrow, I am afraid of losing a job, I am afraid of time as death.

So thought is responsible for fear. Right? You understand this? And we live in thought, our daily activity is based on thought. So what place has thought in human relationship? You have insulted me, that leaves a memory, that leaves a mark as memory in my mind, and I look at you with that memory, or if you flatter me, I look at you with that memory. So I have never looked at you without the eyes of the past. So it is very important to understand what place has thought in relationship. If it has a place then relationship is a routine, a mechanical daily meaningless pleasure and fear.

So one comes to the question then: what is love? Is it the product of thought? And unfortunately it has been made as the product of thought-love of god and love of man and the destruction of nature. And to go into this question deeply to find out for oneself what love is, because without that, without that quality of compassion, we will always suffer. And to come upon it, for the mind to have that deep compassion, one must understand suffering, for passion is the outcome of suffering. The meaning of that word 'passion', its root meaning, is sorrow, suffering. And most of us escape from suffering, not that we must accept suffering, that's silly, both physically as well as psychologically. And is thought the movement of suffering? Or is suffering something entirely different from thought? And therefore it is immensely important to

understand the machinery of thinking - not verbally understand it but actually observe in ourselves what is thinking and see what its relationship is in our daily life.

It is nearly half past twelve. We will continue next Saturday, if you will, with the question about what love is, what compassion is and what death is. That is, what living is, love and death, they are part of life. Living, not comprehending death is no living at all. Living without this compassion makes a life an empty shell, which has to be filled with pleasure. We will go into that, if you will, next time we meet. Because it is time now and perhaps you will ask some questions, if you are willing.

Q: Krishnamurti, you say that time doesn't matter and I have experienced in a timeless moment that comes and goes, that there is no conflict, it doesn't really matter whether I am listening to bells or to you or to a friend. You speak of corruption in the world, in the culture, I have listened and I see there is only corruption in myself.

K: I explained that, sir. I explained yesterday that you are the world and the world is you - which is not an abstraction but a reality. You and I and others have made this world, not the physical world of nature but the social structure which we call the world with its laws, judgements, corruption and so on, wars, violence. It is part of us, and the structure is part of our thinking, so we are the world and the world is me. And to realize that, not merely a statement but as an actual fact then responsibility, individual responsibility becomes immense. Yes sir?

Q: I have two fears and one of my fears is my ignorance, and the other is speaking here before you.

K: All right, sir, that's good enough. Just a minute. He has two fears: fear of ignorance and fear of speaking before the speaker. What is ignorance? Is it the lack of knowledge which is acquired through books-please listen to this - is ignorance the lack of knowledge of facts, of what other people have written or the accumulation religious knowledge and so on and so on, is the lack of it, is that ignorance? Or is ignorance something much more deep? The ignorance of not knowing yourself, not knowing yourself totally, not according to some philosophers, or psychologists, but knowing yourself as you are and going beyond that. That is what I call ignorance, not knowing yourself as you are and going deeply and therefore beyond it.

And the next thing is, you are afraid to speak before this person sitting on the chair. He is nobody, sir, he is just pointing out things, he is acting as a mirror in which you are looking at yourself. What you are afraid of perhaps is looking at yourself, not afraid to speak before the speaker.

Q: I can understand that dreams would be unnecessary. In that event sleep also would be unnecessary. Am I right?

K: I don't quite understand what you have said, sir.

Q: You said before that dreams would be altogether unnecessary. Then in that case sleep also is unnecessary.

K: Oh, on the contrary. All right. Sir, may I take those two up? All right.

Q: If not in the sleep one can also remain conscious and observe how the dreams are happening to you.

K: I understand, sir.

Q: Then can he not make use of the dreams?

K: Wait, sir, I have understood, sir, may I go on now?

Q: Yes.

K: The gentleman says why do you say dreams are unnecessary, and if dreams are unnecessary is sleep also not necessary. Those are the two points. Are you interested in this question?

Audience: Yes.

K: Why? (Laughter) Are you willing to penetrate into this problem and actually find out for yourself and not to repeat something, what another has said, so that it's yours firsthand not secondhand. Because you are all secondhand people. So if you are willing let's go into these two questions.

Are dreams necessary? What are dreams? Is it not a continuation of your daily activity, daily movement of thought, daily anxiety, daily sense of loneliness, anxiety, fear and so on, are they not the same movement which goes on while you are asleep in the form of symbols and dreams? Right? That's the question.

Q: No.

K: No?

Q: In dreams one can work, act.

K: Sir, of course not, when you are asleep - you are not meeting the point, sir. In dreams - we are asking what are dreams, not in that state can you act. Of course you can't act when you asleep. But please go step by step into this. Dreams, I said, are the continuation in forms of symbols, scenes of our daily activity, our daily activity being anxious, fearful, ambitious, you know all that, what we are, that movement is continuing when we are asleep. Otherwise would you have dreams? If during the day you had order in your life, order. Order being the observation of disorder, not an artificial

order created by a society, by a fear, by fear, or by religious sanctions or what you think is order, which becomes mechanical. But whereas if you observe your daily life, which is confused, which is dependent psychologically, which has so many hurts, and that goes on while you are asleep. And if you observe also the brain can only function when it is completely secure. You can find that security in some kind of neurotic belief or neurotic activity or neurotic state. Or that security for the brain comes into being when there is total order in your life. And that total order can only take place when you have observed very closely the disorder in which you live both psychologically as well as physically. Then when there is total order there may be superficial meaningless dreams which have no value at all and therefore the mind when it is resting is totally rested and therefore fresh, wakes up fresh, young, clear.

And the gentleman asks, is sleep necessary. You know, have you observed or read about that darkness is necessary for the flowers, for the trees, so darkness is necessary for nature as well as light. I am not saying darkness is sleep but sleep is necessary because when you sleep in total order, that means total harmony in the mind, the body and the heart - that is merely an artificial division - when there is total harmony the mind then when it sleeps rejuvenates itself, it becomes young, fresh and therefore innocent. You know that word 'innocent' means a mind that can never be hurt and therefore it's only such a mind that can never be hurt that is in complete harmony, only such a mind can understand that which is immeasurable.

I think it is time, sir, to stop.

Q: If one achieves this state of tranquillity and peace, beyond

passion and beyond pain, then doesn't one return to passion and pain?

K: Sir - you have understood the question therefore I won't repeat it. You don't achieve tranquillity. There is no you to achieve tranquillity, there is only tranquillity. You understand the difference? We always think in terms of achievement. That's why, sir, look, when you are happy, the moment you say, 'I am happy', happiness is not, is it? In the same way, the moment you are aware that there is tranquillity in you, tranquillity is not. So you cannot achieve tranquillity. What the mind can do is to observe the disorder, the fear, the lack of compassion, observe without the observer and then 'what is' is transformed and gone beyond.



## **SAN FRANCISCO 3RD PUBLIC TALK 17TH MARCH 1973**

I would like, if I may, this morning to talk over with you the question of suffering, love and whether the mind can ever be free of death. I think they are important questions which every human being right throughout the world is concerned with, whether he be a communist or a capitalist or a socialist or not a believer in anything, he must be concerned with these problems. Whether the mind can ever be free from suffering, whether love is beyond pleasure and desire, and whether death which each one of us has to face, whether there is something beyond death, what is immortality, if there is such a thing, and what is the quality of mind that can face death and be free from all its agonies, from its pains and uncertainties. If we may that is what we are going to talk over together this morning.

The speaker may be describing but the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. And communication is not only non-verbal but also verbal. But most of us unfortunately get caught in the very description and explanation, in the word and the stringing of words and the sounding of words and the resonance of words, but to go beyond it, to actually experience. Which means in this case, sharing together this whole problem of existence with its enormous confusion, conflict and sorrow, and the pleasures that we consider are so important in life with which love is associated, and the fear, the uncertainty, the utter loneliness of death. Though the speaker is going to go into it verbally, to share mere words has no meaning whatsoever, to merely repeat what the speaker has said, or

what others have said has no meaning. What has significance, depth and vitality and energy is to see things as they are and to go beyond it. And to do that one must be sufficiently serious. But unfortunately in this country pleasure plays an extraordinarily important part, not that pleasure is wrong but to make that as the main issue in life, whether the religious pleasure or the stimulation through drink, through sex and so on, it destroys the quality of a mind that is really deeply serious. And we need this quality of seriousness when we are going to talk over together very complex, intricate and subtle problems. And without this seriousness it becomes merely a propaganda. And as you listen to the television, read newspapers, the innumerable books that are put out, we get caught in propaganda, we want to be convinced because in ourselves we are so uncertain, so unclear. So if you are willing this morning let's go into it.

To understand, not verbally or intellectually, one must have the art or the capacity to listen. We mean by that word 'to listen' not only to the verbal meaning of what is being said but also to listen to the non-verbal intimations, hints and to read between the lines, if one can so put it. When you listen don't interpret, don't compare what you have already perhaps read or compare with your own feelings. The quality of listening is attention, to listen with your mind, logically, sanely, objectively, to feel beyond the word, not sentimentally or emotionally but to listen to the truth of something so that you yourself discover what is true and what is false. You yourself discover the truth in the false so that you are directly confronted not through the speaker but confronted with this enormous problem of living.

So we will begin together to observe, to listen and therefore act. Action is not different from perception. If you see something dangerous, both psychologically as well as physically, you act instantly. So action is the actual observation, they are not two separate things. You know, the speaker has talked about these things all over the world, in India, in Europe and here, not to convince, not to propagate a new set of ideas or philosophy, but to help human beings to see actually what they are doing; because we are concerned with life, with every day living, not an abstraction of life, not an abstract of 'what is' as an idea and according to that idea put into action in life. So we are not dealing with ideas, conclusions, beliefs, suppositions, we are dealing actually with 'what is'. Oh, this is such a complex subject, I don't quite know where to begin.

When one looks at oneself both outwardly and inwardly, we are broken up human beings, fragmented, outwardly and inwardly. There is no harmonious whole, we function in different fields of life - technologically, business, if you are a priest talk about, oh, god knows what, and our daily living is something totally different, and our religious life, if we have any, is something quite apart. We are either artists, business people, politicians and so on. We live a fragmentary life. That's a fact. And each fragment is in opposition to the other, and where there is fragmentation there must be division and therefore conflict. This fragmentation as the 'me' and the 'not me', as 'we' and 'they' both outwardly and inwardly is one of the basic causes or reasons for suffering. Either that suffering is physiological or psychological. If it is physical then one can deal with it fairly comparatively easily and simply. But when suffering

is in the field of the psyche then it becomes much more complex. And a mind that is caught in suffering cannot possibly understand the nature of love, which we are going to talk about presently.

So it is imperative, at least it seems to me, that we understand this question completely and find out for ourselves whether the mind can be free of this torture, this extraordinary thing that man has put up with for generation after generation. In the Christian world they have symbolized suffering and one person, the saviour, is the embodiment of that suffering and goes beyond it. In the East they translate it in different ways, but the fact remains that human beings, each one, right through the world, go through great agonies, the more sensitive, the more alert, the more observant, the greater the suffering, the anxiety, the extraordinary sense of insoluble problems. I am sure you must have felt this too, you must have known or felt not only the individual personal suffering but also the suffering of those people killed in Vietnam, the maimed, those who can never have a full meal, can never have clean clothes, who can never live in luxury, in comfort. One must have seen this, or felt this very deeply. So there is not only the personal agony, personal sense of frustration, hopelessness, despair, but also those who can never live either physically or inwardly a deep rich life.

So there is suffering of one human being and there is the collective suffering. And can the mind, your mind, go beyond it? Because unless one does the mind is never free. Freedom is one of the most important things in life. Most of us do not want to be free, most of us like to be attached to a person or to an idea, to a piece of earth or to some furniture in the house. Most of us like to identify ourselves with something or other. And freedom, though we talk

about it easily, glibly, that freedom doesn't exist. We think that freedom to think for ourselves, to express freely what we think, to assert our ideas dogmatically or quietly, intelligently or idiotically, is freedom. Thought can never be free because thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, which is the past. So thought is never new, thought is never free. And freedom from suffering is not a conclusion, an idea. And we are dealing, or concerned not with ideas and conclusions but with the actual fact of this colossal weight which human beings bear right through their life. Suffering may come through different forms, which we won't have time to go into and it's irrelevant.

And the point is, is it possible for the mind to be totally free from suffering and yet not become indifferent, callous, irresponsible, but to have that passion, the intensity, the energy that freedom brings, freedom from suffering. We know we suffer, physically and inwardly. They are somewhat related: there is psychosomatic suffering and suffering beyond the mere physical. And two friends talking over this question, as you and the speaker are doing, one asks very deeply, not superficially, not verbally, whether the mind, whether the whole being, the whole structure of our existence can be so totally ordered that suffering doesn't exist at all. The physical suffering is one thing, you can bear with it, or you can medically do something about it; but the physical suffering, to be so aware that it doesn't interfere or distort the clarity of perception. That's one problem. Though one may physically have pain, not to allow that pain to confuse clear action, to confuse relationship and to be so aware of it that it doesn't interfere with the clarity of perception and therefore of thought.

What is suffering, beyond the physical? If you are asked, what is sorrow, how does it come, is it the sense of loneliness, the sense of not being able to fulfil in your desires, in your objectives, is it the sense of being deprived, capacity, person, or that comparing yourself with another you find yourself smaller, less capable. There are so many reasons for suffering: self-pity, and that conflict that comes through comparison. And also we said suffering, sorrow, exist when the mind is fragmented. All these are the factors that bring about suffering, lack of relationship, lack of love and wanting to be loved, the sense of feeling inferior through comparison. I do not know if you have ever gone into that question of comparison. Are you dull, stupid when you don't compare, or only in comparison you find yourself being dull? These are the various factors of suffering.

Now can you look at this whole structure, not fragmentarily, but as a whole, and look at this suffering and remain with it, not sadistically, not morbidly, remain with it without escaping, or without seeking the cause of suffering? Because if you can, if the mind can remain with it totally, without any distraction, without wanting to go beyond it - and the mind is trained, as we are, through education to escape anything, from anything that is painful - so can you who suffer remain with it without the word? Do try, please, as we are talking. Look at it, observe it, remain with it without the word, without the desire to go beyond it, so that you are observing it without the observer, so that there is no division between you and the thing which you call sorrow. Because the moment when there is a division between you as the observer, the thinker, and the observed, which is suffering, then when there is

that division there is not only conflict but the desire to go beyond it, to escape from it. And when there is no division at all then you are completely with it without identifying yourself with it. Then you will see, if you do it really, deeply, seriously, with that energy which you have now, which has been dissipated through escape, through rationalization, you have that energy to face completely that sorrow, then you will see that sorrow becomes passion. The very word 'passion' has its roots, its root meaning is sorrow.

Because most of us have no passion, we may be lustful, we may be ambitious, greedy, with innumerable desires, but that is not passion. To do anything creatively, fully, completely, there must be a sense of great intensity, great passion, and that passion is denied when sorrow exists. And that's why if you are serious, if life is to be something to be the verbal propagandist level, one must go beyond this thing called suffering.

And also when there is passion we must enquire into what is love. Are you interested in all this? I don't know why you should be, are you? Because we are dealing with your life, not with the speaker's life. We must find out and share together because we have created this monstrous, brutal world, we have made it together and we must together transform it, bring about a different world, and therefore there must be co-operation. And co-operation doesn't exist round an idea, round a profit motive. Such co-operation soon breaks up. Co-operation can only exist when there is love. And to bring about a change in this world which is so utterly mad, so destructive, so meaningless, though intellectually you can give it a meaning, but that intellectual capacity to give meaning to a life that is empty is meaningless also. So we must

find out for ourselves and in the way of finding it out we shall then learn how to co-operate, how to build a differing world which is based on something entirely different. So it is important to find out for ourselves, if you are at all serious, what is love. Is it pleasure? Is it the outcome of desire? We went into the question of pleasure the other day. But for most of us love is pleasure, both sexually and the search for reality or for great experience is based on pleasure. The ambitions, the greeds, the envys, the whole moral structure which we have built is based fundamentally on pleasure, though we cover it up with words like sacrifice and all the rest of it. So is love pleasure? Please, ask yourself this question.

And is desire with all its tremendous energy, is that love? And is love jealousy? Can a man who is ambitious, competitive, who believes in an idea, in a concept - the idealist, can he love? Can a man who is pursuing pleasure know what love is? And for us love is identified with sex, and sex has become extraordinarily important in our life, probably after power, money, it's the greatest thing because in that there is great pleasure, and in that a sense of freedom, and self forgetfulness. And is all that - not self forgetfulness - but a usage of sex as a means of self forgetfulness is a form of pleasure. Now is all that love? And can love be cultivated? And can love, which has been used by the politicians, by the Generals, by the army, navy, you know, all the brutality, and the divisions of churches and religions, all that, they use this word so easily, and is all that love?

One comes upon it through negation of what it is not, but you must negate, not verbally but actually in daily life. For joy, ecstasy is not pleasure. Pleasure you can invite, sustain, nourish through



desire, but joy you cannot invite, you cannot cultivate it, when you are ecstatic, the feeling of it, ecstasy, you cannot hold it. The moment you hold it and want to pursue it, it becomes pleasure.

So through real actual negation of ambition, competition, a negation of sorrow, observing what pleasure does and the pursuit of it, and the divisions that we have made in our life, to negate all that, you come upon this thing which is compassion which is most positive, which has tremendous energy.

Then we can go on to the next thing which is, death. You know, man has always sought immortality, he has always held a belief that there is something beyond death, and has always asked whether he, as a human being, the individual, the you, can be immortal, beyond mortality. And we have pursued that, the you becoming immortal, deathless, timeless. And every religion has given you hope, or conditioned you through propaganda of two thousand years, or seven thousand years historically, has conditioned you to believe in some form of resurrection, reincarnation and so on, because death for all of us, most of us at least, is something dreadful, something to be totally frightened of, something that denies living. The living that we know is, from the moment we are born until we die, a constant battle, constant travail, constant anguish, uncertainty with occasional flashes of happiness, joy, and creative expression, but the matrix of our life is pain, grief, struggle. That's what we know. And death is something we don't know. All that we know is that life comes to an end, and so we cling to the living which is the known.

So is there such a thing as immortality, the `me' living everlastingly, the `me' living in a timeless world? And the `me' is

what I am, and what am I? Look at yourself, what are you? Look at yourself clearly, surgically, not sentimentally, not hopefully, but to see actually as one is. What are you? You are the things that you have identified yourself with, it maybe the country, it maybe your politics, it maybe your church, your husband, your wife, your girl friend or whatever it is, identified yourself with your knowledge, the books that you have read, or the books that you want to write, the furniture, the house, the bank account, the ambitions, the frustrations and so on - all that is you actually. You may think you are a divine entity, there is something divine in you - which is again put there by thought, either it is your own thought or the thought of a thousand years of the priests. Your own hope and that hope being exploited by another. That's what you are. That's what you can find out for yourself, what you are, the known. And you want that thing to be immortal. You want that thing to live beyond time. That thing is a series of conclusions and words. I know most of you wont like what is being said, but that is a fact.

And is there freedom from death - which is a much more important question to ask rather than immortality. Can the mind, living in this world, be free from death? Not only the idea of death, and as death, a movement in time, death as something to be postponed, something that is inevitable but let's avoid it at any price, something far away. So when there is this time element which exists between here and there, between the living and the dying, when there is this gap of time, then death is inevitable. And because it is inevitable man seeks through belief, through superstition, through rationality, a way of escape. And thought, as we went into it the other day, is time, thought is measure. It is this

measurement as time that divides the living, death and life. Now can the mind be free of death, the idea, the sense of being completely isolated, completely lonely? That's what takes place when you are dying, that there is a moment when you are completely isolated, all your relationships, everything is cut away from you and you are completely lonely, isolated. Can the mind free itself from this?

You know, we are caught in the stream, in a stream - or rather there are two streams, the technological stream and the stream of human conduct, of human sorrow, pain, anxiety, aggression, pleasure and so on. There are these two streams in which the mind is caught. I do not know if you have not observed this. To the mind that steps out of the stream that human beings are caught in, to that person there is no death, there is freedom from death; but the person who is caught in the stream of ambition, greed, envy, the pursuit of pleasure and so on, there is always death. And from that stream the Psychological Research Society draws the past, from that stream the persons who have lived express themselves, but they are still in the stream. I don't know if you understand all this.

You see what we are trying to point out is that life is one, the living, love and death are one, they are not three separate things. And when you separate them there is conflict, there is agony, there is pain, there is sorrow and the fear of death. But when life is a whole, non-fragmented, harmonious, total, then to such a mind there is freedom from death.

You know all this requires a great deal of meditation. For meditation is a form of enquiry and that enquiry is not only outwardly but also deeply inwardly. To know oneself, the knowing

of oneself completely is the ending of sorrow and the beginning of wisdom. The knowing of yourself completely both consciously as well as unconsciously, to know yourself, the whole of it, is not dependent on a psychologist, on a philosopher; if you know yourself according to somebody then you know that somebody but not yourself. And to know yourself you have to enquire, look, because you are the world and the world is you, and when you know yourself completely, the knowing is not just acquiring a knowledge about yourself, it is a movement, then you will see that sorrow ends and wisdom begins.

Would you care to ask questions about what we have talked about this morning?

Questioner: Sir, in the last year I have been caught up in tension because I have to get good grades to get my degree. Initially I worked very hard indeed until suddenly I realized the reason why I was working was for a goal instead of just working out of interest, and what took place was that it was as if suddenly my attention grew inwardly, I became more objective and I would just stop working. It's a sort of objectivity that would come about and if tension started again, the objectivity...

K: I am afraid you have to make your question brief otherwise we can't repeat it for others to hear it. So would you kindly be brief.

Q: She says, I get tense because I have to get a good grade in my studies, then I realize that this tension comes from the ambition of wanting good grades. The rest I didn't understand.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is this what you are saying, if I understand a little bit of it:

that the urge or the demand to get better grades makes you tense and therefore various activities become also rather tiring and exhausting and therefore destructive. Is that what you are saying?

Q: Yes, but I find it hard to be objective.

K: I understand. Let's take up that question by itself. We are being educated for what? (Clapping) Please, I beg of you don't clap, you are wasting your energy. We asked, what is it we are being educated for. This is a serious question, not a rhetorical question. What for? To go on with this present structure as it is, ambition, greed, envy, fear, you know all that is going on in the world, is that what we are being educated for, to earn a livelihood so that you can have a job because you have a degree? And if you reject that, fall out, what will you do with your life? Just wander around, take drugs - and there are thousands of them, I have been told fifteen to twenty thousand of them in America, in India, who have dropped out because they have rejected this kind of education, which merely sustains, as they say, the Establishment. And what will they do with their life? So it is a basic question, it is not just a flippant thing to ask: what is it you are being educated for? To run dynamos, to run factories, to get more money, to buy more cars, refrigerators, and god knows what else, toothpaste and so on, which they advertise - is that what you are being educated for?

So what is education? Is it just a fragmentary cultivation of a particular part of the brain, or is it the total movement of man, the total, his mind, his heart, his body, where he is going, what he is doing? Is it merely to cultivate what he should think, or the art of thinking and therefore realize the limitations of thought and to go

beyond it? What is all for? To dress beautifully? To drive more cars? To take drugs and to have some kind of silly experience? To go to church once in a week and look to god, and all that kind of stuff? Play around? What is it you are all doing, for god's sake? More wars, better submarines? You see we never ask these fundamental questions and if we do then we have no answers. Or we try to answer it according to some philosopher, some saint, or some professor, we never find for ourselves the answer so that we live differently. Why should I be educated? To know more about things, facts and then what? You have been to the moon, then what? You have put up an American flag there. (Laughter) Don't laugh, don't laugh, you should cry. This is what your education is doing and then ultimately send them to be killed. If you are a mother and you love your child, do you think you would ever allow your son to be killed. No, sirs.

So you must find out how to bring up a child so that it doesn't become neurotic, violent, and he will become violent if the father, the mother have no right relationship, if each is pursuing his own particular ambition, treating the child as a toy for a few years and then sending him off to school and then forget him. Do please for your own sake and for the sake of the world look at it all, do be terribly serious about it.

Q: You said we must be free, what is this force within which says you must be free?

K: What is the necessity, or the force that demands freedom. Is that it, sir?

Q: Yes. Is it more than a concept or an idea, what is then?

K: Yes. Is it more than a concept. All right. What is the thing

that demands freedom? Is it desire? Desire to be free because you are in a prison and you want freedom. Is freedom natural? Or is it something because one lives in a prison, and we live in a prison. We may have marvellous cars to go out, lovely country, the hills and the beauty of the land and the lakes, to look at it, but inwardly we live in a prison. And to escape from that prison, to wander off, is that freedom? Is freedom the realization of the prison? And the desire to be out of that prison, is that freedom? Or seeing the prison, seeing we are caught in this awful trap of so-called civilization, culture - it's a trap, and the very fact of that realization that it is a trap, the realization, not the verbal conclusion that it is a trap, that very perception is the demand for freedom, and therefore going beyond the trap.

You see, sir, if it is desire to be free, what is desire? Have you ever thought about it? What is desire, how does it come, about which you are so passionate, we want our desires fulfilled. If they are not fulfilled we become violent, aggressive, silly, idiotic, we are rotten. So we have to find out what is desire, how does it come. Surely it comes, to put it very, very simply, there is first seeing, contact, sensation and desire. Seeing a lovely piece of furniture, touching it, the desire to own it. Perception, contact, sensation. And whether the mind can observe this process and not go on with the desire to fulfil that desire. You experiment with it and you will see. Yes sir?

Q: Krishnamurti, I wanted to ask you, do you believe that a man is born with an instinctive nature - instinctive in terms of animal behaviour - and if so what is the nature of it?

K: I understand. What is the nature of man and is it instinctive.

Do you believe that. Look, I don't believe in anything. There are only facts, there is only `what is' and to go beyond `what is'. We human beings are the result of thousands of years of evolution, of environmental influence, heredity, I am the result of the group or the community in which I was born, a Hindu, a Brahmin, conditioned. Conditioned by the environment, by the culture in which that brain was born. It was conditioned, there is no intrinsic essence. And the fact is a mind is conditioned whether it is in the communist world or the capitalist world or the Catholic world or the Hindu world, it is conditioned. You believe in Jesus and somebody else believes in some other person, that's the result of your propaganda of thousands of years. And that conditions you to behave in a certain way, and you revolt against it, as is being done now. And a revolt is not freedom, a reaction is not freedom, it will form another conditioning.

So the question is basically whether the mind can be unconditioned, is it possible for a mind which has been conditioned as a Hindu, Buddhist, Catholic, Christian or whatever it is, communist, can that mind free itself completely? Otherwise it lives in a prison and reacts according to that prison, according to that conditioning. And can the mind be aware, become completely choicelessly aware of its conditioning? Not only superficially but deeply, at the deep layers of consciousness, is that possible? It is possible, not because the speaker says so, you can find out for yourself if you are energetic enough, if you are eager enough, if you are intense enough you can find it out. That is, the enquiry is then, what is consciousness, your consciousness, what is your consciousness? Your consciousness is its content. What the content



is makes up consciousness. That's fairly obvious. And can the mind go beyond the content which makes up the `me' as the content of my consciousness? That is real meditation, not all this phoney stuff that is being spread around in this country - which we will go into if you wish tomorrow morning. Yes sir?

Q: During the last week I was attempting to observe my fears but there came a point when I was walking down the hall to my school when I recognized a woman whom I recognized and I looked at myself and saw my face and...

K: I didn't quite understand the question, sir.

Q: During the past week I was trying to observe my fears and one of the experiences I have had has been a simple total power, and seeing death on my own face. And at that moment I attempted to escape.

K: I haven't understood. Forgive me, sir. I haven't understood your question. Put it in two or three words.

Q: I found during the past week a sense of identifying myself with death and I felt tremendous power and I tried to escape.

K: Are you saying, sir, that you stayed with fear and it gave you a certain energy and you are there, is that it?

Q: I saw the lack of love in my face, I saw a dead face.

K: Sir, this gentleman says he realizes the lack of love in death's face and so on. What is the question, sir?

Q: What can I do?

K: Ah, what can you do. What can you do - please listen - what can you do when you find in yourself that you have no love, that you have only pleasure, that you want this or that, but actually in you there is no compassion, what will you do? Now first of all how

do you find out that you have no love? When you say, I have no love, what do you mean by it? Are you saying it according to a conclusion that you have about love, or do you realize that you have no love when you are jealous, when you are angry, when you are violent, when you are ambitious? Ambition, competitiveness, comparison, do you realize that denies love; when that denies love then you negate what is not love. Can you put aside your ambitions, your competitiveness, your greed and all the rest of it? So through negation, as we said earlier, the real thing takes place.

I'm afraid I must stop.

## SAN FRANCISCO 4TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH MARCH 1973

As this is the last talk here I think we ought to consider the question of religion, its relationship to daily life and whether there is something, or not, an unnameable, a timeless state of mind. One can call it enlightenment, a realization of the absolute truth and so on. And we will this morning, if we may, go into this question, not only of meditation but also whether the mind, the human mind, can ever find, come upon, or discover, something that is incorruptible, that is not put together by the human mind with its thought, something that must exist, which will give a perfume, a beauty, a loveliness to life. Man, if you observe throughout history, has been seeking in so many different ways, something beyond this ordinary life, beyond this world. He has done everything possible, fasted, tortured himself, every form of neurotic behaviour, worshipped legends and their heroes, accepted authority of another who said, "I know the way, follow me". Man, whether he is in the West or in the East, has always enquired into this question. Of course the intellectuals, especially the modern intellectuals spit upon the word 'religion'. To them it is some neurotic enquiry which has no value whatsoever. To them it is some form of hysteria, some form of make-belief; and religion, to them, is something to be totally avoided. Because they see around them such absurdities in the name of religion, such incredible behaviour without reason, without any substance behind their activity. And the intellectuals, the philosophers, the psychologists, and the analysts prefer to deal with human beings who will conform to the pattern, or to the

pattern that is already established, or the pattern which they think is right. You must have observed all this in different ways.

But the intellect is only part of life, it has its normal place, but apparently human beings right throughout the world have given such extraordinary importance to the intellect - the intellect being the capacity to reason, to logically pursue, establish an activity based on reason and logic. But I am afraid human beings are not merely intellectual entities. They are a whole complex, confused human being.

So religion has become something to be avoided, something of superstition, destructive of logic and sanity. But man, if you have observed and you must have observed, wants to find something that is both rational, and has depth, a full meaning, not invented by the intellect. And he has always from the ancient of days sought out, enquired, and perhaps this morning, and it is a lovely morning, clear blue sky, the hills, the waters, and the light of California, when you see all this beauty, what has beauty to do with religion? And what is religion? What is a religious mind? And it is important, it seems to me, to enquire into this. We are asking what is religion, not the organized religion. Religion, which is organized is a business affair, with a central figure and a priest in between you and the reality. It is a vast machinery, not only in this country and in Europe, and also in Asia, it is a vast machinery to condition the human mind according to certain beliefs, dogma, rituals and superstition. It is a very profitable business, and we accept it because we want in our life, which is so empty, which lacks beauty, we want romantic, mystical legend. And we worship legends, the myths, but the myths, the legends, all the edifices man

has built, both physically as well as psychologically, has nothing whatsoever to do with reality.

And in enquiring, if you are at all serious, what is a religious mind, what is its place in the modern world, has it any relationship to daily life, which is so ugly, so empty, so brutal. If you are - and I hope some of you are - really deeply serious in your enquiry, not through books, not through argument, not through comparing what one teacher has said or another, and if you are at all deeply concerned, then one must obviously put away all the legends, however pleasant, however satisfying, however comforting; actually put them away totally. And when you do that you do not belong to any organized religion, which doesn't mean that you become a non-believer; a believer and a non-believer are the same. But when one sees what legends have done to the human mind, the Christian legend or the Hindu legend, or the Buddhist and so on, they have broken up the human mind, they have separated, though they talk of unity, love and beauty and all the rest of it, they have actually put man against man - how many religious wars there have been! Probably, if you observe, the Christians have killed more human beings than anybody else. It is rather surprising, isn't it? Not only killed animals but human beings. And religions, as organized business propagandist affairs have nothing whatsoever to do with reality.

So a mind that is really serious, with all the intensity of a mind that is eager to find out, must obviously put away all beliefs, all belief in God, put aside all the myths, the legends, the saviours, the gurus, so that the mind is not dependent, so that it can seek, or find out, be capable to observe without any delusions. Can you do this?

Because we like to be deceived, we are very gullible people, especially in this country, though you may be highly sophisticated in one direction, you are extraordinarily, if I may point out, gullible, eager to accept some exotic new oriental mysticism. And you are caught in your enquiry by somebody who is very assertive, who explains beautifully. And can you, if you are serious, put away all this? Because if the mind can be deceived, if the mind can create its own illusions, be deceptive, and live in deception, thinking that it is real, then such a mind is incapable of coming upon something, if there is something, beyond time.

So, what makes for illusion? Why do human beings accept so eagerly every kind of false, stupid - I don't know what word to use - make-belief? You have in this country, I do not know, how many gurus, both the native kind and the foreign kind. They go off to India, shave their head, put on a robe and become a guru. It is a very profitable thing; and they have come from India. And these people should know better, because their religion used to be something very, very real, not something to be played with, something that was never used for money. And being gullible, wanting to find something new, because you are tired of the old - the old rituals, the old gods, the old legends, in this country you try to find something new, a new entertainment. And when you are seeking to be entertained, whether physically or psychologically or religiously, then you are bound to be deceived.

So deception exists, or the power of being deceived comes into being when you desire to achieve something, when you want something. So that is the first thing to realize, that when you are seeking, enquiring into this mind which is religious, which man has

sought from time immemorial, there must be no deception whatsoever. And that means no desire to achieve, to become, to grasp, to attain. And that is very difficult because we see what is happening around the world, we see how life is transient, so meaningless and we want something that endures, that has beauty, that has substance which is not the substance of thought. And so wanting that we are caught in illusion. So that is the first thing to realize: that the mind in its enquiry must be totally free from all desire to achieve, to attain, to become.

And naturally one must be free of all belief and organized structural enquiry. When you have done that, then what is the mind that is free from all the human endeavour, what is the mind which has really put aside everything that man has created in his search for this thing called a reality? You know this is one of the most difficult things to put into words. But words must be used and also communication is not only verbal but non-verbal. That is, both you and the speaker must at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity, enquire, then communion is possible between you and the speaker. And we are trying to commune not only non-verbally but also verbally into this question, which is extraordinarily complex, needs clear, objective thinking, and also to go beyond all thought.

Our consciousness is its content, its content is consciousness. The content of your consciousness is what you think daily, how you behave, what you do with regard to your daily labour, and so on. The content of you, your consciousness is consciousness. The content is not separate from consciousness. It is one. And that content has been cultivated, put there, for centuries. It has evolved,

always within the field of time.

I hope you don't mind if we become rather serious because you see we are going to talk about meditation, and meditation is not for the immature. The immature can play with it, and they do now, sit cross legged, breath in a certain way, stand on your head, you know all the tricks that one plays. Take drugs in order to experience something original, and all such activity is utterly immature because through drugs, through fasting, through any system you can never find, or come upon that which is eternal, timeless. But in this country it is becoming more and more apparent that you are craving for experience because you are bored with daily life, with the daily experience and you want something much more, and you think there is a short cut to all this. There isn't. One has to work hard, one has to become aware enormously of what one is doing, what one is thinking without any distortion. And all that requires great maturity - maturity not of age but maturity of the mind, that is capable of observation, seeing the false as the false, and the true in the false, and truth as truth. That is maturity, whether in the political scene, or in the business world, or in your relationship.

And we are going to talk over together, and share perhaps, this enquiry into not only what is the religious mind, but also into what is meditation. Probably most of you have heard that word, or have read something about it, or follow some guru who tells you what to do. And I wish you had never heard that word then your mind would be fresh to enquire. But now that you have been contaminated, now that some of you have been to India, and I don't know why you go to India, truth isn't there, there is romance, but



romance is not truth, truth is where you are, not in some foreign country - where you are. Truth is what you are doing, how you are behaving, it is there, not in shaving your head - good god, all those stupid things that man has done.

So we are going to enquire together into this question of meditation. Why should you meditate? The meaning of that word is to ponder, to think over, to look, to perceive, to see clearly. To see clearly, to observe without distortion, there must be an awareness of your background, of your conditioning. Just to be aware of it, not to change it, not to alter it, not to transform it or be free of it, but just to observe. And in that observation to see clearly without distortion the whole content of consciousness, and that is the beginning and the ending of meditation. The first step is the last step.

Why should one meditate and what is meditation? You know if you saw this morning, out of your window, the extraordinary beauty of the morning light, the distant mountains, and the light on that water, if you observed without the word, without saying to yourself, "How beautiful that is", if you observed completely, were totally attentive in that observation, your mind must have been completely quiet, otherwise you cannot observe, otherwise you cannot listen. So meditation is the quality of mind that is completely attentive and silent. It is only then that you can see the flower, the beauty of it, the colour of it, the shape of it, and it is only then the distance between you and the flower ceases. Not that you identify yourself with the flower, but the time element that exists between you and that, the distance disappears. And you can only observe very clearly when there is non-verbal, non-personal,

but an attentive, observation in which there is no centre as the 'me'. That is meditation.

Now this requires a great deal of enquiry, whether you can observe non-verbally, without distortion, without 'me' as memory interfering. You know that implies thought must not interfere in observation. That is, to observe without the image in relationship with another, to observe another without the images you have built about the other. I do not know if you have tried it, if you have talked about it. When you observe another without the image, the image is you, the you which has accumulated various impressions, various reactions about another, that forms the image and so divides you from the other. And this division brings conflict, but when there is no image you can observe the other with a total sense of attention, in which there is love, compassion and therefore no conflict. That is the observation without the observer. In the same way to observe a flower, everything about one, without division, for division implies conflict, and this division exists as long as thought becomes all important. And for most of us thought and the movement of thought, the activity of thought, is important.

And so the question arises: can thought be controlled? You have to control thought so as not to allow it to interfere, but allow thought to function in its proper place. Control implies suppression, direction, following a pattern, imitation, conformity. All that is implied in control. And from childhood you have been trained to control, and in reaction to that, the modern world says, 'I won't control, I'll do anything I want' - we are not talking about doing what one wants, that is absurd. And it is also absurd this whole system of control. Control exists only when there is no

understanding. When you see something very clearly there is no need for control. If I see very clearly, my mind sees very clearly how thought interferes, how thought always separates, when I see very clearly the function of thought, which is always in the field of the known, then that very observation prevents all control of thought.

And the word 'discipline' means to learn, discipline means to learn, not as it is accepted now, which becomes mechanical. Again in discipline there is conformity, as it is accepted now. We are talking about a mind that is free from control and is capable of learning. Where there is learning there is no necessity at all for any kind of control. That is, as you are learning you are acting. So a mind that is enquiring into the nature of meditation must be always learning, and therefore learning brings its own order. You know order is necessary in life. Order is virtue. Order in behaviour is righteousness. Order is not the order which is imposed by society, by a culture, by environment, by compulsion or obedience. Order is not a blueprint but order comes into being when you understand not only in yourself but about you, disorder. Through the negation of disorder is order. Therefore we must look at disorder, the disorder of our life, the contradictions in ourselves, the opposing desires, say one thing, do another, think another.

So in understanding, in looking at disorder, being aware, attentive, choicelessly of disorder, order comes naturally, easily, without any effort. And order, such order is necessary.

So meditation is a process of life in which relationship with each other is clear, without any conflict. Meditation is the understanding of fear, of pleasure. Meditation is the thing called

love; and the freedom from death, which we talked about yesterday morning; and the freedom to stand completely alone, and that is one of the greatest things in life, because if you cannot stand alone if you are not free. I mean stand alone inwardly, psychologically. That aloneness is not isolation, a withdrawal from the world. That aloneness comes into being when you totally negate, actually not verbally but do it actually with your life, all the things that man has put together in his fear, in his pleasure, in his searching for something that is beyond this daily routine of life.

Then you will see, if you have gone that far, that the mind, not having any illusion, not following anybody and therefore being free of all sense of authority. It is only such a mind that can open the door. It is only such a mind that can see if there is, or if there is not a timeless quality.

Therefore it is important to understand the question of time. Obviously there is the daily chronological time. We are not talking about that, that is fairly simple and clear. But is there psychological time, the time of tomorrow, that is, I will be something, or I will attain, I will succeed; the idea of time being from here to there. Or is it an invention of thought, this whole idea of progress? There is obviously progress, which unfortunately the business world has turned into profit. There is progress from the bullock cart to the jet, but is there psychological progress - the 'me' becoming better, nobler, wiser? The 'me' which is the past - please follow this a little bit, if you are interested - the 'me' which is the past, the 'me' which has accumulated so many things, the insults, flatteries, pain, knowledge, suffering, the 'me', can that progress to a better state? And to advance from here to the battle, time is necessary. To

become something time is necessary, but is there such a thing as becoming something? Will you become something better? Better in the sense, better me, the 'me' more noble, the 'me' less conflict. But the 'me' is the entity that separates. The 'me' and the 'not me', the 'we' and 'they', the 'me' as the American and the 'me' as the Hindu, or the Russian or whatever it is. So can the 'me' ever become better? Or the 'me' has to cease completely and never think in terms of the better or becoming something more. When you admit the more, the better, you are denying the good.

So meditation is the total negation of the 'me', so that the mind is never in conflict. And a mind when it is not in conflict is not in that state of peace which is the interval between two conflicts but a peace - I don't like to use that word 'peace' - but a quality of mind that is free from total conflict. And that is part of meditation. And when you have understood the psychological time then the mind has space. Have you noticed how little space we have, both physically and inwardly? Living in large cities, in cupboards, in narrow space we become more violent because we need space physically. Psychologically also, have you noticed, how little space we have inwardly? Because our minds are crowded with imagination, with all the things that we have learned, with various forms of conditioning, the influences, the propaganda. We are full of all the things that man has thought about, invented, our own desires, pursuits and ambitions, fears and so on, it is full, and therefore very little space. And meditation, if you go into it very deeply, is the negation of all this, so that there is in that state of attention there is vast space without boundary. Then the mind is silent. You know probably you have learned from others that you

must go through a system of meditation so that the mind becomes silent, that is, practise in order to achieve silence, to attain silence, practise in order to become enlightened, which is called meditation, and that kind of meditation is sheer nonsense. Because when you practise - you see what happens - there is the entity that practises over and over and over again, becoming mechanical, more and more mechanical, therefore limited, insensitive, dull. And why should you practise? Why should you allow another to come between you and your enquiry? Why should the priests, or your guru, or your book come between you and what you want to find out? Is it fear? Is it that you want somebody to encourage you? Is it that you lean on somebody when you are yourself uncertain. And when you are uncertain and you lean on somebody for certainty you may be quite sure that you are choosing somebody who is equally uncertain. And therefore the person on whom you lean maintains that he is very certain. He says, "I know, I have achieved, I am the way, follow me." So be very careful, beware of a man who says he knows.

Enlightenment is not a fixed place, there is no fixed place. All that one has to do is to understand the chaos, the disorder in which we live. In the understanding of that we have order, there comes clarity, there comes certainty. And that certainty is not the invention of thought. That certainty is intelligence. And when you have all this, when the mind sees all this very clearly then the door opens. What lies beyond is not nameable. It cannot be described, and anyone who describes it has never seen it, because it cannot be put into words because the word is not the thing, the description is not the described. All that one can do is to be totally attentive in

our relationship, and that attention is not possible when there is image; to understand the whole nature of pleasure and fear, and to see that pleasure is not love, and desire is not love. And you have to find out everything for yourself nobody can tell you. Every religion has said, "Don't kill". To you that is just words, "Don't kill" but if you are serious you have to find out what it means for yourself. What has been said in the past may be true, but that truth is not yours, you have to find it out, what it means never to kill. You have to find out, you have to learn what it means not to kill, then it is your truth and it is a living truth. In the same way you have to find out for yourself, not through another, not through practice of a system invented by another, nor the acceptance of a guru, or a teacher, a saviour, but you yourself in your freedom have to see what is truth, what is false, and find out for yourself completely how to live a life in which there is no strife whatsoever. The whole of this is meditation.

Do you want to ask any questions? Or you have listened a great deal, we have talked about so many things. Things that concern our daily life, and having listened what have you learned, what are you learning? Or are you so full of questions that you're not learning? And who is the teacher? If you have a teacher you are not learning. Because you yourself are the teacher; you yourself are the disciple. There is no teacher outside you, and if you can learn from yourself by observing yourself then you don't have to read a single book about yourself. Well, do you want to ask anything?

Q: Krishnamurti, can we go into the relationship between imagination and the quietness of mind?

K: Could you go into imagination and to the quietness of mind?

What is imagination? Why should you imagine at all? 'Imagine', build images - that's what that word means. Why should you build images at all? Why should you build an image about another? Why should you build an image about the mountains, about the light on the water? There it is. Why should your mind build an image about the light on the water, unless you want to put it on a canvas? And why do you want to put it on a canvas? Is creation ... please, this is... I'll go on if you are interested. Is creation, does creation demand expression? Or is creation itself expression? One writes a poem; you feel something. You see something extraordinarily beautiful; you hear the nightingale in the woods and the beauty of this, the silence, the deep woods and the light of the morning - you want to express it. Why? To convey it to another? And when the other reads it and begins to imagine himself in the woods through your words and listening to that bird ... And what is all this about? Why should I express at all? So, what place has imagination to the quiet mind? None at all. When the mind is absolutely quiet - mind being not only the mind but thought, the brain, the heart and the body; total harmony - when there is a complete sense of harmony, of which there is no recognition as being harmonious - you can never say "I am harmonious"; then you are not. And when there is such absolute quietness, there is no place for building images. That state itself is the expression and the creation. Yes sir?

Q: Does this mean then that we should not write a book, we should not write a poem? What happens to earning a living?

K: I understand, sir, I understand. If we lived like this we would not write a poem, we would not write books, we wouldn't paint, we wouldn't go to the office. Then how should we live? That's the



question, isn't it, sir? Come to this stage and then you'll find out the answer.

- Laughter and applause -

K: Don't, sirs, please. This is not a flippant answer. You put the question, "What am I to do when I come to that state? How can I live in this world in that state? So that state is a formula ... is an imagination which you have acquired from the speaker, and therefore it's not real. But when that is real to you, then you will know how to live in this world. When that is not real then you have the problem of how to live with that. You haven't got it. It's like asking, "What shall I do when I'm absolutely happy?"

- Laughter -

K: If you are completely, quite harmonious, real, then you would do the real thing in daily life.

Q: Krishnamurti, is there another source, beyond mind, which we can tap?

Q: If there is something beyond thinking, what is it?

K: 'Beyond the mind. If there is something beyond the mind, what is it? Is there anything beyond the mind? How do you know there is something beyond the mind? Has somebody told you? Have you read about it? Or do you think there should be something beyond the mind, because you realise your own mind is so shallow, empty, full of conflict, full of contradiction, and you imagine there is something beyond that? Or do you say, I see what is; what is, is discomfort, this shallowness, this emptiness, this second-hand living, and I will look at it, see what it is and whether the mind can go beyond what is. That is the problem, not if there is something beyond the mind. If I say there is, what right have you to accept it?

I may be telling you something totally wrong, false or true, but it's not your truth. So you have to find out for yourself, totally. And to do that you have to see what is in your daily life, and to observe what is demands attention, energy. To observe what is without distraction, without saying it is good or bad, or saying 'I must go beyond it'. The desire to go beyond it, to condemn it, to justify it, to rationalise it, is a wastage of energy and you need that energy to go beyond what is. Then only you'll find out for yourself there is something beyond.

Q: Is there any way you can explain the process of awareness, of becoming aware?

K: Yes, sir, that's very simple. Is there any way to ... Could you explain the process of becoming aware? It's very simple. Be aware of those flowers. Be aware of your neighbour, sitting next to you. Be aware of the proportions of this hall. Be aware of the sounds, the people's words, how they are dressed, what they look like. Without condemning, without justifying, without choosing. Just be aware. And if you say, "No, I can't do that, because I can't look at something without condemning or liking or disliking", then don't observe the far, but find out why you are ... Become aware of why you dislike and like. Why you have prejudice. So from the outward, from the outer move inward. The whole of that is awareness. The whole of that is attention.

Q: I was wondering if you could comment on what is the necessity of suffering? It seems that all of this is so hard; I wonder what makes our conditioning so strong that reality doesn't break through the walls before us.

K: So, you are asking, are you, sir... you are so conditioned that

it is difficult to get beyond our conditioning? Right?

Q: And what's the necessity of the suffering that we must endure to ...

K: What is the necessity of suffering? Can the mind be free of its conditioning? Right? What is the necessity of suffering? There is no necessity at all. But we do suffer, because we are ignorant of ourselves. We do not know ourselves. We haven't looked at ourselves. We have not become aware of ourselves. We may become aware of ourselves by reading about ourselves, written by somebody else but that is not looking at yourself. If you look at yourself, be aware of yourself, then you will see that suffering is part of this unawareness. And our minds are conditioned. If you live in a particular culture, that culture shapes your mind, through education, through economic conditioning, through various influences of propaganda, through the religious authorities and so on; your whole mind is conditioned, as an Indian mind, a Russian mind, Maoist mind, and so on; it's conditioned. Can that condition ... Can the mind free itself from that conditioning? If you say, "Yes, it can" - how do you know? Or if you say, "It is not possible", then you have blocked yourself. So, we are conditioned and according to that conditioning we respond. To be aware of that conditioning, not only consciously, but unconsciously - the deeper layers of that conditioning - is to be totally attentive of your actions, of your behaviour. The words you use, the gestures, the vanity, the pride, the arrogance, the search for status and so on. Be aware of all this, and then you will say to yourselves that the mind can be free from its conditioning.

Q: But why doesn't this come about naturally? For example, you

talked last week about the difference between function and status, why that destructive aspect of the mind continuously prevail?

K: Why should not the mind only function? Why should it seek status from that function? That's the question, isn't it? Isn't functioning, to function in a job, isn't that terribly boring? If you are - what? - a writer and nobody looked at what you wrote, wouldn't you soon find it was not worth writing? Wouldn't you soon find out, if you loved music, that if you played for yourself quietly and nobody bothered to listen to you - wouldn't you soon get bored, tired? Or if one loves, not possessively, not on which you depend, but love without any sense of demeaning, would you be bored? You would? You may be the exception! So, for most of us, the way we have been educated, mere function becomes tiresome because what we do we don't love and therefore through function we want status, and status gives us a certain position in society and the more you have status the more you are respected, or looked up to. The cook you look down upon and the man who is a big executive with a big car you look up to. So there is respect, which is really disrespect, when you look down on a cook and look up to the minister, or to the president, you have really no respect at all. You are only respecting a word called 'status'. Full stop.

Q: Are there layers of consciousness, and if so ... deep layers and shallow layers, and the second question is in our observation regarding observing what is the state of such a consciousness and how does that express itself in one's waking hours?

K: I'd like to answer this question but I've been told that we must get out of this hall at half past twelve. What shall we do?

Q: Could you speak for a second on sanity?

- Laughter and applause -

K: It's not my problem!

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 31ST AUGUST 1974**

I don't know how you listen to these talks, because what we are going to talk over together is quite serious. It is a great matter and we ought to think over it together, go into it together, not interpreting according to our particular idiosyncrasies and fancies and likes and dislikes, but rather investigate together, examine together, so that we establish between ourselves a kind of communication in which there is sharing, in which there is journeying together into the human problems, and especially into this question of what is religion. Because religion is an action in which all our total energy is demanded. Every other action is fragmentary, it is only the religious mind, the religious activity, the religious comprehension or understanding or an insight, that can bring about, I feel, a total inward revolution which is so utterly necessary. I mean by religion not all that is going on in its name - the sects, the gurus, the drugs, the experiences, the circus that is going on in temples and churches and mosques and all the rest of it. I do not consider that religion at all; they are merely play acting, a fanciful, romantic, sentimental thing that has no meaning at all. Really they are nonsense! And we mean by religion not belief, not rituals, not accepting authority, not trying to discover or experience something other than what we want: but rather a religion is the gathering of our total energy so that the mind can comprehend, be in it as it were, so that our actions are never fragmentary, our actions, our daily relationships, our whole way of life is whole, not broken up. To me that is religion, and to go beyond it, to go

beyond the structure of thought.

That is what we are going to talk over together during this week. And to talk this thing over together I think it becomes necessary to observe, not the description which the speaker is giving, but to observe what is going on. And to observe there is no need for interpretation, to observe there is no need for another to tell us how to observe, or what to observe. There is no need to interpret what we observe because the interpreter is the observed. We will go into all this as we go along.

So we have to observe obviously, not only our lives but also what is going on around us - the misery, the conflict, the violence, the extraordinary sense of despair, the sorrow, the meaningless existence that one leads. And to escape from that we resort to all kinds of fanciful, sectarian beliefs. The gurus are multiplying like mushrooms in the winter - or in the autumn - all over the world. They are bringing their own particular fancy, their traditions and imposing it on others. And that is not religion, that is sheer nonsense, traditional acceptance of what has been, what is dead and put into different words and different circumstances. So it becomes very important, it seems to me, not only that we must bring about a change in the world outside us, but also a total revolution psychologically, inwardly. That seems to me the most urgent and necessary thing. That change will bring about naturally and inevitably, a change in the social structure, in our relationship, in our whole activity of life.

So the first thing, it seems to me, is the act of observation, to observe, to observe without the observer. We will go into this because it is quite a difficult problem.

To observe, not as an Englishman, or a Hindu or a Buddhist, or a Catholic or a Protestant, or an American, or a Communist, or a Socialist or what you will, but to observe without these conditioning attitudes, to observe without the traditional acceptance, to observe without the 'me' interfering with the observation. The 'me' that is the result of the past, the result of all our traditions, the result of our education, the result of our social environmental economic influence and so on - this 'me' that interferes with the observation. Now is it possible to totally eliminate in this observation this activity of the 'me'? Because it is the 'me' that separates and brings about conflict. The 'me' that separates in our relationships with each other and thereby brings conflict in our relationship. So is it possible to observe this whole phenomenon of existence without the traditional 'me', with its prejudices, opinions, judgements, its desires and pleasures and fears? Is that at all possible? If it is not possible then we are caught in the same old trap of slight reformation in the same field, in the same area, with a little more experience, a little more expansive knowledge and so on but we always remain in the same area unless there is a radical understanding of the whole structure of the 'me'. It seems to me that is so obvious and most of us are apt to forget that, most of us are so burdened with our own opinions, with our own judgements, with our own individualistic attitudes that we are incapable of perceiving the whole. And in the perception of the whole lies our salvation. I mean by the word salvation, in the sense a different way of living, a different way of acting, a different way of thinking so that we can live totally at peace within ourselves without conflict, without a problem.



That is what we are going to talk over together during this week: whether the human mind, so conditioned, through time, through evolution, through all the experiences, through a great deal of knowledge, whether such a mind, your mind, our mind, our consciousness can go beyond itself? Not in theory, not in a fancy, not in romantic experiences but actually without any sense of illusion. Because our consciousness is the consciousness of the world. I think this is important to understand. Our consciousness with its content is the consciousness of every human being in the world. His content may vary a little bit here and there, different colour, different shape, different form, but it is essentially the content of our consciousness is the consciousness of the world. And if the content can be changed then the consciousness of the world can also be changed. Are we meeting each other over this thing? Are we talking the same language?

If I can change the content of my consciousness it will obviously affect the consciousness of others. And the content of my consciousness makes up my consciousness. The content is the consciousness. The content is not separate from consciousness. So is it possible for me, for a human being, living in this world, with all the travail, with all the misery, confusion, suffering, violence, with the separate nationalities with their conflicts, with their wars, with their brutalities, with all the calamities that are going on in the world, which is part of my consciousness, which is part of your consciousness - the consciousness that has been trained to accept saviours, teachers, gurus, authority - all that consciousness, can that be transformed? And if it can be transformed what is the way to do it? Obviously not a method. Method implies a preconceived

plan or a system invented by somebody whom you respect or whom you think has got the final answer, and according to that method conform. Which we have done, and therefore it is still within the same pattern. So if one rejects the conformity to any pattern, to any method, to any end, that is, to deny not through resistance but through understanding, having an insight into the foolishness of conformity, then the mind comes across a much more difficult problem which is fear. Please this is not mere talk to which you are listening to a few words and ideas and a few instructive sentences, but rather we are together, and I keep on repeating it, together, sharing this thing. Sharing implies attention, sharing implies the necessity, the urgency of understanding, not intellectually, not verbally, but understanding with our minds, with our hearts, with our whole being.

So as we said, our consciousness with its content is the consciousness of the world, because wherever you go people are suffering, there is poverty, there is misery, there is brutality, which is part of our daily life. There is social injustice, the tremendously wealthy and the poor and so on and so on. Wherever one goes this is an absolute fact. And each one of us is suffering, is caught in all kinds of problems, sexual, personal, collective and so on. This conflict goes on right through the world in every human being. And our consciousness is theirs. And therein lies compassion; not intellectual compassion but the actual passion for this whole human being, who is caught in this extraordinary travail. And when one looks at this consciousness without interpreting it as good or bad, or noble or ignoble, or beautiful or ugly, just to observe it without any interpretation, then you will see for yourself that there

is a tremendous sense of fear, insecurity, lack of certainty. And because of that sense of insecurity we escape into every form of neurotic security. Please do observe it in yourselves, not merely accept what the speaker is saying. And when you observe it, who is the observer? Right? Who is the observer that is observing this whole phenomenon? Is the observer different from the thing observed? Is the thinker different from the thought? Is the experiencer different from the thing he experiences? It seems to me that is one of the basic things that we have to understand. To us there is a division between the observer and the observed. And this division brings about conflict. Wherever there is division there must be conflict, the Arab, the Jew and the whole business.

So one must be very clear, it seems to me, about this question: who is the observer and is the observer different from the thing observed? I look at my consciousness - I don't know if you have ever tried to look at your consciousness. Look at it as though you were looking at yourself in the mirror. To look at all the activities, conscious as well as unconscious, activities of this consciousness, which is within the field of time, which is within the area of thought. Now can one observe it? Or does one observe it as though it was something outside of oneself? And if you do observe it, is the observer who is observing different from the thing observed? And what makes him different? Are we all meeting each other? We are taking a journey together, don't let me walk by myself please, we are all together in this. What is the observer? And what is the structure and the nature of the observer? Is the observer the past, with his experiences, with his knowledge, with his accumulated hurts, with his sorrows and so on, is the observer the past? Is the

observer the 'me'? And is the observer, being the past, is he capable of looking at what is going on around him now? That is, if I am living in the past, the remembrances, the hurts, the sorrows, all the knowledge the mind has accumulated and all knowledge is always in the past, and with that mind observe. And when I do observe with that mind I am always looking through the eyes that have been wounded, through the eyes that have remembered things of the past. So I am always looking through the past, through the accumulated tradition, and so I am never looking at the present. There is a division between the observer who is the past, and the active, moving, living present. So there is a conflict between the observer and the observed. May I go on? Is this clear?

And can the mind observe without the observer? This is not a conundrum, this is not a trick, this is not something to speculate about. You can see it for yourself, you can have an insight into the reality. That is, the observer can never observe. He can observe what he wants to observe, he observes according to his desires, to his fears, to his inclinations, romantic demands and so on and so on. And is not the observer the observed? The observed becomes totally different when the observer is himself totally different. If I have been brought up as a Catholic or a Buddhist, or a Hindu, or god knows what else, and I observe life, this extraordinary movement of life with my conditioned mind, with my beliefs, with my fears, with my saviours, I am observing not 'what is', but I am observing my own conditioning and therefore I never observe 'what is' - right? And when I observe, is the observer different from me? Or the observer is the observed - you understand? Which eliminates altogether conflict. Because you see our life, our

education, our way of living is based on conflict - in all our relationships, in all our activities, the way we live, the way we think springs from this everlasting conflict between you and me, between each other, outwardly as well as inwardly. And the religious life so far has been heightened conflict. A life of torture - you must come to God, or whatever that thing is through torture, through conformity, through acceptance of a belief - which are all forms of conflict. And a mind that is in conflict is obviously not a religious mind.

So one comes to the point: can the mind, your mind, observe without the observer? And that becomes extremely arduous because in that there is this whole question of fear - right? There is not only the conscious fears but the deep rooted fears. Now can the mind be free of fear? Not a few fears, or the fears that one is conscious of, but the entire structure of fear, conscious as well as unconscious? Perhaps you would say that it is not possible, no human being can live in this world without fear. Now we are asking whether a mind that lives in fear - fear of tomorrow, fear of what has been, fear of what might be, fear of what is, fear in relationship, fear of loneliness, fear, a dozen forms of fears, the most absurd fears and the most tragic fears - can the mind be free of all that?

Now how do you investigate fear? I am afraid of a dozen things. How do I investigate and be free of that fear, bearing in mind that the observer is the observed - right? Fear is not different from the observer. The observer is part of that fear, obviously. So how is the mind to be free of that fear. Go on sirs, let's talk it over together. Because with the burden of fear one lives in darkness, from that

fear arises aggression, violence, all the neurotic activities that go on, not only in the religious field but in daily relationship. So for a healthy, sane mind that is whole there must be freedom from fear. Not partial freedom but total freedom. There is no such thing as partial freedom. So how is one, bearing in mind that the observer is the observed, the observer is fear himself and when he observes fear as something separate from him then there is conflict, then he tries to overcome it, suppress it, escape from it, and so on. But when one has this insight, this truth that the observer is the observed, then what takes place? You are following all this? No? I am so sorry.

All right let me put it differently: I am angry, is that anger different from me? Me, the observer, who says "I am angry". Or that anger is part of me. It seems so simple. No? And when I realize that, that the observer is the observed, that the anger which I recognize is part of me, not something apart, then what am I to do with that anger? I am not separate from that anger. I am anger. I am not separate from violence. I am that violence. That violence has come about through my fear, that fear has brought about aggression. So I am all that. Then what takes place?

Let us look at it a little more: when I am angry each response, which I call anger, is recognized, recognized because I have been angry before. So next time I am angry I recognize it and that makes that anger still stronger - right? I wonder if you see this? Because I am looking at this new response with the recognition of a previous anger - right? So I am merely recognizing anger. I am not going beyond it, I am merely recognizing it each time. So can I, can the mind observe that anger without recognition, without using the

word anger, which is a form of recognition? Look: we are violent human beings in so many ways, we may have a gentle face and quiet voice but deeply we are violent people. And there are violent activities, violent speech and all the rest of it. Now is that violence different from me, from the observer? I see that the observer is part of that violence, it is not the observer is non-violent, therefore he looks at violence, but the observer himself is part of that. Then what shall he do? You understand my question? If I am part of that violence, which I am, and before I have separated myself from that violence saying, "I must suppress it, I must conquer it, I must go beyond it" and therefore there is a conflict between that and myself. Now I have eliminated that absurdity, I see the fact that I am violent, the very structure of me is violent. Then what takes place? Obviously there is no desire, no desire to overcome it because I am part of that. Please see this. There is no question of my trying to overcome it, suppress it, and suppression, overcoming, escaping is a form of wastage of energy - isn't it? Now when the observer is the observed I have all the energy. Are we meeting? I have all that energy, which has been dissipated before by escapes, by suppression, by overcoming it. Now I have that tremendous energy which comes about when the observer is the observed, and that energy can go beyond itself, which is violence. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

We need energy, don't we, to do anything. I need energy to go beyond violence, and I have wasted that energy through suppression, through conformity, through escape, through rationalization, through all kinds of forms of escapes and justifications. And when I see the observer is the observed and all

that energy is concentrated, and when there is that total energy there is no violence. It is only fragments that create violence. Have you got it?

Questioner: There is interaction.

K. Not interaction sir. No let's stick to one thing, don't bring in interaction yet, we will come to that.

That is sir, look, human beings have tried right through the world, tried in the old traditional way of overcoming violence, overcoming anger, through rationalization, justification, through escapes, through all kinds of neurotic activities and we have not gone beyond violence, we have not gone beyond the anger, the brutality and all the rest of it. Now can the mind go beyond it? Once and for all finish with violence? And it is possible only when we realize the observer is the observed, because then in that observation there is no escape, no interpretation, no rationalization, just the thing is, and therefore you have the energy to go beyond - right? You do this and you will see it. But you must first understand the reason, the logic, the truth that the observer is the observed.

That is, when you look at another - wife, husband, girl-friend, boy and so on - are you different from the thing you observe, from the person you observe? Maybe a man or a woman, the form may be different, the sex may be different, but psychologically is your consciousness different from hers or his? Do investigate this as we go along. And when you observe, you are observing your own image, you are not observing another. The image which you have built through various interaction, the image you have built about her or him, and that image is looking. This is so obvious, isn't it?



So when one really understands, not verbally, not intellectually, but as an actuality, as something true, then you will see that when the observer is the observed all conflict comes to an end, and therefore our relationship with each other undergoes a radical transformation - right?

So can the mind observe fear? We are going back to that. Your fear - fear of death, fear of life, fear of loneliness, fear of darkness, fear of being nobody, fear of not becoming a great howling success, fear of not being a leader, a writer, this or that, ten different things. First of all, is one aware of it? Or one leads such a superficial life, everlastingly talking about something else, and so one is never aware of oneself, of one's own fears. Then if one becomes aware of those fears, at what level do you become aware? Is it an intellectual awareness of your fears, or are you actually aware of your fears - aware in the sense that you are aware of the colour of the jersey that is next to you? And aware at the deeper levels of your mind of your fear, the deep corners, hidden, and if they are hidden how are they to be exposed? Must you go to an analyst? And the analyst is yourself, he needs to be analysed too, otherwise he wouldn't be an analyst!

So how do you uncover this whole structure, the intricacies of fear? You know this is a tremendous problem, not just to be listened to for two or three minutes and then forget about it. To find out for oneself whether it is possible to expose all the fears, or there is only one central fear, which has many branches. And when one sees the central fear the branches begin to wither away. Is there one central fear - like the trunk of a tree, though it has many branches, and if you could understand that one root of fear you

have understood the whole network of fear? Now how do you approach it? From the periphery, or from the centre? You understand my question? If the mind can understand the root of fear then the branches, the various aspects of fear have no meaning, they wither away. So what is the root of fear? Go on sirs. Can you look at your fear - please look at it now - invite it - naturally you are not afraid sitting here, but you know what your fears are: loneliness, not being loved, not being beautiful, frightened of losing your position, your job, your this, or that, ten different things. Now by looking at one fear, at your particular fear, you can then see the root of that fear, and not only the root of that fear but the root of all fear - you understand? Through one fear, by observing it, by observing it in the sense that the observer is the observed, then you will see for yourself that through one fear you discover the very root of all fear.

Suppose one is afraid - of what?

Q: Loneliness.

K. Loneliness. One is afraid of loneliness. Now first of all have you looked at loneliness, or is that an idea of which you are frightened? Not the fact of loneliness but the idea of loneliness - you see the difference? Which is it? The idea frightens you, or the actuality frightens you.

Q: Not separate, is it?

K: No sir, look. I have an idea of loneliness. The idea being the rationalization of thought which says, "I don't know what it is but I am frightened of it". Or I know what loneliness is, which is not an idea, but an actuality. I know it when I am in with a crowd I suddenly feel that I am not related to anything, that I am absolutely

disassociated, lost, cannot rely on anybody. All my moorings have been cut away and I feel tremendously lonely, frightened. That is an actuality. But the idea about it is not an actuality, and most of us, I am afraid, have an idea about it.

So if it is not an idea but an actuality, what is loneliness? Aren't we breeding it all the time - by our self-centred activity, by this tremendous concern about ourselves, our looks, our attitudes, our opinions, our judgements, our position, our status, our importance, all that, all that is a form of isolation. Throughout the day, for years we have done this, and suddenly we find we are utterly isolated, our beliefs and god and everything goes away. There is this sense of tremendous isolation, which cannot be penetrated, and that naturally brings great fear. Now I observe it, in my life, in my daily life, that my activities, my thoughts, my desires, my pleasures, my experiences are more and more isolating. And the ultimate sense is death, that is a different point. And I observe it. I observe it in my daily movements, in my daily activities. And in the observation of this loneliness, the observer is part of that loneliness, is essentially that loneliness. So the observer is the observed - right? And therefore he cannot possibly escape from it, he cannot cover it up, try to fill it with good activity or with whatever it is, going off to churches and meditation and all the rest of it. So the observer is the observed. And therefore what happens then? You have eliminated altogether conflict, haven't you? Trying to escape from it, try to cover it up, try to rationalize it, you are faced with it, you are that. And when you are confronted with it completely and there is no escape and you are that, then there is no problem, is there? You understand, there is no problem because then there is no sense of

loneliness at all. I wonder if you see this?

Q: Surely it is a problem seeing...

K: We are coming to that presently.

So can you observe your fear? Through one fear trace the very root of all fear. That is, through this sense of loneliness haven't you traced the root of fear? I am lonely. I know what that means not as an idea but as an actuality. I know what hunger is, as an actuality, not somebody has told me what hunger is. There is this extraordinary sense of loneliness, isolation. Isolation is a form of resistance, is a form of exclusion. And I am fully aware of it. And I am also aware that the observer is the observed. And there is fear there, deep rooted fear; through one factor of fear, of loneliness, I have been able to find out, look at the central fact of fear, which is the non-existence of the observer. I wonder if you see this? Am I making this clear, or not at all? If the observer is not, the observer being the past, the observer being his opinions, judgements, evaluations, rationalizations, interpretations, all the tradition, if that is not, where is fear? You understand? If the 'me' is not, where is the fear? But we are educated religiously, in colleges, schools and universities, we are educated to the assertion, the cultivation of the 'me' as the observer. No? I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a British, I am this, I am that, all the rest of it. And by looking at one fear I have been able to trace, the mind has been able to look and trace the central fact of fear, which is the non existence of the observer, the 'me'. And can I live in this world without that 'me'? - when everything around me is an assertion of the 'me', their culture, their works of art, their business, politics, religion, everything around me says, asserts, 'be you, me' - cultivate the 'me'.

In that culture, in that civilization can one live without the 'me'? You understand all this sirs? Therefore the monk says you can't, escape from the world, go to a monastery, change your name, devote your life to this and that, but the 'me' is still there because that 'me' has identified itself with the image it has projected itself as the this and the that and the other. But that 'me' is still there in a different form.

So can one live - please this is a tremendously important and a very, very serious question, it is not just something to play around with - can you live without that 'me' in this monstrous world? That means can one live sanely in a world of insanity? And the world is insane, with all the make-belief of religions. You know all that is happening, I don't have to tell you. Can you live in a world which is insane and yourself be totally sane?

Now who will answer you that question, except yourself obviously. So that means you have to see that your consciousness, with all its content, is the consciousness of the world. That is not a statement, that is a reality, that is something tremendously real. The content of your consciousness makes up your consciousness. Without the content there is no consciousness. Your content now is fear, pleasure, all the things that are going on in the world, the culture which is so exalted, which is so praised, which has such a marvellous culture with its wars, with its brutalities, with its injustice, with its starvation, hunger, you know all that is happening in the world - of that consciousness we are. And your consciousness undergoes radical change and that change affects the consciousness of the world, actually it does. Take any of the people who have so-called brought about physical revolution, Lenin, the

French Revolution people, you may not approve of what they did but they affected the consciousness of the world, like Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and all that gang.

Q: Like Christ.

K: Oh! All right take your Christ. You see how you escape? You escape into your old traditions. You don't say, 'Look I have got to change, my consciousness must undergo a radical transformation' - not somebody else has done this, I was giving you an example. One hasn't got to expand the examples.

So one comes to the central issue: can your consciousness undergo a radical change? And it can only undergo a radical change when this central fact is understood or seen, that the observer is the observed. And when you see that all conflict inwardly comes to an end, bound to, because where there is division between the observer and the observed, anger and not anger, then there is conflict. When the Arab and the Jew see that they are the same human beings there is no need for conflict. So can you observe your conflict, and that conflict is not separate from you, you are that conflict.

Look, this leads to something extraordinary if you go into it. The experiencer is the experience - you understand? Therefore when you meditate your meditation is part of yourself, therefore you are not going away from yourself. I wonder if you see all this. When you talk about meditation - that is a different thing - that is, meditation is not something to be invited, you cannot practise it, you cannot sit down and breathe and do all those tricks. Meditation is something totally outside the field of thought. We will go into it some other time. Right.

Would you like to ask questions about all this?

Q: What about the unconscious fears?

K: I explained that sir. What about the unconscious fears? Now, all right. Can the conscious mind investigate the unconscious fears? The conscious mind can only investigate itself, at its own level, it can't investigate something it doesn't know - right? Science can only explain what it knows, not what it does not know. So we are asking: is it possible for the unconscious content to be uncovered, exposed without the consciousness interfering with it - you understand my question? Look sir: I can investigate my own fears consciously, superficial fears. That is fairly simple? By observing in my relationship with others, in interaction, watching, when I am walking, talking, looking, I can observe the fears very easily. But I have all the deep hidden fears, the racial fears, the family fears, the fears that have been imposed upon me, the fears that I have accumulated through hurt, and we are hurt from childhood. All along in life we are being hurt, hurt, hurt; the more sensitive we are the more hurt we are and the deeper the hurts are, and they are all there, hidden somewhere. Now how is the mind to expose all that? You have understood my question? I realize that deliberate enquiry won't reveal it. Right? A deliberate action saying, I must investigate to find out, you can't: therefore what am I to do? Will analysis open the door? Will group therapy open the door? Will talking to somebody open the door? Please these are all the questions we are putting all the time. Or is there a way of opening the door without the least effort on the part of the mind? You understand? The more I make effort to enquire into the unconscious, the more it becomes impossible because I don't know

what there is. Through analysis I cannot expose it. I can reveal a few layers of it, but analysis has its own problems, which we won't go into now. So what shall I do? I can't analyse because I don't know what there is to be analysed. I can't say to myself I must deliberately sit down, talk about it to others, or talk to myself and see if I can't break the door open, I can't do it. So I say to myself perhaps if I leave it completely alone, but be aware of it, leave it completely alone and watch what comes. That means the mind, the superficial mind, has become quiet - right? It is not interfering, it is not asking, it is not demanding, it is not investigating, it is not translating, it is absolutely quiet in observing. Are you following all this?

So I can observe, the mind can observe without the least effort, because effort will not solve the problem. So when the superficial mind is quiet, really quiet, not saying, I will wait until - but absolutely quiet, then this other thing comes up. I don't know if you see the truth of it. It is like watching a child, it reveals all its movements. So in the same way to investigate, to understand, to look into the deep layers of the unconscious, analysis is not the way, group therapy is not the way, talking to others is not the way. The only way is for the mind, the superficial mind not to interfere. That means to be absolutely quiet and watch.

Now if you have ever attended, if you give your attention to something, there is no question of time, is there? Have you ever done this? When you give complete attention to something, are you listening now with complete attention to what is being said? If you are, at that moment of attention there is no time, is there? Come on sirs. At that moment there is no question of thought is there? Your



whole energy, both nervous, psychological, mental, every kind of energy is completely attentive. Now being so attentive, is there an unconscious or conscious? You understand? There is only attention. And therefore in that state of attention you will see there is no remnants of the unconscious with its content - right?

Q: I think we are confused because there are two different kinds of conflict that can exist. If we argue with ourselves and say 'should I do this?', and then we say, 'no, I won't do this, or I will do it' - we argue back and forth. That is one form of conflict. That is a cover-up. That is our means of avoidance. And that is different from real conflict which works towards a solution. There are two different kinds of conflict, and that is why people here are confused, because one conflict is a method of avoidance, and the other conflict is not a means of avoidance but a means of peeling away avoidance.

K: You are saying, if I understand it rightly, conflict exists where there is choice.

Q: No, no. Where there is avoidance there are two different kinds of conflict. Do you understand what I am saying?

K: Yes, I think I understand. Which is you are saying: there are two different kinds of conflict. But all conflicts are the same, there are not two different kinds.

Q: No. One is used to avoid the real conflict as a solution.

K: I see. Through conflict you will find a solution. That is what the Arabs and the Jews are saying! (Laughter)

Q: No. They are using the kind of conflict which is a method of avoidance.

K: Please madame. If I may suggest you are repeating the same

thing. You are not listening, if I may say so. It is we are saying all conflicts are the same, there are not different kinds of conflicts. Conflict is conflict, whether it is between a husband and a wife, or a girl and a boy, or between nations and nations. The war is the extreme expression of that division - conflict. We are talking of ending conflict, whether it is possible to end conflict in ourselves, in a human mind. If that conflict is not ended we will always live in misery, we will always live what we are living now.

Yes sir?

Q: I wonder if you would like to elaborate on the fact that as we don't realize the old traditions and therefore when you look at another person we should be compassionate towards them.

K: So what is the question madame?

Q: The question is: are you stating as a fact that people through their past conditioning are to be pitied?

K: To be pitied?

Q: Yes, and therefore we are all to be pitied.

K: The question has been answered, hasn't it? (Laughter). Right.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1974**

Shall we continue with what we were talking about yesterday?  
May we? We were saying that human consciousness, with its content, makes our whole life and all its activities. The transformation of this consciousness is our concern. If we are at all serious and take life seriously we must be equally concerned with this question of: is it possible for the human mind with all its conditioning through centuries and centuries, with its superstitions, fears, pleasures, sorrows and all the brutality and the violence involved in modern life, as well as in the past, can that mind radically change itself? That is the problem with which we are confronted. Any serious man must give thought to it. Not only thought but seeing what the world is, so utterly insane, one has to find sanity. And sanity, which means health, whole and also the word whole also implies holy, whether that mind can by itself, without any motive, undergo this radical transformation. We think time is necessary - time as a means of evolution, as a process of gradually changing this content which makes up consciousness. Now is there psychological time at all? I know we have been conditioned, we have been educated, all our ways of life, is to take time into consideration. Time implies movement, movement in a direction, in a particular direction, and the covering of that distance to achieve an end involves time. And we are educated, conditioned to that.

As we said yesterday, we are sharing this thing together. It is our problem, not the speaker's problem, but our problem, our

human problem, whether we are in India, or in America or in Russia or anywhere else. And together we have to solve this problem, not as a group therapy, not through confession and all the rest of that business but investigate it and sharing what we investigate together. Therefore this is not an intellectual or romantic or fanciful discussion or talk. This is something very, very serious. Unless you are prepared to be serious what is said becomes merely an abstract theory and therefore of no significance at all.

And if you are concerned with the transformation of the human mind we have to consider, as we were saying, who is the entity that is going to transform this content? Is not the very content of human consciousness part of the entity which desires to change it? Therefore we have a very difficult and rather subtle problem. And in investigating which is our consciousness, your human daily activity with all its problems, can that human mind change disregarding totally time? As we said, time means movement, direction, going from here to there, physically as well as psychologically, inwardly. Where there is direction there must be choice, and choice implies a confusion. And we think when we are free we can choose because we have the capacity to choose and that freedom to choose we translate as freedom of action. But choice is essentially the outcome of confusion. You don't choose when you see very clearly. It is only when you are confused, rather disturbed, uncertain, then choice come in.

So as we are educated, conditioned to the acceptance of time as a gradual process of changing the mind - I hope you are all sharing all this - we must question right from the beginning whether time

does solve this problem, whether tomorrow, or next year will bring about a radical transformation of the mind - right? And we said, what is time? There is not only time by the watch, chronological, but also psychological time - the time to achieve something, to see that I am, or one is confused, uncertain, sorrowful and one thinks time is necessary to dissolve that. That is our conditioning that gradually, day after day, through practise, through awareness, through examination, through analysis, through investigation, we will come to that point when clarification will take place. So time we think is necessary. The Christian religion, the Hindu, the Buddhist all admit time as a means of achieving this clarification. That is the traditional approach. Now we are asking if there is psychological time at all. That is, psychologically, inwardly, is there a tomorrow? Or the tomorrow is the projection of our desire, of our uncertainty and tomorrow becomes necessary when we do not see very clearly today. So what is perception, and what is action in perception - you are following all this? Good luck to you! (Laughter)

You see I have spent my life in this, for years we have talked about it, not only verbally but we have lived it, gone through it, understood it, and to talk about it to people, like you all, who haven't gone into it very deeply, probably you have not given serious thought to it, or serious consideration or investigation. And to share what is being said you have to attend, you have to listen, you have to absorb, you have to give your life to this. It isn't just a plaything for a morning. It is your whole life, it involves it. And therefore it becomes rather difficult to communicate with those minds who are not totally involved in it, who only have superficial

problems and are only concerned with the solution of their particular problem. But to understand these superficial problems, whether they are economic, social, sexual or whatever problems there are, one must go much deeper. And to investigate at depth requires a mind that is really dreadfully serious, not serious neurotically as some people are, but serious in the sense dedicated to a life that demands clarification at all levels, dedicated to the understanding and to act in that clarification, which is essentially intelligence.

So we are asking: is there time at all - in the psychological sense? There is time to go from here to the next town, to cover that distance you need time. And psychologically, inwardly we admit or accept it, we are conditioned or educated to accept time as a process of clarification, a process of freedom. And when you question this time, which we must because we are going to involve action, what is action, we have to understand clearly, is there a tomorrow at all. To realize that there is no tomorrow psychologically is a tremendous shock. I do not know if you realize this because we live either in the past or in the future. The past is time, the past is knowledge, all the accumulated remembrances, experiences, memories; and tomorrow is much more fascinating, perhaps will offer greater hope, greater facility, greater capacities, greater freedom and so on: so we live between the two, the past and the future, which is, we live in time. I hope you are following all this. And we have projected from the past to the future a concept, an idea, an ideal. The word 'idea', the root meaning of that word is to see. Look what has happened. To see - idea means to see. To see clearly 'what is', not abstract from what you see an idea.

You understand? And act according to that idea, which is time. I wonder if you see this? We always abstract an idea, a concept, a formula from what we see - right? And act according to that formula, concept, ideal and so on. The abstraction is the movement of time. I wonder if you get this? Not the observation of the fact. The observation of the fact needs no time, but when you abstract from 'what is', a concept, an ideal, the movement away from the fact is time. And to act according to that ideal involves further time. Right?

Are we meeting each other because it is rather important because our action is based generally, probably always, on a concept, on an ideal. The fact is one thing, the ideal is another. And that ideal is the abstraction from the fact and I act, or one acts according to that ideal. The movement from that ideal to action involves time. Now why does the mind always do this? You understand my question? That is, I see the fact, one sees the fact that there is sorrow - sorrow in different forms. Every human being in the world carries this burden of sorrow, as he carries the burden of loneliness. He carries this burden. That is a fact. Whatever the cause of that sorrow be, there is this sorrow in the human mind, not only personal sorrow but this whole collective sorrow of human beings. We observe it, we know it, we are aware of it. And from that awareness, or from that observation we draw a conclusion - how to get over it, what to do about it, what are the causes of it, how can we rationalize it or accept it, or try to run away from it. Those are all abstractions from the fact - right? Now why does the mind do this? Whenever it is confronted with a psychological problem it instantly draws a conclusion; and according to that

conclusion it acts. Why does it do it? You understand my question?

I am sure most of you have ideals - God knows why, but you have them. Why? Is it part of our education, part of our culture, part of our religious upbringing? The Communists have it, the Maoists have it, every human being has more or less this kind of ideology - why? Is it that he cannot understand, or go beyond 'what is', and therefore he thinks by having a conclusion about 'what is' will help him to get over 'what is' - you understand.

I have a problem. The human being is violent and he projects the idea of non-violence, which is an abstraction from the fact of violence. Why does the mind do it? Instantly it does it. Is it because - one of the reasons - it doesn't know what to do, it hasn't the capacity to deal with the fact, the fact of violence? Therefore it escapes through an abstraction and says, "I must not be violent". So the 'must not' becomes the ideal, the non-fact, and according to that it tries to act, according to non-fact, which is insanity - I wonder if you see this. So can we say idealists are insane? Do watch it please, this is very, very serious, don't laugh it away. And is it because the mind is so conditioned, so accustomed to the idea of postponement, that something will happen to bring about a change in the fact? So either it is the lack of energy which makes the mind postpone, hoping something will happen: or it has not the capacity to deal with 'what is' and therefore rushes off into an abstraction as an ideal: or is it the feeling that life is so short why bother, put up with things - you are following all this? So we have all these things. So all that admits time. We have had, human beings historically, thousands of wars - I believe 5,000 wars during 5,000 years, or something like that - and we accept wars as a natural way



of life. And we don't see for ourselves the disaster, the appallingness, the brutality of it all - do you follow? Again an idea. So action based on an idea, or an ideology, demands time - right? Whereas where there is perception and action there is no time - right?

As we said, there is suffering, in every form - physical, psychologically, intellectually, moral, suffering through death of another, suffering caused by loneliness, frustration, lack of jobs and so on and so on. Now without drawing an abstraction from sorrow, can the mind observe sorrow and remain with sorrow? You follow? Not run away from it, not escape from it, not rationalize it, not bring in the whole process of thought, but remain completely motionless with that feeling which we call sorrow. Now what is the action of a mind that does not move away from the fact in any direction? I hope you are doing this as the speaker is talking about it, otherwise it is no fun at all.

I am sure you have certain sorrows. Without rationalizing it, without trying to escape from it, without an abstraction as an idea of not having sorrow and so on, can the mind remain with that sorrow absolutely immobile, without any movement? Please understand the question first, don't try tremendous effort, don't try effort, there is no effort necessary in this, just watch it. So then what is action in which there is no idea? You follow? As we said, all our actions, human actions, psychological actions, are based on ideas - right? Surely? Now we are asking: is there an action which is not based on an idea? Because we said idea and the action of idea involves time. And when action is based on an idea there is always inadequacy, or lack of complete identification with that

idea, and therefore conflict between the idea and action. You know all this. So when we are concerned with the elimination of conflict altogether then we must be concerned with what is action, and what is perception. What is seeing and the doing, without the formula, without the ideal. Have you understood now? Can I go on? Thank God!

You understand my question? What is perception? And what is action in which there is no abstraction from the fact of what is seen? So I must first investigate what is perception, what is seeing? Is this all too difficult, or may I go on? Right. What is seeing? When you say, "I perceive", what is this process of perceiving, not only the visual perceiving with the eyes, with the ears and so on, but also the mind perceiving according to its conditioning, according to its desires, to its pleasures, to its fears - right? So it perceives through the image it has built about itself and about the fact - right? It has got two images. The image it has about itself and the image, the verbal image or the symbol about the fact. Now such perception is not perception at all, it is like looking through dark glasses. Now can the mind free itself from the image about itself and about the fact, which is the opinion, the idea, the concept, the formula. I wonder if you follow all this.

You know this demands tremendous inward attention, great inward discipline. Discipline in the sense of not suppression, imitation, conformity, but the very act of looking brings its own order. So we are looking at the fact of sorrow - I am taking that as an example. Can you look at that sorrow, whatever the cause be, look at that feeling without the image you have about yourself, which is, I must not suffer, why should I suffer, I am so good, I am

this, you know all that stuff that goes on, without a single image about yourself and without any interpretation of the fact that there is sorrow. You follow? This requires a tremendous enquiry, attention, concern. This is real seriousness.

So perception implies seeing things exactly as they are, not as I want them to be. And the seeing then is the acting, in which there is no time. The moment there is time there is conflict. I see, for example, organized religions with all the propaganda, with all the tradition, with all the nonsense that goes on within the organized religions throughout the world, I see the fallacy of it, not because I have reaction against it, I see the absurdity of it. And seeing what human beings have put together, which they call religion, seeing the truth of it is instant action of denying the whole thing - never going back to it again, in any form. I wonder if you see this point. Therefore there is instant action, which is sanity. Look, if I act according to a non-idea, according to non-fact, the fact is one thing, isn't it, and the idea about the fact is another. The idea about the fact is non-fact, and if I act according to an idea, an ideal, I am insane. Of course I am. And we accept that as sanity. I wonder if you see this. And we are mesmerized by the idealists, by the propagandists.

So one sees very clearly, if you have gone into it very deeply as we are doing now, that action at any level of our life is not in the future, according to an idea, but seeing without the image of oneself, or of the fact, is action, instant action. Have I made it clear? Now you have listened to this. How have you listened to it? Are you listening to the fact, or are you listening according to the interpretation you give to the fact? Don't answer me please. Look

at it and find out for oneself. You see this is one of our peculiarities that what we hear we translate immediately into an idea - right? And why do we do it? Why can't the mind just listen and not draw a conclusion? If you listen that very act of listening itself is an entire action. But if you say, "Well I will listen and if it pleases me I will accept it, if it doesn't conform to my idea I will reject it" and so on - all those are acts of not listening. I wonder if you are following all this?

So can the mind, which has been conditioned, religiously, socially, immorally - I don't know if you realize how immorally we are conditioned, we accept war, that is an immoral acceptance, we accept violence, we accept social injustice, our whole moral structure is based on our pleasure and fear, which is immoral. So we are conditioned immorally, we are conditioned by beliefs, by all the propaganda of the churches, religions all over the world, can that mind, which is so heavily conditioned, please listen to this - can that mind instantly put it away, put away its conditioning entirely?

Questioner: I don't know, it's just like words.

K: Let me go on sir, you can ask at the end of it sir, if you don't mind. If you say it cannot, you have blocked yourself, obviously. If you say it is possible, you are just playing. But if you want to find out, you have then to say, "Is my thinking a slave to time?" You understand? Do please. If I say to myself, "I need time to free my conditioning", then you are admitting a process of postponement, a denial of the fact and the denial of the fact is insanity. The bus is coming towards you, rushing, and you say, "Well there is no bus", that is an insane act! So can you observe your conditioning and not

be caught in the movement of time, remain with that conditioning completely without any movement? You understand? That means you have to investigate also, who is it that is observing. I wonder if you get this. May I go on? If you don't catch it I am sorry, I can't help it.

Who is the observer who is watching his conditioning? If one is born in India, among a certain class of people, you are conditioned there by tradition, a very ancient tradition, by certain beliefs, superstitions, and all the rest of it. If you are born in a Christian culture you are conditioned equally. If you are born in China or in Russia you are conditioned according to their Maoism, or Communistic Marxist dialectic materialism and so on and so on and so on. Now can the mind observe your conditioning? And who is it that is observing? You follow? Is the observer different from the thing he is observing? I am conditioned - suppose I am conditioned - and I observe my conditioning. Am I, who is the observer, different from my conditioning? Obviously not. Right? Just see the truth of it please. That is, the observer is part of the conditioning, therefore there is no conflict between the observer and the observed. You see this point? As long as the observer is different from the observed, then there is conflict - conflict in the sense that he wants to suppress it, to go beyond it, escape from it, rationalize it, accept it, deny and all that, that is conflict. But when the observer is the observed, the conditioned entity who is observing the conditioning are both the same, then you eliminate all that altogether - right?

It is part of our conditioning to admit the division between the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, the

experiencer and the experience, that is part of our conditioning. But when you see that the observer is the observed, which is the truth, then that conditioning is broken down, you understand all this? Instantly it is gone, therefore you have removed, the mind has freed itself from this eternal conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', which is the duality between good and bad, eternal conflict between me and you. I wonder if you see this.

Therefore from that arises: can the mind, which has been conditioned heavily, through education, through culture, through religious doctrines and immoral attitudes, and all that, can all that be instantly wiped away? We say it can. It can be done only when the observer realizes he is not separate from the observed and therefore he has then eliminated conflict altogether and therefore he has energy to go beyond - got it?

So action is not an adjustment to an idea. Action is not approximating itself to an ideal. I wonder if you see this. Therefore action is always in the living present. Action then is the movement of the fact, not what you think the fact should be. Now this is art, which is sanity. Art means, doesn't it also, to fit. To fit everything in its right place. That is an art. Not merely painting a picture, or writing a poem, or doing a sculpture. Putting everything in its right place - not right according to you, but right according to the facts. The fact is always out of time. I won't go into this, I'll leave it for the moment. The fact one has to deal with all the time, not with the ideas. And to deal with the fact, the mind must be free of every form of image that you have built about yourself and the fact. And from that comes complete action, in which there is no regret, no sorrow, no sense of not having done the thing wholly.

You see sir, there is a problem here, a question here: we are educated to pursue pleasure - right? We are educated to conform morally, ethically, religiously, to the pattern of personal, or collective pleasure. I do not know if you have noticed how our minds pursue this constant demand for pleasure. Right? You don't have to admit it, that is a fact. The two principles in our life are fear and pleasure. And again when one observes, the pursuit of pleasure, tomorrow, is the movement of time. That is, I have had pleasure yesterday, I must have it tomorrow - I am working for that pleasure for tomorrow, sexually, intellectually in so many ways. So pleasure implies the continuity of time. Not that there is not pleasure, that is not the point, but the demand, the pursuit of pleasure - you follow? So can the mind - please investigate it with me - can the mind finish each day totally and enter the next day afresh? You understand my question? When we see the fallacy of time as a means of change, then every day must end and not psychologically carry over the next day. If one has a problem in relationship, and most problems are in relationship, to carry that problem over the next day implies a continuity of the problem, which is becoming more and more complex, more and more difficult, and the mind then accepts the problem inevitably, and lives with the problem, and the mind becomes more and more dull. When one understands the nature of time, as we tried to explain this morning, then that problem must be resolved today, not carry over to the next day. You have understood? That means can you, can the mind resolve the problem of relationship between human beings, as it arises end it. Do you understand my question? Can this be done? Not as a theory but as an actuality? Because you see

unless we lay the foundation for all this, meditation and the enquiry into reality, if there is a something beyond thought becomes utterly meaningless unless you have done all this. You can go to Japan and sit for years meditating, a certain kind of Zen monastery, or go to India - I don't know why people go to any of these countries to learn meditation, you can do it at home, you don't have to go abroad, it is a waste of money but perhaps you like to play the tourists!

Now unless you lay the foundation for all this, and the mind is really totally free from conflict, and therefore no problem, psychological problem, unless you have done that you cannot possibly go beyond. Then what you try to achieve then becomes an illusion, an unreality, it has no meaning. So it is very important to understand this, that every human problem that arises, and human problems are involved in relationship between you and another, between you and your wife, husband, girl, boy and all the rest of it. Unless in that relationship there is no conflict, and whenever any problem arises in that relationship, to end it instantly, is our question. You have understood my question? Can one who has relationship - you must have relationship - there is no entity who has not relationship, however much you may withdraw into isolation, become a monk, or whatever you are, you are always related, and in that relationship obviously, problems arise everyday, and not to resolve them as they arise, implies time and therefore conflict and so on. So can the mind resolve the human relationship problem as it arises and dissolve it? You have understood my question?

So what is the problem in relationship? Go on sirs. I love you,



you don't love me. That is a problem. I love my wife and my wife looks at somebody else. That is a problem. I am jealous, anxious, fearful, angry, violent, hatred. She bullies me, or I bully her, she dominates me, I dominate her, I possess, she possesses, I am attached, she is attached and we are attached to that attachment - you follow? And so on and on and on. So in relationship there are all these subtle, non-verbalized movements, fears, pleasures and so on. We are asking, can these problems as they arise end, not carry over the next day? Because the mind must be free to observe, and as long as you have a problem it is incapable of observation.

So what is the problem in relationship? Attachment, detachment and so on. Attachment to what? Do please go with me. Attachment to what? I am attached to you, my wife, my father, my mother, my sister, girl-friend, whatever it is. (God I am glad I haven't got any of them.) (Laughter). Thank God! Sorry! Don't impose then on me please. Attached to what? Dominating what? Jealous of what? Attached to what? Attached to the image that I have built about her, and she has built about me out of her loneliness, out of her whatever it is - you follow all this? Please watch it because we are showing that a problem that arises in human relationship can be dissolved instantly, not carried over. The carrying over is insanity. What is the mind attached to when it says, "I am attached to my wife, my house, my whatever it is" - you know, attached? Attached to the image I have built about her? Am I attached to her? Please listen to this, to her or to him, or to the image I have built about her or him? Obviously to the image, because I can't be attached to the person because the person is living, moving, has its own desires, its own ambitions, its own problems, its own pettiness, its own

shallowness, its own emptiness. But I am attached to the image that I have built about her. And that image becomes much more important than her. Now can my mind be free of building images? You understand the question? Then I have ended the problem. Can the mind empty its images about her? She has hurt me - by word, by gesture, by some act. The hurt is to the image I have about myself; and I am attached to that image, and the image has been hurt, and I am attached to that image and to the hurt. And that is non-relationship, which is insanity. I am living according to the image I have built about her and about myself, an image - you understand - which is an idea and therefore has nothing whatever to do with relationship.

So can the mind never build an image? Which means be aware at the moment of hurt. If you have no image you won't be hurt, it is only when I have an image about myself that you can do something about it, kick it around, but I have no image about myself so you can't kick it around. So can the mind be free of image building, which is the ideation - which is the same thing in other words - so that everything she does or the man or the woman does, is instantly perceived and dissolved so that there is no image at all? Which means every incident is over so the next moment the mind is fresh, young and innocent.

Now would you like to ask questions about all this?

Q: May I ask a question on the talk yesterday?

K: Yes sir.

Q: You said that the consciousness, the consciousness of a human being... the whole world of humanity... (Inaudible) Are you saying to me that if I understood what violence was it wouldn't

matter if I did...

K: No sir, no sir, not at all. We were saying yesterday that human consciousness with its content is more or less the same throughout the world. There are modifications, there are different kinds of colouration, different patterns, different movements of action and tendency but in the content of that consciousness there is a similarity. You go to India, there human beings suffer, there is greater disorder there, perhaps there is less disorder here, there is superstition, there is superstition here, there is a belief there about their gods and there is a belief here about your gods, and perhaps Christians have killed more human beings than anyone else, and so and so on.

Now we said, a change in that consciousness affects the whole of consciousness. That is what we were saying yesterday. That is, if your consciousness with its content undergoes a radical change, not superficial, casual, a peripheral change but radical, deep transformation, that very mind that has changed itself affects the consciousness of the world. That is what we were saying.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Thank god sir, of course! Sir if you are in China or in Russia this kind of meeting wouldn't be allowed. We would all be repeating Mao or Lenin or somebody else. If you are in perhaps a very Catholic country like Spain or South America, really very Catholic, they wouldn't tolerate all this. I know something about it. So I think we are misunderstanding each other.

Look sir, have you observed the content of your own consciousness? You know your own consciousness. When are you aware of your consciousness? When are you aware of yourself - all

right, let's put it that way, it is simpler. When are you aware of yourself? Only when you are in conflict, aren't you? Or only when you are pursuing something that delights you. Only when there is great fear. It is only in those moments of stress and strain that you are aware of yourself - aren't you? Please sirs. Now without stress and strain, can you be aware of yourself? Can you watch yourself, can you watch the content of your own mind - the beliefs, the national feeling, the pettiness, the shallowness, the desires, anxieties, fears, you know all that is part of your consciousness, identification with the country, with a name, with a property and so on and so on and so on? And the hurts, which one has received from childhood. Now are you aware of all this content? And the content makes up consciousness. Without the content there is no so-called consciousness - right?

So meditation - just let me put it briefly - meditation is the emptying of the mind of its content as its consciousness and going beyond. We will discuss it and talk about meditation some other time.

Q: I have a son and I think that I have a responsibility for him - but is the responsibility to the image that I have?

K: I have a son. I have a responsibility to that son. I have understood your question, madame. I have a son. I have a responsibility to that son. Is my responsibility based on an image of what he should be? I have a son, I feel responsible to that son, the responsibility implies image, and the image of what he should be, how he should behave, how he should grow up, what he should do when he grows up, what kind of woman he marries when he grows up. I have got all the images about him and I feel responsible to

what? Do I feel responsible to the images which I have about him? Or do I feel responsible to him? I am pointing it out madame.

I have a son, I feel responsible. My responsibility consists in having images of what he should do, how he should be, how he should grow up, and all the rest of it. So I am responsible to the image that I have built about my son. So I am responsible not to the son but to the images I have about him. Now what is responsibility? What does that word mean? To respond, to react, to act, to respond. Do I respond according to the image I have about him? Or do I respond to him, not to the image I have? I wonder if you see? If I respond, which I call responsibility, to my image about him, I call that irresponsibility - no? And that is what we have done in bringing up our children - we are responsible to the image that we have built about our children. Please see the importance of this. That he must be British, that he must be a Frenchman, he must be this, he must be that, he must become Catholic, I take him to church and baptize him because it is my image of religious upbringing for him. I call that totally irresponsible. My responsibility is not to my image but to the son. And to respond to the son I must have no image about him, obviously. That is insanity to have an image about you, how you should behave.

So can I respond adequately to the son, to see that he has the right kind of education, not what I think is the right kind of education, I have to investigate what is education, why are we being educated at all. You understand? Why are we being educated? To become engineers, politicians, businessmen? Why should we go through all this torture of examinations and all the

rest of it? To become what? A glorified clerk? So I have to question the whole culture. We are doing it now. So if I want my son to be educated, I want to find out what is education, and why he is being educated. To conform to the pattern? And what would he do if he didn't conform to the pattern? Will he be thrown to the wolves and be destroyed? So all this is implied in my responsibility to the son, not to the image I have about him.

Q: May I ask you a question? I am leaving today. You spoke of the religious mind. Now what is the religious mind? some laws are easy to follow. I drive on the left-hand side of the road. Some laws are inevitable and clear. Now...

K: What is the relationship between the law of a country and law generally, between law and a religious mind? That is the question, sir, isn't it? I haven't thought about it before. Let's find out.

First of all we must be very clear what we mean by a religious mind. A religious mind - we mean - that is not burdened by belief, that does not accept spiritual authority of any kind, that is not caught in ritualism. A religious mind that has order, not order imposed upon it but has understood what is disorder and in the observation of that disorder in oneself, out of that observation order comes. And such a mind is capable of investigating further into reality. It has no authority, no beliefs, no conceptual activity.

And what is law? The gentleman pointed out that in this country, in England, you drive on the left side, and if you go to France you drive on the right side, and if you happen to drive on the wrong side here or in France you have an accident. So what is law? Law, which all of us accept, like paying tax - if you don't pay

a tax, whatever happens. So what is the relationship between a mind that is really, deeply in the sense we mean religious, highly moral, not trained in immorality - which we can go into later - which means order, not conformity. Order comes only when the mind understands what is disorder and out of the understanding of that disorder is order. Now such a mind, what is its relationship to the everyday law of every country? Right? Such a religious mind is an intelligent mind, is a sane mind. And wherever that mind operates, whether it is in France, or wherever it is, it will act intelligently. Intelligence is not personal or collective, it is intelligence and it will act according to that intelligence given the right circumstances - right?

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **3RD SEPTEMBER 1974**

This is supposed to be a discussion. The word 'discussion' isn't really the right word. Discussion implies argument, opposing ideas, opposing beliefs, opinions and so on. Whereas a dialogue is something we talk over together; talk over together the many problems that one has, with friendship, with a sense of care, attention, and perhaps the feeling of camaraderie, a sense of affection, all that is implied in a conversation between two friends. And if we could this morning, and on Thursday morning, talk over together a problem which may be most demanding and insistent, if we could put all our questions into one question, if that is possible, and then discuss that one question - not discuss - talk over that one question completely and thoroughly so that we are quite familiar with the problem, with the solution, and leave the tent as though it has been solved - not just carry on the next day. Could we do that?

Questioner: Could we discuss pleasure and fear? Pleasure seems to predominate over fear.

K: Could we talk over together this morning the question of pleasure? Pleasure and fear seem to be, the question says, asks rather, the two prominent things in our life, but pleasure seems to predominate over fear? Could we talk over that.

Q: Could we talk over what is the relationship between health and sanity?

Q: If we cannot reach out to truth then what is one to do?

K: The questioner asks, if we cannot reach out to truth then what is one to do? One is confused, uncertain, suffering, but one



can't just remain there, one must go beyond it. And it seems so hypothetical, verbal, not to be able to reach out.

Now which of these shall we talk over together? Could we go into this question of pleasure and fear, and perhaps the other questions can be included in that one principal question? Shall we do that? Can we do that?

The question is, why the mind, though it is aware of its pleasures and fears, leans more heavily on pleasure? Why is the mind pursuing pleasure all the time? How do we approach this question? The whole religious orthodox, traditional mind says, pleasure must be avoided. If you go to India, there you see certain people who totally deny pleasure, and to them any form of beauty, any form of relationship between oneself and nature, is totally denied. They never consider anything outside which must be pleasurable, which might distract from their central pursuit of what they call truth, or enlightenment, or Brahmin, or whatever word they use. And also throughout the world the monks have maintained: don't look at a woman, don't look at anything that is sensational, that might distract your mind from the central issue of the worship of god. We all know that. And it is there in spite of their determination, in spite of their torture, in spite of their will, this principle of pleasure continues, it is burning in them. They may deny it, they may squash it, they may get up in the morning and pray and do all that kind of thing, from two o'clock in the morning until the evening, but it is there, burning - sexually and every subtle form of pleasure - that is a fact.

Why do people deny pleasure? We must also look at that side. Why does the whole religious concept deny the pursuit of

pleasure? And being caught in that culture, as most of us are, conditioned by that, we all subtly or unconsciously resist pleasure. Though we want pleasure there is always a restraining influence that dominates, controls, or objects, or feels guilty with regard to pleasure. First of all are we aware of this? And what do we mean by being aware? I am sorry to include so many things we have to go into. Am I, are you, aware of the dual instinct, the opposing, contradictory urges, the demand, and the pursuit of pleasure, and also the resistance, the feeling of guilt, the feeling it is not quite right to indulge in pleasure? Are we aware of that? And there have been writers who extol or praise pleasure - sexually, in every form of pleasure - prominent writers and that became the fashion - the permissive society, and all the rest of it.

Now is one aware of all this? Aware in the sense not verbally aware of the fact, but actually aware of the fact? I wonder if I am making myself clear? To be aware verbally is one thing, but to be actually aware of the fact of the pursuit and at the same time the resistance, which brings about guilt and all the rest of it. Now is one aware of this? And when you are aware, what does it imply? Are you interested in all this? Shall we go on?

I am aware of this fact: the opposing, contradictory, dualistic conflict. That is part of the culture in which one has been brought up. Before I enquire into that I want to be quite clear whether it is a verbal stimulation, or an observation of the fact of what actually is going on. I can be verbally stimulated by you to be aware of this, which would be a verbal stimulation. Whereas through the words I can see the fact. So the word doesn't become important, but the fact is. So I am aware of the fact, and not of the entanglement of words.

Clear? Right?

Now what is wrong with pleasure? Why have people denied pleasure? If you deny pleasure you must deny all beauty, whether in the form of a woman or a man, sculpture, painting, the beauty of a tree, the delight of a sunset, a poem and so on and so on. And if you deny this pleasure, what is the factor that makes you deny? Are we moving together? Please, this is not my problem, you understand. Desire and pleasure - all right let's begin that way. What is desire? How does desire arise which turns into pleasure? Right? What is desire?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, we are asking what is desire, what is the source of desire, how does desire arise? Not how it expresses, what is the content of desire, or the object of desire, but what is desire, how does it happen?

Q: Hunger is a desire.

K: Hunger is a desire. Now take hunger: what is desire, not for something? You see a nice dress in the window, you see a nice dress in a shop. You look at it. You observe it with your eyes, then you touch it, you feel it, the material. And so there is the seeing, the contact, the sensation, then the desire - right? Let's be very simple about this. So there is visual perception, seeing, then there is contact, sensation, and the desire to possess, or not to possess, or something better, and so on. So desire begins there. No, madame, look: I see a beautiful tree, a beautiful car, a beautiful something or other, and the very sensation of seeing, the contact arouses the desire - doesn't it? No?

We are not condemning desire, or pleasure, we are just looking

at it first. The whole religious area denies pleasure, denies desire, suppresses desire, controls desire, and part of our culture is that. The more religious you are, in the orthodox sense, the more you are restrained, more confined, more determined to suppress desire. And there is a battle going on all the time. The desire is tremendously strong the more you suppress it, and the more you yield to it the more it demands. So we have to go into this question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. We are just asking what is the source of desire? How does desire come? Why can't we be simple about this? I see a nice person, and he has a nice face, and I say, "By Jove, I would like to be with that person" - it is so simple.

Q: I want to have it.

K: Yes, sir, I want to have it. I want to sleep with somebody and on and on and on. But this is simple enough. Now I am asking myself: why have various cultures denied the pursuit of pleasure, encouraged the pursuit of pleasure, thereby cultivate or bring about a feeling that there is guilt about it - don't you know about all this? So where does one begin to free oneself from all this - neither caught in pleasure, nor denying pleasures? That is the real question. How am I, who have pursued pleasure, in my blood it is, in my thoughts, in my activities, in the office, at home, when I play golf, when I do everything there is this pursuit of pleasure. And also there is the other side to it, that it is not thoroughly educated. Let's put it that way. It is not complete, it is not whole, and therefore I want to find the whole, therefore I deny it. You understand this feeling? So what shall I do? I am aware of all this, not just my little pleasure and the pursuit of my pleasure - that

pleasure may be a political ambition, a religious ambition, or a business ambition - you follow? It is all involved in that.

So what shall I do? I am aware of the whole implication of pleasure, not just one incident of pleasure. The desire and the pleasure to look beautiful. The desire to be famous and the pleasure in becoming famous or notorious, in having a good house, good taste, good possession, good status, all that. Being good is also a great pleasure. And there is great pleasure in controlling your body completely, and so on and on. Now given all this, being aware of all this, not just little bits of pleasure, the entirety of pleasure, what am I to do?

So I ask myself, first of all, what is wrong with pleasure? What is pleasure? Look, sir, we have reduced the world, the earth, everything because of our pursuit of pleasure, we are destroying the earth, over population, one country sells armaments to another country, knowing it is going to create war because there is pleasure involved in having money of a particular group. You know all this. And when one is confronted with all this what is one to do?

Q: Look at it.

K: I am seeing it, sir. I see it. What takes place after that? I see a sunset, there is great delight in it. It is registered in the brain, as memory - please follow this - as memory, the repetition of the memory, the demand for the repetition according to that memory, is the continuance of pleasure. Isn't it? I see that beautiful thing, the brain has registered it, and the memory of it remains. The memory then says, "Repeat, have more of it". So pleasure begins at the very root of memory. Right? Please I am not trying to lay down the law, you look at it for yourself. So can I look at that sunset and end it? I

see that sunset. There is great delight in it. And the brain retains that, has recorded that delight, and it has become a memory. The fact is one thing, and memory is another - right? The memory is not the sunset. Right? May I go on? The memory is not the sunset, so I am pursuing a thing that is over. Of course! It is a remembrance of a sunset, and the remembrance is the demand of the thing that is over. Right? Now can the mind, can I look at that sunset with all the beauty, the colour, the quality of a sunset, and end it, not carry it over? I don't if you have ever done this kind of thing with yourself.

Q: What do you mean by end it?

K: What do I mean by end it? I will show it to you. I look at that sunset and I know the trick of memory and I realize the memory is not the sunset - of course - memory is something which is over and I am taking delight in something which is dead, and I am pursuing something which is dead which will give me, I hope, more pleasure. I see this. I see this fact - the delight, the memory, the memory pursuing that which has gone, and that which has gone has given me pleasure, and I must have more of it. At the moment of delight of that extraordinary sunset there is no desire; there is only the observation of that great colour - right? I see this, the whole phenomenon, or the whole process of it. You follow? If I pursue pleasure as a memory it is a dead thing I am pursuing. Right? Please, look at it, sir, do look. Is this so? Don't accept what the speaker is saying. Is this so?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look sir, this is a very serious subject. Do go into it this because you will see for yourself what takes place. That it is not

recorded as a sunset, it is recorded as the pleasure that you have derived from the sunset.

Q: Why?

K: Because sir, look: why does the mind demand repetition? Why do you think it does? Be simple. Look at yourself and you will answer this so clearly.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, we will go into that presently. But first see, sir, what our mind does to itself. It has delighted in something, remembers it, and wants it repeated.

Q: Why does the faculty of memory exist?

K: If you had no memory you couldn't go home, you couldn't speak the language, you couldn't recognize your friend. No, please, you see all this implies that we live in the past - right? To us memory, remembrance, is far more important than the direct observation at the moment. Our culture is that - live in the past.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, sir, I have just pointed out: sunset, delight, the remembrance of it, and the remembrance encourages the continuity of that delight which is over.

Q: There is no need for it.

K: It is not a question of 'no need', it takes place.

Q: It doesn't always take place.

K: Not necessarily, always, of course not, but ninety nine per cent of the time it takes place.

So I see the mind lives more and more in the past. Aren't you living in the past - your remembrances, your images, your ideas, your concepts, your knowledge, all that is past.

Q: Now is reality, and the past is the confirmation of that reality.

Q: Why do we want to repossess? The thing is over and we want to repossess it.

Q: We can't do anything else.

K: We can't do anything else, we can't find anything new, therefore we live in the past - is that it?

You know, one has to go very deeply into this question of memory. And most of us have cultivated through culture, through education, through tradition, through custom, through ritual, through everyday happenings, this enormous field of memory - right? That is a fact. And without memory we cannot operate. Memory is always in the past - right? Obviously. Like knowledge is in the past - scientists can only tell you what they know, they cannot tell you what they don't know. So knowledge, experience, memory, is the essence of the past. No? Now from that background we operate, whether in the factory, business, in education, learning facts, and so on and so on, always from that background and with that background. I want to go into it a little more, please.

So the seeing of that sunset, the remembrance of that sunset, the seeing of it, enjoying it, then it becomes memory, and that memory then says, "I must have more of that delight" - whether it is sex, whether it is pills, whatever it is. So the mind operates from the past. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, that's just it. I understand, sir. So I am asking myself if the mind is the result of the past, through evolution, through time, through all that, then what place has pleasure, what



place has enjoyment, what place has joy, what place has love, with regard to memory? You understand? I wonder if you understand. Is love a memory?

Q: It is a phenomenon.

K: What do you mean by that word phenomenon? I love you. Is that feeling of love a memory, because you have given me pleasure, you have give me encouragement, you have been my companion, a memory of all that makes me love you? The image of all that, held in memory, says, "By Jove, I love that person". Is love a memory? Apparently for most people it is. And is joy the result of a memory? Or is joy something totally independent of memory? You cannot invite joy. You can invite pleasure, you cannot invite joy.

So one begins to see where memory plays its role, and where it does not, where it should not.

Q: It should be here and now.

K: No, madame, I am not saying it should be now, or here, we are just examining the whole picture. You will see it for yourself, the whole picture, not one part of the picture.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am not categorizing - physical pleasure, or psychological pleasure, you know joy, what joy is, don't you. It suddenly happens to you. You are walking along in a wood or a street and you suddenly feel such a delight about everything. You have never invited it, you have never even thought about it - it happens. And as it happened there is a memory of it and you say, "By Jove, I must have more of it".

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am trying to point out, sir, between perception and memory it is so instantaneous. Now be aware of that instant and see whether that instant can be prolonged. Oh, you don't know all this.

So I am asking: look sir, we started out to discuss what is pleasure. Why various sects and groups and religious bodies have denied pleasure and with it desire. They say you get lost in the world of pleasure, therefore you are not capable of worshipping god, giving your devotion, your service to god. So god demands that you be tortured. You must have a tortured mind to see god. And that is idiocy. That is utter foolishness. But yet one is caught in this, this pleasure, the pain of it, the anxiety of it, and the demand for it, and the guilt. And to take one side or the other is absurd, but to look at the whole picture, to look at this whole map of pleasure, not where it will lead, or where it will go, but to look. And to look at the whole is to be aware of this whole content of pleasure, with its memory.

So one goes back and says, is it possible to observe that function and not register it as a memory which demands more? You understand? Can I look at that car - I like cars! - can I look at that car, the colour, the shape of it, the line, the power, and so on, and not immediately arise, "I must have it"? Then I look at it and pass by - you follow? Enjoy looking at it, the enjoyment of looking at it; and not the cultivation of that memory that says - you understand?

So one has to go into this question, if you are willing to, of the whole problem of memory - memory as pleasure, memory of the things one has done of which one is anxious and frightened and about which one lies, memory of the things that have caused hurts,

deep wounds, the memory of a future, of a future delight, of a future position, of a future goodness and so on and so on. Do you want to go into all this? So memory is in the brain cells. Memory is thought. Thought is the response of memory, obviously. Right, may I go on? Memory is experience and knowledge. That is in the brain cells, contained there. Right? You can observe it, you can see it in oneself if you are aware, sensitive, watching. And thought is matter, obviously. Isn't that so? Thought is matter and all our existence, all our activities, all our culture is based on thought - your gods, your saviours, your churches, everything is based on thought.

Q: And feeling.

K: Obviously. I feel and then memory, thought, of course. I am including in this whole field, everything, in thought, please go along with me. So our culture, our civilization, and religion, is based on thought, which is matter - right? And when thought tries to go beyond itself by saying, "There is god, there is mystery, there are visions of god", it is still the operation of thought, and therefore the operation of matter. I wonder if you see this.

Q: What do you mean by saying thought is matter?

Q: Are you saying that we live a very materialistic life?

K: Absolutely. The gentleman says, are you saying that we live a very materialistic life, though we have gods, churches, rituals, saviours, it is all a materialistic life. I said thought is the response of memory, memory is experience, knowledge, contained in the tissues of the brain. Damage those tissues, you have no memory, or you have memory distorted. So thought is matter. And look what we have done: thought creates an ideal, the super, perfect form, and

tries to live according to that ideal, which is still within the area of thought, which is still within the area of matter. We invent our gods - right? Our thoughts have formed gods. God hasn't made us. We have made gods!

So one lives in this field - right? If you are really ruthlessly clear about this, not pretend we are something spiritual, noble, this is a fact, then from there we can ask: is there any area which thought cannot possibly enter - you follow? Is there any field where thought has no place at all? Don't say, 'Yes'. Sir this is the most...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir you are still limiting, barring a very small field.

Sir this has been one of the problems for human beings: they have gone so far, people have demanded it, and really people who have gone very, very deeply into meditation, into the whole question of it, they say, look, thought has its limitation, and is there something beyond? You can't answer that question, say yes or no. Therefore one must understand completely the whole area of thought - the thought that has created the 'me', the psychological me, the thought that has created the divisions between the Jew, the Arab, the British, the French, the German, the Communist, the Socialist, the Mao, and the thought which prevents co-operation, which wants co-operation but yet it does everything to prevent the co-operation of nations to solve all our problems. So thought, from the ancient of days, from the Greeks with their idea that thought is measure, thought is time, and you need measure. And all our technological development is based on measure, on thought. And one sees this entirely.

And then one sees that as long as one lives there, in that area, no problems will be solved - right? I don't know if you see that. I am going to show it to you. We are going to investigate this now. As long as the mind lives within that area we shall not solve the problems of human beings. We shall have more inflation, more wars, more division - the British, the Communist, the French - and there will be no co-operation between nations. And you need co-operation to solve this problem of human existence because we are destroying the earth. You understand, sirs, all this?

So if you are serious, then one says, as long as the mind, or thought, which has created all this, which has created the most extraordinary things in the technological world, which has created great illusions about gods, rituals, saviours, and all that, as long as the mind lives in that area there is no freedom. It can invent freedom. It can speculate about freedom. There is no freedom - right? Therefore one asks: is there an area of the brain, or an area where thought cannot possibly enter? And if there is an area, who is aware of that area? You are following all this? If thought is aware of that area - please listen to this - if thought is aware of that area then thought can recognize that area and therefore it is still part of thought. So confronted with this problem that human beings have created a culture, a culture in which religion, art, architecture, painting, all the wars, the brutalities, the violence, the ugliness, all that is culture. In that culture we have been brought up, educated, where the operation of thought is of the highest importance - right? And that area is the known area, which the scientist can investigate, and dissect and analyse, and all the rest of it, it is still within the area of the known - right? Please let's proceed.

And can the mind be free of the known, and yet operate in the field of the known? You understand my question? Can the mind, your mind, your consciousness - your consciousness which has always operated within the field of the known, and when thought tries to go beyond the field of the known it is still thought. Its ideas of perfect prototype, the perfect Aristotelian and all the rest of it, it is still part of thought.

So the problem then arises: can thought be controlled and not allowed to enter? You understand. And they have gone into this: that you must control your thought completely so that the other thing can enter - if there is another thing. And the whole question of meditation is control - right? In different ways. I wonder if you are following all this? Does it interest you, all this? I mean by interest, live it! Not just speculate about it. You see in controlling thought there is involved the controller, and who is the controller? Is the controller different from the controlled? You understand this? The controller says, "I must control thought", because he says, "I don't like this area, I must have the other area", so he controls thought. Is the controller different from the thing he controls? Obviously not, because it is still part of thought - you follow? So can there be a living, existing, living an everyday life, without any controls? Oh, you don't see this. No control whatsoever, therefore no conflict whatsoever. Now we are educated to control, that is part of our culture, part of our tradition. "Don't be angry, control your yourself". So we live in a world which has been built by thought, and thought now says, "Somehow we must solve this problem", which thought has created, and so thought says, "There must be an outside agency of god which will

solve our problem", and that outside agency is invented by thought - you follow all this? So thought still is in operation.

So is the mind aware of this whole content of what we have said, all this morning from pleasure, fear, memory, joy, attachment, all that? And thought has created this confused, miserable, mad world.

Q: Why has thought done that?

K: Why has thought done this? You understand the question? Why has thought done this - divided nations, groups, ideas, your belief, my belief, my country is better than your country, my guru is better than your blasted guru and so on and so on - why?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, look at it a little more closely, why? Don't answer, just look. Look before you answer. That is, what is thought? Not, why has thought done this, but what is thought? Watch it please! Thought, being memory, is of time, isn't it? Yesterday, today and tomorrow. Thought in itself is divisive - right? Do you understand? Thought in itself makes fragments. Thought is never whole. Thought itself is a fragment.

Q: It is the result of fragmentation.

K: Fragments, of course sir, all that is the result of fragments. But thought per se, in itself, is the maker of fragments. You are British, I am a stupid Hindu. You are a German and he is a Frenchman. Thought has done this. Therefore thought in itself is the factor of fragmentation.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is what I said, sir, listen. Don't think but listen to what I am saying.

So I will show you. The question is this: the gentleman asks, I hear what you are saying, my sensory perception verbally accepts what you are saying. And the verbal communication is not sufficient, the deeper communication, where does it take place? I see verbal communication is a limitation, it doesn't completely communicate very, very deeply, so where is the deep communication? You understand the question? I listen to what you are saying, I agree or disagree. There is no disagreement, or agreement, just observation. Hear what we are talking, observing what is going on. So verbal communication is necessary, otherwise if I talk in French, or German, or Italian, you wouldn't understand. Where does deep communication take place? And what is the area at which this communication can take place? We will have to investigate it together.

First of all, sir, we are not agreeing or disagreeing. That must be very clear because it is stupid to say, "I agree with you", or disagree with you, because we are looking. So one factor remains, which is, in observation there is neither agreement nor disagreement. You are not opposing my opinion, or I am opposing your opinion because there is no opinion, just observation - right? In observation then there is neither agreement nor disagreement, opposing opinions, but seeing - right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, wait, I am coming to that sir. Verbally - I am going to show you in a minute. First of all as I said, as the speaker said, there is no agreement or disagreement. I point out that pole to you, that pole is a fact, you don't say that is a giraffe, that is a pole, both of us see it as a pole, neither agreeing or disagreeing. That is a fact.



Right. So there is no opinion, no agreement, no judgement, just observation. Right? This is important. So both of us now are capable of looking - right? Not translating what you look at but looking. Right? Now when you look are you looking through the description of the word, or you are looking without the word? Are we going along? You understand sir? This is difficult, go a little slowly.

I say, look at that pole. The word pole, you have an image of what a pole is. So you are looking through the image which that word pole has created. Now can you look at that thing without the image the word has created? You understand? So it means you can look without the verbal image. So you are no longer caught in the network of words. Right? You are no longer caught in the network of words, opinions, judgements, translating, but you are only looking. Now in that looking, both of us, there is communication which is non-verbal, then there is real co-operation, real togetherness, then we are both seeing, doing the exact thing which the fact demands, not what you think the fact demands. Right.

So I am asking - we come back to this - if the whole field of human activity is based on pleasure, fear, memory, knowledge, experience, and thought has created this world of relationship, technological world, the relationship between nature and myself, between god and myself, and yourself, thought has created all this, and thought says, "My god, what a mess it is!" It is an appalling mess, which denies co-operation between each other - between each group, between each religion, each nationality, which is so destructive. And thought says, "I can't solve this problem, I know they are playing tricks with the problems" - the politicians, the

businessmen, they cannot solve it, so it says, "Now I must go beyond and find something which solve this problem" - you understand, sir? God, super guru, super ideology, super something else, super consciousness. It is still within the field of thought. Thought having created the mess, thought says, "I must clear it", and invents a new system, new philosophy, and I see the whole of that, all the intricacies, all the responsibilities, all the involvement involved in that. Then the mind says, is there something which thought cannot touch? Human beings have always operated on this side of the shore - you understand, sir? On this bank. I am trying to change the simile.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look at it, look at it. We have operated on this side of the river, always. On this bank, with the gods, with the churches, with the businessmen, with new ideas, new philosophies, new Maoists, new Communists, and all that. And we never realize there is no answer here. Thought cannot find an answer to this because thought in itself brings fragmentation. You understand?

So is thought love? Is love memory? Is the perception of this whole phenomenon which thought has created, is thought still trying to find an answer within that area? You follow sir? The politicians are, the economists are, the socialists are, the communists, everybody is trying to find an answer within this area - the priests, the gods, all are. And one must be absolutely clear that there is no answer through thought - which doesn't mean there is an answer through romantic sentimentality, and all that nonsense. Right?

So can the mind, realizing this, being totally aware of this,

totally and not fragmentarily - you understand, sir - completely aware of all this - what the politicians are doing, what the economists are doing, what the scientists are doing, what the priests are doing, what all the gurus with their traditions, with their rituals, all within the field of thought. And do you seriously from the bottom of your heart realize that thought cannot answer it? Therefore no politician, no businessman, no philosopher, no scientist, nobody - you understand, sir, how serious this is?

I am doing all the work!

Q: I don't know.

K: The gentleman says, I don't know. Is that a mere verbal statement, or an actuality? When you say, I don't know, you are expecting an answer from the speaker? Or you say, I really don't know what to do? That means you are shedding blood and tears, not just saying, "Well I don't know".

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, there is no desire. Sir, we went through that. There is no desire involved in it. There is only this fact of this terrible mess that man has created. When you say, I must find a way out of it, then desire comes in, then thought says, "Yes, we will invent a new philosophy, a new Communism, new Maoism, new this or that", and we all fall for that.

Sir, when you say, I don't know, that is a tremendous statement to make from your heart, not from your mind, not intellectually. When you say, I don't know, then you are neither in despair, nor in hope, you don't know what to do faced with this. If you really feel it then you will have the answer. Then your mind becomes extraordinarily sharp, aware.

Q: It is free of the past.

K: No, no, don't be free of the past - it cannot be free of the past. I have been telling you: I have to go home, I have to speak a language, I have to recognize you. Knowledge has its place, knowledge is the past. I have to drive a car to go home, if I have a car, and if I say, "I don't know, knowledge has no place", then you can't drive a car.

So knowledge has its place and the more we are clear knowledge has its place then we become objective, unselfish, not concerned with my country and your country.

Q: You say the world is in a terrible mess - we say, is this your conditioning?

K: No, I don't think so. You can just see what they are doing in Cyprus, Northern Ireland.

Q: That is a moralistic approach.

K: It is not moralistic. Sir, I have been through all this before, if you don't mind, we have been through all this. It is not a moralistic approach at all, it is just seeing what is going on.

So we have come to this point - perhaps we can continue on Thursday morning - that the mind, which is thought, has created this world, and thought says, "I must find an answer to all these problems", which thought has created. So it is going round and round in circles. And thought cannot find an answer. It can complicate the problem much more, as they are doing. So there must be a totally different approach and that approach is only possible when we understand the movement of thought as time, as matter, and as action. If we understand that we can begin to investigate if there is another possibility. We will do that on

Thursday.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **5TH SEPTEMBER 1974**

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: Where we left off last time.

K: Where did we leave off last time?

Q: We were asking questions: Can the mind be aware of all this happening within the field of thought and wait with that, with the question, what then are we to do?

Q: Can we leave the field clear and not just keep answering the questions but stay with it?

K: I think we were saying the last time that we met here, that thought is in itself divisive and brings about fragmentation of life. This fragmentation of life into nationalities, classes, religious sects and groups, has created in the world, economically, socially and morally, an utter chaos. I think we all are aware of this mess round us. And perhaps also we are aware of this mess inside of us, this confusion. And if we are aware of it, what are we to do? I think that is where we left off.

I think we should be very clear about the whole structure and nature of thought before we can answer what to do - right? This is a dialogue between two of us, as friends we are talking over together this problem, therefore you are sharing in it. We are taking a journey together, I am not talking to myself.

Thought is the response of memory. I think we are agreed to that - that we see that, not agree, that is a fact. If there was no memory there would be no thought. Memory is experience, knowledge, and knowledge is always in the past - right? And

thought is measure, thought is time. And from the ancient Greeks to the present time, measure has played an extraordinary part in our life - measure technologically, because otherwise without measurement there would be no technology, there is measure as comparison, as conformity, measure as the ideal, the prototype, the perfect example, and measuring ourselves to that example. This has been the process of thought right through the world. Again, there is no question about it. It is not the speaker's opinion or your opinion, it is a fact. Can we go on from there? Right?

And if you are really interested in this, it is rather amusing. You go the east, India and other parts of Asia, and you notice that measure, they have a special word in Sanskrit, maya is to measure, and they said measurement is illusion. Are you interested in all this? Does it amuse you? And to find the immeasurable, because they said if you do not find the immeasurable what is measurable is always within the area of imprisonment: there is no escape from that limitation, from that bondage of time. So they said, the ancient people, that one must go beyond the measure, and therefore control thought. You follow this? Control thought; and the very controlling of the thought projected the immeasurable, which is the product of thought. So they are also caught in the measurement of thought. They thought they could get away with it through meditation, through conformity, through control, through suppression, all through the process of thought. And we see now whether you go to the east or to the west, the orient or the occident, this world is based on thought - all our activities, all our technological, scientific development is based on thought, our gods are the result of thought - the whole Christian world is based on thought, as the Hindu, the

Muslim and the rest of them. And thought, being in itself divided, divisive, fragmentary, whatever it does must be fragmentary - right? Whatever it does, whether it tries to invent a future which is perfect, as an ideal, the perfect prototype, it is still within the measure of thought. And seeing what has thought has done in this world - war, the dividing of nations against nations, man against man, ideologies against ideologies, beliefs against beliefs, seeing all this, the violence, the brutality, the suffering, the starvation, the lack of co-operation right through the world to solve the human problems, as inflation, salvation, and there is no co-operation, so what is a mind to do when it is aware of all this? You understand?

What is your mind to do - because life is action, you can't just still and do nothing, you can't escape into some monastery, or some retreat in India, or enter some Zen monastic order, we have to act - and what is a mind to do, being aware of all this? You have understood? Really this is not a problem for a Thursday morning, it is the problem of life, it is the problem of our everyday life. What am I to do in my relationship with another, what am I to do with the ideas that I have? What is my relationship to the community, to the human beings, and what is my relationship to my friend, my wife, husband, children and so on? Because life is relationship, as action. So seeing all this, what is a mind, aware of this whole problem, not a particular problem, not a particular area but the whole area, is the mind capable of seeing this whole as a whole, not in parts? I wonder if I am making myself clear.

Is my mind, your mind capable of seeing, being aware of the whole structure and nature of thought and its activity, what it has done, and see it as a whole? Can the mind see it as a whole?



Because the mind itself has been the product of thought, of experience, of knowledge, and therefore the mind itself can only see something partially. I don't know if you have gone into this question at all. So we are asking: can the mind, your mind, see, perceive, observe, the whole? The whole movement of thought as time, measure, and thought which has its roots in the past, going through the present and therefore modifying the future, all that is involved, and more, in observation. Can the mind observe the whole of it? Do you understand my question? I wonder if I am making the thing clear because I feel it is rather important to understand. Our minds are educated to observe, or see, or feel, partially. One thinks about oneself and not of another, or one thinks of oneself in relation to another according to the image that one has about oneself. And therefore we are trained, we are educated, it is our habit to draw a circle round ourselves and the other to include the other in our circle. So we are accustomed to look at life partially, as a fragment, and we are asking whether the mind can see non-fragmentarily?

Q: It has to recognize the fact that it is fragmented, that it doesn't know that it can't answer the question, because the question can't be answered from the past.

K: The gentleman says, can the mind be aware that it is looking fragmentarily at life? I look at life as an Englishman, with his particular training, education, culture, environmental influence, economic conditioning and so on and so on. And the Frenchman looks at it in his own way, and the Dutch and the German and so on and so on. We are trained from childhood to look at life that way. Are we aware of this conditioning? That is what he is asking.

Unless we are aware we cannot possibly look at the whole.

That implies the question also: what is the relationship of the individual to the whole? What is my relationship, as an individual, to humanity? Humanity being the human being there, not ten thousand miles away. If I know what my relationship is to the man over there then I know what my relationship is to the man ten thousand miles away. So all this is implied. Can the mind being conditioned, educated, has lived in a culture that says, maintains division, not only as an artist, as a writer, as a businessman, as an economist, as a socialist, as a scientist, but also division in belief - my god and your god - so can my mind, your mind, be aware of this fact, not try to change it, not try to translate it, not try to break it down, just be aware of it, as one is aware that is raining?

Then the question arises: if you are aware who is it that is aware? You understand my point? Is it one of the fragments that is aware of the other fragments and so assumes the authority of direction? You follow? Is this clear?

Q: About authority, could you please repeat that?

K: Could I repeat it. Just a minute, I'll have to think it over. We are fragmented human beings - right? I am an artist, I am a poet, I am a businessman, I am - oh, a dozen things, broken up. And among these fragments one fragment, which thinks it is superior, which assumes the ideal, the authority, the perfect prototype, the supreme self, the inner self, that assumes a position of authority and then dictates what it shall do, what other fragments shall do. That is what we are doing, if you observe it. And is that fragment, which has assumed a superiority of the authority, is it any different from the other fragments? Please this is dreadfully serious, don't

play with this otherwise it has no meaning.

And why has one fragment assumed a position where it can guide the other fragments? And what is that fragment? It is still the product of thought, surely? No? And the other fragments are also the product of thought - my wife, my house, my country, my god, my belief, my progress, my conflict. So can one be aware without the authority of one fragment - you follow? Do go into it, you will see it. It is a great deal of not only fun, intellectually, it is an extraordinary thing when you go into it.

Q: If one were totally aware there would be no fragments.

K: If one were totally aware there would be no fragmentation. That is a conditional awareness - if I am aware, if I am good. That has no meaning. Either you are, or you are not. Please.

Q: We have got no idea of what we are, we are not satisfied with ourselves, we always want something more.

K: We are not satisfied with ourselves. Why should you be satisfied with yourself? Please, you say, "I am not satisfied with myself" - why? You have got a better house, better job, you are not so beautiful - not you, somebody - not so beautiful as somebody else. What is your dissatisfaction based on? Because you want something and you can't get it?

Q: Isolation.

Q: Sorrow.

K: Isolation, sorrow. Wait a minute, sir. Does sorrow make you dissatisfied? Does isolation make you dissatisfied? Is isolation the result of comparison? You have an ideal and you want to be according to that ideal and you can't be, therefore you are dissatisfied. Through comparison you are dissatisfied, through

measurement you are dissatisfied. Does sorrow bring dissatisfaction? Is isolation dissatisfaction? Go on sir. That questioner said, I am dissatisfied. With what? With what you are? And why are you dissatisfied with what you are? Do investigate it, please. I am dull in comparing myself with you who are clever, who are bright, who are intelligent, aware, clear. I am dissatisfied because through comparison I have found that I am dull - right? Why do I compare? Is it the result of my education, from the days of my school days there has been comparisons - you must be as good as that, your marks are not as good as somebody else's. So I have been trained from childhood to compare. I compare myself physically with you, I am dissatisfied because I am not so nice looking, I haven't got long hair, short hair, this or that. I am dissatisfied intellectually because you are bright, and so on and so on. Why do we compare with the ideal, or with a person, or with an example, why? Am I dull if I do not compare? You follow? Go on sirs, enquire into it, act upon it, otherwise it has no meaning. Can one live a life without comparison? I never compare myself with anybody, why should I? Not that I am being superior and all that, it doesn't enter my mind to compare myself with somebody, it seems so silly. Does comparison imply imitation and therefore conflict - you follow? All this is involved in this.

So when you consider all this, can the mind observe itself non-fragmentarily? Which is, to observe the whole movement of thought. And that brings up the question: is not the observer, the one who says, "I must be aware", is that entity, or the observer, the observed? Is not the ideal projected by thought, and to conform or adjust myself adequately to that ideal, it is still myself. I am

playing a trick upon myself. So I have to solve this question: is not the observer the observed? Is not my gods, my religion, all that, projected out of myself? Therefore I have created the gods. I don't know if you see all this. And the mind that is seeking experience, the experiencer is the experience. It is very difficult to grasp this because we want experiences. So can you be clear for yourself that the observer is the observed, and therefore can you be aware non-fragmentarily? The fragment is created, or comes about when there is the observer different from the observed. There are whole schools in Asia, and perhaps in Europe and America, where people are training themselves to be aware, get a certificate or a degree in being aware. So they practise awareness, and they never have questioned who is the entity who is aware. Is the entity who is aware different from the thing he is watching? Go on, please. This is a fundamental question which you must answer for yourself, not be persuaded by the speaker, or by anybody. If you are persuaded or you are caught in the network of propaganda then you will also be caught in another network of propaganda. Whereas if you see this fact, the truth of this, the absolute truth of this, then you eliminate altogether this frightful conflict that goes on in oneself and outside.

So can the mind be aware of itself, which is the result of centuries of thought and its divisive activity, can the mind be aware without an entity that is being aware?

I must proceed. If you are so aware, then in that awareness there is no fragmentation at all, obviously. From that arises: there is no choice. It isn't a state of perfect understanding, all that, it is just being aware of all the things that are happening outside and inside,

without judgement, without justification, without rationalization, just to observe. Then what takes place? Justification, rationalization, suppression, are various forms of dissipation of energy - aren't they? I wonder if you realize that. That is, I am aware of my conditioning, as a Brahmin, as a Hindu, and all the rest of that nonsense. And I try to rationalize it, or say it is quite right, I must be conditioned, it is necessary to live in this world, otherwise you are destroyed - all those reasons. That is, every form of rationalization, explanation, justification, suppression and so on is wasting energy which is necessary to be totally aware. You understand? Awareness means an intensification of attention, complete attention, therefore any dissipation is a wastage of energy. And it is a wastage of energy when I say, "I must uncondition myself". Because when you say, "I must uncondition myself", who is the entity who is saying "I must be unconditioned"? The entity who is trying to uncondition himself is also conditioned - like the analyst who analyses you also needs analysing.

So it is absolutely necessary, if you go much deeper into this question, to realize the truth that the observer, the experiencer, the thinker is the thought, is the experience, is the observed.

Q: It is possible for me to say that the observer is the observed but the moment I say it, it is no longer so.

K: You don't have to say it, sir. Don't verbalize it.

Q: I mean if I can state it, it is already...

K: Agreed, but one realizes the truth of it. One has the insight into this question. That is, when I try to imitate, or conform, or adjust myself to an ideal, is the ideal different from me who has

created the ideal? You follow? Obviously it is not, but I have created it and I try to conform to it and there is a battle going on between what I am and what I should be. And therefore when one realizes this you eliminate altogether this conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. Then you can deal with 'what is'. I wonder if you see this.

Q: I find that when I look at the colour of that cloth that you are seated on, there is no observer there.

K: No, sir.

Q: I can't find an observer anywhere, that's if there is one.

K: Oh, yes there is. Seeing a colour outside you doesn't demand an observer, but when you are hurt, when somebody says something ugly about you, or to you, then there is the observer and the observed. Obviously.

Q: If I stay with the pain then it is the same.

K: The lady says when there is complete attention there is neither the observer nor the observed. Quite right. I am not saying you are right, if it is so, it is so. And you want to maintain that attention - right? Now, look: who is the entity that wants to maintain that attention? See what has happened? Watch it, please watch it. One can be totally attentive for a few seconds, or for a few minutes, or for some time, then the memory of it remains, the memory of that attention. Then the thought says, "I must have that attention all the time" - right? So there you are. Then you being to practise attention, never realizing that at the moment of attention there is no observer. What has happened is that attention has passed, the memory remains, which is dead, and you want to revive the dead thing to life. And we play this game. Now being aware,

being attentive, totally, it doesn't matter if it is for a few seconds, end it, forget it. Then be attentive, or aware of inattention. Be aware that you are not being completely attentive, and that very awareness of inattention is attention. You understand this? So you don't have to battle.

So we have come to the point, when the mind has been trained, educated, to waste energy in non-facts - educated, trained, accepts the ideal, the 'what should be' and struggles to achieve that, and that is a wastage of energy - like nations trying to be brotherly - it is so silly, it has no meaning. So you need all your energy, all energy to go beyond 'what is'. You understand this? I am violent, as a human being I have inherited this sense of violence from the animal, from the society I live in, from the economic environment, from various urges, unsatisfied urges, comparison, all that has made me violent. And I need a great deal of energy to go beyond it, but I waste my energy by either expressing that violence fully, or I have the ideal of non-violence, which is I try to change my violence into non-violence. Please follow all this. Or I suppress it, which breeds further violence. All this is a wastage of energy, and that energy which is being wasted through all these processes, the mind needs to go beyond this violence. So to go beyond the fact that I am violent needs all my energy. Right? Which means all my attention: attention implies the summation of all energy, intellectual, emotional, physical, complete attention. That is the summation of energy. And when the mind is so completely attentive with its energy, is there violence? Do go into this.

Q: You need a lot of energy to see, but you don't actually use up the energy when you see?



K: Do you waste energy when you observe? Obviously not when you observe without the observer.

So we come back: can the mind observe the whole phenomenon of thought which has created this monstrous, ugly, brutal world, not as a fragment but as a human being who has contributed to this? We have made this world, with our greed, with our anxiety, with our demand for security, with our beliefs, with our gods and so on and so on, we have made this. And can my mind, which has made this world, see the whole phenomenon not as a fragment apart from myself, as part of me, which doesn't mean I become depressed. The moment you are depressed there is the entity who is depressed. You follow? All that follows. The mere fact that you are the world, and to go beyond that fact you need all your energy.

Q: Would you say that if you don't think about these things, you just stay watching that thought, then you are not concerned with the observer?

K: Obviously not. When you are doing a job you are not concerned with the observer and the observed. Obviously. But to do the job perfectly, efficiently, excellently, whatever you are doing - washing the dishes, we have done all this, I am not preaching to you - whatever you do excellently, needs attention - in a factory, in an office, washing dishes, whatever one does, gardening, and when there is this extraordinary quality of attention the work is done more efficiently, it doesn't become mechanical. You know all this.

Q: If you see what you are doing, that attention to the work...

K: No, no, of course not. Sir, of course. In the 'what you are doing', what is its relationship to the world - you follow?

Everything is interrelated.

Now having said all this, where are we? What is the place of the mind in relationship? May I go on with this? You are following, you are interested, may I go on? This is a dialogue, a conversation, and I am taking all the - it becomes one-sided I am afraid!

Q: Is that the same question as about the observer?

K: It is the same question as the observer - all right. It is not quite. You see, what is relationship, and what is love, what is death, you follow, there is so much. What is relationship? To be related, I think it comes from the word 'to respond', like responsibility - relationship. What is diligence in relationship, you understand? The word 'diligence'. What is diligence in relationship - not religion, diligence? I am related to you - my wife, husband, mother, sister, neighbour, what is the quality of diligence in that relationship? Diligence - the negligence and diligence. I think that is related also to religion - negligence, diligence, religion. The root is the same, I think. So I am related to you and I see one cannot live without relationship - right? Obviously. May we go on with this? I may withdraw into a monastery, but still I am related. I may renounce the world as many monks do in the west or in the east, but I am still the world. And I cannot deny the world so I have to find out what is my relationship to the world, which is the world of human beings? What is my relationship to you - wife, husband, friend, companion, whatever it is? And what is the place in that relationship of diligence, or have we accepted a relationship with negligence? I wonder if you see this. I am related to you - you are my companion, you give me pleasure, sex, ten different things, you have nagged me, you have bullied me, you have possessed me, and

I possess you, I am attached to you, and you are attached to me, and I am attached to that attachment, and so on and so on and so on. And what part in that relationship, which means responsibility, has diligence? That is a good word. Or am I diligent to my concept of you? And therefore I neglect you? You understand? I have a son, and I want him to be something. I send him to the best school if I have the money, because the best school gives him a certain standard, certain way of articulating words - that snobbism of that group. And I want him to be something. So my relationship to my son is based on my idea of what he should be. Right? Is that negligence or diligence?

Q: Obviously it is negligence.

K: Obviously it is negligence because I am projecting onto my poor son that he should go to the top school and so on, it is the image I have which I am projecting onto him. And the image which I have I have inherited through my education, through my class difference, through my way of speaking and so on and so on. I am a snob and I want him to be a blasted snob. So my relationship is based on an idea, on an ideal, on a concept and that is absolute negligence.

Q: Does it mean that I see my son different from me and the image is not different from me when I am even being negligent to that image of my son? Do you understand?

K: Please listen to this, you will get this very simple fact. So my responsibility is to the idea that I have - you understand? My responsibility is to the concept, to the ideal, to the image I have built about my son.

Q: I am not able to see my son for what he really is.

K: No, I don't know what he is. I am not even concerned with what he is. I want him to be something in this world.

Q: Sir, I find the amazing thing about oneself is that one doesn't know where he comes from.

K: One doesn't know where he comes from. Reincarnation.

Q: It is quite amazing, I found with my son that I didn't know where he came from. It is quite an amazing this.

K: Sir, that is a wastage of energy. Look I have a son, you know how sons are born, I don't have to go into all that. I have a son, whether I want it or not there he is - or a daughter. I am taking facts as they are. Now what am I to do? I see the absurdity, the total irresponsibility when I want him to be something other than what he is. I don't know what he is, but I want him to be something, to conform to the monstrous world he lives in.

Q: If I see him with attention then I see him for what he is.

K: I don't know a thing. I am starting anew about relationship. Please follow this.

Q: Doesn't diligence in relationship mean that you are nothing but a lover?

K: So what am I to do?

Q: I see that is negligence. You come into relationship with some of these people who take drugs, they are dirty, etc. etc., when does that become negligence, when you say, "I can't live like that, I won't live with them" - is that negligence. Is the feeling that I just can't live like that? But you are caring, you are feeling for them.

K: I agree but what are you to do?

Q: That is my question. I can't leave you but I can't stay with you.

K: Quite right. Why should you? Why should I stay with somebody who smells? Is it lack of my love for him? No, sir, this is much more complex. Let's take it a little deeper, not smelly, dirty, long hair.

One has this problem, that is, in relationship responsibility is implied - responsibility to what? You follow sir? To the child? Or to the image that I have about the child? I feel responsible for my family, if I have one, and what is my responsibility? It is a very difficult question to answer, it is not just something you play with. My wife wants this, that, you follow, all those things. And I want also lots of things. And my responsibility is to live with the family and comply, or disregard trivial things, and be responsible not to the image that I have about her, or him, but responsible to behave - you follow, sir? I wonder if you understand this. That behaviour is based not on an ideal but to behave without the sense of being conscious of behaviour - you understand? Am I making any sense?

Q: No.

K: The gentleman says, no. I am glad!

So that brings up the question: what is virtue, what is morality? Is virtue something of which you are conscious, which you have deliberately cultivated? You understand my question? I am vain, arrogant, and all the rest of that business, and I cultivate deliberately humility. In the cultivation of humility, I am asking myself, is it really humility at all, or is it a covering up of my vanity? If I am aware of my vanity - aware in the sense the observer is the observed, therefore there is no cultivation of humility - when I am aware of my vanity, that vanity ends. It doesn't become something else. I wonder if you see this.

Therefore I come back to the question: relationship implies, not to the image I have built about another or about myself, but responsible to co-operation - you understand this? That is implied in relationship, isn't it? Not only to my wife, to my children, but the essence of co-operation.

Q: If someone doesn't understand themselves how can there be relationship?

K: Obviously, sir. How can there be relationship if one doesn't understand oneself. To understand oneself means to be aware of your images that you have built about yourself, and about another. And if you are aware then you begin to enquire, see how you have built the image - either inherited, acquired, or cultivated.

Q: What creates the image?

K: Very simple! You and I are related, and you say something hard, brutal, you hurt me. Right? You have hurt the image which I have built about myself. That is very simple.

Q: Why do I protect that?

K: No, wait. First see what I have done. You say something brutal, or unkind, or unflattering, and the image which I have about myself is hurt. And that hurt remains. Why does one create an image at all? It is a form of self-protection, it is a form of self-security, it is a form of resistance, it is a form of not wanting to be invaded by you, it is a form of wanting to maintain myself within the walls of resistance, and so on. So I have created an image about myself and you hurt me, hurt that image. And in that relationship between you and me, in which there has been hurt, and I have hurt you, consciously or unconsciously, so there is a wall between us, and we say we are related. So can we prevent the hurt and can we

prevent also the image building? You follow? If the mind doesn't build an image about itself it can never be hurt - right?

Q: Is that not an image?

K: No, no.

Q: The mind that can't be hurt?

K: No, sir, look: in my relationship with you, you have hurt me, by doing something. What is hurt - the image I have about myself obviously. Now why do I create that image?

Q: How can the image be hurt?

K: Well, sir, don't you know? If you call me a fool, wouldn't you be hurt?

Q: Would I be hurt, you said the image is hurt?

K: The image is you. The 'I' is you. The 'I' who says, "I am much better than you think I am, I am much more noble" - I am this, I am that, I am desperate, I am ugly, I am beautiful, that is the 'me', the 'I', which is the image, which is put together by words, by thought, by incident, accidents, all that, that is 'me', which is an image.

Q: Is an image of oneself the same as vanity? Is it the meaning of vanity to have an image of oneself?

K: No, sir. You are not following, you are going off. Look, sir, in your relationship with your friend or with your wife, have you not an image about her, or him?

Q: Sorry, I didn't quite get that. Can you say it again?

K: Have you not an image about your wife, or your husband? Of course.

Q: It seems to be the very fragment of the self.

K: That is what I am saying, sir. I am showing it to you.

Q: Are you? Can such a thing come to an end?

K: I am showing it to you.

Q: Or is it just nonsense? It is some kind of weird monkey talk?

Where does it end?

K: You are not even listening to what is being said, sir.

Q: Yes, I am listening.

K: I am showing you sir. I am related to you, as a brother, as a wife, or a husband, or a girl friend, boy friend. And in that relationship you nag me, you possess me, you hurt me. And that hurt is in the image I have about myself - right? This seems to clear.

Q: But you don't mean Krishnamurti and this man.

K: Oh, for god's sake.

Q: Well why do you use those words?

K: All right, I will say 'one'.

Q: Can we go on?

K: One is hurt. And that image is hurt. So the point is this: can the mind stop building an image, and if it stops building an image there is no hurt at all. Now is it possible to stop building images?

Q: I have only just thought about it. I don't know.

K: Oh, you don't know, therefore find out.

Q: What starts is fear.

K: We said that partly - security, fear, uncertainty, all that is implied. I have built an image about myself, and I see why I have built it; in order to protect myself because I am afraid, I am lonely, I am suffering, and I have the image that I must not suffer, and so on and so on. I have an image about myself, not only one but a dozen images. Now is it possible for the mind not to build images?



Is it possible? I don't know if you ever asked even this question. Image means formula, concept, symbol, word, all that is implied in the image.

Q: It is not possible as long as one sits as the opposite, the image has been created by pain.

K: By pain, by pleasure, by fear.

Q: He just spins it out all the time, like a spider spins out a web, for god's sake.

K: Yes sir, I am trying to answer all the questions. So I say to myself, is it possible to stop building images? Stick to that one thing, sir. You say something which is pleasurable, or painful and instantly my image is formed. Can that, at that moment of flattery or insult, be aware? Be totally attentive at that moment? Then is there the building of an image at all? You follow. It is only the mind that is inattentive at the moment of action that builds an image, but when the mind is attentive at the moment of challenge and response, at that precise moment when it is attentive there is no formation of an image.

Q: When I think of it as being the art of acting, an actor, it forms a part in normal life spontaneously where you actually produce images without being bound by them.

K: Sir, did you listen to what I said just now? That where there is attention there is no forming of images. Because in that attention all your energy is there, therefore you listen to the hurt and to the flattery without a single response of either pleasure or pain. You just observe.

Q: An actor has to be very attentive to act.

K: Sir, I am not talking about actors, I am talking about you and

me and relationship. Sir, this is really a very serious matter this, this is not something you play around with actors and all the rest of it. This is your problem, because in our relationship with each other we are always in battle, we are always in conflict, husband, wife, girl, boy, it is an everlasting fight. And a man who is serious wants to find out what it is to live without conflict has to understand what it means to be related.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir. That is a different problem altogether. If you are a teacher... let's finish this one thing quickly. No, sir, I must finish that question, if you don't mind.

Q: If you are a teacher you have to form ideals for the children.

K: That is what I am trying to answer, sir. If you are teachers, we have to form ideals for the children, for the student - why? When you were children you had ideals formed for you - why? What is the importance of ideals at all? Sir, you are all Christians, right? At least you have been. And your ideals have been to love your neighbour, not to kill your neighbour, whether that neighbour is ten feet away, or ten thousand miles away, not to kill him. You have this marvellous ideal: you have had the greatest wars, the greatest number of people you have killed. And what value has your ideal been? Why don't you face the fact that human beings are violent and change that? Wars are brought about through nationalism, through economy, through all kinds of reasons, face that and change that, and not have ideals.

Q: That is an ideal.

K: It is not an ideal, sir.

Q: You are doing the same thing for us that the teachers do for

the children.

K: No, you are missing the whole point.

Q: Am I not violent because my image is threatened?

K: That is part of it, sir. This is not an ideal, I am not talking of ideals. I have very carefully explained: thought is divisive, thought divides, as long as thought creates an image, an ideal, that factor of ideal brings about division. That doesn't mean ideals. That is an insight into the structure and nature of thought. Insight. Insight is not an ideal, it is seeing the fact, it is not an ideal.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 7TH SEPTEMBER 1974**

Shall we continue in spite of the wind, with what we were talking about the last time we met here?

We were saying, I think, that thought which plays so important a part in our lives, thought which has created our culture, whether it is the eastern or the western, all the religious structures and beliefs and sects and dogmas, are brought about by thought. Our gods, our saviours, our masters, our gurus - if you have any, and I hope you haven't - are the result of our thought. And without understanding the structure and the nature of thought we cannot go very deeply into what is the meaning and the significance of life. Thought can project any meaning, any purpose, any goal but it is still divisive, it is still separative, it breaks up. And if we would understand the deeper significance of life, one has to understand oneself, know oneself, not according to some philosopher or psychologist, ancient or modern, but to know ourselves as we are - not according to somebody else. As we are, without condemning, without judging, without rationalizing, just to observe what we are, neither being discouraged, nor hopeful, neither being depressed nor encouraged, but to observe. And then one will see how extraordinarily important it is to understand the movement of thought because we have to learn from ourselves psychologically. You may learn technological things from another but psychologically we have to be our own teachers, our own disciples, then there is no authority, then there is no someone to follow or to accept. But in studying oneself one learns what the meaning of this

self-centred activity leads to. And we are going to talk over together this morning not only our daily life, but also what is the meaning of love and death. We are going to be concerned with these three things: what we call living, what we call love and this question, which has bothered, which has created such extraordinary myths and romance and illusions, with regard to death.

So in understanding ourselves, our daily life, there are one or two very prominent principles that operate, pleasure, fear and suffering. Please as we said the other day, and if we may repeat again, we are learning together, we are thinking together, we are investigating together, though the speaker sits on a platform a little higher than yourself, it is for convenience, not for any sense of authority. And if we are going to share this question of: what is the meaning of existence, what are the implications of love, and that strange phenomenon called death, we have to share this thing together, really share it, not merely listen to a series of words, draw a conclusion and agree or disagree with the conclusions that we have drawn. So we are sharing. And it is very important, I think, to understand that. We have created this so-called civilization, this culture, together, we have built this social structure, the political entity, the economic state, and all that we have built it together, the mess that we have made is made by us together, in our relationships with either principles, ideas, persons and so on. We have built this together and we have to change that thing together. Therefore in investigating all this we are sharing, not merely listening to a series of words and ideas but actually sharing what is being said together. What is being said is nothing with which you can possibly agree or disagree, these are obvious facts and when

we are looking at facts the facts themselves tell you what to do, not what you tell the facts to do.

So in understanding ourselves we come upon these three principles: pain, pleasure, fear and this thing called sorrow. This spreads right through the world. There is suffering right through the world, not only poverty, physical suffering, there is also psychological suffering, the fear and the pursuit of pleasure. Now to understand this suffering one has to look at it. You know what suffering is: there is a physical suffering, the pain of a disease and there is the psychological suffering, the loneliness, the emptiness, the utter meaninglessness of one's own existence and the existence of the world as it is being lived now, and the suffering that is caused by not being loved, or by loving another and not having that love returned. There are so many different kinds of suffering. And can the mind, your mind, your heart, be free of that suffering, because if one is not free from that suffering then inevitably all our actions, everything we look at is distorted, perverted, becomes corrupted?

So it is very important to find out for ourselves whether it is possible to be totally free from suffering, which doesn't mean that one becomes callous, indifferent, or builds a wall round oneself in isolation because when one understands suffering then out of that suffering comes passion. And passion is necessary because without passion you cannot be together. I do not mean by passion lust. The very word suffering, the root meaning of that word, is passion. And a mind that is constantly suffering, that is constantly aware of its own fears, of its own pursuits of pleasures, is incapable of clear total action. So it becomes very urgent and important and

absolutely necessary whether the mind - the mind being the brain, the heart, the whole thing - whether the mind can be free from suffering and yet have that extraordinary sense of vital passion and energy? To find that out, if you are at all serious, and you must be serious when the world is so utterly chaotic, mad, utterly insane, if you are not serious there is something very wrong, and so one has to find out for oneself, not according to somebody else, not create an ideal out of this suffering, but to find out for oneself whether it is possible for a mind to be entirely free from suffering. That is what we are going to investigate now, together.

Each one has his own particular form of suffering. There is not only personal suffering, but also the collective human suffering, the suffering of people who have not enough food a day, who are uneducated, who have tremendous accidents and are laid up for the rest of their life, the destruction of war, all those people who are maimed, destroyed, and also there is not only that but personal suffering. Therefore there is suffering, collective and personal.

We are talking about suffering because that is one of our accepted habitual burdens: we put up with it, or we idealize it as the Christians have done, or as the Hindus with their rationalization of Karma and all the rest of it. Suffering has many causes - personal loss of a person whom you think you love, the loss of a job, poverty, a mind that is aware of its own emptiness, shallowness, pettiness, the shoddy life that one leads, or many forms of frustration, and there is the suffering of death. And when you try to find out the cause of suffering - we are talking about the psychological suffering - is that not a waste of energy and time? Please follow this carefully if you are interested in it. Is not the

investigation for the cause of suffering, is this not only a wastage of energy but it involves time? All analysis involves time and we think time will cure the suffering and so is it necessary to discover for oneself the cause of suffering? Or deal with suffering and not with the cause? Because cause implies in itself time. And the constant investigation of the cause, through analysis, is paralysis of action - right? I hope you understand this. I suffer, for various reasons - what is the cause of that suffering? Because I am perhaps lonely and then I begin to investigate that loneliness and in the investigation of that loneliness I find that I need companionship, and then I escape from that loneliness, and therefore from sorrow - right? So what have I done? I have gone away from the fact of suffering into a secondary issue. Whereas if you can look at suffering without escape, without seeking comfort, without rationalizing and investigating the cause but merely remain with that suffering, without any movement of thought. Because it is the movement of thought that has brought about the suffering - you see this? So the mind is aware that the investigation of a cause is merely the furthering of thought which has brought about suffering, therefore there is no relief from suffering, there is only an illusory form of comfort. Are we sharing this together?

So can the mind see the truth, the fact that any form of escape from suffering, psychological suffering, is a wastage of energy and therefore time, of the pursuit of secondary issues and therefore no solution to sorrow? Now if this is clear, then can the mind remain with that suffering without a single movement of thought? Which doesn't mean that you control thought, because when you see the truth that any movement of thought is a withdrawal from suffering,



when you see the truth of that, it naturally ends. Right? Then the mind is completely immobile with that suffering and it has all the energy to go beyond itself. Have you got it? Have you understand this?

That is, we are not talking of physical pain, you can deal with that by going to a doctor or a dentist or whatever, you can take a pill. We are talking of the psychological anxieties, psychological fears, psychological sense of deprivation, negligence which bring about a great anxiety. This anxiety creates sorrow. You have heard a statement: to remain with suffering, don't escape from it, don't let thought have any place in it. When you hear a statement of that kind you have already translated it into an idea, haven't you? And so you are pursuing the idea, not the fact. So without formulating a concept, to listen to the fact, to the fact that any form of escape from psychological suffering continues that suffering. Can the mind hear it and not make a conclusion out of it, because we have been trained, educated to draw conclusions? The moment we hear something there is a conclusion. And according to that conclusion and idea we act. Whereas we are not acting according to the fact; we are acting according to a conclusion which we have drawn from the fact, which is non real. Right?

So can the mind - please this demands on your part, if you are serious, a great deal of discipline. We are using that word 'discipline' to indicate not suppression, conformity to a pattern, but the word discipline means to learn, not to copy. So hearing this is to learn. Learning is not to form conclusions, learning is constantly learning - right. So with regard to suffering, when the mind remains totally involved in that suffering without any movement of

thought, then out of that totality there is passion. And the same thing with regard to fear and to the pursuit of pleasure.

Then we can begin also to enquire what is love? This is one of the most complex problems like everything else in life. I am sure you have ideals about love, what love should be. And in the modern world love is almost synonymous with sex. So in trying to understand what love is actually, not what we think it should be, or what we would like it to be, but to understand and go into it very, very deeply one needs to find out what is love. We have made such a mess of that word, we have become romantic, sentimental, but if you are not caught in words then we can begin to look at what it is. Then we can begin to ask: is it desire, is it pleasure, is it something personal or impersonal, is it something that the mind can understand? Or is it an ideal, which is what the churches and religions throughout the world have said, love is something totally different, and so on and on and on. I want to find out what it means, what actually it is, not what I would like it to be. So is love something brought about by memory? You understand my question? Is it the product, the result of memory? Memory is experience, knowledge and therefore the past, a remembrance - is love a remembrance? Please look at it yourself, not what the speaker is talking about, use him as a mirror. But break the mirror after you have understood it. Is it a memory of something that you have enjoyed, something that has given you great pleasure, physical, psychological or intellectual or whatever you like? Therefore is love something in the past? And if it is not in the past, then what place has desire with regard to love? Then what place has pleasure with regard to that? All these questions are involved

in this.

Desire is sensation - as we went into it the other day, desire originates through perception, contact, sensation, desire. And is love desire? I can't answer it for you. One has to go into this for oneself. That is, if you are serious and want to know the full significance of this extraordinary thing called love, one has to go into the question of desire. And what part does desire play, or distort love? And is it pleasure? The modern world has made love into pleasure; and also religions have made it into a form of super-pleasure. And the pursuit of that pleasure is the remembrance of something that is over. So is love a memory, a picture, which thought has built, from which it derives sensation, sexual or otherwise? Or has love nothing whatsoever to do with all this? And since in the modern world sex has become so astonishingly important, love has become identified with that, therefore all pleasure becomes very personal, very limited, very small. And can the mind in understanding, in being aware of this whole structure of desire and pleasure, which soon becomes a memory, and what place has memory with regard to love? Or has it no place whatsoever? And therefore is love a matter of time? "I will love you", or, "I have loved you". And where there is jealousy can there be love? Where there is ambition, physical, psychological or a social ambition, can there be love?

In understanding all this, going into it by yourself, not casually, not indifferently but giving your total attention, then you will see that love has nothing to do with all this. Then it becomes compassion, passion for all. And we have divided love, separate from living and separate from death. You are following? It is

thought that has divided living, loving, dying.

And now, if we have understood really, as you are sitting there this morning, on a windy morning, really understood deep within yourself, have learnt, or are learning the nature of desire; not to suppress it, not to deny it, not to run away from it, but to look at it, to understand it, to investigate it, to unravel it, in the unravelling process you will understand fear and pleasure. And also you will see the meaning of what love is. It is stripped of all sentimentality, because sentiment can become cruel, like emotionalism. And then you will find out for yourself what that thing is that man has talked about endlessly, written volumes about it, what love is.

Then we can begin to investigate what death is. You know this has been one of the problems, probably the greatest problem in human life; not love, not fear, not relationship, but this question, this mystery, this sense of ending, has been the concern from the ancient of days. And here we are trying to investigate what that thing is. Can we investigate what death is when we have separated it from living? You understand my question? I have separated death as something at the end of my life - right? Something that I have postponed, put away, a long interval between the living and the dying. Dying is something in the future, something of which one is frightened, something which one doesn't want, to be totally avoided. But it is always there, either through accident, disease, old age and so on, it is always there, whether we are young or old, infirm, or full of joy, it is always there. And people have said, living is only a means to dying, death is much more important than living, and, look to death rather than to life. And knowing that there is death people have invented every form of comfort -

comfort in belief, in ideals, in hopes that you will sit next to God when you behave properly, on the right hand of that entity, and so on and on and on. The whole of Asia believes in reincarnation. And you have here not such a rationalized but a sentimental hope.

When you look at all this, the beliefs, the comforts, the desire for comfort, knowing that there is an ending, and there is a hope that next life you will continue, and also there is the whole intellectual rationalization of death. When you look at all this one sees that one has separated dying from living - right? I hope we are following all this together. Dying separate from living: the living, the everyday living, with all the conflicts, the miseries, the attachments, the despairs, the anxieties, the violence, the suffering, the tears and the laughter, all that something totally separate from the dying. Why has the mind separated life from dying? You have understood my question? Which we have done, why? Is life that we lead, the everyday life, the shoddiness of it, the bitterness of it, the emptiness of it, the travail, the routine, the office, year in and year out for fifty years or more, going to the factory, all that we call living: the strife, the struggle, the ambition, the corruption, the fleeting affections and joys and pleasures, that is what we call living. And we say death mustn't enter in to that field because that is all we know and death we do not know, therefore keep it away. So we cling to the known - please watch it in yourself - to the known, to the remembrance of things, past, to the sorrows, to the anxieties, to memories, to experiences, which are all the known and therefore the past - we cling to the past and that is what we call the known. And the unknown is death, of which you are frightened. So there is a wide gulf between the known and the unknown. And

we would rather cling to the known than enter into the field of the unknown because our minds operate always within the known, because there, there is security, we think there is security, we think there is certainty, we think there is permanency, and when you look at it, it is impermanent, it is totally uncertain, but yet we cling to it because that is all we know. That is, we only know the past.

And death is something we do not know. Now this division exists and it exists because thought has divided life as living, dying, love and all the rest of it, the artist, the business man, the socialist, the politician, thought has divided. So thought has divided life into the known and death as something unknown. These are all facts.

Now can the mind, which clings to the known, enquire into what is permanent? Because that is what we think we are clinging to: the permanent relationship between you and another, the permanent ownership of land, property, money, name, form, idea. Now is there anything permanent? - not as an idea but an actuality. You understand? Please work at it. Is there anything permanent? My name, my reputation, my house, my wife, my children, my ideals, my experience? And yet the mind wants permanency because in that there is security. So realizing there is nothing permanent here, nothing, it creates a permanency in god, in an idea. And you find how extraordinarily difficult it is for human beings to change ideals. And that is our battle now, between you and the speaker. Because you have ideals or ideas or pictures, images which you think are permanent. And you have accepted the permanency as real. And then comes along somebody who says, "Look, there is nothing permanent, your ideas, your gods, your

saviours, you yourself are impermanent" - and you refuse to see that. And to realize that there is impermanency, uncertainty, creates havoc in one's life. The more uncertain you are, the more neurotic you become, the more imbalanced, the more insane the world your activities become, so you must have something permanent, and so you create a belief, a god, an ideal, a conclusion, an image. As we said, these are all illusions because there is nothing permanent, but yet unless the mind has something basically permanent all its activities will be distorted, neurotic, incomplete. Therefore is there something totally permanent? You are following all this? For god's sake follow it, it is your life.

If there is nothing permanent, then life becomes totally meaningless. So is there something permanent in the sense not as a house, as an idea, but something that is beyond and above this impermanency? We are investigating that. You have to follow this a little bit carefully otherwise you will miss it.

As we said, we live in the past and the past has become our permanency, our state of permanency. And when you observe and see the illusion of the past, what comes out of that perception? You understand? I see that living in the past has certain values - because I can't ride a bicycle, I can't talk English, or drive a car, or do certain technological things, or recognize you my friend, or my wife, children, so there must be the knowledge of the past. But is there a quality of mind that is not put together by thought, which in itself is impermanent, is there a quality out of this perception? That quality is intelligence. That intelligence is not yours, or mine. It is intelligence. The intelligence that is capable of seeing the impermanent and not going off into neurotic habits or activities,

but because there is intelligence it is always acting rightly - got it?

With that intelligence we are now going to look at death. Death is something, we say, unknown. Being attached to all the things that we know, what we are frightened of is complete ending of that attachment: attachment to my name, attachment to my family, to my job, to the book I have written, to the book I hope to write or to the picture of god knows what else, various forms of attachment. Death is the ending of that attachment - right? Now living, daily, can you be free of attachment, therefore inviting death? You understand what I am talking about? You have understood? Am I making myself clear? That is, I am attached to my book, to my reputation, to my family, to my job, to my pride, to my vanity, to my sense of honesty - you follow - to my sense of glory or whatever it is that I am attached to. And death means the ending of that attachment. Now can I end that attachment immediately, which is death? So I have brought death into the very moment of living - you understand this? So there is no fear, therefore when the mind sees the truth of this, that death is an ending of the things that you are attached to, whether it is the furniture, to your face or whatever it is you are attached to, to the ideals and so on, you have brought this far away thing called death to the immediate action of life, which is the ending of your attachment. So death means a total renewal - do you understand? A total renewal of a mind that has been caught in the past. So the mind becomes astonishingly alive, it is not living in the past.

But then the problem arises: if the mind is incapable of this action and it is tremendous action, to end completely every day to all the things that one is attached to, every day and every minute,



you are living with life and death together. Do you understand?

From this arises the problem: if you cannot do it what will happen? Do you understand? My son can't do this, or my friend, my brother, can't do this, you have done it and I can't do it. You have applied, you are diligent, you are attentive, you have understood this thing basically, radically, that you are not dependent any more on anything. Ending all that dependency, that attachment immediately, that is death. Then what happens to those who do not enter into that intelligence, supreme excellency of action?

You know most people live in the past, live thoughtlessly, live without sanity, what happens to all those people? You understand my question? You have stepped out of that stream of life, which means you are compassionate, you know what you are doing, aware of all the significance of the past, the present and the future, all that is involved. And I am not. I don't even listen to you, I don't even care, I just want to have a good time, I want to enjoy myself, that is all my concern. I may be afraid of death and I have a comforting belief that I will be born again next life, or that I will end up in heaven. So what happens to me? You understand my question? What is your relationship to me? You, who have understood all this, therefore compassionate, and your actions are supremely intelligent and therefore excellent, and I am not interested in what you are saying, doing, writing, thinking, I am caught in this stream, which most human beings are - you understand? Very few step out of that stream. And what is your relationship to the man in the stream? Have you any relationship? Or none at all? You understand? How can you have any

relationship with the insane when you are sane? You can be compassionate, you can be kind, generous and all the rest of it, but you have no relationship. Therefore what can you do?

Your responsibility then is, if you are out of that stream, to live that life and not be an example. If you are an example then you become a dead person, then you have a following, then you become the authority, then you are the very essence of destruction, you are the very cause of that stream - do you understand? Then what will you do? You have a responsibility: responsibility to act intelligently because you have seen the whole issue, therefore the perception of the map of the whole thing that we have talked about brings that intelligence, according to that intelligence you will act. Not, I like or I don't like. That is the responsibility. And if you say, "Is there for me, who are still caught in that stream, a future life?" - do you understand? You know thought creates the future, as thought created the past and from the past, through the present, modified, becomes the future. Right? So the man who is still thinking in terms of the excellency of thought will have a future. I don't know if you follow all this. But to the man to whom thought means time, thought means matter, thought means memory, experience, knowledge, which is the past, to such a man obviously thought and its structure becomes all important, and he is caught in that. Therefore he lives in the past, in the future. Which there is not the time to go into now because that is a very complex problem to go into: what happens to a mind that is caught in this. Is that an individual mind, or a collective mind? Is it a consciousness which is separate, unique, indivisible, which means individuality? Or is that consciousness collective, therefore it has no individuality at

all? You follow all this? The moment it is collective it is not individual, and most people are the collective. Look at your own mind and you will see it. You are an Englishman or a German, or a Hindu, or whatever it is, and you are the result of that culture, of that economic condition, the climate, the food you eat and all that, you are the result of all that. So as a collective human being you will follow the collective. But the moment you step out of that stream you are not collective or individual, you are intelligent. You understand?

Do you want to ask any questions about all this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K. Sir, when you look at yourself, are you an individual? You know what that word means? It means indivisible, whole, not fragmented; whole means sane, healthy and also it means holy. Are you that? Are you an individual? Or a collective? Be terribly honest about it, and you will see how you are the collective - the traditions and all the rest of it. And to be an individual means to be whole, not fragmented - think one thing, say another, do something contrary - you follow - all this contradiction in oneself is the collective, because the collective, the mass, the whole of human beings, are caught in this everlasting battle within oneself and therefore outward battles. And the individual is one who is totally out of that. He is then no longer an individual.

Q. You talked earlier about suffering. (Inaudible) The trouble seems to be that one...

K. Of course. That is what I said sir. The gentleman says one suffers, and he hears the statement that you must watch suffering. So you have made that statement into a conclusion and you are

watching the conclusion. You follow sir. Not watching the fact. I suffer because my son is dead, or my mother, wife or whatever it is. My son is dead and I feel lonely, I have invested everything in him, I have made him a continuity of myself, and he comes to an end, and I suffer. In that suffering there is self pity and a sense of loss, a sense of life has no meaning, and all the rest of it. I suffer. Not to escape from that suffering, just to live with that suffering - you understand sir? Which is not morbid. I don't know if you are following all this. To live with it, not to escape from it, not to transcend it, not to suppress it, not to translate it into something other than what it is. When the mind does that then you have all the energy which has been dissipated in trying to go beyond it, escape and so on, you have all that energy, all that attention, which is energy, in the observation of that suffering. In that observation the observer is the observed. This is important otherwise you will separate it again and there is conflict. So in that observation there is no observer, only that fact, then you have the energy to go beyond it. That is meditation.

Q. Does the abandonment of passion mean one abandons one's responsibilities as well?

K. Abandon also one's responsibilities.

Q. If you abandon your attachments doesn't it mean that you have abandoned your responsibilities?

K. When you abandon attachment, are you not also abandoning responsibility? When you abandon attachment, do you lose responsibility? Or you become much more responsible? Please follow this. I am attached to my son, my poor son, who is dead. I am attached to my son. What am I attached to? The image of my

son? What I would like my son to have been? Or am I attached to the person? Which is it? Both, the person as well as the image? If I am attached to the image, which I have built about my son, that he must be this, he must be that, he must be a great politician, or a great musician, or a great writer, or whatever it is, or marry very well and have a big house, and money, property. Now if I abandon my attachment to the image that I have built about him - have I lost responsibility? On the contrary, I feel much more responsible to him - responsibility being to respond rightly to the person, not to the image I have about that person. So when we are attached to the image we are really irresponsible. When I am attached to my idea of my nationality, that I am an Englishman, a Frenchman, then I am irresponsible to man, I am irresponsible to the rest of the world. And we have made this irresponsibility into a highly respected thing. And we need co-operation to bring about the daily human problems, and which we are unwilling to do because you are an Englishman, you are a Frenchman, or somebody else - you understand? Therefore attachment to the idea is irresponsibility.

Q. If we are not to be examples or teachers, how can that intelligence grow, spread?

K. If we are not to be examples, or teachers, how can that intelligence grow, spread? First be intelligent. You understand sir? Don't bother about that intelligence being spread abroad, but be committed, seriously to the awakening of that intelligence, and then that intelligence will tell you what to do. You may go out and talk about it, write, give up your life to it - do you understand? You will be totally committed then.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH SEPTEMBER 1974**

This is the last talk here, for this year at least. We have been talking about, this last week, the necessity to bring about a transformation in the very process of our thinking, and a transformation in the very psyche itself. It has become necessary, as one observes what is happening in the world, outside of us, and inside the skin as it were, that we live in a rather chaotic world, a world that is slowly disintegrating, a world where there is so much violence, brutality, where morality has become immorality, where the collective has almost destroyed the wholeness of man. There is the pollution, over population and the destruction of the earth, the bomb and all the rest of it that is going on in the world. The intellectual energy, with its traditions, has not been able to solve any of these problems, neither the wars, nor the economic condition, nor the social injustice, the over population, the division between man and man. The intellectual philosophies, the brains of the very, very clever people, have in no way solved our human daily problems. Nor the tradition of religions, with their divisions, with their beliefs, dogmas, rituals, all the structure of thought in its despair and hope, fear and pleasure has built a religious structure and made god in the image of man. None of these things have resolved any of our problems. On the contrary they are increasing, multiplying. And we have spent a great deal of energy in the solution of these problems: intellectual energy, emotional energy, physical energy, and this energy, with its contradictions, with its conflicts, with its varying purposeful destructive activity has not in

any way resolved any of our psychological human problems. I think this is a fact, which nobody can deny.

And if any of us, who are serious, and I hope we are serious and this is not a weekend entertainment for you, if we are at all serious, concerned with the transformation of the human mind and heart, we must be concerned, we must be totally dedicated to the resolution of our problems, because the content of our consciousness is the content of the world, though there is a modification and so on, but the consciousness of each one of us is the consciousness of the rest of the world. And if there is a radical change in that consciousness, that consciousness will affect the rest of the world. That is an obvious fact.

So we are concerned, if we are not at all playing with things, with the transformation of the mind, with the content of our consciousness, and to find out if there is a different kind of energy which will, if we can tap that energy, resolve our problems? That is the question which we are going to investigate together this morning. When we use the word investigate we mean that we share this problem together. It is your problem and we have to go into it, we have to find out, each one of us, not according to somebody else, not according to some authority, or some psychologist, or philosopher, find out for ourselves if there is a different kind of energy which might resolve our human problems. The traditional energy, the intellectual energy, which man has expanded throughout the centuries has in no way resolved our problems - right? That is clear.

Now we are enquiring into the possibility if there is, or if there is not, a different kind of energy which is non contradictory in

itself, which is not based on the activity of thought with its divisive energy, an energy which is not dependent on environment, on education, on cultural influence? I hope I am making myself clear. Please do give a little attention to this. We are asking if there is a different activity, a different movement, which is not dependent on self-centred activities, the activities and the energies which the self, the 'me', with all its contradictions, creates, is there an energy which is not dependent on environmental conditioning? Is there an energy which has no cause, because cause implies time? And that is what we are going to enquire into.

That is, the energy that man has expanded, intellectual, emotional, traditional energy and the self-centred energy, has not in any way solved our human problems, which are: suffering, fear and all the pain that is involved in the pursuit of pleasure, and all the confusion created by thought in its fragmentary activity, we are asking if there is an energy totally different? That is, we have only used a very small area of the brain and that small area is controlled and shaped by thought; and thought intellectually, emotionally, physically has created a contradictory energy - the 'me' and the you, we and they, what we are and what we should be, the ideal, the perfect prototype and 'what is'. I hope you are following all this. You should, those of you who have heard the last few talks here, should be able, I hope, to follow this together. And I think that it is very important to understand that we are working together, that the speaker is not telling you what to do, because the speaker has no authority. Authority has been, in spiritual matters, very destructive because authority implies conformity, fear, obedience, following, acceptance. And when we are investigating together the



implication in that is that there is no sense of following, no sense of agreeing or denying, but merely observing, enquiring. Together we are doing this. Therefore when we are together you and I disappear. When we are doing any work together, the work is important, not you or I. And we are working together to find out if there is a totally different kind of energy, which is not based on a cause that divides the action of the present from the past. Are you following all this?

Now this enquiry implies, we are asking, whether there is an area in the brain which is not contaminated by thought? An area in the brain, or in the mind, which is not the product of evolution? An area of the brain which man, throughout the centuries, has created a culture, and is not touched by that culture. The enquiry into that is meditation. I hope you follow all this. Do you understand my question, my problem, our problem? From the ancient of times we have used only one area of the brain, and a very small area in which there has been conflict between the good and the bad - you can see that in all the paintings, in all the symbols, in all the activities of man, this conflict between the good and the bad, between 'what is' and 'what should be', between 'what is' and the ideal. That conflict, that area has produced a culture, Christian, Hindu, Buddhist and all the rest of it. And by that culture our brain, that area, small area, is conditioned - right? This is obvious. And can the mind free itself from that conditioning, from that limited area, and move into an area which is not within the area of time, within the area of direction?

You know we are talking about something very, very difficult. This requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of inward

learning, which is discipline, it requires the art of learning.

Learning is not merely acquiring knowledge, but learning implies a constant movement, freedom from knowledge to learn not more, learn something new. So there must be curiosity, attention, and commitment.

Can the mind within the area of culture, which is the known, can the mind free itself from the known, and enquire or move into an area which is not controlled by time, by causation, by direction? So one has to begin to find out what is time, what is direction and what is it human beings are trying to achieve in the psychological field. Is this clear? What is time psychologically? There is time chronologically, by the watch, yesterday, today and tomorrow. That is by the watch, 24 hours. Psychologically, is there time at all? Time meaning movement, time is movement - right? I wish you would go with me. And time also implies direction.

Psychologically we say that traditionally 'what is' can only be changed through gradual processes, and that requires time. And the gradual process is in a definite direction. The direction established by the ideal, the prototype, the archetype. To achieve that you must have time as a movement from here to there. And in that area of time we are caught. That is, I am what I am, I must transform that into 'what should be', the ideal, and to do that I need the movement of time - right? That is simple. And the direction is controlled, shaped by the ideal, by the formula, by the concept which thought has created. We are questioning that altogether. That is, the ideal is created by thought, the thought which says, "I am this, and I should be that", and then the movement towards that. That is the traditional approach to the transformation of man. Religiously, in

every field, this is the movement: I am this, I should be that. To bring about a change from this to that, I need time to achieve the end which thought has directed. So we live always in conflict. Because I am dissatisfied with what I am, or I justify what I am, or rationalize what I am. and conform to a pattern which thought, trying to change what I am, brings about an ideal - right? So time is a movement in a specific direction, set by thought. Right? And therefore we live always in conflict, because the ideal is fictitious, non real, but what is real is the fact, what I am, whatever I am. That is so, that is the fact, that is 'what is'. And our tradition says to change that, imitate, conform to the pattern set by the ideal and all that. This divisive process of what I am and what I should be is the very action of thought, which in itself is divisive, fragmentary - right? Thought itself is fragmentary. It has created the British, the French, the Communist, the Socialist, the American, the Indian and all the rest of it. Thought in itself is divisive. It has divided religions, people, human beings, you and I, and so we are always in conflict. And we are trying to solve our problems within that area of time - right? Are we working together, or am I talking to myself?

Now can the mind, which is so conditioned in this tradition, break away from it, and only deal with 'what is', and not with 'what should be'? And to do that you need energy, which we talked about sufficiently in the last few days. And that energy comes and maintains and sustains itself when there is no movement of thought away from 'what is'. Right? 'What is', is violence. Any movement away from that violence is a wastage of energy, the ideal of non-violence. Therefore when there is no wastage of energy then the

mind can deal wholly with the fact of violence, and go beyond it.

Now we are saying, we are asking: can the mind, your mind, which is the mind of man, because you are the collective, you are not an individual - individual means indivisible, individual means the whole, non-fragmented, non-broken up, as human beings are - can that mind uncondition itself, not through time and therefore bring about a totally different kind of energy? Are we meeting? Can your mind, which is the result of centuries of time, conditioned by propaganda of religions, by propaganda of nationalities, can that mind, with its self-centred activity, uncondition itself, not in the future, but instantly? You understand this problem? The problem, not whether it is possible or not. You understand the problem? My mind, which includes the brain, the whole structure of the human entity, my mind is shaped by the culture in which it has lived in India, shaped by the culture of the west, educated here, conditioned. Can that mind, your mind, which is my mind, can that mind uncondition itself not through the process of time, because then the ideal then becomes to uncondition the mind and therefore conflict? Can that mind uncondition itself without the thought of time? You understand this question? Are we moving together? Please, some of us at least.

So time is the observer, who is the past, and the observed is the present. All right? You understand? My mind is conditioned and the observer says, "I have all these problems and I have not been able to solve them, and I will observe my conditioning, I will be aware of my conditioning and go beyond it." This is tradition reacting - right? So the observer, who is the past, which means he is the essence of time, and that observer is trying to overcome,

transcend and go beyond what he observes, which is his conditioning. Now is the observer, who is the past, different from the thing he observes? Right? The thing he observes is what he sees according to his conditioning - obviously. So he observes with a thought that is the outcome of time - right? And he is trying to solve the problem through time. But one sees the observer is the observed - right? (I see you don't understand all this.)

Look sirs, I'll put it very simply. Is violence different from the observer who says, I am violent - right? Is violence different from the actor who is violent? Surely they are both the same, aren't they? Right? So the observer is the observed. As long as there is a division between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. So this division comes into being when the observer assumes that he is different from the observed - right? Get a little insight into this and you will see what is implied in it. Now I am asking myself: can my mind uncondition itself, not through gradual process of time, but without the concern of time at all, because time is a factor of conditioning? Let's move away from that a little bit.

We live a life of control - right? All our life is control - we are educated to control ourselves, our anger, our appetites, our pleasures, everything is 'control yourself'. Control yourself in order to achieve an end. Which is, that end is created by an idea, by thought as an idea - right? So control in order to be righteous, in order to be virtuous, in order to have freedom. Control your thoughts in order to meditate - you have been through all this, haven't you? Now who is the controller? Is the controller different from that which he tries to control? And is there a way of living

without any control? Please this is a dangerous subject because we all want to live without control, without restraint, do whatever we like to do, which is absurd because you can never do what you want to do.

So we have to enquire into this question very, very seriously because all our life we are educated from childhood to control, to obey, to accept. And that is our tradition. Is there a way of living without any sense of control, neither desire, nor appetites, sexual or otherwise, anger, violence, no control whatsoever? Does this interest you? Which doesn't mean dissipation, which doesn't mean disorder, it in no way implies doing exactly what you want to do - the permissive society in which we live. Because we have to understand this, because meditation implies freedom from all control. It is only the free mind that can really enquire, not a controlled mind, not a tortured mind, not a mind that is twisted by tradition, by fear, by all the anxiety and so on and so on. I hope you are understanding all this. So we are asking: is it possible to live a life in which there is no shadow of control, which means conflict? Who is the controller? If you understand that principle once, really have an insight into that, the truth of that, then you will see for yourself that the controller is an entity created by thought, in its fragmentation, an entity who is part of the fragmentation - right? And that entity tries to control the other fragments. That entity is still a fragment. Right? So the controller who tries to control his thought, is the thought itself. Therefore the controller is the controlled, therefore there is no division.

Let us put the thing differently. We live in disorder, physically, psychologically and intellectually, we live in total disorder, in

confusion, if you have observed yourself - confusion being contradiction, saying one thing, doing something else, thinking something and acting in another way. We live in disorder, in confusion, and order is necessary because the more there is order the more the brain can function effectively. It is only the mind that is in disorder that cannot function properly, objectively - right? It is obvious: like a good machine if it is not functioning properly it is a useless machine. And our life is in disorder - greed, violence, contradiction and so on. Now can order come out of this disorder? Order, not according to the priest, or according to social order which is disorder, which is immoral, can order without conflict - please listen to this - without conflict, without control, not admitting time at all, seeing this disorder in which one lives and out of that perfect order, which is virtue. You have understood? Can that be brought about? Which means can the mind observe, or be aware of this disorder? Aware, not what to do with disorder, or to transcend disorder but to be choicelessly aware of this disorder - and to be choicelessly aware of this disorder the observer must not interfere with the observation. The observer who says, this is right, this is wrong, I must choose this, I must not choose that, this should be, this should not be, this is - you follow? The observer who is the past must not interfere with the observation at all.

Do you understand the question? Can you do it? Observe your disorder without the interference, without the movement of thought, which is time, just to observe. And observation implies attention, obviously. And when you are attending totally to disorder, is there disorder? And so order becomes like the highest form of mathematics, which is complete order.

So there is a way of living without a single control; which is to observe without the movement of thought as time and merely to observe without the interference of thought. Go into it and you will see this. What creates time is the division between the observer and the observed. And you have removed this division altogether when there is total attention and awareness. Right? That is, we have said during these talks and previous talks, that unless you establish in your life, the daily life, a relationship between each other, man, woman, child and all the rest of it, with the neighbour, whether he is close to you or far away from you, unless we establish a relationship in which the image of you and the image of her or him is non-existent, which we have talked about enough, so that there is a relationship, an actual relationship, not a relationship between two images. That is absolutely necessary. Then order, because order is moral, virtuous, without order you cannot possibly proceed further. Order means a brain that can function effectively, objectively, non-personally. Now having established this, which is order, now we are asking whether the brain, that small area which is so controlled, which is so shaped by culture, by time, whether the mind can be free of all that? Which means function in the field of knowledge effectively - right?

Now we are asking another question, which is: can the mind, can the brain - let me put it differently. Is there a part of the brain which is not touched at all by human endeavour, by human violence, by human hope, desire and all the rest of it? Now how are you going to find this out? You understand my question? I have brought about, not I - the mind has brought about order within that area, within that small area, without that order there is no freedom



to enquire. Therefore there must be complete order in that. Order means freedom, obviously, order means security so that there is no disturbance. Now the mind says, "I know, I have lived here and I see the necessity of order, responsibility in relationship and so on", but the human problems are not solved, there must be a different kind of energy. And the mind says: is there such energy? You are following all this? This is meditation: not sitting quietly, breathing in a certain way, following a system - you understand? - which all the gurus in the world teach you how to meditate, which is all silly nonsense. But to find out if there is an area of the brain where there may be a different kind of energy, and perhaps there may be a state where - not a state - where there may be an area where time doesn't exist, therefore an immeasurable space. How is the mind to find this out, if there is such a thing?

Therefore first there must be doubt - you understand? Doubt. Doubt is a purifying thing. But also you must know how to hold it on a leash. Do you understand what I am saying? You must not only doubt but also you must hold it on a leash, otherwise you will doubt everything, which would be too stupid. So doubt is necessary. Whatever you experience, doubt, because your experience is based on your experiencer. The experiencer is the experience - you understand? Therefore the search for more experience becomes silly. Doubt, and the mind must be very clear not to create illusions. I can imagine that I have got the new kind of energy - you follow? I have achieved the timeless state - which is all tommy rot! Therefore one must be very clear to have no illusion. Now illusion comes into being only when there is a desire to achieve something - psychologically we are talking about. When

I desire to achieve god, what ever that god is, that god which I have created out of myself, it is an illusion. So I must understand very clearly this desire, and the drive and the energy that desire has. I desire, living in a shoddy little world, shoddy little life, a life of ugliness, brutality, I desire to have a marvellous, peaceful life; according to my desire I create the illusion that I am living in a marvellous world. And I call that an intuition also. So there must be doubt and no factor of illusion. Do you understand what we are talking about? This is very serious, this isn't a plaything. And all religions have created illusions, because religions are the product of our desire, exploited by the priests, with all their business.

So: then to come upon that energy, if there is such energy, if there is such an immeasurable state, thought must be absolutely quiet - do you understand? Without control. Is that possible? Do you understand sirs? Our thought is endlessly chattering, our thought is always in action. I want to find out if there is that state, all right I'll doubt, I'll have no illusion, I will live a life of order because that other state may be marvellous, therefore I must have it. It is chattering, endlessly. Can that chatter come to an end without any control, without any suppression because any form of suppression, control, distorts the full movement of a brain? Every form of distortion must come to an end, otherwise the brain ends up in a neurotic action of security. So I am asking myself, and you, whether the mind can be absolutely still? That means can time have a stop, can thought come to an end but only function where it is necessary, which is the field of the known - the technological world, how to drive a car, when I speak English or French, or whatever it is, that is the field of the known? Otherwise it has no

place. But my mind is chattering. I am not this, I must be that, I must be beautiful, or why didn't I do that yesterday, this and that - you follow - there is endless chattering going on. Can the mind be completely quiet? And they say, all the gurus, all the traditionalists say it can be quiet only when you have the completest of controls, therefore follow the system to control it. That system invented by some bearded gentleman and you accept it - or unshaven, whatever you like!

Now can the mind - please listen to this - be completely quiet? Because if it is not quiet it cannot move into any other field, it will carry its own momentum into the other - if there is the other, because I am doubting the other all the time, because I don't want to be caught in any illusion which is so easy, so cheap and so vulgar. I have this problem, nobody can answer me - you understand? I am putting this problem to you to find out, to exercise your capacity, your brain to find out if your mind can be absolutely quiet, which means the ending of time, the ending of thought, without effort, without control, without any form of suppression. Is your mind ever quiet? Not day dreaming, not vacant but quiet, attentive, aware. Haven't you known it? Haven't you known it happen occasionally when you are not involved in it? Because to see anything, or to hear anything the mind must be quiet, mustn't it? If you are chattering, and I hope you are not now, you are not listening to what is being said. Your very interest in what is being said brings about this quietness of mind that will listen. I am interested in what you are talking about because it affects my life, my ways of living, what I do, what I think, it affects me and I want to listen to you completely, not only verbally

but behind the words, not the semantic movement of thought but also behind. I want to find out exactly what you say, not interpret what you say, translate according to my pleasure and vanity what you say. So in my very intensity of listening to you to find out I have to have a quiet mind, don't I? I wonder if you see this. I have not compelled the mind to be quiet; the very attention to listen to you is quietness. I wonder if you get this. And this silence of the mind is necessary. Untrained silence, because trained silence is noise, it is meaningless.

Therefore meditation is not a controlled, directed activity, but it is an activity of no thought - I wonder if you realize all this. Then you will find out for yourself if there is, or if there is not, something which is not nameable, which is not within the field of time? And without finding that out, without coming upon it, without seeing the truth of it or falseness of it, life becomes a shallow empty thing, you may have perfect order in yourself, you may have no conflict because you have become very alert, watchful but all that becomes utterly superficial without the other.

So meditation, contemplation - not in the Christian sense or in the Asiatic sense - means thought operating only in the field of the known and thought realizing itself that it cannot move into any other field, therefore ending of thought means the ending of time. Right.

Do you want to ask any questions about this?

Questioner: Is unfragmented thought insight?

K: Is unfragmented thought insight? I am afraid you have put the question wrongly, haven't you. Thought itself is fragmentation. Thought itself breaks up, in itself is a factor of breaking up - the

Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, the Catholic, the Jew and the Arab, the Communist, the Socialist, and so on. Thought in itself is a movement of fragmentation. Thought cannot have insight. Insight only takes place when the mind is acting as a whole. That is, I listen to you, to the fact, to that statement that time must have a stop, thought must come to an end. I listen to you. How do I listen to you? Do I, by listening to you, draw a conclusion from what you have said? Draw a conclusion, an abstraction from what you have said and that abstraction is an idea, and I go away, after listening to that statement, and say that idea I agree or disagree with, how am I to do it - I am concerned with the idea and not with the fact of listening to you, understanding what you are saying - right? So fragmentation takes place when I do not listen to you totally, but draw an abstraction as an idea and follow that idea, which is a fragmentation. So insight is to listen without abstraction, to listen to you wholly. In that attention I see the fact, I see the truth of what you are saying, or the falseness of what you are saying. That is insight. That is understanding.

Q. I feel that I have experienced times when time hasn't existed but...

K. The gentleman says he has had moments, occasions when time has ceased. And now those moments are a memory and he would like to have some more of those things which are past. Which is an abstraction from the fact that you have had an occasion when time has ended. Now it has become a memory and you pursue that memory, pursue a dead thing. Now can you - please listen to this - can you when those occasions in which time came to an end, not carry it over the next day, end it so that your

mind is again afresh to find out?

So sir, look, as we said yesterday, if you were here, is love a memory? A thing that you remember which gave pleasure, delight, sexual or otherwise? So we are asking, is love a memory? Is love a desire - a desire according to a past picture, past image and that past image, picture, symbol stimulates and you say "I love you"? So is love a memory, a stimulation, a thing of time? Or it has nothing to do with time, stimulation or imagination. Go into it sir. You see we are all secondhand people, we want to be told.

Q. When the mind is wholly listening, or when it is quiet, in a way like being asleep, then I find I can't move, or as soon as I move it is not quiet. I mean physically move, I can't do anything.

K. When I am quiet, the questioner says, it is like sleep and if I move physically that quietness is gone, therefore I must remain absolutely immobile physically. You follow what you are all saying? And sleep, what is the function of sleep - if you are interested and you don't go to bed too late, drunk or whatever it is, taking pills and all the rest of it in order to sleep, what is the function of sleep? Have you ever gone into it? And what are dreams? And what is the necessity for dreams? You follow all these things? Do you want me to go into all that?

Audience: Yes.

K: If you are interested in this question of sleep, what is the function of sleep, and what is the function of being awake? Do you understand? The two go together: sleep and keeping awake. Now are you awake now? I know you have your eyes open, you are listening, sitting and not lying flat or sideways, but are you awake? Partly, aren't you? No? Do enquire into it please, do go into this

question. What does it mean to be awake? Does it mean keeping your eyes open, carrying on your traditional activities, following a routine whether in the household or in the office, or walking along in the woods, just to keep going, routine, conforming to a pattern, or accepting and pursuing your desires? What does it mean to keep awake?

Q. To be aware.

K. To learn? To be aware. Are you aware? Or is that an idea? To keep awake implies a mind which is not conforming. So you have to find out whether your mind is conforming, and where is conformity and non conformity. It is like where is co-operation and non-co-operation. You understand. Where do you co-operate and also to know when not to co-operate. So when the mind is conforming to a pattern, to a tradition, saying I am an Englishman, I am German, I am this, that, my country, my god, my beliefs, that is conformity and such a mind is asleep because that is the easiest way to live, conforming - no? Where there is conformity there is security, specially in a country where either Catholicism or Protestantism, or Hinduism or Buddhism becomes very strong, is strong, and therefore you have to conform otherwise you might not get a job. Go into it.

Is the mind awake when it is frightened, when it is suffering, when it is prejudiced, when it is crammed full of opinions? And such a mind goes to sleep: half awake during the day and almost asleep, like a heavy log - right? So a mind that is not conforming has understood the full meaning of fear and has gone beyond it, a mind that is in order, is an awakened mind, it is watching, listening, observing, aware, attentive - right. Such a mind goes to

sleep. Then what happens? Go on sirs. When during the day you are awake, following, observing all the unconscious intimations and hints, that is to be awake, isn't it, to see what your unconscious is telling you also, not only the outward activities, responses and stimulation, but also what the unconscious, the inward intimations, the inward asking, demanding, suggesting, to be awake to all that, then such a mind goes to sleep, the body goes to sleep, then what takes place?

Q. It rests.

K. Just listen to it. It rests. What does it mean, rests? Have you ever done it?

Q. Yes.

K. Sir, this demands tremendous - do you follow sir? Not to conform. I put on trousers, of course I conform. When I go to India I put on some other clothes, that is conformity. So I have to find out what is a mind that is conforming, tradition, it may have created its own traditions, its own habits, therefore it is conforming to the past habits, all that is involved. Not just, I won't conform.

Q. How do you end all the rubbish that you are so clearly expressing?

K. Will you listen to me now? I will tell you. How do you end all the garbage, rubbish that one has collected. Just listen sir, you asked me. Is one aware of this garbage? Or you are merely aware of the word, not the actual fact of the garbage? Go on sir. I hear you tell me that I have got garbage, this weight. Am I listening to the word and therefore recognizing through the word the fact? Or am I aware of the fact, not of the word? You see the difference?

Q. No.



K. Oh! Sorry sir. Wait sir, I am explaining.

Q. Not that sir. It is when I am in relationship, it is not listening to you. It is when I am moving from here to there with this person, that person. It flickers like a flame and you notice it and what can you do then? What do I do then?

K. Sir. You asked me one question sir. I have got all this collection, this garbage, what am I to do to put away all that - right? I am showing it to you. First are you aware of the actual fact of this garbage, this collection? Wait a minute sir. Are you aware of the word? Or of the fact?

Q. Both.

K. Yes sir. So can you put away the word and watch the fact?

Q. That freaks me out.

K. What does that mean?

Q. It does my head in.

K. I don't understand.

Q. I retreat into words. Sorry.

K. It freaks me out. What does that mean? (Laughter)

Q. It stops me.

K. It stops you. That is new - I don't know. It freaks me out. (Laughter) No please, sir this is important. Am I hungry because you tell me I am hungry? Or I know I am hungry? When you tell me I am hungry, it is not a fact; but the fact is when I know I am hungry, I am hungry. Surely these two are entirely different things, are they not? So am I aware of what you are telling me? Or the actual fact that I have got a big collection of garbage? If I am aware of the fact that I have got this collection of rubbish then I can deal with it, not with the word. But if I am living in words, I

can't deal with this. So I must be very clear whether the word is stimulating the fact, or independent of the word the fact is there. Do you follow? Then I can observe the fact. Then how do I observe the fact? Is the rubbish different from me who is looking at it? I have created that rubbish, how can it be different from me? So I am rubbish. Ah, you don't admit that!

Q. Yes.

K. I am rubbish. Therefore I recognize that fact and remain with that fact without any movement of running away from it. Then I have all the energy to go beyond that rubbish. I have explained this ten different times.

Q. Has the speaker found by observing his own body rhythm that intelligence comes into harmony at certain times more easily than others?

K. Have you observed the intelligence of your own body? Of course! Each body has its own intelligence. That is clear. Sir we started talking about being awake and asleep: not being awake during the day, or for a short period awake and for the rest asleep during the day, then when we do sleep we have all kinds of intimations from the unconscious, which turns into dreams and so on and so on. Or the unconscious says this is going to happen in the future, be careful - in the form of dreams. Now when the mind, when your whole attention is awake during the day, and all the intimations of the unconscious are revealed as you go along, then when you sleep there is a quietness, the mind then rests, becomes fresh, young, alive, not all the time worried with problems - you understand? So waking is as important as sleeping.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 31ST JULY 1974.

This is not a talk by me. I have done seven talks, so that's enough. But this is supposed to be a discussion - the word 'discussion' means, I have just looked it up in the dictionary, 'through argument find what is truth; and a dialogue is a conversation between people who are seriously interested in understanding certain problems; and dialecticism is the discovery or the examination through opinion of what is true. And opinion means, judgement based on a belief, a prejudice, or on a preconceived idea. So it is none of these that we are going to do; neither discussion - the root meaning of that is 'to shake' - nor a dialogue, nor an opinion, or offering opinions and investigating those opinions to find out if they have any value. But what we are trying to do in these - I don't know what it is called, dialogues, or discussions, all that - what we are trying to do is to expose certain problems which one may have, and understand those problems by looking at them, not offering an opinion, a judgement and your criticism, exposing them. In the very exposure one discovers what is the truth, what is the meaning. That is, we may have many problems, human problems, not technological problems, the speaker couldn't possibly deal with those - human problems, such as violence, sorrow, relationship and so on. And it is like talking over together with friends who are serious, not casual friends, who want to find an answer, who want to discover an approach through which the thing is resolved, not carry on day after day, day after day. That is the meaning of our gathering here for the next five mornings - which is, to converse together

amicably, with care, with a sense of real affection, so that we understand the problem, our many problems and go beyond them - not carry them for next year, or for the next day.

So what shall we together talk over this morning?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand. One of the questions is: there must be total understanding to go beyond anything. Our understanding is only partial. How is a mind that is always looking, or thinking partially, to understand totally? That is one question. Any others?

Q: Would you talk over together the question of education?

Q: How is thought to end completely, without conflict?

Q: Please talk over relationship.

Q: Thought and feeling.

Q: Everyone contributes to the horror of war.

Q: Talk about fear.

K: Now wait a minute: you have asked, partial understanding, and how is one without conflict, without effort to come to total understanding? And would you talk about education, fear, and the ending of thought totally without conflict, and feeling and thought and their place in the mind. These are all the questions that have been put so far. Now can we discuss, or rather talk over together a question that will include all these? Can we put a question that will cover most of the questions that have been put this morning, can we do that? Including how is a mind that only sees the part and not the whole, a mind that is educated to war, a mind that sees the necessity of thought and its activities and movements coming to an end without effort, and a mind that has been so utterly wrongly educated, is there a different kind of education, and thought and

feeling. Right?

Now, which question, which one of these questions could we ask so that it will give us a comprehensive understanding of all that, of all the questions that have been so far?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is one of the questions, I am wondering. Would that also include fear, war, and the ending of thought, and its recognizable feeling, would all that be included in the understanding, or investigation, or examination of total understanding? I think it would, wouldn't it - right? No? Would that include how to observe, what is the process of observation, both inwardly and outwardly? I think it would, that one question. I am going to include it. Right, will you accept that?

Why does a mind accept war, with all its horrors and violence, and brutality, and at the same time talks about peace? Why is a mind afraid and so on? Now these are the various things: education, fear, observation, the ending of thought, feeling and thought, all these are factors of the mind. Right? Mind, heart, the brain and so on, which is the mind. Why is the mind so fragmented? You understand, sir? Why is an artist, who is sensitive, supposed to be, concerned with beauty, perception, sensitivity, and seeing something other than the mere object, why does such a mind live a shoddy life, which is fragmentation. Which is, seeing perhaps the whole and incapable of seeing total action in life.

Q: It is always in relation to oneself.

K: No, madam, we are just examining. The lady says it is always in relation to oneself. Look, I have all these problems as a

human being - violence, war, partial understanding, education which is really no education at all, I have never been able to observe very clearly, and I also see the necessity of ending thought, because I understand though is the past and so on. I understand sometimes, a partial understanding, and it is never complete, so it is all fragmented, isn't it? Right, sir? Now why is the mind fragmented, broken up? Examine your own mind, your own life. Why is it that in your daily life there is this conflict of the opposites? Right? - conflict of duality, conflict which comes about through contradiction - I understand one minute, and the next minute I don't understand it at all, I see something very clearly for ten minutes and the rest of the day I don't see anything at all. Why is your mind broken up?

Q: It all depends on our laziness, because we are indolent.

K: Is that so? I may be very active, full of energy, not lazy, but yet I am fragmented.

Q: God is one, whole, complete and if we could invite that whole we will merge into it, be swallowed up by it, be covered by it.

K: How do you know god is whole?

Q: I know.

K: Now that is not serious. You are not talking seriously when you say, I know.

Q: It is my experience.

K: No, your experience has no validity. No, madam, you don't listen. Your experience may be a wish fulfilment and therefore it has no validity. Any man who says, "I have experienced god, who is whole" must be distrusted, because he has been educated, or

believes in god, or he is frightened of living and invents a god, and according to that invention he experiences. That has no validity.

Q: Are there not serious people who have said that god is whole and they have experienced god?

K: I wonder what you call being serious? Look sir, an insane person can be very serious, a neurotic person can be very, very serious, a man who is convinced about his experience according to his background can be very, very serious. But a man who is free of all belief, who is free of his conditioning, has dropped his belief in all forms of gods and all the rest of it, such a man is really a free man and therefore a serious man.

Now sir, let's come back to it. Why is our mind so broken up, contradictory, dividing itself against itself, why, what is the cause of it - not what to do about it? If I know why my mind is broken up, fragmented, contradictory, saying one thing, doing another, thinking something else, acting in another direction, why is your mind like that? It is the result of our culture, the culture in which we live, whether that culture is in India, Russia, or in Europe and so on, our education, our culture, our thinking divides - why? The culture is what we have created. Right? My grandfather, the past generation, and the present generation, have created this culture, this culture which divides, breaks up life into fragments - business, artist, the scientist, the religious, the quack, the insane, you follow - all that. I am asking you, what is the cause of it, behind it, behind the culture? Do examine it, go into yourself please.

Please bear in mind that we are not offering opinions. Look, I seriously want to find out this, because where there is division there is conflict. Right? The Arab, the Jew, the Russians, the

communists, the socialists, the capitalists, the Mao and so on and so on, where there is division in oneself or externally there is inevitably, logically, it is a law that there must be conflict. The culture has created it and we are asking, why is the culture, which we have created as human beings, what is the reason of it, what is behind it?

Q: This division comes about, the cause of it is because man is seeking security.

K: I am not saying it is not so, is that so? Security in religion, security in belief, security in experience, security in knowledge, security in relationship, and the desire to be secure brings about this fragmentation. Is that so? Examine yourself please, sir.

Q: Who is it that is seeking security?

K: We will go into that. Please, let's take it slowly, we have got the whole morning. The mind is seeking security and therefore, it is suggested that, the desire, the demand for security brings about this division. And from that the question is asked, who is it that is seeking security? You understand?

First of all, let's take security in a belief - right? Shall we go on with that? You are saying that the fragmentation of the mind is brought about through the demand of the mind to be secure, and it finds security in a belief, in god, or in something it calls god. Now is that belief, is that god, real, or an invention of thought?

Q: Is it that we are fundamentally, deeply frightened and therefore we are trying to find security in every direction?

K: First you say security, security in a belief, and there are other forms of security, is that demand for security born out of fear of - what? Of not knowing myself, of the unknown, of the uncertainty



of life, of the future, this impermanency, and therefore the mind seeks permanency in a belief?

Q: Is every religious man insane?

K: I think I am dreadfully religious, am I insane? I don't think so. But a man, a religious man who believes in god, is somewhat neurotic. Please, sirs, you are not following this at all, if I may suggest. We are talking about the demand for security, and that security brings about fragmentation of our mind and life. And it is suggested by a questioner, that fear is the basis, or the root of this desire to be secure.

Then the problem is, if fear is the cause of this fragmentation, can that fear be completely wiped out? You follow? Completely wiped out, finished with, gone beyond? Please listen. That being afraid of uncertainty, being afraid to suffer, being afraid of this impermanency of life, being afraid of doing the wrong thing, that brings about the desire to find something secure, and I am attached to that security, and being attached to that security brings about division, which is fragmentation. Right, so far it is fairly clear.

Then the next question is: can the mind be free of fear altogether, not partially, not for a few days and then come back to it again, but completely be free of fear?

Q: How can one free oneself from the fear which paralyses the physical body, the mind, everything?

K: We are discussing now, going into, this question of fear which someone raised earlier. Please, give your attention because this is very serious, if you want to go into it. Since you have taken the trouble to come here this morning, sit there, do give your serious attention to this. Now can the mind be free of fear which

brings about fragmentation?

Q: Is not fear necessary for survival, as animals have that fear which makes them aggressive and therefore survive?

K: Let's put it this way: fear of self survival, fear of not being able to survive brings about division. If I am living in the Arab world and I am not an Arab obviously physical survival becomes rather difficult. If I am living in a Catholic country and I am not a Catholic, that becomes rather difficult. If I am living in a Muslim - and so on and so on, in a communist world and so on. So we have adjusted ourselves to the communist world, to the Maoist world, to any world as long as we can be secure. And that desire for security is based, we have said, on fear. Now can we survive without fear and yet be secure? You understand sir? Be free of fear, which means no fragmentation, and out of that ending of that fear another factor comes in which in itself becomes security. I don't know if you follow this? Right? Now can the mind be free of fear?

Q: May be the mind itself is fear.

K: We are going to find out. If the mind itself is fear, then who is it that says he is afraid? You see we are going to block ourselves all the time, we are not proceeding further. I am asking a very simple, but very complex question, whether your mind, your whole being, can be free of fear?

Q: To end fear we must have total understanding of it.

K: That's right. We'll come to that in a minute, sir. But we haven't got that total understanding. So we are examining, sir, to find out if there is a total understanding of fear, not a partial understanding. We are answering your first question: that is, can this fear be observed totally and not partially? Right?

Q: How is it possible to examine fear totally when it has so many factors?

K: Of course. Fear of death, fear of losing money, fear of public opinion, fear of so many ways of fear. Now is there a central root of fear? And these are all factors, manifestations of that central root: it is like a tree, having many branches but it is only the trunk that makes all the branches. So can we find out the central root of fear? And then in the discovery of it I see the totality of fear. You understand, sir? Now can we look and find out for ourselves, not because somebody else says so, find out for ourselves what is the root of fear?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No. I am asking, please, I am asking myself and therefore you are asking yourself, what is the central factor of fear?

Q: It is thought, it can be unconscious.

K: Please find out. Don't merely express an opinion. I am explaining something. Do listen. Do put an opinion, a judgement, but find out for yourself deeply inside, what is the main root, or main substance, main cause, main drive of fear, conscious or unconscious? Give it a little minute, madam, don't be so impatient. Look, I want to find out what it is, I must look, I can't just throw out words, I must look, I must say, let me look, let me be silent for a minute, let me look inside to find out what in me is the root of this fear.

Q: Is it not the separation of me from total life?

K: When you say, 'is it not', that is an opinion, that is a judgement. I am asking something else.

Q: Fear is the denial of 'what is'.

K: That again is an opinion. You haven't found for yourself the root of fear.

Q: We are frightened to find out.

K: Yes. What is this fear? Have you ever asked this question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have you found out for yourself, madam, what is the cause of your fear?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is that the root of fear?

Q: It is me separating itself, and the separation causes fear.

Q: It is the ego.

K: Please, would you mind for two minutes by the watch, or more, just without offering words, putting into words, find out for yourself, go into yourself, if you can, and find out without verbalizing what it is you are frightened of, and what is the root of that fear.

Have you found out? Yes?

Q: I am afraid of death.

K: Is that the root of fear?

It is a lovely morning, isn't it. So you haven't found out, therefore, sir, you don't know what the root of fear is.

Q: Awareness of oneself.

K: The consideration of oneself.

Q: I like to be afraid.

K: Now, if you like to be afraid, keep it and don't talk about it. But if you want to investigate what is the root of fear, please you haven't done it. You are just talking round it.

Q: How is one to find out?

K: I am going to show it to you sir, you haven't even the patience to listen.

Q: I want my desires to be fulfilled, I want my demands satisfied, and because they are not I get afraid.

K: I want to find out, because I am a serious man, I want to find out why there are so many fears, conscious as well as unconscious - losing a job, public opinion, being crippled physically, afraid of death, afraid of my wife, or husband, afraid of life, afraid of so many, many things. I am asking myself, why is there this fear, what is the central factor of it? Right? Please, one moment. I am asking, madam, I am investigating myself, so please I am trying to show how to investigate. My mind says, I know I am afraid - I am afraid of water, darkness, I am afraid of somebody, I am afraid of having told a lie being discovered, I want to be tall, beautiful, and I am not, I am afraid. I am investigating. So I have got many, many fears. Just a minute. I know there are deep fears which I have not even looked at, there are superficial fears. Now I want to find out the fears, both that are hidden and open, I want to find out how they exist, how they come into being, what is the root of them. Just a minute. Now how does one find out? I am going step by step into this. How does one find out? I can only find out if the mind sees that to live in fear is not only neurotic, but very, very destructive. Right? The mind must see that first, that it is neurotic and therefore neurotic activity will go on, destructive, and a mind that is frightened is never honest, a mind that is frightened will invent any experience, anything to hold on to. So I must first see the necessity clearly, wholly, that as long as there is fear there must be misery. Right? Now do you see that? That is the first requisite. That is the

first truth, that as long as there is fear there is darkness, and whatever I do in that darkness is still darkness, is still confusion. Do I see that very clearly, wholly, not partially?

Q: One accepts it.

K: There is no acceptance, sir. Accepting I live in darkness? All right, accept and live in it. Wherever you go you are carrying the darkness, so live in the darkness. Be satisfied with it.

Q: There is a higher state.

K: A higher state of darkness?

Q: From darkness to light.

K: You see again this contradiction, darkness to light, which is a contradiction. No sir, please. I am trying to investigate, and you are trying to prevent me showing it to you.

Q: It is analysis.

K: I said to you, it is not analysis, please sir, do listen to what the poor chap has to say. He says, I know, I am aware, I am conscious that I have got many fears, hidden and superficial, physical and others, psychological. And I know also that as long as I live within that area there must be confusion. And do what I will I cannot clear that confusion until there is freedom from fear. That is obvious. Now that is very clear. Then I say to myself, I see the truth that as long as there is fear I must live in darkness - I may call it light, I'll go beyond it, but I still carry on that fear.

Now the next step is - not analysis, observation only - is the mind capable of examining? You understand? Is my mind capable of examination, observation? Let's stick to observation, it is better than examination - examination has another meaning and observation has another meaning. Is my mind capable, realizing

that as long as fear exists there must be darkness, and is my mind capable of observing what that fear is, and the depth of that fear? Observing. Now, wait a minute. What does it mean to observe? Right? Can I observe the whole movement of fear, or only partially? You understand my question? Can the mind observe the whole nature, structure, function and the movement of fear, the whole of it, not just bits of it? I mean by the whole, not wanting to go beyond fear, because then I have a direction, I have a motive, therefore where there is a motive, there is a direction, I cannot possibly see the whole. Right? And I cannot possibly see the whole, observe, if there is any kind of desire to go beyond, rationalize, can I observe without any movement of thought? Do listen to this. If I observe fear through the movement of thought, then it is partial, it is obscured, it is not clear. So can I observe this fear, all of it, without the movement of thought? Don't jump. We are just observing, we are not analysing, we are just observing this extraordinarily complicated map of fear. When you look at the map of fear if you have any direction you are only looking at it partially. That's clear. When you want to go beyond fear you are not looking at the map. So can you look at the map of fear without any movement of thought? Don't answer, take time.

That means, can thought end when I am observing? When the mind is observing can thought be silent? Then you will ask me, how is thought to be silent. Right? That's a wrong question. My concern now is to observe, and that observation is prevented when there is any movement, or flutter of thought, any wave of thought. So my attention - please listen to this - my attention is given totally to the map and therefore thought doesn't enter into it. When I am

looking at you completely nothing outside exists. You understand?  
So can I look at this map of fear without a wave of thought?

Q: Each time there is a surgence of fear I realize spontaneity ceases, and so is thought the reason of fear?

K: I want to look at the map of fear and thought is always interfering with it - I am afraid not to look, I like being afraid, I like having a neurotic activity and so on and so on. So thought is always precipitating itself, percolating when I am observing. So I say to myself, can thought stop? And if it stops, what takes place? You understand? So my question is, can it stop, not what takes place afterwards, but can it stop, voluntarily, without conflict - if there is a conflict, again the same problem. So can thought come to an end? Have you followed this so far? Are you doing it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, does your thought come to an end, not what happens afterwards.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, do listen, sir. I want to look at this map of fear, the whole of it, not just one end of it, or one part of it, or one branch of it. I want to look at this whole phenomenon of fear which you have kindly exposed to me. And I somehow can't observe, I can't keep my eyes totally on it because something is distracting all the time. The distraction is the movement of thought, (noise of train) or the sensation of that noise, or somebody on the telephone. So I am saying, to look at the whole width of that map of fear, the depth and the width and the height of that fear, thought must be in abeyance, because thought is divided - it says to me, "Look there, don't look there" - right? "This is good, this is bad, this is the way



out of it". So thought is always interfering, so I say to myself, can thought quietly go to sleep for the time being? And it can't. Wait. I am going into it. It can't, it is so vital, it is so chattering, it is so alive. Right? So what is the mind to do, knowing - please listen - knowing that thought interferes in the total perception? Right?

And inevitably I must understand, observe, the total movement of thought - right? - not fear, but the total content of thought. You follow, sir, what has happened? I started out by asking, why am I afraid of death, of public opinion, of this attachment, why are there so many, many fears the mind is caught in. And I am observing that, this whole field of fear, and the observation is prevented by thought, by the movement of thought. So now my attention is given to the understanding of thought - right? - not of fear. Are you moving with me?

Now I want to find out, what is thought, why does thought interfere in everything I do - sexually, morally, religiously, every movement is there, of thought, why? Is it that the culture, religion, all the activities and education say, thought is the most important thing? Right? All the books, encyclopaedic knowledge, everything seems to have its root in thought. Right? When I say, "I love you", the very expression itself has its root in thought. Right? Not the feeling, not the factor of love, but the expression of it, the verbalization of that fact is the movement of thought - right? - my gods, my desire to be noble, my desire to have great success, my ambitions, all are based on thought - I am devoted to you because you are my god, you are my guru, you are my saviour, you are my blasted companion, whatever it is - thought. And this thought has been the current in every market of life - right? - from the

Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans and the present culture - thought. Right? And my brain, the area of my brain is the content of that thought. So I say to myself, that is a fact - learning a language and all the rest of it.

Now what is thought? What is thought, the direction of thought, what is thought moving to create, to destroy, what is this thing called thought? And can the mind be without thought, and what happens if it is without thought? We have seen examples, doctors and others, when there is no thought the mind becomes a vegetable - right? Amnesia, doesn't know a thing. Now what am I to do? You understand my question now? Thought prevents the understanding of the whole of fear, therefore there must be an understanding of thought, its structure, its nature, its activities, its limitations, its binding quality and so on. So what is thought? Why has man given such tremendous importance to thought? In India, for example, they have given importance to thought by saying, life can be divided into many temples - the devotional, the active mind, the devotional mind, the active mind, the silent mind, the mind that requires knowledge - which are called the four yogas, the four philosophies. So again the division - you follow? The Greeks, not that I am a specialist in this, I have observed, I don't read history but just observe - the ancient Greeks said, thought is necessary because thought is measure, without measurement you can't do anything, you can't build a (?), you can't create a face without measurement. All their philosophy, their democracy and so on is based on measurement, to measure. And the Hindus said, on the other side, said to measure is illusion. They have a special word called 'ma' - 'ma' means to measure, maya means illusion. So India said, where

there is measurement - please listen to this, it is very interesting - where there is measurement mind must create illusion. And the west, from the Greeks, said, measurement is necessary - and on that all our western world is founded, technology, everything is the movement of measurement. Right? Don't accept it, you can observe it as a fact. It is not my opinion. I have no opinions, thank god! So there it is.

So what is thought? Why are all our actions based on thought? Love has become part of thought. You follow? I love you. I am attached to you. I love you, I want to sleep with you - pleasure. And the measurement of pleasure is thought. Right? Measurement of pleasure. So where there is measurement there is time. Right? I will have that pleasure tomorrow, which is the time. The tomorrow is the measure of thought. Are you following all this? Does it interest you? For god's sake this is your life.

Q: (In Italian)

K: I'll translate it. The fear is the impermanency of ourselves, and the attachment - I'm translating generally - then becomes the cause of fear. Now just a minute, sir. You see how my investigation is going on.

I see around me in India, in Europe, in Asia, in America, the movement of thought, the movement is thought in relationship, the movement of thought in religion, all the inventions of their gods are the product of thought, and all the philosophies are based on thought, the philosophy of devotion, the philosophy of knowledge, the philosophy of action, everything around me is based on thought - thought being measure and therefore time. Right? And we call progress the measurement of time. Right? The growth of national

products, everything. So what is wrong with thought? You understand? The Asiatics, especially India, India exploded over Asia, as Greece exploded over Europe, India exploded much more vastly over the whole of Asia. There they said, thought is measure, and to find the immeasurable, which is not measurable, thought must end. Right? Because they said, to live in thought is to live in prison, and prison is a measurement. See the beauty of it. I am thinking aloud for you, they don't say all this. To live in prison is measurement, and to be free of that measurement is to come upon that which is Brahman, which is immeasurable. Right? Therefore they said, control thought, suppress thought, thought is brought about through sensations, the senses, therefore don't look, don't go near a woman, don't touch, don't touch, don't see anything, but close your eyes, suppress thought and work at it.

And the western world has said, thought is absolutely necessary, there is no immeasurable. You can invent the immeasurable, all your gods are inventions - the serious investigators - they are all your emotional reactions, the wish for your father, as the Christ and so on, they won't even accept that.

So thought has become the foundation. Right? So what am I to do? I am investigating with you, I hope you are sharing and not just going off to sleep and polishing your nails.

The moment I say, the mind says, thought must end, who is it that says this? You are following this? In observation thought is interfering therefore there is an assertive action taking place - thought shall end. You follow this? Why do you come to that conclusion? Because it interferes with your observation? Therefore there is a motive for your desire to observe, and that motive is

measure. I don't know if you follow this. Therefore that motive is time. I wonder if you see this, the subtleness of it.

So is your observation without a single motive? It is not, because thought says, I want to go beyond it. And thought has a cause, the cause being the desire to go beyond it, therefore it is measurable and therefore you are still caught in thought. So what is the mind to do? It is not interested in observation at all - observation of fear. Now it has turned its attention to the enquiry into the whole movement, structure, nature, function of thought. Not that it won't stop it, not that it wants to control it, just to observe. Right?

Why has man, right through the ages, given importance to thought?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Go a little deeper than that, we will go into all that. All cultures, ancient, those cultures that have disappeared, all cultures have given importance to thought. Why? Find the answer, don't give it up.

Q: It is the only instrument that we have.

K: Is that so? Wait, wait. You people don't know how to investigate. You all say, everyone says, including you, thought is the only instrument we have, and we abide by that. Right? Which is our tradition, of course. So see what has happened. We said that is the only instrument, and this has been handed down to us, generation after generation. Right? And I say, yes, that is the only instrument I have. Why do you limit the instrument that you have to only one thing? You understand my question? Aren't there other instruments? So I am asking, is there an instrument other than

thought?

Q: I want to know the answer quickly.

K: Sir, the answer quickly is to observe without the movement of thought. Observe yourself, your wife, the world, everything about you, nature, the clouds, the beauty of the hills, the flowing waters, and the bird on the wing, everything observe, including your own desires, without a single movement of thought. That is the final answer.

Q: I am locked inside a room, and the key is on the other side of the door, and you are asking me to open the door, which is an impossibility.

K: That is a good simile but not real. By stating that the key is on the other side you have already blocked yourself. I have no key, I have no door, I have only one problem.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait. The gentleman wants to know, I have talked for fifty years, is it merely an intellectual philosophy, or is it something that is real? You know the meaning of the word 'philosophy' means, the love of truth. Right, sir? The love of life, not the invention which the intellect creates, that has nothing to do with reality. So I am not giving you a philosophy.

Q: We all want to change.

K: Change to what?

Q: To be a little free-er.

K: I am not interested in being a little free-er? Sir, you don't understand. You haven't taken the time or the trouble to read or find out what the speaker has to say.

Q: I have read all your books.

K: Then, sir, you know it by the mind, but we are talking of living, not speculating, not talking about it.

We have come to the point when we said, that we have only one instrument, the intellect, which is thought. And I am asking, why do we limit ourselves to one instrument? Is it that we are caught in habit, in tradition, in accepting there is only one instrument? Of course. So all this is involved in change in action, in our daily life, not in your speculative philosophies, in your gods, that has nothing to do with it. What we are talking about is your daily life. If your daily life is based on thought, then you are going to create such havoc in the world, which you have. And any change that thought brings about is still within the same area, whether communist, socialist, Catholic, or any other religion, it is still within the same area of confusion. So you have got to find out if you want to radically change. And to go into that you have to say, why does thought in your life play such tremendous importance?

Q: There is a tremendous urge to find out about life.

K: A tremendous urge to find out about life, which is thought. Your life is based on thought, all your activities are based on thoughts, your relationship is based on thought.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are doing that, madam, we are doing that.

Q: We refuse to consider ourselves as a whole.

K: We are coming back to the same question. How do you consider yourself as a whole when you are looking at life partially? - my country, my god, my desires, my ambitions, all the rest of it - how can you see the whole?

As the gentleman pointed out, the speaker has talked for fifty

years, and as he says, "Has the speech produced one single human being, apart from yourself, who is really free?" You understand? I am not interested if after fifty years I have produced one single human being who is free. You understand? I am not interested. If you are interested, take it; if you are not interested, don't take it. This is not propaganda, this is not something to convince you. If you are willing to listen, if you are willing to pay attention, if you say, look, I really want to understand what you are saying, I want to understand myself, I want to change totally myself, then give care, attention, affection. But if you are not, it doesn't matter. There are plenty of shrines, which are delusions, you can go to.

Q: I have a question about thought. When you have a new thought after...

K: There is no new thought. Is there a new thought? Or thought is always old? Thought can never be free. It may come up as new but it is still thought.

So I am left with this: thought is my life, thought is my actions, thought is my relationship, thought is my god, thought is the thing that man has put together for thousands of years, as devotion, as guru, as this, ten different things. And I see thought divides. Right? - my country, your country, my belief and your belief, my god and your god, my ideals and your ideals, and so on and so on. Thought divides. Right, are you following all this? True is it, or real to you? Thought divides. So thought is not love. So how can the mind, which has been put together through centuries, in the structure of thought - follow this, please - how can that mind which is the result of thought, whose essence is thought, how can that mind change radically? Right? To change radically thought must be understood,



otherwise there is no escape. Can you understand your thought - your thought, not my thought? If you understand your thought then it is the thought of everybody. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, I know what you are saying is so, but to answer that question you also have - which is what we are trying to do - to see why this constant chain goes on, movement. Right? You have got to find the basis for all this, sir, haven't you, not intellectually but actually in your life? You see, sir, our difficulty is to sustain a continuous, sane, logical investigation. You haven't got the vitality or the energy, or the urgency of it, we are playing.

Now thought is the basis of our action and our life. Thought has produced such mischief, and also it has produced great architecture, great painting, but it is still thought. Right? And thought also brought wars, thought has destroyed millions of people. Right? Christianity has probably destroyed more human beings than any other religion in the world. Right? Swallow that pill! So thought has done all this, and so thought cannot bring change. It can go from one corner of the field to another corner, but it is still within the same field. Right? Communism, socialism - you understand? The change within that area of thought is the same, with modifications. Right? That is so, sir, there is no point in hesitating about this.

So thought is not the instrument of change. If I realize that, I have got to find another instrument. It is my responsibility, it is my duty, it is my tremendous necessity to find another instrument, because I am concerned with the world, which is myself. To bring a change in the world I must find out something which is not based

on thought because thought will not solve it, all our misery. Right sir? Don't accept this, but look at it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, you haven't even accepted, you haven't even seen that thought is destructive, thought cannot bring about change. You put another question. Look, sir, please look. Look what has happened: in your Christian world, how many divisions of Christians there are. In your Christian world how many wars you have had. In your Christian world the division amongst people, class, quarrels, divisions, fight, fight, that's what your life is. And that is all the result of your thought; and you are using thought to bring a change. And I say, that is impossible, don't do it.

We must find a way which is not the way of thought. Right? But to find a way which is not the way of thought, you have to understand the whole business of thought, not say, "I must look in other directions". Because if you are still caught in the field of thought then you can't look in the other direction. So you must understand what thought is. Right? So if I understand how to run a car, there is no problem. But because we don't understand the nature of thought we go on employing it. So we are going to find out.

There are two questions involved in this: What is thought, what is thinking? And the necessity of thinking. Right? The necessity, because the very words you use and the expression is thought. So thought has its place, which is in the operational field, in the functional field. That is, speaking a language, driving a car, the business world, the technological world, which is all based on knowledge, experience, memory, thought - there thought must live,

must operate. And I am asking, has it any other place except in that area only? Right? You are following this? Follow it in yourself, don't follow the description, follow the described. That is, I see thought is necessary to write, to speak, to communicate - there are other forms of communication - but thought is necessary, thought being knowledge, experience, accumulated memories, that is necessary; otherwise you can't go to your home, otherwise you can't travel, otherwise you can't speak and so on. And when there is observation why does thought move into that field? You have understood? I want to observe the beauty of those hills, and the beauty of light and shade, and the depth of shadows, and the movement of leaves, but thought comes in and says, "That is a lovely hill", or "I don't like this, I like that", "That is a bird" - you follow? Why does thought do all this?

Now is my mind concerned with the cause - please listen to this - is my mind concerned to discover the cause of thought and its activity? You understand my question? When I say, why does thought do this, keep interfering, I have put that question to find a cause, haven't I? Right, sir? So cause and effect. Right? Are you following this, it is fairly simple, isn't it? Cause - all right, I'll show it to you. I have said, why do thought do all this, interfere, push itself in? When I put that question I am looking for the cause, am I not? So there is a motive in looking for the cause. Right? You follow this? So what have I done? When I look to the cause, a motive, it is still the operation of thought, so I am not looking, I am only investigating the cause. So the cause becomes the time. I see that, therefore I won't ask that question. You understand, sir, are you following this? I won't ask the question, why does thought do

this, because the moment I have put that question I am investigating the cause which is within the field of time. I wonder if you understand this.

Look, if I say, I love you, and I say to myself, why do I love you? What have I done? I don't love you, do I? You understand, sir? When I say, why do I love you, I have brought in an intellectual process which says there must be a cause. And where there is a cause there is no love, is there? What's the matter with you? So when I put the question, "Why does thought interfere, weave itself into observation", I am really putting a wrong question. I want the cause, and I want to destroy the cause. You follow? And therefore I am caught again in the process of thought.

So, see what I have done. I want to observe the map of fear, and thought interferes with it and I say, "I must find the cause", I am still within the same area, I haven't moved away from it. Right? So I play this game with myself all the time, and I am thinking I am changing. Whereas put the question and don't seek a cause. Just put it, and don't look for it. Then you will see the whole thing unfolds itself without your asking, why. You understand? When you put the 'why' and you find a cause, that is a direction. Where there is direction there is time, there is will, and therefore you are back again in the movement of thought. But if you say, "Yes, why is thought doing this?", just observe it, not saying, what is the reason for all this. Just observe. Sir, don't you ever do this when you love, do you say, "Why am I loving you?". Why I am talking for fifty years, and I say, my god, why am I doing this? Then I find a cause but it is not the real thing.

Now look at what we have done, see what we have done, we

have said all our culture, past and present, is based on thought. And thought has divided the world, thought is the principle activity in life, as we know it - life being you and me. In that life it has created fragments - I am a Hindu, you are a Christian, and all the rest of it. And can I observe this whole - can the mind observe this whole phenomenon of thought without another thought? You understand? You have understood, sir? A cause without another thought, because if you have another thought it is still the same thing. You understand what we have done this morning. Do look at the structure of it, sir, the beauty of this thing, how it works.

We have put several questions this morning: wanting to see the whole, war, education, thought, feeling, all that, what we have talked about. We said we would take one question, which is, seeing the whole. To see the whole there must be no parts. And there is a part as long as thought interferes. Right? Seeing the whole means there must be no attachment, no root. Right? No cause. If there is a cause you can't see anything. If I say, "I love you" I have a cause which is because I want your money, or your body, it is not love. Right? So we see that thought divides, thought brings conflict, and all our work is that. Don't do anything but just look. Don't say, partial look, whole look, just look at this whole phenomenon of war, of education, not seeing the whole, fear, security, and always the mind searching for the cause, as though finding the cause you think you will be out of it.

Look sirs, we have had, man has had, in written history, five thousand wars within the last I don't know how many years. That means two and a half wars every year, in history. We know the cause - man's greed, man's desire for power, man's desire for

economic position, man's desire to dominate the world and we know the cause but yet we are still going on with it. So the discovery of the cause doesn't eradicate. What brings eradication is to observe this extraordinary phenomenon, just to observe it. And if you can do that, then you are completely beyond it. And the speaker has shown how to observe all this morning.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 1ST AUGUST 1974.

K: What shall we talk over this morning together?

Q: Would you talk about celibacy with regard to the mind?

Q: What is the quality of the mind that is able to look?

Q: The relationship between thought and feeling.

Q: If there is no marriage as legally accepted, would there be attachment between the two, and what is the relationship of the parents to the children?

K: Shall we go into all this? Or do you have some other questions?

Q: If thought is matter, as we have said, is intelligence different from thought?

Q: How can the mind observe itself without the desire for security?

K: Now that's enough questions. Why is it so difficult to be free of attachment? And what is the relationship between celibacy and mind? What is it that observes apart from the mind? And is intelligence different from thought? Shall we take up some of those questions?

Q: I would like to know whether or not celibacy is necessary psychologically?

K: So which do you want to discuss, or can we include in one question all these other questions?

Q: How is it possible to observe without fear all the things that one has built throughout life, and face annihilation?

Q: You have said that in observing there is a pleasure.

K: I didn't say that.

Now wait a minute, that's enough questions if you don't mind.

Now which question will include all the others?

Q: Is psychological celibacy, or physical celibacy, necessary for psychological health, well being, freedom and so on?

K: Why is so difficult to be free from attachment? Can we take that question of attachment and through that answer the other questions? May we? Shall we do it?

Why is the mind so attached to things, to ideas, to ideals, symbols, family, name and so on? What is attachment, what is the meaning of that word, to be attached? Please, as we said yesterday, this is not a talk by the speaker. We are together, as friends who are serious, considering human problems. And it is not an intellectual entertainment, a discussion, an argument of opinions. We are trying to find out the truth of the matter, and to find that out you have to share in it, you can't just listen to the speaker. So we are together taking a journey in understanding these problems. When we use the word 'understanding' we mean not intellectual or verbal, but an understanding that takes place when we are serious and examining and from that action. This whole process is understanding. Right?

Now we are asking, why is the mind so attached - to ideas, opinions, values, people, houses, furniture? I used to know a friend in the old days who was very fond of a particular table. It was a very, very old table and he used to polish it every day. And you could only touch it with kid gloves. And all his activity was round that table - he was that table! And aren't we also like that, it may not be a table, it may be house, it may be an ideal, a symbol, an



experience, a person, why is the mind attached? The meaning of that word, 'attached' is to hold on, to cling to, to totally rely on somebody. Why?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand. Now please, when we are examining, don't immediately, if I may suggest most respectfully, answer. We have got to look into this problem, we have got to look into ourselves if you are attached. Aren't you attached to your symbols, to an experience, to a particular desire, what you think and attached to your ideas, ideals, aren't you? To your nation, to your background, you know, all the rest of it, tradition. Now we are asking, how does it happen that the mind is so caught up in this? You see this is a very difficult problem, very complex, so don't just say, "Yes, it is this". Man has tried not to be attached, and therefore he has cultivated detachment. That is one of the demands of any orthodox religion - be detached from the world, from sex, from women, from drink, detached so that you can give your energy to the service of god, or whoever it is. This is a very complex problem. And if you are serious, if you really are interested in it, one has to go very deeply to find out why the human mind throughout the ages has lived these two principles: attachment and the cultivation of detachment? All the monks throughout the world try to be detached, have taken vows of poverty, vows of celibacy. Why this extraordinary phenomenon of attachment and detachment has not been solved by people? You understand? We are still talking about after ten thousand millions years. Why is the mind so incapable of freedom from either? That's what our enquiry is.

When we ask, 'why', we are not, as we explained yesterday,

trying to find out the cause. Please let's understand this carefully. May I go into it? The analytical process is to find the cause and eradicate the cause. And in the process of trying to find out the cause of attachment the mind is still caught in another motive. Isn't it? I want to find out what is the cause of attachment, the motive of that examination is to be detached in order not to have pain. I am attached to you, and you turn to somebody else, and I feel hurt, angry, jealous, hatred, bitter, and I try to find the cause of that, and in trying to find the cause I still have a motive. So the motive is much more important than the cause. You have understood? Not the cause, but the motive that seeks the cause. All right, is this clear?

So when we ask, why it seems so difficult for the mind to be free of attachment - now in examining, have we a motive? The motive being, we want to be free of it, we want to go beyond it, because we have suffered a great deal through attachment. We know all the pains of attachment, the loneliness of attachment. So in enquiring into it my motive is to go beyond it. So a mind that has a motive has a direction. Right? And that direction distorts examination. Right? Have you understood, sir? No? If not, I will go at it ten different ways because I feel responsible to put this clearly.

So in enquiring, any motive is a distorting factor and therefore one never sees the truth of attachment, and therefore freedom from it. Is this clear?

Q: What is one to do if there is a motive there?

K: If the motive exists, what am I to do with it? You can't do anything about it, but if you are really seeking to understand this

whole business of attachment, the imperative necessity to understand attachment pushes away motive. I want to understand completely what is the structure and nature and the drive of attachment, and if a motive prevents that understanding I put it away naturally, because my intention, my responsibility, my drive is to understand attachment, and if anything comes in the way of that understanding and action, I naturally put it aside.

Q: Where does the drive come to understand?

K: Do you want me to answer that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, don't you want to understand attachment?

Q: No.

K: Why?

Q: I want to get rid of fear.

K: So your motive is to do away with fear, not the understanding of attachment. So when you have a motive will you understand attachment?

Q: The motive doesn't exist.

K: All right, the motive doesn't exist, so you are concerned with attachment.

Q: Why is it so difficult to be free of attachment?

K: Sir, I am showing it to you, sir. This person asked, why is it so difficult to be free of attachment, and we are trying to find out whether the mind can be free of attachment. And we are saying, if there is a motive in any action, in any investigation, that action and that examination is distorted. Right? If I have a motive to be friendly with you, I am not friendly with you. If I say, "I love you", and I have a motive for that love, I don't love.

So motive, or the examination of a cause are the same. So - please listen - can the mind be free of motive in examination, in investigation into the problem of attachment? Say for instance, I am greatly interested in the ending of sorrow, if it is at all possible. And I have no motive, I just want to understand it, because I see human beings suffer and I want to find out, and therefore I have energy. You understand, sir? A motive initiates energy. The energy that I need to understand, to investigate, is wasted when there is a motive.

Q: But wanting to understand is saying, why.

K: I don't. I have no 'why'. You are holding on to words. We will go into this in a minute, later.

Now we are asking, can the mind be free of attachment? Now to go into that you need energy. Right? All your energy you need, and if you have a motive that is a wasting of energy. I need complete energy to understand attachment, and therefore I mustn't waste that energy in finding out the cause or the motive. Now I have got that energy because I have no motive, nor the analysis of a cause. Right?

Q: There is a motive in finding out what lies beyond attachment.

K: I don't want to find out, I am observing. I don't know what comes beyond, what lies beyond. You follow, sir. I am just observing the map of attachment, as we did yesterday the map of fear. I just observe this map, there is no motive in it. Are you like that, that you have no motive in looking at this map of attachment? Sirs, first see if you understand the meaning of these words verbally, then see it intellectually, then see if you can go beyond

the verbal, intellectual comprehension because the problem is that you are attached - to your wife, to ideals and all the rest of it. Now being attached, what happens? I am attached to my ideals - one is - then what takes place? I am attached to that. Then what takes place?

Q: Without attachment there is no sense of direction.

K: And your attachment gives you a direction, and what is the result of that direction?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, the gentleman asked, attachment gives you direction, if there is no direction there is confusion, therefore you are attached. Attachment gives direction, and without direction there is confusion, so I am attached. I am attached. Does attachment give direction to avoid confusion; or you are confused therefore you are attached? Not the other way round. Please don't accept anything but let's look at it. The gentleman says, "I am attached and that gives a direction to my activity, to my responsibility, to my action, and without that direction I am lost, I am confused". So does direction give you order? Does direction free you from confusion? Let's put it that way.

Q: Confusion exists between two directions.

K: You are making it all so complicated. Be a little bit simple.

Q: Confusion brings division.

K: Obviously, sir. You have a direction and another has a direction, the Arabs have a direction and the Jews have a direction, and so on and so on. What are all these directions bringing about in the world? Confusion. No? So, please, one wants to understand what is the nature and structure and function of attachment? And

we are saying very simply, if you want to examine anything if you have a motive you blind yourself, you don't look clearly. That's simple, isn't it. The intention is to understand attachment, not my motive. May I go on? Sir, don't you want to understand attachment?

Q: I have a motive in being here.

K: Yes, you have a motive, of course. You are all here because you have a motive. That's understood. But what is your motive, why are you all here? All right. Why are you all here? What is the motive for your being here? Look, I come here to understand what the speaker is saying, and the speaker says, don't understand what he is talking about but what he is talking about is yourself, so understand yourself. Understand yourself. And to understand yourself don't have a motive. That's all he is saying all the time, in different ways. In the understanding of yourself you come upon this problem of attachment, and you see what attachment does - pain, suffering, a sense of loss if somebody goes away, and so on. So you are trying to understand attachment in the understanding of yourself. Now why - I am using the 'why' not for cause, I am asking that as a process of investigation - why is the mind attached? Why is your mind attached - attached to an ideal, attached to a nationality, attached to a person, attached to your experience, attached to your gods, to your opinion, and so on - why does the mind cripple itself with all these attachments?

Q: There isn't an answer, I don't know.

K: We are going to find an answer. I can't just, I don't know, and just leave it. I must find an answer.

Q: In words.

K: In reality, not in words, don't go back to all that, because just verbal explanation is nothing. So I want to understand whether the mind can be free from attachment. And I ask then, why is the mind attached, what is behind this attachment?

Q: You need security, therefore you are attached.

K: Yes.

Q: I am attached because I'm lonely.

K: So you are attached because you are lonely, is that it? That is one of the reasons, isn't it? Please, let's go into this. Are you tired this morning?

Q: Psychological conditioning by the society.

K: That is one of the reasons. The society is what we have made of it, what human beings have made of it. And we are part of that mankind that has made the society, we are part of it, therefore that society is me. I am not separate from that society; or the culture, the education, the religion, is me. I have created that. So I see one of the reasons of attachment is this sense of desperate loneliness. Right? Loneliness. Don't just brush it aside. You people are too clever.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We have to use our minds, we have got to use our reason and go beyond reason. We can't just say, reason doesn't count.

Q: Is life worth living if you are not attached to worthwhile things?

K: You see you are really not interested to investigate, or understand and see if the mind can be free from attachment. Look, my son is dead. I have been attached to him. I have put all my energies, my hopes, my intentions, the desire for immortality in

that son, and he is dead, and I go through suffering. I don't talk about reasons, worthwhile this and worthwhile that, I want to find out. And I see where there is attachment there is suffering. Right? - whether to furniture or god, or to worthwhile values. Right? Then I ask myself, is it possible for the mind to be free from suffering and therefore not attached? You understand? May I go on? I can go on but you have got to live it, you have got to see it. My son is dead and I have been terribly attached to him. And when he is gone I feel very lonely, and I escape from that loneliness in order not to suffer - I go off climbing the mountains, reading books, and churches and drugs, and sex, and everything in order to escape from that suffering. And that's what mankind has done - spread a vast net of escapes and in that net we are caught - intellectual, emotional, sentimental, romantic, illusory net.

Now I see that net has no value at all because it hasn't solved the problem that my son is dead and I am suffering. Escape festers that suffering. Right? Right, sir? And also I see in attachment there is fear, in attachment there is jealousy, there is bitterness, there is anger, hatred. Haven't you noticed all this? No? And I also see that mankind has made an opposite, that is, be detached. Now please follow this - is there an opposite at all to attachment? There is an opposite with man and woman, darkness and light, I am not talking of that, for the moment. But is there an opposite to attachment?

Q: There has to be an opposite otherwise it wouldn't exist.

K: He is caught in Aristotle. Aristotle apparently, according to him, has said, opposite must exist, otherwise 'what is' is non-existent. Listen to it carefully, please. The opposite must exist otherwise 'what is' is non-existent. I am attached, and the opposite



is detachment, and if there is no opposite there is no attachment. I am afraid even Aristotle can be mistaken!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going into it. We are examining it, please have some patience. I am asking, is there an opposite to attachment, or has the mind invented the opposite because it does not know what to do with 'what is'? I am attached, I don't know what to do with it, I am caught in it, I am in despair with it, and I say to myself, "I will be detached from this", that is the opposite. Right? And I am questioning, why does the opposite exist at all? Because I have only 'what is', why should I have an opposite? Why should I have a duality in this? It may be because I do not know how to resolve this problem, therefore the opposite, by going for that, struggling to be detached, may help me to be detached from attachment. Therefore I say to myself, I'll forget the detachment, it is not a fact. The fact is I am attached. Right? That is the only fact. The detachment is a verbal non-fact. So I have to deal with 'what is', not with 'what should be'.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. First please, I am saying something very simple, sir. The fact is attachment, that is what is going on. Detachment is a non-fact, it is something I have invented in order to get away from the fact.

Let me put it another way. Man is violent, human beings are violent, and we have non-violence, the opposite. The opposite is not a reality, what is reality is violence. Now if I know how to deal with the actual then I won't go to fiction. I will deal with 'what is'. Because I have an opposite there is conflict between the two. Oh

sirs, come on!

Q: I am not always violent.

K: Sir man is not constantly violent, of course he is not constantly violent. There are occasions when he is quiet.

Q: Why isn't there peace?

K: I never talked about peace, I am talking about attachment. That's the only thing I have to face, attachment. And in that observing attachment, in being aware of attachment, I find that there is sorrow, bitterness, anger, jealousy, annoyance, hatred, violence, all that. That is the only thing I have, not the opposite. That we must be very clear about. If I say there is the opposite of attachment, then that opposite creates a division between attachment and detachment, and therefore there is a conflict where there is division.

I find that my son is dead, and in that there is sorrow, that sorrow is the outcome of my loneliness, my loss, my lack of companionship, and so on. And from that suffering I try to escape, and if there is no escape I become bitter, angry, furious, cynical. Right? That is the problem. Now what is the mind to do? It has no opposites.

Q: It is the action of thought.

K: Don't go after thought, sir. Let's look at it differently. To say to myself that is the action of thought, doesn't help me to overcome my suffering. That's mere rationalization. I suffer. Now just a minute. Can the mind not suffer - not become brutal, I don't mean build a wall round itself so that it doesn't suffer. Attachment, loss, suffering, and that suffering arises when I have felt lonely, and I have filled that loneliness with my son. Right? And when that son

goes I am at a loss, and the sense of loss makes me suffer. Don't give me reasons, I know all the reasons.

Then I say to myself, attachment has brought this about, I know nothing about detachment. You all may do, but I know nothing about detachment, and I say to myself, what am I to do? I won't escape because that's futile. What is the mind to do? Go on sirs.

Q: Adopt another child.

K: Sir, you people are not serious. To adopt another child, who also may die, or get crippled, or become insane, or a crooked politician, or become a guru - the same thing! If you are serious sir, please give some attention to this. So the mind says, what is it to do? No escape, no opposite - you see what has happened. Escape is a wastage of energy. Right? The opposite is a wastage of energy because it creates a conflict. And the mind needs all its energy to understand and go beyond suffering. Right? So no escape. Can the mind remain with that suffering without any movement of escape or duality or trying to find the rational of it? You understand my question? I suffer. My son is dead, I suffer. Can I remain with that suffering without any movement of escape? Because any form of escape - the worship of a god, going to church, reading a novel, trying to say, "Yes, my son will live next life, and I'll meet him next life", or "He will be resurrected and I will be also resurrected and shall meet in the clouds" - all those are escapes and wastage of energy. Right? And what am I to do?

I'll show you, right? I have no escapes. Can the mind, please listen - remain with the fact? Now what is the fact? Please listen carefully. The fact of suffering - is it the word has created the feeling, or is it an actual suffering? You have understood? Is the

mind facing suffering? Or does it face what it calls suffering because of a word called 'suffering'? You understand? The word is not the thing, the description is not the described. And is suffering a word or a reality? So I must find out whether the mind is caught in words. The words may be an escape.

So I have to find out whether the mind is capable of being free from the word and therefore capable of looking at 'what is' without the word. This is not an intellectual game. Because words play an extraordinarily important part in our life - Christian, immediately you have an image; German, communism, a black man - you follow, these are words. We think by using these words we have understood. So can your mind be free of the word? Free of the word 'suffering' as well as violence? Right? That requires attention. You understand sir, it isn't just a plaything.

Then if it is accurate, not the word that is stimulating the feeling, then can the mind remain with that fact of that feeling and not move away from it? When it remains with that feeling you have a tremendous energy, haven't you? - which has been dissipated. And when you have that energy then what is suffering? Is there suffering? You know the word 'suffering' has its root in passion. If you look into a dictionary you will find it comes from the word 'passion', not the passion which Christians have made, but the actual word, the semantic meaning. Now when you remain with suffering, when the mind remains totally, completely without a movement, when the mind remains with the fact and not with the word, with the fact of that feeling of great sorrow without any escapes, out of that comes passion. And without that passion you can't do a thing.

Sirs, let's look at it differently. We have all been hurt - haven't you, hurt, from childhood. Our education is a series of hurts, and can the mind look at those hurts, because one hurt is as many other hurts, therefore there is only one hurt, not the multiplication of hurts, that one hurt is good enough. Can the mind look at that hurt without a single saying. "I want to hit back, I want to build a wall round myself to isolate myself in order to be never hurt" - remain with that fact, not with the word. Then you will see that you have great energy to go beyond it. It doesn't then exist at all. Do do it please.

Q: Is there a passion which is not suffering?

K: Is there a passion which is not the outcome of suffering? There is lust, there is the intensification of pleasure, which you may call passion, but that is not passion. Suppose one takes great pleasure in doing something climbing a mountain, achieving, fulfilling your talent, great pleasure - that's not passion, is it? Because passion goes with compassion - compassion means, passion for all. You understand sirs? Compassion is that. That compassion is different from taking a great intense pleasure in doing something, or fulfilling your particular little talent.

Now is your mind free from attachment? You understand? - attachment to an ideal, to a person, to an experience however great that experience is, attached. Now just a minute. Is attachment in the present, or in the past? I am attached to you, is that an active present, or is it a past anchorage in you, and a remembrance?

Q: Is attachment a link between the past and the present?

K: We will find out. I am asking first a question: you are attached to your ideals, or to an image, or to a symbol, or to

something, is that attachment an active movement in the present, or is it a remembrance of something of the past? Is it a remembrance or active present? You understand my question? Like action is active present, it is in the present, action. And if your action has a motive it is not in the present. If your action has an ideal and you are conforming to that ideal, action doesn't take place, because action is always active present. To act. The verb, to act is the present.

Now I am asking, we are asking: attachment, is it a remembrance, therefore out of the past, or is it a living thing that is going on, alive?

Q: It is obviously in the past.

K: Obviously, the gentleman says, it is in the past. What do you say? If you examine this, please, you will find lots of things. If attachment is a remembrance, that means in the memory, stored up in the brain cells, then that attachment is from the past in the present. Right? Therefore the present is a movement of the past, therefore it is not present. I wonder if you get this.

Look sir, I am attached. I am attached to you, you are nice looking, you give me pleasure, sex or companionship, or whatever it is, and I am greatly attached to you. That attachment is the past, isn't it? Because I have walked with you in the woods, and it has given me great pleasure, a delight, to point out the beauty of the mountains, the shadows, the wide open fields, the birds singing, and I tell this to you and it gives a great pleasure. And I am attached to you through that pleasure, and that attachment is a remembrance because when I walk the next time you are not there, and I say, "Oh, I wish you were here". So attachment is a

remembrance. And I am asking myself, what is the relationship of the past, remembrance of an attachment, to the present? Or is the present a continuation of the past? Is this all becoming too difficult? So if it is a continuation of the past, what is the relationship between the two people? You understand? The brain is living in the past. Of course. Memory is in the past, knowledge is the past, knowledge in the present can be modified, or added to, but still knowledge is always in the past. Right? Oh come on sirs, somebody.

So my life is being lived in the past. Right? I live in the past so I don't know what is the present. I don't know what is the fact because I am living in the past, and facts are always in the present. Right? So I look at the fact always with the past. So I have coloured the facts. That means can the mind live wholly in the present? This is not a speculative silly question, but it requires tremendous understanding of the past. You know the philosophy - 'Forget the past, live for the present' - enjoy yourself for the present. You can't live in the present if you don't know what the past is, and whether the past can end in the present.

Therefore you have to find out in the enquiry of attachment, whether attachment is a strengthening remembrance, or a fading remembrance which is always strengthened by the present, or there is no attachment when there is the living present? You see something? I am just discovering something. That is, when the mind is wholly living in the present there is no attachment. Right? See it? Come on sirs, move! It is only the remembrance of things past - the remembrance of my attachment, the remembrance of my son, and my attachment to him, the remembrance of that

loneliness, the remembrance of being left alone, no companion, somebody to whom I can give all my things, and so on. So the moment when the mind sees that, is there attachment in the living present, in the active verb of that word, living? I have lived in the past, and I will live in the future, but I do not live now because all my mind, my brain is the product of the past. The brain holds memory in the cells and the tissues, and that memory dictates my life, the living. And the living, if it is dictated by the past, is not living. Right? Am I going on by myself, or are you following this?

As we said, this is a dialogue, two serious friends who have known each other for some time, talking about their difficulties, their problems, and trying to go beyond them, not verbally, not intellectually, but actually to transcend, to go beyond this problem of attachment, with all its sorrows, with all its aching, anxious, fearful loneliness. And in the understanding of that the mind sees that it is always living in the past. And tradition is the past and therefore a betrayal of the present. So can the mind live wholly in the present, in which there is no attachment? You understand sir, this is psychologically a very important question because psychologically there is no future. You know when you realize psychologically there is no future, what a shock it gives you. You understand. I know I will meet you tomorrow and I have pleasure of meeting you tomorrow - sexually or otherwise, all the images of sexual pleasures. There is no tomorrow. You follow what takes place? Either you go into a despair that there is no tomorrow psychologically, or you realize something which is immense, which is, every action ends today. There is no, "I will do something tomorrow", or "I must be that tomorrow". I wonder if you



understand this? Just see what is implied. Psychologically there is no future. The saying, "I am today and I will be tomorrow", or "I will become great tomorrow", when the psyche realizes 'the tomorrow' is the movement of the past, through the present, to the future - you understand? The past, through the present modified is the future. If the mind lives in that time period, it lives in the past, however much modified it is, it is always the past. When the mind realizes that, not verbally but deeply, inwardly, with all its fulness, then tomorrow has no meaning. It has the meaning that I have to go tomorrow to London, but we are not talking of that. But the psychological effort to be something tomorrow ends: you are or you are not. And it is a very hard thing to realize. Goodness is not tomorrow, it is now. It is not, "I will be good", then when you say, 'I will be good' you are never good.

So the mind has been educated, conditioned through education, through society, through culture, through religions that there is god in heaven and you will achieve - you follow - and when you realize that tomorrow is what has been yesterday and modified, then you see that your whole existence is in the past. And when you are living in the past there is the conflict with the present. That conflict never ends, but when you see the truth that there is no tomorrow.

Physiologically when you are doing something like learning to ride a bicycle, there is a tomorrow. Right? Of course. If you are doing yoga postures you need tomorrow to make your muscles supple. Learning a language, how to drive a car, learning a function, there is a tomorrow, but psychologically when one lives in tomorrow you are really actually living in the past. And the present is in conflict with the past. Of course. And to end conflict,

really, deeply, at the very roots of your being, to realize that there is no tomorrow, then our whole action changes. Therefore everyday there is an ending of everything that you have done, and begin anew tomorrow. You understand?

## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 2ND AUGUST 1974.**

What shall we talk over together this morning? The utter chaos that exists round us, in the world, sometimes a little less, sometimes more, we human beings have created this society - the misery, the poverty, the extraordinary sense of brutality and wars, and all that, and out of this chaos one hopes that there will be some day some order. And we don't feel, as human beings, responsible at all. We are all concerned with our own little problems, with our own critical, rather asinine attitude towards institutions, towards this and towards that. And what is the place of morality when there is no authority, when the so-called religions are fading away, when you can do almost what you like - steal, murder? And we feel utterly helpless. And for all this - this corruption, this destruction, this great misery and suffering - we are responsible. We don't feel that responsibility. And what can one do to make, or to help you realize the utter inescapable flame of responsibility that you must have?

Now if we could this morning give some thought and dialogue or conversation about this matter I think it would be worthwhile because our problems are the world's problems. That's an absolute fact. Unless our minds radically undergo a change we will maintain this corruption, the brutality, the appalling confusion in the world. So how does one, in what way can one, feel this overwhelming responsibility? Would that be worthwhile to consider, or would you like to discuss, or argue, or offer opinions about if there is god, if there is no god? I hope I haven't put any of you off your

particular question. Perhaps if you put your question, what you want to discuss this morning, we can include all that in this major question.

Q: Can we go into detail, keeping the general perception of the whole?

Q: One comes from a poor country and governments are incapable of dealing with the matter, what is one to do?

Q: How do you propose, or how do you suggest the feeling of responsibility into action?

Q: To understand the feeling of responsibility it seems to need a great deal of energy and I was wondering how that comes about.

Q: Can I do anything to the world before I change myself?

Q: You have said, the world is you and you are the world. I am afraid most people don't understand that statement.

K: Look, sirs, you have put many questions: to observe the whole and yet be concerned with the detail; what is one to do when governments throughout the world are not concerned with poverty, with the solution of hunger, actually - they talk a great deal about it, there have been organizations but people are still starving and so on; and would you also please explain, or go into, the world is you, and you are the world, and so on.

I think, if we could, see the world as it is, and ourselves as we are, and not a division, a demarcation between the world and me and you, because we are all involved in this, we are all in the same boat. And realizing that, not intellectually, not verbally, not theoretically but actually to feel this actual reality that we are the world and the world is you. And I think when one feels that then the responsibility begins to awaken. Now can we discuss that. In

that we will include - how to observe the whole and yet not forget the detail, what can the governments do to abolish poverty - United Nations, I hope there is nobody here from the United Nations! I have a great friend who is at the top of the United Nations, but he is not here. And what can one do, realizing the responsibility, and what is the response of that responsibility in action?

First of all, why have we divided the world there, and the world here - the inner and the outer? You know this has been a great problem. The yogi, the sannyasi, the monk, says, "I am not the world, the world is an illusion, the world is a temptation, the world is destructive, and I withdraw from it in order to find reality". This has existed from time immemorial - the division between the outer and the inner. And there are still people who say, "I don't want to identify myself with the world, the world has nothing to give me". And there has been a great deal of controversy among the communists - the commissar and the yogi - the division. And having divided, the outer and the inner, we are trying to bring it together, integrate these two divisions. See what the mind has done - divide first and then integrate, bring them together. That is part of yoga - the meaning of that word, means to join, the outer and the inner. And having divided the outer and the inner then we proceed to join them. I don't know if you follow this. Now why has the mind done this? Let's think about it. Don't say, "Yes, I have an answer". I don't know, we are investigating. Why has the mind, your mind, and the mind of civilized human beings, the culture that minds throughout the ages has created, why is there this division? When you say, "I must meditate", you are discarding the outer and running away into some inner nature. I don't know if you follow all

this.

So I think it would be worthwhile if you would give your attention to find out for yourself why this division has existed for ages? What is your answer?

Q: Was there a time when this did not exist?

K: I don't know. But it exists now, unfortunately. And I want to find out why, why the mind has divided this thing.

Q: The identification of the 'me'.

K: You understand the question, sir, the full implication of this question. It requires a little investigation, if you don't mind. The world we see, we touch, the world of senses, the world as it actually is - the technological world, the scientific world, the business world, the artistic world, the world of education, entertainment - all that, our there.

Q: That is the identification of the 'me' and the development of the 'me' is the cause of this division.

K: Is the 'me' different from the world?

Q: Is one necessarily an individual?

K: Now is there individuality? Individual means indivisible, a human being who is not fragmented, who is whole. That is the actual meaning of individuality, indivisible. In that there is neither the outer, nor the inner. We are not that kind of human beings, we are not individuals. Individual also means unique. We are not unique. There may be a unique genius, a gifted or talented person that's a freak. But as human beings we are not individuals at all in the real meaning of that word. So I am asking myself, I am asking you, why does this division take place? Why am I not satisfied with the outer completely? You understand? Just listen. I am one of

the questioners, sir, so please give your attention to the questioner. If we are completely and utterly satisfied with the outer - cars, the amusement, everything that is going on, say, "It's marvellous, I love that", and many millions say that, then there would no inner, would there? Come on sirs. I am not laying down the law, I am just asking. If I identify totally with my country and endow that country with all the virtues, with all the beauty, with all the loveliness of everything, I'm finished. But I don't do that. I want something much more. The more intelligent, the more sensitive, the more alive you are, you say, "That's very superficial, I want something much more". I think there begins the real worm of division. Don't you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the moment we say that that toy is mine, there is the division. You follow? I wonder if you understand.

Q: If I have a wound I feel it in my body, which is me. I am not concerned with others.

K: Of course, madam, that is quite true. Yes, I won't feel the intensity of that pain as I do myself with regard to others. You see we are all offering opinions. We are not saying, "Look, let me find out - apart from Aristotle, apart from philosophers, apart from freaks, apart from everything that has been said". I don't know, I haven't read those things therefore I can come to it fresh myself, but you can't because you are full of opinions, full of other people's ideas. So if you could put that aside for the time being and say, look, why do I always think in these terms of the outer and the inner?

Q: Is there always evolution?

K: You see - what do you mean by evolution? To evolve, to go forward in evolution. Are we? No, please, don't make statements, don't assert anything. We are trying to find out, if you will kindly pay attention, not to your answers but find out for yourself why the mind has divided the world out there and the world of 'me' as something separate.

Q: We understand so little about ourselves, we are ignorant.

K: Is it this ignorance that has separated me from the rest, from the world?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Why does this division exist? Please stick to that one thing for the time being. We will come upon all the other questions - suffering, my personal suffering and the suffering in the world, and is there a suffering which is not personal at all? We will come upon all these questions if we can find out the first question we are asking. Probably you have not thought about this at all.

Personally I never thought, I never feel that the world is out there and the world is me separate. And everybody around one approaches the problem from the outer to the inner, and the inner to the outer, it is this endless ebb and flow. Not one constant stream - you follow? Not flowing back and flowing out. Now this is what we have done, the division has taken place. I am asking myself, who has created this division - god, the priest, the philosopher, the clever verbalizer, the erudite - have they created this and created the structure as the outer and the inner, and we are educated in that and are caught in it? Somebody must have started this game.

Q: Is it not the nature of cells themselves to separate?



K: I know all that, sir. The cells separate. They have been saying, the atom is the whole, it is not broken, now they know it can be broken, the cells are broken, and all that. And you are saying it is the very nature of life to divide.

Q: And to build.

K: Build, destroy, corrupt. Don't just say, build, and leave it at that. It destroys. So you are saying, it is the very nature of existence that creates this division, the very nature of life. The very nature of our daily life creates this.

Q: The 'me' and its activity creates this division.

K: Now let's take that. What is this 'me'?

Q: What is the action of memory that sustains and maintains the 'me'?

Q: Why don't we see the action that is generating the 'me'?

K: Because you are probably blind. We are not aware. Look, sir, I think it begins - I am just exploring, don't jump on it - I think it begins in the act of observation. When you observe there is always the observer. I am not laying down the law, just listen to it and tear it to pieces, but first listen. When I see a mountain, or observe the mountain, the word 'mountain' springs into my mind. The word. The word has its associations, and those associations are stored up in the brain. So when I see that range, that line of snow on the peaks and the beauty of it, I say, "It's a mountain". Go slowly. And the word has already divided the fact from the observer. You understand? You follow? Am I right in this? You understand what I am saying? The word, or the screen of words have separated the observer and the observed. Obviously. The words with their associations bring about a certain feeling, sensation. You follow?

My wife - there are certain associations with that word, and the word and the memory have separated the woman and the man - my wife. Right? We are investigating, we are moving.

So there is this problem of verbalization. And I know the word is not the thing, and yet all the time words are coming into action. Right? So words, phrases, all that plays an immense importance. He is an Italian - immediately there is a division. Now can the mind be free of the word, of the mountain, and look at it? Then is there a division - division being space, distance, time? You follow this? Slowly, slowly, patience.

So I see the image I have is projected in front, which says, "That's a mountain". The image which I have about a tree divides, the image is my memory - memory, knowledge, experience. And when I say, "It's my wife", the word is a symbol, an image put together by various incidents, pleasures and so on and so on, which are all in the memory as words. So I am questioning, I am asking, the division may come into being with the word. After all there is the Christian, which is a word, with all the symbols, with all the tradition, with all the ideas. And there are the Jews, Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims - they are all words. And the mind, and the brain, is the instrument of words. The word creates the thought, without the word is there a thought? I hope somebody will follow this, contradict it, or say, 'No, you are talking nonsense'.

Q: The thinker invents the word. The word is the consequence of the thinker.

K: I am saying the opposite. You may be right, sir. But let's look at it. I said - we are investigating - the speaker said, the word divides, the word is employed in order to recognize and so on - the

word. And I said the word may be the division. And the word, our friend says, is the expression of thought. Right? Now is there a thought without the word, without the symbol, without the image? You understand? We said, there is the thinker first and then words flow from that thinker; and therefore those words divide people - words being labels, etiquette, images. Now that is the generally accepted tradition all over the world: the thinker is the employer of words; the thinker is the maker of words; the thinker uses the word to convey his thought; the thinker is, in essence, non-verbal. Is that so? I do not know if you have ever tried to find out if you don't use a word - words - is there a thought? When you look at that mountain there is perception, sensation, and the actual contact, physical contact with the mountain, the stone, the river, the tree. So seeing, contact, sensation and from that this whole question of desire arises. Now can the mind observe - please listen to this - can the mind observe that mountain without the word, without the sensation, without the contact, just look non-verbally?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look sir, put it much more simply. I use the word 'communist', or the German, or the Russian, or the American, and I have immediately put him into a category and I think I have understood him. You follow? So my mind is incapable of looking without categorizing.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, of course. Sir, we are trying to find out, sir, why is it we have the world outside, the world inside. Why is it there is a German, a Russian, a Jew, Arab, Hindu, why this division - the Catholic, non-Catholic and all the rest of it? Obviously, it is so

simple. It is so simple you won't see it. The form, the form of your face, your body, then the name - look at what takes place - the name, with the name the associations, so immediately you have a name, a word, different from me. So you are the word, the form, the shape, and I the form, the shape and so on. So immediately there is a division. So I am saying to myself, does this division take place with words? The word being Muslim, the Christian, remove the word, remove the label, remove all that, you are me, because you have your problems of suffering, pain, anxiety, despair, hope, criticism, all the rest of it.

Q: Does a child have this?

K: Don't take a child, yourself is good enough. Look at yourself. Forget the child, look at yourself as you are, don't look at the child.

And when we give a label, which is the word, I think I have understood the whole thing. When I say, "He is a Hindu", I have finished. Remove the label it is much more difficult.

So that may be the reason why the division exists. The word being memory, the word being the remembrance, knowledge, experience, all that is stored in the brain which reacts in action according to the image it has. Right sir, that is fairly simple. I have an image about myself, if I have, I have an image about myself - noble, ignoble, despair, I am not worthy, I am not capable, I am worthy, I am a great master of everything. I have a great many images. And you have an image about yourself. The image is the memory, the experience, the accumulated knowledge stored up in the brain cells as memory. Obviously. So when I look at you I look at the image which I have, through that image I look at you.

Q: It is a protection.

K: Wait sir, Of course it is a protection of oneself. Protection of an image which I think I am. Sir, look at that first, before you ask questions see if you have an image about yourself and what kind of image you have about yourself, how it is put together - education, suffering, the whole civilization, the whole culture says, you are important. And the other culture says, you are not important but the State is important. Which is again just words.

So can I - please go the next step - can I, can the mind observe that mountain without the word? The word, the experience, the word, the thought, memory, experience, knowledge is the observer. You have got it? The word with all its associations, sensations, the word, the memory, memory is experience, memory is knowledge stored in the cells. Now when I look at that mountain all that comes into being. Right? Therefore I am looking at that thing with an image which I have. Now can I look at that thing without the image? You understand? This is really important. Go into it and you will see.

Then see what happens. It is so exciting. Now when one looks at the mountain there is space, distance, and to cover that distance time is necessary - physical distance, physical space, physical time. That will always be there. Now when there is no word with its association, sensation, contact, memory, all that coming into being, what takes place when the observer is not but is merely observing? You have understood my question? Now what takes place?

Q: There is nothing.

K: Oh no, you haven't done it, don't say, there is nothing.

Q: There is no psychological 'me'.

K: Sir, look, the observer divides - right? The observer is the

past, which is memory, experience, knowledge. When you are actually experiencing there is no 'me'. The 'me' comes into being only after saying, "Yes, that was a marvellous experience, and I must have more of it."

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I am showing you something. There is no experience when the observer is not. Experience implies a recognition. Right? Recognition means that it has already been experienced, stored up in the memory as an experience and remembered, which is the observer. Now when the observer is not what takes place?

Q: It is like listening to music or looking at an abstract form.

K: Yes. When you are listening to music, or looking at an abstract form - leave the abstract form for the minute - listening to music what takes place? When you are actually listening to a piece of music what happens? You listen, you go to concerts and listen to music, pop or otherwise, what takes place?

Q: It becomes part of you.

K: Look, sir, you are listening - Mozart, Beethoven, or the modern pop, if you like that kind of stuff - and you listen, what takes place? Do you listen without remembrances, without emotions, without romanticism, without saying, "By Jove, that was a marvellous thing which I heard the other day, and it woke up so many memories, so many feelings, and I would like that capture that same feeling when I listen today". Don't you go through all this? So you are not listening, are you?

Q: You immediately try to capture it.

K: That's what we are saying. Can you listen, observe, without the observer? Sir, do it, don't always say, "I can't", "I don't know",

and remaining there always. You see you are not pioneers, you are traditionalists, you don't say, "Let's find out".

Q: How do we find out?

K: I'll show you, sir, it's very simple. When you look at that mountain, can you look at it not only without saying the word 'mountain', but actually not having the image of it?

Q: How am I to see myself while looking at the mountain?

K: Yes, I understand that, but go beyond that. Don't try, just look. Find out if you can look without a single image. That's fairly easy, you understand, to look at a mountain. But can you look at your friend, wife, husband, without that? It is much more demanding, much more - you follow? You need to have an astonishing energy and attention to look.

So the division, apparently takes place when there is an image which has been put in the mind through so-called culture - the culture of the Catholic world, the culture of a Hindu, and so on and so on. That's one part. The other part is, you give a child a toy and it is immediately his, and you take it away from him and he cries, you know, all the rest of it. The immediate pleasure, the immediate identification with that toy, is me, the creation of the 'me' - it's my toy - the toy, the house, the car, the various possessions and so on and so on. The moment there is an identification with the toy, the whole process of the 'me' begins. Right, sir? So that's another problem, and that divides as mine and yours.

Then there is another division which is the ideological division - you are a communist, Marxist, Maoist, and I am not, I am some other 'Maoist' and there we are. And there is another division - division as my god and your god, my guru and your guru, and my

guru is better than your guru, obviously! And there is the division of nationalities and so on. There it is. All depending - please listen to this, we are going to discuss something - all depending on my conditioning by the culture, the culture which I was conditioned in, and according to that conditioning, my temperament, my idiosyncrasies, are reactions to that conditioning. You understand? And I say, "Yes, I am devotee", and "I am an intellectual" - you follow? The division. The response according to my conditioning is the temperament, is the character, is the tendency. I have built myself into a perfect cage, a cage around myself, that is me. And that 'me' separates you from the 'you' who are different. My goodness, see what we have done! And then we say we are brothers. And we try to find, holding on to my division and you holding on to your division, a common ground to meet, which is called tolerance. I am not being cynical. This is the game you are playing. And I say to myself, is it possible not to have this division, not to be conditioned, not to have this everlasting 'me' operating, operating, operating?

Q: When division ceases there is unity.

K: Not unity. When the reason for division ceases I don't talk about unity, brotherhood or any of that. And when there is no division then the question of poverty, all that, will be answered.

Q: The image shapes our behaviour.

K: Of course, of course. The image I have about you as a great man, and the image I have about you as the cook are different, and my behaviour is different, obviously. No? You are the great man and my behaviour to you, because I have an image of what is great, and according to that image I behave.



Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, sir. Therefore I am saying, sir, can you look at your image? You understand? Whether hidden or open, can you look at that image and see how it is created, how it is put together? And from that image all action, all behaviour, all morality, everything takes place.

So morality in this chaotic world has no place. But morality has a place when there is no image at all. I don't know if you are following this. It is very interesting. Do you want to go into it? So the stronger the image the greater the division, obviously. And I see you as a rich man, everything you have, and I am a poor man, and I want to be - I have to work, work, work all day and every day for a pittance. You follow? Where is morality in that? I will steal. And I say, "Why shouldn't I steal, you have stolen otherwise you wouldn't be rich." So there is no morality there, is there? I wonder if you are meeting all this? And if I have no image and you have no image, what takes place? Sir, look, you can't answer this question honestly if you have an image. You can speculate about it, you can theorize about it. But if you have literally no image of yourself at all, and I say that is utterly possible, and then there is no motive to be moral. You are moral. I don't know if you understand this.

So we are asking, we have come back to the question: you are the world and the world is you. The world is out there and the world of you is here. The division takes place through the image, label, identification with a race, with a group, with an ideology, which are all the images which you have built in yourself, or society has put it upon you through education, that society past generations have created so it is you. Now when you see the effect

of division, see it, actually observe it - the rich and the poor, the Catholic and the Protestant, the communist and the capitalist, the Hindu, the Jew, the Arab, the world which is so divided - it is our world to live on, to be happy - when you see that and you realize that division exists because of your various subtle and obvious images that you have, then your responsibility is to get rid, free yourself of those images absolutely. And when you feel the responsibility then the flame of that will burn every image. The flame is energy.

Q: Am I then aware of the details?

K: No, wait a minute. You have used the right word. Am I aware of this whole thing, not only the details as that gentleman asked, the details we have looked at a little bit, but are we aware of the whole thing with the details? Or we are just looking at the map as though from outside? You understand the difference? Am I aware of this whole process taking place in me - you understand, my brain, in my whole structure; or is it a verbal communication which you have accepted? You see the difference? If you are accepting a verbal description then you will go home with your image; but if you actually are aware of this whole phenomenon which we have described this morning, somewhat in detail and also expansively, then you are aware without the word, without any choice, there it is. Are you aware like that? If you are not, why aren't you? Don't say, "I am lazy", "I am afraid", "I don't know what will happen". You have got to, this is your responsibility - your responsibility as a human being living in this world, having created this appalling misery for everybody, and you say, "Well, I am sorry I can't do anything about it. Good morning", and walk

out.

Q: Our innocency from childhood has been destroyed, and therefore we are afraid from childhood, and that cannot be got rid of.

K: That's a traditional acceptance. My mind refuses to accept that it cannot be free of anything. So if you are saying that is the basic fault then is fear, can the mind be free of fear?

Q: It is a childhood fear.

K: Again the word - you follow sir? See how we play with words. Is that childhood fear so strong, so highly developed by the parent, by the society, by the food, by college, everything that we call culture, is it a word or a reality? Please listen to this. Is it a remembrance or an actuality?

Q: It is not an actuality.

K: Not an actuality, therefore it is a remembrance in the past. Right? If it is in the past, why does the past play such tremendous importance? So you are living in the past and you are trying to answer the problems of the present, so division takes place. So can the mind see, actually see, not verbally see, actually come to grips with it that your fear is always a remembrance? Watch it in yourself, sir, for god's sake. It is always a remembrance which is in the past, so your brain is in the past, the brain cells are the past.

Q: Brains are influenced by the past.

K: Wait. Just a minute. I am going to go into that. Just a minute. So there is a division through remembrance. The remembrance is not the actual. The actual is in the active present, which is action. Now can there be action without the infantile, grown-up memories? You understand, sir? This requires a great deal of

perception, and the feeling for words, and the feeling of the reality of remembrance, the feeling that we are all living in the past, in tradition, and betraying the present all the time. Live it, sir, put your mind and your heart, look at it.

So fear is a remembrance, the thing that is over. It is over but the brain retains it and recognizes a feeling which it calls fear, because it recognizes it verbally, and absorbs it into the past. I don't know if you follow this. You understand, sir?

There are the remembrances of fear, which is the past, stored up in the brain. Next minute, or sometime a little later, or today, somebody brings, says some things to me and there is that feeling, that reaction, the brain responds immediately and calls it fear. Follow this. Immediately responds and calls it fear, recognizes it as fear, and strengthens the present fear with the past remembrance. You have got it? Have you got it, sir? Have you got it? Look: I see a snake, and from childhood I have been told snakes are dangerous. That's a memory, a remembrance, stored up there. And when I look at it the whole response is from the past, and says, "Be afraid". Now can I look at that snake without the remembrance? I have personally done this thing because it is greatly amusing to watch oneself in operation. I have met lots of snakes.

So can there be an observation without any movement of the past, and therefore no fear at all, just observation? It doesn't mean I observe the bus rushing towards me, I step out of it.

So sir, we have come to this point, which is, what is responsibility with regard to morality, with regard to action in a world where there is no morality, where action is a continuation of the past as tradition, and therefore incapable of meeting the

present, what is a man who sees all this and feels utterly responsible, not verbally but actually...

Q: I want to say something.

K: Just a minute, sir. I haven't finished sir. Sorry.

Q: I say something and you jump at me.

K: For the simple reason sir, I have not finished my sentence.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I won't even discuss this point.

Where was I? What is responsibility in relationship to action in a world that is utterly confused, what is my responsibility? When I see the whole of this thing - the division, how the divisions have arisen, how we sustain those divisions, what the divisions have brought about in the world - I see not only the whole of it but also all the details of it - the economic, social, religious, private action, public action, private belief, public belief, deception, all the rest of it, the whole of it, what is my responsibility? What is your responsibility? And if you say, "I have no responsibility, I didn't create the world", you have created the world, you are the result of the past generation, you can't say, "I am not responsible" - that's a very convenient way out of it. But if you feel totally responsible for the whole thing, not romantically, not sentimentally, not emotionally, but actually - you understand? There is a house burning and you have got to do something, you don't sit round and discuss and say, "Who set the house on fire" - whether it was a black man, white man, pink man, or what kind of beard he had. Why don't you feel the responsibility of this? I am afraid you feel responsible when it touches you drastically. Right? When you are hurt, when things are taken away from you. That is, to affect you

personally, then you feel responsible, but you are the world.

Now, sir, what was your question?

Q: I have forgotten it.

K: I am sorry.

So in this world when authority has been rejected, when religions have no more meaning, when religions have become a circus, a meaningless repetition of something dead, when governments are corrupt - all governments are corrupt, some more, some less - when everything is so dishonest, hypocritical, how will you, feeling responsible, act? Retire into your private shell? We used to know a friend, an Indian, belonging to the same group as we did, highly educated, and he said, "This is too much for me. The world is too awful, I can't do anything about it." And he withdrew totally. I haven't met him for many years. And when I saw him some time ago, he was withdrawn into a world of his own, into a meditative world, and he said, "Yes, you are perfectly right, through my meditation I have hypnotized myself into an isolated state". You understand? "I have no relation anymore. I am dead." And probably that is what most of you will say. But as you are alive, active, respond to your pleasures and demands, you are responsible for your pleasures, you want to fulfil them - don't you? Your sexual pleasures, your vanity pleasures - right? There you feel utterly, totally responsible. So you have the energy. Only that energy you don't apply totally to this, to respond.

Look, when you respond totally that is creative action - you understand? There, there is no imitation, conformity, authority. You respond because you see the whole and the detail, and because you see it you are free to act.

Q: We cannot do this in a consumer society.

K: And how will you change the consumer society? If you feel responsible for the consumer society, for all the wars, for everything that is going on...

Q: One can't be part of it.

K: Then you won't buy a pair of shoes, is that it? Then you won't buy a pair of trousers, or skirt, or whatever you call it, because by buying, supporting, the consumer society is sustained, therefore you won't buy, will you? Then what happens, you gradually isolate yourself and go away. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, look, when you write a letter, put a stamp on it, you are sustaining, you are maintaining war - right? You are paying tax.

Q: I don't pay taxes.

K: I don't pay taxes either because I have no money. But those who pay taxes by saying, "I won't pay tax", or "I won't buy this, I won't do that", what happens? You are going to stop war? Or war is much more complex than that? Begin with the whole and not with some petty little thing. When you see the whole there is intelligence.

Q: I can't understand this.

K: Sir, I have spent an hour and half this morning, you mean to say you don't see this.

Q: I see it but others don't.

K: It's up to them. I can't force them, I can't bribe them, I can't push them. I have no motive to do that, I don't want to do that.

Q: You can be an example.

K: I don't want to have an example.

Q: You are one.

K: I don't want an example because if you are the example then I want to imitate the example. I refuse to conform to the image that I have built about you. So that is what I am saying - please listen, sir - when you see no authority, no example, no acceptance of following somebody else, the right, and so on, I see the whole of this.

Q: You are therefore teaching us.

K: I don't want to teach you. That is our old repetitive conditioning that says, "Somebody has to teach me". Wisdom cannot be taught. Wisdom comes when you understand sorrow.



## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD AUGUST 1974.

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: There is a feeling that the speaker is being isolated from other people of human existence, and therefore his listeners with him.

K: Why is it that though the speaker talks so passionately about responsibility and so on, why is it that most of us haven't got that flame? Is it because he is missing, or doesn't take into account other areas of human existence.

Q: Can we go into the question of being hurt from infancy until we die and whether those hurts can ever be wiped away from the mind?

Q: Can we talk about physical tension?

Q: Could we go into communication and attention?

K: All right, sir, let's talk about communication and attention.  
Any other thing?

Q: Is it possible to bring up a child without conditioning him?

Q: How can I have a balance between psychological quiet and the activity of the mind in my work?

K: How can I have a balance, a harmony between the noise of my activity in the functioning and also inwardly at the same time keep peace and quiet and so on?

Q: Suffering, energy and action.

Q: What do you mean by the heart?

Q: The nature of healing.

K: Look! The nature of healing; how can I keep the noise and

the activity outwardly and inwardly be quiet and bring about a balance; can we bring up a child without conditioning him; and so on? Now amongst all these questions which is the central question, which in discussing it we will perhaps include all the others?

Q: Attention.

K: I thought so too but I wanted you to say it. Attention. I wonder why we are inattentive. What is the relationship between attention and the lack of attention? Is attention the opposite of no attention? And what do we mean by attention, and can that attention be sustained right through; or there is always a gap between two attentions which we call inattention? What is attention? And what is it to be inattentive? There is somebody knitting in here. Can that lady, or man, pay attention to what is being said? Can we divide attention in knitting, talking, looking, listening? Let me put it round the other way, it is simpler. In attention, being attentive is there in it any kind of division?

What is the difference between attention and concentration? First of all there is awareness, to be aware, then there is concentration and attention. Is awareness different from concentration? What do we mean by the word 'to be aware'? I am aware that you are all sitting there, there is a tent over us, and it is very hot. I am aware of all the colours and the shape of the heads and so on and on. Is the mind aware, cognizant, know, conscious of what is going on within the sphere of the mind? Are you aware of your thoughts, of your feelings? Are you aware that you are fidgeting, scratching, yawning, pushing your hair back? Are you aware of all that - as you are doing it, not after? So what does awareness mean? I am aware of conflict and violence. I am aware

of beauty, the loveliness of a tree, the flowing waters. I am also aware of my responses to the river, to the mountain, to the lovely tree. Are we aware of all this? Go on, sirs. This is not a speech by the speaker, we are examining, investigating together. Therefore when we are investigating together there is communication, not only verbally but also intellectually and much deeper. A non-verbal as well as verbal communication.

Now I am just asking you, are we aware of the movement of thought? Are we aware of the starvation, the hunger of millions of people - not what we read in the paper, or magazine, or an article, or somebody telling you that millions are starving, but the awareness of a mind that is perceptive?

Q: I don't understand.

K: Is awareness a continuous movement? Voluntary, or is it involuntary? When are we conscious of anything? That is, when are we aware of anything? Is it that we are aware, conscious when there is pain, or when there is great pleasure, or are we aware non-descriptively, non-verbally of the areas of human existence which the mind has not touched at all?

First of all to be aware one has to be sensitive, hasn't one? No? Both physically and psychologically. How can you be physically sensitive when you have overeaten? Right? When you are sexually indulgent, when you are concerned with the physical sensational satisfactions? Come on sirs, discuss it.

Q: If you are a vegetarian and don't get enough vitamin C and all the rest of it then the vitality of a vegetarian goes down.

K: The speaker has never eaten meat in his life.

Q: I don't eat meat either.

K: Good! So physically most of us are not sensitive, alive physically. Psychologically, inwardly, we are hardly sensitive to what is going on inwardly - aware of our hurts, aware of our ambitions, violence, hatreds, personal antagonisms and so on and so on. And mentally, intellectually we are secondhand people. So mentally, intellectually, psychologically, physically there is not total sensitivity. And shouldn't there be that quality of sensitivity, not to your particular desires, to your particular wants, but being sensitive. And that is the beginning of awareness. Right?

The next question is: psychologically, inwardly, are we aware of our responses? Are we aware when we are not telling the truth, when we are indulging in double talk, when we are saying one thing and doing something else, when we are quoting others? You follow, this whole phenomenon of being secondhand, which is to be traditional, which is to conform - conform to an example. That gentleman yesterday said, "There is a perfect example". And why do we need an example? Is that not conformity, in that is there not imitation, fear, and authority and following? All that is traditional. We have had thousands of examples - right? And we want to be that. And in that there is the acceptance, non-verbally, essentially, of authority. Tradition implies authority, conformity, imitation, following. No? Oh, come on sirs.

Now all that is tradition - following, accepting, being secondhand. In that is implied comparison - you are better than I am, therefore I must be like you. All that is implied in that word 'tradition', to hand over. Now a mind, the psyche, psychologically that follows, how can such a psyche be sensitive? Go on, sirs, please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I haven't quite understood the question. The gentleman is saying, life is a form of tradition, is a form of continuity. Is that what you are saying, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, we are discussing, we are trying to find out what tradition is. There is the physical structure, the genes, and all the rest of it, the physical structure. We are not talking about the physical structure. We said, psychologically, inwardly, how can there be sensitivity if that inward structure is essentially based on tradition? That is all we are saying.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you traditional? Move from the physical and are you traditional? - traditional being accepting authority, accepting an example, following, imitating, conforming, and educated to be deeply secondhand human beings. Of course we are. Tradition being the past. And psychologically we live in the past.

I hope you are following all this. Am I talking to myself, or it is too hot? And can a mind that lives in the past, at whatever area - religiously, psychologically, intellectually, even in science, the real scientists cannot possibly accept this idea - you follow, all that. Now can the mind become aware of all that area? Please give your attention to this, it is rather interesting if you go into it.

You see there are these things: we are educated to follow; we are educated to accept; we are educated to conform. Let's keep to those, there are a few other things. Now are you aware of it? And if you do become aware of it then you have the problem of choice. Don't you? That is, how can I live without the indications of what

is right and wrong established by the past? Are you following? So you have choice - whether you should do this or that. Right? That is, being aware - just look at the map of tradition - being aware of this map of tradition - authority, conformity, acceptance, obedience, taking a vow, resisting, dividing, conflict, sorrow, all that is within the area of tradition - when you become aware of all that you say, "Which is the right thing to do amongst all this?" Right? Now I am questioning whether awareness has any choice at all.

Q: No.

Q: No.

K: The gentleman says, no, and the lady says, no.

Q: If there is confusion there must be choice.

K: Sir, I am sure you are not theorizing therefore you are saying, as a fact, where there is confusion there is choice. Right? That's a great thing to admit. You understand. It is not an intellectual admission, or agreeing with something because you think it, but if you are aware of it, if you realize the significance of it, that the mind when confused chooses - politically, chooses between this guru and that guru, between this religion and that religion, between this symbol and that symbol - you follow? When you are confused this is the inevitable action. So I am asking, has awareness any choice at all? Or you are aware, in which there is no choice? I am aware of aeroplanes. I am aware of all the colours here, the variety, the extraordinary colours and I am just aware. Why should I choose? I choose only some material which pleases me - right? Either pink, or red, or white, or something or other. But when I observe, when I am aware there is no choice.

So can the mind be aware of this whole map or area of tradition? You, not me. Can you be aware of your secondhand thoughts - all thoughts are secondhand anyhow? Can you be aware how you conform? And what does conformity mean? Where do you draw the line of conform and not conform? You follow? Where do you say, obviously it is necessary to adjust oneself to a particular culture, putting on trousers, or whatever you do, and another culture says, it is so hot, don't put on trousers, put on something else. You are following all this? Now where do you draw the line between conformity and non conformity? Please listen. When you are aware is there a demarcation between the two?

Q: No.

K: Don't agree, please do look at it. Because for most of us conformity is almost instantaneous - in the world of fashion, in the world of crazy things, in the world of ideas and so on and on. With great ease we adjust ourselves, we conform. And I am asking, when you are aware of this conformity, intellectually, psychologically and perhaps physically too, because somebody says you must do yoga and you trot out and do yoga, and you must be a vegetarian and you are a vegetarian, and all the rest of it, conform. Where is there freedom from conformity? You understand? Do enquire with me please. It is very interesting. Not verbally but actually find out if you can be free, if there is such a thing as freedom and what place has conformity in freedom? You understand what I am saying?

Q: It is only the man in prison that knows there is freedom and wants to be free. When you are free you are not conscious of it.

K: Madam, look, do you know what conformity is? And the mind is asking, when you become aware of it what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam. If I am aware that I am conforming there is the whole problem of why does the mind conform? Why does the mind conform? Fear? No, don't shrug your shoulders.

Q: We have been brought up like that.

K: That is tradition. You have been brought up like that, and if you don't conform there is fear, there is the sense of lack of security, physically, you might lose your job.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So where is there nonconformity? If our mind is merely conforming all the time, one is living in prison. And being in prison it is no good saying, there is freedom. It is only when we leave the prison there is freedom. So one has to find out where is the end of conformity.

Q: In the awareness of the prison.

K: That's a theory. So are we aware that we are conforming? I wish you would discuss this.

Q: Is it like playing a role in a theatre?

K: Who is playing the role, playing what role?

Q: My role.

K: Your role. Is your role different from somebody else's role? Sir, this not a role. We are asking, if you don't mind, when one becomes aware - we are talking about awareness, nothing else - when one becomes psychologically aware of what is going on inwardly, then you inevitably come upon this question of tradition - tradition being the acceptance of authority and so on and so on.



And as you become aware of it and look at it, what is your reaction?

Q: To be free of it.

K: Now, the reaction is to free yourself from conformity, imitation. Do you?

Q: Tradition and conformity are necessary as a background for creativity.

K: Don't agree or disagree. So we have to look at what we mean by creativity. How can a secondhand mind be creative? How can a traditional mind be creative?

Q: What is creativity?

Q: To do something new out of nothing.

K: You see now we are indulging in descriptions, in opinions. Right? A writer who lives a shoddy little life and writes marvellous poetry, is he creative? For god's sake think it out. A man who is in conflict with himself, with the world, he may produce a novel of that conflict, describing all the details, the tortures, and psychological tantrums and all the rest of it, is he creative?

Q: Yes.

K: So we have to find out what it means to be creative? You are merely observing somebody else and judging whether he is creative or not. Right? You have never found out for yourself what it means.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, don't theorize, sir. You see that is why unless you go into this very, very deeply in yourself you will never find out, you are just theorizing. So come back. We will come to what is creativity. That is, when one becomes aware of a traditional life,

the traditional life of so-called writers, creators, is conformity because they are conforming to a pattern. And they may have a talent and you call them creative. That's not creativity - no, I won't go into all that.

So when one becomes aware - I hope you are being aware - of your conformity, what is your reaction to that conformity? You conform when you put on trousers and all the rest of it, when you have long hair, short hair, you conform to a fashion, you conform to a particular craze, you conform when you accept the authority of a guru when you have rejected that authority of the priest in your own country. Right? You are following all this? And the mind wants to conform, why? What is the movement of conformity and from where does it spring? Come on sirs.

Q: Krishnaji, when I was a child if I didn't conform I was punished. At school if I didn't conform I was laughed at.

K: I agree, sir.

Q: Now if I don't conform everybody will...

K: So why does the mind want to conform? I know when I am child they tell me and all the rest of it, we all know that. But I am asking why does the mind, the psyche, want to conform? And where is it that the mind says, "It is absurd to conform"?

Q: Because I want to belong.

K: Yes, sir. I want to belong to the Mao group, I want to belong to the communist group. I have got tribalism in my blood. Just see it sir. How hopeless it is.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going to find out sir. Are you aware that you are conforming? And when you are aware that you are conforming

what is your reaction? And are you aware of that reaction? And if you are aware of that reaction and go beyond that reaction you will never find out what it means to be intelligent so that there is conformity and total nonconformity. Have I conveyed something? Sir we can't reject all conformity, can we?

Q: No.

K: Don't please say, no. Think it out.

Q: It is necessary to conform sometimes, it depends on the level.

K: Madam, that is what we are saying. Let's put it round the other way: is intelligence the outcome of conformity?

Q: When you recognize the conformity, then nonconformity or conformity doesn't matter, you are just aware of it.

K: So is awareness - please listen, sir - with regard to conformity, does it awaken intelligence?

Q: Conformity is...

K: No, no. I am aware, I become aware of conformity. And I am aware of the reaction to that conformity. There is an awareness of either rejection or acceptance of that reaction. When I reject, is it a rejection which is a reaction, or is it a rejection of intelligence? Wait. Therefore awareness is an act of intelligence. When I am confronted with a fact how can I, without reaction, face that fact, without choosing? When I am confronted with a fact and action is necessary, I have to choose.

Q: It is not, 'how can I' but...

K: I understand, sir. I understand. Look, sir. I am confronted with a fact and can I be aware of that fact, without choice, and from that choiceless awareness act with regard to the fact? Are we

playing tricks with each other? I am confronted with a fact. Does the fact demand a choice? The fact.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait. It demands either an action, or non-action. Of course. Come on sir, be quick.

Q: I am aware of it. But I am on the road...

K: I understand. Wait sir. I am on a road and I come to a fork and either there is an indication which says, go where you want to go, there is no choice. But if there is no indication then I have to choose, therefore I ask somebody, "Which is the way to Pisa?" That's very simple. There is no choice.

Q: If there is nobody on the road.

K: Therefore I am asking - I know all the tricks! - I am asking, does a fact demand a choice? The fact - listen - the fact I suffer, the fact, does it demand choice? The fact never demands choice, it is my reaction to the fact. Of course, sir. I can escape from that suffering, I can rationalize that suffering, run away from that suffering, do everything, the fact never demands choice; it only demands action.

Q: Why does it demand action?

K: Oh, sir, look. There is a snake. That is a fact. And the fact that it may be poisonous, therefore the fact demands action. Either you leave it alone, play with it, and all the rest of it. You are not meeting all this.

I want to come back to the point, sir, I wish you would go with this, because it's your life we are talking about, not my life.

Q: A fact demands action.

K: That's it, the fact demands action - it's the same thing.

Q: If I see 'what is' there is no confusion.

K: Yes, sir, that's just it: if I see 'what is' there is no confusion. If I see that I am a liar there is no confusion. If I see I am double talking, or if I hate somebody, there is no problem. The fact demands action.

Q: I don't see how you can take any action with regard to a rattle snake.

K: Sir, I took that as an example. Forget the example but see. I am asking, when you are aware that you are conforming, and you are aware of your choice, aware of your reaction, and has that reaction another series of reactions? You follow? Right? Then one is living in the past all the time. Now when you become aware of conformity without reaction, just to observe it, then that awareness is the act of intelligence. Right? I hope some of you get it, I can't go on and on.

So awareness has no choice. Awareness is an act of intelligence. Now move from there to the next thing, which is: what is the relationship of awareness to inattention, and to attention? That's what we are discussing.

Q: Is attention total or partial?

K: We are going to find out, sir, we are going to enquire now. Is the mind aware totally, or only partially? Aware of its unconscious activities, or is it aware only at the superficial level? Go on, sir, please.

Q: It is part of our nature...

K: Sir, if you don't mind, what we are discussing has great significance because we are concerned - please, I must go back to it - we are concerned with the responsibility as a human being to

bring about a radical change in the human mind. You understand? That is what we are concerned with, through all the talks, through all the discussions. Because when one's consciousness changes you affect the consciousness of the world. You understand this?

Q: Inattention seems to be caused by the background.

K: We are going to find out, sir. But I want to point out that all the talks, the seven talks that we have had, and the dialogue, conversation that we are having now, are involved with the transformation of the human mind, the content of it, because the content, the human consciousness has created this appalling, suffering, confused world - where there is hunger, war, violence, division, the corruption of politics, that's going on. Any man that feels responsible for all this has to act, not just sit down and theorize, theorize.

So the corrupting factor is conformity. And how is the mind - not 'how' - does the mind realize the nature of conformity, intelligence and awareness? Right? So we have examined somewhat: conformity, and we are asking now, what is the relationship of attention to inattention, and to awareness? Right? They are all related. Why is the mind inattentive - not, can the mind be continuously attentive? You see the difference? Is a continuous attention, attention? Do go into it.

Q: No.

K: Has attention the movement of time? So I have to enquire into the factor of inattention, not, what is attention. Please see the importance of it. That is, I am attentive one minute - that's quite a long time. Attentive, I give my mind, my nerves, everything I have to attend, to listen, to see, and in that attention I have all the energy

captured, all the energy is there. In that energy there is tremendous clarity. Now it is over, the next minute I am inattentive. Right?

Then I say to myself, "Goodness, I wish I could keep that attention all the time". So I begin to train - listen to it - train myself. I begin to train myself and say, "I must be attentive", "I must watch myself", "I must drill myself", "I must eat the right food", "I must concentrate on attention" - you follow? But I never ask, what is inattention. Because attention I have had for a second, for a minute, and I fall back into inattention. The understanding of inattention is much more important than inattention. Get it? Right? Is that clear, may we go on? Now what is inattention? Why is the mind inattentive? And why shouldn't the mind be inattentive?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, no sir. Sir, look. No, sir, I explained. One minute I am very attentive, I see everything very clearly, I have no conflict, there is a sense of a great thing, you know, to be completely attentive, there is no problem, there is nothing. And that attention goes away, and I suddenly find myself that I am inattentive, I have lost the quality of clarity, and then I say, "How am I to recapture that attention?" And I struggle, and I ask questions, and I get miserable because I can't get that attention. So I am saying, what is important is not the understanding of attention for the moment, but the understanding of inattention. Right? That's simple enough, sir. What is inattention, why is the mind inattentive?

Q: It seems that thought causes inattention.

K: So you are saying, the operation of thought may cause inattention, is that it? Are you sure what you are saying, sir, or is it just a guess? Don't let us guess this, it is not a guessing game. I

want to find out the importance of inattention - please listen - the importance of inattention, and the importance of attention. Right? Inattention may be the mind needs rest, not that heightened energetic tremendous attention. And therefore it says, 'Let me have a few minutes'. But in those few minutes - just listen to it - in those few minutes any action becomes corrupting action. You understand what I am saying? I wish you would come with me quickly, I am racing and you are not.

Look: I am attentive for one minute, and there, there is no border, there is no time, there is no me, there is no problem, the whole energy is involved in that attention, it is a heightened attention, energy. That's for the mind a tremendous movement. Then it gets tired and moves to inattention. Now in that state of inattention any action, any action, must be conditioning. Right? You understand? Look: I am attending, in that state of attention I can do things without effort, without thought, you know, do things. That's real creativeness - we won't go into that. And in the state of inattention action has to go on, I have to meet a friend, I am bored with that, there action has to have happen. At the moment of action, if I am aware, inattention is not. I wonder if you are following all this. You understand my question, sir? The moment the mind is aware that it is inattentive there is attention - not that we must maintain attention. I wonder if you understand this.

So inattention is part of attention. Got it? Not, from inattention go to attention. You know, sir, meditation is total attention in which concentration, which has a motive, and therefore an end, doesn't exist at all. Are you following all this? And in meditation there can be inattention - you understand? Oh, do follow this.



Please, don't agree with me, I don't think you follow what I am saying because it is really quite complex this thing. I mustn't discuss meditation because this is not the moment, perhaps we can do it tomorrow, if you want it.

What I am pointing out is, in the state of attention, state, it is a movement, it is not a dead thing, it is a movement of attention, not the movement of time - the movement of time is concentration - in that quality of attention there is no time, there is no border. You understand border? A fixation. Because there is no centre and therefore no circumference. That is attention. Now in that attention why shouldn't there be inattention? You follow? It is within the whole area, I don't separate inattention from attention. I wonder if you get this. It's only when inattention says, "By Jove, I must leave this and capture that", then you separate inattention from attention.

Q: Sir, are you saying that when there is awareness in inattention...

K: No, sir, no sir. Sir, look, conformity is a wastage of energy. Right? When I conform to the pattern set by tradition - the whole involvement of tradition, not just one tradition, the whole, that is authority and all that - when there is conformity there is a wastage of energy because then there is conflict - I mustn't conform, and where am I to draw the line of conformity? You follow all this. So that is a wastage of energy. And accepting authority - authority, let's understand this: there is the authority of law, that I have to conform to otherwise I would be put in prison. That is, if I don't conform on the road, keep to the left or the right, well I will soon have an accident, so I have to conform. Now we are saying conformity, when we become aware of the whole nature of

conformity and I see what is implied in it, and I see that is a wastage of energy, in that awareness of attention and inattention - you follow - then a totally different intelligence comes into being, which then says, "Conform", "Don't conform". It is not your reactions that dictate. I wonder if you get this. Am I going too fast?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait. No, no. You are translating it differently. I don't know what I said just now, I can't repeat it. Look, sir: we are rather a mindless people. We are reflexive people, always reacting. Now I have got a problem of conformity, which is part of the structure of tradition. The mind becomes aware of the implications and the structure of conformity. Why the mind conforms, because it wants to protect itself and so on and so on. Now in that awareness when there is a reaction, it is still a reflexive reaction. And I see in that awareness the reflexive reactions are from my background, and the background says, "Conform". Right? So can the mind become aware of conformity, its reactions and its successive waves of reactions? And when you are so attentive of conformity, reaction and the waves of reactions, in that attention there is an intelligence which operates and tells you when to conform, when not to conform - which is not based on reaction. Right, it is simple enough.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir. You will say what you have to say. Have you understood what I have to say? Right.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going to, sir. We are going into the question of what is inattention. Because, sir, the highest form of intelligence is

necessary in a mad world, and our intelligence is not yours or mine. Of course not. It is not national, it is not religious - it is not religious in the sense of belonging to a religion. It is the very essence of religion. Wait. I am going to go into it if you will listen.

And that intelligence operates at all levels, and it is really religious intelligence - not the phoney religious thing - and I see that as the mind, which has conformed for generations, is becoming more and more mechanical, and such a mind, whatever it will do to transform the world or bring about greater this and that, it is still in a world of conformity. Right? Please follow this. And my concern is that the consciousness of a human being must be changed in order to bring about a different structure and nature, and function in the world. I am consumed with that responsibility, it is not just words. And I see that human beings are very little aware. They are aware of their own pleasures, and their own fulfilments and their own desires, and their frustrations and their angers, and all the rest of it. But that's a very small area of awareness. And awareness implies the total movement. In that movement there is no choice, which we went into it. To be so attentive, to sustain that attention - perhaps very few can do it - they have been practising to maintain that attention, which is the whole idea of meditation. And I see where there is concentration, which has a motive, restriction, resistance, it is not awareness. And there is also a state of inattention. Is inattention something opposite to attention?

Q: The other side of the coin.

K: I want to find out, not verbally, I want to find out what is the relationship between attention and inattention. The moment you

say, it is the other side of the coin, I create an image and say, 'Yes', but I haven't found out. It isn't a reality, it is just a descriptive image which I have accepted. So I have to find out what is inattention? And why shouldn't the mind be inattentive? It is only in that state of inattention either there is an increase of pleasure or increase of fear, to that I respond. You follow? In that state of inattention, I am asking what is wrong with it, why shouldn't I be inattentive?

Q: Inattention brings sorrow.

K: I don't know. Why shouldn't I be inattentive. I have been attentive. Look, sir, I have been attentive for an hour and a half here and why shouldn't I be inattentive for a few minutes, what is wrong? Is that inattention an unawareness? See it sir.

Q: No, it is not.

K: See it, sir.

Q: I am aware of my inattention...

K: Yes, sir, we have said that earlier. You are not meeting my point.

Q: There is a quietness.

K: No, sir, I am not talking of quietness or anything. Just I am attentive, I have been attentive the whole hour and why shouldn't I now be inattentive? Just remain there for a minute. Is inattention then something opposite to attention? Or, is the mind taking a rest?

Q: That is inattention.

K: That's not inattention. Sir, look, for an hour and a half the speaker has been attentive. And he says, "I will rest". The rest period is not inattention.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, wait.

Q: If you are sensitive you are attentive, and in inattention you lose sensitivity.

K: Not at all. He is saying, sensitivity implies attention and when there is inattention you lose sensitivity. Sir, just look. When you have been attending for a long time, as we have in this tent, if you have morning, the mind says, "I am resting". In that rest the mind can respond instantly to attention, instantly. But it is taking it quietly, it is resting. What is wrong with that?

Q: Nothing.

K: Then what are we objecting to? Go slowly. I will show you. In that state of inattention, you are never inattentive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, give me two minutes, will you, just follow. Attention, you know what that means, more or less. The mind can't sustain that attention unless you have gone very, very deeply into it. And the mind gets tired and says, rest. In that period of rest it can respond to attention instantly. And there is another kind of inattention, another kind of rest; which is, I have captured, for a second, attention, and I am struggling to maintain that attention. The struggle to maintain that attention is inattention, and out of that inattention I can't respond instantly; I will respond according to my tradition.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: It doesn't matter. Sir, be quick enough, move. Are you ever inattentive? When you are - no, I won't use similes because that is dangerous. You know what it is to be inattentive, don't you? We all know it. In that state of inattention we do things which bring

conflict, we do things which are not nice, we do things which may hurt others and so on. We know that inattention. Right?

Q: We don't know it at the moment, we only know it afterwards.

K: Yes. That is the state of inattention. Right? When I say nasty things about you, or criticize you, or say, "You are a nice man, be friends with me" and so on. Those are all - we know that. And in that state of inattention actions go on. Right? Don't we act? Of course. When I say something nasty, I am acting. So most of us know what it is to be inattentive. That inattention has no relation to attention. I can't move, the mind can't move from that inattention to attention, that movement will still be inattention. Right? Are you getting tired?

So I see that. So I see: awareness, sensitivity, awareness, attention. In that state of attention - that state of attention is the summation of energy, unless your body, your mind and everything is in complete harmony, you can't maintain that attention for a whole hour, it is impossible, or an hour and a half. There is that attention for a while, in that attention there is also inattention, you say, "Well I am resting, I will be quiet". That inattention is totally different from the ordinary inattention. Got it? That's all.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 4TH AUGUST 1974.

As this is the last dialogue, at least for this year at Saanen, what shall we talk over together?

Q: Will you talk about creativity?

Q: What is the actual process of identifying the mind with tree? Is it becoming the tree?

K: No. I hope the mind doesn't become the tree.

Q: The daily life, with all its problems, and the other area, which is not the daily life, what is the relationship of the two?

Q: Energy and action.

Q: Would you talk about celibacy.

Q: The speaker has said that in talking over things together his words act as a mirror, therefore the speaker is merely an information bureau. And could the speaker put questions, instead of us putting questions, and the speaker going into those questions himself.

K: So, in other words you are saying, have a small group of people with whom you can discuss very seriously and the others listen. Is that it? Or there are not many, only a few, with whom to discuss.

Q: Could you pick people and then discuss with them?

K: Oh, no. I understand what you are saying, sir. And then discuss with him. Now I am going to do that. Not pick up persons, but I am going to put you a question. It is not really a question. We have been talking now for five discussions, and seven talks, what has been the action of all that? In what way has your mind

changed? Or are we going along the same pattern - the pattern of a new record, gramophone record, a new one, and repeat, repeat, repeat? Or is there a totally different kind of activity going on? Now who would like to answer that question?

I think it would be best for me to proceed. There have been several questions put: what would you consider is the important question that needs to be answered among all these, by you, or by another, or by the speaker? The question of meditation, celibacy, meditation in action. Now which do you think is an important question in all that which can be answered?

Q: I don't know what you are talking about.

K: You really don't know? The gentleman really doesn't know what the speaker has been talking about for the past month - is that it?

Q: I wish the speaker would answer it.

K: Don't give the speaker a certificate, please! Now sir, nobody wants to answer it. May I propose a question, which is: the energy that matter creates is one thing, and is there another energy which is not the product of matter - matter being thought? You understand? That is what I would like to talk about, to discuss with you. I think that will include meditation, celibacy, meditation in action and so on.

Q: I...

K: Disagree?

Q: Yes. You protect the speaker, he is considered as a guru and an authority, therefore for myself I can't utter what I think.

K: But sir, nobody has prevented you.

Sir we have got several problems, several questions that you



have all put: meditation, celibacy, meditation in action, energy and so on. Now can we have a conversation, a dialogue, about this question of energy - energy produced by the machine, energy produced through conflict, energy produced through a formula, energy produced through competition, energy produced through various forms of struggle, imitation, following and so on? That's what we mean by energy, mechanical energy. Right? Is the explanation of that word clear, what we mean by the word 'energy'? Energy created by thought in its action towards an end; energy created by thought in conforming, in competition; the energy created by thought as the 'me', and that 'me' struggling to assert itself in all the various areas of existence. We mean that by energy. Right?

Now we have functioned in that area all the time - function being acted, moved, changed, adjusted, imitated in that area. Right?

This is a dialogue, which is a conversation between you and me, I am not the speaker only. You and I are talking over together this question of energy, because it seems to me such a question is important, whether the mechanical energy of thought, which is matter, can ever bring about a transformation in the human mind, and therefore in society. That is what we are talking about.

Q: It seems we are talking about different centres of the mind. But it is impossible for one centre of the mind's energy to bring about energy in another centre of the mind.

K: Therefore, sir, I am asking, sir, this mechanical energy of matter - thought is matter - is there another form of energy? Wait sir. I am enquiring, sir, I am not saying it is, or it is not, if there is,

or if there is not. I see this mechanical energy of thought cannot possibly change the social, economic and inward structure of human beings. They may alter a little bit here and there.

Reformation and revolution are within the area of mechanical activity of thought. If that is so, then we are asking: is there another kind of energy necessary to break down this mechanical process?

Q: You speak about mechanical energy in a derogatory way. Whereas my life's work requires this mechanical energy.

K: I agree, sir.

Q: So I must find how to live with it.

K: We are going to find out. There is this mechanical energy - first see all the implications of that mechanical energy, which is, the energy of matter, thought and so on, and what it has done in the world, technologically, economically, socially, morally, religiously, which affects our daily life of which we are a part. And we are saying that as long as we live in that area of energy mere reformation and revolution are changing the corners, changing the surface. In that there is no radical transformation. That's all I am saying.

Now we are enquiring, talking over together, if there is any other kind of energy.

Q: The destruction of ideas can also bring about energy.

K: Obviously.

Q: It is a matter of direction.

Q: What do you mean by energy? It is very difficult to define.

K: Sir, I explained just now, I defined, or put into words what I thought was energy. Scientists will have a different definition of energy, or the business man, and so on, each has his own definition

of what he considers energy. When you look it up in a dictionary it means - force, drive, vitality, life, all that is involved in that word.

Q: Are you saying that you are only dealing with mechanical energy?

K: Sir, first we are considering - at least I hope we are considering - the mechanical energy of thought, and whether there is through that energy a release of man - you understand? - a release, a freedom, an ending of suffering, a different structure of society, different morality and so on.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know, but apparently, sir, we are still there, because all these questions are related to that, like saying, celibacy. All right, if that is the way you want to tackle it we will tackle it your way.

Celibacy: in religions, ancient and modern - perhaps not modern - celibacy was considered necessary. Priests, monks, took a vow to be celibate. And though they took a vow, inwardly they were burning. Right? Obviously. So there was a contradiction. The mind verbally took a series of vows and said, "I am going to remain a celibate in order to serve..." - whatever image it had created. But he suffered enormously, conflict of all his desires, he was burning.

Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait a minute, sir. I am just beginning, sir. Or you identify, the monk identified himself with the symbol, or feel in love with the symbol so completely he was absorbed by the symbol, and therefore there was no conflict. He was married to Jesus, or to Krishna, or whatever it was, and in that absolute identification with the image, with the symbol, with the idea, the conflict didn't arise.

This identification obviously helps one to soften the desires, the urges, the sexual lust. It is like putting a toy in front of a child and the child is completely absorbed in the toy. But deep down the thing goes on, the mischief in the child; remove the toy and it again becomes mischievous, or does something else.

Now what is a chaste mind? That is the real question, not celibacy, or the vows, or all the conflicts involved in taking a vow, or so completely identifying oneself with a symbol, with an image, with an idea, but what is much more important is to find out what is a chaste mind? Would that be all right? Right, sir?

What is a chaste mind? The word 'chaste' means pure - I am quoting the dictionary, please don't jump on it - pure, clear, untouched, a mind that has not been through conflict, it is an innocent mind. I am using that word - please bear with me, I am describing what that word 'chaste' means. You may not accept the meaning of that word, but I am using the meaning from the dictionary - clean, a chaste mountain, the snow is fresh, chaste, untouched. I think we ought to talk about that rather than the mind that is caught up in sexual desires and all that.

Chaste also means a mind that is really innocent. The word 'innocent' means a mind that has not been hurt. The root meaning of the word 'innocent' means not capable of being hurt. Right? Is there such a mind? Wait, sir. Wait. Is there such a mind that is incapable of being hurt, and therefore chaste, and therefore clean - in the ordinary sense of that word?

Q: All very young children have chaste minds.

K: I am sorry. I wouldn't know. But have we such a chaste mind?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir. Have we human beings now in this tent, or a few with whom we can discuss and go into it, have we got such a chaste mind - a mind that has not been hurt, or a mind that has no image created by the senses, a mind that is free from the pleasure of yesterday?

Q: Is chastity a quality of the mind?

K: Is anger a quality of the mind? Is violence a quality of the mind? Why have we made chastity one of the most important things in the so-called religious world, why? And before you can answer that question, is it a quality? Is goodness - please listen - is goodness a quality of the mind - the mind being the brain, the intellectual capacity of perception, the various thoughts and the emotions that thought can recognize? All that we call the mind - at least I call the mind, you may call it by a different name, but if we both agree that it is the mind then we can proceed.

So is chastity a quality of the mind? - the mind being intellectual perception, and all the memories of the brain, experience, knowledge, the capacity to draw a conclusion, the capacity to understand verbally and non-verbally, all that is the mind. Now we are introducing a word like, chastity, and saying, is that a quality of the mind. Right? What do you say? This is a discussion please, a dialogue. Now what do you say?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we are not discussing consciousness. We are saying are chastity, anger, violence, a quality of the mind. Is the word the thing? You understand?

Q: You are saying the mind is thought, but if you say also

emotions, I would say yes.

K: Is the mind emotion?

Q: You have defined the mind as thought, but before the mind, emotions and thought, then yes, anger could be the mind, a quality of the mind.

K: If you say the mind is thought, emotion, and the recognition of emotions, and the whole of the brain, memory, all that is the mind, and if you say, is chastity, violence, anger the quality of such a mind, then the lady agrees that it is the quality of the mind.

Q: It is the product of the mind.

Q: It is the mind itself, the mind is emotions.

K: That is what we are saying. Now is chastity, the word - the word - does that denote the state of the mind? Look, I use the word 'violence', is the word the actual fact? So the word is the description. Let's go slowly into this. So the description is not the described. Right? So what is the described? What is the described, which says, "What is chastity?" You understand my question? Sirs, we have used the word 'chastity', and in using that word we have the various images and associations connected with that word. Obviously. But those words, associations with their feelings, is not the quality, is not the thing. Right?

Q: Right, right.

K: One moment. So what is the thing that is described? Look sir, may I put it this way. Let's be simple. I want to find out objectively, not with some hope or with some desire to be inviolate, I want to find out if my brain, my mind, this mind is really chaste. Right? I want to find out. And so I say to myself, "Am I caught in the word?" The word, the association, and all the

remembrances that are awakened with the word - the condemnation, the approval, the holy man, the unholy man - you follow, all that is involved when we use that word, chastity. It is the traditional word to denote a man of god - whatever that may mean, So I say to myself, is my mind caught up in the word and its associations? That I must be very clear about first, mustn't I? Right? So can my mind be free of the word, the symbol, and all the condemnation and approval of that word? Go on, sirs, this is a dialogue, a conversation.

Q: As long as...

K: I don't want 'as long as', 'if', 'when', 'must'. I want to see the state of my mind actually as it is when the word chastity is moved.

Q: The word chastity...

K: That's what I said, madam.

Q: Before we can get on to chastity don't we have to observe chastity?

K: Oh, there is nothing much to look at, is there? Oh, don't let's make this all become so silly. I am going to stick to that word because it is a very good example of how our minds refuse to look at something that is not held in a word.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, do be simple. I am not trying to convert you, or tell you what to do. Let's find out, as two friends discussing a very serious matter, which has somewhat coloured the whole of humanity, humanity has said, "To reach God you must be chaste, you must have chastity". And people have gone through tortures about it, people are so deeply identified with their symbol and so on and so on. I want to find out if my mind which has been brought

up in these traditions, in these ideas, in these conclusions, whether it is chaste at all. If I understand it, then sex, all the other things become fairly simple and clear. Because the moment a conflict arises in sexual relationship, it is no longer love, chaste, or anything. So I want to find out. How am I to find out? Go to books? Go to my guru? Ask somebody, what is chastity? He would immediately translate it in terms of his own traditional conditioning, and I have to either accept it or reject it. So I won't go through all that business because I know it very well. So I say to myself, is the mind free from the word - and the word includes condemnation, justification, and all that, and all the associations involved in that word? Right?

Q: My mind...

K: Wait. I have asked a question, let's find out. If I say, no, I have finished, then no enquiry is possible. Or if I say, yet, it is possible, that again blocks enquiry. Right? Can we now find out, your mind and my mind, whether it is a slave to words and therefore cannot possibly investigate. Right? Because if I have a conclusion that one must have chastity in terms of tradition, it is finished, I can't enquire.

Q: What is a chaste mind, sir?

K: I explained, sir, what chastity means. A chaste mind, a mind which has not been hurt.

Q: An innocent mind.

K: No, no. A mind that is innocent is a chaste mind. A mind which is incapable of being hurt is a chaste mind.

Q: They are also incapable of hurting.

K: That follows naturally. So a mind that is not caught up in



images, in pictures, in the remembrance of things past and desiring more of it. All that is implied and more in that word 'chaste', or 'chastity'. And I am saying, asking you, and I am asking myself, whether it is possible for the mind to disassociate itself from the word, or is the mind merely a verbal structure? You understand, sir? Therefore it cannot disassociate itself.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir don't introduce a simile. Sir, please put this problem to yourself and find out whether the mind, the brain, and all the things associated with it, are merely the structure of words. That structure of words being pictures, images, conclusions, depending on your like and dislike, pleasure and pain, all that is implied in the word and the memory which contains the word. I am including everything into it.

Q: Also included is traumatic shock.

K: Have you had a traumatic shock now, as somebody else? Sir, I want to look at your own mind, at yourself, and I say to you, is the mind merely the result of words - not just words but the whole complex of verbalization and the word - or is the mind something different? I am not saying it is, or it is not. And can the mind disassociate itself from the word? And if it does, what then is the mind? Sir, this is part of meditation. Sir, just a minute. This is part of meditation. Because meditation implies action in daily life. And if meditation is merely the continuance of a verbal structure, then a verbal structure with the pursuit of all its images and so on, then action is merely mechanical. Obviously.

And is meditation - if you want me to define meditation, I will - can the mind disassociate from the word? The word has its own

energy. The word has its own content which has been put there by thought. Of course. And if the mind merely lives in that area meditation is then a purposeful, directed activity of thought and will. Right?

Q: Sir, what do you mean by disassociate?

K: Sir, that microphone, this thing which we call microphone, is not that thing, is it? The thing - you follow, sir? This metal thing is not microphone, the word, but we both agree to call that microphone; we might call it, giraffe, if we both agree. That's all. The disassociation of the word microphone from the fact. Now can the mind disassociate itself from the word, and if it does, what is the mind, and can the mind disassociate itself? You follow the problem? You have got to work at this, it isn't just an agreement or disagreement. When you realize the word is not the thing, the word 'wife' is not the woman, but to us the word 'wife' covers everything.

Q: When I try to do this, look at chastity, the word disappears.

K: Sir, look: meditation is not a conscious action and that is what you have all been doing. Right? Meditation is not a deliberate act.

Q: Why do you talk about it?

K: Because from India some of the gurus have brought it over to this country and to America and they are polluting the air. And they are forming groups, getting money, doing all kinds of things, mischievous things with the mind. And somebody raised it, not only now, previously and at the other talks, please talk about this. So I am saying, meditation is not a conscious act. If you realize that, it is something entirely different. Because as that gentleman pointed out, I can try, try to disassociate the word and see what

happens. You understand? Therefore there is a deliberate action taking place to see what is the state of the mind without the word. Now who is trying, and who is recognizing the result? And if the result is according to his desire then he accepts the result. But I say, please don't try, don't deliberately disassociate, look at the problem. You understand, just look without saying, "I must disassociate", "Associate", "What is the quality?", but just look. That is, there is this mind, the mind which includes the brain, the brain cells, memories, experience, which is knowledge. That knowledge is the known, the known is the word, the known is the field in which we are all operating. That's obvious. Right, sir? It is the area of all our activity - sexual, moral, ethical, artistic and all of that is within the area of the known. And within that area there is tremendous activity of energy. Right? And I say to myself, "I must meditate". And I am still meditating in that area, when I say, "I must meditate, I must breathe rightly, I must learn to breathe rightly, I must control" - you follow? So meditation as has been accepted and practised throughout the world is within the area of the known, and the attempt from the known to enquire into the unknown. You understand all this? Just listen.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am not trying anything. Don't, don't. I have said, don't try. Sir, meditation must be totally uninvited. We will go into that.

Q: Do you say, don't try?

K: Yes. Don't try. Don't try, don't try to exert will, just - sir, do you know the art of listening - just to listen, not interpret or translate what he is saying, just to listen to the music without the romance, without the association, without all that, just you listen to

a lovely sound. In the same way, if you can, listen, not try, just listen, which doesn't mean you accept, you deny, you agree, you this, or that. Just the art of listening, sir, as the art of seeing.

So I am saying, can your mind disassociate itself from the word? The word has an enormous tail - you follow? Can that happen? Don't try. See what takes place. If it cannot, then we are always living within the field of the known, and therefore it is a prison. And the scientists, the really top scientists are enquiring into this problem: whether the mind can go beyond the known, not deceptively. You understand? Whether it can enter an area where the known has not penetrated, where the known with all its contamination has not touched it, therefore that area may have quite a different quality of energy. Now I have said this.

Q: How does that tie in with meditation being uninvited?

K: It doesn't tie in at all. But we must know the whole field of the known, and all its activities, which is the 'me'. You understand, sir? I must know myself; myself is discoverable, the known. I may not have looked at it, it may be hidden, but the 'me' must be totally exposed. The 'me' is the word, the 'me' is the memory, the remembrances, the experiences, the struggles, the tradition, the past, all that, with all its complexities, conscious and unconscious, the hidden motives, secret desires, all that is within the field of the known. And when I say, "I must meditate", I am meditating from the known, in the known. I control myself, I breathe in a certain way and I concentrate - all that is within the field of the known. And I say, meditation consciously done is no meditation at all. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, that's the whole problem. When we put that question we are still within the area of the known. And we want an answer within that area. But we never put the question without wanting an answer, but just to see what the question does. You have understood, sir? Look, there is violence, human beings are violence, with their opinions, with their conclusions, with their gods, with their possessions, it is all violent. Violence means anger, jealousy, competition, aggressiveness, the desire to be someone, all that is included in that word, violence. I have defined it so we can go on.

Now when there is an attempt to be free of violence, you must find out who is the entity that is attempting to be free. Is the entity different from violence? They are both the same, aren't they? You agree, sir? Now I have described it. Then you say, "What am I to do?" - you understand? - when you realize that the observer of violence is himself violent - when the observer realizes

Q: There is a trick.

K: No, there is no trick. Please, just listen. There is no trick at all. I will show you. I am violent. I am angry. Is the anger different from the man who says, "I have been angry"? Is he different?

Q: He doesn't realize it.

K: It is not a question of realizing. I am asking; and you say, no, obviously it cannot be. We are saying, the mind is the field of the known. The mind is the result of centuries of growth, centuries of experience, millions of years of knowledge, and it has operated always within that field. And it says, meditation is from this field to that field - whatever that field is. And therefore it makes a deliberate attempt to meditate. That is, try to control, try to

suppress, try to silence the mind so that in that silence it sees something new. Right? That is the idea of meditation.

Q: What happens during dreams?

K: No, that's a different question.

Q: Mind is a concept.

K: Which means thought has created the word, the idea, reasoned the idea and put it as a formula, then the mind says, "Yes, I am that". But you are not following it. You see how difficult it is, sir. I want to talk with you and you are going off at a tangent.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, all that, different parts of the brain, aren't there. No, sir, we are not dividing the brain or the mind into different categories. We are asking a very simple thing, sir: if the mind is incapable of freeing itself from the known it must live a mechanical life - whatever it does, and its society must be based on division, and therefore no morality.

So we are asking: there is this brain, mind, can it be free of the word - the word is the known - and what happens when the word is not? - word being knowledge, word being experience. That means, can the brain, can this whole thing called the mind with its brain and so on and so on, see the importance of the activity of the brain - you follow - and not merely hold on to that? I don't know if I am conveying anything.

Q: (inaudible)

K: Yes. Sir, I had an experience yesterday, pleasant or unpleasant, and I carry it over to today, the brain carries it over to today. Can that experience of yesterday, pleasurable or painful, end with yesterday? Otherwise it is a continuity of the past.

Q: It happens with some things you don't like.

K: Find out. You can drop those things very easily. But something that gives you great pleasure, great excitement, sexual, I don't know, whatever it is, can the experience be dropped, instantly removed? That's what we are asking in different words. You have hurt me and you know all the implications of that word hurt, and can I drop it, and not carry it over?

Q: Yes.

K: You say, yes. Do you do it? Intellectual agreement is not action. It is the same thing, we are saying the mind, the brain, carries over, therefore it is continuing within the field of the known all the time. And in that field, do what you will, there is no hope. As we see what is happening politically, religiously, economically and pollution, all of that, overpopulation and all the misery that is going on. So if you are serious, and I mean serious, not just words but burning with it, with the responsibility of it, then you have to ask this question, whether the mind can ever be free from the known? You see that is what man has done, attempted to free himself, attempted so that I can't free but there is an outside agency that will help me. If you reject all that - the outside agency, attempt, trying, will, direction, deny all that totally, which you must because they are all still within the field of the known, then what is the mind without the movement of time as the past? We live in the past - right? That's our life, isn't it. What he said, what he didn't say, why this, why that, my memories, my anxieties, everything is in the past - my fears, my remembrance of fears, my sexual appetites and the appetites projecting themselves tomorrow through image, through sensation, through pictures and all that.

Now what is the nature of the mind when there is, not through will or desire or attempt, when you see that there is no way out through the known, then what does the mind do? Does it get depressed, hopeless, cynical? All that is still part of the known.

So can you - this is a dialogue, that is, a conversation - have you done this, not verbally but actually gone into it? And you will say to me, have you done it - naturally, right sir?

Q: Yes.

K: I thought so. Look sirs, the speaker would never say anything which he hasn't done.

Q: If you have done this what have you seen?

K: Have you seen? You see the gentleman's question? If you have ever done this what have you seen?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, he wants something else. Please answer that gentleman's question. To see, to observe without recognition is one thing. To observe with recognition is still within the past. Right, are you following this sir? So there is nothing to see, and nothing to experience. The moment you recognize something - I recognize you because you were here yesterday, and that recognition is the movement of the past. You were here yesterday, the brain registered it and says, today I recognize you. So if there is recognition when the mind is free of the word and all that, then it is not free of the word, it is free of a certain series of words. Can you say that you have had an experience without recognition?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's is what we are saying, it is exactly the same. You are asking me what I saw.



Q: Yes, but it doesn't lead me to anywhere.

K: Why should it lead you to anywhere?

Q: Why are we here?

K: I don't know why you are here, sir. But why are you here, any of you? Why are you here?

Q: Because we want something from you.

K: Because you want something from me, it is suggested.

Q: To find out about ourselves.

K: Sir, what are you here for? I would like to ask this gentleman who says, "What are you here for, sir?"

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, that is not quite fair. Sir, you haven't understood. I have just now said, sir, and I'll put it differently: The speaker doesn't talk about anything which he has not done, and all the rest of it. Otherwise he would be a damn hypocrite.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I don't speak about that. Madam, you are missing my whole point. I did not say that, madam.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I did not say that either. No. Madam, I know what the question was. Please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That was one of the questions. The other questions were: are you speaking, saying things which you, which your mind has realized, seen, understood, comprehended, aware, attention - do you know what you are talking about, or is it merely an intellectual amusement? Right? I am sorry it is not an intellectual amusement. As that gentleman asked, what have you seen, there is nothing to

see.

Q: Is it like when the mind is a complete blank?

K: Not blank, sir. You see. You first use a word 'blank' and I have to contradict that word and then we get into verbal communication. I don't say, blank. That's why, sir, I am asking you whether the mind can disassociate or separate or put away, understand the nature of the word and find out what happens, what takes place. Don't previously say, "It is blank", "It will see visions of Krishna", or Buddha , or something standing on his head and all the rest of it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's another of your ideas. Sir, you see this is so hopeless.

Q: It is not an idea.

K: Sir, may I put a question this way: has love a motive? No, has love a motive? Sir please, has love a motive? If it has a motive is it love?

Q: No.

K: Wait. Now I want to find out. I want to find out if I have a motive. And if I have a motive it is not love and I won't use that word ever until there is no motive.

Then you ask me, what is that love without a motive. I say, I can't tell you. Then you tell me, you are cuckoo. Because you want a verbal communication, and accept or reject according to your idea of what love is. That's all you are interested in. You don't say, now let's find out if I can live a life without a motive, except in the world of getting money, I have to have a little motive, that's irrelevant, psychologically I am talking about.

Q: Aren't all these questions - what you are seeing and what you

are experiencing - aren't they misleading. And even your response of saying you wouldn't speak of anything that you have not experienced, isn't that response misleading also.

K: Sir, unless you and I understand the meaning of the word, and the difficulty of the word, and the communication - communication implies sharing together. The meaning of that word in the dictionary means sharing together, thinking together, not agreeing, thinking about the problem together, partaking, building, doing things together, all that is contained in that word, 'communication'. Now we know there is a verbal communication and non-verbal communication. The verbal communication may also be very deceptive, misunderstood, and the non-verbal communication is much more difficult, much more deceptive, so we must go through the verbal communication first, that we both understand, and then perhaps we can commune non-verbally at a different level.

Q: How can we commune on a non-verbal level?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, you asked a question, wait a minute. I didn't say - you are misquoting me. I must correct it. I did not say I have gone beyond.

Q: That's what I understood.

K: Ah, that's what you understood, that is quite a different matter. I said I would not speak of anything that I hadn't gone through. I would be a hypocrite, and I don't want to be a hypocrite. I said that very clearly.

Q: I did not hear that.

K: I won't answer your question. That's an impudent question.

Q: You asked, why are you here.

K: I didn't ask that question, sir, somebody asked. I wouldn't be impudent enough to ask why you are here.

We have talked, the speaker has talked during seven talks, and we have had five so-called dialogues, communications, verbal, as friends meeting together, serious and concerned not with their own little problems, which are included when we consider the whole problem of mankind. The whole problem of overpopulation, pollution, the corruption that's going on right through the world, the deceptions, the divisions of religions, races, and nationalities, wars, violence, all that, and what is your place in it. After listening to twelve talks and dialogues, what is your place in this world?

You have to answer it, not to me, I am not your confessor, but you have got to answer that question. If you are serious and feel utterly responsible the answer is there. Because life is action and if your action is based merely on your self-centred opinions, judgements, evaluations, then you are just merely answering irresponsibly. But when you have looked at this whole human endeavour with all the things that are going on in the world - the new inventions, the destructive machinery, all that is going on, and you, who are so-called educated, and what are you educated for, and what is your place in all this? Just to disappear into all that, be swallowed up?

So if one is utterly responsible for the whole, for the world, because the world is you, and you are the world, there is no question about it, and since we human beings have created this monstrous ugly world, not nature, the world of human relationships, you have to, if you are serious, you have to answer it, and therefore you have to find what is your place in all this. Just go

off and meditate? Or join this party or that party, politically? Or follow this guru or that guru? Follow some authority, to save your own little salvation? The house is burning. If you don't see the house burning there is nothing to be said. But if you see the house is burning you have to act. Right? That's all, sirs.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 12TH APRIL 1975

After all the rain and clouds and fog, I am glad it is a nice morning. But if one might remind you this is not an entertainment. You shouldn't, if I may suggest, make a picnic of it.

We are going together to consider what is happening, not only in the outward world, but also what is happening within the world in which we live, the inside world, the world within our skin, the world of our thoughts, feelings, affections, like and dislike, hates and violence, we are going to go into all that. And also we are going to talk about meditation, love and death. And whether it is at all possible to transform our human minds and hearts into something totally different from what we are. That is what we are going to talk about during these four or five meetings.

First of all I would like to say that we are being bombarded by various propaganda, the religious propaganda, the commercial, by the scientists, by the inundation of the gurus from India with their nonsense, with their beliefs and all the rituals and dancing and all that business that is going on in this country. We are being bombarded on all sides. And this is not one of those bombardments. We are going together to investigate, consider, examine the problems that each one has, and the world has, and to do so we must think together, not agreeing or disagreeing because then we cease to investigate, we cease to examine freely, we cease to in freedom to find out what is truth in all this. So communication implies not only a verbal understanding, but also investigating, thinking, looking together; and that is very important to look together, to see together, to find out for ourselves together this

whole problem of existence. And so if you are at all serious, and these meetings are meant to be serious and not an intellectual or an emotional entertainment, because we want to be entertained, our literature, our magazines, the TV, the religious affairs, all those tend to become, as they have, a kind of entertainment, a carnival, and I hope this won't happen here. So we are examining together this whole problem and therefore it is your responsibility, if you are at all serious to find out, to observe and to learn, not from what the speaker is saying, but learn by or through observation, by looking, not according to our personal prejudices, not according to our particular idiosyncrasy and the knowledge that we have acquired because they condition the observation. If one is caught in a network of beliefs, dogma, personal opinion, like and dislike, then you cannot possibly observe. And to observe very clearly one needs the freedom from all this, freedom from your particular opinions, what you think, what you don't think, your personal experience, all your hopes, beliefs, none of those will help to perceive, to observe, to examine - which is fairly obvious. If you are a very good scientist, not hired by the government, but first-class, top scientist, you observe putting aside all your prejudices, all your previous knowledge, all the experience that has been collected through centuries as knowledge, and have the capacity to examine totally, objectively, impersonally, dispassionately. And I hope that this will be possible - one hopes that it will be possible that during these talks, together we are going to examine the chaos outside, the violence, the misery, the suffering, the agony, the appalling things that are happening in China, all over the world, the violence, the brutality, the cruelty.

Man, which is you and I, (it seems rather a pity to talk about all these things on a lovely morning, doesn't it?) - I wonder if you have ever considered what beauty is? The loveliness of a tree and the mountains, the beauty of a cloud, the curve of a branch and the shining leaves, and if you have ever gone into this question of what is beauty, not the beauty of a painter, the product of the canvas, or in the marble, or in words, which have filled museums all over the world, but when one sits under a tree like this, with a clear blue sky, with those mountains over which you are looking, that snow, the line against the blue sky. I wonder if you have ever considered what beauty is, not intellectually, not sentimentally or romantically, which all deny the depth of beauty, but when you do perceive that leaf in the sun, the green grass, the curving trunk, and the quiet still air, including that aeroplane noise, what is beauty? Because of that we are going to talk also, because without that, without that sensitivity, one cannot examine very deeply, non-verbally, the problems that we have to face in our daily life.

Beauty is related, I think, to the clarity of perception, and you cannot perceive infinitely, deeply, profoundly if there is any movement of selfishness, of the self, the 'me', the problems that one has, then they act as a screen that prevent you from looking at the whole world. And as we are going to examine, what is the mind or the heart that is capable of observing? How do you observe the things that you see around you? Those hills, those mountains with the snow, these lovely trees and the green grass, your wife, your husband, your girl or your boy, how do you observe? How do you observe your belief in god, or in Jesus, or in Krishna or in something or other, how do you observe? I wonder if you have



ever gone into this question of observation, of seeing. We think we see; we hardly pay any attention to that which we see.

So it is very important, I think, to understand and to learn the art of seeing, without that one can never possibly understand, go very deeply, not enter into the world's problems, but also into ourselves. What does it mean to see? To observe? And who is the observer who sees? To see something very clearly you must look. To look at the mountain or the tree, or at yourself, or your wife, or your husband and so on, your politicians and the leaders that one has, if you have any, and I hope you haven't any, including the gurus who are mischief makers, how do you observe all this? Do you observe them with your background, with your fears, with your hopes, with all the things that man has accumulated as knowledge through centuries? Do you look at all this through the screen of that which you have experienced, which you have acquired, or the image that you have built about another or about yourself?

Please, as we said a little while ago, we are doing this together, not just merely listening to a series of words, or to a picture that the speaker is painting. But together we are investigating what it means to observe, to see. If you have an image about another, obviously you are not looking at that person, you are only looking at the image that you have built about another. That is obvious. Therefore you never see. If you are sitting there and listening to the speaker because unfortunately he has some reputation and so on, then you are not listening, observing, you are merely concerned with the reputation that you or someone else has built about the person. If you want to see those mountains very clearly, not only the word, 'the mountain', the word itself must disappear because a

mountain, the word 'mountain' is not the thing that you see, the word is not the thing. So one must be free of the word to look. The word means the image, the symbol. And I hope you are doing this as we are talking, actually being aware that you have these images, descriptions, words, a network of reactions in which you are caught which therefore prevents you from looking. In the mind, your mind must be actually free to observe.

So the impediment of a word is as important as your reaction to the word, so that one can observe. And can one observe without any image - image being that which you have gathered, or that which you have built about another, so that you can actually see. Because we are going to ask a question presently whether knowledge has any place in the transformation of the human mind and heart, and so his society. Because society needs to be changed totally, radically, fundamentally, because the present society in which we live is immoral. And whether knowledge can transform man's relationship to man, and therefore society. And that implies, can you observe your relationship with another however distant, however close, however intimate, however foreign, can you observe that relationship without any image, picture, memory, remembrance? Because we have used knowledge as a means of action, as a means of accumulated knowledge, as a means to bring about in ourselves a fundamental change. Please do understand this because it is very important as we are going to go into this question.

Knowledge which is the accumulated experience of man, stored up in the brain as memory, accumulated through experience of thousands and thousands of years, knowledge accumulated by the

scientists, by the philosophers, by the analysts, psychologists, all that immense knowledge in every field of life - in the world of art, in the world of science, in the world of technology, in the world of our own relationship, whether that knowledge can bring about change fundamentally, psychologically in man. And to find that out one must be capable of observing the whole phenomenon of action with knowledge, with its skill, and whether knowledge can bring about, or change man? Or is there a perception which is direct and which is not related to knowledge? Are you following all this? Are you interested in all this? I hope you are because that is why you are here and I am here.

We have accepted knowledge as a means of transformation, as a means of change of the human psychological structure. And we are questioning that totally. And is there a direct perception which will transform man without all the accumulated knowledge gathered, however important it is in certain areas? Right, are we meeting each other? Please do take some interest in this. Don't make this as an entertainment, or some kind of philosophy - the word philosophy means the love of truth in daily life, not some theory invented by some clever brain. And to understand this question very deeply, that is, man has accumulate knowledge in every field, he has got an immense collection, and that apparently we rely on to bring about a sociological and psychological revolution. And we are saying, we question that whole structure; and we are saying that a direct perception is the only way to bring about transformation. You understand the question?

Q: What is the question?

K. What is the question. Look here sir, or ladies, you may know

about yourself, you may know what other people have said about yourself, the analysts, the psychologists, the Freudians and so on and so on: there is this vast accumulated religious knowledge as well as the modern knowledge about yourself, your behaviour, your reactions, your violence and all that, as knowledge. And you have probably read a great deal about all that. And we are asking whether that knowledge has transformed you, has radically changed you, the human action in daily life? That is the question.

So one must find out what place has knowledge, and where knowledge becomes totally irrelevant. Because one must bring about a change in oneself. Right? That is so obvious. There must be a psychological revolution. Because man, though he has advanced technologically greatly, man is just about the same as he was three millennia, five thousand years - violent, brutal, cunning, ambitious, greedy, anxious, fearful, great sorrow, in conflict. And we have created a society that is violent, that is brutal, that is totally commercial, a religion of make-belief, a religion that has become propaganda of the priests throughout the world, which is totally unrelated to our daily action. So belief has no place in daily life. So observing all this, both intellectually and actually, any serious person who is concerned not only with himself but with his children, with his grandchildren and the world as a whole, if he is at all serious he must be concerned how to bring about this deep fundamental psychological revolution, transformation in man.

Now, we have made a statement. How do you hear that statement? How do you receive that statement? You understand my question? We have said - please listen - we have said that knowledge has not transformed man fundamentally, deeply;

psychologically he remains as he was ten thousand years ago. There are modifications, peripheral changes but basically he is what he has been for thousands of years. Now how do you listen to that statement? What is your reaction to that statement? How do you listen to that statement? In listening do you see the actual fact? Or you make an abstraction of what you have heard? You understand? Oh lord! You understand? Look: I say that mountain against the blue sky is marvellous, lovely. You hear that statement, do you make an abstraction? That is, draw from that statement an idea, and therefore you are looking at that mountain through the idea and not actually seeing. You understand? Do you understand what the speaker is saying?

So, we are asking: knowledge has its right place but knowledge has not transformed man. A statement. How do you listen to that statement? Do you see the statement as a fact, as truth? Or an idea which is an abstraction of the statement and discuss about that idea? Therefore you are away from the fact. If you call me something or other, and in listening to what you have said to me I withdraw from it a conclusion, I am not facing the fact of what you have said, I am concerned with the conclusion. Can I go on? Right.

So it is very important to understand this because we live in conclusions, in abstractions, that there is god, that there is no god, that we are progressing. You know what that word progress means? Entering the enemy's country fully armed. We have got a great many conclusions and we live in these conclusions, and the more subtle, the more cunning, the more descriptive, the more fine, we think the greater our life is.

So through conclusions, through abstractions, through words we

live. Words become tremendously important, conclusions. So can you observe the fact as a fact, as 'what is', that knowledge has not transformed man? He may feel better, he may look better, more healthy - which I question - he may have more capacity to kill, to do things of greater skill, go the moon and all the rest of it. But all that knowledge has not transformed man. Don't please draw an abstraction from it, a conclusion from it, that is a fact. Now how do you look at that fact? You understand? It is a fact that the mountain is there. The light, the shadows, the waving the hills and the movement of the sky, all that is there, that is a fact. If you draw a conclusion from it, how beautiful, or I wish I was there, or this, then you are away from the fact. And how do you look at that fact? How do you look at the fact that knowledge has not transformed man? By looking at it, the fact, not the conclusion, not the abstraction, but the fact, then the next question is: what is there that will transform man? You understand? Not how to transform man? Which again implies a system, a method and therefore you are back again in knowledge. You understand this question? Oh gosh! You know most of us are not educated although we go to college, schools, degrees, we are not properly educated. We learn what other people have said but we don't know how to deeply think about things. We are so conditioned and we will go into all that presently.

As knowledge has not changed man, and it is imperative, essential, imminent that man change radically because he is destroying the earth, he is destroying the seas, he is destroying everything around him, the whales are disappearing - you know what is happening in the world, for god's sake. Then what will

bring about a fundamental psychological revolution? We are going to go into that.

That means I must know - I am using the word 'know' in the sense of not accumulated knowledge, I must be aware, know, be conscious of the nature and the structure of myself, because I am the world, I am the collective, I am all the religions of the world with their beliefs, with their dogmas, with their superstitions, with their rituals, utter nonsense, all that. I am the world, not a separate human being living somewhere by himself, I am related to the whole world, Now, just a minute. I made a statement of that kind. How do you listen to it? Is that a fact? Or you say, 'No, I am not, I am an individual, I am great man, I am separate, I am this and that' - you are the collective, aren't you? You are Christians, or not Christians, you belong to some group, or some sect, you believe in it, that is what the world is, with all the fears and pleasure, the violence, the greed, competition, envy, all that you are. The collective is that. So when we are talking about 'I am the world', that is a fact. And therefore I must know myself, because I am the world, I am the collective. Though I may break away from the collective and join a group or a community, I am still the collective of that community, of that group and so on. And to transform myself means I transform the world. That is - please listen to this - that is the content of consciousness makes up consciousness. Right? The content. And the content of my consciousness, of human consciousness, your consciousness is the content of the Indian, the Japanese - the world - with certain modifications, with certain colourations, with certain shapes and so on, but it is essentially the same. Now when there is a change in that content

you affect the content of the world. You understand? The content of the consciousness of the world. You understand what I am talking about? Therefore it is absolutely important that I understand myself because I am the world. Right? Can we proceed from there? Are you following this?

Now how do I look at myself? Do I look at myself with what other people have said about myself? You understand? The psychologists have said a great deal about myself, they have gone to Africa to study the animals, and say I am like that, and I have swallowed that pill! They have said - I am what - conditioned reflexes and great volumes have been written about myself. Do I look at myself through the eyes of others? That is, do I look at myself with secondhand eyes? And can I look at myself without the knowledge of other people, what they have said about me? You understand this? Move sir, let's move. Which means I don't understand myself at all. I understand what other people have said about me and I remain a secondhand, or third-hand human being. And that is what knowledge has done. We are terribly educated but caught in that education, in that knowledge, we are secondhand whatever we are. So can I - please listen - can I look at myself, putting aside what other people have said about myself and look. Look at my actions, look at my feelings, look at my thoughts, the way I explain, the way I try to find excuses for my action, all that, can I look at it? Now how do I look? Do I look with previous knowledge, knowledge of myself? Or do I look without the previous knowledge? You understand? All right sir. I look at myself. And I say I am - what? I am greedy. Please watch this. I am greedy. I find that I am greedy. I have used a word that is



already conditioned, with all its associations, and that word already has a content of condemnation. You are following this? So by using that word I have already conditioned my observation. I realize that. I see that fact. And I want it - the moment a certain feeling, a certain reaction arises, I look at it without the word. Are you doing it? Don't just listen to me for god's sake. This is not group therapy. That is an abomination. Going to somebody, talking about yourself endlessly. This is a fact that one is greedy or ambitious, competitive, hateful. Those very words have a condemnatory meaning because we are conditioned through the church, through all that, to associate certain words with certain meanings, which is generally condemnatory. So can I look at myself without the word and watch the reaction? You understand?

And one realizes what a slave the mind is to words. The word 'communist', the word 'Christian', the word 'black' - whatever word - we are so conditioned by the word, and therefore that conditioning prevents you from observing. Now can the mind - please listen to this - can the mind be free of that word to look? Don't make an abstraction of it and say, 'How am I to be free of the word?' If you ask how, then you are lost. But if you see the fact in observing yourself that you are caught in the word, that very observation frees you from the word. At the instant, not later. Therefore you can look.

And in looking I have learnt - listen - I have learnt from you to look at myself without the word. I have learnt that. And what I have learnt becomes knowledge. Right? Are you following? And with that knowledge I examine the next reaction. So I move from knowledge to knowledge, never free from knowledge to look. You

are getting it? Let's move together. So can I look, can the mind look at itself without the previous conditioning - however happy, however subtle, however agreeable, however nice it was, to look without the accumulated knowledge which I have gathered by observing myself. You know that requires tremendous discipline. Not the discipline of suppression, control and imitation, conformity - all that is not discipline. The word 'discipline' means to learn. Learning is not accumulating knowledge. Learning means a movement, not from an established knowledge.

So, can I look at myself afresh every minute? So I can never say 'I know myself'? You understand? I wonder if you get this. Because you are learning. So there are two types of learning. Learning which gives you knowledge, and so with knowledge you learn skill, skill to function in the world. That is one kind of learning: learning about mathematics, learning about physics, learning about everything, how to ride a bicycle, how to go to the moon. Learning which gives you an accumulated knowledge to function skilfully in the world of knowledge. Have you understood? Now there is another kind of learning, in which there is never an accumulation. Because the moment you accumulate and function within the field of knowledge there is no freedom. You are always moving within the field of the known. Do you understand? However wide that known is, however intricate, however subtle, however expansive, it is always within the field of the known, and in that there is no freedom. You may have a choice in the field of knowledge, and that freedom of choice we think is freedom. It is not. So can I look at myself each minute without the previous recognition, previous word, previous knowledge? So that

I am looking at the mountain, at you, at myself afresh, anew? That is freedom. That is one point.

And can I look at myself without analysis? Are you interested in all this? Or is it all getting rather tiresome? You are not to encourage me, please. If you are bored with it, be bored and I'll go on or I'll go home. Can I look at myself without analysis? In analysis there are implied several things. And the world accepts analysis as a means of understanding yourself. That is the fashion. That is the conditioning, that is the thing which we have been taught that we must analyse in order to understand. And there is an understanding which is direct, which does not depend on analysis at all. I am going to go into that. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed, doesn't it? Obviously. And who is the analyser? Is he different from the thing he analyses? Think it out, go into it. I analyse my violence, if I am violent. Who is the examiner, the analyser, the watcher that says, 'I am going to look into my violence'? Is he not the same as the violence? Obviously. This is so childish. And that analyser thinks he is superior, he knows because he has learnt, or accumulated knowledge about the analysed. And then he begins to analyse, separating himself from the thing which he is going to analyse. And each analysis gives him greater strength in his knowledge as the analyser. Watch all this in yourself. Please I haven't read a single book about all this nonsense, about all philosophy - they bore to me to extinction, I don't read them - philosophy, Upanishads, Gita or the Bible - occasionally I read the Bible for the beauty of language, not the sentimentality of it, not some of the historical events, just the beauty of the language.

So I observe myself and I see we are conditioned to analyse, and when I analyse I see the analyser is the analysed. That is a fact, irrevocable fact. And when there is a division between the analyser and the analysed there is conflict. Which is also a fact. And in the process of analysis I am accumulating knowledge about what I have analysed, and with that knowledge I analyse the next time, so I gather more knowledge, so I am caught in that. And all this analysis implies a great deal of time. I can go on analysing myself until I die. And analysis also prevents me from acting. So gradually I become hopelessly caught in my own knowledge about myself. I become more and more neurotic, more and more insensitive, dull, stupid, because I am living within the field of the knowledge which I have accumulated about myself, through analysis. So I say analysis is out, finished, I won't analyse. So what am I to do? You understand my question? I want to know myself, how am I to know? I see analysis has no meaning any more. So is there a way of looking which reveals totally, completely, all the content of my consciousness, instantly? You understand my question? Please understand the question first. If I do not analyse, which means seek the cause of certain reactions, certain actions, because the searching for the cause is a waste of time, which is part of analysis. Now I am asking myself: is there a way of looking at myself which reveals totally the whole content of my consciousness. At the moment I observe, at the moment I am fully aware, I am asking, I have put aside completely the introspective, analytical conditioning, now I am asking whether it is possible to look so that it reveals the whole content. You have understand my question?

So I must learn how to look. How to look at a tree, at a bird, at

the people I am related to, the people around me, to look at them, not romantically, intellectually and so on - is that possible? Is it possible to look at you when you have hurt me, when you have done things against me? To look.

So, as I said, I must learn, the mind must learn how to look, not learn in order to accumulate knowledge, to understand what it means to look. So we come back to the original thing, which is to observe. Observation implies not only to the ideas and to all the sensual responses and so on, but to observe without the image I have built about myself or about another. Can I do that? You are following my question? You have done something wrong, you have done something not true, hurt me, and that hurt remains, which is the image I have built about myself and the image is hurt. You follow? Now can I, can that hurt be wiped away and never to be hurt again, not resist but to have no capacity of being hurt? Have you gone into all this? Or is it just? Are we talking Chinese?

So I want to find out how to observe without an image, without the word, without the picture, without the symbol, without remembrance. You know all that is implied - it implies great attention, doesn't it? So I learn to look at myself non-verbally. It's the word, the image that divides the observer from the observed - when the image, the word, the symbol, the remembrance is not, then the observer is the observed. Then there takes place a tremendous transformation, because in that there is no duality, there is no conflict, when there is no conflict then you have all the energy to go beyond 'what is'. You understand? Right?

I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it? Do you want to ask any questions? Right.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 13TH APRIL 1975

If we may we will continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning. We were saying how important it is, considering what the world is like, that there should be a radical psychological revolution. Not the revolution of bomb, tyranny and the ideologies but a revolution that can bring about a totally different kind of society because we in ourselves are totally different. We were talking about too yesterday the whole problem of knowledge. What place it has and where it is irrelevant.

This morning, if I may, I would like to go into the question of conflict, ideologies, fear and pleasure. The word 'idea' comes from the Greek which means to see. Idea means to see, to observe; not what we have made of it, we have translated it as an ideal, a concept, a conclusion, a matter of intellectual perception. Idea being what it is, which is to observe, to see, we have abstracted from that observation, a conclusion, which becomes the ideal. Perception, seeing and drawing from that seeing a conclusion, an idea, an ideal, and something projected in the future. And so there is conflict between 'what should be' and 'what is'. And we are conditioned through education, through social structure, religious sanctions and all the rest of it that ideals are necessary: not the observation of 'what is', but the importance and the cultivation of ideals. The communist ideal, the religious ideals, capitalists ideals and so on and so on. All derived from that word 'idea', which is to see. And we spend our energy in this conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. This is the constant battle in our life, which is utter waste of energy.

And the problem arises: is it possible to transform 'what is' without the ideal? Which means to transform 'what is' without conflict which ideal brings about.

Please, as we said yesterday morning, this is not an intellectual entertainment, this is not something that you casually attend, absorb a few ideas or words, some conclusions, and go away. On the contrary, we are here to find out for ourselves whether it is possible to live in this world without conflict, in harmony, not as an ideal, not as a concept, but in our daily life and thus bring about a radical psychological revolution and so bring about a different society. That is the problem: whether it is possible to live a life without any conflict. And that involves understanding the conditioning of the mind which has accepted ideals as a means of transforming 'what is'. I hope we are sharing all this together. We are taking a journey together and the speaker is not indulging in some kind of intellectual or emotional entertainment for himself, or for you. You are here for a serious purpose, because life demands that we be serious and it is only the earnest people, really earnest people of sound mind that can enjoy life. So if you are serious - and you must be I hope because you have come from some distance, the climate isn't too good this morning, it isn't as beautiful as yesterday - we will go into this question: why man with all his immense knowledge about everything, lives in constant battle within himself and with society. One of the factors of this conflict is ideals. We think ideals are necessary as a lever to bring about a change in what we perceive now. I perceive, as we said yesterday, in oneself, envy, greed, anger, violence, anxiety, and great sorrow. Can one meet that, look at it, observe it without the ideal? Which

means when there is an ideal there is a time element involved in it. Isn't there? I am what I am, I am jealous, angry, or whatever it is, and to become that which is not, which is an ideal, takes time. A direction set by my perception of 'what is', and projecting what it should not be. We are following each other, I hope. So there is a time gap, a lag between what is actual, a reality and what should be, which is in the future, towards which the mind is progressing slowly and that involves not only direction but will and effort. And we are conditioned to this, whether you are a communist, or a socialist, or a capitalist, or belonging to any sect, religion, or your own inward perception, it is based on this, on this everlasting conflict. And one sees that it is utterly wasteful of energy. So one must find out if there is a way of living in which conflict doesn't exist. Because conflict is the very essence of violence. And you may say, violence is necessary, nature is violent, and we are part of that nature therefore it is right that we should be violent. That is one of the theories. And so it gives you an opportunity to vent, to express your own personal violence. And the more cultured, intelligent one is, the urge to violence must disappear totally.

So we are going to go into that question of conflict, violence and whether it is possible to live a life in which there is no conflict whatsoever, not only at the conscious level, but also at the deeper layers of the mind. Is this clear? Can we go on from there? This is our problem - not mine, but your problem. That is what we are facing in the world, where there are constant wars, constant brutality, the conflict between man and man, man and woman and all the rest of it, whether it is possible to live without any shadow of conflict. Probably you have not asked this question at all. If you



have asked, you say, it is not possible, living in this rotten society one must be violent, otherwise we will be destroyed. But if one is serious, one has to answer this question for oneself.

Why does conflict exist at all? What is conflict? This battle that is going on inwardly and so outwardly. Why should man live like this? Is it because we are not satisfied with 'what is', what actually is? We are going to go into this. And therefore we want to change 'what is' into what we think 'should be'. Right? I am dissatisfied with myself and I project an ideal of what I should be. So where there is a division between 'what is' and 'what should be ' there must be conflict. Right? Like the nations who have separated themselves into nationalities, the Arab and the Jew, and the American and the Russian, the German and the Italian, and all that, this division of nationalities must inevitably create conflict. That is a law: where there is division inwardly or outwardly there must be conflict. And is it possible to transform 'what is', what actually is, without the ideal? What is, is reality: what should be is not real. Right? Now, there is a difference between reality and truth. May I go on? Are you interested in all this?

Reality comes from the word, the Latin word which we needn't bother about - reality is that which thought thinks about. And truth is something that thought cannot think about. It is very interesting if you go into this. I think about the ideal which I have projected and that becomes a reality, but it is not the truth. The truth is actually what is - though it is the product of thought - perceiving that as it is, is the truth. I wonder if I am making myself clear? Right, sirs? Now therefore I have to go into the question, which you are going along with me, I have to go into the question, what is

thinking. Because thought has created 'what is' and 'what should be'. And to transform 'what is' completely I must understand the whole structure and nature of thinking. Because it is thought that has projected the ideal, it is thought that has created the culture, the civilization, the religions, it is thought that has brought about this duality in myself, and in society, the 'me' and the 'not me', 'we' and 'they'. Right? So all religion, whether Hindu or Christian, or whatever it is, all religions are fundamentally based on thought. So if I would understand how to live a life without conflict I must also go into the question very deeply, what is thinking.

Please don't memorize what the speaker is saying, because we said if you act from memory all the time that is a factor of degeneracy. And we are degenerating mentally, psychologically, morally. The word 'degeneracy' means inferior to that which is excellent - not the excellence set by thought as a pattern.

So I must, to understand myself, to transform my misery, confusion, conflict, and the whole network of beliefs that the mind has cultivated as a means of being secure, I must investigate, examine what thinking, thought is. I must have the capacity to observe thinking. Right? I hope you are doing that too. What is thinking? Now I ask that question: what is thinking - what happens to you when you are challenged with that question? Watch it carefully and you will see it for yourself. I have asked a question: what is thinking. And thought is investigating, looking into the memory, knowledge, books that you have read, stored up, and try to find an answer according to that memory, according to that knowledge. Right? So the question is asked, there is an interval of time to investigate in memory and then the answer. The gap

between the question and the answer is the process of thinking. Right? Please observe this in yourself, it is so simple. But if I ask a question with which you are totally familiar there is no time gap at all. What is your name - immediate answer, because you are familiar. But if you are asked a very complicated question, the interval between the question and the answer is longer. During that gap thought is looking, examining, questioning, asking; if it can find an answer it says, 'Yes, this is it' - or if it cannot it says, 'I don't know'. Right? That is, thought is the response of memory. Thought is the response of memory accumulated through experience as knowledge. Right? And therefore thought is a material process, a process of accumulated knowledge, experience, sensory movement. Right, sir?

So thought is a material process and thought has built the structure as the 'me', both physical as well as psychological, as well as spiritual, it is still the movement of thought. So thought has brought about this fragmentation as the fact of 'what is' and 'what should be'. Right? And so thought being in itself fragmentary, breaks up all my actions into fragments: I am a businessman, I am a religious man, I am a phoney man, I am a hypocrite, I am an artist, a politician and so on. Thought by its very nature is fragmentary, and it has created a fragmentary society. Right? Can we go on from there? You are not agreeing with me please, or accepting. We are just examining what is going on around us and in us, not according to the speaker or according to anybody else. And thought, being fragmentary, has created fear. So I have to go not only into the question of whether I can live without conflict, whether human beings can live without conflict, but in the process

of observing one sees thought has also created the ideals and thought also has created fear. And in looking at fear, what is the root of fear? This is an immense problem. You understand? It isn't just a casual, intellectual investigation. But as long as one lives in fear, as most of us do, one lives in shadow, in darkness, in restriction, in a state of, you know what fear is, don't you - not only the fear of another, fear of something that you have done and should not have done, fear of public opinion, fear of darkness, fear of the things which you have created which have become neurotic, if you are conscious of it, fear of having no security at all, psychologically, fear of not being loved, fear of great loneliness, isolation, fear of having repeated physical or psychological pain, fear of receiving shocks and hurts, and ultimately the fear of death.

So we know all this, if you are at all aware, if you are at all enquiring, observing, looking, but if you want to escape from all this the world gives you a lot of entertainment, both religious and non-religious. So is it possible to live without conflict? Is it possible to live without fear? Not only at the conscious level, superficial fears, but deep hidden fears? May I go on with all this?

I wonder why man, man including woman - please, when I use the word 'man' don't sit up and say, 'What about the woman?' Don't become suddenly 'lib', or whatever it is in this country, include the whole human race - why man has never been able to resolve this question of fear and conflict. This goes from the ancient of days, the battle between what is right and what is wrong, between the ugly and the beautiful, between honesty and dishonesty, between pride and humility, you know this battle that goes on within us. And this battle is expressed outwardly - violence, and all the rest of

it. That is one question. And also why man has lived with this fear. We will talk about death and all that next Saturday or Sunday, and meditation too. But we are now talking over together this question of fear. Why? And is it possible to completely be free of fear? I mean completely, absolutely, not partially. We are going to find out together, it is your problem. It is your life, therefore you have to look at it, go into it, not just sit outside it and consider it.

You know first of all there is physical fear of pain. Physical deterioration through pain, through some kind of damage, disease, and you are cured - if you are lucky - and you want that pain not to occur again tomorrow. Please follow this a little bit. You have had pain last week. It is registered in the mind, in the brain. There is remembrance of that pain. And one says, 'I don't want that pain again tomorrow'. And there is fear that it might come, and the fear is caused. You follow this? There is the registering in the brain of the past pain, the memory, the remembrance of it, and thought which picks up that pain and says, 'I mustn't have it again tomorrow'. That is, put it the other way: you have been hurt psychologically, as most people are, through education when they are very young, in the family, they are hurt, in school they are hurt. The hurt takes form in different ways; comparison, you are not as good as somebody else, you don't get as many marks as the other fellow does, you are not as clever as your brother. All these are forms of that hurt mind, the sense of being. So there is the psychological hurt and the physical hurt, which are recorded and kept in memory as memory. Right? The recording must take place, but need it continue? You understand my question? I will show you. You have said something to me which has hurt me, I can't

help hearing it, I can't help feeling it, but why should it continue tomorrow? You understand my question? What gives it a continuity? Thought obviously. Right? So is it possible psychologically not to be hurt at all? Which means to hear what you have to say, the ugly word or the brutal word, or the brutal gesture, to listen attentively to what you are saying, and when there is that total attention to that cruel intention, then is there a hurt? You are following all this? It is your life sirs, come with me. I have had pain, physical pain yesterday, and yesterday is over, why should I fear that pain recurring tomorrow? Because thought is in operation, the remembrance of things past and the fear of the future. So it is imperative that I understand the structure and the nature of the whole process of thinking. So as long as thought is in operation as a reaction to memory, there must be fear. Right? Do understand. So I have got a problem, which is: what am I to do with the whole movement of thought? Thought which has created the ideal and the division between 'what is' and 'what should be', and thought creates this conflict, through creates this sense of being hurt. I have created an image about myself from childhood and you say something to me, and that image is hurt, and that image is me. Which means again though. And thought has created this fear of having no security, psychologically, which is much more important than having physical security, because we want to be psychologically secure, therefore we identify ourselves with a nation, with a group, with a guru, with an idea, with ideals, and all the rest of it, and that creates fear. And what am I to do with thought? Right, sirs? The thought which is endlessly chattering.

So not being able to perceive or understand the movement of

thought, I hope for some divine intervention to cleanse me of all this! So I invent a god. So I invent an outside agency that will help me out of this mess. And the outside agency, people are too willing to give you that security, the gurus, the systems, you know all that blah that goes on. So what am I to do with thought? Can I do anything with thought? Please listen to all this. You know how to listen? Not to the words, not to the idea and then make an abstraction of that, but just listen without any movement of either wanting or not, you know, just listen.

And also I must understand this question of pleasure, because that is part of our thinking. So I have got these many problems, conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', the ideal, fear, conscious as well as unconscious fears, and the incessant unconscious or conscious pursuit of deep abiding demand for pleasure. Right? So I have to find out why my thought pursues pleasure. Not that we must be against pleasure, or deny pleasure, that is what they have done, the monks, the priests and all that, but we have to understand it, go into it. Lord, there is so much to talk about, isn't there. Too bad!

What is pleasure? Why do we give such extraordinary importance to it? Pleasure in so many ways, sexually primarily, pleasure of possession, pleasure out of power, having power, power over others politically, religiously, dominating people which gives extraordinary pleasure - why? So I have to go into the question of what is pleasure. And is pleasure love? And can there be love when there is the pursuit of pleasure? Can there be love when there is ambition, when there is attachment, when there is possession, possessiveness, which are all forms of pleasure? Can

there be love of a man who is pursuing power, position, prestige, success, which are all forms of pleasure?

So pleasure, an experience of something that you have had yesterday, either sensual, sexual, and the sight of a beautiful sunset, the morning star, the beauty of it - and there is great delight in that beauty. Then that is registered and thought comes along and says, 'I must have more of it'. Haven't you noticed all this? I must have more of that pleasure which I had yesterday, sexually, the repetition and all the rest of it. So wherever there is a continuity of an experience of thought, an experience which has been pleasurable, and thought gives it a continuity, that is pleasure, giving a continuity. Right sirs? Do you understand what I am talking about? Am I explaining myself? Somebody say, yes, or no, please.

Audience: Yes.

K: So, is love a remembrance, a memory, a picture, a pleasure? Or love has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure? Therefore love has nothing whatsoever to do with thought. And if it has nothing to do with thought, then what is the action of love? You are following all this? So I must understand, the mind must understand the whole movement of thought, as conflict, as fear, as pleasure. Not how to stop thought. That's a game you can play endlessly. If you want to stop thought, who is the entity that is going to stop it? It is still part of thought. Right? You can divide it as a higher consciousness, a superior self, higher self, and all that business, but it is still the movement of thought. So please listen to this. So the thinker is the thought. Right? The experiencer is the experience. If you have an experience of any kind you must be able



to recognize it, otherwise it is not an experience. Right?

Recognition implies that you have already had it, otherwise you can't recognize it.

So can the mind do, act with regard to thought? And what is the mind? Is this all right? Is it getting too much in one talk? So what is the mind? Somebody says it is the intellect, the capacity to think, the capacity to observe, the capacity to have an insight, the capacity to act skilfully, the capacity to observe, rationalize, conclude, act. So the mind is the whole thing. Right? Not merely the intellectual perception and action and conclusion; not merely a gathering of information, storing, and responding, acting skilfully. Mind is the total thing. That is the brain, the feeling, the affection, everything is the mind. Now can that mind, which has - no, let me put it this way: the brain has evolved through centuries, it is conditioned, it is like an electronic brain, and that mind is the storehouse - that brain is the storehouse of memory, and from that memory we are always acting. And as long as we are acting from that memory there must be degeneracy, because we then become like machines repeating, repeating, repeating. So what is to be done with this enormous problem of thought? Can one do anything at all? And if there is an entity who can do, who is that entity? You are following this?

So then the problem arises from that: what is action, and non-action? Action as we know it, is either according to a principle, according to an archetypal ideal, or according to a conclusion, or according to an experience as knowledge. Right? Which is all within the area of memory, within the area of knowledge. So as long as we are acting within the area of knowledge, within the area

of conclusions, the mind must deteriorate and therefore excellency, that is, the highest form of excellency, is a state in which there is no degeneracy. Right? And to find that action, which is not based on memory, the repetition, can the mind do anything? Or it can do absolutely nothing? You follow?

Now let's go back and look at it. Can I, can the mind observe without any reaction, just look at your greed. I am taking that as an example. Just look without any action, which means without any movement of thought. Because thought has created greed. Right? And if thought says, 'I must not be greedy', it is still the movement of thought, or suppress it, it is still the movement of thought, or sublimate it, it is still the movement of thought. So can there be an observation without the movement of thought, which means without an idea, merely observe, which is non-action, and therefore complete action? I wonder if you get this? Right sir? No, you haven't got it.

Look sir: human beings are violent. To look at violence without the idea of non-violence, because the non-violence is fiction, it is unreal. What is real is violence. Real in the sense that which you can think about, as we explained earlier. That which you can think about is the real, and you can think about violence: try to suppress it, try to rationalize it, try to say, 'Well, it is necessary to live with violence in this world' and so on. Now can you look at violence without any movement of thought which has created the opposite, which is non-violence? Just to look, and not make an abstraction of what you see. Then will that violence exist? Don't agree, don't say, yes or no, do it and you will find out. When there is violence and the ideal of non-violence there is conflict. And conflict is the very

essence of that violence. So can the mind observe, knowing all the structure of violence, can it observe without a movement of thought? The movement of thought is the observer. Right? Who says, 'I mustn't be violent', or 'I'll rationalize this' and so on and so on. Can you observe violence without the observer, who is put together by thought? Right? Then when you do, then is there that which is called violence? Because then you have all the energy which has been wasted on suppression, control, conflict between the ideal and the fact. All that wastage of energy has gone and you have got tremendous energy to go beyond 'what is'. You have understood?

So the problem then is: what is action which is not always based on memory? You are following all this? Because action based on memory must inevitably lead to degeneracy. That is our problem. Because human mind is degenerating, and one of the factors of that degeneration is conflict, is fear, is this everlasting pursuit of pleasure. All based on the movement of thought which is a material process. Have you got it? Is there an action which is not degenerated? Is there an action which is perception and action? Not perceiving and then ideal, action. You follow? Actually perceiving-acting, without the interval of time.

Look sir: let me put it the other way, if you are not bored. To me this is of tremendous interest so I can go on talking to myself. I can do that in my room anyhow. Life is relationship, without relationship there is no life, living. And in one's relationship there is a great deal of accumulated memory in that relationship, between two people, the hurts, the nagging, the pleasures, the annoyances, the dominations and so on. You know what happens

in a relationship. All that is stored up in memory as an image. You have an image about her, and she has an image about you. And these two images say, 'We are related, we love each other'. See what is happening: love is reduced to the images that you have about each other. And those images are memories. And so you call love a remembrance of things past. That is a fact. That happens in daily life. Now can you live without these images? And then only is there love between - is there love, not between. And in that relationship, in which there is no image, there is an action from moment to moment, which is always fresh. Have you understood? I'll go into it. You are related to somebody, intimately, your wife, or your girl, or your boy, or whatever it is. And living together for a day, or for fifteen years, or thirty years, you have created, put together an image about her or him. That is a fact. You can see it in your own life. And from that memory, accumulated memory of various incidents, insults, annoyances, impatience, anger, pleasure, domination, all that, that has become a memory, an image, and that image is always responding. Right? That memory is always responding in that relationship. Now can you live without building an image at all? Then only there is relationship. Right? Now can you do it, never to create an image, whatever happens? Don't say, yes, or no, please don't say, you are going to find out. Then if you say, 'No, it is not possible', then there is no problem, you go on in your own way. But if you want to find out, which is how to live differently, you must ask this question, whether you can live without a single image. Do you want to find out? I'll show it to you - not show it - I will point it out to you and go together. I am not your guru, thank god! Nor your teacher, nor your explainer -

nothing.

So you have to find out what is attention and what is inattention. You understand? I am related to you, intimately, family, and I have an image about you. Why has that image come into being at all? And does the image come into being when there is attention? So I must find out what is attention. What is attention? Is attention concentration? And what is concentration? When you concentrate you exclude. Right? You are putting your whole being on a certain point when you concentrate, and therefore you build a resistance round yourself, and in that resistance there is conflict, not wanting and wanting. Do sit down. Sorry! You see this is it: if I was concentrating I wouldn't have observed the girl walking. So I must find out what is attention. And if there is attention will there be no image? Because relationship is the highest importance in life. If I have right relationship with you, I have right relationship with everything, with nature, with my neighbour, with everything in life I have right relationship. And because I have not right relationship with you everything goes wrong. So I must find out, when there is attention will there be an image? Or when there is no attention, only then there is an image? You understand my question? You say something cruel to me because you are my wife, or husband or whatever it is. And because I am not paying attention it is registered. But if I pay attention completely, at that moment of insult, do I register at all? You understand what I am saying? Find out. Go into it and do it. That is, when there is attention there is no centre. When you concentrate there is a centre. When you are completely attending there is no me, the image, nothing. When, say for instance, you are listening now with complete attention, if you

are, what takes place? There is neither agreeing, nor disagreeing, there is such care, such affection, such love, so you are completely listening. In the same way when in relationship there is a word, a gesture, a look that hurts, when at that moment there is complete attention there is no image, nothing to register, go beyond it. That is enough.

## **OJAI DIALOGUE ON EDUCATION 16TH APRIL 1975**

I believe we are going to talk over together this morning the question of education, because you are going to have a school here and I am sure serious people are interested in this question so we thought we would have a meeting on education - if that's all right with you. This is not a talk by me but we are going to have a dialogue about it rather than have a discussion. The word 'discussion' means, I think, argument, through argument to find what is right opinion. Whereas a dialogue is a conversation between two friends about something they are both interested in seriously. So this is a dialogue rather than a verbal, intellectual, argumentative exchange.

I wonder why we are educated at all, if we are, why we go to schools, colleges and universities, what does it mean to be educated. Why should one be educated? Is it to conform to the pattern of existing society, acquiring enough knowledge to act skilfully in that society to have a livelihood? Does it mean, to be educated, does it mean adjusting oneself to society and follow all the dictates of that society? This has become a very serious problem right throughout the world I am quite sure. The ancients, both in Egypt and in India, and China of course, thought of education not in terms of society, nor in terms of merely conforming to the edicts of society but were concerned with the culture of the mind. That is, with the culture of a mind that is capable of intelligent action in society, not merely conform to the pattern of society but, leaving the ancients aside, when one looks

round at the world with all the awful mess that is going on, the butchery in China, the threatening wars, the tyranny, the lack of freedom and all the rest of it, and in every country there are highly educated people, highly technological entities, skilled in their action, and what has education brought about? What has education in the orthodox sense of that word made man into? So that is the thing we ought to discuss - we ought to have a dialogue about rather than discuss.

Is it merely to cultivate one segment of the mind, which is one part of the brain, as memory acquiring knowledge and therefore using that knowledge skilfully? That is what most of us are educated for, we are conditioned for that. The rest of the psychological or the wider entity of man is totally disregarded. And is it possible to educate - we use the word 'educate' in quotation marks - is it possible to educate the whole of man, including his brain, intellectually, that is, the capacity to think clearly, objectively, and act efficiently, non-personally and also to enter into a field which is generally called spiritual? Again that is rather a doubtful word. Is this possible to do in a school, college and university, that is, to educate the totality of man instead of cultivating memory, as we do, and depending on that memory to act skilfully in our labours? And that cultivation and the dependence of that memory is part of this degeneration of man because when man becomes merely mechanical, always acting in the field of the known, the known being the accumulated experiences, the great deal of words put in books, the collection of centuries of knowledge, and always acting within that field as the known, is that not a degenerating factor in our human life? Please,



this is a dialogue. Because when you are acting in the field of the known all the time, which is in the field of knowledge, knowledge becomes traditional and you are then acting according to a past pattern set by various scientists, philosophers, psychologists, the theologians and their persuasive methods, then the brain must be very conditioned, it has not the flexibility. And so gradually, as it is happening in the world, degeneration in art, in literature, and in our relationship with each other must degenerate, must end up in war, in hatred, in antagonism, and that is what is going on actually, if you consider it impersonally, not as Americans and Europeans and the rest of it but actually as human beings confronted with these problems, what is happening, one can see the destructive nature of always operating with or in the field of knowledge. And our schools, colleges and universities condition our mind to that. And seeing that, seeing the fact of that, what can we do?

Questioner: Can you give some examples of degeneration in this culture?

K: I don't think examples are going to help, you can see it, sir. When you are corrupt politicians.

Q: But there has always been corruption.

K: You see, therefore is that an excuse?

Q: Degeneration implies things are getting worse and worse.

K: No. Degeneration implies, the meaning of that word, is not being at the highest point of excellence. Please, sir, just look at it, just consider that word, what it means. Not having the highest excellence in thought, in ourselves not in somebody else, not having that highest excellence in morality, in our relationship, all that points surely to degeneracy. Not that at other times and other

historical periods there has not been degeneracy, civilizations go down or are destroyed because they become degenerate. And we are asking, is our education all throughout the world giving us, helping us, bringing about that excellency in ourselves, in our morality, in our thinking, in our reactions, all the structure of human existence, that excellency? Yes, sir?

Q: Do you think you can teach anybody to attain that state if they don't want it?

K: Why don't you want it?

Q: If they do want it even? We come here year after year to hear the talks, we want it, we don't learn.

K: You want it. Then what do you do about it? We want a kind of education where the whole of man is concerned, the whole of man, not just the cultivation of a certain segment of man but the totality of man. There is no such education, no university, no school, no college offers that. And of course religions aren't concerned with that; they are concerned with dogma, with belief, with rituals and authority. So what shall we do?

Q: Could you give an example of actual immorality?

K: Oh, my lord! I can't. Do you think it is right to kill somebody for your country? Do you think it is right - oh, I don't have to give examples.

Q: Why not?

K: Because it is dangerous to give examples.

Q: Krishnamurti, you asked twice, what can we do. One thing we can do is to question within, we can question the authority of these teachers, we can question why we are doing what we are doing, we can question how we are conditioned by all of these

things; as he is saying, find out for ourselves through ourselves in relationship by asking questions. That's how we can do it.

K: Not only that, sir, if you had a son or a daughter and are deeply concerned, as you must be concerned, what will you do?

Q: In talking about education we need a structure for how to be free. I don't understand how that can be done with a method or a structure.

K: You want a method.

Q: I don't want a method, I want to understand how it can be done without one.

K: We are going to find out, sir. First look at the problem before we ask what to do. Look at the problem all round. I think if we can look into the problem without the question of what to do, then the problem itself will answer, we will find the way out of it. But without looking at the problem all round, be totally involved with the problem, totally committed to that problem - you have that problem, it isn't that you must be committed to it, it is your problem. If you are a parent it would be tremendous agony to find out what to do. And what to do can only come about if we understand the problem itself, the depth of the problem, the seriousness, the complexity of the problem. Without looking at that we say, give us a method. And the method is part of this deterioration.

Q: My children are growing, we haven't got time.

K: Yes, sir, children are growing but we have an hour here. We can during that hour or hour and a half go into this question, to see the depth of this question.

Q: I experience the problem as a dichotomy. You mentioned

that there is a place in this world for knowledge, that we need it to function, and at the same time I have experienced trying to accomplish that I have wanted to achieve some confluence with a questioning and a search about the higher purpose in life, it seems like there is a struggle. I experience a division; at the moment when I am pursuing or guiding students or trying to lead them towards searching themselves I find this dichotomy of needing to disseminate knowledge. To achieve the confluence of those two is what I am searching for. How does one do that?

K: The dichotomy that is a division between knowledge and freedom from knowledge. As we talked about it the other day, the word `art', the meaning of that word `art' means to put everything in life in its right place. Please understand the meaning of that word first, to put everything that is concerned with living in its right place. That is the meaning of that extraordinary, beautiful word art. Now to learn the place of knowledge and to learn the freedom from that, then there is no dichotomy, there is no division. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

Please, I would like to go back to education, this is part of it. Wait a minute. Doesn't education mean to learn? The word `school' means a place where you are learning. That's the meaning of that word `school'. Now here is a school and we are learning, I am learning and you are learning. We are trying to learn or trying to find out what is the depth of that word `education'. We are trying to find out whether man can be free totally and yet live with the knowledge which we have acquired, which doesn't condition us, which doesn't shape our minds and our hearts. Yes sir?

Q: If all people die what is the good of an education outside of

oneself. Is not a real education only known from within oneself?

K: Are you saying, sir, you must have knowledge about yourself and not merely the knowledge outwardly? Is that what you are saying?

Q: What good is knowledge about temporal things, temporary things, the outside, if it is not going to carry you through after you are dead.

Q: A person might say, what is the reason for this life - is it just to live to die.

K: How does external knowledge, technical knowledge, help to bring about an understanding of ourselves, is that it?

Q: Well, in other words, are we only mortal beings and are we living on the earth only as mortal beings? Or can a person know other than that?

K: I don't quite follow.

Q: I think what you are saying is, what good is knowledge if we are going to die.

K: What good is knowledge, I understand.

Q: No, no, it is to say if there is a knowledge other than the human knowledge, other than just being concerned with mortal human beings, are we other than mortal human beings?

Q: Is there knowledge beyond this temporal world, is there knowledge that will perhaps be of another life - is there just this temporal knowledge or is there other knowledge?

K: I see. Sir, to have knowledge other than temporal knowledge you must understand the right place of temporal knowledge first, because that is what we have first. Then putting that knowledge in its right place we can then proceed to enquire if there is another

knowledge, if there is a knowledge that is far superior, or there is no knowledge at all except temporal knowledge. Please, when we talk on Saturday we are going to talk about death, suffering and all that, then you can bring up this question, what is the point of having temporal knowledge if you are going to die pretty quickly.

So now let's, if you don't mind, confine ourselves to this question. As one observes in the world, wherever one goes, knowledge has become the factor of conditioning the mind to a certain pattern according to which you act. If I am a communist, that pattern of thinking, acting, brings about certain misery and so on and so on. This is happening right through the world and this is what we call education, whether it is the education under Mao or the education under the politburo or under the Catholic society, or other societies. Where there is the cultivation of a particular segment of human life disregarding the rest it must inevitably bring about human degeneration. That's obvious. If I am cultivating my left arm all the time it becomes too silly. So we are asking, is it possible to educate human beings, children, from childhood and keep on, to cultivate, to nurture the whole outward and inward totality of man? That is what is, for me, right education. Yes, madam?

Q: I wonder if you feel perhaps that establishing any school you would be limiting yourself, you would be setting up one system and therefore limiting the totality of the school.

K: Are you saying we mustn't have schools?

Q: I am saying I wonder if it is possible to have...

K: We are going to find out. Please we must stick to one thing and go into it otherwise we disperse and waste our whole morning.

We are asking a very simple question. Look at it, please, before you answer it. Is it possible in our life to educate ourselves completely, totally, both inwardly as well as outwardly? Yes, sir?

Q: It seems to me that it might have to be done on a kind of research basis because you are saying we have to break out of the limitation to confine these things about education and do new things like create peace in the world and ourselves, and how can we create love in the world within ourselves, it seems we have to set up research programmes to do that.

K: Sir, let us put it this way: you have a son and a daughter, some of you, must have, I hope you have, some of you, what are you going to do with those children, how are you going to educate them? What's your responsibility? Have you any responsibility? If you have responsibility, which means care, attention, love, what are you going to do with those children? Oh, gosh, you don't face all these problems.

Q: Sir, we're talking about schools and education; it seems to me that any school whether it be a Krishnamurti school or any school no matter how ideologically instituted, it becomes an authority and conditions.

K: Yes, we are going to go into that question of authority and include it, but you are not...

Q: Sir, I have a daughter and one thing I have noticed is that I am conditioned, and I am conditioning her through my conditioning, I have to be aware of mine. I see that. It seems to me I have to help her understand the rest of conditioning, of the whole society around her in which she is growing up.

K: Are we saying, sir, in a school, both the educator and the

educated are conditioned.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, wait, take it. I have been at this game for fifty years, sir! I have helped to form several schools in India, and this has been one of the major problems, how to deal with the parent who is conditioned, the child, the children also conditioned because they live with the parents, with the society, with their group, and the teacher is also conditioned. Conditioned in the sense they are prejudiced, they are violent, they are nationalistic, class conscious, the rich and the poor, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian - conditioned. Now how to deal with this problem, both at home, and in the schools. That is a question we are discussing now. You are a teacher, I am the student, I am the child; you realize you are conditioned, you are aware you are conditioned, and I, the student, am not aware of it because I am still too young. I am being conditioned by the TV, by the magazines, and so on and so on, by my friends, now how will you deal with this? First look at it, how will you deal with this problem? You are conditioned and the student is conditioned, your child is conditioned and the teacher is conditioned, the educator. Now in the school - we have tried this, that's why I am talking about it - in the school the teacher and the student are both conditioned, for the teacher to wait until he is unconditioned you might just as well wait until the rest of his life. So the question is then: can he and the student in their relationship in a school uncondition themselves? You follow the problem? That is, in teaching or before giving certain facts about mathematics and so on, discuss this problem, talk it over with the student: look, I am conditioned, and you are conditioned, and explain all the



complexities of conditioning, the result of that conditioning, show him the picture, the real picture not your fanciful picture, imaginative picture, but the actual picture of a human being's conditioning, as a Jew, as a Muslim, as a this or that, they are at each other's head. I would discuss this problem and have a dialogue, go into it with the student, every day, as part of the school work. Then the teacher begins to uncondition himself and the student at the same time.

Q: But there is no method?

K: Of course, how can there be a method? The method is our conditioning.

Q: How can you do that with a very young child?

K: You follow, sir? Therefore it becomes very alive, intelligent, active, creative.

Q: At the moment it's happening.

K: So the teacher and the student have to establish a relationship. That means a relationship not of one who knows and the other who doesn't know, he sits on a platform - I am sorry, here there is no platform! So the establishment of right relationship between the teacher and the student is imperative. And the teacher has the responsibility, he is dedicated to this. The parent is not because he has got to go to the office - you follow - he hasn't time, the wife hasn't time either, the mother. So the teacher, the educator becomes tremendously important; he is the highest profession in society, it is not the lowest, as it is now. Wait, you and I see this, now what are we going to do about it? You follow, sir, follow it up.

Q: You just now said something a second ago, when you said

the mother and father have no time because they have to work all day, go to the office, and that's a big problem, and I don't want to skip over it because that's what a lot of people think about who have children and there aren't all these educators around and we do have to work and take care of the children at the same time, so we end up sending them to schools. And that's a big problem.

K: I know, madam, that's the problem. So we are trying to find out how to deal with all these problems, whether the school should be a residential school and not isolated. You follow? It is not just you and I in an hour can settle the whole problem, you can't. But if you are interested, if I am, we can together create this thing.

Q: I have found an answer for myself because I believe that I am responsible for my children. I have taken them every three to four years to a different environment, to a different culture, and I have experienced that culture with them and so I am released. To experience for myself with them, but I have found I have had to do a lot travelling!

K: That means you are a fairly well-to-do man.

Q: No, because I am willing to live on a little.

K: That little must be considerable to travel. Sir, that doesn't solve it, you are missing the point. By showing him different cultures, different societies, different, you know, ways of thinking, does that solve the problem?

Q: No. But the problem is solved by the experience of seeing and being involved with the situation then coming back for the inward education. Addressing myself to the question that you asked about the possibility in our life to educate ourselves inwardly and outwardly, the outward I find in the travelling, in the cultures,

in the different religions or beliefs and ways of living.

K: I understand that, sir.

Q: And then the inward is how we are able to relate to it between ourselves, or for ourselves individually.

K: I understand that, sir, but this is a much wider and deeper problem because we may not be able to travel. We may be living in a village, in a town, confined and we have not too much money. You follow, sir, it is not just a casual problem that one human being has solved, it's a collective problem, it's a problem for each one of us, how to deal with this problem. We say we are responsible for our children. I question that responsibility.

Q: In instructing the children we are learning ourselves with them.

K: Madam, you say you are responsible, are you? What does responsibility mean?

Q: You are responsible only when you love, that's the only responsibility.

K: What does the word 'responsibility' mean? Please, go slowly into this.

Q: The ability to respond directly to what is happening.

K: That is, adequately. That means if you don't respond adequately there is conflict. Responsibility means to respond totally to the problem of the child and the parent. Now just take, sir, if you feel utterly, totally responsible for the child and therefore love the child, you want to educate him not to be killed or kill, but you don't. So don't let's go into all that because that's a tremendous problem.

So the question is this, sir: if you want to educate a child, for

what reason do you want the child to be educated? Why are you all educated, what for? You have been to schools, universities, colleges, if you are lucky, what for?

Q: To be free of conditioning.

K: You are further conditioned, aren't you? I mean in all the colleges and all the universities and all the schools that exist now you are conditioned.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Go slowly, sir, take it step by step, you will see it. So education must have a different meaning, mustn't it. And that means education implies cultivating the totality of man, the outward intellectual, emotional, sensitive, and also the cultivation of a mind that is capable of seeing something real, true, reality. You follow, all that is implied. And we are saying no school, no college, university is doing that. They are doing it as a master's degree in something, but they are not concerned and they are not concerned because it would lead to tremendous danger.

Q: You spoke of educating a man totally, is it possible in education man totally externally, of learning of everything without, to automatically learn of everything within, or to learn of everything within to automatically have a knowledge of everything without?

K: You know this is a battle that has been going on between the commissar and the yogi. The commissar says: pay attention to everything external, arrange everything properly outwardly, control, subjugate it, tyranny, all that, arrange everything first outwardly and then if you have time think about the inner. And the yogi, that word `yoga', I won't go into the meaning of that word for

the time being - the yogi says: don't bother with the outer, begin with the inner. And he disappears into the woods and so on and so on, or joins a community and so on. So this battle has been going on throughout the ages. And we are saying it is neither that nor this, it is the totality. You understand? It is the whole, don't break up the whole as the outer and the inner.

Q: There seems to be a self-righteous platform, a mental platform and a subject.

K: I didn't quite follow that.

Q: If you are going to build a school and you say, all the universities in the United States they are not teaching right and I'm going to teach right.

K: Oh, no, no, I don't say that, sir. For the love of Pete, I am not saying that.

Q: What you are saying is that through the admission that you don't know something we begin to learn about it. If a teacher says I really don't know how to deal with this problem...

K: Sir, look, to learn physics, about physics, I must go to a man, a scientist who knows about physics, I must go to a man who knows mathematics, to learn mathematics, there I have to learn a certain - and all the rest of it. And I learn, which becomes my knowledge. Now is there anyone - please listen to this carefully - anyone who can teach you about inner knowledge? Or there there is no authority and only then you will learn about yourself. You understand? There must be the authority of knowledge as a scientist. Right? He teaches you what he knows and therefore he becomes the authority, like a doctor, if he isn't after money, like a good doctor, he tells you what to do if you are unhealthy because

he has studied medicine, practised, you know, all the rest of it, he has spent years and years and years, and he has accumulated knowledge and he becomes the authority and you, if he is a good doctor, you talk it over and he tells you what to do, and you follow it. Now is there - please listen - is there any authority for inward understanding of yourself? And if you have an authority for that then you are merely following the authority, not the understanding of yourself. This is simple enough. Therefore I say, authority has its place as knowledge, but there is no spiritual authority under any circumstances - the gurus, the priests, the churches, the temples, the whole thing is based on authority. And that is one of the factors of degeneration of the mind. We carry the outward authority - you understand, sir? - about mathematics to inward authority.

Q: To start with you had better learn not how to be free, but the importance of it from someone who is already free.

K: All right, sir, just a minute, go into it. You are free, suppose, I don't say you are, suppose you are free, and I want to learn from you that freedom.

Q: I can't give it to you.

K: No, then what will I do?

Q: Together we can talk about the importance of it.

K: We are doing it now.

Q: All right. But if I am free then it has meaning to discuss it, but if I am not free and you are not free how can both of us become free together?

K: By both realizing that we are not free. Of course, sir. And going into it, having a dialogue, discussing it, observing it in our relationship, in our action, everything, and find out.

Q: Wouldn't this require an extraordinary energy to maintain an honest enquiry and not to degenerate?

K: It does, sir. It does. You are saying, doesn't this require a great deal of energy, it does. So how will you get that energy? Do you want to find out how?

Q: Yes, how?

K: Now the moment you ask, how, you want a method and therefore you are back again into the degenerative process of thinking. But if there is no how, what will you do? You understand, this is a central issue sir, do please pay attention to this a little bit.

Q: How do we achieve then a moving relationship, I hear you saying that. There is no method there but we talked about relationship and this has to do with learning. How does one achieve the moving relationship in an educational setting?

K: First of all, sir, let's be clear. There is a method to learn mathematics. Right? If I want to learn mathematics there is a definite method. Right? That's simple enough. Now, can I learn about myself through a method? And who is going to give me the method? The guru, the psychologist, the analyst, the priest? And will method, following the method help me to understand myself? Or I must look at myself. I must be free to look at myself. That means I must be free of all authority to look at myself. Therefore I must be free of the guru, the priest, the psychologist, everybody and learn to look at myself. And that gives me tremendous energy because I have got rid of all the superficial, unnecessary and destructive barriers.

Q: Do you feel that if you really desired that enough you

wouldn't have to ask 'how'?

K: Sir, again why haven't you got it? You see if you had that intensity, sir, you would have it. Why haven't you got that? You are going off all the time.

Q: Sir, I don't understand in my life how a person doesn't have energy when all you have to do is to look around and go down a few miles and see all the trash homes and the traffic, turn on television, just looking at that and seeing everybody destroying the earth right in front of your eyes, how can anybody sit back and not do something. I don't know.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: If you want the knowledge of yourself then you must have some idea that that knowledge of yourself is attainable, therefore you need an experience of some kind to at least get you in that direction.

K: So you take drugs.

Q: OK, let's say you take drugs and you get that experience and then you look into yourself somehow.

K: No, sir. Why do you want to take drugs? You see you are off on to something else when we are talking about education.

Q: I am talking about education, how do you show a child that that experience is attainable?

K: Sir, what is happening in the world? The young people are taking drugs, and the old people are taking alcohol, whisky, tobacco, so the young people take to drugs, different kinds of drugs because they say, we want to have a different kind of experience. Right? That will help us to have an experience of reality, uncondition our minds and all the blah that goes with it. Right? Do



you know what is implied in the word 'experience'?

Q: To go through.

K: The word means to go through, but also it means something else too. To experience implies recognition, doesn't it. Do think it over together, sir: I experience something, how do I know what I experience? I can only know it because I recognize it. Recognition implies that I have already had it. Of course. Therefore when I experience through drugs I experience something which I have had which is my conditioning projected. Don't you know all these little things, for god's sake.

Q: What happens when you take a drug and it so disrupts your conditioning, it just disturbs the ego structure so much that you, as you have been and lead your life, are not anymore. You can see the world through a different set of eyes.

K: Sir, if you take drugs, marijuana or LSD or some other kind, there are so many of them, that it disrupts, breaks down for the time being your ego structure - that's what he is saying - and at that moment you see something totally different. And after a certain period that disappears and you take to drugs again.

Q: What if you incorporate this experience into your day to day consciousness and you no longer need to take the drugs.

K: Sir, that is, you are incorporating what you have experienced through drugs in your daily life. You are all so childish, sorry.

Q: Sir.

K: Wait, let me finish this, sir. So you incorporate, include something you have experienced which is dead, into your living daily life.

Q: What I mean to say is...

K: Yes, sir, that is simple. I experience through drugs, through mesmerism, through all kinds of ways, something which is free, that experience becomes a memory and I want to live according to that memory, or include that thing in my daily life. A dead thing with a living thing, how can you do it? This is what I have been saying, which is, we are functioning all the time within the field of the known and never free from that. And that is one of the factors of deep degeneracy, whether you like it or not that's a fact.

Q: Sir, didn't you say once that it took the strength of a genius to overcome circumstances of one's life?

K: I don't know if I said that, but it doesn't matter.

Q: Have you ever heard of alcoholics anonymous?

K: Oh, for the love - yes, sir, yes, sir, I have heard a lot of words.

Q: What if older people honoured the question of can we educate the total man.

K: I know, sir, that's what I am saying.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, madam, the gentleman is asking, which we have asked before, how can we educate the totality of man, in schools, in colleges, in universities, in the family, in our relationship intimately, how can this be done? Can we stick to that thing for the time please?

Q: I think the point is that one cannot be educated totally as a human being, perhaps the schools can teach mathematics or history or something, but that one must learn on one's own self-realization, I don't think one can be taught that.

Q: As I understood it, first the meeting was to have a dialogue

on right education, and then we decided that the way to go into that was to first look at the problem and then out of that we came up with one of the problems was conditioning of the teacher and the student and the parent. And another problem that seemed to arise in the dialogue was the one of authority of each of those. So that's where we are so far.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: Sir, that brings up a point that I would like to discuss, and that is, why do we separate our educational environment from the so-called real environment? In other words why do we have schools which are separate from what is happening in real life? If you understand the question.

K: Real life is part of the school, isn't it?

Q: But in most cases it is not, sir, in most cases you go and you hear somebody talk about something and they are not doing it, they are not really involved with it.

K: Of course, sir. Can we please, that gentleman asked and I am asking, and you have answered, which is, in this dialogue we have said authority, unconditioning ourselves and the student and a relationship not only between the parents and the children but between the teacher, the educator and the educated. Right, sir? Shall we stick to that for the time being and see what is involved in total education. That is, authority denies freedom, but the authority of a doctor, mathematic teacher and how he teaches, that doesn't destroy freedom. And there must be freedom to learn, that is the essence of learning, surely. Right, sir? Freedom. Now what does that mean? In a school or in a family where we are trying to learn the totality, the cultivation of the whole human being, what place

has freedom and authority? Please listen to this.

Q: So that's one of the problems in a right education to establish the correct...

K: To understand it, to understand the student as well as the educator, to understand what place has authority and what place has freedom. Can the two go together?

Q: That's the question.

K: We are investigating, we are having a dialogue about it. So what does freedom mean? Does it mean every student doing what he likes? Go into, sir. And every student wants that, because he has been conditioned to that: this permissive society, do what you want, individual expression and all that. So he comes with that conditioning and says, 'I am going to do what I want to do, if not I am going to be violent, do vandalism', you know all that follows.

Does freedom mean doing what you want to do? And can you do what you want to do? And what is it you want to do? Express your conditioning freely? Go into it, sir, go into it, you play with all this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, please listen to this first thing; Freedom is absolutely necessary, that is a human demand, historically it is so. And does freedom imply doing what you, as a human being, want to do? That's what you are doing now, isn't it, each one doing what he wants to do.

Q: Is there such a thing as beneficial conditioning?

K: No, all conditioning - you see conditioning is conditioning. You may call one conditioning beneficial and I might call that evil. So we are talking of conditioning, there is no good and being

better, there is only good - you know the French phrase, 'the better is the enemy of the good'. Right? Let's proceed from there. Let's see this, please stick to this. Does freedom imply each one doing what he wants to do? Go into it, sir, don't answer me, look at it in yourself. As a human being, does freedom mean doing what you want to do, does freedom mean to choose? And we say, freedom implies choice. Right? The capacity to be allowed to choose this, that or the other. Now choice implies confusion. I don't know therefore I choose; if I am clear there is no choice. Therefore being not clear I choose and therefore deny freedom. Come on, move sir!

So does freedom mean being attached to this, that or the other, which is choice - you understand, sir? I am a Hindu and I become a Catholic because I am free to choose!

Q: But if you are a Hindu and you stay a Hindu then you are conditioned to be one.

K: I don't want to be a Hindu, I am not a Hindu, or a Catholic. But I am just showing to you.

Q: I understand that. What I am saying that if you were to remain a Hindu then it would be because of your conditioning.

K: Of course.

Q: Just like it would be your conditioning to have the free choice to choose to be a Catholic.

K: I am saying sir, I am a Hindu, born a Hindu and I am free to choose and therefore I say, I won't be a Hindu, I will be a Catholic. And I think that is a freedom of choice. From one conditioning I go to another conditioning.

Q: Does freedom not involve seeing?

K: We are seeing now, madam, we are making the picture clear,

for goodness sake look at it. So does freedom mean doing what you like, does freedom mean choice, does freedom mean expressing, fulfilling yourself? Right? Doing what you want to do: I want to fulfil - what is 'you' to fulfil? You are the conditioned entity and you want to fulfil according to your conditioning. And that's not fulfillment, you are just repeating the pattern. So does all that mean freedom? Obviously not. Therefore can you as the educator, as a parent, be free of that, not just verbally?

Q: That's the problem.

K: Not a problem. If you see that, sir, you won't be.

Q: I see that for five years sir, I see that point but I can't sustain it.

K: Ah, sir, wait a minute, you can't sustain it. I'll show you, wait, go into it.

Q: In attention be aware of the inattention.

K: I'm going to show you something, sir, once you see this you will understand it very quickly. When you see a snake you react instantly. That reaction you don't have to sustain. Whenever you meet a snake you will react always in the same way - why?

Because your parents, your society, your books, said, snakes are dangerous. That's your conditioning. That conditioning says, that thing is dangerous, and therefore you react. And that conditioning is your sustaining factor. Right? You are following this, sir?

Q: Could you repeat it?

K: Oh, no. I have to repeat it? Sir, you asked a question, how to sustain what you have perceived. You have perceived a snake and you react, that reaction is your conditioning that is responding. That conditioning has been the result of past knowledge,

experience, parents have told you that is a dangerous thing to touch, a snake, your books have told you, so you are conditioned, and that conditioning is the sustaining factor which says, move, run away, leave it alone. Now is there a sustaining factor when you see all this is not freedom? You understand, sir? No? I see freedom is not choice. Right? Freedom is not to do what I want. Freedom is not fulfilling myself.

Q: Freedom is to...

K: Wait. Freedom is not authority. Right? See that. Not verbally, not intellectually but as truth, because I have an insight, I have an insight into the fact that where there is authority inwardly there is no freedom. Right? I see very clearly the truth that the demand for fulfillment is the fulfillment of my conditioning, and that's not freedom. Right, sir? I see the truth of it and seeing the truth of it is the sustaining factor. I don't have to any other factor. Got it?

Q: Didn't you repeat it just now?

K: Of course, if you are not paying attention, as you didn't just now, I have to repeat it ten times. If you pay attention you see it and it is finished, you don't say, 'I must pay attention to it again', you see the truth of it. When you see a bottle marked poison, finished, you see it, you don't take it.

So the total education of man implies for that education there must be complete freedom, not the freedom which you have called freedom. Right, sir? Therefore can you have that freedom in a school where the teacher, the educator, really has seen the truth of it and therefore helps the student to see it, in conversation, at table? You follow? Every moment he points it out, discusses it. And

therefore out of that freedom there is order. You understand, sir?

Q: We relate about encouraging discoveries.

K: We have done it just now.

Q: What do you mean by total education?

K: I have explained that, sir. Seeing, listening, learning about mathematics, learning what freedom is. Right, sir? So total education implies the art of learning, to put everything in its right place: knowledge in its right place. Right, sir? If I didn't know how to drive a car, I learn; I must know mathematics, it's part of the structure of life, mathematics means order, the highest form of mathematics is the highest order in life, not just learning some trigonometry and all the rest of it. And total education implies the learning about authority. And also learning, if there is something sacred in life, not invented by thought but really something holy in life. Not the things invented by priests and the statues and the beliefs, that's nothing sacred, it is the outcome of thought. So all that is the cultivation of the whole of the human being. Right, sir?

Q: Can we remember that this is not dependent upon a specific place?

K: No, I don't think so, sir. I mean to have a school in this beautiful place, it's marvellous, I am glad we have got it. We are going to have a school here, we are working for it, we have to have money and all the rest of it. It's a beautiful place, we will do it, but it can be in other places.

Q: By education do you mean right living in and out?

K: Of course, sir.

Q: Sir, I am not sure this is completely relevant but I really hope it is. I heard you once say that freeing the mind is a different



action. There are two different actions required, one if you are partially confused and one if you are completely confused. Two different actions.

K: Look, sir, there is no partial confusion and complete confusion.

Q: We discussed this in Switzerland. You talked about it.

K: Sorry, I don't know, perhaps we didn't quite hear properly what I said. Either one is confused or not confused, there is no partial confusion. It's like partial something or other.

Q: Where do the parents, Mr Krishnamurti, fit in with what we have talked about?

K: I'll show you. Parents. Sir, in a school that we want the parent is part of our school, the parent must be interested in what we are learning, what we are doing, otherwise he is not a parent responsible. It's like sending off a child and getting rid of it. We are saying the parent, the teacher, the student are all concerned with this. Is that enough for this morning? No?

Q: Isn't right or wrong a matter of social conditioning?

K: Right and wrong, is it not a matter of social conditioning. Of course it is. If you go to India, they think it is very bad to do certain things which you consider quite normal here. And that is their conditioning, and that is your conditioning. But the good is not conditioning. You understand, sir? What is good is not good here and bad over there; what is good is good everywhere. And that good, which means the goodness, the flowering of that goodness, the beauty of that, is not to be touched by thought. You understand, sir? Thought can't produce goodness. I think that's enough.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 19TH APRIL 1975

If I may I would like to remind you that this is not an entertainment. It is not something you attend on a lovely morning and forget all about it. It is rather a serious gathering as we are concerned with grave things. And we have been talking the last two times, or the third time that we met here about the necessity and the importance, and the immediacy of the transformation of the human mind. Considering what the world is becoming, degenerate, violent, cruel and somewhat neurotic, if one is serious one is concerned with this problem, whether the mind, which has evolved through time, so heavily conditioned, whether it is at all possible to transform it, not into something else but rather to uncondition that mind so that it is free, because it is in freedom alone that one can learn. And it is freedom that gives perception, that gives insight, that one begins to understand truth.

We have been talking about fear, whether the mind can ever be free of it, we went into that. And also we talked about pleasure and love. This morning, if one may, the speaker would like to talk about time, suffering, and this great question of death. It might be rather morbid on a lovely morning to talk about death, but it is not.

I think one has to understand the totality of all our problems, not try to solve one by one, because all problems are interrelated, there is no one problem separate, isolated from others. And in investigating, in understanding the problem of time, suffering, death, we must understand it as a whole, as a total movement, not something that you take one part of it and try to understand it, or try to find out the depth and the beauty of the thing, but rather take

the whole structure, the whole content, and try to find out how to observe the whole. There is no 'how' as we went into that question too. Because the moment you ask 'how', then you are again caught in methods, systems, in the whole movement of time, from here to there.

So we are going to, if one may, consider this whole problem as a unit, not something separate from each other. I do not know if you have ever gone into this question whether time has a stop. Can time ever end? Or is it something that is a continuous movement? Time by the sun is one thing; time psychologically is another. We are bound to the psychological time. We are slaves to that time. And perhaps we are also bound to the sun as yesterday, today and tomorrow. We are going to talk over both issues, both the time by the chronometer, and time as psychological movement. And I think it is very important to understand this question: whether time can ever come to an end. Or, must we be caught both psychologically as well as the time sequence as yesterday, today and tomorrow? Because in understanding the problem of time, one will also understand, go deeply into this question of suffering. And we will also, if we can, understand, not intellectually, that problem of death which man has been trying to solve from time immemorial.

It is important to find out for oneself, not through verbalization, not through some intellectual, analytical process, but rather find out nonromantically, non-emotionally, non-sentimentally, whether time, to which we are slaves, can ever come to an end and therefore freedom, away from time. The time by the sun, the time as night and day, time as a movement, physical movement from here to there, seems a necessity. Otherwise we couldn't arrange

things, we couldn't live reasonably. If we are not clear where we are going physically then we get confused, we get lost. So time chronologically as yesterday, today and tomorrow is necessary for planning, for learning.

We went into this question of learning. There are two types of learning. Learning as a means of acquiring knowledge, that needs time. That learning and knowledge is necessary for actions, if you would act skilfully, efficiently, objectively, that time as a means of learning is essential. I think that is very clear so we will not go more into that question. And also we pointed out the other day that learning also has a different meaning, at least I think so. It has a meaning where time is not involved at all. Time implies accumulation. Time implies a learning, as a sequence to action. Time implies the movement from here to there. In learning there is no ending or a beginning, there is learning all the time - time, you understand? So that is a different kind of learning in which there is no accumulation as memory and acting from that memory, which becomes mechanical and if one lives in that field always that is one of the factors of human deterioration. We have talked about that. So we need not go into this question of time, by the watch.

Then there is psychological time. And that has become extraordinarily important. In that is involved hope, ideals, achievement, attachment, gaining and losing, the whole question of a psychological evolution, psychological advancement. That is what we are attacking, not too violently. That is what we are talking about. If one doesn't understand this movement, the psychological movement as time, then time has no ending, and therefore there is no something new taking place, which is not of

time. Please as we said, this is not a talk but rather we are sharing this thing together. Unfortunately the speaker has to sit on a platform so that you can see me and I can see you. But sitting on a platform doesn't give him an authority, a position, he is not teaching you and you are not learning from him, therefore the relationship as a teacher and a disciple doesn't exist here. That implies authority which is most destructive, in the realm of the spirit. So we are sharing this thing together, we are walking together, perhaps holding hands, being friends, talking over diligently, carefully, with affection, with care, and if you will, with love. So there is that quality of sharing. So if you are not sharing but merely accumulating certain ideas, then there is no possibility of partaking what is being said. I think that is fairly clear. So it is your responsibility to share, not merely hear certain words and draw some conclusions and act according to those conclusions. Then that is sharing something verbally, and that has not very great importance.

So we are asking whether time as a means of psychologically advancing towards a particular principle, towards a particular concept, towards a particular projection of what should be, whether there is such time at all, whether there is a psychological tomorrow at all, and whether time in that sense psychologically can ever come to an end? Please understand this very carefully because in this is implied the whole question of death and suffering. If one doesn't understand this basic problem, the other, the others like love, death, suffering, all that becomes superficial. So we are asking a fundamental question: whether time psychologically can come to an end? Or psychologically time is necessary as a

movement towards a particular goal, to a purpose, an achievement and all the rest of it? You have got the question clear?

This psychological entity as the 'me', the 'I', the 'you', the 'we' and 'they', that whole way of thinking on which our society is based, and our relationship with each other, what part does time play in bringing about suffering in that? Whether I as a human being with all my psychological structure and nature has a tomorrow at all? Or is it an invention of thought so that I have a hope, so that I have something towards which I can go to, something which I can cultivate in the future? Cultivation implies a movement in time. So we are asking a question, which is: our conditioning, if one observes your own conditioning, our conditioning is a psychological advance towards what you may call god, or towards enlightenment, or towards a deeper understanding, or towards a fulfilment, all in the future. So we are caught in this network, network of the future, which is, there is light, there is enlightenment, there is something called love, all in the future, to be psychologically achieved. Right? Please if I labour this point it is important because when we go into the much deeper question of death, you have to understand this question of time. That is our conditioning. I need time to learn a language. I need time to learn a technique, I need time to learn how to drive a car. There, time is necessary. But we have taken over psychologically that time. And have projected a future, that I will be good, I will be something. The speaker is questioning the whole of that. Or there is not psychological future, but only the ending of time which is totally now. You understand this?

You see we live either in the past, a remembrance, in all the

things of the past, or in the future - I will meet you tomorrow, how happy it will be, and how unfortunate it was that this happened in the past, or how happy I was in the past, and I hope that happiness, that joy, that something celestial will take place tomorrow. So we are always caught in the psychological time as memory of the past, and the hope of the future. That is time as memory, time as hope and we don't know what it is to live totally now. Because now is life, not there or behind. Am I making myself clear, not verbally? If you observe yourself, if you are aware of yourself, this is what is going on all the time in us - the past and the future. In that there is suffering. So I have to find out, the mind has to enquire, examine and find out whether there is a timeless state which is called the now. This has been the haunt, the search of deep persons concerned with life. Which means is love a memory - either as the past or the future, I will love you, or I have loved you. And do I know or understand, or have an insight, or be aware of what love is now? You are following, we are sharing together? And why do we, as human beings, live in this battle of the past and the future, which is the psychological time? Therefore there is an effort to forget the past, an effort to put away the future and try to live in the present. That is, I want to live in the present. We don't understand what that means but we immediately react to every reaction that we have, idiotic, rational, stupid or neurotic - doing the thing now, whatever we want, this is what is happening.

And we are asking: as long as man, human beings, the mind, is looking to the future, which means hope, which means a sense of advancement, moving towards the ideal and so on, is that the truth or a reality created by thought? You are following this? Please do

follow this. Thought whatever it thinks about is a reality, but is not truth. Reality means the act of thinking about something which then becomes real. That is reality of a hope, reality of a purpose, reality of an ideal, reality of an enlightenment, all are the projections of thought. Therefore thought has made that real. But that reality is not truth. Thought cannot think about truth. Now the truth of finding out a way of living, not a way, of living without the future and without the past. To find that out, which is the truth, thought cannot invent it, then it becomes an illusory reality. You have got it, what I am talking about? I can't keep on repeating this, I want to get on.

So, can the mind uncondition itself from the psychological hurts and images and pleasures of yesterday, and the psychological demands of the future, the hopes, the longings, can that mind, can it uncondition itself and find, see the truth of what it is to live totally now, in the now, and therefore that is the truth?

Now from there let's move to the understanding, and therefore freeing the mind from suffering. This has been also one of the great problems of life, from ancient days, whether the mind can free itself from suffering. Not become in that freedom callous, indifferent, concerned about itself, but in the freedom of suffering there is compassion. A mind that suffers is never compassionate, because the word 'compassion' means passion for everything. And to find that, to come upon that compassion, that sense of total passion, one has to understand this problem of suffering, because all human beings suffer: grief, ache, deep sense of agony of not being, fulfilling, losing gaining, and the despair of total loneliness. We suffer physically, when we have a great deal of pain, and that



can be easily understood and do something about it. The doing of something about it either can pervert, destroy the capacity of the mind, or that suffering need not leave an imprint on the mind. You have understood? I can suffer physically and not let that suffering interfere with the clarity of thought, with the clarity of perception. If you have gone into the question of that, that I think can be done, should be done, must be done. Because physically we go through a great deal of sickness, whether malnourished, heredity, the social impact on a sensitive body, drink and you know all the things that you indulge in. So there is physical suffering, which can be rationally, sanely dealt with, and see that suffering, that pain, that remembrance of that pain does not affect the mind. That requires an awareness, a sense of watchfulness, a concern, not just to escape from physical pain, but concern to have a mind untouched by pain. You understand? Untouched by pain, which means untouched by hurt, because we all hurt from childhood, in schools, at home, in college, in university, in society, in an office, in a factory, we are psychologically being shocked, hurt all the time. That is part of our suffering. And whether the mind can be free from that being hurt. So there is that physical suffering.

Then there is psychological suffering, I love you, you don't love me - whatever that may mean. I am lonely, anxious, fearful, in agony of something I have done and something which I would like to avoid and so on. There is the suffering of losing somebody whom you love - at least you call that love. So there is this personal agony of suffering, and there is the collective suffering. Right? Suffering that is going on in the world, children being killed, mutilated, the wars, endless wars and the preparation for

wars. We have built a marvellous civilization all right of which you are so terribly proud. So there is that suffering, the personal and the collective human suffering. Now can the mind, you as a human being living in this mad, insane world, be out of that suffering, completely, not only consciously but deep down so that there is no suffering because when there is suffering there is the personal concern about oneself? This tremendous concern about oneself is one of the factors of degeneracy, self-improvement as it is called, self-fulfilment - am I doing the right thing, am I following the right system to achieve some kind of enlightenment, tell me how to be good - you know this tremendous self-concern which brings about callousness, a neurotic sense of progress - you know all that. So is there an end to suffering? When there is no suffering only then is there the possibility of being compassionate.

So one must find out, delve into this, whether the mind can be free from this ache and grief and sorrow. Which doesn't make the mind empty, dull, stupid, on the contrary. When we suffer psychologically there is always an escape from it, that is our conditioning. I suffer psychologically and I must do something about it, go and talk to an analyst, which is the new priest, go and do - I don't know - go to a church, anything to forget it, escape from it, take a flight away from it. Please follow this. That is a wastage of energy, isn't it? To move away from the fact. The fact is suffering, you suffer, and to run away from it verbally, rationally, romantically, or try to go away from the fact to an entertainment. All that is a wastage of energy which prevents you from looking at it. To look at it and to stay with it, not neurotically, not morbidly; the morbidity, the neuroticism is in the flight, which is to believe in

something, to go to somebody, to read a book, to analyse and find out the cause - the cause is there if you look, it is there immediately. So can the mind, which has been so conditioned to escape from suffering, especially in this country, in the Christian world which is to delegate this suffering to somebody else and worship that somebody else. In India they have another kind of escape, which they call Karma and all kinds of other things. All that is a wastage of energy and therefore recognizing that fact, seeing the truth of that, to remain totally without any movement of thought, which says 'Run away' any movement, remain with that suffering. If you do, out of that comes passion, because the root meaning of that word passion is linked with suffering.

So then we can go into this question of death. Are you all right? Are we all moving together? Please, not verbally because then it is no fun. Then you can pick up a book and read about it, and that has no meaning, it is too childish. This again is a tremendous problem. From ancient of days man has tried to find out how to avoid it, how to find immortality, and find out if there is another life, another existence in heaven or in hell - the invention of hell is the fruit of Christianity, and heaven is the permanent abode. Man has always tried to find a comfort, or say, living is the fulfilment in death and beyond. You have seen this in the ancient Egyptians, you know, right through the world this has been one of the major factors of enquiry; either believe in some comfort, in some future, or rationalize the present living and say there it is, make the best of it, jolly good time, rather unfortunate, miserable, but make the best of it and get on with it, there is the end of it. We have rationalized everything and at the end of it we have found nothing.

So one has to find out, go into this question, not only intellectually, verbally but much more beyond it. What it means to die, what it means to die not when you are diseased, old age and crippled and unconscious and drugged, and all the rest of it, you end up in the hospital, but living, what it means, not committing suicide, I am not proposing that. As we said, time is involved. We, living with all the things involved in existence and death something far away to be avoided, postponed, a distance between the living and the dead, or the dying. And what is it that we call living? And who is it that is living? You are following all this? Please if this is all too much for a morning, you forget it I'll go on. You understand - if you can't follow all this and you get tired, let me talk about it and perhaps something will enter you head.

What is it that we call living? And who is it that is living? The living that you call is this constant travail, this constant effort, the battle that goes on within us silently, verbally or outwardly, the competition, the aggression, the ambition, the struggle, the agony, the pain, the loss, the fear of losing, not gaining, this battle is what we call living, with its passing pleasures, an occasional flash of joy, an occasional ecstasy of something which thought has never captured, or never can produce. But this is our life. And who is it that is living? Who is it that says, 'This is my life, this is I' - who is that entity that is living? To complain about society has made us what we are, environment, therefore change the environment and we'll be changed, and to say, bring about a different outward conditioning which will condition us differently, is one of the factors of the communists, or the people of the world, people who say change all the outward things and man will change. But man

has created all this, you have created all this, the misery, the war, the irresponsible butchery that is going on, the national division as the Jew, the Arab, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, you are responsible for this because you think that way. Go to any town, to any village, you will see the Wesleyan, the Baptist - you know - the Catholic, the Protestant - you have created this. And you say 'Well I can't change, it takes too long. Or if I change what of it? I can't change the world.'

So you have to find out who is it that is living this. And why is he living like this, callousness, indifference, why? Or we are educated this way. If you are educated this way, change the education. Why do we support all this in ourselves? So I must find out who is this that is living? This horror, this misery, this confusion, this pain. Is it that entity that is frightened of death who says, 'I am living', and death is the ending of that living'? You are following? So who is it that is living? Is that living, chaos, mess, confusion, misery, is it different from the liver - not the liver! - but the entity that lives? You are following this? Is this mess, which I call living, is that different from the entity who is afraid of dying? I don't know if you follow this. Is this entity different from that which he has created? Or both are the same? The entity is the living, he is not separate. I wonder if you understand this. So the entity that says that living is me, the chaos, the mess, the confusion, the irresponsibility, the pain, the cruelty, the horrors that are going on, is me, it is not separate from me, I have created that, and what I am frightened of is the dying, which means the ending of that which I have created. You follow?

So what is the meaning of death? There is the physical death,

the ending, physical ending. And I am attached in my relationship to you, I depend on you. You are my companion, you have given me pleasure, both biologically, sexually, in different ways, I depend, you fill my life, and I call that love. And I don't want to lose you, therefore I am attached, cling to you. But there is death of you. You understand? You are going to die, as I am going to die some day, but I don't want you to die, you are mine. So there is that suffering in attachment. I can't face that fact. And I want to keep you and I am frightened of losing you, and I am frightened of losing myself. I am frightened of coming to an end myself - myself which has created this misery, this confusion, this mischief, the corruption, all the things that man has done to another man in my relationship.

So what is death? Is the self, which is the 'me', frightened of coming to an end? Coming to an end of all this? As I am frightened, I postpone it. Which is, I avoid it, I run away from it. The running away from it is time. You understand? Now if I don't run away from it what happens? Then the ending of all the things I have done is death. You understand sirs? Therefore the gap, the time interval between the future as death and the present as living, have been brought together. Do you understand? So I know what it means to die, which means totally be free of everything that I have created. Have we understood something?

And there is always the search for immortality. Man wants to be immortal, never asking the question: who is it that is going to be immortal? Does immortality lie in the book I have written? The name, the name in history as a General, as a butcher, or whatever it is? So what is immortality? Which means really to be free, for the

mind to be free of the idea of death, of that quality of mind when time has totally ceased. You understand? So all this is implied in the understanding and in the living of this whole problem of time, suffering and death - not as separate things but to condense all that into a whole. And then you will see for yourself that suffering brings an extraordinary sense of passion, not lust, not the absurd things that are going under the name of passion. Because out of the ashes of suffering comes this extraordinary passion and with it compassion. And when you have understood very, very deeply, not verbally, not intellectually, the sense of timeless moment, timeless whole, then you have understood what it means to live without this fear of death, and the dying is the living. Right.

Do you want to ask any questions about what we have been talking? Or would you rather sit quietly and observe all this?

Q: Sir, the idea for me has for years been the thinker and the thought as being one. I, perhaps from conditioning, I see the thinker as separate from the thought.

K: Yes, the idea of the thinker and the thought are the same, is difficult to grasp, the questioner says. You know the word 'idea', the word, the meaning of that word means to see, to observe. Not what we have made, which is the seeing and drawing an abstraction from it, a conclusion and acting according to that conclusion. Right? That is what we have made the word idea into. The word 'idea' means to see and the seeing is the acting - not acting according to a conclusion. The seeing that there is a precipice is the action. Now the questioner says, it is difficult for me to understand that the thinker is the thought, because, he says, I have been conditioned that way, that the thinker is different from

thought. Right, have you understood the question? Is he different? Observe it, don't agree, or disagree, just to look at it. Look at the thinker who says, 'I am thinking' and what he is thinking about.

Let me put it differently. Is the experiencer different from the experience? This is a very important question to understand, because you will see in a minute if you go into it. Because you are all so crazy for experience - divine experience or you know, drug experience and all the rest of it. So you must find out for yourself whether the experiencer, the thinker, the observer are different from the observed, from the experience, from the thought. So we are looking at the experience. Is the experiencer different from the experience? If you have an experience of any kind, what is involved in that experience? First recognition, otherwise you couldn't say, I have had an experience. You understand what I am saying? I have had an experience of god, of Jesus, whatever you like, Krishna, Buddha, whatever. Now how do I know that I have experienced Jesus, unless I have already known Jesus or Krishna, or Buddha or somebody else? You are following this? So the experience, which I am experiencing, is a projection of my own conditioning which I am experiencing. Right? So the experiencer is not different from the experience. Because he must first recognize it otherwise it is not - you can't say, 'Well I've had a marvellous experience, I adore that experience', because I know the content of that experience otherwise I couldn't enjoy it. You understand all this? So the experiencer is the experience, he may call it what he likes, it is his projection which he is experiencing. A Hindu unfortunately is conditioned by his own gods, by his own priests, by his own culture, and he says, 'I am experiencing that'. That is



the projection of his own conditioning. Right? Now go step by step. So the mind says, 'I must have experience', so he projects these experiences and experiences them. And experience apparently is necessary to keep the mind awake: I must have experience otherwise I will go to sleep.

So you think experience will keep the mind awake - right? - of different kinds. Now when you see - please understand this - now when you see that the experiencer is the experience, then the whole problem of the desire to experience comes to an end and therefore the mind in itself is totally alive. So the thinker is the thought.

Right sirs, that is enough, isn't it? Yes sir?

Q: Whatever it is that is sitting there experiencing, is there any kind of me itself?

K: I don't quite follow the question. Will you speak louder sir.

Q: Whatever that's here, that is creating these outer and inner experiences, is there any kind of a me that is here? An individual?

K: I don't understand your question.

Q: Is there a me, an I of any kind?

K: That is what I have just explained.

Q: He is saying what is the core of the creator of the experience? What is the core of the self? Is there anything in the self?

K: That is what he is asking sir, the same question. Which is: what is the me who divides himself as the outer and the inner? Is that it sir? Or would you put the question: what is the point of accumulating all this knowledge when I am going to die? What is the point of having a good relationship with another when at the end of it I die? What is the point of improving the world, or

changing the world, transforming myself when death is next door?  
So you are saying, I, who is this I - is that it? Is that the question  
sir?

Q: Is there such a thing as the individual?

K: Is there such a thing as an individual - right. Is there such a  
thing as the individual - are you an individual?

Q: What about you?

K: I am asking you.

Q: Here and now...

K: Just a minute madame, let us finish this question. Are you an  
individual? Do you know what that word means?

Q: I realize that I am...

K: I am asking sir, do you know what that word means,  
indivisible, who is whole; the word 'whole' means healthy, sane  
and also it means holy, H O I Y. All that is implied in the word  
'individual', indivisible, therefore he is whole unbroken, not  
fragmented. Are you that individual? Or are you the collective and  
you think that you are the individual? - which is part of the  
deception of the collective. Go on sir, think it out, watch it.

So the problem is: can the mind observing this fragmented  
entity, calling itself an individual when it is really the collective,  
can that mind free itself totally and be whole? And to do that you  
have to have a mind that can look, not fragmentarily as me and the  
not me, as an American, Christian, Hindu, Buddhist and all that  
nonsense, but look at things as they are. Can you look at yourself  
and see you are the collective, through your education, through  
your tradition, through everything, you are the collective. And look  
at it, not try to escape and say 'I must be individual', be with that,

look at it with all your attention. Then observe how fragmented you are, with your desires, contradictory desires, self-deception, hypocrisy, wanting, not wanting, violence - you follow - broken up as an artist, as a business man, as a family man, as a factory man. You follow? All that fragmented. Look at it. And as you observe it, as you see it without moving away from it, out of that comes total perception. That is enough sirs.

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH APRIL 1975

We have been talking about so many different problems, but the main issue is the transformation of the human mind. For it is the human mind that has created the confusion, the misery, the brutality of society in which we live. And this morning we should really talk about what is religion. We have talked about death, love, fear, pleasure, relationship, so many things. And I think it is right that we should this morning, for it is the last talk, talk over together this question which has really been one of the major concerns of mankind, what is religion. What place has it in life, in daily life, whether it is an illusion, a delusion. That is, holding on to something in spite of rational explanation, rational thinking. Or is it an hallucination - the content of the word called religion? There are the religions of India, and they are coming to this country, wave after wave. There are the religions of the Muslim, the Hindu, Buddhists and the Christians, they all have said, and believe, those who follow them, that there is god, and the nameless one, the infinite, and man has believed in them, has put his faith in them, and has killed people for their faith, for their belief. There have been wars, religious wars, specially I think among the Christians. And the Muslims have also have had great wars; perhaps only the Buddhist and the Hindu have not indulged in that kind of brutality. And the ancient people from India, and the Egyptians, have all believed that there is a supreme being, an ultimate principle. But it is all based on authority, on hope, belief in something, a faith according to one's inclinations and tendencies and the culture in which one lives. That has been the pattern right throughout the

world. Belief, faith and the authority of a book, of the priest, of the disciple, the followers and so on.

So it would be right and proper to find out for ourselves what is the meaning, the depth of that word. And to find out for ourselves, not according to any authority, belief or faith, if there is something that is really sacred, which thought has not put together. If there is something or not, that is beyond time, beyond belief, beyond all the concepts that man has put together in his search for that something which is called the eternal. And I think it would be worthwhile if we could this morning, go into this question which involves the question of seeking, meditation, and the peculiar spiritual authority that has exercised such influence on man's mind.

And as we have been saying during all these talks, that we are sharing this thing together, partaking of it. Not merely listening to some kind of rational or irrational explanation but going into it, facing the thing as is, and going beyond, if we can.

First of all, authority in so-called spiritual matters is really nonspiritual. I think that must be clear and must be understood deeply. There is no authority in man's endeavour to find out if there is that ultimate truth. The authority of a priest, of all the religions based on hearsay, on propaganda, on conditioning the mind to believe in certain saviours, masters and so on. Because one has to be a light to oneself and you cannot possibly light your light from another. And we are going to go into that briefly. Unfortunately gurus are invading this country. The word 'guru' which is almost adopted in the European language and in English, the word 'guru', the root meaning of that means weight, heavy, weight. And also it means, one who dispels ignorance. And also it means, one who

points. And it has got several meanings like that. One who dispels ignorance, one who takes away your burden, doesn't impose his burden onto you, but takes away your burden. You understand? But the gurus generally in this country that have invaded, and the Americans have become so gullible, they generally impose their weight, their conditioning, their ignorance, their beliefs, their traditions. And changing from one conditioning to another is still the lack of freedom. And here in this country, and as well as in India, this acceptance of authority of the guru has become a fashion. And you are practising various methods and systems that they have brought over here. And if you are not satisfied with them then you trot off to India, or to Japan, trying to find a guru originally for yourself down there. That is, you deny freedom, freedom to find out for yourself. And that means the total denial of all religious spiritual authority - total denial. Otherwise you can't be free to enquire, to examine. Politically, democracy, so-called democracy, allows you to be free, not under tyranny, but you have accepted the tyranny of the gurus, of the priests, of the authority, of tradition. And we are saying that a mind, a religious mind that is trying to find out what religion is, the truth, if there is an ultimate reality, ultimate truth, must be totally free from all authority. Because we want, we are confused, uncertain, unhappy, and these people promise all these things - happiness. And so we are only too eager to follow. That is one point.

Then what needs there be to have any belief in something you do not know, or are aware, or cognizant, or conscious? So there must be freedom, complete freedom from all belief. Because belief conditions the mind. If you live in India, if you are brought up in

that tradition as a Hindu, you have certain beliefs, superstitions, certain knowledge and so on, you are there conditioned. And if you are born in this country, or in Europe, you are conditioned according to your propaganda, churches, and all the rest of it. So a mind that is concerned with the understanding and to come upon that immensity, there must be freedom from belief: freedom from authority, freedom from belief. And if you would know that thing that man has sought and asserted, you must go into the problem of what it is that you are seeking.

If one may ask, why are you here? Why are you all sitting there and listening to the speaker? What for? As an entertainment? As something that you can get from listening to the person that is speaking? What is it that one is seeking? And what is implied in that word 'search'? And I think it is very important to go into this because we are all saying we are seeking truth, love, etc., and so on and on and on. And if one actually asks what it is that one is seeking, how can you seek truth if your mind is not in order? You understand my question? Putting what belongs in its right place is order. And when the mind is confused, uncertain, groping, unclear, wanting security, wanting something or other, that very desire, that very uncertainty must inevitably create illusion, or a delusion to which you cling to. So one must go into this question very carefully: what is it that human beings are seeking, you and I? Is it that we want to be happy? Because we are so unhappy, miserable, in conflict, uncertain, neurotic, and so we say, 'Please tell us how to be happy'. 'Please tell us' - I hope you are not asking me, you are asking the others - 'Please tell us how to live a life in which there is happiness' - is that what you are seeking? Is happiness the opposite

of unhappiness? You have understood my question? If one is unhappy, miserable, living in great pain and anxiety and suffering, you want the opposite of that - clarity, a sense of freedom, happiness, order. Is that what you are seeking? And is the opposite - please listen to it carefully - is the opposite something totally different from its own opposite? You understand? Or the opposite has its root in its own opposite? Man has invented the opposite. Not that there is not dark and light, woman and man, and all that, but psychologically, inwardly, the opposite which we want, which we seek, is the projection of 'what is'. Right? I am unhappy - if I am - and I want happiness. That is all I know. Caught in this unhappiness the reaction is to have the other, happiness. That which I want is born out of what is actually going on. Right? So the opposite has its root in what actually is. So the opposite has no meaning. So what has meaning is 'what is'. And I do not know how to face 'what is', therefore I invent the opposite. If I know what to do with actually what is going on, then the opposite doesn't exist. Are you following all this? Please, it is your life, not my life. So please give your attention, if you care to.

So the understanding of 'what is' is far most important than the pursuit of 'what should be', or the opposite of 'what is'. Why are we unhappy, miserable, quarrelling, violent, and all the rest of it, why are we like this? That is 'what is'. If I know how to transform 'what is' then the whole problem is solved. Then I don't have to follow anybody. Then I am a light to myself. So is it possible to solve 'what is' without wasting our energy in the battle of the opposites? Do you understand my question? Are we following each other? It is possible only when you have total energy, which is not wasted in



conflict. You understand? I am unhappy. I am in a sense of great anxiety. That is 'what is'. To go away from that is a wasting of energy. Right? So to understand actually 'what is' I must have all the energy that I have. Then I can go beyond it. Is this understood?

And order is necessary in life. Order, as we said, is to put what belongs in the right place. Putting order - order means putting everything in its right place. But we don't know what the right place is. We only know disorder. Right? You grant that?

Q: No.

K: No? Politically there is disorder. Religiously there is disorder.

Q: Not quite, not always.

K: There is disorder now.

Q: It is a point of view.

K: We will ask that question later on. There is disorder now - wars - aren't you in disorder yourself, now, in daily life? Now that is what is the fact, that is what is going on. And we want order - order we think is the opposite of that. That is, we establish a pattern of order out of disorder. Right? We are disorderly in our conduct, in our thinking, in our behaviour, in our outlook and so on and so on. And we think order is a blueprint of the opposite of 'what is'. Then in that bringing about that order as a blueprint there is conflict, always. That is the contributory factor of disorder. Where there is conflict there is disorder, nationally, politically, religiously, in every direction. So there is disorder. That is a fact. Now can you observe, be aware of that disorder? Not try to change it, not try to transform it, not try to suppress it, not say, 'I must have order out of it' - just be totally aware of that disorder in your life.

Then you will see that out of that disorder comes order, which is not the opposite.

So freedom from authority is absolutely necessary to find out, or to come upon if there is, or if there is not, the ultimate reality - truth not reality. And no belief of any kind, which implies no fear because belief exists where there is fear, where there is despair. And there must be order. These three things. Then we can proceed to find out. That means freedom. So then we will ask: what is meditation? You are interested in that, aren't you? What is meditation? Why should one meditate at all? Is meditation something totally unrelated to daily living? Is meditation something you practise? Is meditation something that somebody says, 'Meditate and you will get this' - whether it is transcendental meditation or the meditation of a particular system, and so on, the Zen meditation and all that. A system, a practice, a goal, an end to be achieved. Right? This is what you call meditation. And to achieve that end you follow a system of daily practice. You know what happens when you practise something over and over and over again? You become mechanical, your mind becomes dull, insensitive. Obviously. Isn't it so?

Q: No.

K: Oh!

Q: You become very proficient.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: You become very proficient if you practise.

K: Wait a minute sir, let me finish what I have to say.

So we think meditation is a process by which we can attain understanding, enlightenment, something beyond man's thought.

This is generally what we mean by meditation. Right? Have you practised meditation, any of you? No? You have. What for? And you have practised it, learning to control thought. Right? And you have never gone into the question: who is the controller. Right? Who is the controller that is controlling thought? Is the controller different from the controlled? Or the controller is the controlled? You are following all this? So first you divide the controller and the controlled. Right? First you divide it, and the controller then controls, tries to hold thought in a particular direction. But the thought that wanders off, is that different from the entity that is trying to control that particular thought that is going off? Have you understood my question? Are they not both the same? Which is, thought.

So meditation is to understand the proper place, or where thought belongs. You have understood? Without control. Have you ever tried to live a daily life without a single control? You haven't. And when you go into this problem of meditation, you have to understand why man has developed this sense of controlling everything, controlling his thoughts, his desires, his pursuits - why? And that is called - part of it - concentration. Right? You know what happens when you concentrate? You are building a wall of resistance. Aren't you? Within which you say, I must concentrate on that, and therefore push everything else aside. Which is to exercise will, to hold thought in a particular direction. And will is the expression, the essence of desire. And in concentration there is conflict going on. Your thought wanders off, all over the place, and you bring it back. Keep up this game. So you have never asked why thought should be controlled at all. The mind chatters

endlessly. And to find out what part, or the right place for thought, not controlling thought, it's right place. You are following all this? Then if you have an insight, if you see where thought belongs then there is no problem of control of thought. You have understood?

And as there has been no system, no practice, no control of thought, then you have to find out what it means to be attentive. What does it mean to attend? You see attention means, if you have gone into it very deeply, as we are going into it, if we can, attention implies an observation without the centre. You have understood? The centre as the 'me', as my desire, my fulfilment, my anxiety, when you are attending, which means giving your nerves, your eyes, your ears, everything you have, that total energy, in that attention there is no centre as 'me'. You see that? Now, just experiment with what is being said. Are you attending now? That is, are you listening completely? Listen which means not interpreting, not translating, not trying to understand what he is saying, but the act of total listening. If you are, there is only that sense of hearing without a single movement of thought.

So this thing, you can't go to a school to learn it. Right? You can't go to a college, or to a school, or to a university to become sensitive, can you? I suppose you do. You find out in your daily life whether you are sensitive or not by observing, by seeing how you react to people. All that in daily life, not learn and then what you learn from another is insensitivity, nothing else. So this attention is necessary, and that is part of meditation. Meditation implies also a mind that is totally quiet, not enforced quietness, because in that then there is conflict, isn't there? The mind is chattering, thinking, listening, you know going on, and you have

heard, or see for yourself a mind that is completely still can really observe. Right? If you want to look at those mountains, with their shadow, with their light, with their beauty and their depth, then you look, totally. And your mind goes off, and that is inattention, but when you want to see something totally, completely, your mind naturally becomes quiet, doesn't it? So a mind that is enquiring into something that is not put together by thought, there must be this total attention, and therefore complete silence, quietness. And most of us find it terribly difficult because physically we are never quiet, we are always doing something with our hands, with our feet, with our eyes. You follow? There is always something happening. We are never aware of our own body. If you are then you will find that it has its own intelligence, not dictated by taste, by the tongue, by the imposed artificial desire for tobacco - you know, drink and drugs and all the rest of it. So a mind that is enquiring into reality, into truth has to be totally free from authority, from all belief, that is complete order. Not a mind that is endlessly chattering, endless analysing, endlessly enquiring, then it is wasting its energy, but a mind that is completely still regenerates itself.

And from this problem arises another thing: which is, what is sleep? You understand? You are following all this? I wonder! You know - let me put it this way. The content of consciousness - you understand what the content of consciousness is - your consciousness has its content. Right? American, Indian, big, small, conflict, desires, attachments, identifications, 'me' and 'not me', fears, the whole and more, all that is the content of your consciousness. Right? Isn't it? That's simple. Now that content makes up the consciousness. Without that content the

consciousness as we know doesn't exist. Are you also working as hard as we are working? Or are you just playing with words? Because meditation is this, is part of this. The emptying of that content totally, not adding more to the content, which you are doing now.

So one has to go into this question of dreams, sleep, and the unconscious. Right? I wonder if you are interested in all this, are you? Have you ever asked why you dream at all? Not according to some psychologist, and analysts, and all the rest, why do you dream? If you overeat you have certain kinds of dreams. If you are terribly interested in sex you have that kind of dream. If you are actively attached and actively interested in your daily life in a certain pattern, then it is a continuation of the daily life. Are you following this? So dreams are the continuation of your daily life in a symbolic or pictorial way. You are the continuation of your daily life when you sleep. And so the mind, the brain, is constantly active. You are following this? During the day it is active, consciously or unconsciously, endless active, and when you sleep that same activity goes on, modified, symbolic and pictures, it is the same pattern being repeated. And when there is order during the day - you understand, order in your relationship, order in your behaviour, order in your thinking, which we have gone into, what we mean by order, putting everything in its right place, what belongs to its right place, in your relationship, and so on and so on, which we have talked a great deal about. Then if there is, in your daily life, there is order then the brain has not to work hard to bring about order. Because a brain can only function in order efficiently, not in disorder. And when you have order during the day, therefore

there is order when you sleep, then out of that there is a regeneration, instead of degenerating it is generating.

So: all this is implied in meditation. Not just sitting quietly, taking certain postures, breathing in a certain way. That is all childish. And in this is also involved yoga. Right? Again, unfortunately they have brought that word to this country. The word 'yoga' means union, a bridge between - listen to this carefully - union between the lower and the higher, union between the self and the supreme being, or the ultimate principle. And to reach that ultimate principle there must be a curriculum, a group of studies, all that is implied in that word 'yoga'. Certain exercises, certain studies, certain disciplines in order to bring about union between what you are and that which is the supreme being, or the ultimate principle. You have understood? Now see what is involved in this, which you all practise, some of you practise yoga. That is, physical exercises. I do it too every morning for the last forty years, for an hour a day, that is irrelevant. Don't do it because I say so. But I am pointing out to you the meaning of that word, and what are the implications of that word. Union between you, the self and the supreme being. So there is a division between you and the supreme being. Right? And who is the entity that is bringing about union? You understand this? So first you divide, as the supreme being and the self, which is not the supreme being, then you invent a method to bring about a union. See the absurdity of it! Which is, the supreme being is an invention of thought, as long as there is this division. And thought is a material process, as we have gone into, that question, there is nothing sublime about thought. It is the response of memory, knowledge, experience. And that invents a

supreme being, an ultimate principle. You follow? And then you try to bring about a union, a bridge, between yourself and that. And to cross that bridge you practise. But you don't see for yourself clearly that where there is division there must be conflict - the black and the white, the Jew and Arab, the Hindu and the Muslim, the communist and the capitalist, there must be conflict. If you see the truth of that then yoga means doing physical exercises.

And as we said, meditation is to have a completely still mind. And it can only be still naturally, not cultivated stillness, not practised stillness, then if you practise stillness it is death, it is no longer stillness. Then you have to come upon, because you cannot have stillness of mind if there is no compassion. Do you understand? So we have to go into the whole question of what love is, as we did the other day. Love, is it pleasure? Is it desire? Can a man who is ambitious love? Can a man who is competitive love? Can a man or a woman love when he is self-centred, concerned about himself? Or love is when the self is not. You understand all these problems? When I am not, me, with all my problems, with my ambitions, with my greed, with my envy, with my desire to fulfil, to become something, or imagine that I am a great man, as long as I am concerned about myself love cannot exist. So without that complete compassion, that means no killing animals for my food, all that is implied. So out of that comes complete stillness of mind, because my mind has put everything in its right place, put everything where it belongs, so it establishes right relationship between man and woman, between each other, a relationship that is not based on images, memories, hurts. And then out of that comes complete attention and silence.



And what is that silence? What takes place in that silence? Can it be verbalized? You are following all this? Suppose you have that exquisite, that extraordinary sense of the beauty of silence, that silence which is not a gap when there is no noise. You understand? There is a silence when there is no noise but that is not silence. It is like having peace between two wars, that is not peace. You are following all this? So what takes place when the mind is completely and totally silent? There is no movement of thought as time, there is no movement of thought as measurement.

Now I am going to say something that perhaps you won't like at all, because you are all very respectable people. You are very respectable people. When that silence takes place there is space and absolutely nothing. There is space and absolutely nothing. See why it is important, because it is important to be nothing. You understand? You understand, sirs, what I am saying? Because you are all somebodies. You all want to be something. Either professionally, or you have delusions of grandeur, you want to achieve something, become something, realize something, fulfil. You follow? Which is all respectability. And here we are saying that in that total silence, there is nothing, you are nothing. If you are something there is no silence. There is noise and when there is noise you cannot hear or see. And when there is nothing there is complete stability. Do you understand? It is only when the mind is nothing, in that there is complete security, complete stability. Are you following all this? Sorry, you won't understand.

So then only the mind can find out if there is, or if there is not, something that is nameless, something that is beyond time. All this is meditation. So one has to live a life daily in which relationship

with another has no conflict in it, because all relationship is life. If you do not know how to have a relationship with another without conflict then life becomes distorted, ugly, painful, unreal. All this is meditation. It is only then one comes upon that which is timeless.

Perhaps it would be unwise now to ask questions.

## **SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 13TH JULY 1975.**

I suppose one must talk: there are not only personal problems, and the world in which we live is becoming more and more dangerous for all living things. And it seems to me, that very few of us are able to meet the challenge completely and totally, and during these talks here we are going, if we can, in detail into the many problems. These problems are not separate, they are interrelated; if one wishes to solve one's own personal problem apart from the problem of existence as a whole, I am afraid we shall not be able to find the correct answer.

So we must, if we may, consider the whole structure of our society and civilization in which we live. We are not only concerned with the economic, social problems, political, as well as all the problems we have to face every day: livelihood, the enormous amount of suffering that's going on in the world, the deterioration of human morality, his behaviour, the problems of fear, pleasure and the very complex problem of not only individual suffering, but the suffering of humanity.

And then there is the problem of death, love and if there is any truth as all the realities we have to face are so enormous, that we have neither the time, the inclination or the energy to find out for ourselves if there is, or if there is not, a truth - when grasped or understood or related - that truth will perhaps absolve all our problems. This is what we are going to talk over together during these three or four weeks. So it is not a diversion, an entertainment, something that you listen to for an hour and forget all about it afterwards, but it is something that we have to consider very

seriously, give our minds and hearts to understand the extraordinary complex problem of our existence.

I do not know how serious you are, or how curious you are, with what intention you come and listen to these talks; if these talks have any relationship to your life, to your daily existence or you are merely seeking something that is pleasurable for an hour and entertaining intellectually and then go away without actually understanding what is being said and related to our daily life. So in communicating with each other, that is, not only verbally, and also there is non-verbal communication, which demands a great deal of earnestness, a great deal of not only intellectual capacity; that is, to be awake and to find out for ourselves what is true and what is false. And so on a lovely morning we have to spend, not only the understanding of words, because each will interpret a meaning or give a meaning to the word, but we have to meet each other at a level that is serious, that demands your attention, your care, your affection.

And so, at the first talk or the first gathering of this meeting, we have to look into this question, why man, human being has not changed at all. Why he lives in a society so corrupt, so utterly meaningless, why he allows himself to be dominated by the politicians all over the world, a world that is becoming more and more authoritarian, totalitarian, neo-Communist, Fascist, or the old pattern of Communism. Why we allow ourselves to perpetuate wars, why we allow ourselves to live an isolated life in a territory divided against other territories, internationalism and the constant struggle of livelihood, instability, insecurity and the threat that is becoming more and more violent right through the world. I think,

most of us realize this - at least if you have given some thought to it, if you are aware of the world events, most of us are concerned, at least those who are really serious, and we wonder what can be done. Either we can escape from all that into some neurotic, imaginative area and cultivate that area through various communes, utopian ideals and so on, or come to it with various conclusions: the Capitalist, the Communist, the neo-Communism, Fascism or Socialism, or come to it with certain strong beliefs - God or no-God, personal salvation, personal enjoyment, being concerned only with ourselves and with nothing else, or we can come to it, that is, the world as it is with all the misery, the suffering, the conflict, the inequality, the injustice, the perpetual threat of war - one power against the other and so on. We can come to all that with a totally different kind of energy. And this morning, if I may, I would like to talk about that.

We need a totally different kind of energy to comprehend. The word 'comprehend' means to take hold totally, comprehend this vast thing that we call living, come to it with a quality of energy that will not only understand it, act upon it and go beyond it.

So this morning, if I can, I'd like to go into this question of meeting this enormous complex thing called living, existence, with an energy that is whole, non-fragmented, not broken up. And to find that energy, to come upon that energy, that is the problem. Is this fairly clear? We have exercised a great deal of energy to create this society, we have exercised a great deal of thought to bring about a religious order which is disorder, a discipline that has become mechanical, an energy which has produced an extraordinary technological advancement, an energy created by

thought that has fragmented the world. So first we have to look at that energy - the energy that thought has created. Right?

If one observes intellectually as well as non intellectually, not sentimentally, not romantically, not imaginatively but actually - the word 'actual' means, what is actual, what is taking place now.

Thought has created this society, this culture, this religion whether it is Christianity, Hinduism or any other form of religion. Thought has been responsible for this. I do not think anybody will disagree with that. And thought in its activity, in its movement, has created the energy of reality. Right?

One has to differentiate between reality and truth. And that's what we are going to do. I hope you understand all this? Personally one has spent a great deal of time about this matter; not only has one gone through this with various scientists and psychotherapists and analysts, to find out if there is an energy which is not the energy of thought, because the energy of thought, being in itself fragmentary, because thought is fragmentary, it must inevitably create a structure - social, economic, religious - essentially fragmentary. So that which thought has created, which thought has brought about, which thought has manipulated, structured, is the world of reality. Please, one must understand this. Whatever you do is based on thought, whatever you imagine, whatever you work for, whatever you try to bring about - a change in yourself or in the outer world - is essentially the energy of the movement of thought.

And this movement of thought has created tremendous problems which is obvious, both in the world of religion, in the world of economics, in the world of social relationship. And we are trying to solve our problems, our human problems - not

technological problems, our human problems in the area, or in the field which thought has created, in the field of reality. Are we meeting each other?

We have got religious problems - whether there is God or no-God, whether Christianity is superior to other religions, whether there is the only Saviour and there is no other - you know. The paraphernalia of rituals, dogmatism, superstition - all that is the work of thought. And in the world of economics it is the same, and in our social relationship with each other. The movement of thought, being in itself fragmentary, has isolated each one of us into a self-centred human being - his success, his stability and so on. That is the field of thought which is the reality. And we are trying to find all our solutions in that field through the exercise of thought. This is clear! We say: separate religions destroy men, obviously. And this separation has come about through thought: thought trying to find security in a world in which there is no security, in a world it has projected as heaven - this is all the movement of thought. And economically each country is trying to solve its own problems unrelated to the rest of the world. Again the operation of isolation which has been brought about through the fragmentation of thought. This is obvious! And in our human relationship, if you observe, thought first of all creates because it is fragmentary the self-centred movement as the 'me' and the importance of the 'me'. Right? This is the movement of thought which has created extraordinary problems and in that area we are trying to solve our problems. Is that somewhat clear? Please don't let me talk to myself.

And we say, the speaker says: you will not be able to solve any

of your problems in that area, in the area of reality which thought has created. And the speaker says, you must find a totally different kind of energy which is not the energy of conflict, of separateness, of division, the energy of the movement of thought.

Are we communicating with each other? Please, this is dreadfully serious, if I am not explaining clearly, stop me. So if you don't understand me, stop me, because I am dreadfully serious about this. Please listen, listen, because it is a very complex thing that we are going into. Because all our life is shaped by thought. And thought, which is time, which is measure, and its movement is always limited. Right? Thought can imagine that there is truth, that there is something beyond itself and project from its limitedness something extensive, not limited at all. But it is still the movement of thought. Right? I can imagine that there is a heaven, that there will be a perfect society, I can imagine or project from my despair, from my loneliness, from my sorrow, from my anxiety, from my grief, from my struggle, a heaven, a God in which there is complete security, complete certainty, no suffering - but it is still the movement of thought.

So thought is the response of memory as experience and knowledge, so we are always operating in the field of knowledge. Right? Oh, come on! And knowledge has not changed man. We have had thousands of wars, millions of human beings have suffered, cried, and we still carry on! The knowledge of war has not taught us anything, except how to kill better, on a vaster scale. Knowledge has not changed man; we accept division, nationalities, we accept that division though it will inevitably bring about conflict with each other, we have accepted the injustice, the cruelty



which thought has brought about through knowledge. We are destroying species of animals: fifty million whales have been killed from the beginning of this century. Everything man touches brings about destruction. So thought which is the response of memory, experience, knowledge has not changed man, though it has created an extraordinary technological world.

So the problem then is: what will change man? You have understood? If you say: knowledge can change man - you have to be actual, not theoretical. That is, the actuality of change through knowledge as an instrument which we bring about a different human behaviour, radically, not superficially, not certain peripheral action outside. We are talking about the radical change of man through knowledge. And if you observe, that knowledge has not radically, basically fundamentally brought about a revolution, psychological revolution in man. We may be a little more kind, a little more clever, a little more tolerant, a little more this or that - but fundamentally man has not changed. He is still greedy, envious, competitive, aggressive, violent, suffering endlessly. So if knowledge has not changed man, then what will? You understand the question?

Look, this is not a thing that you are going to understand in a couple of minutes however clearly, objectively it is put, we have to have the capacity to investigate, not just to accept words. Words are meaningless. So you have to give your mind, your capacity, your energy to find out. We say: the world of reality is the movement of thought and all the things that thought has created, the Gurus with their system, with their meditation, with their system, with their philosophies are all the activity of thought and

through thought there is no solution. It is not, how to stop thought, but to find out if there is an energy which is not the energy of thought - right?

So what is the relationship, please listen to this, what is the relationship between reality - you understand what I mean by reality - that is, the reality which thought has brought about, the reality which thought has created, the actual. The actual being, not only what is rational, sane, but also what is irrational, what is insane - both are realities. The man who believes in God or in a perfect state or in something or other, he has thought it out, projected, come to a conclusion however irrational, however neurotic, it is a reality, as well as the man who thinks clearly, rationally and acts according to that rationality - both are realities - the irrational, the neurotic, the insane, the crooked as well as the man who acts according to a pattern, a rational pattern. Both are realities - the neurotic and the non-neurotic, because they are both brought about by the movement of thought as time, as measure. I wonder if you understand all this? This is the world you live in, we live in. And out of this world we create a different world, a different philosophy, born out of this world. Out of the world of reality we create a world of thought which is called philosophical, intellectual, godly, spiritual and all the rest of it. Right?

So then I ask myself, as you must too, if thought is not going to resolve fundamentally our problems, then what will? You understand this question? Not theoretically, not as an idea, something put forward to you and you accept it and say: "Yes!" But something that you yourself actually see, of which you are aware.

So the problem is: are you aware of the movement of thought as time, as measure and all the things thought has created, the real and the un-real? Are you aware of this? Or, are you aware, please, listen, are you aware of the description which the speaker has given? You understand? Aware of the description, aware of the words but not the actuality of this reality of thought. Right? Which is it? Please, this has to be clearly, definitely understood before we go any further, because then it is a waste of time. Am I aware of the reality of all the movement of thought - what it has created in the field of technology, what it has brought about in the psychological field and in the so-called spiritual field? Am I aware of the actual, or of the picture. You understand?

I hope I am making myself clear. Am I aware of the description or the described? Am I aware of the word or the thing which the word represents? Because the word, the description, is not the thing. So which is it I am aware of? If I am aware of the word, the description, then it becomes terribly superficial. It has no meaning. But if I am aware, not of the description, not of the words, but the actual thing, the actuality, then my relationship to it is entirely different. You follow this?

So which is it I am honestly, seriously aware of - the word or the thing? The word 'door' is not the door. The explanation is not the explained. So, am I aware of the door or the word? If I am aware of the real, the actual, then what is my relationship to the actual? You understand my question? Are you really serious about all this? Or are you just playing with me or with words? On a Sunday morning you have nothing else to do and so you go and listen to that poor chap and perhaps he will tell you how to live. So

don't let's play games! I don't want to play games with you, so, please, equally have the respect not to play games with me. The word 'respect' means, to look again. You understand? To look again. When you don't look that is disrespect, when you casually listen and go away, that is disrespect. But if you have respect, then you listen, you try to find out, then it is a mutual respect. I want to tell you something, if you are not interested, don't bother. And if you are interested then give that respect, which is to look again, consider again, watch again.

So what is it that you are aware of? The conclusion, the abstraction or the actual? If I am aware of the actual - not the description, not the word, the word may help me to understand the actual, but the perception of the actual is entirely different from the understanding through the word. Have you understood this? Right, sir? Thank god, somebody does. So I am aware of the movement of thought and all the things that it has created - both irrational and rational, insane, idiotic, superstitious, destructive and thought has put together various things. I am aware of it. Then what is my relationship in that awareness to that thing which I have seen as actual? You understand the problem?

Is this getting too much? I'll repeat it again. I am aware of the actual, not of the abstraction or the conclusion - that has no reality. What has reality is, what actually is. Right? Which is: I am aware of the whole movement of thought - technologically, personally, collectively, in the field of economics, religion, in relationship with each other. That is the actual reality. I am aware of that. Now in that awareness is there a division between me and the thing which I observe? You understand?

I want to find out when I am actually aware of the movement of thought, is that thought different from the observer, or the observer is itself the thought? Because if this is not clear, I will live everlastingly in conflict which is the movement of thought again, isn't it? I wonder if you see that?

Is the thinker different from the thought? Is the entity who is aware of the actual - the actual being that which thought has created, neurotic as well as non-neurotic - is that different from the man who is observing it, or, the division is non-existent and therefore the observer is the observed, the thinker is thought and therefore division ceases. Therefore I am aware totally, there is a total awareness. Not, I am aware of something. Is this clear?

Questioner: No!

K: Let me explain. All right, I am glad. I observe the mountain. I am aware of the mountain, the beauty, the majesty, the extraordinary line against the blue sky, the beauty of that thing. Is the observer different from the observed - the mountain? Obviously he is. He is not the mountain. That is clear, isn't it? If he is the mountain he will be rather strange, he will be fit for an asylum. This is one point. I observe you. Is the observer different from you? Obviously. You are taller, shorter, clever, more beautiful, more intelligent, more awake, more capable of deep investigation - therefore you are different from me who is not bright, who is not clear. That's an actuality. We are different. Am I different through comparison? Please, listen to all this, don't jump at one or two words, go into it. Am I different because I compare myself with you who are this or that - therefore I am different, through comparison am I different? You are taller, I am shorter,

you are fair-skinned, I am not, you are bright, you are suffering, all the rest of it. So by comparing myself with you I become stupid - I am less clever than you, which is the movement of thought as measurement. You understand this? Therefore am I dull if there is no comparison? I may be something entirely different - but I am dull only in comparing myself with you. So I am not you - but is my thinking, my desire, my anger, my suffering different from me who is observing, who is looking? You follow the point?

Obviously not. So I am angry, so I am jealous, I am envious - not I am something which is called envy. I am that! So the observer divides himself from the observed, psychologically, not outside, not mountain, you and the tree - all that. Psychologically thought has divided itself as the thinker and the thought. He has divided himself because that is part of the tradition, part of education, part of his conditioning to always divide himself, and you as something separate from me.

So I realize, there is a realization in this total awareness that the thinker is the thought and therefore what takes place? You understand my question? Before, I separated myself from anger and I did something about that anger, controlled it, rationalized it, said: 'Why should I be angry, it is immoral to be angry, I must control it, I must overcome it, must suppress it' - I did something about it, because it was separate from me. Please, understand that, move with me - not verbally but actually. And when there is the realization that there is no separateness from anger, from myself, then the energy is totally different. You understand? Before there was the dissipation of energy in division. Now, when there is complete awareness of anger and no division as the me being angry

then there is an energy which dissipates anger. You've got this?  
Please, get this!

So there is no struggle, no conflict. There is conflict between the Arab and the Jew or the Communist, you follow - because they are divided. And if there is no division there is no conflict. But human beings won't accept that, because they are being trained, educated to call themselves Arabs and Israelis and Communists, you know, Christians - non-Christians - you and I - all the rest of it.

So from this arises the question: if thought is not capable of resolving the problems which thought has created, which is, knowledge cannot change man, right? - as this has been proved - knowledge being the whole movement of thought as time and measure - as that cannot change man, what will? Right? Now what is your position - not my position, not my description. How do you stand in relation to that? If you are completely aware and have given your attention to the problem that thought cannot solve our problems - not theoretically, actually - then what will you do? What is your action? What will you do with it? Go off to a Yogi, run off to a monastery, form a Utopia, a Commune, become a monk, join some Order? If you do none of these things which are all movements of thought, then what will you do? Wait, let the fruit ripen! You have never faced this problem, therefore let the problem mature in your mind. Not take time - actually look at it, therefore give your attention to it.

Now there is a difference between awareness and attention. May I go on? In attention there is no border, there is no centre from which you are aware, from which you are attentive. I do not know if you have not noticed. I'll show it to you.

You are listening now, aren't you? I hope so. That is, listening means, the art of listening. The art of listening is to put everything in its right place. The word 'art' means that - to put everything where it belongs. Now if you are listening from a conclusion, from a centre, from an opinion, from a prejudice, from previous knowledge, from a centre that is comparing what you already know, then you are not listening. Whereas if you are listening attentively there is no centre from which you are listening, therefore there is complete attention. Right? And there is much more beyond attention, which we won't go into now, for the moment. So if you are completely attentive, have given your total attention to the problem of the thought as knowledge and try to change through knowledge and you totally realize that there can be no radical transformation of man through knowledge, then you have a totally different question you can put, which I am going to put presently. I am totally aware that thought has created extraordinary things - the beauty of the drawings of an architect, the beauty of the silver-smith, the beauty of a picture - the thing hands created by thought. And also thought has created the atomic bomb, the marvellous machinery to kill others on a vast extensive scale. And also see thought has divided man against man - not as an idea but as an actuality, in my blood. Also see when I am completely attentive that thought in comparing myself with you - I am less or I am more - and so can thought be without measurement, or thought is endlessly measuring? Or in that attention there is no division between me and the response: I am that response. So I am totally completely aware of the irrationality of thought and the rationality of thought and the reality of both. So



I am totally aware, attentive to reality, to that field I call reality in which all of us live and try to solve our problems, from the highest politician to the highest orthodox organized religious leader - the Communist, the Socialist - everybody is in that - the artist and the non-artist, the layman and so on.

So realizing that, seeing completely that, then what will change man, what will change me? - radically, most profoundly, so I am something entirely different - not the difference that thought has projected. I must find out - not 'find out' - I see reality, then what is truth? You understand? If I live entirely in reality, then there is no truth. I wonder if you understand? But if I realize the whole movement of reality, which is thought, then I must inevitably ask: "What is truth? Is there a truth?" You understand my question? We say truth is something which is totally unrelated to thought - please, don't accept this most dangerous thing that I am saying to you. This is what man has always said: God is truth. But his truth is the invention of thought, his God is the invention of thought. We are saying quite a different thing altogether. Unless you realize completely the total movement of thought and its activity, its creativeness, its rationality and irrationality - which is still reality - see the whole of that, then only you can ask the question: what is truth? But to ask, living in that, "What is truth?" - you can invent it. You have got this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no sir, you have misunderstood altogether. I have said: am I totally aware of the movement of thought as knowledge and its activity, what it has created - all the mischief - totally aware of that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, listen to it. Don't let me go back to something I have repeated ten times. I said: if I am living in the world of reality psychologically, knowing the irrationality of thought and rationality of thought - both are realities, then only I say I can ask the question: is there something beyond the limit of this? I cannot ask this question if I have not understood that - then I can invent it. Then what I think will be truth, God or whatever you like to call it, will be neurotic, irrational. And all our Gods, all our churches are irrational.

That being so, then I say to myself: What is truth? Is there such a thing at all? I know what's reality, the complexity of reality in which I have to act - not just talk about it. I have to live there, rationally, sanely, wholly, with order and so on. All that has nothing to do, or may have to do, with truth. So I have to find out. To find out there must be no projection of thought. So thought realizes its limitation. When you realize you cannot do something, it is finished. I cannot physically go to the moon. I may imagine that I can go to the moon.

So when the mind realizes the limitation, the narrowness, the finiteness of thought, then only it can ask the question: what is truth? Is this clear? I do not accept truth given by philosophers - that's their game. Philosophy means love of truth, not love of thought. So there is no authority - Plato, Socrates, Buddha, but Christianity has not gone into that very deeply. They have played with words and symbols, made a parody of suffering and all the rest of it. So the mind rejects all that, because that is all in the field of reality. Therefore my mind is clear: the limitations of reality, the

operations and the movement in the field of that reality as thought.  
Right?

Then, what is truth? Has it any relationship with reality? Please, don't agree or disagree, you have got to sweat your blood to this thing, got to give your heart to this, not just accept some silly thing. You have to have the capacity to investigate, not the capacity which time cultivates, like learning a technique; but this capacity comes when you are really, deeply concerned, when it is a matter of life and death - you understand? - to find out. Then one can ask: is there any relationship between reality and truth? If there is no relationship between truth and reality then what value has truth? Value! That is: how can truth be used in the field of reality? Listen to the words, because our mind says: what is the good of something if I can't use it? Our minds are trained to be utilitarian, to work in the market places. If truth cannot have any value in the field of reality, it is not truth. Therefore we are always concerned with the utilitarian use of truth in that field: because I suffer, if truth cannot help me, what's the good of truth?

So I must understand clearly that suffering, pleasure, fear and all that is in the world of reality as thought - my suffering, my fears, everything there. Therefore truth has no relationship to reality. No relationship! I can only say that with complete sincerity, complete authenticity, when I have understood totally the reality. I wonder if I have made this clear?

Q: But it is not clear what you mean by truth.

K: I don't know, what I mean by truth. I know exactly what reality is. When the mind has clearly seen that and is no longer caught in that, then I can find out. So I must go back to reality. I

must understand suffering, I must go beyond suffering. The mind must go beyond fear and understand the whole movement of pleasure, the thing called love in the field of reality, the thing called death, and what is meditation, is that in the field of reality? Or the understanding of reality and moving away from that is meditation? I must go into all this till I have completely understood this, lived it, not just talked about it, then only can I find out. Then I can say: truth is in no relationship to reality. Then truth has its own energy which is going to transform reality, which is my conditioning, which is my psychological fundamental change.

Q: You cannot say that truth has no relationship to reality without playing with words, you must see the reason of truth.

K: I am coming to that, sir. First I'll explain carefully - I can't understand or explain or comprehend - the word 'comprehend' means hold totally the whole thing - what truth is. I don't know. It may not exist or it may exist - one may not be able to put it into words, or able to put it into words - unless I comprehend the totality of thought and its movement, I have no right to ask, what that is. So we must go back and understand the whole field of reality. That is our daily conversation for the next three weeks.

## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 15TH JULY 1975.**

May we go on where we left off on Sunday morning? We were saying that human beings right throughout the world whatever their nationality, their political structure of social behaviour, there must be a radical fundamental transformation psychologically of man - including woman of course. And knowledge - that is the accumulated experience stored up in the brain as memory - that knowledge has in no way, except at the peripheral, which is irrelevant - has not changed man deeply. Knowledge has not in any way basically brought about a change in human behaviour.

We said that. And what is the quality of energy, we went on to ask, that will change man, if it is not knowledge, if it is not all the theories, the book learning, the innumerable assertions of the priest and the politicians and the analysts and the psychologists that has not changed man, then what will? What is the energy? What is the nature of that energy? And how will it act in human behaviour? That's what we were talking about last Sunday. If one sees this very clearly, that thought which has created the modern as well as the ancient civilizations, thought which is the response of memory, thought which is physical as well as chemical, if that thought which has built the whole human structure of behaviour, technological activity and the science and so on, the movement of that thought, which is time, which is measure, is the world of reality. I think that was fairly clear.

In that world of reality there is not only the illogical reality but logical, sane, rational reality. Now to see this very clearly, not theoretically, not in abstraction but to see it actually as it is, out of

that perception comes beauty and from that beauty, action. Now we are going to investigate that.

That is, what is rational and irrational reality that thought has brought about, which confuses man in his outlook, which distorts his activity? And therefore he does not see very clearly, because in clarity - please listen to me - in clarity there is tremendous stability, psychologically and therefore will bring about physical security. That is, to see very clearly the whole movement of thought, what it has done, the absurdities, the silliness, the incorrectness of thought and the correctness of thought, to see that very clearly brings about not only that quality of perception which puts everything in its right place and therefore in that there is stability. And when there is clarity, there is beauty, not the expression of beauty, not the painting, the crowded museums and all the rest of the music, and all that, but the quality of a mind that sees clearly. In that clarity that mind has the depth of beauty.

So we said: thought thinks correctly and incorrectly. The incorrectness of thought is the utter denial of freedom, both politically, religiously and socially. When thought is incorrect - we are not laying down any dogma, we are just observing how thought in its activity creates obscurity because it is not clear. And therefore in that lack of clarity, in that lack of being totally correct, there is no freedom. And this lack of freedom is shown in the structure of belief which thought has brought about through fear. Right? We all believe in something. Belief has no validity at all of any kind. Belief implies a projection of incorrect thinking, from a desire for a hope out of despair. Right? I have not prepared the talk, so I am going along with you.

When one believes in nationality as something totally different from the rest of humanity, that is incorrect thinking. When you state that separate countries according to nationalities, according to religious structure or economic structure - that is incorrect thinking, therefore in that there is no clarity and no stability.

Now if you see clearly the danger of belief - when you see the sun rise in the east and set in the west, you don't believe, it is so! But we have fear brought about by thought and we believe in the most extraordinary things. If you examine not only the economic world and the Communist block direct as credulous, as brutal, as violent as the believers in something which is Utopian, which is godly, which is divine, which is Jesus, which is Christ, which is all the rest of it - or, as in India it is the same pattern. Now do you see this clearly: that belief which is incorrect thinking, which has no basis, but it has a basis of desire, fear, which again is a movement of thought, if you see that clearly belief has no place whatsoever. Therefore you won't fight me, because I believe in something else and you believe in something else - we have no belief. I wonder if you see this? The importance of this. Belief implies opinions, judgement, evaluation, which prevent the clarity of perception - right? Is one aware of this? Is one aware that one has beliefs, clings to them and for those beliefs we are willing to kill, to destroy other human beings? - not only the deeply rooted beliefs but pragmatic beliefs. Now is one aware of this? Does one see this clearly? Therefore the mind, therefore thought denies the incorrectness - thought sees the valuelessness of belief, sees it and therefore in that perception there is stability. You never wander away into belief, which is stability. I wonder if you understand it? Therefore

freedom in the world of reality can only exist when there is correct thinking. Right?

So what is correct thinking? - not according to the speaker or according to you. Correct means accurate. Accurate means order, therefore thought in the world of reality - which we went into on Sunday morning, so we will not go on repeating the old thing. We said, thought, whatever it thinks about, whatever it has created, constructed technologically, psychologically and in relationship, all that area is the world of reality: the thought that has invented gods, the whole system of religious beliefs, dogmas - all that is the movement of thought as time and measure which operates in the world of reality. Reality means - I looked it up in the dictionary yesterday - reality comes from the word 'res', which means thing, a thing. And thought is physical, chemical, therefore it is a thing.

So we have to find out in observing - and this observation needs freedom in the world of reality. May I go on? I am exploring, so don't jump on me yet. Later on you can. There are two kinds of freedom: the freedom in the world of reality and freedom totally outside of reality. If we deny freedom in the world of reality then we become slaves to politicians, to ideologies, to dictatorships, to totalitarianism, to the whole structure of authority. Right? And you must have freedom in the world of reality, even to think correctly. As the world is becoming more and more dangerous for human beings, people are depending for guidance, for authority politically, religiously and so on. So people who are insecure, uncertain, do not see clearly, inevitably bring about dictatorship, totalitarianism of the gurus - please understand - of the gurus, of the politicians, of the priest of the drug addicts. So there must be freedom in the



world of reality and there is no freedom if there is no clear perception. So I, you, must have clear perception, what is correct thinking, accurate thinking and not accurate thinking.

I might ask: what value has correct thinking in the world of reality? I may think very correctly - in the sense we are talking of correct, orderly - what value has it in a world that is confused, uncertain, unstable, disorderly, what value has it if you see clearly? That's an inevitable question.

To answer that properly, correctly one must consider consciousness and its content. May I go on? You don't mind my talking like this? The content of consciousness, which is what you have, what each one has, that content is brought about by the priest, the politician, by experience, by knowledge, by grief, by pain, by attachment, by sorrow, by hope, by despair - all the reactions, all the things that one has acquired, attached to, the despair, the anxiety, the hope - all that is the content, if you observe your own mind, your own consciousness. And that consciousness of every human being, with all its content, is affected by the words - please follow this carefully - by what you read, by what you are told, how you are educated, propaganda, all the religious, political, economic, Marx, Engels, Mao, everything. If you think correctly in the world of reality, you are bringing about, are you not, an incident, a happening in that consciousness. I wonder if you understand what I am saying?

Look: Lenin, Mao and the priests in the name of Jesus - if he existed - have affected our consciousness. Have they not? The philosophers with their theories, with their ideas, with their tricks, have affected our consciousness. Whether you are aware of it or

not, this is unimportant, it has affected. Hitler has affected you, your consciousness, Mussolini, Stalin. Every strong violent incident, happening affects consciousness, or even the most humble. Now if I change, if there is clarity in the field of reality, I affect the whole of consciousness of man. You understand. It's bound to. I am affecting you now, either rationally or irrationally? So to the question: what value has a human being who thinks in the field of reality very correctly in the face of this monstrous confusion? - the correct answer is: that where a human being changes radically in the field of reality, correctly, he affects that consciousness, as irrational thinking affects consciousness. Right?

So one realizes that freedom in the world of reality is necessary for clarity. Please follow, this is really deeply important. That means freedom from total authority - not the technological authority, not the authority of the surgeon, doctor and all the rest of it - the psychological authority. So the acceptance of authority is incorrect thinking, whether the authority of the guru, the priest, the politician, you follow, psychologically. So one begins to see clearly that in the world of reality, which is the field of thought, the operation or the process of thought, thought has created authority, belief as the means of its own security, of its own certainty, and clings to things which have no validity at all.

I once saw a person who had been brought up in the Catholic world, in that very narrow, restricted Catholicism, and at the age of forty that person left it. And he came to see me casually one day and he said: "The only thing I am afraid of, though I have left my church and all the dogma etc. etc., I am afraid of hell". (Laughter) It sounds very funny - but you see the depth of wanting complete

security, psychologically, will bring about the most extraordinary activity of attachment to something totally unreal, illogical, insane.

So can you, listening to this, see, be aware of this attachment to authority, to belief, to knowledge as guide? So then you begin to see that in the world of reality there must be order, and this order is not possible, if there is no freedom. Please, listen. These are just words, but feel it in your heart and mind - then you will have this freedom.

So disorder is authority, in the sense we have been using that word which is logical, which is sane, which is not incorrect, and disorder is brought about by belief, your belief, my belief, your opinion, my opinion, your judgement, my judgement and the assertions of all the priests and so on. So our consciousness is in total disorder. And to be aware of this disorder - not through words or descriptions of the speaker but actually be aware of it and see where your thought is totally incorrect, and finish with it, not carry on day after day. Then it has no meaning. Then you are fit for an asylum.

So the mind then, thought then, brings order in the world of reality, you understand? - because order means stability, security psychologically, which then will bring about security and order outwardly - not the other way round, I wonder if you see that?

That is: all the organized religions have said that there is no order in this world, you cannot have order in this world, there is only order in heaven. Each religion puts it a different way, but basically that's that. And the environmentalist, the Marxist, the Communist say: control the environment, shape the environment by thought (of course you can't shape it in any other way) then that

will change man. You understand? The religions say: there is no order in this world, cannot be, there can be a minimum of order - but there is order in heaven, not here. And the others - the Communists, Socialists, the Materialists, the Humanitarians, Marxists say: change the environment, then that environment will change man - which has not happened, which will never happen. And there is the other, which is what we are talking about, which is: there must be order in this world, in the world of reality, otherwise there is no security in this world of reality. And this order can only come about when there is correct thinking, not neurotic thinking - right? Does this order take place in you, as you are listening? That is the vital question - you follow? Otherwise you are just playing games with me and I refuse to play games with you, I don't want to play games with you. Right?

So then what is order in the world of reality? We know what creates disorder: belief, separateness, psychologically - you may be taller, you may be this or that. I am not talking of that physical division, but psychological division. Where there is division there must be conflict. Where there is division between me as the observer and the observed, which is division, there must be conflict. I am going to go into this presently.

So wherever there is psychological division, as the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim and so on, and so on, and so on - there must be conflict. That is law! That is order, that's correct thinking in the field of reality. So how can there be order? That is, order being the freedom from disorder, because I have understood what is disorder, how disorder comes about through wrong thinking, through various forms of ideological pursuits and the attachment to

those pursuits. All that creates disorder. I have understood it, I have seen it, I have eschewed it, put it completely away, finished.

Therefore out of that complete sense of freedom from disorder, there is order which cannot be systematized, which cannot be put into a pattern, because it's a living thing, though in the world of reality. Are you following all this?

And now we must go much deeper and find out, what creates disorder. I understand what order is but the basic root of disorder - because if I have not solved it, if I have not understood it, if I have not penetrated very deeply into it, there must be constant order and disorder. Right?

There are three fundamental principles of disorder. I am investigating, please go with me. One is suffering, the other is fear and the third is the pursuit of pleasure. Now which shall I begin with? Which shall I examine first? Examine, which is to observe, not to analyse. I wonder if you see the difference between observation and analysis. Analysis implies time. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed, the division and all the things involved in analysis. And perception is entirely different from analysis: you perceive that which is and let that which is reveal itself, which is quite the opposite of analysing 'what is'. You understand this? Analysis implies, as I said, we must go into this a little bit, analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. I analyse myself or a professional analyses me. It's the same thing. He may have a little more advanced knowledge than I have, but it is on the same principle. The analyser, is he different from the analysed? Who is the analyser. He is the past with all the knowledge which he has acquired, and learned through recent psychologists and all

the rest of it, that he is separate from the thing he is going to analyse. So he creates a thought, it is all the process of thinking still, thought creates this division and then begins to examine that which is to be analysed. And so there is always a distance, a separateness between the analyser and the analysed. And this process can go on indefinitely and it's a game of the people who indulge in all that kind of stuff. And also analysing implies time. I must analyse layer after layer, dreams and so on, and so on, and so on, indefinitely. All that involves time, a peculiar kind of energy which is dissipated in words, never penetrating profoundly, because analysis can never go deeply. Whereas perception is quite a different thing. It sees instantly the whole of it, sees the division, sees the futility of the analyser, understands who is the analyser, sees the whole structure of the analyser and the analysed, and sees how this division has been created and therefore there is only the realization that analysis has no place whatsoever - but only perception, seeing - right?

So can I, without analysis, see the whole structure and all the depth of it - not just the words of it - of suffering, fear and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure? These are the three basic principles on which we function. Right? This is so. So which shall we start with?

I think I will start with suffering. Because suffering - not only physical but psychological - when there is that suffering, everything is in operation: your body, your nerves, your brain, you are completely held within that. Haven't you noticed it? Or you haven't suffered. Your body is nearly paralysed, your mind is held, your nerves, your thought, everything is concentrated. Isn't that so?

So suffering of the loss of someone, suffering because one is utterly, desperately lonely, there is that suffering when you realize you are not loved and want to be loved, there is suffering when you realize, that nobody can help you, you are completely isolated, that you have lost all relationship with everything, that there is no answer - you want an answer, but you know very well inside yourself, that there is no answer. You may run away seeking comfort, drugs or God knows what else - drugs, the Bible or the Gita or the Guru - but the thing remains.

So suffering, both physical and psychological is a factor that makes man, or woman, completely held. And being enclosed in that suffering, one tries to get away, minimize, we say: "Time will cure it". Or go to church, you know the various things that we indulge in to escape from that factor of extraordinary concentration, of total energy - which doesn't take place where there is fear and where there is the pursuit of pleasure. It is only when there is this extraordinary suffering which we all go through - in that suffering all thought is held - right?

So Christianity has made suffering into a parody - you know what is happening. And the Hindus, the ancient Hindus, knew what suffering was and gave a rational explanation. They say: this is what you did in your past life, called Karma, which is, you acted wrongly. The word 'Karma' means - it has a root meaning, which means to act, to do. Therefore they say: in your past life you did wrong, therefore you are paying for it now. Be careful now, next life will be better. You know the prop is of a better life next life which you all want and they are very clever at it.

And what is a man who is suffering out of loneliness, out of

desperation, out of realizing that there is no security, knowing that you have lost everything that you held, in death, and thought itself at that moment is paralysed. Have you noticed all this, have you been aware of it? If you have, which means there is no movement of thought in any direction: no hope, no desire for comfort - you know very well those are all escapes, which is correct thinking. So what takes place in a mind which has known this suffering and which has not found an answer, because to find an answer is incorrect thinking. I wonder if you see that? Because this very suffering is the product of thought - because I am attached to you and you desert me - that's a paralysing action. I have lost you, in whom I invested my comfort, my desire, my sexual appetites - everything in you. I have lost you, you are dead and I call that suffering. What is a mind that sees the incorrect thinking of escape - escape is incorrect thinking, to rationalize is incorrect thinking, to accept is incorrect thinking, or to deny is incorrect thinking - but only the fact which is 'what is', what takes place in that mind, knowing suffering is a distorting factor? There is not only personal separate suffering, as you and me, and also there is the suffering of mankind, the whole of suffering, the suffering that has been brought about through wars, millions of mothers have cried and wives or whatever they are. There is this vast cloud of suffering, personal suffering and also the universal suffering, the global suffering through economic lack of money, lack of food, lack of education, ignorance, poverty. All that is vast human suffering, which is part of my consciousness - right? Please follow this. Part of my consciousness, not only my suffering but also the suffering of human beings right through the world.



So then what is the quality of a mind that has faced this? What is the quality of your mind, when you face this fact? That there is no escape, that there is no rationalization, that any movement of thought is furthering the confusion of sorrow? In seeing the reality of that - I am not using the word 'truth' purposely - seeing the reality of this suffering, what takes place? Now, who is going to answer you? This is not a clever trick on my part. Who is going to answer this question? Because all of us have suffered to a minor degree or a great deal, either become embittered or cynical, depraved and ugly, run off into some monastery, which is all incorrect thinking, and therefore bring about greater confusion, which is part of suffering. So realizing all that, what takes place in the mind? If you answer, answer correctly, because you are speaking out of the depth of your suffering, not out of your escape, or words and explanations, abstractions - because we have to test this, you can't just accept words and live on words and explanations - that has no meaning. You can't test explanations, but you can test the reality of suffering and actually what takes place.

So one has to go into the question: what is love, hasn't one? For most of us suffering is an act of love, right? I love you, you don't love me. I love you, you have gone away. I love you and I am attached to you and you spurn me, you go away and I am lonely. I have never faced that loneliness, now I realize that loneliness. And all this movement of attachment, pleasure, despair, jealousy, anxiety, hate, is what we generally call love. No? And we translate this love as human or not human, divine - it's the same process. And I see suffering is one of the acts of what we call love. My god, just realize it, sir, you understand? I love you and therefore I suffer

- just think of such a thing. So I have to go into this question very deeply: what is love?

Has love any relationship to thought? Has love any relationship to jealousy, to hate, to envy? But yet I am in it. That's the world of reality I live in. Has love any pleasure and is love enjoyment? Please this is very complicated, don't just say: "I love you and you love me and it is a beautiful world". That's all romantic nonsense. So I must go into this question because it is terribly related, very intimately related to suffering. So I must understand the nature and the structure of love and what place has thought in it. If love has no remembrance then what is my relationship to you, whom I love? You understand?

So suffering leads me to realize that it is one of the acts of sorrow, and therefore I must have a clear perception of what love is, not the description, not the word, not all the romantic sentimental nonsense but the actuality of it, which is: I love and with it goes hatred, jealousy, anxiety, and with it goes loneliness, despair, attachment and the fear and the anxiety that one must be detached and the struggle and the envy and all that. Are you following all this, it is your life! So what place has thought in the world of love? So is love in the field of reality? You follow? Field of reality in which I enjoy sexually, the remembrance of it, the demand for it and the looking forward to it, the picture, all the encouragement of modern civilization with all the nakedness, with their exploitation of nakedness. All that is called love.

So: what relationship in the world of reality, which is the world of thought, and can love exist in the field of reality? Then what is the relationship between you and another? You understand the

question? If it is in the field of reality, which it is, as it now is, then suffering is inevitable. I can go to church and think suffering is somebody else's - all that is silly nonsense, but I realize suffering exists in the field of reality - reality is that which thought has brought about, that which thought has created, cultivated, structured and holds it up, and nourishes it by constant remembrances. And I also see very clearly, that as long as love is in the field of reality, which is sustained by thought, sustained in our relationship with each other - man, woman whatever it is - there must be constant suffering. I see it clearly as I see you sitting there; you are as real as the perception. Then what is love? Is it at all related to suffering? What is love? Then what is compassion? The word 'compassion', the word 'com' means - with, together, altogether, completely, totally. Passion is totally. It means for the whole, not just for one or two - for the whole. Can thought bring about in the field of reality this sense of complete compassion? No, no, don't say "No". You have to find out. And how does this extraordinary thing, that passion, that compassion, that love, which is not in the field of reality, how does it come about? Because once when one has seen the mystery of that, because that is a great mystery - not the mystery of a conjurer, the mystery that the church has created, or the religions who have organized the mystery - but the mystery of compassion, and that can only come - I won't go into it.

First we must go into this question of love in the field of reality. And in that field of reality, in which there is 'love', if we don't understand it, live it freely, completely, the full significance of all this, sorrow is inevitable. Therefore as a human being whose

consciousness is crowded with all its content - because the content makes consciousness. It is not two different things - the content is consciousness and consciousness is its content. And I live with that content. I am the content. And that content is put together by thought. That thought says "I can hold love in that content". And holding it in that content, in that consciousness inevitably brings suffering.

Now do I, listening to you say this, and you are saying it not verbally only, but you are saying it because you know what you are talking about - do I realize, do I see this totally? Therefore I have to go further into finding out whether love can exist in relationship, you understand sir? Or it is the love which thought has created in relationship? You understand? Thought is memory, experience, knowledge. Thought is physical and chemical. Thought is measure and time. Therefore out of that thought there is remembrance - you and meremembrance of what you have given me, what you have told me, sexually you have given me pleasure, all that, and that says, thought says: "I love you", and we are satisfied to live that way - all of us say: "That is enough, please, just leave it alone."

As long as thought holds you in that field of reality, I hope in that there will be no trouble, no disturbance, no breakage. That is what we call love, right? And thought, being in itself fragmentary, it must inevitably create disturbance, wanting to hold it and yet, because in itself it is broken, it must break up. Obviously you can see this. So then what is relationship in reality? In the world of reality? In the world of reality must there always be conflict between you and me? Wife and husband, boy and girl? Must there always be conflict? You follow? Because this conflict means

sorrow, either superficial, passing or deeply abiding, a wound that has been deeply carved out. And has love no relationship whatsoever with the world of reality? Don't translate it as the Christians and the Hindus: love of god and love of something else.

After investigating this, I am asking myself: is love not in the field of reality at all and therefore no suffering? I wonder if you see that? Not, my not suffering, but humanity not suffering, because I am part of that humanity, I am part of the world and the world is me. If my mind can solve, can understand this, can see the truth of it - the truth that love is outside the field of reality - then because one human being has seen it, it affects the content of consciousness of other human beings, therefore it becomes tremendously important that you see it. Therefore from that one asks: if suffering is in the field of reality, and if thought is the factor that gives energy to suffering, then how is it possible, because suffering is a distorting factor, it is a burden, it darkens everything, how is it possible to live in the field of reality and yet have relationship and not suffer? You understand all this? I'll show it to you, I'll go into it.

May I say just something? You have seen the picture haven't you? I'll describe it if you want it, again. You have seen the picture: the shadows, the lights, the depth, the variety of colours, you have seen the picture of suffering, and the relation to the act of love which brings that suffering. You have seen the picture of relationship in the field of reality, which we call love, which brings suffering. And you have seen or been explained the relationship between thought and suffering, and thought which sustains, through memory, what is called love, the pain, the pleasure, the

remembrance - all that. All that is within the field of reality, which is the movement of thought as time and measure. Measure being: I was happy, I am not, I should be, I am not, which is the movement of thought as measurement. Now if you have seen the picture clearly, not distorted, because thought can distort the picture, and you see how thought can think incorrectly and run away from it. Now can you remain with that picture, not try to alter it, not try to bring in a different shape and colour, a different framework, different environment and so on, and so on. Just totally remain with it. That means to remain with it, without any movement of thought away from it: verbally, escape from it, rationalize it - just remain with that picture, which means, you are that picture, not you are looking at the picture, you are the observer and the observed - remain with it. Then find out what happens.

I'll go into it with you the day after tomorrow, when we meet? Then I'll go into it. But this is something you have to live not just verbally play tricks with each other. You have got to see this thing completely. And see then what happens to a mind, to a human being who has seen the total content of suffering, not only the physical suffering, the pain of yesterday, the ache and the loneliness of that pain of yesterday, and the ache and the loneliness psychologically - all that. And see what takes place, meeting that twenty four hours till we meet. Then we can have communication at a deeper level - no, not at a deeper level - at the only level that matters.

## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1975.**

May we go on from where we left off the day before yesterday?

We were talking over together, suffering and all the implications involved in suffering, and whether it is at all possible to be totally free of that suffering without becoming callous, indifferent, without any affection, care and compassion.

And we were saying that in the field of reality - we mean by reality all the things that thought has put together, all the things that thought has built, technologically as well as psychologically, thought that is illusory and thought that is real, reasonable, sane. Illusion is sensory perception of objective things, involving belief - we talked about that the other day. In that field of reality, which is our daily life with all the economic, social and political problems, the divisions and griefs and wars and travail, in that field of reality which is the product, which is the process of thought as time and measure, we said freedom cannot possibly exist - total freedom. But yet we must have freedom in that field of reality - politically, religiously and so on. And in that field of reality of our daily life, we said there must be order, because order gives freedom, limited, but yet it is free. Without that order in that field of reality, freedom cannot possibly exist. There are, we said too, two types of freedom - freedom of truth and freedom within the field of reality.

So as we are saying, as thought which is the movement of time and measure as knowledge, that knowledge has not profoundly changed man, and any serious person - and I hope we are here - any serious person, observing what the world is - the mess, the brutality, the violence and all the rest of it - must deeply enquire

surely what place has knowledge, and if knowledge has not changed man basically, then what will?

The knowledge of energy, that is, the whole accumulated process of thought as experience, memory, that knowledge has its own energy. And that energy has not changed man. Therefore we must enquire - if we are at all serious, if we are at all concerned with human beings which are ourselves - is there a different kind of energy which is not the energy of knowledge, that will bring about a fundamental, radical revolution, psychologically, in man? The energy of knowledge which has not changed man: and is there an energy which will change man? That's what we are enquiring - not intellectually, not theoretically, which is an abomination. This speculative, imaginative enquiry has no value at all - they are merely excursions, verbal.

So we are concerned with the enquiry into that energy which might change man - but that energy of knowledge which has not changed man. So that is what we are concerned with.

And we were talking over together this problem of suffering. We said Christianity has made suffering into a parody, and the Hindus and the ancient Asiatic world have got various explanations of suffering and yet man goes on suffering. Is there an end to that suffering? Because, if there is no end then we shall always remain in the cloud, in the darkness of suffering, and therefore always remain in the field of reality and therefore no fundamental, radical change. Right?

So we said, in enquiring into the whole structure of suffering, we must also go into the problem of what love is. I am just going over what we discussed the day before yesterday. Thought is



limited and therefore thought conditions the mind. Please, we are communicating with each other, I am not talking to myself. We are communicating and that means we are sharing this thing together. We are not merely listening to various explanations and drawing an abstraction from those explanations, but actually sharing the problem together. Sharing implies care, attention, responsibility and the responsibility is to find out in our relationship in the field of reality, what love is. Because for most of us suffering implies the lack of that love - or the frustration of that love, or the feeling completely lonely. So one must go into this question: what is love in the field of reality, and can there be freedom in relationship in that field of reality, and is suffering one of the factors or one of the movements of thought in relation to love and in relation to human beings? Are we understanding each other?

Because the western world, including America, is nearly destroying the world with their industrialization, with their technological knowledge, overproduction, the whole business of it - consumerism. And the eastern world is copying it, as much as it can, and therefore destroying the earth, themselves and their environment, which is again obvious.

And thought can uncondition itself and condition itself. That is what is taking place. Right? One sees that. Thought has conditioned itself into Catholicism, Protestantism, Communism, adjusting itself to Totalitarianism, Mao and so on, and that very thought can uncondition itself and create another conditioning for itself. This is called 'progress'. I do not know if you understand the meaning of the word. Progress means, entering into the enemy country, fully armed and if you have a Bible, so much the better.

You understand the meaning of 'progress'? That is the original meaning of that word, to progress, to go forward.

Thought - please, understand this - thought has been conditioned by the culture, by the social structure, by the religious propaganda. Thought has created the propaganda, the social structure, the cultural environment and has conditioned itself. And when thought sees that it is not worth it, it doesn't pay, then it will uncondition itself and create another conditioning. This is the process of the movement of thought in time, in measure.

So that's what we are doing. We are always living in that field of reality, knowing the cunningness of thought and knowing also thought cannot possibly change radically our psychological structure. Now if you listen to what is being said and not draw an abstraction from what is being said, but actually be aware of what is being said, then the problem is: what is love in relation to our existence, our relationship between you and another? You understand? Are we travelling together?

Because this is not - if I may point out - a gathering in which you are being entertained, satisfying your rather obvious curiosity or trying to stimulate you to thinking. We are serious people, at least the speaker is, and if we are going to journey together into this problem of suffering and love, we must have certain communication, which means care, respect for each other. That is, to have respect means to give attention to what is being said - not think about it afterwards, that is disrespect, both to you and to the speaker. Not that the speaker wants your respect, but any person who is serious must resolve this problem. In our human relationship between man and woman, between each other, what is

love? Is love one of the major causes of suffering in this relationship? If it is the cause of suffering then what value has love in that field of reality? I hope you understand this.

So what is freedom in the field of reality between two human beings who love each other? Love being - I am putting it in quotes. Because apparently that is one of the major causes of this extraordinary suffering. If there is order in that relationship, then that order must come about through freedom - not through regulation, not through legislation, not through vows.

So what is the actual relationship between human beings? - the actual, not the theoretical, not the romantic, mystical or sentimental. What is the actual relationship between man and woman, which creates the whole structure of society? Right? Because the society is what we have made of it; what we have made of it is based on thought, thought which is limited, thought which is fragmented and our society is that - corrupt, all the rest of it - it is obvious.

So, a serious person must enquire into what is actual relationship and in that relationship, what is love? We said in that relationship between two human beings love has become a matter of great pleasure, a matter of attachment, a matter of dependence, a matter of utter lack of communication. There can be communication between two people only when they meet at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity - otherwise there is no communication. Now, if we are to communicate with each other, as we are doing now - which is our relationship between you and the speaker - we must meet at the same level, neither intellectual nor verbal, nor sentimental or romantic; we

must meet. Our minds must be in contact and there can only be contact when we both see the same thing - not, you see and afterwards you tell me about it. We must see the same thing together, at the same time, at the same level, with the same intensity - otherwise between you and the speaker there is no communication, there will be verbal communication, which is irrelevant. Right?

So: in our relationship with each other is there such a communication - between man and woman, between man and the whole world? Or is the communication verbal and therefore symbolic, and so imaginary? You understand? Is the relationship between human beings at the level of images, symbols, words, conclusions, remembrances and therefore at the level of thought, and so limited and hence division and conflict? I wonder if you see this? See the beauty of it.

Are you following all this? Now what is the actual? What is your relationship with another, however intimate? Is it verbal, a thing that has been concluded, a thing that has been remembered and therefore an image? All the movement of thought? Therefore our relationship with each other is based thought - I wonder if you see - therefore limited and therefore contradictory. Right? That is so. Then realizing that, what can thought do? You understand my question? I am related to you as a husband, wife whatever it is - and I realize and I observe accurately - the word accurate means care, curare, from the word to care - and as I care, I watch my relationship. I do not know why I put so much energy to this. I watch accurately what my actual relationship is. I see it is that: verbal, a conclusion, a remembrance, a movement of thought as

time, the past through the present and the future. And thought, being limited and fragmentary, therefore in that relationship there must be contradiction and therefore isolation. I am aware of that. Then thought says: what can I do? I know I have done this, what am I to do? This is the problem. Therefore one must understand very, very deeply that thought which has created this division - the 'me' and the you - the 'me' with all my ambitions, with all my greed and so on and you with yours - then thought which has operated in the alteration of the conditioning is now going to alter that conditioning into a different pattern. I wonder if you see that. Do we meet this? So I see that. So I see, I perceive, I am aware that any movement of thought in relationship must inevitably create this, and therefore thought creates suffering. And one has been aware, or one has lived with this suffering as a necessity for the pleasure of love. I wonder if you see all this?

Then what is love? Is love in the field of reality or outside of it? You understand, please, don't answer, "Yes" or "No", because this is a tremendous problem. We have only known love as pleasure in the field of reality and we see, if one is at all serious, gone into this deeply, one sees that this love not only brings about a great friction but also breeds suffering, which is attachment, dependence, psychological dependence and attachment. So I must enquire why human beings are so dreadfully attached to another, as that is one of the major causes of suffering, and to understand and to be totally free of suffering without becoming callous, one must go into this problem of attachment. You understand, sir? Are we travelling together? You are attached, aren't you? - to your knowledge, to your status, to your capacity, to your efficiency, to your

knowledge, to a person, to a belief, to a conclusion, to your country, to your god, you are endlessly attached. One of the causes of this attachment is the movement of thought, which is seeking security, because thought itself is insecure, therefore it seeks security in a person, in an idea, in a conclusion. This is all so obvious. No? Or you cling to an ideal or to a projection which you call god.

Why is one so deeply attached? Is it a matter of conditioning or is it a psychological emptiness and the fear of this emptiness and out of that emptiness and the fear of that emptiness one clings to another or to a belief and so on and so on? You understand - either it is a matter of environmental conditioning, or is it that inwardly one feels lost, uncertain, empty, lonely, therefore one clings to these things? I also looked up the word 'emptiness', which means leisure, one of its meanings, leisure - to have leisure. If you have no leisure, you cannot learn. The word 'school' means leisure - that leisure is going to help you to learn. You follow? A school that has no leisure, offers to the student a mechanical movement, repetitive movement which is what is happening now. Our education is mechanical. It has no leisure. I don't know if you see this.

And is it this emptiness that makes man cling to a something and in that attachment or in that adherence to something, is called love? So as one must have leisure to learn about this emptiness and to understand the whole movement of thought as attachment, one must have freedom to look. I wonder if you meet all this? Are you bored, sirs? One must have freedom to observe this emptiness, not as the observer and the observed, because when you are observing, there is no observer, there is only observation.

One moment sir, let me finish. Sir, I can't throw any light on anything. You have to throw light yourself and find out.

There is an observation of this emptiness, and if there is an observer who is observing the emptiness, then that observer is the conditioned entity who is observing. That observer is the past with all its memories, with all its remembrances, its hurts, its prejudices, and with all that background he is observing that emptiness.

Therefore it is a distorted observation. So to observe without the observer one must enquire into the structure and the nature of the observer, right? Is it all getting too complicated? It is not one of those puzzles you put one box into another.

So: the observer is the past. The observer is the conditioned entity - conditioned by environment, conditioned by the culture in which he has been brought up, with its prejudices, with its knowledge, which is always the past; that observer sees this emptiness and therefore he is looking at it from a very limited, conditioned point of view, he is incapable of looking at it totally. You understand? If I am prejudiced as a Hindu, or a Christian, or a Catholic or a Communist - it is a prejudice, if I say, "I am a Communist" it is a prejudice. If I look with my prejudice, the prejudice is fragmentary, is limited and therefore I look at something in a limited, small, petty way. And if there is no observer then there is a total perception of this emptiness.

So when there is no observer but only observation which reveals the totality of that emptiness, then there is no movement of thought as attachment. I wonder if you see that. Do you see this, some of you? Not what I say, but actually, that is with care, observe your emptiness and see that the observer is interfering, is

cutting across your observation, and therefore distorting it, limiting it, conditioning your perception. If you see that, then you see the totality of this emptiness and then what takes place? One of the factors of uncertainty and insecurity lies in becoming something, right? I am becoming something - professionally or ideologically or psychologically. In that becoming something there is great uncertainty, whereas in not becoming, which is to remain totally with that emptiness, is to be nothing, and therefore complete security. I wonder if you understand all this?

So attachment with its pain and pleasure, to be obsessed and to obsess, is part of this attachment, and to be free of that attachment totally, because that is freedom in reality and therefore order in that reality and therefore no friction between human beings. I wonder if you see this? Do you see this, please? Not up here but with your heart, with your mind, with your whole being see this, the truth of it.

Then what is love? Then is love in the field of reality? And in that field of reality there is confusion when there is attachment, conflict, pain, suffering - then what is the relationship between two human beings - you follow - in that field of reality, in which there is no attachment? Right? What is your answer? Answer it to yourself, not all of you answer to me. What is your answer? If there is no attachment - not detachment, callousness, indifference, that is the opposite and therefore the opposite is always part of its own opposite. I wonder if you see that. The opposite is part of its own opposite. Therefore opposites have no meaning. I wonder if you see.

So what is relationship between human beings when there is no



attachment? Attachment brings the pain, the conflict, the contradiction, the isolation and that brings about disorder in the world of reality. And one must have complete order in the world of reality, because we are going to something, when we have established order here in the world of reality, then we can move. But if we have no order here we can't possibly go further. So we must establish order in the field of reality, and that order comes when we go into this question of attachment between human beings - attachment not only between human beings but between conclusions, ideas, suppositions, theories, beliefs and so on.

Now what is the relationship between two human beings when there is total freedom from attachment? Because we said, attachment is one of the causes of great suffering, pain. What is it? Do you want my answer - or are you facing, looking at the actuality? The actuality means what is actually taking place and therefore you are observing with care, with respect - not casually and come back to it, which is disrespect. You are watching it with complete attention, with care. That is: what is the human relationship between each other, when there is no attachment at all? Is it love? Then it has no continuity in time, you understand? I am related to you, wife, husband and god knows what else, and really completely free from attachment. I have no attachment - belief, conclusions, ideas persons, knowledge - and yet we live together. What takes place there? I am asking: is that love? Love being not a series of conclusions, therefore remembrances, therefore a process of time, which is thought. That is: is that love a timeless movement - no movement means time - no, please, find out. I am going to find out. A timeless... got it. Love is then

timelessness or now. I wonder if you understand that? You see, when we use the word 'timeless', we mean - let us begin. Time means movement - from here to there, physically as well as psychologically - from here to there to cover the distance - that's a movement. And my whole conditioning is from here to there, psychologically as well as physically. Physically I must become - more clever - I must become the Chief Executive or I must become the foreman or the shop steward, or the manager of something or other - archbishop or the pope - they are all in the same category.

So my mind is conditioned in the movement of time, and I have lived in that movement as the 'me' and the you, I am attached to you and out of that attachment there is great disorder and suffering. And that suffering, that pain, that jealousy, all that I have called 'love'. And I see also that when there is this emptiness and I am totally aware of it, then I am asking what is my relationship with another, is it of the same order as before, or is it something totally new, which thought cannot think out? If it is thought out, then it is limited, then we will be back again to the same old mess. So is love a movement in time, or is it totally out of time; which means, there is no future and no past, only, now? And the now has tremendous responsibility. I wonder if you see that. The responsibility which we know is the responsibility of - first let us explain what that word 'response' means: to respond adequately - that's the meaning of 'to respond'. In our relationship in the world of reality there is no total response - obviously. If there were total response there would be total relationship. And as there is no total response our relationship is fragmentary, contradictory, isolated, bringing pain and all the rest of it.

Where there is no attachment in relationship, there is total response, that means total responsibility. Total responsibility for the whole of mankind, not just you and me. And that may be called love.

So then what is suffering if there is total response which we have said is love. Is there suffering? I suffer, one suffers both physically and psychologically. Physically there is disease, pain and the remembrance of that pain, which if one is not very alert affects the mind, affects the brain and therefore affects correct thinking. We said correct thinking is accurate thinking and accuracy means care, attention, respect. And is there suffering when there is no attachment whatsoever to anything - to a house, to a name, to a form, to a belief? Now is a human being capable of that? Or is it just a blasted theory like so many other terrible theories? That is: physically there is pain, I can observe that pain and not let it influence the correctness of thought. That's fairly comparatively easy when you are watching it. That requires its own discipline. But psychologically we have many hurts, deep hurts, from childhood - in school, in the house, in college, in the university - the whole of life is an affair of being wounded. I am not exaggerating. The more sensitive, alive and active you are, the more you are hurt. And that's one of the causes of suffering. And psychologically is it possible not to be hurt at all, never be touched by something or some accident, incident, a word, a gesture, nothing that will hurt?

So we have got two problems: one, we say being hurt is one of the major causes of suffering. What has been hurt? And when there has been hurt, all action becomes neurotic, all action is a form of

resistance. Please bear in mind what we are discussing, what we are talking over. We are concerned with the radical transformation of human beings so that they can live a totally different kind of life, and therefore totally different kind of social structure - not my personal salvation or yours, that's too silly, because you are the world and the world is you. So we are concerned with the totality of that. And as human beings right through the world are hurt, have been hurt - how to be free of the hurts that one has received and how not to be hurt any more? You understand the problem?

First of all not to be hurt, knowing that you have been hurt and no more hurt. Is one aware that one has been hurt? Are you aware of it? And when you are hurt, you resist, you build a wall around yourself, you don't want to be hurt any more, so your actions are always more and more limited, more and more self-centred and greater form of resistance in a very small space. Right?

Now how is one - not a method, or a system, those are mechanical - can there be freedom from the past hurts, not through analysis - we went through that yesterday or the day before - not through analysis, because you can endlessly repeat this pattern of analysis; can there be freedom from the past hurts and the freedom never to be hurt? You understand my two questions? Right?

Because it is very important to understand this: never to be hurt. That is the quality of innocence. The very word 'innocent' means a mind that is not capable of being hurt. Hurt is not only pain but also pleasure. You understand? Don't just take hurt and keep the other, because they both leave marks.

How is a mind never to be hurt? Deal with that first. Then we'll deal with the past. Never to be hurt. What is it that is hurt? You

say: you have hurt me by your word, by a gesture, by a cruel action, by putting me down and so on, ten different ways. You've hurt me. What is the thing that is hurt? Is it the image of me which thought has created as the 'me'. You understand? I think I am very superior, full of some rot and you come along and say to me: 'How childish you are!' - and that hurts me, because I have an image about myself and you are pulling that image to pieces. And that I call hurt. Follow this carefully, please. If I have no image about myself you can't hurt me. That is, if I am completely empty of all images, but if I am attached to an image about myself or the image which somebody has given me about myself or the image that society has given me, and I am attached to that, then there is inevitably hurt.

So I see that, that is an actuality, correct thinking - therefore when I have no image and therefore the mind is totally empty of image, then it is not only that you can't hurt me, then there is no past hurts at all. I don't know if you see that.

Questioner: (Inaudible)

K: I never said do away with thought, sir. Please you can't do away with thought.

Q: The image will continue as long as you have thought.

K: The images will continue as long as we have thought. I am pointing out, sir, do listen. I said, we said, the speaker said, that there is suffering as long as one is hurt. That's one of the causes of suffering. And what is hurt? The image I have about myself. A physical hurt I can cure very easily. The body looks after itself and cures it. But the psychological hurt is the hurt of the image which thought has built about itself, and any derogatory word or incident

hurts that image. See that. That image is unreal, it has no validity, it has been put together by thought which is an illusion; an illusion, as we said, is sensory perception of an objective thing involving belief. That is illusion. I have created a belief, thought has created a belief that the 'me' is a marvellous image, and you have your own marvellous image about yourself - and you pull me down, that hurts me, hurts the image which thought has built. And if I see that, actually be aware of it, then the image is not. Thought doesn't build images, the image is not, therefore there is no hurt. When there is no image, the past hurts I have lost and therefore there is no future hurts. I wonder if you see this.

So the mind then can understand and look at this suffering, this total suffering, the suffering that makes the whole movement of thought come to an end, all the nervous responses, it is a complete paralysis. Have you noticed all this in people? And we have seen one of the major causes is what we have called love, for this suffering - that love which is attachment, that love which is - you know, I won't go into all that. And also we see that being hurt, with all the things involved in it, is also one of the causes of suffering. One is totally aware of this and in that awareness there is no question of overcoming suffering or running away from suffering, or rationalizing suffering, it is there completely and you see the whole movement of thought as suffering. Then, when there is an ending of suffering, then there is clarity, there is no distortion to thought. Is that clear? It is very important to understand this. It is the hurt, the so-called love, that brings suffering, and that suffering is like a cloud that distorts the clarity of thought in the field of reality - and therefore clarity of thought in the field of reality

brings order, not conflict between human beings. Therefore there is an ending to suffering.

And there is the problem of the whole of mankind suffering, you understand, sir? The suffering in Vietnam, the suffering of the people, the terrorists who have created suffering, the wars - there is this vast human suffering - and what effect or what value, what significance or what meaning, has the ending of suffering on the total suffering of man? You understand my question? Are you all awake or are you getting tired? You understand my question? I am asking you: you have listened to the speaker, if you have paid attention, care and you see how suffering can end and does end, you have to test it, not just accept it, you have to test it in life, then it has significance. To you suffering has ended - how does it affect the bias of suffering of human beings? You understand my question? Suffering out of poverty in the East, in Africa, their appalling sense of ignorance, their brutality, their callousness and the endless suffering. Now will the ending of suffering here affect all that? As we pointed out the day before yesterday - you are the world and the world is you. That's an actuality, not a supposition, a theory - that is a fact. A fact means the thing that is done, that is. Your consciousness with its content is the consciousness of the world; that also is so. And if there is an ending of suffering in one consciousness or your consciousness, then it affects the whole consciousness of the world. That's an obvious fact. Hitler affected the consciousness of the world, Lenin, the priests with their belief in Jesus and all the rest of it, have affected the consciousness of Christianity, mind, your mind; so, if a human being - you - are completely free of suffering, hurt and live in that quality of

affection, love, then you affect the whole of mankind, you can't help it. And that is the mystery of compassion.



## **SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1975.**

May we go on with what we have been talking about during the three last gatherings, meetings that we have had here.

We were saying that given the situation of the world, the gradual creeping of dictatorship all over the world, the denial of freedom and all the confusion, the wars and the starvation and the great suffering of human beings all over the world - and this catastrophic existence has not been changed by any experience, by any religious organization or belief or through scientific knowledge or the ordinary knowledge that one has gathered through experience.

It is becoming more and more obvious that knowledge, that which one has accumulated through centuries, has not basically changed man in his behaviour towards other human beings. I think that can be taken for granted by those who have gone seriously into this matter. And, if I may again remind you, this is not an amusement for this morning, an entertainment, something you listen to for an hour and forget all about it and return to your own life. We are very serious and we have been discussing, talking over together, the question of suffering, love and the whole movement of thought, as knowledge.

This morning, if I may, I would like to go into the question of time, action and fear. We are using ordinary language, not jargons, not technical words but simple words that have meaning according to the dictionary - the dictionary being the commonly accepted meaning of words. And we also said, there must be total psychological freedom to observe. Without that freedom all

perception, all waiting to perceive and then to act denies the total relevance of living now. And we were saying that thought - which I must repeat again a little bit - thought whatever it has constructed, whatever it has reflected about or upon is the world of reality. That thought can be rational or irrational, both the actual and the fictitious are realities, the neurotic as well as the sane, are both in the field of reality. And, it seems to me, unless one understands this whole problem of time, man will never be free of fear. Time is fear.

And one has to go into this question of what is time? Because we live by time, we act according to time, all our thinking is based upon time as remembrance of something past, acting in the present, constructing the future according to our conditioning, which is essentially time.

There is not only the chronological time: yesterday, today and tomorrow by the clock, which is necessary if you want to catch a train or a bus, and there is also the psychological time. The time to achieve psychologically, to gain, to become, to change, to achieve an ideological status of a mind, to change from one conditioning to another conditioning, to radically transform that which is conditioned to something which is not conditioned. That movement is called time. There is not only the becoming into something which is time, but also there is all the unconscious movement as time. I hope we are communicating with each other clearly? Because there must be not only a verbal communication, a description, an explanation through words - but the explanation, the description, the word is not the thing, not the described, not that which is explained; but words are necessary and if we are to

understand each other, communicate with each other, words are necessary which will help us to share that which is being said.

That which is being said is not an opinion, it is not a personal inclination, tendency, or personal conclusion. We are dealing with facts, that which is - not that which should be, or that which we hope to be or indulge in absurd speculations, we are actually dealing with how we live in our daily life. And if one is concerned with the radical transformation of not only our own lives but of the society, the world of which we are and we are the world, we must understand not only suffering, love and all the complications of love and pain and sorrow and grief, which we went into the other day, but also we have to understand this problem of time.

So time is movement - movement from here to there, not only physically but psychologically. The psychological movement may be conscious or unconscious; the movement of desire as becoming something, the projection of a goal, a purpose, an end psychologically, needs time - the movement of 'what is' to 'what should be', the actual and the fictitious which is the ideal. All that is a movement conscious or unconscious. The desire to become or not to become, this constant movement of desire with its reactions is in the field of time. I think that's fairly clear for most of us. We live in the past and with the past function in the present, which is a movement from yesterday to today, which is time at the conscious level. And also there is at the unconscious, semi-awakened, dim conscious state, there are all the movements of desire, movements of concealed hypocrisy, the movements of double talk, the assertions of saying something and doing something totally different, and the unconscious movement of desire - conscious

movement of desire and the unconscious movement of desire; one must be aware of both and this movement is time. Right?

This time, this movement, is the movement of thought. Right? So thought, conscious or dimly-conscious or unconscious, is always operating in the field of time. Time, not only the outward chronological time by the watch, but also time as the movement of thought as desire, conscious as well as unconscious. This is what is happening to all of us.

And what is action? Because we must act, life is action, relationship is action, that is the doing, not having done or will do, neither the past nor the future, that is not action. I don't know if you realize this - the meaning of the word 'action' is always in the active present. Right? But that active present in action is coloured by the past through memory, through our conditioning, through our education, environmental influence and various influences, and stored up as memory, which is time. Please, follow this. Which is time, and this action is always limited, confined. That is, when I act according to a pattern which is one's conditioning, then that action is never in the present. It's always from the knowledge, which is the past, acting through the present, therefore it is not action. I wonder if we see this?

So one has to ask: what relationship is action to time? You are following this? I act according to an ideal, according to a belief, according to a conclusion. The ideal is in the future. A conclusion is in the past, like knowledge, and a belief is irrational, future, past and an irrational act which is a theoretical, fanciful, neurotic act. So there it is. All that is time, obviously. So action is always coloured, limited, incomplete, fragmentary and therefore self-

contradiction. Is this going too fast?

Please, if I may point out, if one may point out, we are talking about your life, your daily life, not some theoretical life of somebody else. We are actually, as two friends, gathered together in a quiet place, talking over their problems, both being serious, and concerned and committed to the solution of human problems, because they feel as two people that they are the world and the world is them. They are the very essence of the world and what they do affects the world.

So it is very important to find out if there is an action actually in the present, not an action dictated by the past according to a conditioning, or acting according to a future concept, which is what we have been doing all the time, and therefore our action is incomplete, contradictory, an action that breeds regrets, anxiety, pain and so on. So it is absolutely imperative to find out an action which is without time, and therefore one has to understand very, very deeply the problem of time. Is this clear? Because, as we said, our actions are conditioned, conditioned by the culture we live in, by the social influence, by the economic pressures, by the climate, food and so on. And according to that conditioning we act. That conditioning is the content of our consciousness. Our consciousness is the content, the two are not different and that consciousness is within the area of time, right? Do you see this? It's rather fun, if you go into it.

And we are asking: time being a movement, is movement - is there an action which is not dictated by time? Because time is fear and if the mind, a human being is to be totally free of fear psychologically, completely, absolutely free of fear, he must

understand time, time as a movement of thought. And is there an action which is without time? That is: time ends, action begins. I wonder if you see this? Now this is very complicated, please, this is a very serious matter. This isn't a thing that you come to curiously one morning, on a lovely morning like this, and forget and go away. We are concerned with the total movement of life, we are concerned with our existence, with our misery, with our fears, with our pleasures, with our agonies and not run away from them. And that demands a mind that is really serious, not curious and not argumentative or opinionated, a mind that's inquiring, that is wanting to find out. And to investigate you must have freedom to look - not to look with conclusions, with opinions, then you cannot possibly examine. So we are talking over together a very serious matter, which is: can there be freedom, total freedom from psychological fears? And to go into it very, very deeply one must not only understand what is time, but also what is action, because action breeds fear, stored up as memory and that memory restrains, controls, shapes action. So if you would be free of fear you must understand that fear is time. If there was no time, you would have no fear. I wonder if you see that? If there was no tomorrow, only now, fear as a movement of thought ends.

So there is time - the chronological as well as the psychological - in that area we live. In that area as movement of thought as time there is action, acting according to a Christian or a Communist, or a Socialist, Buddhist, Hindu and so on, and so on, and so on - always within the movement of thought as time and measure. This is clear, I think.

So we can go now into finding out, what is fear? Not the

various forms of fear, which we'll discuss presently, but what is the nature of fear, what is the source of fear? You may not be afraid of anything now, sitting here, but obviously in your consciousness there is fear - in the unconscious or in the conscious. There is this terrible thing called anxiety, pain, grief, suffering and fear. One may be afraid psychologically of tomorrow, what might happen or what might not be achieved, or will there be a continuity of that relationship which has given great pleasure, great comfort, will it continue? Will the relationship be permanent or will there be change? - which the mind dreads, because the mind, the brain needs stability, needs security to function. Please, follow this. The brain will create any conclusion and hold to that conclusion because that gives it security - it may be an irrational conclusion or rational conclusion, an idiotic belief or a rational observation - if we cling to both, because that offers to the brain, and therefore to action, a complete sense of security. Right?

So the brain, the human mind needs total security, as in a child, the baby needs complete security otherwise it becomes neurotic and all kinds of things happen to it. Similarly for a grown-up human being the demand and the necessity of security is immense, and that search for security may be in a belief, the Protestant belief, or in the Utopian belief, the Catholic belief or belief in Lenin and Mao and also in your Guru - I hope none of you have any Gurus, because to follow a Guru is to destroy truth. I'll go into that later.

So there are fears, conscious as well as unconscious, open fears and secret hidden fears in the recesses of one's own mind, which have never been explored, never been opened. Fear like sorrow is a dark cloud that affects all our action. Please watch it in yourself,

please, don't listen to the description. Use the description to watch yourself. The description is the mirror in which you are seeing yourself. There are the conscious fears which one can observe clearly - not distort them but observe, not analyse but look. When you look, it reveals the totality, when you analyse - analysis is a process of fragmentation. I wonder if you see that? Right?

So there are the unconscious, deeply hidden fears, and how do you deal with them? Because fear, as we said, distorts all action. Fear either breeds despair, cynicism or hope - both are irrational. And fear is the movement of thought as time. So it is real, it is not fictitious. So now our problem is: how is the mind, how am I, or you to unravel these fears so deeply hidden? Can they ever be unravelled or is it always there, showing its head occasionally, when a crisis or an incident takes place, when a challenge is offered, or can it be totally brought out? I wonder if you follow this?

We said, analysis is a process of fragmentation, therefore through analysis the uncovering of the unconscious with all its fears becomes a necessity when the mind realizes that there must be total freedom from fear. That being so, what is a human being to do? Shall he analyse? Shall he wait for the intimation, hints of the unconscious through dreams; when you are not occupied and the unconscious gives a hint that there is this quality of fear? You follow? Are you to wait through dreams, through hints, intimation, take time as analysis? If you discard all that - please, understand what I am saying - discard it, not in theories but actually discard it, because that has no meaning, what is then the totality, the whole structure of fear? You follow? Both the unconscious as well as the



conscious? Am I conveying this? If I can understand, if the mind can understand the totality of fear, look at the totality of fear, then the unconscious has very little importance. I wonder if you see this? Do you actually see this, what the speaker is saying?

It is when we see fragments of fear, then we are concerned with the unconscious, with what is hidden in the cave. But when we are concerned with the observation of the totality of fear, with the whole structure of fear, then the greater washes away the lesser. I wonder if you see this? No? You don't see it?

Wait a minute. Thought has created the microphone, but the microphone is independent of thought, of the thought which has created it. Right? Please follow this. The mountain is not created by thought, it is independent of thought. Fear is put together by thought. Is that thought independent of fear? No, wait! Listen carefully. This is independent of thought, but thought has created it. The mountain is not created by thought but it exists independent of thought. Is fear - follow this, please - is fear independent of thought, though fear has created thought? If it is independent of thought as the mountain, then that independence of thought, that fear not made by thought will go on living. If it is made by thought, as the microphone, then there is a perception of the whole movement of thought as fear. Does this convey anything to you? Wait a minute. I'll go into it differently.

What is it, what does it mean, to see the whole? The word 'whole' means 'healthy', sane, rational and also it means 'holy'. Whole. How does one perceive the whole of anything? The whole of fear, not the broken up of fear in different forms or the fear of the unconscious and the conscious - in the conscious and in the

unconsciousness - but the whole of fear. You understand? How does one perceive the whole of fear? How do I perceive the whole of me - the 'me' constructed by thought, isolated by thought, fragmented by thought which in itself is fragmented? So it creates the 'me' and thinks that 'me' is independent of thought. The 'me' thinks it is independent of thought but it has created the 'me' - the 'me' with all its anxieties, fears, vanities, agonies, pleasures, pain, hopes - all that. That 'me' has been created by thought. And that 'me' becomes independent of thought, it thinks it has its own life - like a microphone which is created by thought, and yet it is independent of thought. The mountain is not created by thought but yet it is independent. The 'me' is created by thought and the 'me' says: "I am independent of thought". Now to see the totality - you understand - is this clear now?

By Jove! You are not quick! (Laughter) So what is fear totally - not the various forms of fear, not the various leaves of this tree of of fear but the total tree of fear? Right?

How does one see the totality of fear? To see something totally or to listen to something completely there must be freedom, mustn't there? Freedom from prejudice, freedom from your conclusion, freedom from your wanting to be free of fear, freedom from the rationalization of fear. Please follow all this. Freedom from the desire to control it - can the mind be free of all that? Otherwise it can't see the whole. I am afraid. I am afraid because of tomorrow, losing a job, afraid I may not succeed, afraid I might lose my position, afraid that there I will be challenged and I'll not be able to reply, afraid of losing my capacity - all the fears that one has. Can you look at it without - please listen - any movement of thought

which is time, which causes fear? Have you understood something?

That is: I am afraid of not becoming something, because I have been educated, conditioned by a society that says: I must be something, as an artist, as an engineer, doctor and the corrupt politician, whatever you like. I must be something. And there begins one of the seeds of fear. Then there is the fear of thought not being certain - and thought can never be certain - I don't know if you see this - because in itself it is a fragment. Thought can never see the whole. I don't know if you see that, because thought being a fragment, it can only observe fragmentarily.

And there are the fears of desire. Right? The fears of a remembrance of something past, a remembrance evoking a certain incident which causes fear. And what is the root of fear? You understand? One can describe various psychological forms of fear, afraid of the dark, afraid of losing my husband, afraid of losing a wife, afraid of disease, afraid of lack of a job - a dozen fears. Each insoluble because they are fragmented by thought. And so one asks: what is the root of fear? Can I see not only the whole tree of fear but also the root of fear?

So far we have described - and don't be caught by the description, by the explanation, then we are back again in the same old stupid business.

We are asking: what is the root of fear? What do you think it is? Don't answer me, please, there are too many of you. What do you think is the root of fear, both unconsciously as well as consciously? Bearing in mind: through education, school, college, university - if you are lucky to go to those places or unlucky to go to those places

- your society, the religion - always in the future, you'll be good in heaven, but not now - bearing all that in mind, what is the source, the root, the basis of fear?

If you are challenged, how do you answer it? We are challenging. How do you respond? Please, listen - how do you respond to a question of that kind? That is: do you see, perceive, observe, are aware, what is the total cause of this thing called 'fear'. Or are you waiting for somebody to tell you and then you accept it, and then you say: "Yes, I see it". Which means, that you don't actually see it. You see the description. We are seeing there are physical fears, ordinary physical, chemical fears, meeting a snake, a precipice, fears of old age, fears of something you did in the past and you don't want to be discovered - and so on, these are ordinary physical fears. And you meet them intelligently - that is an onrushing bus - you don't stay in its way, you jump out, you move away, which is self-protective intelligence which is not fear. When you meet a snake, it is self-protective, instinct, therefore it's an act of observation, which says: "That's danger, move!"

So one can deal with the physical fears, if you have a mind that is capable, rational, whole, healthy. That's simple. But psychologically we are asking: what is the foundation, the depth of this fear, from where does it come? Is the root of fear time - the root of time being movement of thought? Is the source of fear uncertainty, therefore no stability and therefore no security, psychologically, which will affect the physical action and therefore bring a different society and so on and so on? So is it time, is it action, the uncertainty of action, which is a mind that is confused, as most people's minds are, and out of that confusion is fear, not

knowing what to do, go after a Guru or whatever you do. So is thought the source of fear or is there something far greater? You understand? Thought, action, uncertainty, the lack of deep security psychologically, and therefore how will you find or have or participate in this complete security? You understand my question? If there is complete security psychologically there is no fear. I wonder if you see this?

We seek that complete security in relationship, in holding on to a belief, however irrational, however stupid, superstitious, traditional, we hold on, however neurotic, we hold on. So is it, the mind, we, not having psychologically complete, total security, from that arises fear? Now where is that security to be found? One has sought it in god, which is a projection of thought, in saviours, which is a projection of thought, in beliefs, which is a projection of thought, in relationship with you and me, in attachment, in a conditioned mind and not wanting to break that conditioning. So where does the mind find a whole, complete, absolute security - absolute, not relative? You understand my question? Where?

Please, I must go on with this. Until you see this when I show it to you, then you will miss it. Thought wants to be secure, the brain demands complete security because only then it can function rationally. So it has sought security in knowledge, in science, in relationship, in conclusions and it has not found security in any of this - in the church - in none of it. And you must have security, then your brain functions clearly, objectively, highly sensitive. Now where do you find it? Is it out there or somewhere else? You know the word leisure - leisure - to have leisure. Have you had leisure at any time? In leisure you learn. We have, sitting here,

having leisure, for an hour or whatever it is, and you are learning - not from the speaker, together we are learning. Right? So we are learning together in leisure the futility of security in the projections of thought - whether it's god - whatever it is. So having leisure means learning. Now we want to learn, we are going to learn where there is security, absolute security, not variable security. If one has that, the whole problem of fear ends - the total fear, both physiologically as well as psychologically. Our minds are active, chasing one thought after another. Our minds - in their movements of thought there are gaps between thoughts, an interval, a time interval, and thought is always trying to find a means where it can abide - abide in the sense hold. What thought creates, being fragmentary, is total insecurity. I wonder if you see this. Therefore there is complete security in being completely nothing. Which means: not a thing created by thought. You understand? To be absolutely nothing! Which means total contradiction to everything that you have learned, everything that thought has put together. To be not a thing. If you are nothing you have complete security; it's only the man that is becoming, wanting, desiring, pursuing, in that there is complete insecurity.

So after listening for an hour, seeing the nature of time, which is movement of thought - apart from the chronological time - seeing that action is never complete, always fragmented and therefore an action can only be complete when there is total security; and seeing the whole nature of fear as the movement of thought, as the achievement of an ideal or living in the past, in romantic, idiotic, sentimental past, or living in knowledge, which again is fragmentary and therefore never complete. Action means: to act

completely now, the active present. That can only take place when there is complete security. The security that thought has created is no security - this is an absolute truth. And the absolute truth is, when there is nothing, when you are nothing.

Now what happens in our relationship when you are nothing? You understand? You know what it means, to be nothing? No ambition, which doesn't mean you vegetate, no competition, no aggression, no resistance, no barriers built by hurt - you are absolutely nothing. Then what is it to be related to another? Have you ever thought about all this or is this all so tragically new?

Our relationship now is unstable, not stable and therefore it is a perpetual battle, perpetual division, each seeking his own pursuits, his own enjoyment, his own - you know, isolated. That relationship being insecure must inevitably bring division and therefore conflict. Right? Now when in that relationship there is complete security, there is no conflict. But you may be completely nothing, and I might not, therefore what takes place? You follow? You understand all this? You are nothing psychologically, inwardly, you are completely secure, because there is nothing, and I am still fighting, quarrelling, insecure, confused, then what is our relationship between you and me? This is what is going on. You understand?

Not certainty created by thought - that's no certainty. Like a man saying: "I believe in that" and establishes his relationship in a belief, and therefore that belief is conditioning, breeds fear and therefore division. Here it is entirely different. You have perceived, realized, understood, seen the truth that in this nothingness there is complete security, and I haven't. What takes place between you and

me? Come on, sirs, investigate it. You have affection, love, compassion, born of this tremendous unshakable stability, and I haven't. I am your friend, your wife or your husband, what takes place? What do you do with me? You understand, sir, what do you do with me? Hit me on the head, cajole me, talk to me, comfort me, tell me how stupid I am. What will you do? You understand, sir? Now look at it differently.

Let's look at it differently. There are about fifteen hundred or twelve hundred of us in this tent. And some of you - at least I hope so - have listened very carefully, given your attention, care, affection and you realize that you are the world and the world is you - not verbally but profoundly, the truth of it. We'll discuss later what is truth and what is reality, what is the relationship between reality and truth. We will go into all that later. So you are the world and the world is you, you realize that and you realize, see the immense and eminent responsibility to change radically, because you have listened, not argued, not opinionated, you see the truth of it, then what is your relationship with the rest of the world? Twelve hundred of you listen to all this, see it, aware of it, give your deep committed concern, because you are serious people, I hope, and when there is that fundamental transformation, then what is your relationship with the world? It is the same question, you understand? What do you do? Or do you wait for something to happen? If you wait for something to happen, nothing will happen. So if you actually see the truth that you are the world and the world is you - not as a theory, a verbal association but as an actuality and you see the extraordinary importance that when you basically transform yourself, you'll affect the whole consciousness of the



world, bound to. And won't you, if you are completely, wholly secure in the sense we are talking about, won't you affect me, who am uncertain, lonely, despairing, clinging, attached, won't you affect me? Obviously, you will. But the important thing is that you listen, see this, the truth of this - then it is yours, not somebody else giving you something. Right?

## **SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 30TH JULY 1975.**

I believe that we are going to have a discussion, but really it is a conversation, a dialogue. A discussion, the meaning of that word means, I believe, according to the dictionary, argument. We are not going to argue. That is a game that can be played very efficiently in politics, in clubs, in debating societies. And a discussion implies investigating what is true among opinions. That can also be everlastingly amusing, merely to discuss which is the most truthful opinion - but all opinions are really prejudice and therefore they can never be true. So we are going to have together, these next five days, every morning if you can stand it, a dialogue. A dialogue means conversation - conversation between friends, between two people or several people who are interested as friends, talking over things amicably, with a serious intention, to find out, or rather to investigate their problems, so that at the end of that investigation they are free of the problem, not carrying on endlessly discussing about their problems.

So if you would consider what would be worthwhile to talk over together, as two serious, friendly people talking over their problems, not only the world outside, but also inwardly.

Q: Can you speak of relationship, understanding, compassion?  
Can we be free of exclusiveness?

K: Can we be free of this division that brings about exclusiveness. That is one subject.

Q: I think you were talking over about being free of selfishness and about the possibility of stepping out it. Evidently I, or the 'me',

cannot step out of it, so what happens, or what takes place when something like that is going on?

K: I understand. You talked the other day about the stream in which we live daily, the stream of selfishness, using that word to convey anxiety, fear, pleasure, political pressures, economic conditions, the anxieties, suffering, all included in that one word. The question is, how can that 'me', who is caught in that stream, step out of it, and can the 'me' ever step out of anything?

Q: I do not find an urge to serve other people or society at large. Is there anything wrong with me?

Q: How can I live with noise without suffering too much? I feel a physical pain when there is too much noise?

Q: When one suffers one loses all one's energy, and how is it possible not to lose that energy, and to meet the suffering?

K: Which of these questions shall we take: relationship, the stream of suffering in which we live, and how to step out of it, and if you do step out of it what is action in the world of reality, that is, what is the action in our daily life? And the other is, noise; and when one suffers it seems that one loses all energy, and having no energy one cannot actively end suffering? Now which of these would you like to take up?

Shall we take that question, and perhaps the other questions will be included in it, that is: all of us, most of us, are selfish - in that word we include sorrow, pain, physical suffering and psychological suffering, anxiety, competition, greed, envy, brutality, violence, the desire for power, position, in that word we include all that. That is, the word selfishness, self-centred movement. How can one step out of that stream in which we

human beings all live? And if one can step out of it, what then is the action in the world of reality, in the daily existence? Would you like to discuss?

If we may, let's go into this very carefully, seriously and not come to any conclusion, but observe the whole phenomenon of selfishness, perceive the totality of it. So let's go slowly into it and hesitantly, and therefore not come to judgements, opinions, conclusions. Is that all right, so that we can slowly go into it. It is a very important and rather interesting question this, because if we can go into it very deeply perhaps we shall understand all other problems involved.

First of all, is one aware of the stream of selfishness in which one lives, in one's daily life? You are? One is aware, not condemn it, not evaluate it, not rationalize it, just to be aware that one lives in this conditioning.

Q: I can only see my point of view.

K: Please, slowly, let's go into it. What is perception? What is seeing? I see you sitting there, and you see me sitting up here. There is visual perception, sensory seeing - right? That sensory seeing is transferred to the brain and it responds according to its conditioning. Be simple about it, don't complicate it. I see that red dress or shirt, I see it visually, then it is communicated through visual perception to the brain, the brain which says, it is red, I don't like red, or I like red. Right? Slowly. It may be obvious, but go on into it, you will see how complex it becomes. So the appreciation or depreciation of red, is conditioned by the culture, by the society, by my pleasure and so on. So my response is according to my conditioning. Right? That is simple enough. So I am always

perceiving, seeing things according to my opinion, my judgement, my conditioning - conditioning being social, environmental, ethical, cultural, and also my own pleasures, fears and so on, all that is my conditioning - through that conditioning I see. That's simple.

Now wait a minute. Am I aware of this process - aware in the sense, conscious? Am I conscious that I am responding to things according to my conditioning? Is one aware of this, as an American, Catholic, Protestant, Communist, Socialist, Hindu, Buddhist, whatever it is? So that is the first thing, isn't it - no? Are you aware of it? Yes? Now what do you mean by being aware of it? Are you aware of it as an outsider looking in, or you are aware of it directly?

Q: One is aware of it directly but we react to it.

K: We are going to find out. Let's go step by step. Am I aware of my conditioning and the responses of those conditionings, which I call my temperament, my idiosyncrasies, my opinion, my judgement. Am I aware of this? Or I am aware of it because you are telling me of it? You are telling me about it, therefore I am aware of it? There are two states - I tell you about it and then you acknowledge what I say, and then say, 'Yes, I am aware of it'. Or you are aware of it for yourself without my telling you? The two states are entirely different. Which is it? If the speaker didn't point it then it is your own, it is direct awareness; but if the speaker points it out and then you become aware of it, it is through the stimulation of the speaker, and therefore that stimulation fades and you are lost. Right?

Now am I aware, without your telling me, or indicating, that my

whole response to life is according to my conditioning? And if I am aware who is it that is aware? The observer? And when the observer is aware there is a process of duality - the observer and the observed - right? Is that what is going on with you? Go on sirs.

Q: I am aware just for a moment. It is only a part, not whole.

K: All right, sir, it doesn't matter. You are just aware partially, or you are aware of something. You are aware of the tent, you are aware of the people sitting here, you are aware of your response to the colours, to the proportions of the tent, to the sky and so on. Now is there in that awareness a division as the observer and the observed? Begin slowly. Don't talk about the whole.

Q: Why do we separate the two?

K: We are going to go into it, madam. First see how our minds work, how we respond. I'll begin again. I am aware I am conditioned. I am aware that I am conditioned because I have been told; or I am aware that it is a fact, a reality, it is so. It is so. And the next question is: am I observing that conditioning as an observer watching a tree, a car, the stream? Or there is no observer but only that state of conditioning? You understand? This gets a bit more complicated doesn't it, no? It will get much more! You hope so.

So which is it: am I aware, or are you aware looking in from the outside, or you are inside? See the difference?

Q: When I am aware of myself being conditioned it is usually because I am aware of the past, something that has just happened, and I look back on it and I see it. That is me looking from the past. But I can't describe being aware.

K: Are you looking at the present through the past? The past is

the observer, isn't it - the memories, the remembrances, the hurts, the pains, the conclusions, all that is stored up in the brain - right? And that brain responds. And it responds according to the accumulated knowledge of pain and all the rest of it. Right? So are you observing from the past, or is there only observation? You have understood? Please, be simple about this.

Q: As I sit here I understand you, the words, but I don't have a sense of urgency to bridge the gap between the words that you say and the meaning behind it. There is no intermediate, sir.

K: I will show it to you sir. See how complicated it is becoming. First of all let's be clear that the word, the description, the explanation, is not the thing. Right? Just go slowly. The word 'tent' is not the tent. I can describe the tent, I can describe the various colours, but the colours, the tent are not the words, are not the description, the explanation is not the explained. That must be very clear. Right? So the word is not the thing. So when I use the word 'suffering', that is an explanation, a word that contains all other factors, which we just now said. But the word suffering is not its content - right? Please. So the word is not the thing. Am I aware of the word, because I listen to it, and am I also aware that the word is not the reality? And am I looking from the past, from my remembrances, from my hurts, from my conclusions, from my hopes, which is the past? So am I looking with the knowledge of the past, am I aware that I live in the stream of selfishness? You have got it? Are you beginning to understand this?

Sir, please, this needs discipline. You understand? Discipline in the sense of listening with attention and going on, not dropping it in the middle and picking it up later. Right? So am I aware that I

am looking from the past at this stream of suffering in which we live, this stream of selfishness, which is our daily occupation? Are you aware of it?

Q: I am aware intellectually only.

K: That means you are aware, as the gentleman points out, of information, that is words. You are only aware of the words, not of the fact. The fact being that which is. That which is, is the truth. So I am looking at the fact through a verbal description, and the verbal description is not the fact. Right? So there is a lack of communication between you and the speaker. He wants to go beyond the word, beyond information, beyond the knowledge, and you say, 'I can't do it'. Which means words have become tremendously important - right? For a Christian the cross has become tremendously important. For a Hindu it is something else. The cross, the symbol, the word, he is a prisoner to that, and is he aware of that prison?

Q: It is a part of my culture.

K: Yes sir, I have explained that. It is part of culture, part of your religion, part of your ethics, part of your economic conditions, part of your clothes, part of your climate. I have explained all that. Just a minute, sir, just a minute. Go into this slowly, please. Are you aware that you are caught in words? That you are a prisoner of words? The word 'communist' will make you shiver if you are a capitalist. And if you are a communist then 'capitalist' is something dreadful. So one asks, are you aware how we respond to words?

Q: In awareness there is solitude.

K: No, no, madam, I am not talking of solitude, I am talking about matter-of-fact things, and then we can go much further. If



you don't understand this then the further you go it becomes a sheer nonsense, a verbal illusion.

So are you clear that we are prisoners of words?

Q: Sir, there is another factor of words. Fundamentally I have organized my reality around words.

K: I understand that, sir.

Q: Where does that organization..

K: Have you understood my first question, sir, before we take up your question?

Q: I hope so.

K: Not, 'hope so'. When I am drowning I want to be saved, I don't say, 'Well, I hope I am going to be saved'. This becomes a play. I want to find out what this whole process of living is. Do we live at the verbal level? And if you have noticed something very interesting - all the books in the European world are printed from right to left, which is linear, and Chinese, Japanese are up and down. We think along that line, linear line, because we are used to reading books, so our thinking is also that line, and therefore it is very superficial. We are caught in the superficiality of words. When the tyrants use the word, like the dictators, like the communists, 'Democratic proletarian state' it is sheer nonsense. We are caught in these words. So please are you aware that we are prisoners of words?

Q: You are jumping from one thing to another.

K: Please I am not jumping. Are you conscious, do you know, do you recognize, is it so to you that we live as prisoners of words? Be simple.

Q: We are using words to express ourselves to you.

Q: We are conditioned, OK.

K: Not, OK.

Q: I mean that is a fact, isn't it?

K: It is a fact but am I aware of it?

Q: We are.

K: All right. Let's move from there. If you are aware of it, then words are necessary to communicate, but words don't block you.

Q: They shouldn't.

K: Shouldn't! Don't. You see how again we play with words.

Let's go further. Am I aware of my conditioning - conditioning being cultural, religious, economic, the school, education, all that? Am I aware that my brain from which I respond, am I aware of this conditioning?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, madam, listen. I am talking about something, and you are talking about something else. I am asking you, do you recognize these trousers as blue? And I am saying, do you recognize that your minds, your brains are conditioned? Now just a minute, go slowly. Please do listen to this, this is really important. Are you aware that you are conditioned? If you say, 'Yes', are you aware as a description, aware of the description or the reality of it? You have understood? You hear the description and then you say, 'Yes, I am aware of the description,' but not the reality which is my conditioning. So which is it?

Q: I find that when something has just happened that it arouses a response of a different quality, and then when I look at it, when it has just happened I can see it unilaterally and I can perceive it emotionally, I can really see it. But when I try and look at

something which is deeper, which is more into the past, then I can see the emotions get in the way..

K: Sir, I described to you the tent, the structure of the tent. Are you aware of the description or the actuality? That's all. Don't bring in emotions and all that. Are you aware of the description of the tent, or the tent itself?

Q: The tent itself.

K: That is very simple. I look up and see the tent. It isn't complicated. So am I aware of my conditioning, or the description of the conditioning? This is so simple. Which means, I look at my conditioning, not the description, the description can be thrown away. I look at my conditioning. Now proceed then. How do I look at that conditioning? Am I looking at it from the outside, or I am that conditioning? You have understood? So the description has lead me to the realization, I am that. So the description has gone. So I am now living with the reality of that conditioning because I am that conditioning. There is no observer saying. 'I am conditioned'. I am that. Right? Is this clear? Can we proceed from there?

Now that conditioning is the result of my parents, the society I live in, the education, climate, etc., etc., I am that. Now how do I look at it? How do I perceive it? As an observer looking in, or there is no observer but only the fact? Now I'll show you. There is this fact, which is the microphone. I can look at it without naming it. Right? It is there. And I call it 'microphone' in order to communicate it to you because we both have agreed to call it microphone, not a giraffe! So it is very simple. Now there is an observation of that conditioning without the word, without an

observer from the outside, I am that. Can we proceed from there? By Jove, it takes a long time. So that conditioning we called selfishness - right? We have called it selfishness.

Q: The word selfishness is already a judgement.

K: Watch this carefully. The word 'selfishness' is condemnatory, evaluating. Please, you don't listen. We said that word includes everything - judgement, evaluation, suffering, pain, everything is included in that word, and I use that word to communicate with you. That's all. I am not using that word as a condemnation. You may translate it and say, 'You are using it as a word to condemn', I am not, I am just describing it. Right? Shall we proceed further?

Now human beings right throughout the world, whatever their position, whatever their status, whatever their culture, whatever their political points of view, economic and so on and so on, live in this stream. Right? From the highest to the lowest. Right? Whether it is in India, Russian, America or China, this is the main stream, the essence of human suffering, human greed, we are not condemning it, we are pointing it out - and this is the stream in which we are caught, in which we live. We are born in this stream, we are nurtured in it, we are sustained in it by society, everything. Now the question then is - please listen - am I aware of this stream? Not the description but the reality that I am selfish, that all my actions revolve round this centre of suffering, centre of selfishness - are you aware of it? Or do you say, 'Yes, I live like that'?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are not going into what to do yet, we will come to that, madam. We will come to find out presently what to do. That is the

question he asked: being caught in this stream of selfishness, if one can step out it, then what is that human being to do in the world of reality? - the world of reality being politics, religion, all that.

So are you aware, conscious, know, that you live in this stream? I am not condemning the stream, I am not saying it is wrong, or right, this is a fact. Are you aware of this fact? Whether you live in Gstaad, or in a little village, or in a capital, it is the same movement of mankind. If you are aware of it what happens? You understand? What takes place in you if all human beings, whether black, white, purple, yellow, brown, whatever they are, they are living in this everlasting suffering, selfishness, what is your response?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, what takes place in you?

Q: Compassion.

Q: You get a shock, a terrible shock.

K: You see sir, wait a minute. I am going to point out something to you. Don't accept it, just listen to it. When you perceive this whole movement, not details, but this whole stream of mankind, what happens to the brain? You understand my question? Before I have lived, saying I suffer, my pleasure, my pain, my anxiety, my position, me first and everybody to hell afterwards. So you suddenly realize you are like everybody else - you may be a little be more clever, but the same suffering, the same anxiety, the great pressures and so on, it is a tremendous jolt to the brain, isn't it? No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Watch it, please listen to what I am saying. You are already going ahead of me. Before I lived in a little circle and the brain had

the habit of living in that circle. The brain accepted that circle and it said, I must adjust myself to this circle, to this suffering, to this selfishness, because in that I am secure. And somebody comes along and says, 'Look, this has happened to everybody', and you get a shock, don't you. Now when you perceive this, the brain cells themselves undergo a change. Now it is getting complicated.

Q: Is this a result of fear?

K: No, sir, just a minute. I have accepted fear. I have lived in fear, like millions and millions of people, they have accepted suffering, like millions and millions of people, they have accepted anxiety, pleasure, death, everything and the brain has conditioned itself to that. Right? And you come along and tell me, 'Look, my friend, this is happening to everybody, whether they live in India, Japan, China, Russia, under tyrannies, under democracies, under whatever it is, the communists, this has happened to every human being.' If you are at all sensitive, awake, it must affect the brain cells. So the brain, which has accepted, which has become habituated, gets a shock, a jolt. That jolt brings about a change, a transformation in the cell itself, so you look at the whole thing totally differently. Oh, for god's sake move.

Now let's proceed. So I am aware that every human being in the world goes through this horror, this selfishness. And is it possible for a human being to step out of that? Right? You understand my question? I am like everybody else - I have suffered, anxious, I want position, money, power, sex, and I want to be recognized - this whole phenomenon of existence. And you come along and point out to me that as long as you live in that stream there is no solution for human problems, whether economic, political,

religious, as long as you live there, there is no issue. And I say, 'Yes, I realize it', not verbally, it is a shock. You come and shake me. Discussion, the root meaning of that word, is to shake. You understand? To shake, and I hope you are being shaken.

So is it possible for a human being to step out of it? For you to step out? That means, do you see the totality of this stream, the whole implications of that stream - politically, religiously, economically, socially, as a person, as a human being, ethically, morally, the injustice, you know, the whole thing is monstrous? So is it possible? Do you see it as a whole, or do you only see it partially - because I am committed to political action and nothing else - I can go and talk to Mr Wilson and or Mr Brezhnev, they would pay no attention. And since you are paying little attention, I don't say you are paying complete attention, you are paying a little attention, do you see this fact as clearly as you see the tent, as you see your face in the mirror? Do you see it as clearly as that? That's what I mean by being aware of this tremendous stream in which human beings are caught.

Now wait a minute. That is the world of reality, that is the world in which we live, that is the world which thought has created - right? We went through that. A hundred times I will explain to you if you want, but that is the reality in which we live. And the question was: who is it that gets out, and is it possible for me to make an effort to get out? You understand? All right, I'll go into it.

I am caught in that stream. I recognize it completely. I see it, not only visually but inwardly, psychologically, I see the whole structure of it, the nature of it, the brutality, everything wherever I go I see this. And I say to myself, I must get out of it because I

want unity of mankind, I want right political action, I want human beings to live happily, and so on, I want to live that way, so I say I must get out. Then the problem is, how am I to get out? You understand? How? Shall I make effort, shall I exercise my will and say, 'I won't belong to that', or shall I run away, meditate, take drugs, play with communes, become a socialist, bomb thrower, a terrorist and all that? What am I to do? Come on sirs, discuss it, go into it with me.

Q: Whatever I would do would already be from my thoughts, from the past, from the world of reality.

K: So the gentleman says, whatever I do - please listen to this - whatever I do is still part of the stream.

Q: I should be inactive.

K: So I should get inactive, the lady suggests. You see how our minds go to the opposite. I want to do something to get out of that stream, and somebody says, you are part of that stream, you have built that stream, and your thought says, get out of it. So your thought is merely creating another stream. And you say to me, if I can't do that what shall I do, be inactive? Do I realize, does my brain realize that whatever I do, whatever it is, join new religions, new meditations, new awakening, whatever I do I am still in that stream, because that stream is created by thought and that thought now says, get out of it. So when I move with thought I am still in the stream. I wonder if you see this.

Q: When I see this, the thought of getting out of it arises.

K: When I see this, the gentleman says, the thought of getting out of it arises.

Q: I accept it.



K: You say you accept it. Now wait a minute. Why do you accept it? You are not answering my question. Who is there to accept it? When you are, what are you accepting? I am light brown - wait a minute, listen to me - I am light brown, and when I compare myself with you who are lighter, then I get dissatisfied, perhaps, with my brown because that is not so popular as the other. So in comparison I accept what I am. You are missing the point. In comparison I accept. Why should I accept, which is a fact? I am that, why should I accept it, it is so.

Q: Yes.

K: Ah, now you are saying, yes. Before you said, accept. I never accept, therefore there is no acceptance or denial, it is a fact.

Now let's move to the next thing.

Q: If I stop thinking and stop doing..

K: Who is it that stops thinking? You don't get it. Please, just listen to what I am saying. Before you have accepted that you could do something about the stream, the brain had been conditioned to the fact that it could do something about that stream. That is part of our conditioning. You come along and say, 'Look, whatever you do with regard to that stream is still in the stream, because that stream is created by thought', and you show all the processes. It is so. Right? That whatever thought does is still part of the stream. Do I see that as a fact, not as an idea? Then if I see it as a fact what happens?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We went into suffering, we went into the whole question of suffering the other day. In that suffering there is a tremendous gathering of all energy in that suffering. I don't know if you know

what it means. That you have suffered and there is no movement, either of thought, psychologically, nothing, you are paralysed. I won't go into all that now.

So do you recognize, understand, aware, conscious, see, that whatever you do with regard to that stream is still within the stream?

Q: I can only live now.

K: No, no, you are all going ahead of me. Do you see this? Do you see the truth that whatever you do in that stream, or with regard to that stream, is still part of the stream, do you see the truth of it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course. I said, whatever you do. Before I made effort, I said, I mustn't be selfish, I must devote my life to god, or I must serve others, or I must help others. I said, no I must retire from this monstrous world and go into a monastery. And I said to myself, I must take drugs - I have never taken drugs - I must take drugs, I must drink, I must do this, I must do that. Always action within that stream. And you come along and say, 'Look what you are doing, don't be silly, don't be an ass, look what you are doing'. What you are doing is still playing in the stream. Whatever you do - become a Catholic, go to Japan to learn Zen, etc., etc., you is still within this enormous stream which thought has built, or thought as time and movement created. Do I see it? Or am I still talking about words? If I see it then what takes place? If I see the totality of that movement - politically, religiously, economically, socially, ethically, morally, the tyranny, political tyranny, there is the tyranny of the priests, the tyranny of gods, the tyranny of books,

everything is in that stream. Do I see that, be totally aware of it? If I see the totality of it, the brain then has a great shock, and therefore in that very shock there is a transformation of the cells, which then is out of the stream. If I don't see it I can go on discussing endlessly about this.

Then if the brain cells have shaken themselves away from the tradition and are free, then how does such a brain act in the world of reality? Now have you seen this, shall we move from there? I happen to be out of that stream, there is no I - and that is the main thing. There is no centre as the 'me' that steps out of the stream. When the 'me' steps out of the stream the 'me' is still the stream. If I see the truth of that and therefore accepts the truth, then what shall I do, I as a human being, not I, as a human being what shall he do politically. Right. Let's begin politically. What shall he do?

Q: Care about the others.

K: The missionaries said that. They went to Africa with a bible and a gun. Or rather with a bible, and later on came the gun, and later on the business man.

Q: How do you step out over yourself?

K: There is no yourself to step out of. You are part of that stream. You don't see that. I must go on.

What shall a human being do who really has seen the truth of this stream, and therefore the brain cells have undergone a transformation, and therefore they no longer belong to the old tradition? That's a fact. Either you play with it, or actually live it. Then what happens? What shall he do politically? Wait a minute, careful. Is it political action, religious action, business action, economic action, separate? Or again is it the whole thing? You

understand? I wonder if we are meeting each other.

Q: Surely it is necessary not to be attached.

K: To the stream?

Q: To anything.

K: We went through that. We went that the other day. Is attachment love? When you are attached can you love? Silence! Just words.

Q: If you are attached there is no love.

K: So, fact the fact that when you are attached there is no love. Because attachment implies dependency, fear, jealousy, anxiety, a sense of loss and therefore hate that person, all that you call beautiful love. And you say, no that is not really love, but go on that way. That is part of the stream. Either you see the reality, you don't just accept it. It is so. Then move from there.

Attachment to the country, attachment to an idea, attachment to a conclusion, attachment to a belief, attachment to a principle, are all the same, they still belong to the stream. So I am saying, what shall a man do when he is no longer selfish? How shall he act politically, how shall he act in relationship with each other, man and woman, how shall he act with regard to labour? What shall he do?

Q: I don't know.

K: That's right, you don't know - right? So what are you playing with?

Q: You act as a whole then you can be out of the stream.

K: Oh, that's just a theory. I am fed up with theories.

Q: It is not a theory.

K: Madam, I am fed up with theories, that has been filling my

mind with theories, with speculations, that has been the game of tradition. I said all that is part of suffering. I don't want to play with words, theories.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How does she know?

Q: If you step out you act differently.

K: That's just a theory. I am pointing out to you, madam, you are speculating on something which has no value. A man who will step out of it will act differently. That has no meaning, I am still in the stream. I want to find out how to get out.

So I can only remain with the fact that we live in this stream and we cling to it, we mesmerize ourselves that it is a marvellous stream, that stream is love, attachment and so on. I live with that. And anything beyond that, any hope, is mere speculation. And please, I said to myself, please don't speculate, I am hungry, don't give me words, the menu of a marvellous dinner, I want to be fed.

Q: We depend so much on the physical. Our whole structure and thought and psychology is based on the physical condition.

K: And so the physical becomes extraordinarily important - the physical pleasures, the physical observance, physical comfort, physical satisfaction, physical stimulation and so on and so on. But we don't realize also that thought is a physical phenomenon and a chemical process. So thought is a physical and chemical process as the organism is, so it is not separate. If you see this then quite a different action takes place between the physical and the psychological. If I see the whole structure, how the physical depends on food, clothes, shelter, and for that security we would do anything, kill anybody, wars. And psychologically, which is the

movement of thought in time, is part of the process of the physical which is thought, which is chemical, so the whole structure is physical and chemical and that has created that tremendous stream of selfishness. Is one aware of this extraordinary process - how we divide the physical, the psychological, the spiritual, the businessman, the politician, the artist, all a movement of the fragmentary process of thought? Is he an artist? As we explained the word 'art' means to put everything in its right place, where it belongs, that is the meaning of that word. Is the artist creative when he lives a disorderly life? You work it out, sirs. Is he a religious man who believes? Is such a believer a religious man? Or is religion something outside the world of reality?

So let's stop this morning. We will go on tomorrow morning. The question is: is one totally aware, cognizant, that we live and exist, act in this field? This stream is the past, this stream is the present, this stream is the future modified through the present. This is our life, this is our reality and we think we can solve politically, economically, socially, all the problems, in the stream. And nobody has succeeded in the stream. The politicians play a game with us, they think, it doesn't matter who it is, that they are going to solve the problem. So are we, you and I, aware of this stream completely, and that whatever movement we make is still within the stream? Sir, see this as a reality, as something true, then you will see how it affects the brain cells. Because the brain won't accept anything which doesn't give it security. It has lived in the traditional world, which is the stream, and has accepted it and says, please, don't disturb me, let me live in that stream, with the followers, with the gurus, the whole business. And you come along

and tell me, whatever you do in the stream is going to free man from his misery.

Q: What about you?

K: Is that a fact? Are the politicians doing something to save you and me from sorrow? Are the priests doing anything, is anybody doing anything outside the stream or within the stream?

Q: You say in order to step out of the stream you have to live an ordinary life.

K: I did not say that. No, madam. I have explained everything, madam. Listen, look. I have to live in the world of reality - food, clothes, shelter, money, I have to live there.

Q: That is a compromise.

K: I am not compromising anything.

Q: You don't have to, you are saying it.

K: I am explaining to her, sir. Most human beings live in that field of reality. And the problems are getting more and more complex, and they have not been able to solve them, they are getting worse and worse.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam, I explained all that. Look, please. What is a human being to do, confronted with all these facts, that the politicians, whoever they are, are not going to solve the problems, they pretend. The religious people are not going to solve this problem of human suffering, human selfishness. Nor the analysts, nor the psychologists, philosophers - they have all tried for centuries. And besides why should I accept them as my authority? They might be as foolish as I am, why should I accept them, as cunning, deceitful as I am. So I say to myself, they cannot solve

this problem. So who will solve this problem? God? - god is an invention of thought, whether it is a Christian god, or Hindu god, or the Muslim god. So I say to myself, thought is in action all the time, thought has created this world in which I live, the world of nationalities, wars, brutalities, thought has done all this, and my mind is caught in that stream of thought. And whatever thought does in that stream will pollute further the stream. That is the thing I have to be shocked into. Then the brain operates differently.

Right sirs.



## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 31ST JULY 1975.**

I would like to remind you, if I may, that this is a serious gathering, not something that the intellect can be entertained with, not a sentimental, romantic, mystic, or imaginative theoretical issue; but rather being serious we are concerned with the world about us, which is in a very tragic condition, and also see the absolute necessity of total psychological revolution. So on this basis we are talking over together - not intellectually be amused, or theoretically offering various opinions, judgements and so on. We are concerned with what actually is, not only out there but also in here, in oneself; and the imperative necessity of this psychological transformation of man which will affect the whole consciousness of human beings. I hope we realize that is what we are trying to do, we are gathered here to do.

So what shall we talk over this morning which would be worthwhile?

Q: Continue with what we were discussing yesterday.

Q: What is the right kind of relationship between parents, the children, wife and husband and so on?

K: Shall we discuss, talk over together, what we were talking about yesterday, or shall we talk about relationship between human beings?

Q: It is the same thing.

K: Which shall we do? Do tell me. This isn't a verbal exchange, we are dealing with serious problems, it isn't that we pick up a subject and say, let's talk about it. It is ourselves we are talking

about.

Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday, and perhaps we will include in that, relationship and other things which may be relevant.

We were saying yesterday, weren't we, that our minds, our brains, cling to tradition, because in tradition, whether it is a modern tradition or an ancient tradition, in clinging to tradition the brain feels totally secure, safe, and it will go on functioning in that area which thought has created and considered as secure, which becomes the tradition and hold on to that. That is what we are doing all the time - all our responses, all our attitudes and our solution to our problems, is along traditional lines. The word 'tradition' means handing down, to hand over, and all our culture, whether in India, or all over the world, is utterly traditional. There may be varieties in that tradition, changes in that tradition, a modification in that tradition but it is always within that area. I do not know if you have considered that at all. Our responses to any challenge, whatever it be - political, economic, social, personal, or universal, it is always from the remembrance of things, from the acquired knowledge, or imposed knowledge, or knowledge that one has gathered through generations, which is the background; from that background we respond to any challenge, and so we always remain within that limited area.

And that is what we were talking about yesterday, that the brain, your brain, if you observe it, the speaker is not a specialist on the structure of the brain, or the responses of the brain, how it works, the electric movement and so on. One has watched one's own brain in operation, in activity, in function, and one sees that one's brain

always moves from the known to the known, because in that there is complete security. The known becomes the tradition, the known may be tomorrow, and the known of the tomorrow becomes the tradition. So the brain always seems to move from the known to the known, which is our tradition.

And we were saying yesterday, if I remember rightly, please correct me if I am wrong, that suffering in its widest sense, because being wide it includes everything, every form of physical, psychological, neurotic, fearful suffering, the suffering of loneliness, despair, anxiety, death, the suffering of a person who is arrogant and sees he cannot fulfil that arrogance and so on and so on - that suffering which we term as selfishness, it is that stream in which human beings right throughout the world, whatever their occupation, whatever their position, whatever their status are caught in. I think that is fairly clear. And we were saying yesterday, we seem to accept, live with this suffering, this selfishness, though it brings wars, enormous sums are spent on armaments, each nation trying to say we are seeking peace through force - you know the game they are playing all over the world. And we seem to accept it not knowing what to do. And what can one do? How does one affect by one's action the whole movement of degeneracy? It used to be considered in the ancient days that to be a soldier was the lowest rung in social order - you understand? The lowest rung, but now it is the highest. And this current in which human beings are caught, is there any action within that current, within that area which will affect the structure and the nature of the brain. You understand my question?

Being a serious person - I mean serious in which there is

laughter, smile and delight - and also watching all the tragedy, the misery, the confusion, which the politicians are making in the world, for which we are responsible, because we have elected, or they are dominating us, how can I, as a human being, affect this whole current, which is destroying man, which is destroying the earth, the animals, the ocean, you follow - polluting everything it touches. As a serious person, what can I do? I do not know if you want to discuss that. If you want to talk over that, please let me again remind you, if I may, that it is a very, very serious thing, not a plaything, not a game, not a verbal exchange. You must be totally committed to it, not occasionally, not for the next two, or one week while you are in Saanen. You must be committed for the rest of your life, otherwise don't play with it - go to the cinema, or play golf, or climb a mountain, or jump in the lake. This is very serious.

Can one affect this vast stream through one's actions - politically, religiously, psychologically? You understand my question? I am serious, I want to affect this awful thing that is going on in the world - the drugs, the alcohol, smoking, killing animals, you know what is happening, wars. Now what shall I do? Shall I, as a human being, take politics and work at that? You follow? Or, as a human being concerned with a psychological transformation, be only concerned with that? Or as an artist, only with that? You understand? Or is there a way of looking at the whole - politics, religion, psychology, inward struggles, relationship, the misery, the confusion, the anxiety, the arrogance, vanity, look at all that as one unitary movement, not divided movement? Am I making this clear? Shall I take relationship only and neglect the rest? Or will relationship, politics, everything be

included if I can look at the whole movement - you understand my question? That is, is it possible - I am not giving a talk, please we are discussing, talking over together - is it possible for the mind to see this totality of this misery, this selfishness, this suffering, the brutality, all that, see it as a whole? Is that possible? You understand, please.

How is the mind, how is one to see the totality of anything? You understand my question? Please, let's go on. How is a human being, who lives in fragments, who lives a broken up life - the wars, married, divorced, children and so on and so on, broken up - how is that human being to see the total, the whole? You understand my question? Can thought see the whole? Please we must be quite sure of this before we go further. Can thought, which is memory, which is experience, which is knowledge - and knowledge being the past - can that thought see the totality of existence?

Q: Thought is always fragmentary because it is always moving from one centre, therefore it can never see the whole.

K: So you are saying thought in itself is fragmentary, therefore thought cannot see the whole - right? Now be quite clear on this point.

We are going to find out whether thought is capable of seeing all the complexity, all that the human being is and what he is creating out there, see it, as a total movement. It was suggested that thought is fragmentary and therefore it cannot see the whole. Why is thought fragmentary? We must find that out. We said thought is fragmentary, broken up, therefore it cannot see the whole. But why is thought itself fragmentary, what makes it into a fragment? We

are going to find that out.

Q: Because there is a thinker.

K: Now who created the thinker?

Q: Thought.

K: Of course, obviously. So we are going round and round in circles. If you say thought created the thinker, and therefore the thinker becomes the fragment, and therefore the thinker can never see the whole - which is the same as saying, thought cannot see the whole.

Q: Can thought create energy?

K: Wait, sir, just go step by step.

Q: He said that thought created the thinker. Can thought create anything?

K: Can thought create anything? Of course, thought has created this tent. But the thought has not created the mountain, thought has not created the river, thought has created this microphone, and the microphone is free of thought, that which has been created is independent of thought. The tent, created by thought, is independent of thought. Is the thinker independent of thought? Wait, wait. Go slowly, go slowly.

Q: The thinker thinks he is independent of thought.

K: But thought has put him together. Please go slowly, you will see something extraordinary taking place if you observe it in yourself.

Q: I don't agree that thought has created the thinker.

K: No, no. You say you do not agree that thought has created the thinker. The thinker identifies himself or says he is separate from thought. That is not what we are discussing. Is there a thinker

if there is no thought? Obviously not. So just see the importance of this: thought creates the tent and the tent is independent of thought. The mountain is not created by thought and yet it is independent. But thought created the thinker and the thinker says, I am independent of thought. And the thinker says, I identify myself with this and that and that, therefore I am independent of thought.

Q: I agree.

K: Please, it is not a matter of agreement or disagreement. Look at it. I am not trying to persuade you to anything, or influence you to any kind of thought or conclusion. The obvious thing is, thought has created this tent, the tent is independent of thought - right? Thought has created the thinker, and the thinker says, 'By Jove, I am independent, I am original. I am the soul, I am god,', or 'I am Brahman, I am everything'. But thought has put him together.

Q: Whether I think or not I have a feeling that I am.

K: Whether you think or not there is a feeling, I am. Is feeling different from thought? Wait, wait.

Q: A sense of being.

K: Sense of being. What do you mean by, sense of being?

Q: The same as the plant, the tree, the mountain, it is aware of being.

K: I don't know what the tree feels. No, please, stick to something simple, we will go into it, you don't proceed. We are asking why thought is fragmentary? You haven't answered that question.

Q: I do not know.

K: Thought can say, I do not know, and acquire knowledge and therefore know.

Q: When you see the truth you don't need to think.

K: What is truth? Is it related to thought? Is it part of thought? Or is it within the area of reality, which is the reality that thought has put together? Or is truth something totally outside reality? - reality being all that thought has put together. Please let's go slowly.

So why is thought fragmentary? We are asking that question because we said, can thought see the whole - the whole movement of existence, including itself, including what it has made, what it has put together, its gods, its hell, its heaven, its misery, all that, can thought see the totality of this? And somebody said, thought cannot see it because it is a fragment. And we are asking, why is it a fragment? Keep to that. Why is it a fragment?

Q: Because it has detached itself from the whole.

K: Now what made it detach from the whole? I want to find out why thought is fragmentary. Aren't you interested in this?

Q: Time is involved in thought. Time is always in fragments.

K: You are saying thought is a movement in time, so thought is time, therefore it is fragmentary. But who created time?

Q: Thought.

K: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. 12.0 o'clock, 1.0 o'clock and 6.0 o'clock. Thought has created time, time is thought.

Q: I do not know that, sir. I don't see it as time.

K: Sir, look, look. Just go into it slowly. There is time by the watch, chronological time - the sun rises this morning at 5.0 o'clock or 5.30 and the lovely pink of the mountains and the beauty of shadows, and there was a meeting here at 10.30, all that is by the clock. That is chronological time. Is there any other time at all? We



say there is, which is the 'me' that is going to evolve, the 'me' that is going to become, the desire that is going to fulfil, I must be perfect, I must achieve - all that is the movement of thought in time. Shall we go on?

So we are asking, can thought solve the human problem, which it has created; or can thought see the whole and the perceiving of the whole is the solution of our problem? So, we are asking, can thought see the whole? And you say, no, because it is fragmentary. And I am asking myself, and you are asking yourself, why is it fragmentary?

Q: Because it is mechanical?

K: You are saying thought is mechanical, which means the brain is mechanical, which means the mind, totality, is mechanical. But that doesn't yet answer my question.

Q: Thought is creating a centre.

K: Go slowly. A centre. Why does it create a centre?

Q: Thought needs security in order to function.

K: Sir, I have said all this. But I want you, if you don't mind, to think of it anew.

Q: By identification.

K: Thought identifies itself with something called the 'me'. Is that it? But it has created the 'me', therefore it has no need to identify itself with 'me'.

Please, give me two minutes, will you? Let me talk and I'll point out, and then we will discuss.

We are asking, thought has created the outside world and the world inside me. The world is in chaos, and the world is 'me', human beings are in chaos. And we say, can thought solve this

problem? And the politicians are trying to do it - cunningly, subtly, deceptively, with spies, with all that business that is going on. And can the religious people solve this - Christians, believers, non-believers. So thought, apparently, has not been able to solve this centuries upon centuries.

Please, madam, don't take photographs, if you don't mind. I am not a circus. I have a horror of all that kind of thing. Please do have some kind of sensitivity and respect, when somebody doesn't want to be photographed don't do it.

We are asking, as thought created all this can thought undo all this? And we said, can thought see this whole movement of suffering, anxiety, politics, all the things that thought has put together which we call reality. And we said thought cannot solve it because thought itself is fragmentary. And I say to myself, why is thought fragmentary, why can't thought see what it is doing and grasp it and finish it? And we see thought is fragmentary, is broken up, whatever it touches breaks up - the businessman, the artist, the socialist, the capitalist, the communist, the nationalist, the believer, everything thought touches is fragmentary. Now I say to myself, why is it a fragment? If I can find that out, not be told because then repetition is like a monkey anyhow, so I want to find out why. Thought creates a centre - watch it. The centre becomes a means of unifying, like a bureaucracy is the unifying factor in politics, like a party, a centre, the democratic party, or the labour party, is a centre round which one hopes to create a unified entity. This is what is happening. The family is a centre, which means the father, mother and the children are one unit. So thought creates the centre - politically, religiously, in family life, in the human being - a centre,

hoping thereby to bring about unity. The family is a unit - they quarrel, they beat each other, or whatever they do, or many things that go in a futile little family, but yet it is a unit. The communists try to break up that unit but have come back to it again. And so on and so on and so on. So thought creates a centre in the hope that it will be the unifying factor. Because in a unifying factor there is a vitality, there is strength, there is stability - right? So thought has created that, and that has become independent of thought. I don't know if you have noticed it. Having created that centre, that centre then feels itself independent of thought, and that centre begins to dictate to thought - what it is to do, what it should not do, therefore thought becomes an outside thing, an irrelevant factor though a necessary factor, and therefore it is fragmentary. Got it?

Please don't accept what I am saying. Just look at the world, look at the world and see how the world is trying to unify through centres - American centre, with their president, with their army, it is a unit though in that Federation there are all kinds of troubles, ambitions, each wanting to - you know, but it is still within the centre of America, the idea of America. So the idea becomes a centre.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, madam. We are just watching it. I said please give me two minutes to go into it.

So there are various centres formed by thought - the Indian centre, the Italian, the Russian, the American, there is a centre in me, and a centre in you, and a centre in the family, all trying to unify - like the sun is the unifying factor of this universe, without the sun we would all be gone. So it is the unifying factor. So

thought having created that centre, and the centre feeling itself totally independent of thought, then thought becomes something outside, therefore it is fragmentary, therefore it is broken up, it is not the centre. As thought created the tent and the tent is independent of thought, so the centre is independent of thought and it dictates to thought what it should do. And thought has created that in the hope of creating unity. So thought, wanting to create unity, becomes fragmentary because it cannot create unity. I wonder if you see that?

I am not going to move from there until we completely understand that, because it is a very important factor in life.

Q: Why does thought feel the necessity of creating a centre?

K: Thought can condition itself to any pattern. It can become Catholic, Protestant, Capitalist, anything it can make itself. So thought realizes that it is very changeable, that it is in a flux, but yet thought says there must be security. You follow? So it creates the centre which it hopes there is security. The centre is 'me', the centre is my country, the centre is my god, the centre is my wife - you follow?

Q: Why can't thought see what it is doing?

K: I never said, sir, please be accurate, I never said thought can see the whole because it is fragmentary. And I keep on repeating that. So please, are you aware of this, do you know it as a fact, not as a theory, not as somebody telling you it is so and then you accepting it, but as a fact that you, that your thought has created the centre? And the centre is the hope of unifying, bringing people together.

Look, thought creates an ideal - Marxist ideal, or Mao ideal,

thought has created it. And people work for that - Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin - whether you approve or disapprove, that is not the point. And a Catholic and the whole of Christendom is based on that - the centre as Jesus, the saviour, whether he existed or not, that is not the point. And that held all Christendom at one time, then they began to break up. Which means thought realizing its own insecurity, because it is in constant movement, changeable, it creates a centre, as my country, my god, and so on and so on, and that becomes the security, the unifying factor of human beings. You are all Catholics or Protestants, aren't you? As the Hindus - you follow? So thought cannot see the whole. Right? Can we move from there? Don't accept this. Do you feel it in your bones?

Q: Can thought be modified by education?

K: My god, are you asking me that? Can thought be modified as communist - don't let's go on into this.

Q: I don't see why thought cannot remain with its own insecurity.

K: Do you know what would happen? Please see the consequences of that. You are asking a question, which is, why does not thought remain and realize its own insecurity? Watch it, sir. Watch it in yourself. What would happen to you if thought had no security, no certainty, - could it function? Therefore it must have a pattern, a centre, an ideal, a god, something which gives it safety. Now proceed from there.

So we are saying that thought cannot see the total movement of selfishness, the stream, which is suffering, anxiety and so on. Then what is it that sees the whole? If thought cannot see the whole then what is it that sees the whole? Wait, we are going into it, don't

agree or disagree, or put it away. I want to find out. Because that may be the answer, that may be the solution to all our problems - human, mechanical, political, everything. If thought cannot see it, what is meant by seeing, or perceiving the whole, is there such a thing? Or must we always live with this centre which creates fragments and all the rest of it, which is our tradition? Right? Can we go on from there. This is our tradition, to live with the fragment, with the centre, and constantly modifying the centre by thought and never bringing about a human unity, never answering a fundamental problem of human beings - like relationship, whether there is truth, whether there is god, whether there is a reality, it cannot answer it. Therefore one asks is there a quality of mind that sees the whole? Now wait a minute. Are we going together, discussing this, talking it over together.

So I am asking, what does it mean to see the whole?

Q: I don't know.

K: I have gone into it a great deal, but I don't know. So I am willing to learn. Learn. I can only learn if I have leisure - right? I can't learn if I am constantly moving, constantly offering opinions, judgements, evaluations. So I am going to learn. I am going to learn what it means to apprehend - apprehend means to take whole, what is meant by the whole - so I have to understand the word first. The word means sanity, health, rational, clear thinking, and also that word means holy - h-o-l-y - holy, rational, sane, objective, in which there is no emotional, sentimental, romantic, imaginative quality at all. So I have understood the meaning of that word. Now is the mind capable of seeing the whole - the whole being health, good body, healthy body, or unhealthy body which doesn't distort

perception? I may have cancer or disease, diabetes, or whatever it is, but that physical condition doesn't affect the clarity of perception, it doesn't distort. That's why we said health - right? And also it means sanity, sane thinking. Please watch it. Can there be sane thinking if you believe in this and that and the other, if you are a nationalist, or if you have faith in something? So sanity implies a non-belief, non-attachment, observing clearly 'what is' without any distortion, and therefore such a mind is a holy mind. So we have understood the meaning of that word.

I am asking, can thought see the whole, and we said, no, and we have gone into it pretty thoroughly. So I am asking myself, can there be a perception of the whole? So I have to understand, I am going to learn what it means to perceive. Right? Am I talking too much, or to myself? I want to learn, not to be told, not to accept, I want to learn, because the moment you learn it is yours, it is finished. So I must find out what it means to learn - you understand how I'm going? I can only learn if I don't know. If I know then.. So I really don't know what it means to look at something wholly. So I am going to learn. I can only learn when there is curiosity - right? There can only be curiosity when I don't know and I want to find out. And learning implies leisure. I must have space, I mustn't be crowded, I mustn't have all kinds of problems shouting at me. So I must have leisure. And I must have it to learn, and I create it to learn. I wonder if you follow this. I create leisure in order to learn. If I say, I have no leisure because I am occupied with my family, with my job, with my - you follow? Don't learn. But if you want to learn you have to create leisure. That means also curiosity. You can only be curious when you don't know. I don't know Russian,

and I am curious to learn. So I learn. So I am learning what it means to observe totally - curiosity and a driving interest. If I want to learn something, it doesn't matter what, technology, to be a doctor, to be a good carpenter, I must have driving interest in it, a sustained, driving interest. You follow? All this is implied in learning. I don't know if you are capable of it, if you want it, if you really pursue it.

Then learning implies never accumulating what you have learnt as knowledge. I wonder if you see that. We learn a language - what am I doing with all of you? Why are you all listening to me? Are you learning something from me? I doubt it!

Learning implies a driving interest, curiosity, and sustained energy. All that is implied in that word 'leisure'. Now I am saying, is there a perception which sees the whole? So we know what we mean by whole, by learning, now we want to look into that word 'perceive'. Is there a perception if my mind is looking at something else? I want to listen to what you are saying, therefore I must give attention to what you are saying, which means I mustn't compare what you are saying with what already I know - right? I mustn't interfere, translate, or substitute something from what you are saying, I must listen to you totally, mustn't I? No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am telling you sir, though we are in the stream how to look at the totality of the stream. If thought is not capable of looking at it, is there a way of looking at it which is not the movement of thought as time and measure? That's what we are saying.

So what does it mean to perceive? To see you there must be no screen between you and me - screen of my prejudice, screen of my



desire, or this or that, there must be freedom between you and me, a space between you and me. Then I can see you. If there is no space between me and the mountain I can't see the mountain. If there is no space between me and the tree I can't see the tree. So is my mind capable of looking at this vast stream with space between me and that? Consider it, look at it. If the space is created by thought, then it is not space. I don't know if you see that. Right? If I say to myself, I must look at my wife, and I have never probably seen her properly, I must have some space between her and me, but if I have no space but images about her, how she has hurt me, how she gave me delight, sex, or a damn nuisance, vulgarity, you know, space, if there is no space between her and me I can't see her. Right? That space, which thought has created, which is the image between her and me, that image prevents me from looking. So to perceive I must have space - space being no image, no conclusion, no prejudice - I must look, which is rational. If I want to see you, though you have colours which I may not like but I must put aside those prejudices and look at you. So is my mind capable of looking with space, which means freedom from all the structure of thought as images? Can you do it? Can you?

Q: No.

K: You say you can't, why? Why do you say you can't? Is it because you have never learnt about yourself? What we are talking about is yourself, so you have never looked at yourself, actually what you are. Therefore when a new thing is proposed, you say, 'For god's sake, I don't know what you are talking about.'

So we are saying, to perceive there must be self-knowledge. I am putting it round the other way. Without knowing myself, as I

am, I cannot see the whole. So I must learn about myself. Learn. Not learn according to Freud, Jung and all the rest of them, not learn about myself according to Socrates or according to the ancient Indians, but actually what I am. I don't know what I am. I think I know what I am. So thought says, 'I know myself, I know what I have created', but see the trickery, what it has created it doesn't know. I wonder if you realize this. Sir, thought has created this whole structure of 'me', and the 'me' has separated itself from thought and says, 'I am independent', and so thought says, 'I don't know you'. And thought says, you are what other have said, you are angry, you are this, you are that, but those are all the creations of thought. So I have to learn about myself, not according to any professional enquirer, classical professors, with doctorates and all the rest of it, I must look at myself and see what I am. I cannot look at myself because I have got so many ideas about myself. If I see something of myself, I say, that's wrong, I must change it, I must look at it, it is right, it is wrong - you follow? I am always clothing it according to opinions, judgements, evaluations. So can I look at myself without any interpretation? You can, can't you?

Q: To see myself will take time.

K: Ah, that's another of our traditions. To look at myself will take time. That is one of the things that we have learnt from school, from professors, from analysts, from psychologists, that is the whole structure of tradition - you will learn gradually. I will learn gradually mathematics, I will learn gradually Algebra or Russian. Why should I say the same thing about myself? I may learn instantly the whole of myself, but if I say, well it will take time, I am lost. You follow?

Q: I see in myself more than one centre.

K: Obviously, but they are all centres. I may see a centre in the morning when I wake up, rather joyful and clear eyed, having slept well, there is a marvellous centre, and later on, as the day goes on, I meet people whom I don't like, or I like, they begin to insult me, there is another centre, but it is all the same movement of centre. Don't waste time on this.

Q: Has thought created awareness?

K: Now what do you mean by awareness? In awareness - please listen - in awareness if there is choice - I like, I don't like, this is beautiful, that is ugly - in awareness, because awareness implies seeing everything, when there is in that awareness choice, there is a preference, there is a conclusion, it is the movement of thought, therefore thought is not aware. Now let's go on.

Q: Is there anything else in human beings except thought?

K: That's what we are going to find out. We like to think there is something beyond thought, something extraordinary - god, spark of divinity, something utterly beautiful, romantic. That is all the structure of thought. But to find out if there is something beyond thought I have to know the right place of thought, I have to know the limits of thought.

Look, sirs, we will stop in a little because you can't maintain this for a whole hour and a quarter. First let's see: we said thought is fragmentary, thought being fragmentary cannot see the whole - the whole being health, sanity, holiness. And to see the whole one has to learn about it. To learn about it is not the same as learning a language. Learning a language takes time, but this may not need time. So I break away from the tradition of time. I wonder if you

see that. This may require something totally different, but if I say, 'Well I need time, as I need time to develop a certain muscle', then I am caught in something which is irrevocable.

So to perceive there must be space. There can only be space when there is no image, no word, no movement of thought; then only I can see. I have to learn about it because I have always seen through interpretation, through memories, through images - my image, my conclusion dictating what I see. My conclusion of being a Hindu, or whatever it is, and that conclusion prevents me from seeing. Or I see through that conclusion. So a space is necessary. That space cannot exist if there is any form of image, any symbol, any word, any kind of prejudice. So I have to learn about myself because I am prejudiced, I have got all kinds of attachments, all kinds of beliefs. So I must learn about myself. That means I must learn not according to professional investigators and their conclusions, I must learn about myself as I am. I can only learn about myself in relationship with you - how I act, how I behave, what my speeches are, what my actual thoughts are. So in knowing myself I then learn to have a space which will bring about the perception of the whole, which means there is no perceiver at all because the perceiver is put together by thought.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 1ST AUGUST 1975.

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: In the first dialogue there was a question, what would be the action of a man if and when he steps out of the stream, how would such a person act in the world of reality?

Q: Does it have any meaning at all to a man who is not free?

K: So what shall we discuss?

Would you like to discuss, talk over together, the relationship between reality and truth? Which means freedom from the cloying, clinging effects of reality, and if there is such freedom, what relationship is there between truth and reality?

Q: I have been listening to you for several years but I do not seem able to go beyond the word. I am a slave to words, one is caught in words, and one lives from a centre and how is one to act?

Q: Would you mind talking over together the energy that is necessary in daily life to maintain attention?

K: To maintain attention, what kind of energy is necessary in daily life?

Q: Is there anything like positive and negative thought?

K: Good thought and bad thought, right thought and not right thought. All thought is one, whether good or bad or indifferent. Now let's find out which shall we talk over together. That question that was put forward, time, where does thought come from? Now which shall we discuss or talk over together of all these questions?

Q: The first question.

K: What is the action of a man who is not caught in time? Shall

we begin by talking over together, what is the relationship between reality and truth, if there is such a thing as truth, and what is a man to do who lives in the world of reality all the time, caught in that world of reality, verbal, imaginative, the world of conclusions, ideologies, tyrannies, what is a human being to do? Shall we discuss your question, sir, that includes all this? Shall we go into that?

What is the difference, or what is the relationship between truth and reality? We said reality is all that thought has put together, all that which thought reflects upon, or reflects about, all that thought remembers as knowledge, experience and memory, and acts in that area, and lives in that area, we call that reality. Right? Is that clear between us. Please, don't say at the end of it, 'What do you mean by reality?' We are saying reality, the word reality, the root meaning of that word is res, thing. So we live with things, we live with things created by thought as ideas, we live with things called conclusions, which are all verbal, and we have various opinions, judgements and so on. That is the world of reality. And what is the relationship between that and truth? How shall we find this out? This has been one of the problems of the ancient Hindus, and some philosophers and some scientists, modern and ancient: is there such a thing as truth, and if there is, is it within the field of reality, or is it outside reality, and if it is outside, what is the relationship between that and reality? Is the question clear?

What is the activity of reality? What takes place in the field of reality? Shall we begin with that, and see its meaning, its significance, and its value, and when we have understood completely or totally the field of reality, then we can enquire into

the other, not the other way round? Is that clear? Because one's mind may not be capable of enquiring into truth. But we can enquire into the world of reality, its activity, how destructive, how constructive and so on. When we are absolutely clear, logical, sane, healthy about the world of reality then we can proceed to find out if there is truth. Would you go on with that? Would you concede that as a necessary step? Not what truth is, but then we can speculate about it, your speculation as well as somebody else's.

So what is the activity in the world of reality, both outwardly as well as psychologically, inwardly? Can we go on with that? I am not giving a talk, this is a dialogue between two people. In that world of reality there is always duality - right? The 'me' and you, we and they. This duality expresses, acts in the world of reality as nationalities, as religious divisions, as political division and tyrannies and domination, all this is actually going on. So there is this activity of duality - the 'me' and the 'you', and the 'me' separating itself from the actual, and having a conflict with the actual. I wonder if you see that. May we go on? Is this clear?

That is, the world of reality is created by thought. Thought, as we said, is movement in time and measure. That is the whole movement of thought in time as measure. That thought has created the centre, as we were talking about yesterday, that centre separates itself from thought, then that centre creates the duality as the 'you' and the 'me' - right? Is this clear? Please, not verbally, not intellectually, but actually, does one see the reality of this? - I was just going to say the truth of it. This is the truth, that which is, is the truth. And do I see that which is? That is, thought creating a centre, that centre assuming power, domination and all the rest of

it, and creating division between the centre and the periphery, which is thought. We said thought, having created the centre, that centre becomes not only a cohesive, unitary process, but also it acts as a dividing thing. Right? Do you see it as clearly as you see this tent? The tent is real, it has been created by thought, that's independent of thought but it is actual. May we go on?

So we live outwardly and inwardly, psychologically, in the field of reality which is basically not only fragmentary but divisive, that is dual, divided. That is our life. One of the symptoms of this division is the centre trying to control thought, trying to control desire, trying to control various appetites, various reactions. So the centre becomes the factor of division. This is fairly simple. That is, in the field of reality conflict is always part of that - right? - conflict, not only within myself, but outwardly, not only in myself but in my relationship to others. Right? Please! So conflict is one of the principles of reality, as division is one of the principles and from that division conflict arises. This is factual. The centre separates itself from violence, and then that centre acts upon the violence, controlling it, dominating it, trying to change it into non-violence and so on, from the centre there is always the effort made to control, change. Politically this is happening, in the democratic world as well as in the tyrannical world where the few dominate the many, the few are the centre - I don't know if you see the beauty of all this. And the few want unity, and therefore they must dominate, etc., etc.

So in the field of reality division is one of the basic principles - the guru and the disciple, the guru who knows and the disciple who doesn't.



Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, we are not children, we are talking about ourselves. If a child is born in a jungle and brought up differently, god knows what would happen. But your child and the other people's child are not born in a jungle. We are here in a jungle of reality.

So that is one of the principles in the world of reality - division, conflict. That is, the centre trying to control thought - please understand this because from this we are going to the world of truth, and if you don't understand this don't let's talk any more. Let's stick to this and understand it. We try to control anger, we try to control various forms of desires, always from the centre - the centre being that which thought has created, and which has become permanent, or rather attributed to itself the quality of permanency. Right?

So from that arises: is it possible to live - please listen - in the world of reality without control? You understand my question? Without any form of control - sexually, which predominates in the western world, and that is becoming a neurotic thing and distorting the mind, everything - no control, is it possible to live in the world of reality without a shadow of control? Go on, sirs.

Q: You can do this in the privacy of thought.

K: If you are by yourself, are you saying, you can do this, but if you are with others you cannot live a life in which there is no control - is that it? Yes? You see what you have said just now. I don't think you realize what you have said. That if you are by yourself perhaps you could do this, but if you have to live with others you cannot do this. Who are the others? Divided by thought as you and me, but the actuality is, you are me, I am the world, and

the world is me, the world is you. I wonder if you see this. We went into all this.

Q: That is not true.

K: I think it would be more correct if you used the word 'correct' rather than saying, it is not true. Correct means care - it comes from the word care, accurate, accurate means care. You say, that is not so. Now let's look at it: basically - we have gone into this a dozen times before - basically whether you live in America, in France, or Europe, or Russia, China or India, basically we are the same - we have the same suffering, the same anxiety, the same grief, arrogance, great anxiety, uncertainty - basically we are the same. Environmentally, culturally, we may have different structure and therefore act superficially differently, but fundamentally you are the same as the man who is across the border.

Q: I need privacy.

K: Oh, you still want privacy. Who is preventing you? I don't understand the question. If you say, I still want privacy, you mean you still want to be enclosed by a house, by a garden, by a wall round your house, or enclosed so as not to be hurt. So you say, I must have a wall around myself in order not to be hurt. We went into this question the other day.

As we were saying, in the field of reality conflict and duality are the actual things that are going on - conflict between people, conflict between nations, conflict between ideals, conflict between beliefs, conflict between states, armaments - the whole field of reality is that. It is not an illusion. As the Hindus would say, 'That is a maya', in Sanskrit 'ma' means measure. Please understand that. 'Ma' means measure. So they said in the field of reality there is

always measurement, and therefore that is illusory because measurement is a matter of thought, measurement is a matter of time, from here to there, and so on, and therefore they said that is illusion. But the world they wanted is also an illusion created by thought. I wonder if you see that. I won't go into all that.

So in the field of reality can one live completely without control, not permissiveness, not doing what you want to do, because that is too childish because you can never do what you want to do; one thinks one can? So is it possible to live a life without a shadow of conflict? I don't know if you have gone into this.

Q: It seems that when we are aware of all these processes that thought tries to control, this brings conflict and then to control thought brings more conflict, and then control again brings more conflict, then there is trouble. So why control?

K: No, sir, if I may a little bit go into it. Have you ever tried, or known how to act without control? You have appetites - sexual, sensory appetites. To live with those appetites, not yielding to them, not suppressing them, nor controlling them, to see these appetites and end them as they arise. Have you ever played that - not 'played', have you ever done this?

Q: It's impossible.

K: No, sir, I'll show it to you, sir. Don't say you can't do anything, the human mind can do anything - they have gone to the moon, before this century they said, 'Impossible' - they have gone to the moon, technologically you can do anything. So why not psychologically? Find out, don't say 'I can't, it's impossible'. Look, sir, go into step by step and you will see it. You see a beautiful

house, lovely garden, a desire arises, and how does this desire arise? You understand my question? What is the nature of desire? And how does it arise? I'll show it to you. There is visual perception of that house, a beautiful garden, architecturally beautiful, nice proportions, lovely colours, and you see it visually. Then that vision thing is communicated to the brain, there is sensation, from sensation there is desire, and thought comes along and says, 'I must have it', or 'I can't have it, I am going to have it'. I don't know if you have watched all this. So - wait a minute - there is the beginning of desire, the beginning of thought - thought we said is physical as well as chemical - perception of that house, sensation, contact if you touch it, and desire and thought. Right? This is, sexually, visually, psychologically, intellectually. Right?

There is that beautiful house, the seeing, the sensation, the desire, can that desire end, not move with thought as possessing and all the rest of it? You have understood my question? The perception, sensation, desire and the ending - not thought coming along and saying, 'I must'. Now in that there is no control. I wonder if you see that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, I am asking - let's stick to one thing - I am saying, can you live a life in the world of reality without control? And I will show you how it is done. All action comes from a desire, a motive, a purpose, an end. Surely this is simple, isn't it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. You eat a good omelette, tasty omelette, what takes place? The brain registers the pleasure, and demands that pleasure be repeated tomorrow. But that omelette is never going to be the

same. You see what we are trying to point out is, the taste and not let it register as a desire, as a memory, and end it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. Desire, appetite, I am hungry, is that thought? But thought says, 'I would like to have such-and-such dish'. Appetite, hunger is not thought.

Q: We are not quick enough to stop the thought.

K: Therefore learn. Sir, look, as we said yesterday, let's learn about it, not how to do it. You see one's mind, or brain is traditional, you are always saying, 'I can't, tell me what to do' - it is all the pattern of tradition. What we are saying is very simple: which is, the seeing, the sensation, and desire. You can see the movement of this, can't you, in yourself? No? When you see a beautiful car, a beautiful woman, or beautiful man, or god knows what else, when you see it, and the sensation arises, and the desire. Now to be so alert to watch it, then you will see as you watch it thought has no place. I wonder if you see this.

So I am saying to you, I am suggesting, that in the field of reality as conflict is the very nature of that reality, the ending of conflict in oneself, in a human being, and therefore in the world, because you are the world, and the world is me, and the world is you, your consciousness with its content is the content of the world, so there is an understanding, a radical change in you, it affects the whole of consciousness of man. For god's sake see this.

Q: How can we get this to work, it is not a dialogue.

K: I have tried to make it a dialogue. As we can't hear, you have to speak louder or tell somebody to tell us. If somebody nearer has heard what she said, would you tell us what she said.

Q: May we go on?

K: We said this is a dialogue. Dialogue means conversation between two friends, or between people who are really serious to find out. It is not an argument, which becomes a discussion, nor a dialectic investigation, which is the investigation of opinions to see what is true in opinion, and opinions are prejudices, therefore we are not enquiring into truth, prejudices are prejudices. So we are having a dialogue, a conversation, and if somebody wants to say something which we can't hear, please convey to somebody near who will tell us. But don't let you and I have a battle about it.

So we are saying can a human being live in the world of reality without conflict? Because if he cannot then truth becomes an escape from reality. So he must understand the whole content of reality, how thought operates, what is the nature of thought.

Let's begin again: we said the field of reality is all the things that thought has put together consciously, or unconsciously, and one of the major symptoms of that reality, a disease of that reality is conflict - nationally, between the classes, between people, between individuals, between you and me, and so on and so on. Conflict outwardly and inwardly, that conflict is between the centre which thought has created and thought itself, because the centre thinks it is separate from thought, so there is that conflict of duality between the centre and the thought; and from that arises the urge to control thought, to control desire. Right? Now is it possible to live, not only in oneself, a life in which there is no control - please I am very careful in the usage of that word 'control', which does not mean doing what you want, permissiveness, all the modern extravagance which has become vulgar, stupid, meaningless. We

are using the word 'control' in quite a different sense - a man who would want to live in complete peace must understand this problem of control. And this control is between the centre and the thought - the thought taking different forms, different objects, different movements. Now we say, one of the factors of conflict is desire, and its fulfilment. Desire comes into being when there is perception and sensation. That's fairly simple and clear. Now can that desire, as it arises, can the mind be totally aware of it and therefore end it, not give it movement first? You understand what that means.

Q: There is no recording in the brain as memory, which then gives vitality and continuity to desire.

K: That's right. I don't know if you see this point. I see a beautiful picture and the response is to have it - just one of the responses, or I may not have it, just look at it and walk off, but if there is a response to possess it then that sensation as desire is registered in the brain, the brain then demands the possession of it and the enjoyment of it. This is fairly simple. Now can you look at that picture - please experiment, it is so simple once you understand the whole movement of it - when you see the picture, desire, and the ending.

Q: Sir, I don't recognize that I have a desire until afterwards. In other words there is no recorder in my mind that tells me I am having desire.

K: Sir, I have gone into this. I said - we said, this is a dialogue between all of us - and we went into this question. Please listen, sir, you asked a question. We said in the world of reality conflict seems to be the nature of it. Right? And we are trying to find out if

it is possible to live without conflict. And we said conflict arises when there is duality, the 'me' and the 'you', and the centre created by thought and thought itself. And the centre tries to control, shape thought. There lies the whole problem of conflict. And further, that desire arises through sensation - sensory perception. Sensory perception of objective things involving belief is illusion. I can believe that I am something when I am not, therefore there is the problem of conflict. So is it possible to live a life totally without conflict? I do not know if you have ever put this question to yourself. Or we live in the world of tradition and accept that world, that conflict is inevitable.

Q: Sir, I am not conscious of living in conflict.

K: All right, then you say, I am not conscious that I live in conflict. You say that you are not conscious that you live in conflict.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, we are not talking of that, sir. We are talking over together this question of reality and truth. That's how this began. We said unless you understand the whole nature of reality, all its complexities, mere enquiry into what is truth is an escape. And we are saying let us look into the world of reality, the world of reality which thought has created, nothing else. And in that world of reality the conflict is the movement of life. I may not be conscious of that conflict sitting here but unconsciously, deeply, there is conflict going on. This is simple enough. I wish we could go on further.

So that is one of the things, conflict. And this conflict takes many forms, which we call noble and ignoble. The man who has



ideals and is trying to live up to those ideals, which is conflict, we call him marvellous, a very good human being. Those ideals are projected by thought. Follow it. And the centre pursues that and so there is conflict between the ideal and the actual. This is what is happening in the world of tyranny, dictatorship. The few know what they think is right and for the rest to follow. So this goes on all the time. And it is the same with regard to authority - the authority of the doctor, the scientist, the mathematician, the informed man, and the uninformed man, the guru and the disciple - he wants to achieve what he has got, what he has got is still in the world of reality. Right? He may talk about truth but he is conducting himself in the world of reality, using the methods of reality, which is division between himself and the disciple. This is so obvious.

Q: What is the function of a teacher?

K: Am I teaching you anything? Be clear, don't accept, don't say, yes. Find out if I am teaching you anything. Please be serious for a few minutes. What is the function of a so-called teacher? There is the mathematician.

Q: You are not a professor because you have not accumulated and therefore are not giving that accumulated knowledge to us.

K: No, it is much more. What is a teacher, and who is the taught, and what is being taught? The teacher, a mathematical teacher, he has accumulated information about mathematics, biology or physics, or whatever it is, he wants to teach you, or give you information about mathematics. He can assume in that relationship that he is superior to the disciple and therefore there is a totally different kind of relationship between him and the student.

Or both are learning; the teacher is learning about his conditioning, and in talking over with the student he is also helping the student to be aware of his conditioning. So both are learning.

We said, what is the teacher and the disciple, and what is taught? If both the teacher and the student and the disciples are learning, not the teacher accumulating knowledge and then gives it, then that is merely transferring information. In that giving information the teacher can assume extraordinary authority, position, give himself superior airs and all the rest of it. But if both are learning - and I hope this is what we are doing here - then there is no teacher and the taught, then there is no authority. And the field of reality has authority because authority then assumes status. Through function the teacher assumes a status. You understand that? Here we are not assuming any status - I am not, because I have made it perfectly clear right from the beginning that I am not your guru, you are not my followers, I am not your authority. But together, if you are serious, and I hope you are, if you are serious we are investigating, not offering one opinion against another opinion, I have no opinions, I have no belief. I don't rest on my laurels, I have no laurels. All that is stupid.

So if both of us are learning, then we are equal, and therefore we are free. And it is only in freedom you can learn. So we are learning together by investigating if it is possible to live in this world without conflict. That means you must exercise your brain, not just casually listen and interrupt with something or other. You are giving your attention to one thing only, which is to find out, to learn together whether it is possible to live in the world of reality without a single conflict. And I say to you, it is possible, let's find

out. And to find out you must investigate, you must look, you must listen, that means you must be serious.

So we say, that desire, thought, is one of the factors of division, probably it is the only factor of division, and as long as we don't understand the whole nature of desire, there will be the fulfilment of it, and the despair of not fulfilling it and the conflict involved in fulfilling it, all that is involved in that word 'desire'. Desire arises - perception, sensation, contact, desire. Can that desire have no further movement? Investigate. Because what gives it vitality and the drive to fulfil - you understand my question?

Q: There is already in desire a conflict.

K: No. Just look at it sir, look, learn. I see that car, it is a beautiful Mercedes Benz, and naturally perception, sensation and I see it. Why should there be a strengthening of desire - you follow? Why should desire continue? And what gives continuity to desire? Do look at it, please learn. I see that car, there is the perceiving, sensation, desire. Then why is there a continuity of that desire?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Which means what? I have driven in a Mercedes before, it is a nice car, powerful, and somebody else drove me in it and I see that car, I'd like to have it. That is, the perception, sensation, desire, the memory, the response of that memory is thought, and thought says, 'I must have it'. This whole movement. So is it possible to live a life without conflict? There is much more involved in this, you don't quite see it. That is, our brains - as I said the other day, we are not professionals, I have not taken a degree in the structure of the brain, or studied it, but I have watched brains - the brain functions in tradition because in tradition there is safety, tradition

being in knowing, whether that knowing, that knowledge, has been transmitted to me, to the brain, by the past, or acquired recently, that brain functions effectively when it is completely secure. You can watch this in babies, you can watch a professional technician, because he knows perfectly the motor there is no problem. That is, he functions in tradition. And our brains demand security, certainty, and it finds it in knowledge, in memory, in tradition, in experience, which is the past. So it is afraid to move out of that realm - if you have watched yourself. So a challenge is put to it: can you live without conflict? And the immediate response is, 'I can't because I have lived that way'. It is not learning. In learning things may alter. Therefore it is a 'Please, don't disturb'. So the brain seeking security, finds it in conflict, accepts it as suffering, pain, other things. So can the brain, listen to this, can the brain perceive, see, sensation, desire and not operate in the traditional way? Which means there must be an investigation into the whole structure of memory. We said, thought is the response of memory, thought is physical as well as chemical, so the cells are that, the cells of the brain.

Now my question is: can the mind - please listen to this - can the brain register only those things that are technological and nothing else? I wonder if you see this question. You understand my question - understand the question, not the answer. That is, the brain registers, it registers because it has to function efficiently and to function efficiently it must be sure, certain, sane. And it has found that safety in holding on to memories, in holding on to experiences, which is the whole content of knowledge. Now I am asking myself - you are asking this yourself too, please - we are

asking can the brain, though its function is to register because that is the way to be safe, only register the activities in the field of the known and nowhere else? That is, no movement of thought outside its own area. You understand?

Q: Can you give an example?

K: I am sorry, I can't think in examples. We'll try. Look, sir, I see that car, there is perception of that Mercedes - I am not a propagandist for Mercedes! - there is that Mercedes, and there is perception, sensation, desire. The next movement is thought registering it in the brain and saying, 'I must have it'. Now can there be no interference of thought but only observation, sensation and no interference of thought? Have you understood?

Q: How do you..

K: We are learning, not how. There is no how. When they ask the 'how' you had better ask the professors. Here we are learning. You see it is much more complex than this because if you go into it, we are registering everything, every influence, anything that we see - the television, the books. Now you are registering what I am saying. And in that registered state the brain is completely secure, and it demands security. So it says, I will live in tradition, in knowledge. Now we are asking, challenging the brain, say, look, you have lived for millennia in conflict, find out how to live without conflict. And the brain refuses, which you are doing. You don't want to find out. You want to be told how to live, then that becomes security. You understand? So you say, 'Tell me quick'. But we are pointing out. The brain demanding security lives in the field of knowledge which is tradition, and that tradition is going on, being added to, modified, all the time. Now we are saying, look

at that brain, look at yourself, which is your brain, your mind, your feelings, and all that, look at yourself and find out if you can live without a single conflict. In that there may be complete security. And because it is told you that there might be complete security in that you will begin to grab it. So find out if you can live without conflict. If I didn't know the way to the house I would be in conflict, but I do know the way to the house, it is registered, it is familiar and I go to it. I don't know mathematics, I learn about it. Or I don't know Russian and I go to somebody who teaches me Russian - or mathematics, or history, or medicine and so on and so on. What other place has thought? Has it any other place except in that field?

Q: No.

K: Don't say, 'No'. Learn. So freedom is not in the field of reality because freedom implies freedom from conflict. But if there is freedom from conflict such a mind will know how to live in reality. I wonder if you see that. If I have understood, if my brain has completely grasped the full significance of living a life without conflict, which means discovering the utter limitation of thought, its narrow boundaries, then the brain will know how to live in the world of reality and act in freedom from conflict. I wonder if you understand this?

Our whole society economically is based on buying and selling. Right? Produce, demand - consumerism. I see that. And I am greedy because that is my tradition. I have been educated from childhood to have plenty, you know, whatever it is, consume. And I see in the world of reality that this consumerism is doing a tremendous lot of harm, but I need clothes, shoes, a house, a

shelter, but the need becomes the greed. You are following all this. So I am back again. So if I realize, if I see the whole nature of the world of reality, which is very complex, it isn't just a childish thing and throw it out, the world of reality in which the brain is involved, the brain that has functioned in the field of knowledge because that is the only thing it can be secure in. But that security it seeks psychologically - in ideas, in images, in beliefs, in opinions, in judgements and so on. So I say that as long as thought goes beyond the limit, which means no judgement, no opinion, no belief, no ideas, which are all projections of thought pretending that it is something totally different. And to live entirely in the field of reality, which is knowledge and be free to act there without the interference of belief, dogmas and all the rest of it. So action then in the field of reality is immediate. If I smoke - which I don't - if I smoke I realize, see the whole implication of it, end it instantly. Do it. Alcohol, anything. That is, see actually 'what is' and then the action is not tomorrow.

So when there is a total comprehension of the movement of thought as time and measure, which is the world of reality, then we can begin to enquire into truth.

## **SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 2ND AUGUST 1975.**

K: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: What happens to thought when it realizes it can't grasp the whole?

Q: The act or the passion of learning.

Q: You have never talked about apparitions, ghosts, and all that business after death.

Q: What happens to your own mind when you are not talking, when you are not with people, when you are not reading, what is the state of your mind?

Q: The problem of violence.

Q: What is boredom?

K: Perhaps you are bored here.

Q: What is the relationship of the mind to thought?

Q: What worries me is, our relationship to children, our responsibility to children, to older people and so on.

Q: Could we talk over meditation in relation to a total perception which transforms, or changes, the structure or the cells in the brain?

Q: What is it to be sensitive, and what is right education?

K: Now just a minute: which shall we take of these - what is the state of your own mind when you are not talking, reading, being with people? Then: what is right education? And what is our responsibility to our children, to the older people, to the people about us? Could you talk over meditation and total perception; perception of something whole, you said, transforms the very cells



of the brain? The act of learning. Now which shall we take of these which will cover all the questions that have been raised?

Q: Your state of mind.

K: Perhaps we can come to that - if you are still interested in it at the end of it - by talking over together the problem of responsibility, not only with regard to our children, but to society, to the politician, to this world that is in chaos, and perhaps, if we could, go into this question of meditation we might cover all the questions that have been asked.

So could we take - I am asking, I am not saying you should - responsibility? What is our responsibility to our children, to our neighbour, to all the things that are happening in the world - dictatorship, violence, suppressing free speech, all that - what is our responsibility and what is the action of that responsibility, and could we learn what that action is? That includes, I think, most of the questions that have been asked, and perhaps we can also go into the question of meditation after, or we will come upon it.

Do we feel responsible: what is happening in India, suppression, you know what is happening there: you know what is happening in Russia, if you have read Solzhenitsyn and Zharkov and the others, and talked to some people, diplomats or friends who have been there: and in China, and in America and in Europe, and the starving people throughout the world including Africa and India: what is one's responsibility, what should one do? This is a dialogue. What should one do? Do you feel strong enough, or passionate enough, that things can't go on as they are? Or do you say, 'That's not my responsibility' - what happens in Russian, in India, or Africa and so on? Do you feel responsible - the word responsibility means to

respond adequately to the challenge that is going on around us. The word 'responsibility' means that, to respond inadequately or adequately or fully. Does one feel responsible? Go on sirs. And if you do feel responsible, at what level - casual responsibility, casual response, convenient response, responding according to your political theories, or according to your convictions, beliefs and so on. How do you respond?

Q: Is guilt involved in responsibility?

K: You understand, all these questions are involved in this. What is one to do? I feel terribly responsible - suppose one does - I do personally feel terribly responsible that something must be done to stem the tide of tyranny, and all the political chicanery, the secretiveness of politicians and their conclusions and their documents behind the door, all that is happening. And looking at it as a human being I feel utterly responsible. Do you? Or do you say, 'That is not my business, I can't do anything about it. What can I do about things that are happening in India or Russia, where there is no freedom of speech, the new class, people are treated like lumps of flesh, and that's happening also slowly in India and in Africa? How do you feel responsible and what can you do about it? Sir, face it, let's talk about it.

Q: I don't know what you mean by adequate.

K: I am coming to that, sir. Does one feel responsible to one's children? Let's begin with that. I don't know why you beget children, but do you feel responsible - that they have the right kind of environment, right kind of education - we will discuss what is the right kind of education - right kind of parents, and not indifferent parents, parents who are occupied with their own

problems, with their own ambitions, with their own greed, with their own status, the maladjustment between the wife and the husband, and therefore they feel very little responsibility to the children because they are occupied with themselves - the parents. And then talk about responsibility to children. You understand? And if you do not feel responsible, why not? When the house is burning, which it is, we sit back and meditate, take drugs, form little communes and go to Japan or India to find little gurus? What do you do?

Q: I see all this state of affairs in the world comes about through divisions, nationalities, families and so on.

K: So what shall I do? Face the problem. Who is responsible for creating this? You understand?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going into that, sir, go slowly.

Q: It is very difficult to be totally responsible for the whole because one is so occupied with one's own problems, with one's own livelihood, with one's own passions, appetites and all that. Therefore how can you talk about being responsible for the whole?

K: So if we could approach this problem, who is responsible for making this mess in the world - the Catholic mess, the Hindus, you understand, the mess, the violence, the brutality, who is responsible? The politicians, the priests?

Q: We are.

K: You are. Don't be casual about it, don't be hesitant. Either you are, or you are not. Don't let's pretend and say, 'Well I am not responsible really, somebody else is responsible'. Who is responsible?

Q: How does it help for me to be, I have no power.

K: How do you know you have no power? You haven't even looked at it, sir. Please look at it first before you answer it. If you attribute this chaos in the world, and violence and all the rest of it, to environment, to a society, to the priest, to the politicians, then you have to say, who brought this politician into being, the priest into being? We have, haven't we? Through our fear, we have created the church, the temples, the mosques - right? No? Come on sirs, move. And we have elected these politicians, whether in this country, or in so-called democratic countries - which is really not democracy at all, but that doesn't matter. We certainly have not created the communists, they have usurped power in the name of the people and all the rest of it. So we are responsible, aren't we? Oh, face it, sirs, don't be shy about it. We are Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or Italians, or Russians, we have demanded that we be nationalistic, divisive, no?

Q: Yes.

K: Sir, if you feel that, if you feel that you are utterly responsible for everything that is going on in the world, not to get depressed by it, but feel utterly responsible..

Q: We have no money.

K: Does responsibility depend on money?

Q: No, but money dictates..

K: Wait sir. I know that, money dictates, power dictates, sex dictates. But first we are responsible for this, not the moneyed people, or the poor people, we, you and I. It was already existent, this confusion, this misery, this suffering, and the chaos, violence, before I was born. Obviously.

Q: I don't know what to do.

K: We are going to learn what to do. So if one feels utterly, totally, wholly responsible for this, because in oneself one is violent, in oneself one is ambitious and therefore we have created this.

Q: I feel part of the mess.

K: All right, you feel part of the mess, but that part has created this. You are in it, we are all in it, and what shall we do? Just be carried along? So we have to find out, we have to learn - please, don't be definite, don't come to any conclusion.

Q: I see it intellectually but I don't feel it.

K: Oh, I see. You don't really feel it, you intellectually agree we are responsible but you don't feel that thing.

Q: This is the nature of existence, I accept it.

K: I don't accept that this is the nature of this world. That means I am doomed for ever. Now please let's go slowly, let's learn about it, don't jump from state to state to state. Let's learn about it.

What am I to do? I feel totally responsible as a human being, who is the world, and the world is him, that is the basic thing first. If you don't accept it let's talk it over together: that you are the world and the world is you. You have been brought up in a particular culture, western culture, culture including all the social, economic, ethical, moral, religious, structure, you have been brought up in that, but in essence you are like everybody else - greedy, envious, arrogant, violent, all that, right through the world this is what is going on.

Q: Intellectually I see that but I still don't feel it.

K: I wonder if you see it intellectually at all. Why do you divide

the intellect and the feeling. What you mean by the intellect is hearing the words, and the understanding of the words, and then you say, 'I understand it intellectually'. Do you understand intellectually when somebody beats you, when you are hungry, when your house is burning, when your wife or girl runs away from you, do you intellectually say, 'Yes'? Or do you feel it? This is a false division - the intellectual comprehension and having no feeling.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We have been through that, sir. I am talking about, what shall we do, or you do, if you feel utterly responsible. I am personally totally against killing human beings and animals. To me to kill or to hurt somebody is something totally incorrect. And if I have money, a bank account - thank god I haven't got it! - if I have money, a bank account, whatever I do, buy, goes towards maintaining war, by paying taxes. Face all this, sir. So I know through tax, war, the things of war, the materials for war, for killing, is maintained; so what shall I do? Not pay tax and go to prison?

Q: Don't get attached to it.

K: No, sir, this is just ideas, theories, we are talking of reality, what is going on. What shall I do? You are in that position.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am telling you, madam, this is what we are doing, we are going into it. What shall I do, not pay tax and end up in prison? Which is of greater importance - end up in prison, or grasp the whole problem and attack it at a deeper level? You understand my question? I buy stamps, and buying stamps is also a form of

sustaining the military spirit in the world, so shall I not buy stamps, not write letters? And I can go on frittering my energy about details like that, not buying stamps, don't pay tax, no telegrams, you follow, gradually close myself in. Don't use aeroplanes, trains - everything is maintaining war. So what shall I do? Wouldn't it be wiser, saner, to approach this problem, not with 'don't buy stamps', this or that, but approach the problem at a deeper level? No? What is the deeper level? I see as long as I am a Hindu, with all the superstitions, with my beliefs, I maintain division. As long as I am a Christian I maintain that division. No? As long as I am nationalistic I maintain that division. So I feel utterly responsible at the greatest depth not to be any of these things. And from that I act totally differently.

So my responsibility is not to belong to any of this. I have an Indian passport, that's merely for convenience, and when I am in India they say, 'You are really Indian, you have got the real Indian mind, the ancient Indian mind, therefore you belong to us'. I say, 'Nonsense, skip it'.

So do you attack this problem superficially or deeply? If you approach this problem deeply then it is your responsibility not to be any of these things - neither communist, socialist, none of these things. They are just labels. Which means you see the false and therefore you see what is real and act.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, I have just explained that. I have just explained in English your question and I have answered it. You say, I am responsible, if you do, and if you are responsible then at what level and depth are you responsible? If that responsibility is that you

cannot belong to anything which is divisive and therefore lacks co-operation, then you act from that. Then you have your education, how do you educate your children, who will not have this mentality, this tradition of being a communist, Catholic, Protestant, the whole works, how will you educate him, knowing that when he goes with other boys and girls he is going to be conditioned? You follow all this? You may not want him to be conditioned - conditioning being the tradition of being an Englishman, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, communist and so on. But when he goes to school the other boys and the teachers are going to condition him. So what will you do? It's your responsibility.

Q: Not send him to school.

K: Have you time to educate him at home? Oh, sir, don't play around with words. So what will you do? So if you feel responsible you will want to find a school where they are going to see both the teacher and the student are helping themselves to be unconditioned. For that you are responsible. Right?

Q: Is there a school where the teachers are unconditioned and how can they face the world when they leave?

K: How can they face the world when they go out of that school when they are not conditioned? Conditioning means unintelligence. When you are conditioned you are unintelligent. And when you are unconditioned, if that is possible, then you are intelligent, and that intelligent will act when he goes out into the world. These are all simple things.

Q: Can you do this in a school which is conditioned itself?

K: Therefore find out. Find out if the teacher and the school and the student and the parents, altogether want, desire, feel responsible



that these children should be brought up without any conditioning. As the teachers are conditioned, discuss with the children. 'I am conditioned, old boy, you are conditioned, let us investigate it, go into it, make it disappear'. That's part of education, not just memorizing facts.

Q: It is usual to go as a teacher to a school which is itself conditioned.

K: I have explained to you, sir. I have a child.

Q: I talk about myself as a teacher.

K: You are conditioned, yes? Do you acknowledge that you are conditioned?

Q: No, I don't allow that.

K: It is not a question of allowing yourself: you are conditioned. And the child comes to you, the student, who is already conditioned by the parents, by the society, so there you are. The student and the teacher in a school are conditioned. And it is the responsibility of the teacher, and the school, to see that these children are unconditioned. It is their responsibility. I send my child to you because you say you are going to learn and help him to uncondition himself, therefore it is your responsibility. So the teacher talks it over with the student, says, 'Look I am conditioned, and you are conditioned, see all the implications of that conditioning - divisive, destructive, violent, separative' - you know the whole thing. The boy will learn, the girl will learn from you. So there is the responsibility of action. That is, the responsibility of intelligence which acts wisely. A conditioned mind is an ignorant mind, it cannot act wisely.

So let's proceed from there. Therefore my action, not as a

parent, as an ordinary human being, is the outcome of understanding my conditioning, my greed, my whole structure, not intellectually but deeply, and from that intelligence, from that awakened state I act. That action doesn't depend on a pattern. Intelligence is not put into a framework. It is the neurotics that live in frameworks. Right?

Is that clear? I am passionate about it, you understand? Because I think a teacher has the greatest responsibility because he deals with the new generation, and society despises the teacher, pays him very little, he is looked down upon. Haven't you heard when they say, 'Oh, he is a teacher', he is down there somewhere. But a guru is right on top. The real guru is the teacher who is willing to learn and help others to learn. Oh, for heaven's sake!

So we have answered that question. You are responsible as a human being because you are the world, and the world is you, basically, whether you like it or not. And if you realize that, not verbally, I won't use the word 'intellectually' - that is a stupid thing to say, 'Intellectually I understand', verbally you understand. So if you feel that to be utterly true, and you feel responsible to that truth, then you will act, and not talk everlastingly about responsibility to children, and violence and all the rest of it.

Now let's go on to the next thing, which is, meditation and the perception of the whole, which we said transforms the cells themselves, which have been traditional, which have followed tradition. Have you understood the question, sirs? One's human brain - I am not a professional expert but I have watched it - the human brain functions in the field of knowledge because that is the safest field - right? And that knowledge is tradition - I am a

Christian, I am a Buddhist, I am a Communist. To become, or be, or belong to, attached to a group gives the brain security. People who believe the same thing, however idiotic, however stupid, however nonsensical, to belong to that gives to the brain great security - right? That's the essence of neuroticism.

So the brain is accustomed to function in a groove, tradition, conceptual, superstitious, or believing in something, there the brain is safe. This is so, one can see it in everybody. And is it possible to transform the brain which functions traditionally into non-traditional functioning, non-repetitive functioning? Repetitive functioning is mechanical - right? Belonging to the same thing, repeating the same thing, going to the mass every morning, or every Sunday, repeat rituals, it is mechanical, you may get a little stimulation out of it but it is mechanical. We are asking whether this mechanical brain which has its own volition, it has its own independence, it has its own inventiveness, not creativeness, we are asking whether such a brain is capable of transforming itself? You have understood the question?

Q: You talk about security but the problem is not that for me. It is the lack of energy always.

K: The gentleman says, it is the lack of energy. Why do you lack energy? Don't say, no, why - wrong food, over sexed, habits, worries, thinking about something that is dead, you follow? Sir, I am not analysing it. You have got plenty of energy when you want something.

Please this is a very serious question, you can't just throw words into it and expect something true to come out, it isn't a jigsaw puzzle, you have got to pay attention, you have got to find out, you

have got to learn about it, not that I am teaching you, you have got find out, through investigation we are learning. If you have observed your own activities, your attitudes, your desires, your anxieties and so on are constantly being repeated. Right? There is never an ending to them, there is always something new to be worried about, something new to get excited about, something new that will give you a new appetite, and so on. The whole process of thinking is mechanical. And that mechanical can be invented, obviously. Shall we go on from there? Do we understand, realize, see it, that your own life is utterly mechanical? You get into the habit of smoking and for the rest of your life you smoke, you drink or whatever you do, you keep on repeating, repeating, repeating, though the doctors tell you, you know it is bad for you yet you keep on because it has become the habit - which is mechanical.

Now we are asking: a mind that is mechanical, your mind which is mechanical, can the brain, which is computerized, which is mechanical, following tradition, can that brain change itself, and how is this to be done? - not 'how' - how does this change come about? You have understood, can we go on?

Are you aware that your habits, your attitudes are mechanical? Just be aware, can't you, of course, you know it. I won't complicate it. Then how is that mechanical habit to end, not gradually, take ten years, end it? You understand? If you smoke, as many of you do, which has become a habit, the nicotine dulls the system, the nervous system, and so on, you know all about it, can you end that habit instantly? Can you? Have you done it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Listen, listen. We will go into it, please. I am taking the most

obvious thing first. The body demands the nicotine poisoning, that poisoning that has been going for years and years; and you realize it is mechanical, and can you end it instantly now, never smoke again? That is intelligence. But to carry on day after day, saying, 'It is bad for me', this and that, and carry on, it is the most stupid, unintelligent way of living. Sorry if I drive something home!

So now move to a different level. Psychologically the brain has created a centre, thought has created a centre - please follow, I have explained all this a dozen times before - thought has created the centre, the centre is its hopes, the unifying factor that brings together the family, the nation, the group and so on. Now that centre functions and reacts mechanically - my country, my god, my saviour, my belief, my ambition - you follow? 'I'd like to have more, but I haven't got it. I'd like to be clever but I am not clever, by Jove, how clever you are', and so on. That is the response of a mind that functions in tradition - tradition being the repetition of what has been and continuing in that field. Of course, this is simple. Now can psychologically that mechanical, traditional attitude and activity stop? And what will make it stop? Now this is the beginning of meditation, not sitting cross-legged and breathing and doing all that kind of stuff, or looking at a candle or a picture, or repeating some mantra - you have done it haven't you, some of you? Oh, you are so gullible you people. You can repeat 'Coco cola' for the rest of your life. But if you understand the whole significance of sound then you will put aside all these outward tricks. Sound has tremendous significance. I don't want to go into it now, that is not the point.

You know the mantras that people are giving to you for thirty

five dollars, or twenty dollars, or a hundred dollars, the origin of that is - there was a teacher, a guru, and he had with him several disciples for a number of years. And the teacher studied each disciple very, very carefully for a number of years, watched his characteristics, his tendencies, his appetites, his way of looking at things, his fears, his pleasures. At the end of this deep long study the teacher said to the pupil, 'I'll give you the word, don't repeat it anybody else, its yours' Right? That is the origin of it. Now you pay a hundred and fifty dollars and some idiocy comes along.

So we are asking whether the brain, which is the repository of tradition, of knowledge, experience and therefore the past, therefore it is the past, and that functions and operates and moves always in the lines, in the reactions set out, because that is the safest way of living - it thinks. So we are asking whether that brain can transform itself? You have understood my question, is it clear? The question, not what comes out of it. And this is beginning of meditation. And meditation implies, if you are at all serious, the total transformation of conduct, the total transformation of the energy which has been dissipated. It is the salvation of total comprehension. That is what we are going into to.

Q: If there is no centre what is the focus of this energy?

K: When you have a centre, that energy is limited isn't it? No? I am focussing my energy on myself - which you are doing most of the time - my quarrels, my appetites, my hopes, my ambitions, my fears, my activities - my energy is self-centred. Right? And that self-centred energy is very limited. Right? Now we are saying, when there is no centre as the 'me', what happens to that energy? What need is there for focussing it? It is there. You want to play

with words.

So meditation is a movement, an understanding, of the whole of the structure and the nature of thought. Right? Unless there is understanding totally - I am using the word 'understanding', an awareness, an apprehension to hold what is the truth of this reality - unless there is complete uncovering of the total works of thought, what it manufactures, what is false, what is true, in thought, the whole of it, unless that is very clear, meditation then will become a projection of thought which then becomes visions, images, one sees Christ, or Krishna, you know all the circus of visionary people.

So one has to understand very, very deeply the nature and the structure of thought. If you have not understood it you can't meditate. You can fiddle around with it.

Q: What do you mean by the structure of thought?

K: The tent is the structure of thought - right? - depending on the stress, strain, the proportions, and the necessity, the structure. The tent is independent of thought. I mean by structure also the movement of thought which imagines, which builds, which foresees, which lays down a structural path to follow. Unless one understands this, the reality of thought, and its activity in the world of reality, business, and all the rest of it, meditation then becomes merely an escape, or it breeds illusion, false ideas - not false ideas, all ideas are false, sorry. And it invites experiences in which you will be held. You will say, 'I have had a marvellous experience', and that holds you for the rest of your life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am going into it. So in meditation there is no experience.

Right? I wonder if you see that. This is very important to understand. Experience implies, the word experience means to go through, not to hold to something back, to go through and finish. The meaning of that word. And also in experience several things are implied. When you have an experience inevitably you must have the recognizing movement with experience. Right? When you experience something you must know what it is, no? To know what it is you have already had it, no? You understand what I am saying, it is so simple. I met you yesterday, and I recognize you today. That is, there is the memory of meeting you yesterday, and that memory responds and recognizes. In the same way when I have an experience, if I don't recognize it, there is no experience. Right? When I recognize it, then it is already known.

Q: If you suddenly see something new.

K: You see you are not following this. You are following your own thoughts. You are not learning. I am not teaching you, you are not learning by investigating. You go so far and bring in something new. The lady asks, if you see suddenly something new. When you say, it is new - finished. When you say, it is the new, it is already the old. So you have to understand the whole nature of thought, its nature and structure, and all the things that are involved in experience - which all of you want, new experiences, sexual, otherwise, new experiences. And in that is implied memory, the past, recognition, and attachment to that memory, to that experience. And then you are lost.

So the first movement in meditation is the total awareness of the movement of thought as time and measure. If you have not grasped that deeply you won't know what meditation is. You may do what



you will. Then we can proceed to find out, is it possible for the brain, which is fashioned, shaped, moulded, by knowledge, experience and memory, whether that moulding, that shaping of the brain, that conditioning, can be broken, not slowly but instantly? You understand the question?

Q: I see I am conditioned but thought is independent of that conditioning.

K: The question is, I see I am conditioned and yet thought is independent of that conditioning. We have been through that. We said thought has created the conditioning, and the conditioning says, 'I am independent of thought'. Thought has created the tent, and the tent is independent of thought. The mountain is independent of thought, but thought has not created it. Thought has put together our conditioning, the centre. The centre is the essence of that conditioning, and that centre feels it is independent. Therefore feeling independent, it says, 'I will control, shape, adjust thought.' And the conditioning goes on. But thought is the conditioning, not the division between conditioning and thought, the observer is the observed, and all that.

So let's go on. Is this possible, first of all, is it possible for a mind that has lived for centuries upon centuries, a brain that has evolved upon centuries of time, for that brain to radically transform itself instantly? You understand the question?

So we have to go into the question: is there an observation which is totally different from the usual observation? Sensory perception, sensory seeing of objective things through belief, through a conclusion, through an image, that is illusion. I wonder if you see this. I see through my conclusion that communism, or

socialism, or capitalism, or Hinduism, or Buddhism, is limited - or I become Catholic now, instead of all that. So my brain is attached to something, and can that brain see without illusion? Do you understand what I am saying? Look: I am attached to a particular belief - if I am - and that belief, in observing objective things, distorts observation. Right? That's fairly simple, isn't it? I believe in god - if I do - and because of that belief I look at life from a peculiar, distorted point of view, which is the tradition - the politicians talk about god, and the Generals talk about god, poor Hitler talked about god, everybody. So illusion comes about through sensual observation involving belief, which means attachment. Now the brain is accustomed to that, functions that way, lives that way. Right? Watch in yourself. Now to see totally the implication of this belief, and the illusion, to see totally, is to break the pattern of the brain. You understand? All right, sirs. I'll show you something.

That is, the brain can only function in security because then it is efficient, whether it is neurotic or rational, it is the same. A neurotic belief - all beliefs are neurotic - a neurotic belief gives to the brain complete security as a rational belief. Now is it possible to see the whole nature of belief, fear, attachment, and hold it. Can you see the whole of that? Not just parts of it, but the totality of it. If you see the totality of it then it is a shock to the brain, and that shock changes the structure of the cells - got it? No, do it!

Suppose one lives in the neurotic belief of nationalism - that I am a Hindu. And it has lived in that because it is secure. And it functions, operates, moves in that field all the time. You come along and say, 'Look, that way of looking at life distorts action, that

action which should be comprehensive, whole, becomes limited, therefore breeds conflict'. You point out all that to me. I listen to you, I listen, that means I pay attention, that means care, respect to what you say. And because I listen it is a great shock to the brain, and that very shock, that challenge, brings about a totally different movement in the brain. Do it, you will see. That's only part of meditation. There is much more involved in meditation. Perhaps we will go into it tomorrow.

Q: Does it mean the child must wait until it grows up to see this?

K: It is the responsibility of the parent, the teacher, to see that this takes place in the child. That is education, not the cultivation of memory, the everlastingly mechanical memory. That is also part of education but fundamentally this is the basic thing.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD AUGUST 1975.

K: As this is the last dialogue, conversation between us, what shall we talk about this morning?

Q: Would you talk about jealousy and suffering?

Q: Would you talk about attention and awareness?

Q: Should we continue with meditation?

K: Should we continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning - meditation, and the non-repetitive process of the brain?

Q: Could you talk about love and compassion?

Q: You talked yesterday about sound, would you go into that?

K: Now, just a minute. Love and compassion; awareness and attention; the importance of space and sound; and meditation, what we were talking about yesterday morning.

May I suggest something, that those who come here for the first time, though their problems may be urgent, would they kindly refrain from talking or interfering because we have already discussed most the things like, jealousy, anger, greed, violence, all that. To go back over again would not be worthwhile. So would those who for the first time, out of curiosity, or out of serious intent, have come here, would they kindly, as suggested, refrain?

So perhaps if we began talking over together what we were talking about yesterday, which is: what is the meaning of meditation, is it worthwhile doing it, and what is the mind that is meditative, whether it has any experience at all, whether it is capable of acting in this world, in the world of reality. That's what

we were talking about yesterday. May we go on with that? Would that be all right. And also bring in the question of awareness, attention, love and compassion.

Let us talk over together the question of space. I think that is rather an important issue that we should consider. Outwardly the world is getting over populated, one lives more and more in towns, in cities, where there is hardly any space, living in a little apartments, flats. And so space is becoming rather scarce, outwardly, which has its own results because when there is no space outwardly various problems arise like violence, a sense of inescapable pressure of so many thousands around you - what a lovely world it must have been a thousand years ago! And when one lives very close to another there is no space, there is no sense of freedom in that life. I don't know if you have lived in New York for a little while, or in London, or any of these places, one feels cramped, held in.

So outwardly there is becoming less and less space. And inwardly we have hardly any space at all. I don't know if you have observed this phenomenon. We have our problems - jealousy, envy, not having sufficient money, despair, loneliness, all the psychotic, neurotic problems, and ambition, ruthless violence. All that gives very little space within oneself. Now we were talking about awareness, is one aware of that fact, that in oneself one has very little space, ordinary space, emptiness? Is one aware of it - that one has so many problems, at all levels, conscious as well as unconscious? One's consciousness is so crowded in, and there is hardly any space - is one aware of it?

And, as we said the other day, thought has created the centre,

and the centre thinks it is independent - I hope you are following all this, if you have heard it I am just going over it again - thought has created the centre, that centre thinks it is independent and free of thought, so that centre creates for itself a space - me and my little enclosure, me and the family, which is a little larger enclosure, and so on and on, the nation. And within that little limited space we live.

So it is important to find out for oneself, or learn together, what is the meaning of space? Because a mind that is crowded, a mind that is stifled, held in, enclosed, such a mind must inevitably become violent - right? And with all the other problems involved in ruthlessness, in violence, in this drive for fulfilment and so on, in that little space we live. Now is there any other kind of space? You understand my question? And to go into that question we must also understand the importance of sound. When you listen to some classical music, not all pop, which is mere noise at the end of it, some of it is good, naturally, but the rest is such a noisy affair, when you listen to some great classical music, if you listen to the sound, and you can only listen to the sound if you have equal space to receive that sound. Have you understood? Are we meeting each other or it's impossible?

Q: Not completely.

K: Look sir, when you listen to music, there is the beauty of it, the romanticism of it, the remembrance of it, hearing it in different places, and the association that evokes that music, with whom you heard it, how you talked about it, what the critics said about it and so on. So when your mind is occupied then the space is very small. But if you listen to it without any association, any image, then that

music itself creates a great space. Haven't you noticed this? And so we try to create artificially that space, through sound, making a noise. That is, the Hindus have gone into this question of sound and listening to that sound, and producing that space in which that sound can continue. I wonder if you know what I am talking about. Do you know what I am talking about? I have my doubts.

You see freedom is space, outwardly and inwardly, specially inwardly. And as the outward space is becoming more and more difficult, more and more crowded, the search for inner space becomes important, and so one takes drugs, drink, smoke, pot or grass and all that. And there are those people who come from India talking about transcendental meditation through sound, repeating certain words. Those are all the activities of thought trying to produce a space in which whatever is heard is total movement. That is an artificial process brought about by the desire to have space. I wonder if you see. And the word becomes then very important. So they introduce Sanskrit words, or you can introduce your own word - Coca-cola is as good as any other word, I really mean it - or introduce any word, it doesn't matter what, and you will see if you watch yourself, if you are aware of yourself, that sound creates a little space. And you think that space is freedom to go beyond.

So this space round the centre is the process of thought, and therefore it is still physical and chemical, because we said thought is a movement in time, chemical as well as physical. Right? And living in a small space denies freedom, and so there is always an unconscious demand for freedom, and so one escapes through some noise - call it transcendental meditation, or what you like, but

it is still the movement of thought. Right?

So consciousness is its content. Your consciousness is made up of what you think, what you feel, what you desire, what your tradition, your culture, your demands are, it is a whole content, and that content makes your consciousness. And that content limits the consciousness. You understand? I wonder if you do. And so therefore in that there is no space. Are we going together?

So is one aware - one of the questions was to discuss, talk over together the question of awareness and attention - is one aware of this crowded content of consciousness? And in that consciousness there is a little space, there is a little, and we wander in that little space. Can we go on now? So is one aware of it? By being aware I mean, observe without choice, without discrimination - this is good, this is bad, this should not be - but just be totally aware of that consciousness with its content, which is also the unconscious. Here the problem arises: how can one be aware of the unconscious, the deeper - that's what everybody talks about. What we are saying is, if you are aware totally, then in that totality the unconscious is also. I wonder if you follow that.

I will go into it a little bit. I do not know why the unconscious has become so tremendously important. The psychologists, the analysts, the professionals, everlastingly talking about it. They have written volumes and volumes and volumes about dreams, about everything, which is the unconscious. And to uncover the layers, the content, the intimations, and the hints of the unconscious, one thinks one has to go through analysis, analysing. And analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. So there is duality. And you go endlessly investigating into duality and never



reaching anything. Now if you are listening to what is being said, also the analyst actually listening, then knowing your superficial consciousness, the content, then in that total awareness you see the whole of consciousness. I'll explain this because you are puzzled - by your faces you are puzzled. We'll go into it.

How do you see the totality of anything? You understand? How do you see the totality of a tree? If you were a professional, a lumberman, you don't see the totality of the tree, you are thinking what you can do with it, how many houses you can build, what kind of paper you can produce and so on. So you never see the totality of anything if there is a previous conclusion about it. Right? That's fairly simple, isn't it. So I do not know what the totality of my consciousness is. Right? That is a fact, not a supposition. Though they talk a great deal about the unconscious and the conscious, the dreams and you know all that is going on, actually when you look at yourself do you see the whole content, or parts of it? Go on, sir. You only see parts of it, don't you. So the observation of the part denies the whole. I wonder if you see this. If I am concentrated on my problems, my ambitions, my country, my this, I can't see the whole. Right? I can only see the whole when I am not concerned with the part, though the part is included but I am not concerned with it. Then in that perception, though there are the parts, I see the totality of it, which means my mind is free to observe. And it is not free to observe when I have already come to some conclusion about it.

You know we were talking once to a very famous scholar and a writer, a very well known writer, superb style, a great friend. He said, you know I find it terribly difficult because I have read so

much. He was a scientist, an artist, he could play the piano, and he could draw, he could talk about Vedanta, Tibetan Buddhism, any subject on earth. And he said, 'I have read so much, my mind is so full of words, knowledge, and how can I experience something original?' You follow. So to see something originally, that is, the totality of consciousness, don't bring your knowledge, your associations, your - look at the whole thing. So knowledge becomes a danger which will prevent you from seeing the whole. Knowledge is useful. Knowledge means, if I speak English, therefore there is the knowledge of English, and so on, mechanical processes.

So freedom implies space. And that space is denied and therefore freedom is denied by the politicians, by the dictators, by the totalitarian socialism, by the priests, by our own beliefs, by our own pursuit of pleasure, greed and so on. So freedom implies emptying the consciousness of its content. Please, this is real meditation. Don't fool yourself, you know nothing about it. One's consciousness is its content. Right? That's clear. Indian, English, you know, the cultural, ethical, economic, personal, everything is in that space of consciousness with its content. Right? That consciousness can expand or contract but it is still held by its content - held by its content. One is aware of all this, not verbally, but actually. Right? That is, one is a Christian, one is a Buddhist, one is a communist, one has so many opinions, judgements, evaluations, problems, sex, demands, full of that. And in that content there is no space and no freedom. Right. Does one see that? Go on, sirs, please. Are you aware that in that limited consciousness there is no freedom and therefore no space? And

without space the inevitable process is that thought fills that space. I wonder if you see this. Have you ever noticed when you are by yourself, or walking along the woods quietly, that your mind when it is not thinking at all, when no thought is there, there is an extraordinary sense of deep wide quiet space? And thought is frightened of that space because it is uncertain, so it begins to fill that space. Have you noticed all this?

So our question is: is it at all possible to empty the psychological content of consciousness? You understand my question - the question, not the answer? So we are going to find out, we are going to learn about it together if you are interested in this, we'll go together. As we said yesterday, our brains can only function in areas of certainty, in areas of security. Obviously. It is frightened of the unknown - death, what will happen tomorrow, the unknown. So it functions and operates and lives within the area of the known, which is tradition, old or new. And in the field of the known there is hardly any space. I wonder if you see that. Right? May I go on? Please this is a dialogue between you and me, you must also talk. I am not just talking to myself.

So how can the mind create, bring about space not artificially, because the artificiality then is the movement of thought. We are back into the good old business, therefore it is valueless. So is there a possibility of consciousness, its content, emptying itself? All right. Suppose my consciousness is filled with my pride, with my arrogance, what it has done, what it has achieved, what it has - you know, what it has accumulated, the tradition, the nationality, the culture, all that occupies my consciousness. And therefore in that consciousness there is very little space and therefore there is no

freedom there. And I ask myself, can this content naturally fade out? Right? Naturally, not propelled out, kicked out, willed out, or substituted, can it naturally empty itself of its content? You have understood the question?

Now we are going to find out. First of all, am I aware of it - aware of my content? I am a nationalist, I am a Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, or a communist, socialist, and I have got various problems of sex, pleasure, ambition, greed, I must be beautiful, I must know more, I am not as good as that, ideals - you follow, all that. Can all that be washed out, emptied? Have you ever asked this question? No. We are asking it now. How shall I set about it? Right? I know the content of my consciousness, and the content of my consciousness is the content of your consciousness. You understand? My content is your content because you are ambitious, greedy, violent, stupid, clever, all that. So our consciousness deeply is like yours. And I am asking, can this content end instantly, not gradually because through a gradual process I am accumulating. You understand what is meant by this. If I am gradually emptying the well, the water is filling up all the time. You understand? If I am gradually, layer after layer, problem after problem, ideal after ideal, remove, it takes time, in that time some of those factors arise which bring further complications - like they are doing in politics. So my question is: can that end instantly, otherwise it has no meaning. I wonder if you see that. Right?

Now how does it end? What is the process of it? I said, am I aware of this whole movement of the consciousness, am I aware of it? Then if I am aware what is the meaning of attention? Right? Now when there is no observer then there is total attention. So who

is the observer? You follow. The observer is the past, is the accumulated knowledge, association, remembrances, all that is the past, which is time. So as long as there is an observer who is observing and trying to be attentive, there is no attention. Right, have we understood? If I am trying to practise attention, as many do, then it is still the process of thought, which is, the centre says to itself, 'Attention may be most useful and so I'll practise it', and that is still within the area of reality which is thought. I wonder if you see. So we are saying that attention comes about when there is no observer. Right? Think it out, learn about the observer. That is, me observing you, me with my prejudices, observing you, so I never see you. I see you through the screen of my conclusions. So can I look at you without any conclusion, that is, without the observer? Which means only observation and therefore total attention.

Now let's go the next step - this is not a step, this is total comprehension. If you understand it totally then you can break it up into parts; but you cannot come to the totality through the parts. How do I see anything totally? I want to see myself totally, that is, not fragmented as the physical, psychological, intellectual, emotional but the totality of myself. How do I find out? Come on sirs, it is your problem. Are you all paralysed by any chance?

Q: What has sensitivity to do with the perception of the whole?

K: Obviously unless you are sensitive you can't see. You must have a fairly sensitive body, sensitive perception, eyes, sensitive feeling, you know, the whole thing must be sensitive. That is necessary, but we'll leave that aside.

Do you ever see the whole? Do you see yourself as a whole, not

as a fragmented human being?

Q: I can't see the whole.

K: We are going to find out, sir. Obviously the 'I', the centre, can't see the whole. Now just listen please. When I ask you, if I may, do you see yourself as the whole? Now you heard that statement, what do you do with that statement? Do you make an abstraction of it into an idea? Listen carefully please. I made that statement: do you see yourself as a whole? You have heard that statement and how do you respond to that statement? Either you say, 'I have never asked that question myself', or 'I can't see myself as a whole because I have always lived in fragments', or hearing that statement, you make of that statement an idea? Right? And then try to conform to that idea, or bring that idea and say, 'How am I to work it out' - you understand? Either when you listen to that statement, you say, 'I have really never put that question to myself', or you say to yourself, 'How can I look at myself as a whole when I have lived, functioned in fragments?' Or, you hear it, and the very act of listening makes it into a conclusion - it is possible, not possible - into an idea. Now which is it that you are doing? You understand my question? Don't answer me, please. I am not your analyst. I am asking you, if I may, which is it that you are doing: say, 'I have never looked at myself as a whole, I don't know what it means because I have always lived in broken up parts, 'me' and my pleasure, 'me' and something, broken up.' Or I, by listening to that statement, draw a conclusion and try to live according to that conclusion. Right? So am I aware of this process - fragmentary perception, never putting oneself that question, having put that question draw a conclusion - am I aware of this

total process?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: First of all I don't know, I have never even gone into this. You can't answer now immediately because you are being challenged, and you are still looking at it, whether you are drawing a conclusion, never put that question to yourself and always living in fragments. Are you aware of this movement? If you are aware, then what does it mean to see the whole of yourself? You understand? Are you separate from your thought? Is your desire separate from you? Is your anger separate from you - your ambition, your greed, your violence, arrogance and so on, is it separate from you? Or you are that? Right? Surely you are that. Now if you see that you are that, then there is no observer. Before, traditionally, I said, 'I am different from my anger' - right? 'I can control my thought' - thought which has created the centre, the centre becoming independent of thought, then the centre says, 'I will control thought'. See the trick it is playing. So when you are aware of this process of living a fragmentarily life - your life at home different from your life at office, there at home you may love, or curse, or whatever goes on in the home, and in the office, you know, you have to be very careful otherwise you can't get on, and so on and on. So we live in fragments - god, all that. So are you aware of this fragmentary way of living, and are you aware that whenever you hear something new, a new statement, you draw a conclusion from it, make an idea of it, and try to comprehend the idea, not the statement. Right? Do you give attention to this? When you give attention - which means no observer - you see the whole movement, don't you? You see the whole movement - how you live

fragmentarily, never looking at a new challenge, and challenges are always new otherwise they are not challenges, and drawing a conclusion. This is the total movement of thought. Right? And do you see the whole of it now because it is so clear?

Now in the same way, can you see the totality of your consciousness, not the parts? And you cannot see the totality if there is any kind of choice in your observation - I like this, I'll keep it, the other I don't like, I'll put it away. If there is any kind of attachment to any content in that consciousness. So you see then the totality of your consciousness and therefore in that totality the part, the unconscious, is there clear. You don't have to plunge and go into all kinds of miserable business of examining the unconscious, it is there. Right.

So we are asking, as long as there is no space there must be violence, which is what is going on outside, outside in the world. When dictatorships rule the world, as they are doing more and more, they are going to deny space, because space is freedom, and that is deadly to them. I don't know if you follow all this. So there must be space inwardly, and that space can only come about naturally, not invented by thought, or persuaded by thought, that comes about naturally, when there is a complete observation, seeing the whole of the content.

And we can move from there and ask: what is love and compassion? Is the love that we have spacious? That's good! Or is it terribly limited? Is compassion without border and therefore infinite space? So we have to examine that. The love that we have in the world of reality, that love is pleasure. Right? Would you acknowledge that, or are you too holy for that?



Q: Love is called sentimentality.

K: Romantic, pleasurable and the pursuit of that pleasure is called love. Right? I love you because you give me sexual satisfaction, or you give me comfort, you support me, you fulfil my loneliness, I depend on you psychologically, emotionally and physically. So I am attached to you, and when there is any trouble between you and me there is antagonism, there is jealousy, being wounded, there is hate. All that we call love. And we say, 'I am very sensitive'. So in that love, as we call it, which is both divine and not divine, the divine love is the invention of thought - I don't know if you see that. And we are saying, in that love there is no space. Right? Because there is no space there is violence in it.

So what is compassion? And is love pleasure? Is love the fulfilment of desire? You are following all this? I love you, and in that there is pleasure, and if in that love there is any disturbance there is jealousy, antagonism and all the rest of it. And in that love there is no space because I am holding, I am clinging. Right, I don't have to go into all that silly stuff.

So this so-called love has no space and therefore that love is really irresponsible. And responsibility comes into being only when there is compassion. Compassion not for you - compassion. Like the sun, it is not shining for you. So where there is vast space there is compassion. And that vast space cannot come into being if there is a centre as the 'me'. Right?

So without compassion there is no meditation. You understand, sirs? Because without compassion, which means passion for everything, care for everything, respect for everything, without compassion what is sacred can never be found. You understand?

You know we have created - thought has created something sacred - the temples, the churches, the symbols - and we worship those symbols, and call those sacred. But it is the movement of thought in time and measure. So that is not sacred. Once in India, the speaker was asked by the followers of Mr Gandhi, who said, 'All peoples can enter, every type of strata of human society can enter into that temple, for god is there for everyone'. And they asked me, 'What do you say to that question?' I said, 'Anybody can enter, it doesn't matter who goes in because god isn't there'. You understand? God is an idea put together by thought. But one has to find that which is eternally, incorruptibly sacred. And that can only come when there is compassion, which means when you have understood the whole significance of suffering - suffering not only of yourself, but the suffering of the world. The suffering of the world is truth, it is there. It is not a sentimental, romantic fluttering of thought. It is actually there, as in us. And to live with that suffering, go to the very end without escaping from it, when you don't escape you have tremendous energy to meet that suffering, and then only you go beyond it. Out of that comes compassion.

So meditation then is none of the things that have been traditionally brought from India to this country, or abroad, those are all the activities of thought. Meditation then is the total comprehension of the movement of thought, giving it the right place, the correct place. Thought has its correct place, and that correct place can only be understood or seen or have insight into it, when you understand totally the movement of thought - all its activities, all its cunning, its deceptions, its illusions. Then when you understand pleasure and the whole significance of fear, out of

that there is this whole thing called suffering, which man has never been able to solve. Christianity has made a parody of it, we have never been able to solve it, and therefore we have never been compassionate. And compassion comes only when you have understood the whole meaning of suffering, and no longer suffer, and therefore out of that comes compassion. It is only the compassionate mind that can meditate and find that which is eternally sacred.

Q: The 'I' can't understand, can't be aware of suffering, because the 'I' is important. But if there is no observer there is no I. I can't be aware.

K: Sir, I said sir, the 'I', the centre, is created and put together by thought. Right sir? Do you see that? That's a reality, isn't it? Go step by step, sir, I'll show it to you. Thought in its demand for security has created the centre - right? Agree, sir? That centre is independent of thought. Right? Now is the centre aware of this process? Is the centre aware that thought has created it, and the centre becomes independent of it, and tries to control, shape thought? Is the centre aware of this movement, and does not think it is independent?

Q: But it is thought itself.

K: Wait, sir. I am going into it. You go to the ultimate. Do we see this, sir, that thought has brought the centre about, and this whole process, are you aware of it, is the centre aware of it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. I am just asking a very simple question. Is one aware, is the centre aware of this movement of thought? If one is aware then the question is, who is aware? Is the observer looking at

the centre, says, 'I am aware', or is the centre itself aware of the movement of thought, which has created it? If it is aware, then who is the entity that says, 'I am aware that thought is doing this'? It is still the centre. Right? So are you aware of that?

So what next then? The centre is always responding, observing, correcting, discriminating, chastising - right? All that is the movement of thought. Is one aware of all this? Is the centre aware of this?

Q: May be.

K: Not, 'may be'.

Q: I don't know.

K: Leave it alone then. If you don't know, watch it, learn about it, see if the centre can be aware of itself of the movement of thought.

Q: There is still an observer.

K: No, sir. Look, sir, you are aware of this tent, aren't you? Yes? You are not the tent, are you?

Q: I don't know.

K: No. If you are the tent, then Mr Graf will be very pleased because then he won't have to collect money!

# 1ST PUBLIC TALK MASONIC AUDITORIUM SAN FRANCISCO 20TH MARCH 1975

If one may point out this is not an entertainment, nor a complicated explanation of some philosophy, nor is it a gathering of people who have to be told what to do. More and more with all the things that are going on in the world, the catastrophes, the misery, the violence, one seeks to run away from it through some form of entertainment, amusement, or merely to accumulate knowledge. And it would be a great mistake if this gathering, this meeting becomes a kind of amusing, intellectual explanation, entertainment and in which you, as an audience, you a person, do not take a part. As we said also this is not a philosophy brought over from India, a system of thought which you can copy, imitate, conform to. But it is a serious affair, a sustained investigation, enquiry into several things with which we are confronted. Among them is this question of communication. Communication implies that both the person who receives, and the person who gives, should at the same time think together, share together, take a journey together. All that is implied in that word communication: to think together, to share together, to bear the responsibility of what is communicated. But it does not imply agreement or disagreement. But it does require that both the speaker and you who are listening should together think out seriously, go into the problems that we are confronted with. And that means a quality of listening in which there is not merely the acceptance of the meaning of the word but go behind the word. Because language is necessary to communicate, words must be employed to convey what one wants to say, but behind the word

there is a great deal, the overtones, the significance, the deeper meaning of a particular word. And that means a quality of attention in which both of us are deeply concerned over the enormous problem of living, with all its complexity. A quality of attention which is sustained, continuous, for we are going to investigate together the problem of freedom, the problem of discipline, the problem of self-knowledge.

Freedom implies, does it not, that you must not follow anyone? You must be free to enquire, not accept, not look to a guide, to a system, to a saviour, to a guru, to a swami, to various forms of inundation that is coming from India to this country. Freedom implies that one must have the capacity to enquire, not what others say but to enquire within oneself, to enquire, to investigate, to examine the whole structure of a human mind, that is our mind, your mind. And so freedom means really, does it not, that any form of conformity, imitation according to a pattern, a mould, does not allow free enquiry. And what we are going to talk about this evening demands that you be free to listen, not only to the word but the meaning of the word, and not be a slave to the word, and not accept whatever the speaker says, or deny what he says, but to listen to find out. To find out for yourself not according to some interpretation, not according to some other speaker, but to find out for yourself the truth or the falseness of what is being said.

So freedom is not to do what you want to do. That is not freedom at all. And I think probably that freedom has brought about great misery in the world, each one doing exactly what he wants to do. And that is rampant in this country, where there is no tradition, where there is no discipline - I am using the word

discipline totally in a different sense, which we will go into presently - where Christianity has become what it has, a meaningless structure, an entertainment, a carnival. And this country is inundated, flooded by gurus, yogis, swamis from India and they are collecting not only coins but disciples, which totally denies freedom. Freedom is not - does not imply choice. One thinks one is free if you can choose. I do not know if you have ever gone into this question of choice. You have a vast array in front of you, the various teachers, yogis, philosophers, scientists, psychologists, analysts, bombarding your mind, constantly, day in and day out. And among this array you are going to choose who you think you should follow, who you think you should listen to. So you choose according to your temperament, according to your desire, according to your pleasure. Please do listen to this, if you will, carefully because you are confronted with this problem, when so many of them are telling you, 'Follow this and don't follow that' and 'Do this' and 'Do that'. And you are forced or faced with the question of who to listen to and who to follow, whether that yogi, that philosophy, that guru - I wish the word 'guru' never existed in this country, because it has quite a different meaning, that word in Sanskrit means weight. It also means one who dispels ignorance, and it does not mean the one who imposes on another his ignorance. (Laughter). You laugh but you still want to follow somebody, you still want to be told. So you are not free and it is absolutely necessary to be free to find out what is true and what is false for yourself, which no one can tell you, no system, no philosophy, no guru. And when you face this array of teachers, philosophers, and systems you are forced because you yourself are

confused, life has become terrible, painful, uncertain, there is so much poverty, the threat of destruction, violence, and you want to escape from all that. You are forced to choose one of these. And your choice is based upon your confusion, naturally, whether to follow, to listen to that yogi, to that guru, to that philosopher, so you begin to depend on yourself thinking you are free to choose. The background of choice is invariably confusion. Aren't you confused when you choose? Aren't you uncertain when you pick one amongst all these? So your choice is essentially the outcome of confusion.

Please do listen to this because life is becoming very, very difficult, not only in this country but in Europe and India, and elsewhere. Life has become so uncertain, so painful. There is so much brutality, cruelty. And one must think out all these problems very clearly so that one is completely free from choice, so that you see for yourself directly what is true. And you cannot do that if you are conditioned, as we are, conditioned by the culture in which we live, conditioned by the climate, the economic structure, by the philosophers, by the saviours, by the church, by the organized religions throughout the world, we are conditioned. Knowledge conditions us, and knowledge is always superficial. Knowledge is the outgoing of thought, accumulated through memory, experience and knowledge is invariably outwards, there is no other knowledge, which we will go into presently.

So freedom is absolutely necessary to investigate, to look at the world, to look at ourselves as we are, not according to some philosopher, some psychologist, but to investigate freely into ourselves what we are. And that investigation demands its own



discipline. You cannot investigate if your mind is not in order. And you cannot investigate if you are prejudiced, if you are frightened, if you are merely seeking and pursuing pleasure. So discipline implies, in the very root of that meaning, the root meaning of that word is to learn, not to conform, not to suppress, not to imitate, but to learn. And one cannot learn if one is not free, if one is conditioned by one's own prejudices you are not free to learn. If you are conditioned by your own fear there is no freedom to learn, or if you are merely seeking everlasting pleasure then that conditions the mind and therefore it is not free to learn. And here, at least for this evening, we are trying to find out what it means to be conditioned, whether it is a gradual process to uncondition the mind, or can it be done instantly, and to find out for ourselves how to observe, not only the world about us, but also the world that is inside, below the skin. And to do that there must be freedom.

If this is what you want, if this is your urgent enquiry, that very urgency makes one very, very serious. Not go off at a tangent but stick to the point and pursue it to the very end, which is I hope what we will do this evening.

Freedom also implies, does it not, that there is no authority in this enquiry. Because you are the teacher and the disciple in yourself, you are enquiring and learning and therefore freedom implies this sense of absolute cessation of every kind of authority. Not the authority of law, not the authority of a technician, but the so-called spiritual authority, the hierarchical attitude which all religions have diligently cultivated, and as the gurus do. So freedom implies a mind that is serious, enquiring, examining, and such examination is not possible when there is prejudice, when

there is fear, when there is merely the desire to find deeper and wider pleasure.

And all this implies, does it not, that one must know, understand oneself. You know a great deal has been talked about, and written about, knowing yourself. The Ancients from every country have talked about know yourself. And apparently no one has done it. They have escaped from themselves into all fanciful, imaginative, speculative philosophies, and the word `philosophy' means actually the love of truth, the love of truth in daily life, not the love of speculative thought. And to know oneself is the beginning of wisdom, which you cannot buy in a book, or by following somebody, or by following a system, whether others have invented it or you have invented it for yourself. So self-knowledge, knowing oneself implies a great deal. And that is what we are going to do together, investigate not through analysis because analysis is paralysis. Analysis implies a great deal. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. Analysis implies time. Analysis implies a movement of thought as knowledge, enquiring into another thought, which is also knowledge. And analysis gradually postpones, paralyses all action. But without analysing we are going to look at ourselves, we are going to see, investigate the structure and the nature of the mind, which has created, through thought, this whole scaffold of the self, the `me', to which one has given such enormous importance.

Now is it possible to look at oneself, the images that one has created about oneself, the desires, the failures, the frustrations, the hopes, the faith that one has cultivated through this hope for a future, the faith in an imaginative god or saviour, or a master, or a

guru - can one look at that, this whole structure, which is the structure of thought which has created me and the rest of the world around me, can we look at that without analysis and observe actually what it is? I hope you are following what the speaker is saying. I do not know if you have not realized that all our religions, Christianity, whatever religion it is, organized, is based on thought, is the product of thought, and thought is the movement of matter. Thought is the response of memory, response of experience which is knowledge. On that all our culture is based, both technologically, artistically, spiritually. All our religions are the product of thought, and thought is a material process. And can we look at ourselves and the movement of thought in which all our minds, all our activities, all our sensual pleasures and so on are based. To look at ourselves without any distortion. Because if you can, then you need no guru. Then you do not need to read a single book about all this business. You may read technological books, but there is no need to read a single book about philosophy, psychology because everything is in you as a human being if you know how to look at yourself. Because after you are the result - your mind is the result of the collective. You are not individuals, are you? Individuality, the word means indivisible, an entity, a human being who is not fragmented, broken up, divided in himself. And most human beings are fragmented, and so you are actually, the very word is misapplied; you are like the collective, you are the result of the collective, of the social structure which thought has created. And that social environmental culture, with its religions, with its philosophy, with its immorality, has conditioned our minds.

So can the mind look at itself, observe without any distortion?

And that is only possible when you understand who is the observer. Are you all interested in this? Yes? I hope you are because it is your life, not mine. I hope you are seriously concerned with your own life, and not waste it, not distort it. And our civilization helps us to distort it, to destroy it, our education, our religious upbringing destroys the capacity to live a life that is whole, not fragmented; a life that is whole, that means sane, and sanity means health, and whole means also holy - h-o-l-y. And as human beings we are fragmented, we have divided the world nationally, racially, religiously, economically, the business man, the artist, the doctor, the scientist, we have broken up the human being as specialists, and so we are not individuals at all, we are fragmented human beings. And being fragmented we think we can put it all together and integrate it. You cannot integrate broken fragments. What one can do is to observe these fragments, how they have come into being, what has divided them, why this division exists: then out of that observation comes a total sense of wholeness. So one must go into this question of how to observe, not only the things that are outer, but also inward.

You know we want to learn, we want to be taught, we go to colleges, schools, universities, or go to some of these classes of the yogis and the gurus, and all that, we want to learn. But learning has two qualities, learning in order to accumulate knowledge and from that knowledge act skilfully. That is what we do when we go to college, accumulate knowledge in order to live in the outward world skilfully with what we have learnt, technologically and so on. There is also another form of learning, learning which is never the accumulation of knowledge. And to learn about ourselves, not

according to any philosopher, or any psychologist and all the rest of those people, but to learn about ourselves, and there comes the difficulty. Please do listen to this. When you look at yourself freely, without fear, without prejudice, you examine yourself, and by examination, and through examination you have learnt a little part of yourself, and that learning has become knowledge, has it not? And with that knowledge you next examine, you examine the next movement of your reaction, of your thought, of your feeling, of your desire. So you are never free to look afresh at the next reaction without the previous knowledge. You are following all this? Do please, it is really very interesting if you go into yourself very deeply. So the previous understanding, the previous learning, the previous knowledge impedes, hinders the examination of the fresh movement of a feeling. You distort that feeling. So is it possible to be free from knowledge of that kind to examine afresh, so that your mind is capable of seeing directly without the previous conditioning? Do you understand my question? Because this is very important to understand, because that is the very essence of freedom, that the previous knowledge conditions the mind and so it is incapable of examining a new movement of thought, a new reaction. And so one asks what place has knowledge? What place has knowledge in the world, not only outwardly, but inwardly, in the world, in this inward world that is so complex, so contradictory, so limited? You understand my question? What place has knowledge in the transformation of man and society? That is what we are concerned with for the moment. What place has knowledge in the examination, or the observation of myself? Will the previous knowledge acquired, or gathered from another

help to observe? Or must there be freedom from knowledge to observe?

So one must go into the whole question of the observer. I hope we are thinking together, sharing this thing together, journeying together, otherwise my talking about it is quite useless, if you are not at the same level, at the same time, which is the very essence of love, then communication comes to an end. So one hopes that we are sharing this thing together, therefore it is your responsibility to share, not to merely learn and accumulate as knowledge and act according to that knowledge, therefore that denies freedom.

So, as we said, we must enquire into this question of who is the observer? Because that is what we are doing. We are observing the world, all that is going on, in the scientific field, in the world that is violent, brutal, wars, starvation, poverty, and the affluent society of this country, where there is also great poverty, not poverty of prosperity but inward poverty, you are terribly poor people inwardly, terribly, and being poor you are gullible, you will accept, try anything for a while and then drop it, go to something else, which all indicates an extraordinary sense of inward insufficiency, inward poverty, inward loneliness. And to enquire together, for I am not your authority, for the speaker is not your guru, thank god, he is not your leader, teacher, he has nothing to do with propaganda, to tell you what to do, but to observe, share what is being said so that it is yours, not someone else's, so that you are independent, free human beings.

So we must go into this question of who is the observer? When you look at the war that is going on in Vietnam, the fear of the threat of war in the Middle East, the appalling poverty in India, and

the things that are going on in this country, the vulgarity, the noise, the everlasting desire to be entertained, the inundation of the oriental thought in the shape of gurus, yogis and their magazines and their dances and their stupidities, how do you observe them all, how do you look at them? Are you separate from them? Are you capable of looking dispassionately? Or are you frightened, uncertain, unclear, confused? Wanting to get something, to attain something, attain peace, enlightenment, Nirvana, god knows what else you want? Have you observed all this? And how do you observe, with what eyes, with what kind of mind, with what kind of heart do you observe all the things that are going on in this appalling world? How do you look? Do you look at it as an American? - whatever that word may mean. Do you look at it with eyes that are satisfied, angry, prejudiced, hatred, jealousy and so on, do you look at it with those eyes? Or do you look at it with eyes that are clear, without any prejudice, without any conditioning? Because if you have such eyes then you know what love is, what compassion is. And it is only compassion that can solve all our problems. But unfortunately we haven't got such eyes. Our eyes and our heart and our minds are conditioned by our affluence, by the culture in which we live, competitive, selfish, immoral.

So we observe the outward world in this distorted way. And also we observe ourselves, if we at all ever do, either with fear, with condemnation, or rationalization, or justification, look at ourselves with the image that one has built about ourselves, the image imposed by society, the image which we have created for ourselves about ourselves. Again these images, these conclusions,

these speculative assertions, which are really prejudices distort our inward look. So it is very important, it seems to me, to learn not from another because what you learn from another is his prejudice, his dogma, his conclusion, his arrogance, his ignorance and stupidity, but if you can learn about yourself by observing yourself then out of that learning there comes freedom.

So the observer, when you look at the world as an Englishman, German or Italian, or an American, or a Russian, as a Communist, as a Socialist, as a Capitalist, the world as an architect, as a scientist because you are specialized then you bring about, not only in yourself but in the world, in the outer world, this fragmentation. So can you look at yourself without any distortion? And you can if you see the truth that to understand oneself there must be no distortion - if you see instantly that truth. And that truth can be seen instantly when your mind is not conditioned by your religion, by your culture, by your own imaginative, fanciful desires. You know you are so conditioned to accept gradual understanding, gradual perception, gradual seeing the truth of something. But I think that gradual process of understanding is sheer nonsense because when you want to understand something immediately you do, about yourself. For that immediacy you must have energy, you must have the intensity to find out. Here you are conditioned, take one thing, conditioned by your religion - I am taking that as an example. Or by intellectual conclusions, which are fanciful prejudices, you are conditioned by a conclusion. Look what that conclusion does. You have your conclusion, another has his conclusion and that divides you, as belief does. Where there is division, nationally, politically, religiously, the division of



conclusions, there must be conflict, and conflict is the very essence of violence. Now if you see that, the truth of it, not the verbal explanation, the verbal comprehension of that explanation, because that which is explained, that which is described - the description is not the described. So if you see the truth that any form of division in oneself and in the world must inevitably breed conflict - the Arab and the Jew, the Communist and the Socialist and so on, division between you and me, we and they, the division between the one who knows and the one who does not know, the guru and the disciple, which is a division. And that must inevitably, logically, bring about conflict. If you see the truth of that, and you can if you apply your mind, then you will see that this whole idea of hierarchical progress, gradually unconditioning, step by step or jump from one state of another conditioning and go beyond it, becomes utter nonsense.

So we have created the division between the observer and the observed, in ourselves, have we not? When you look at yourself you are the observer and what you are looking at is something different from the observer, isn't that so? When you say, 'I am greedy', 'I am arrogant', I am this, or that, and I must be different, when you say that you have divided the observer from the observed, haven't you? So in that division there is conflict, there is the desire to control, to change, to bring about a satisfactory conclusion. Now is the observer different from the observed? You understand my question? Am I talking Greek? Or have you gone to sleep? Or are you actually sharing what we are talking about together? Therefore you are giving attention, it is your problem, you have got to solve this. It is your life, whether you are young or

old. So is the observer, that says, 'I am watching myself' - I am watching myself, there is a division in that. Is the 'I' who is watching different from the thing which is being watched? Therefore - do see the truth of that, not my explanation and the understanding of that explanation, but the truth that there is no division between the observer and the observed. That is, the observer is the observed. When you see that as truth then conflict in yourself comes totally to an end. Then quite a different thing takes place. When the observer is the observed then there is only the observed, not the observer. When there is division as the observer and the observed there is conflict, there is the desire to control it, to suppress it, go beyond it, to conquer it and so on and so on, all that is a wastage of energy. But when there is only the observed, not the observer observing, watching that which he is seeing, then you have the energy, then there is that energy to go beyond the observed, beyond 'what is'. So it is very important to find out how to observe. Don't go to schools, or classes to learn how to observe, that is your tendency in this country, you go to schools to learn how to become sensitive, or go to some community where they teach you how to become sensitive. And when you learn how to become sensitive you are no longer sensitive. For god's sake be simple. It is very important to understand this for yourself, not from my explanation, not what the speaker is saying. But this is a fact. This is the truth. See it for yourself. Then this conflict in yourself comes to an end and therefore you as a human being have no violence. Because what you observe, what you see is yourself without the division, therefore there is no you and me, we or they, the Jew and the

Gentile, and all the rest of it. Inwardly also. The division between the observer who says, 'I am greedy and I must do something about that greed, or that violence' brings about a conflict, and that conflict is another form of violence. Where there is the truth, the understanding, not intellectual but the fact that the observer is the observed brings about a totally different freedom in which there is no conflict whatsoever.

And to learn about oneself is to observe without the observer, to observe, to see without distortion, without prejudice, without fear. And out of this observation you begin to understand the nature and the structure of fear and pleasure, because those are the two things, fundamental issues or principles in our life. And perhaps next time we meet on Saturday morning we can go into that. But we have these problems as human beings, these problems cannot be solved by another because the solution of the problem is in the problem itself, not in the organized groups. You know there is a lovely thing which I used to talk about, which is: two friends were walking down the street one day, one walked a little ahead and picked up something off the street, a dirty street, much travelled upon. Looks at it and his face brightens, he is cheerful, he is extraordinarily radiant, and he puts it in his pocket. And the friend says a little later, 'What did you pick up that made you look so radiant, so happy?' The friend said, 'Oh, that was truth that I picked up, I am going to keep it'. And the other friend says, 'Don't keep it, let us organize it'.

Do you want to ask any questions about what we have talked about? Before you ask questions, if you want to, it is very important to find out who is going to answer your questions. But

we must ask questions, we must have doubt, scepticism. But doubt and scepticism must be kept on a leash, as you keep a dog on a leash, to know when to let it go and to know when to hold it back. Otherwise doubt and scepticism destroy people. So we must ask questions. And also find out for yourself who is going to answer them. If you are waiting for an answer from another, that answer is going to condition you, is going to destroy you. But when you share that question with another, in the enquiry of that question, in the sharing of that question, in the problem that troubles one, then there is no one to answer you but the very enquiry into the question, there is the answer in the question. Which does not mean that you mustn't ask questions of the speaker. The speaker is not, by stating that, preventing you from asking. If you have no questions...

Q: Yes. (Laughter)

K: Yes, sir?

Q: Do we speak in the loudspeaker?

K: I can hear you.

Q: Because while I wish to ask a question, I would also like to include by definition what I hope is an answer. I do not have much doubt or scepticism over your observation of the importance that we look into ourselves but must we equate conflict with violence? As the water of the seas bash the rocks of the shore, as the branches of a river go in divergent ways, are we not constantly in our lives, within our own selves, faced with the dilemma and the conflict of our greed and our kindness? If we are to accept all conflict as violence, are we not precluding the importance that while there is conflict in nature and conflict in man, we can

reconcile this conflict by the important word you used, compassion. And is not that the bridge in the dilemma of our conflict?

K: Are you saying, sir, I hope you have heard the question. I don't know what you are laughing at. But I asked if you have heard the question.

Audience: Yes.

K: The gentleman asks: why do you equate conflict with violence? Nature is violent, the rivers, you know all the business. We human beings are supposed to be a little more intelligent and must solve this problem of violence. When a wild animal kills a deer and a tiger destroys a cow, that is part of nature. That is its nature. If you accept that human beings by their nature are violent and that it is necessary to be violent, that is part of our innate structure, then we will create a society as we have, violent, competitive, aggressive, brutal and all the rest of it. And the question is also: can this violence be transcended, gone beyond? And the gentleman pointed out that the speaker used the word 'compassion'. You know compassion is something that you cannot come by through the conquering of violence. It is totally unrelated to violence. The word 'compassion' means passion for all things; passion is not lust, is not the act of determination or will. Passion comes from the word suffer, suffering. When you understand deeply, fully what is suffering and the freedom from suffering then there is compassion. But the freedom from violence is not necessarily compassionate. You see one has to go into the question of what is freedom. Is freedom from something, freedom. You understand my question sir?

Q: I am a little puzzled.

K: Right, sir, sorry. I wish you had told me earlier. Is freedom from violence, that is freedom from violence, is that freedom not a reaction, and is there a freedom which is not from something, but freedom, per se? So we are asking, as we human beings, living in this world which we are slowly and gradually destroying, because of our greed, for various economic reasons and so on, this violence that we have accumulated, inherited, cultivated, is it not possible to be free from it, not as an ideal, to become non-violent, that is just non-existent, that is just political jargon. To be free from violence is one thing, and to feel this sense of total freedom, not from anything, which is the very essence of intelligence. And intelligence is not the cultivation of knowledge. Intelligence is wholly different from knowledge. One can be free, put away, through great observation, understanding, the sense of violence in oneself. I don't know if you have gone into this question of how important it is - may I go on a little bit? May I go on? Sorry, a little bit, no more.

You know human consciousness, that is your consciousness, is the consciousness of the world, isn't it? What you think, and feel, they feel the same thing in India, or in Russian, feel. Your consciousness is the consciousness of the world. And that consciousness can be affected. Hitler affected that consciousness. Stalin affected that consciousness. The priests in the name of Jesus affected consciousness, the priests not the human being. So if you transform yourself, you affect the world consciousness. You understand? If you understand the nature of violence, the whole complexity of it, not say, `Well, nature is violent, therefore it is all

right for me to be violent', but the violence that human beings feel, their anger, their hatred, their jealousy, their antagonism, all that is involved in that word `violence'. And it is part of that consciousness of human beings, and when there is transcending, going beyond that violence, you affect the totality of the human consciousness.

Sorry, that is enough.

## 2ND PUBLIC TALK MASONIC AUDITORIUM SAN FRANCISCO 22TH MARCH 1975

I would like, if I may, to repeat again what we said the other day when we met here. This is not a one sided affair, you and I, the speaker...

Audience: We can't hear.

K: Is that better? It is not better? Is it any better now?

We are sharing the thing together, we are not just merely gathering some ideas from the speaker, some conclusions or some philosophical concepts. We are dealing with `what is', what is actually going on outside and also what is going on within ourselves, what actually is going on, not what we would like to think is going on. And so, if I may repeat again, we are sharing this thing together and so it is your responsibility also to work, to listen, to find out what the speaker is saying without agreement or disagreement, but closely examine together `what is' and if it is possible to transform, to go beyond `what is'.

As we were saying the other day, when we last met here, that knowledge conditions the mind, and through knowledge we look at all the phenomenon of the world, both outward and inward.

Knowledge is the accumulation of experience, and from that arises memory, and the response of memory is thought. So thought is a material process. And this knowledge that one has accumulated through centuries, ever since man began, that knowledge however good, however necessary and so on, that knowledge shapes our minds, our hearts, our activities, and as long as we live within that field of knowledge, knowledge is always in the past, there is no



freedom, freedom from the known. And as we are going to talk about several things, like fear, pleasure, relationship, love, we are going to examine all these together and see for ourselves directly their significance, their structure and their nature. Then perhaps, if you are serious, if one goes into it very, very deeply, not urged by circumstances, by some influence, but go into ourselves, look at it, then perhaps there might be a total psychological transformation, psychological revolution, which is so essential to bring about a different culture, a different society. That is the whole meaning of this morning's investigation, that the society, the culture in which we live has conditioned our minds, our hearts, our activities, our daily life in relationship. And that society, that culture is created by each one of us, by our parents, by our forefathers, by the ancient people and so on, that society with all its economic, social problems, has shaped our minds and that shaping, that conditioning is essentially through knowledge, through constant repetition. Like a computer, you programme it and what you tell it, it will respond instantly. And our brains have been conditioned for millennia. And whether it is at all possible to uncondition that mind so that there is a psychological revolution, so that we can live on this earth happily, intelligently, with compassion, without any sense of violence, conflict. That is the problem that faces most of us who are at all deeply concerned with what is going on in the world, the violence, the starvation, the wars, the national divisions, religious separations and so on.

So we must enquire, if you will, and we will share together, what is the place of knowledge, if it conditions, as it does, the human mind - I mean by that word 'mind' the intellect, which is the

capacity to reason logically, sanely, and the mind includes the heart, the emotions, the totality of the human entity, at least we are using that word 'mind' in that sense, the totality of human activity, human responses, feelings, the various thoughts, desires, purposes, conclusions, the incessant suffering, all that is the mind. And that mind has been conditioned, and we are asking whether it is at all possible to uncondition the mind because a conditioned mind is not a free mind, it is a mechanical mind, it is a repetitive mind, and when faced with a totally different kind of challenge it responds according to its old knowledge and therefore its response is not adequate, and hence the inadequacy brings about conflict. I hope we are following each other.

Our question is: what place has knowledge? And what is the relationship of knowledge to the transformation of man, psychological man and therefore the outward man? Really there is no, if you go into it very deeply, there is no outer and inner, there is only this constant movement of thought and its activity, which expresses itself, outwardly and inwardly. And what place has thought in the transformation of man? What place has thought in bringing about a totally different quality of mind? And therefore heart, and therefore that sense of compassion, what place has thought in all that? Thought being the response of memory, experience and knowledge; and knowledge, as we said, is essentially the past. I think this is fairly obvious so we needn't labour the point. So what place has knowledge, and therefore thought, in bringing about a radical revolution psychologically, and therefore society, has it a place at all? Or no place? And therefore we must examine, again together, share together, journey together,

it isn't that the speaker is just talking to himself, we are sharing this very, very serious thing together and therefore it is neither agreeing nor disagreeing, we are two friends talking over together their problems, and therefore there is no authority. The speaker is not a Delphic Oracle. But two affectionate, friendly, companionable people talking over their many problems and being friends they are aware of each other, they are aware of their prejudices, their shortcomings, their impulses, their desires, their pettiness, and their merits and their arrogance, but in spite of all that, talk over, not only casually, hesitantly but also seriously the problem that is in their heart and in their mind.

So what is thought? What is this process of thinking upon which all our civilization, all our culture, religion, activity is based on? Thought has produced this world both outwardly and inwardly. And again that is a fact, that is what is going on actually. Can thought transform man? And man has to change radically. That change is not according to a certain pattern, or according to certain ideals, certain conclusions, philosophies, because those philosophies, conclusions, ideals are the product of thought. Thought has put together the skeleton of what is called religion, with their saviours, with their masters, with their heaven and hell, and as one observes both historically and actually what is going on, thought has bred all this, and yet we think through thought, thinking rationally, quietly, deeply that thought can somehow, through some mysterious process, change our minds and our hearts. And we are saying, the speaker is saying that thought cannot possibly transform man, however subtle, however erudite, however cunning, however insane it is. Thought has no possibility

whatsoever in bringing about a psychological revolution which is so absolutely necessary.

So then what place has knowledge if thought cannot bring about a change of great depth, of great beauty, of compassion, which are necessary in this world, both as a human being and in the collective? Then what place has thought? Do you understand my question? Please at the end of the talk, if you will, ask questions, but now is not the moment.

You know the western civilization sprang from the Greeks who maintained that measure, measurement is essential, and measurement is thought. And the ancient Greeks with their philosophies exploded over Europe. That is a fact. They said rational, clear thinking based on knowledge and measurement is necessary. And if you observe all our technological knowledge and activity, everything in the west is based on thought, both its religions, its national divisions, its economic status and so on. And India, ancient India not modern India which is as corrupt, rotten as here, ancient India said, and then again very few, that measurement is illusion, to find the immeasurable, and that is the search of man, that is the everlasting enquiry of man, thought must be suppressed, thought must be controlled in order to go beyond the illusory structure of thought to find, or to come upon that which is not measurable, the eternal, the infinite. But they too, the ancient Indians, used thought, though they tried to suppress thought, the very suppression is the process of thought. So both the west and the east are in the same position. The one trying to solve the human problem in terms of thought. And we are saying - please listen to it if you will, neither agreeing nor disagreeing but seeing actually the

fact of `what is', that thought in no way can change man. Thought has its place, in the technological world, in the world of action, in the world of skill, in the world of everyday activity. If one wants to learn cycling you have to learn, memorize, learn balance and so on, knowledge has its place. But it cannot bring about a psychological revolution in man. Then what will? You understand the problem?

So to find out what will, one must go into this question of fear. You understand what we are saying? That thought has its place, knowledge has its place, but knowledge, thought through centuries though it has tried to transform itself, has not done so, and so thought, whatever it will do, however much it may control, discipline itself, however much it may run after the gurus, saviours and all the rest of it, is not capable, utterly irrelevant in the transformation of man. And if thought cannot, what will? What is the energy, not some mysterious energy, not some energy to be awakened through a series of mechanical practices and so on and on, but what is that energy that will change man? And to find that energy, to go into it, we must first find out whether the mind can be free from fear, because fear in all its forms limits energy, confines it, darkens it. And our life, a great portion of our life unfortunately is based on fear, fear of poverty, fear of not achieving what we want, success, and in this country success is worshipped as a god, fear of physical pain, fear of old age, fear of death, fear of what somebody says about you - you know the innumerable fears that the mind has collected, both conscious as well as unconscious. And we are asking: that fear, whether it be casual, superficial or deeply rooted, whether that fear can be completely set aside, can the mind be totally free from it? Don't say, `It can never be free'. If you say it

can never be free then you are blocking yourself. Or if you say, 'Yes, it can be free', then you have already come to a conclusion. But if you begin to enquire, to find out whether the mind so deeply entrenched in fear, whether it is at all possible for it to be free, not at different levels of consciousness but completely.

Now how do you enquire into it? Please bear in mind this is not a group therapy which I have a horror of, nor a collective enquiry; you are enquiring, your personal problem, it is your issue, you have a dozen fears of which you may be conscious or unconscious. And you know very well what it does both in relationship with another, fear of the past, fear of physical pain, fear of old age and death and disease. And if you are aware, as you are sitting there, if you are aware, that is, if you are conscious of one fear, at least one, by enquiring into that one fear, that enquiry will reveal the whole structure of fear, if you are aware. That is, to be aware means to look without distortion, without prejudice, without the desire to go beyond fear, just to observe, as you observe the sunset. You can't do anything about the sunset, or yesterday's storm, you just observe, look at it, see what it is doing. And to be so choicelessly aware that awareness opens the book of fear, the whole book, not the many chapters or one or two pages, but the fear from the beginning to the end. That means whether you are capable, as you are sitting there listening, to be aware. Not go to school or college, or go to somebody to learn how to be aware. It is like those people who are learning to be sensitive, which is absurd.

One is afraid of a physical pain that one has had last week, and one hopes it will not recur again, and in that there is fear. One is afraid of death, that everlasting thing that is waiting for all of us.

One is afraid of one's wife or husband, or girl or boy - there are so many fears. And if you invite one as you are sitting there, what is the cause of fear?

We are going to say something that perhaps you have not gone into. If you have please forgive the repetition of it. What is the cause of fear, the deep roots of fear and also the casual fears? If you have gone into it as we are doing it now, you have to find out, not from the speaker - as we said yesterday the speaker has no authority whatsoever, you have to find this out for yourself, and therefore examination of this fact together - together, you understand, you and I examining, not you accepting or denying, and memorizing the words, the ideas, the conclusions. Together we are looking at this enormous thing called fear. What is the root cause of it, whether it is the fear of physical pain, fear of losing a job, fear of poverty if you are rich, if you are well off, fear of, for heaven's sake, you know all the fears that one has - what is the cause of it, what is the essence of it? If you are looking for a cause that is a waste of time, that is a process of analysis. And having discovered the cause, if you can, through analysis, where are you at the end of it? So the investigation into the cause of fear, the cause is not only irrelevant but a wastage of time and energy. But if you ask: what has brought about, not the cause, this abiding, this sense of agony, this sense of loneliness that brings about fear? How has it flowered? If you ask it, and I am asking for you, the speaker is asking for you, then you will find that it is thought that has brought this about, thinking. Thinking, as we said, is the product of memory, experience, knowledge. That is a fact. I think I might lose my job. I had pain last week and I don't want it today, it might

happen, which is again the movement of thought. And nobody can deny this fact that thought, which is a material process, that thought conditioned by knowledge, invariably must produce fear of tomorrow, uncertainty. And we are living in a world, in the modern world, where everything is uncertain, and we want certainty, both outwardly and inwardly. And the groping after this certainty, whether religiously, economically or socially and all the rest of it, is the movement of thought; and thought must and does create fear. And one hasn't time to go into it much more deeply because we have to talk about several other things this morning.

And I do not know if you have noticed how our mind is always pursuing pleasure in different forms, pleasure of possession, having power, economically, politically, socially or individually and so on, power over others, power which that knowledge gives, power of awakening certain capacities, all that, and the pursuit of all that is pleasure. The sexual pleasure - I do not know if you have noticed how the mind, thought is always pursuing this. Not only pleasures in domination, but also pleasures in relationship. The pleasure and the delight of seeing a clear mountain against the blue sky and the delight of that moment is registered in the brain cells as memory, and the repetition of that delight, the demand of that through thought of that delight is pleasure. When you actually see that mountain, in the lovely clear blue sky, at that instant there is no thought of pleasure, there is only observation, the beauty, the loveliness, the shadows, then thought comes along and says, 'I must have it again tomorrow'. That is what you do sexually, a repetition, the boredom, the mechanicalness. We are not saying that you must suppress pleasure, that is for the priests! (Clapping)



Don't waste your time sirs, clapping or agreeing, just listen. Because that is what you are caught in, not only the denial of pleasure, the resistance of certain forms of pleasure but the intent of pleasure, the direction of pleasure, which again is the product of thought. So thought creates both fear and the pursuit of pleasure. This again is a fact, that is what actually is. And can you observe, be aware of this, of fear, pleasure as the product of thought? And not deny it? Not suppress it? Therefore out of that arises the question: what is discipline and control? You understand? I have pleasure in over eating, pleasure in so many different ways. Pleasure of possession, pleasure of domination, pleasure of power.

So what is discipline? And what is control? Has control any place at all? Please listen carefully. We are not advocating no control, that is what you are doing any way! But we are asking: what is the place of discipline and control where pleasure and fear are concerned? Control and discipline, again is the movement of thought, resistance and acceptance. The word `discipline' means to learn, it comes from the word disciple - disciple who is learning from the master, from the teacher. Not suppression, conformity, imitation, which now signifies that word discipline. Discipline means to learn, and the very act of learning has its own discipline. You understand this? If I want to learn Italian, the very learning of it brings about order in the mind - that is so, isn't it? Are you all following each other? Or are you all on a clear lovely morning wishing to be somewhere else? So discipline means the act of learning from moment to moment, not gathering knowledge and acting according to that knowledge, which is what is generally understood as being discipline. Right? Can I proceed? Can I go on?

I hope you understand all this. If you don't, I am sorry.

Control implies resistance, in that there is the controller and the controlled. The pleasure of possession, the pleasure of domination and the power that comes with domination, and you say, 'I must control that desire'. Which means resist that desire, build a wall psychologically against that desire, and so on. Now is it possible - please listen carefully - is it possible not to have any control at all but to learn all the implications of pleasure, the structure and the nature of fear and pleasure. And when you observe then you will see that the observer is the observed and therefore the necessity of control totally disappears. You might say, 'You, as the speaker, do you actually do this?' The speaker says, 'Yes, he has had no control whatsoever in his life.' Which doesn't mean he does what he likes, but order is necessary. Oh Lord, there is so much to talk about! When there is order in yourself, not the mechanical order of discipline, control and imitation and conformity, when there is order in yourself, which means no confusion but direct perception and action, then there is order, not artificially brought about, conforming to a blueprint; but this order comes when you understand the whole nature of disorder in which we live. In our lives there is such disorder, and to understand that disorder, then you will see out of that disorder comes an order which is absolute, mathematically clear, and such a mind has no need for control or discipline in the sense of suppression, conformity and so on.

And now there is the next question: is love pleasure? Do you understand my question? Is love desire? Is love sex? And that word unfortunately, 'love', has been so misused, trodden on, made dirty, both by religions and by modern permissiveness. So we must find

out, if you are at all serious, because if you have no love in your hearts you are dead human beings, you may have pleasure, any amount, any amount of sex, any amount of possession, you might be the most powerful man in the world with a lot of money, but you are a human being, a mechanical entity, repetitive, inconsistent, contradictory and in conflict. So you must find out, not accept, deny, find out for yourself for god's sake what love means. That word has been spoiled by religions - for the love of god, love of human beings, love of whatever you love. So we are asking: is love pleasure? And we have made in this modern world, and probably in the Victorian era too, only they did it under cover, pleasure is identified with love. And when there is no pleasure in love there is fear. So fear, pleasure go together, they are two sides of the same coin. So you have to ask yourself what is this strange thing which man, throughout the ages, sought after, suffered for it, called it chastity, denied all the pleasures, all the sensitivities, all tastes and gone off into a monastery and labelled himself as being chaste.

So we have to go into the question of what is chastity? A mind that evokes pictures of pleasure, sexual or otherwise is an unchaste mind - not the act but the pictures, the imaginations, the fancy, the demands, the constant repetition, such a mind is an unchaste mind. And a mind that is pursuing pleasure and avoiding fear, can it come upon love? And an ambitious man, can he love? You are ambitious aren't you? All of you, in one way or another. When you follow somebody, your guru, your teacher, you are ambitious, you want to gain what he has, or what he thinks he has. The man who says he knows heaven, he does not know heaven. So you are

ambitious, greedy, violent and can that man know what love is? Come on sirs, answer it yourself. Can a man who is competitive, who is always comparing himself with another, physically, psychologically, intellectually, and so on, can he know what love means? And yet he talks about love, 'I love my family, I am responsible because I love my wife and my children' - is that love? In relationship between human beings, is there love? Question it sirs and ladies, don't accept a thing, find out, because relationship is one of the most important things in life: to be related to another, how you are related to another brings about a society, a culture. So you have to find out what this relationship means between two human beings, and is there love in that relationship? Or is it a matter of routine, sexual pleasure, or the frustration in sex, you know all the battles that go on in this mad, crazy world? So when you say, 'I am related', what are you related to? You are related, are you not, to the image that you have built about her and she has built about you. The relationship is between these two images, which is verbal, which is memory, which is knowledge, which is the past.

So is love memory? So love is none of these things. And can you, as a human being, put aside your ambitions, your images about others, your conclusions, and be simple, clear, and then you will know what love is, and therefore compassion. You talk a great deal about love. You kill animals for your food, whales are disappearing, the earth is being destroyed for your pleasure. So you have to understand this whole structure of thought which has produced human beings that have no love, though they may talk everlastingly about it, no compassion, compassion means passion

for all human beings, for all living things. They have no love between themselves, between a wife and husband, girl and boy, they are just living on images, memories, the past, the future memory projected from the past; though they may talk about love they are ambitious, greedy, violent, selfish. Can you, as a human being, put aside all this, easily, quietly, without great demonstration of your sacrifice? And then perhaps you will come upon that extraordinary thing, without which life has no meaning.

Tomorrow and on the other - we have got two more meetings - tomorrow we will talk about suffering and the enormous problem of death. And also what is meditation, because we are concerned with the whole of life, not with one segment of life, one part, but the whole of it. The whole of it is death, relationship, fear, action, and whether the mind can come upon that which is eternal, all that is the whole of life from the very beginning to the end. And therefore we must, if one is at all given to earnestness, we must enquire into all these matters.

Do you want to ask any questions? Or is that enough for this morning? You remember there is a lovely story of a preacher, every morning he talked to his disciples, a sermon. And one day as he was getting on the rostrum and about to speak, a bird sat on the window sill and began to sing. It was a lovely morning, clear, soft air and everything was rejoicing. And the bird sang its song and flew away. And the preacher said, 'The sermon for this morning is over'. Do you want to ask any questions after that? (Laughter)

Q: Sir, I have listened to you and I believe if I could fully understand I could live a much better life. But still I find this gap between what I can do, I don't know what to do.

K: I understand. You have heard the question, so I won't repeat it. When we say we understand, what do we mean by that word? Is it an intellectual understanding, a verbal understanding? The grasp of the meaning of words which signifies what one wants? Is that understanding at all? Or is understanding something which is not a mental process, a verbal dissertation, a verbal examination, for the word is not the thing. If I say, 'I understand, I have got what you mean', then you must examine, look into this 'I have understood' - meaning you have really understood verbally, which is no understanding at all. So understanding implies instant action, not understand verbally and later on act. There is no division between understanding and action.

Good lord! Are you all going to ask questions?

Q: If worldly life implies reflection of our inward spiritual life, then it seems to me outward and inward material poverty is a reflection of spiritual poverty, and material well-being is a reflection of spiritual well-being. Can you comment on this?

K: What is the question sir?

Q: I am curious about the fact that the...

K: I understand, I have got it. Quite, quite. I understand.

It is the responsibility of all governments, isn't it, to see that man, whether in America, Europe or India, or Asia, to see that man has food, clothes and shelter. It is necessary. Those are absolutely necessary. Now science says we can have that. Every man can have food, clothes and shelter. Why is it not possible? What is preventing this? Which means the well being of man, physical well being, what is preventing it? The communists say, 'Follow my system, I have got a system', the communists say, 'that will solve

the problem - dictatorship of ideas, dictatorship by the few controlling the many. And the socialist has his own system, so have the capitalists. And the world is divided into nationalities, with their national prestige, with their sovereign governments and armies and so on and so on. This division of ideas, ideals, systems, nationalities is preventing the unity of man, deeply. Until you solve that problem, we have discussed this with politicians, with economists, with others, they can't go beyond their specialization. We are human beings to live on this earth, all of us happily. It is our earth, not the communist's world, earth, nobody possess this earth, it is ours. We are destroying it because we are divided amongst ourselves, the rich and the poor, the intellectual, the architect and so on and so on. So until that takes place, which means you must be free of this division, and then only can we have a system that will be happily accepted by all. That is enough sirs, I can't go deeply into it.

Q: Sir, when you observe yourself do you see a meaning in or behind your life?

K: When you observe yourself - do you what sir?

Q: Do you see a meaning?

K: I don't quite get it.

Q: Purpose, meaning.

K: Do I have a purpose? You are asking? Do you have a purpose, the speaker. Do you have a goal. I am afraid I haven't. Isn't that enough? Do all of you want to ask questions? Go ahead.

Q: I want to ask a question. You make it sound so simple to be free. But in society how can we be free from fear?

K: I pointed it out. First I pointed out the nature of fear and to

look at it, be aware of it choicelessly, without resisting, without accepting, just look at it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is what you are educated to be competitive. All your social structure is based on that, but somebody must start the other thing going. That is enough. Isn't that enough sirs? All right. Go ahead.

Q: Thank you. I would like to communicate with you first if I may briefly.

K: Yes, go ahead with your question.

Q: You have to understand what I am talking about before you can understand what concerns me. Can I share that with you briefly first?

K: Yes. Whatever you want to say.

Q: I personally see that our way of life of which you have spoken of as being a state of corruption and a monstrous way of life, is virtually the way of life for the entire world, and so on. And it seems to me that this monstrous and poisonous way of life, I have watched the earth, the air and water.

K: Sir could you kindly make your question brief because there are two or three others waiting. So what is your question sir?

Q: It is a question that concerns me. You would not understand my question if you did not understand me.

K: The question is you, isn't it?

Q: We talk about our simple way of life. My father heard you speak four years ago and said he respected you very much because of your ability to cut through the appearance to the underlying germs. And I am disappointed because I don't hear anyone



addressing what I would call the germs to our sick way of life. I see our sick way of life is on a throne, it is a throne and the throne is perched on circumstances which we are going to.

K: So sir, you have to do something about it, haven't you?

Q: I am trying to share it first, that is why I am at this microphone.

K: What is the question sir?

Q: The question is to be understood by you if you are going to answer me. You announced in your talks about the Indian traditions, and the Greeks how they tend to measure things.

K: Yes sir, but what is the question sir? Forgive me.

Q: If you will forgive me I'll make it clear to you, because if I don't make it clear to you then I won't be addressing you, I'll be wasting my breath too. (Inaudible)

K: Sir you have not understood what I said. I said in India and here the human beings are the same. They go through torture, anxieties, fears, traditions, all that, we human beings are similar.

Q: But what is the germ of their way of life which is corrupt and sick as ours is? (Inaudible)

K: Therefore we must change. Change ourselves into what I have been talking about.

Q: But what are the germs of our sickness?

K: Ah! If you have got germs that are making you sick, take some kind of medicine. Homeopathic, allopathic, and there are different kinds of remedies. Sir, this is not what we are talking about, for god's sake. Please give the other fellow a chance, sir.

Q: Thank you, sir. I am sorry you couldn't understand my question.

Q: You said in the very beginning that if anyone didn't understand, or didn't follow what you were saying, he should speak up. Well, I didn't quite understand exactly what you were trying to get across about thought and conflicts. And as a result of that I have some questions for you.

K: What are you talking about, the questioner says, I don't understand what you mean by the process of thought. That is what he didn't understand. Must I go into it all again?

Q: OK.

K: It is not OK, sir.

Q: What I would like to know is how does one divorce oneself from thought?

K: Ah! How does one free oneself from thought. How does one control thought? How does one understand what place has thought? Thought, as I have explained, has its place, when you go from here to your house, you know where it is, the memory tells you where it is and you go there. So technologically, in skill, and in other ways, thought, memory, experience is necessary. Right, sir?

Q: That is what I was going to say. I felt that. It seems to me that you have advanced to such a point, in our society, that it is necessary. The only thing that we have is thought, but it cannot change us psychologically.

K: I understand, sir, that is what we said. Thought cannot change psychologically man. So one has to go into it and find out for oneself what place has thought, because thought must be used. When I speak English I am using the words which I have learnt, memory, and so on.

Q: It is really a waste of time.

K: I am sorry. I'll have to stop, if you don't mind.

## **3RD PUBLIC TALK MASONIC AUDITORIUM SAN FRANCISCO 23RD MARCH 1975**

I hope you can hear me, can you? May I again repeat that this gathering is not a diversion, it is not a form of intellectual or emotional, or the so-called religious entertainment. We are talking about very serious things, serious in the content, serious in their approach. And it is only the earnest mind that lives, that can be happy, that can enjoy the beauty of the earth and the skies and the sea. It is only the serious mind that can possibly investigate, observe itself in action, follow the movement of its own thoughts. And it is only the serious mind that is wholly committed, not to some fragment of life but the totality of life, the wholeness, the complete movement of life. So I would like to remind you again that this is not mere verbal understanding, a verbal communication, though words are necessary one must go beyond the word, see the significance of words. And when one does that there is really then communion, which is more than communication. Communication implies, doesn't it, that one thinks together, shares together, creates together, examines together: it is not one particular entity, human being having examined shares with another what he has examined. Here we are trying, and we are communicating not only verbally, but beyond the word at the same time, at the same level, otherwise communion and communication comes to an end.

We were going to talk this morning, weren't we, about the question of suffering, of human beings right throughout the world, and whether there is a possibility of ending that. And also the immense question, and it is rather complex, death. In uncovering

the structure and the nature of suffering, one must have a free mind, an enquiring mind, not a prejudiced mind, not a mind that is seeking an end. It is examining what actually is, and in the penetration of 'what is', one discovers a great many things. Reality, the word, reality means that which you think about, the root meaning of reality is that, that which is thought about, which is entirely different from what is truth. Truth cannot be thought about, and we are trying, we are doing it this morning, not only to understand, penetrate the thought that thinks about and creates reality, which ultimately leads to illusion, but also we are trying to find out what is truth, which is totally different from the process of thought.

So, let us begin, if one may, to find out why human beings, with their so-called education, with their technological advancement, with their understanding, perhaps intellectually, of centuries upon centuries, why human beings have not been able to resolve totally this question of suffering, to go beyond it, to transcend it, so that the mind is no longer in the shadow of ache, anxiety, and all the travail of human beings. Why is it that we have not solved this problem? And is it our laziness, our incompetence, our sense of accepting suffering as inevitable. One can understand the physical suffering because we misuse our body, various forms of indulgence, drink, alcohol, drugs, excessive indulgence in every form - that one can understand and perhaps go beyond it. But psychologically, inwardly, we have not been able to resolve this problem. And we are proposing this morning, whether it is possible to totally be free of suffering, which does not mean indifference, callousness, concern with oneself. Because when there is freedom

from sorrow then there is the beginning of wisdom. And wisdom is something that you cannot possibly buy in books, through any school or college, or discipline yourself in order to come upon this jewel which is called wisdom.

So we are going to, together, this morning, examine, not through analysis which we have gone into, but observe why you, as a human being, with all the centuries behind you of knowledge, experience, work, responsibility, have not been able to dissolve this darkness. And suffering, it is maintained, brings understanding, brings sympathy, brings love, compassion. And in the Christian world suffering is elated, worshipped. And if we can this morning go into this question, not hoping to find a realm in which there is no suffering. Hope breeds faith, and faith enduring becomes a dogma, an entrenched belief. And we are not hoping to go beyond it. Because you will see in examining it, in being aware of the whole nature of sorrow, its nature, structure, skeleton, the bones of it, being aware of it then one can transcend it.

From childhood, in school, college and university, and later on through life, we are hurt, we have a great many wounds, psychological, inward wounds, bruises, hurts. And being hurt through comparison when we are children, through the authority of the older, of the elders, through the other students, other friends, this wound gets deeper and deeper and we begin to resist, build a wall round ourselves - please observe this for yourself. Be aware of it for yourself, not because the speaker is pointing it out, because it is there, every human being is hurt in different ways. But in school you are compared with another, that you are not so bright as the other, and there begins the process of hurting, wounding. And so

through school, university, if you are lucky to go to school and a university, and then later on in life, in the office, in the factory, in the family, this wound becomes a source of sorrow, of resistance and the sense of deep loneliness. I do not know if you are ever aware of the sorrow of loneliness. And most human beings because they have been hurt, because they have built a wall around themselves, have no communication with another, are not deeply in relationship, because the other might hurt you, and this resistance, this building a wall round oneself, and out of that the feeling of great loneliness, is one of the reasons of suffering. And out of this loneliness, out of this great inward poverty, one tries to escape from it. Please observe it in yourself, if one may point out. One escapes into all kinds of neurotic beliefs, activities and professions of theories. Because the mind, the brain rather, can only function in complete security, most efficiently, clearly. The brain, as it can only function in that sense of complete certainty, efficiently, seeks that security in belief, in hopes, in some kind of neurotic unreasoned structure of thought. And that is exactly what is happening in the world - if you have observed it. All belief is neurotic. Do you accept this? Whether you believe in god, whether you believe in your nationality, whether you believe in your own structure, in your own brilliant, or not brilliant mind and activity, all belief is a form of neurotic unbalanced activity. Do look at it, don't accept it or reject it. Look at it, observe it, taste it, put it in your hand and see it.

Because one of the reasons of suffering is this loneliness, this self-centred isolation, and you fill that loneliness with knowledge, with entertainment, religious or otherwise. And the more you try to

fill that emptiness, that poverty, that vacuum of the self, the more pain, the more isolation. And from that lack of communication, lack of relationship, arises suffering. And also there is physical suffering because we have misused our bodies, overeaten, indulging in every form of tasteful habits, alcohol, drugs, smoking, you know what you are all doing. And the stress and the strain of modern civilization, with its shocks, does affect the mind, the consciousness, your being. And when there is that physical suffering one can deal with it without affecting the rational, clear, intelligent mind. But that again demands an awareness of the body, the organism, to see that it has the right nourishment - and I don't know why you all eat meat. I don't know if you have gone into the whole question of cruelty, compassion, but when one is addicted to a particular form of taste, and it is as difficult and perhaps more difficult than to give up a particular habit of thought. And to observe, to be aware that this sickness of the organism does not affect the mind, it is not a psychosomatic disease.

And there are other forms of suffering - suffering in relationship. Have you ever gone into this question of what it means to be related to another? Man, woman, in the family, and all the nagging, the domination, the criticism, the conflict between the man and the woman, the hurts, the pettiness, the shallowness. And if one examines it very closely, relationship is one of the greatest things in life, to be related rightly. And where there is no relationship you create a society, a culture that becomes immoral, that leads to war and every kind of conflict. So it is very important to find out whether in this relationship between man and woman, and therefore with the world, whether it be a thousand miles away



or near you, to find out for oneself whether that relationship is based on the image, the picture that you have built about another, and the image of the other, and the image that you have about yourself - whether these images, these pictures, these structures have any relationship at all? Or are they merely verbal, a structure of memory and therefore something dead, past, mechanical and therefore no relationship at all? And is it possible to have a relationship with another which is not based on memory, remembrance of things past and the freedom from every kind of image? You know what I mean by the image? If you live with another for a number of years, sexually, in close contact, you inevitably build an image about the other. You remember the things that the person has said, the hurts, the irritants, the indifference, the demands, the possessions, the domination and so on. And can there be a relationship in which there is no image whatsoever. You understand my question? I will elaborate that point if I may, not as a repetitive thing but to examine it more deeply.

First we are hurt, there are these wounds, and can one be free of these wounds? That is one problem. And is it possible not to be hurt at all? Is it possible, though we have images built about another, to be free of them and never create an image about another? So that is the problem: being hurt, how to go beyond it and never to be hurt. Not building a wall around oneself, that is absurd, it is rather infantile. But not to be hurt, to have a mind that is really innocent. The word 'innocency' means not what the Christians have made of it, the root meaning of that word means a mind that is not capable of being hurt. So we have got these

problems: being hurt, what to do with it, and also never to be hurt. Is this possible? Having an image about another and never to create another image? So let's find out if it is at all possible.

What is hurt? What is the thing that is being hurt when somebody says something harsh, brutal? Hurts your own vanity, what is that? Is it not an image that you have built about yourself? You might think that you are an extraordinarily intelligent man, and somebody comes along and says, 'Don't be a fool' and you get hurt. You think you are extraordinarily bright, intelligent, awake, and by your activities they say, 'Don't be foolish, don't be an ass, you are just like everybody else' and you get hurt, and so on. Can this hurt be wiped away? If I may, if one may I'll point it out to you and go into it with me and share the resolution of the hurt and the prevention of further hurts.

When the mind is attentive there is no hurt. When the mind is capable of observing without any reaction, to listen attentively, giving all your attention, at the moment of discredit, at the moment of disparagement, at the moment of insult, to be completely aware, then you will see there is no recording in the brain as hurt or flattery. Do it sometime and you will see the response from that. Then one sees that the images that one has built about another disappear completely. And in the latter there is no recording of any insult and therefore there is no hurt. Have you understood this? At least verbally? Perhaps some of you may have gathered it intellectually, but that is no good, because you will be hurt again, but if you go into this, be aware of your hurt, look at it, not wanting to wipe it away, to go beyond it, resist it, and all the rest of it, just to observe 'what is', choicelessly. Which is to be completely

attentive and then out of that attention every form of hurt and flattery come to an end, because hurt and flattery are the two sides of the same coin. And the same thing in relationship, when in that relationship your wife or your girl says something to you, or he says something to you, be attentive at that moment, to give your ear wholly. And then you will find no past hurts and there is no possibility of being hurt further, therefore your mind is astonishingly fresh, innocent and free.

And there are other forms of suffering: you know what is happening in Vietnam, thousands homeless, and you are responsible for it, the wounds, the cries, the misery that is going on there. And the poverty in India, in Asia, in certain parts of Europe. And there is the collective suffering for which you are all responsible. And there is separate human suffering, you lose somebody whom you think you love, with whom you have companionship. So there is this vast shadow of suffering created by man, the wars, maiming, destroying people - you have seen it in cinemas, on television, so there is that immense suffering of the world going on throughout the ages. And then there is the suffering of yourself. Can that mind be free of this suffering? Because when there is suffering there is no love. It is like a darkness, like a cloud that envelopes you and holds you and you cannot see clearly. However much you may try to escape from it, it is always there. So is it possible to go beyond it? It is possible, only when you suffer in different ways, there are so many ways to suffer, not to escape from it, just to look at it, be with it, remain without any movement of thought away from it, verbally, rationalize it or suppress it - all those are forms of escape and therefore a waste of energy, which is

inattention. And to remain with that suffering choicelessly, without any movement of thought because thought is the very process which fragments, brings about fragmentation, but when there is no movement of thought but merely that feeling of sorrow, to remain with it completely, then you will see out of that non-action of thought, where there is sorrow comes passion. But you have no passion; you have lust, you have enjoyment, you have enthusiasm, you have got plenty of energy. But passion, there isn't any and it is only when there is passion that you can create. And that passion comes only when you understand and live, and without any movement away from that thing called sorrow.

Now we can go into the question of what is death? Do you want to go into all this? Sure you are not tired? Or are you merely listening to words? Carried away by words? If you are listening with your heart, with your mind, with your whole being attentively, then you must be tired. But we will go on into this question of what is death. You know it is a very complex problem. Like all human problems, death is one of the most complex, despairing, unavoidable, aching problems. And the ancient people in different parts of the world tried to solve it. The ancient Egyptians tried to solve it in their own way, they said, 'Live in order to die so that you can carry on with what you have had' - their tombs are filled. And every other group of communities tried to solve this problem. The Christians, their idea of resurrection, they would be revived in heaven or in hell. And there is that thing called death, the ending, and man doesn't want to end because he has built a house, he has lived in that house, lived with his family, with his children, with his enjoyments, with his troubles, with his anxieties, fears,

pleasures, with all the accumulated knowledge, and he says, 'Why should I die? It is unfair, why should it happen to me, let it happen to somebody else'. And because there is this death one hopes that there is something of you continuing after you die. The Asiatics exploded over Asia many centuries ago, as the Greeks exploded over Europe, their ideas, their beauty, their philosophy, their rationalization and so on. India said there is hope, you will be reborn next life, which is reincarnation. Please listen to this carefully. You will be re-incarnated depending on how you live now. If you live wrongly, mischievously, without consideration, if your behaviour isn't righteous, true, honest, then you will suffer more in the next. And those who believe in it, and there are billions, naturally lead a stupid immoral life. Because their belief is just a verbal comfort, it gives them solace. And so they lead a life that is cruel, dishonest, double thinking, talking, you know what is happening. And in this part of the world you have your own theories, if you are at all concerned about them, and I'm afraid you are not, because you try to avoid it. You try to decorate death. Your gurus, your teachers, all those people who talk about religion and all that, never talk about the enormity, the beauty, the vitality, the strength of death because you are not interested. What you are interested in is the immediate, the immediate satisfaction, pleasure, the fulfilment of certain desires. So when you are concerned with death you must be concerned with the ending. And you are afraid, naturally because you are so attached, to your belief, to your profession, to your family, to your books, to your knowledge, and to let all that go does breed fear.

So that is actually what is. If you observe it yourself. Then we

can ask: what is the significance, the meaning of death? What is it that dies? And is there an ending which is incarnating now, not in the future? You are following this? There is an ending, whether you will like it or not, willy-nilly there it is, dying through old age, disease, accident, at the last moment totally unconscious. And it is there, ending, the organism comes to an end. And you who have identified with that organism, you psychologically, what is that you? Please go into this with the speaker, because that is what one is basically afraid of: this sense of ending the `me', the `me' that has lived, the `me' that has fought, struggled, the `me' that has accumulated, cultivated certain qualities, the `me' that has gone through every form of travail, suffering, torture, anxiety - what is that me? Is it a verbal skeleton put together by thought - please listen to this - put together by thought and therefore has no reality whatsoever? Reality, as we explained, is that which thought thinks about. You have thought about yourself, your comforts, your position, your work, your advancement, your enjoyment, your beliefs, your griefs, your success, you are so terribly concerned about yourself. So yourself becomes the reality of thought, and that thought says, `I am coming to an end, there is no tomorrow', and naturally the thought that has created that reality is frightened, and it must have hope. And hope then becomes a thing some time in the future, a belief.

So time is the process of thought. And if you suddenly realize for yourself now, sitting there, psychologically there is no tomorrow - you understand? - psychologically realize that there is no tomorrow, that means that you won't fulfil your desires, that you won't meet your friend and so on, no tomorrow - what will you do?

You will be in despair, you will be shocked. And that is death.

So first look at the life that we are leading, actual life, not a life of ideals, a life of something we should do, or ought not to do, but the life that we live actually, daily. It is one of constant inward struggle, conflict outwardly, anxiety, worry, problems, the problem of poverty, losing position, losing a job, wanting greater success, spending years and years and years in an office, or in a factory, disease, old age, fear, that is your daily life. And to that you cling desperately. And death is there - please listen to this. We are speaking of something that we have actually done, not theorizing about it, not speculatively imagining fancy, but what actually has been done. That is, to end psychologically to everything that you want tomorrow, because that is what death is, to end your desire, not control your desire, not suppress it, see what death means. That is, you have made an artificial gap between living and dying, a gap of time, psychological time. The living with all that misery, confusion, mischief, and death something far away, to be put away, to be run away from. So there is this time interval, time gap created by thought. And to shorten completely that gap, to have no gap, which means living and dying. You understand? Not to die some time in the future when you are diseased, unconscious, but living with vigour, vitality, full attention, knowing what exactly is happening inside your consciousness, and to shorten or not to have that gap at all between the living and the dying. Therefore there is an incarnation each moment, there is a newness. And that is creation.

And man has sought immortality. A writer, if he is a good writer, seeks immortality through his books, through his words,

through his thoughts, he is there, at least he is there, he thinks, permanently. There is nothing permanent. There is no permanency of you. Others seek immortality in history, the politicians, the kings. But you and I are not writers, we are not kings, we don't make history. We are ordinary people, living with trouble, pain, anxiety, not knowing, confused, with a little affection, we are the ordinary people. And also we want immortality. We have never asked what is immortality. That is, not mortality, immortality means no dying. And if one has gone into it very deeply, one sees there is nothing permanent, nothing, whether on earth or in yourself. Which isn't a despair, which isn't something to be frightened of. And when you see there is nothing permanent, that very observation, that very perception is the highest form of intelligence. And intelligence, which is not personal, which is not yours, nor mine, is the everlasting. And from there the mind becomes infinite, because it is no longer caught in attachment, it is no longer seeking anything, any experience. It is completely a light to itself and therefore eternal.

Do you want to sit quietly, or to ask questions? If you want to sit quietly, sit quietly and I will leave you. But if you want to ask questions, ask something that relates to your life, not some theory.

Q: What do you think of the position of Frederick Teacher who maintains that much of suffering comes about trying to live up to the dictates of grief and twisted morality?

K: Right. Ideals corrupt men. Ideals are the projections of thought which have no substance. Therefore when you are trying to live up to something according to an ideal, according to a conclusion whether Christian or Hindu or Buddhist or what you



will, you are leading a double life, a hypocritical life and therefore there is suffering. But if you observe what actually is, what is actually going on in your daily life, then having no contradiction you can look.

Q: If innocent action, although I don't understand it, is necessary to acquire a change; is there any way I may invite this change without entering into thought, or striving, without it becoming premeditated?

K: You are speaking too close to the microphone. Please don't take photographs. This isn't an amusement park, for god's sake. You are grown-up people, serious people.

Q: If innocent action is required for change, is there any way one can invite this change without entering into thought, or becoming too premeditated? Or am I wrong?

K: I'm afraid I don't understand American voices or American language. It may be my shortcoming but would you put it very simply and clearly.

Q: To lead a better life requires a change. I think I don't quite understand you. You said it required an action not an intellectual understanding.

K: The lady asks, to lead a better life there must be change, and an action corresponding to that change. Right? You know this idea of `better' is the enemy of the good. Do you understand what I am saying? You cannot become good. There is no `better good'. You are either good or not good. But we are so conditioned to better ourselves, to become something. So to be good now is to think non-comparatively, to observe without comparison. I am not good, suppose, I am not good. I am greedy, I am violent, I am stupid. Is

my stupidity - please listen to me - is my stupidity the result of comparison because you are clever and I am dull therefore I call myself stupid? If I have no comparison, am I stupid? Or am I, what I am? And the observation of what I am brings about a radical revolution.

Q: Sir, when you mention the cessation of the 'me', and the coming to an end of the organism, now when there is a dying every moment, there is the cessation of me. Now at that moment there is no me, not like what we call death, now is that death immortality? And if that is immortality whenever there is the cessation of the 'me' and there is ending of the living organism, what then is immortality?

K: Sir, are you asking a question of a theory, a theoretical question? Or are you asking actually what happens if there is no me? Can I live in this world surrounded by a thousand me's, who all working for themselves, who are all concerned with their own petty little happiness, desires, fulfilments, me, how can I live in this world without I also being aggressive, violent, stupid. Are you asking that question? If you are, if there is no me, then there is intelligence. Not the intelligence of the intellect, but that supreme excellent intelligence in which there is compassion, there is love, there is no sense of fear, then that intelligence is, because it is supreme, it is everlasting to everlasting.

Sir, look there are so many questions all in a row, would you mind putting your question very briefly?

Q: I hope to make my question very clear. I observe that sleeping sickness is an outgrowth of a germ. And I see that our way of life has its roots in Europe and in Asia. And I see that in Europe

and in Asia tradition has made deserts out of their land, their animals extinct, and trees extinct, and over population. These are worldwide problems today.

K: Are you saying, sir, to make it brief, that you are the result of the traditions, troubles, the churches and all the rest of it over Europe, and you are the result of all that?

Q: No, that is not what I said. I am saying that our way of life has its roots...

K: I understand, sir, you are the result of all that.

Q: I am not. I don't consider myself personally the result of this, otherwise I don't think I would be asking this question of you, or listening to you. I never said that in Europe and in Asia there has been customarily mercy. Unlike the people of Africa and Australia and North and South America, exclusive of course of the Indians. I think we are communing. I hope so.

K: Would you ask your question, sir?

Q: What I am really concerned with is the European, Asiatic community has come in contact with processes of Australia, Africa, North and South America.

K: What is happening?

Q: I understand the question.

K: She is telling you, my darling be quiet.

Q: You know when you were talking about mortality and immortality, you came to the point where you said one must examine immortality to see if it is worthwhile, and you began...

K: Not worthwhile. Sir it is not a question of worthwhile. This has been the problem of man for centuries. What happens after death, is there a continuity, or is there not? Is there something

permanent, or is there nothing permanent? It is not worthwhile, it is not that you are going to get something out of it.

Q: I didn't mean it that way exactly. What I meant was, you were saying let us examine immortality and it seemed that there was an implication, I didn't understand how you got to the place where you said the mind becomes infinite. I just lost you there.

K: I am sorry I can't go into it all again sir.

Q: OK.

K: Please let the others have some chance sir?

Q: Do you mind if I make myself clear. I asked you a question.

K: Ask your question sir.

Q: Did you understand what I was saying before?

K: Yes sir. But ask your question sir.

Q: I appreciate your patience.

K: Not my patience. It is not my patience, the lady who came up, she is asking you for patience too.

Q: As I said, when European and Asiatics...

Q: I have considered some of what you said yesterday and today and I thank you for coming to talk to us. I have taken some of what you said for myself in a very brief way. The development of Asia and Europe have developed sophisticatedly which has caused much suffering, while the undeveloped tribal countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia have developed religions which have played very positive roles in their communities. Do you believe there is any current relationship between progress and society, thought and violence?

K: Do I believe in progress...

Q: A relationship between progress and society.

K: Would you put it in my language.

Q: In other words, if a human being is thinking, does he have a chance of living without destroying himself? It seems that the religions of developed countries, which have developed the religions on the basis of their thought have also gone about thinking and have also gone about killing themselves.

K: Would you like me to put in French? I don't know what you are saying. Sir, please forgive me, I really don't understand what you are asking.

Q: Is he asking: is it possible to have progress in a society without having a counterpart of violence with it? Isn't that the question?

Q: Yes, that's what I am asking.

K: Can you have progress in society without having violence? Oh, my god is that all? Can you have progress without violence. Do you know what that word `progress' means originally? To enter into the enemy's country fully armed.

## **4TH PUBLIC TALK MASONIC AUDITORIUM SAN FRANCISCO 25TH MARCH 1975**

This is the last talk. During the last three times that we met here we have been talking about the chaos in the world, the misery, the suffering, and the desire for entertainment and the avoidance of fear. We went into several things concerning our daily life. During all these talks it must have been very clear that we are concerned with the human transformation psychologically, for that alone can bring about a change in the society in which we live because in ourselves there is a radical psychological transformation. That is what we have been going over together. And this evening we said we would talk about meditation.

This is really a very, very complex question, and to go into it very deeply one requires a mind that is passionate, and we explained the meaning of that word. It requires a great earnestness, and an attention, which is not concentration. But before we go into this question of meditation, we ought to consider why, throughout the world, human beings are becoming degenerate. Degeneracy means the failure to live excellently, in its highest form. And degeneracy also implies the cultivation of memory only, and acting according to that pattern, according to that knowledge as memory. Therefore life becomes more and more mechanical. Our responses are mechanical, our attitudes are mechanical and our actions. All that indicates the degeneracy of the human mind. And to put an end to that degeneracy with all its violence, brutality, cruelty, mainly concerned with amusement and the search after pleasure, to put an end to all that one needs quite a different kind of energy.

Not the energy of strife, not the energy of thought, not the energy of contention, argument, but a totally different kind of energy. And it is through meditation only that one comes upon this energy, which is not the product of thought.

First of all, most people in this country have never heard that word meditation before the invasion of the gurus. And I wish that you had never heard the word, because then you and I, the speaker, can investigate together, to find out whether it is necessary to meditate, what value it has, what significance, not the market value but what significance it has in one's life, the daily living, because with that we are concerned - the transformation of the human mind and heart in the daily living, and if there is, or if there is not, something sacred, holy in life. And that is what we are this evening going to investigate together, to understand the significance of meditation, what are all its implications, and to deny totally what is not important, essential.

All religions, organized belief which are called religions, throughout the world have stated as a form of faith, belief and hope that there is something immeasurable, that there is something beyond; and you can come upon it only through great austerity, through self-abnegation, through control of your desires, devoting your life to good work and so on. At the end of it the reward is something that is eternal, blissful and so on. If we could this evening put away all these ideas, concepts and theories and find out for ourselves if there is something sacred; not the word, because the word is not the thing, the description is not the described, if there is something real, not an imagination, not something illusory, fanciful, a myth but a reality that can never be

destroyed, a truth that is abiding. And to find that out, to come upon it, all authority of any kind, specially spiritual, must be totally set aside. Because authority implies conformity, obedience, acceptance of a certain pattern. A mind must be capable of standing alone, be capable of being a light to itself. And following another, belonging to a certain group, following certain methods of meditation laid down by an authority, by tradition, by group practice and so on are totally irrelevant to a man that investigates into this question, whether there is something eternal, timeless, something that is not measurable by thought, that operates in our daily life. Because if it does not function, if it is not part of our daily life then meditation is an escape and absolutely useless.

So what we have been talking about during the last three talks is the investigation into behaviour, to establish right relationship, not based on image, hurts, that utter lack of love, and to have no psychological fear at all. All this implies that one must stand alone. There is a difference between isolation and aloneness, between loneliness and being able to stand by yourself clearly, unconfused, uncontaminated.

Because meditation is really quite an extraordinary process if one goes into it, as we are going to this evening. So we are not telling you how to meditate. That is too absurd. When you ask, how to meditate, you want a pattern, a system, which can be laid down by thought - thought, as we pointed out the other day, what it thinks about is reality, but it is not truth. So there is no 'how' - how to meditate. The word 'meditation', the root meaning of that word, is to ponder, to think over, according to the dictionary, to give one's attention deeply; and also it means to measure. Measure



implies time, movement from here to there. And when you ask how to meditate, time is implied - time being measurement of thought. And measurement is necessary technologically, physically; but measurement psychologically has no value at all. Measurement implies comparison, conformity, imitation, obedience. And time is involved.

So we must understand this question of time. Time is movement, both physically and psychologically, inwardly. Time is necessary to go from here to there. The distance covered, mileage, kilometres and so on, that requires time. And is there psychological time at all? Or thought has invented it for psychological purposes in order to achieve a psychological result. For that you need time, but is there psychological time at all? I hope you are following all this because talking to oneself, one can do that in one's room. But we are sharing this together, not the speaker is giving you something, but together we are taking a journey, together we are eating the same food, the same nourishment, drinking at the same fountain. What is important is the water, not who has led you to the fountain. So we are partaking, sharing this investigation together. So please do listen, because it affects your whole life, it affects your activity, your labours, your daily relationship, the society in which you live, the culture which you have created. We are concerned with the whole of life, not one segment of it, one fragment of it, but the whole. That is, what you do, what you think, what you feel, how you behave. And as we are concerned with the whole of life we cannot possibly take a fragment which is thought, and through thought resolve all of our problems, because thought itself is a fragment, and it may give to itself an authority to bring

all the other fragments together, but thought has created these fragments. And when we are investigating, sharing together this question of meditation we have to find out the measurement of thought as time, measurement as a movement towards a particular direction, as time, to control, to discipline, to achieve so-called enlightenment. All that is implied in measurement.

So we are asking, though physically time is necessary to go from here to your house, to build a house, a bridge, to learn a language, to learn how to drive a car and so on, time is necessary, but is there psychological time? Is there a betterment of the 'me', of the self? And is the 'better' the good? All that is involved in considering the question of time. Because in meditation one must understand the significance of thought, its value and its total irrelevancy in going beyond measurement. We are going to go into all that presently.

So first, meditation implies the freedom from measurement, that is, freedom from time, is that possible? Because we are conditioned to think in terms of progress, of gradual achievement. We believe in psychological evolution. But is there such a thing as me psychologically achieving something other than the projection of thought? You know most of you probably believe in god, don't you?

Audience: Yes.

K: That is a rather feeble yes! And when you investigate into this belief, what is god? There is the Hebrew god, the Christian god, the Hindu god, the Muslim god and so on. Is it an invention of the mind, of thought? Is it a projection of thought because thought says to itself there is nothing permanent in life - my relationship,

my love, my profession, my knowledge, my experience, faith, in all that there is nothing permanent. And it projects in fancy, in imagination, in hope, an idea called god. And so the projection is yourself ennobled, so you are worshipping yourself. Do you understand the significance of that? So we are not investigating into the reality of whether there is god or no god, because that is fairly simple because there are so many gods, as so many beliefs, they are all projections of thought. And thought in itself, what it thinks about is reality but it is not truth.

So we are going to find out through meditation if there is something that is not projected by thought, that is not an illusion, a myth. And so to go into that one must ask whether thought can be controlled, whether thought can be held in abeyance, whether thought can be suppressed, so that the mind is completely still. You know this has been a problem for a man who is really truly trying to find out, trying to meditate. That is, to control thought. So he says, 'I can only control thought through discipline, through concentration, through total identification with that which thought has projected.' And all the scriptures, the teachers of meditation, their systems, all say - if you have gone into it - control, discipline, obey. And the speaker is saying something quite the contrary: not the opposite of what they have said, but what they have said is merely a process of suppression, a process of disciplining the mind or the thought according to a pattern in order to achieve a result. So we have to go into this question of control.

Control implies, the controller and the controlled, doesn't it? Who is the controller? Is that not also created by thought, one of the fragments of thought which has assumed the authority as the

controller? If you see the truth of that then the controller is the controlled, the experiencer is the experienced, the thinker is the thought - they are not two separate entities. So if you understand that then there is no necessity to control. Then what takes place, if you don't control, then what takes place? I hope you are sharing all this together, are we? At least I hope so. Otherwise you are wasting your time.

Then what takes place, if there is no controller because the controller is the controlled, then what happens? When there is a division between the controller and the controlled there is conflict, there is a wastage of energy. And when the controller is the controlled there is no wastage of energy, then there is the accumulation of all that energy which has been dissipated in suppression, in resistance, brought about through division as the controller and the controlled. And when there is no division you have all that energy to go beyond that which you thought must be controlled. Is this clear? Please at the end of the talk there are going to be no questions, so please if you don't understand we will go into it differently.

Discipline means to learn, a disciple who learns from a teacher. The word means to learn. In learning any language, any technique, that very technique, that very language creates its own order, its own act of learning. And in meditation this must be clearly understood, that there is no control of thought, no disciplining of thought, because the one who disciplines thought is a fragment of thought, one who controls thought is a fragment of thought. If you see the truth of that then you have all that energy which has been dissipated through comparison, through control, through

suppression and so on, all that energy to go beyond what actually is. Then in meditation - we are not advising you how to meditate or what meditation is, it is only fools give advice, and those who accept advice are also fools, so we are not giving advice, we are saying what is not meditation. All the systems that you have been offered in this country by the so-called people who seem to know what meditation is, if you follow a system it needs practise, when you practise you make your mind mechanical, repetition, you practise in order to achieve a result. You know we were told the other day by a pianist that a good pianist never practises, what he practises is his mistakes. So each time he plays that is his practice. All right, may I go on?

So in meditation don't follow anybody, including the speaker. Don't follow any system because it will make your mind dull, stupid, mechanical, it destroys whatever energy you have because you need tremendous energy to go beyond all thought. And they are introducing in this country, most unfortunately, miracles - not that there are no miracles, there are, but not the miracles of these gurus - they are introducing all kinds of things which ancient India kept secret. And when you vulgarise these secrets they lose their potency. Now there are these Kundalini meditations, Yoga meditation and all the rest of it. You know what yoga means? It is a Sanskrit word which means to join, to join the higher with the lower, the higher spirit, the higher energy, the highest form of the self to the lower, to join. And that implies a division. And who is to join them? And so they invent a higher self. So there is always division, always duality, and so maintain conflict. So if one may point out, don't follow all this. Use your reason, clarity to find out

the truth.

And in meditation the essential thing is the mind must be absolutely quiet. And is that possible? You know they say it is possible if you know how to breathe properly, if you sit in a certain posture, cross your legs, hold your hands in a certain way, do all kinds of tricks, and then perhaps you will have a mind that is utterly quiet. There is a story of a teacher to whom a very devout and serious disciple comes. And takes the posture of cross-legged, closing his eyes, holding his hands in a particular way, and so the teacher says, 'What are you doing my friend?' He says, 'I am meditating.' And he goes on meditating, so the teacher picks up two pieces of stone and rubs them together, making a noise. So the meditator, the disciple says, 'Master what are you doing?' 'I am trying to rub these two stones to make one of them into a mirror'. And the disciple says, 'Master you can do that for ten thousand years, you will never make that stone into a mirror'. So the teachers says, 'You can sit like that for ten thousand years' - and that is what you are doing. You learn all the techniques, all the ways they are teaching you, but your mind and your heart are empty.

So we are asking whether the mind can be absolutely still, because that which is still has great energy. It is the summation of energy. And can that mind, which is chattering, always in movement, which is thought, always looking back, remembering, accumulating knowledge, this constantly moving, changing, can that thought be completely still? Have you ever tried, if you are interested and serious, to find out if thought can be still? And if it is not, how are you going to find out how to bring about this stillness of thought? You see thought is time; time is movement;

time is measurement. Now in daily life you measure, don't you? You compare, both physically and psychologically. That is measurement, comparison means measurement. Can you live a life without comparison in daily life, not in meditation but in daily life can you cease to compare altogether? And when you do compare, when you are choosing two materials, this cloth or that cloth, when you compare two cars, their mechanism, when you compare knowledge, but psychologically, inwardly we are comparing ourselves with somebody; and when that comparison ceases, as it must, then can you stand completely alone? That is what is implied when there is no comparison, which doesn't that mean you vegetate. So to find out in daily life, not to compare that you have been happy and now you are not happy and you want to be happy, you have had certain experience and you want that experience enlarged, given strength and so on, comparing in your relationship how happy you were when you were first married, when you first met the girl and later on how it withers. That is remembrance of things past, comparing with the present. Can you live a life without comparison? Do it once and you will find out what is implied in that. Then you throw off a tremendous burden. And when you throw off a burden which is unnecessary you have energy.

And we are asking: is it possible for thought to be completely still? And meditation is a non-directive in which there is no operation of will at all. So we will go into that. Will, that is, 'I will do, I will control, I must achieve' - all that is the action of will. Will is the essence of desire, the achievement of a certain result through desire, and desire accentuated, hardened is will. And we are educated to exercise our will. Is there a way of living in daily life

without the action of will? Will implies a form of resistance, does it not - as concentration is a form of resistance. So is it possible to live a life, daily life, in which there is no exercise of will, comparison and how is this to come about? Attention is something totally different from concentration and the action of will. You know when you attend to something there is no centre as the entity who is attending. Have you ever done any kind of attention, given any kind of attention to something totally? Now you are listening, aren't you, to what the speaker is saying. Are you giving attention to him, to what he is saying? Or are you listening with a comparative mind which has already acquired certain knowledge and comparing what is being said to what you already know? Listening half-heartedly, interpreting what is being said according to your own knowledge, your own tendency, to your own prejudice? All that is not attention, is it? But if you give complete attention, that means with your body, with your nerves, with your eyes, with your ears, with your mind, with your whole being, when you so attend there is no centre from which you are attending, there is only attention. That attention is complete silence. Have you understood this? Please do listen to this. Nobody is going to tell you all these things, unfortunately. And so please give your attention to what is being said, non-comparatively, don't interpret what is being said according to what already you know. So that the very act of listening is a miracle of attention. And in that attention there is no border, there is no frontier, and therefore there is no direction, there is only attention. And when there is that attention there is no me and you, there is no duality, there is no observer and the observed, there is only attention. And this is not possible when



the mind is moving in a particular direction. Do you understand? Look, we are educated and conditioned to move according to directions, from here to there. We have an idea, a belief, a concept, a formula that there is a reality, that there is a bliss, that there is something beyond thought and we fix that as a goal, as an ideal, a direction and walk in that direction. When you walk in a direction there is no space. When you are concentrated and walk or think in a particular direction you have no space in the mind. And space is necessary. You have no space when your mind is crowded with attachments, with fears, with the pursuit of pleasures, with the desire for power, position, then the mind is overcrowded, it has no space. And where there is attention there is no direction, but space.

Now meditation implies no movement at all. That means the mind is totally still, it is not moving in any direction. There is no movement, movement being time, movement being thought. If you see the truth of it - not the verbal description of it but the truth, which cannot be described - if you see the truth of this then there is that quiet still mind. And it is necessary to have a quiet mind, not in order to go to sleep longer, or to do your job better, or to get more money, but as most people's lives are so empty, so poor, though they may have a great deal of knowledge their lives are poor, contradictory, not whole, unhappy, so all that is poverty. And they waste their life trying to become rich inwardly, cultivating various forms of virtue and, you know all the rest of that silly nonsense. Not that virtue is not necessary, virtue is order, and order can only be understood when you have gone into this question of disorder in yourself. We do lead a disorderly life. That is a fact. And to understand what that disorder is, the contradiction, the

confusion, the various assertive desires contradicting each other, saying one thing and doing another, having ideals and the division between you and the ideal. All that is disorder. To be aware of that disorder, to give your whole attention to that disorder, out of that attention comes order, which is virtue, a living thing, not a thing contrived, practised and made ugly.

And man desires power, he has conquered the air, nature, he wants power politically, he wants power spiritually, he wants power in his relationship. And everybody is seeking power, which gives him a certain status. And in meditation the mind does acquire certain powers, but they are to be totally avoided because then mind or thought becomes a slave in the pursuit of those powers which give ultimately pleasure. Powers of thought-reading, producing miracles and so on.

So meditation in daily life is the transformation of the mind, the psychological revolution, so that we live in daily life, not in theory, not as an ideal, but in every movement of our life, in which there is compassion, love, and the energy to transcend all the pettiness, the narrowness, the shallow life that one leads. When that mind is quiet, really still, not made still through desire, through will, then there is a totally different kind of movement which is not of time. You know to go into that would be absurd. It would be a verbal description and therefore not real. What is important is the art of meditation. The word `art' means to put everything in its right place. You understand the meaning of that word? Not that which is contained in the museums, but putting everything in our life, in our daily life, in the right place. That is the art of meditation, so that there is no confusion. And when there is in our daily life order,

righteous behaviour and a mind that is completely quiet, then the mind will find out for itself whether there is the immeasurable or not. Until you find that out, that which is the highest form of holiness, one's life is dull, meaningless, as most people's lives are. And that is why meditation, right meditation, is absolutely necessary, so that the mind is made young, fresh, innocent. As we explained the other day, the word 'innocency' means a mind that is incapable of being hurt. All that is implied in meditation, which is not divorced from our daily living. In the very understanding of our daily living meditation is necessary. That is, to attend completely to what we are doing. When you talk to somebody, the way you walk, the way you think, what you think, to give your attention to that. That is part of meditation.

So meditation is not an escape, is not something mysterious, and out of that meditation comes a life that is holy, a life that is sacred, and therefore you treat all things as sacred.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 28TH AUGUST 1976**

What shall we talk about this morning? I would like to talk over together with you, if I may, the very serious problem of how to bring about deep transformation of man, of a human being. That's what I would like to discuss, talk over and share together. If it is at all possible for man, a human being, who represents the whole of the world - every human being is the whole of the world - can that human entity undergo a deep, radical transformation; not superficial changes, not move from one cage to another, or one system to another, one guru to another, or one belief to another, but deep transformation which implies freedom totally from all belief, from all ideals, from all contradictions in our actions in our daily life? And can this be done without any effort, without the battle of the opposites?

That is the problem and that is the question I think we ought to talk over together during these four talks and two discussions. Because I feel that when a human being changes radically he affects the whole consciousness of the world because the world is you and you are the world, basically. You may have different manners, different costumes, different colour, different taste, but essentially, deeply, wherever you go - whether the Far East or the Near East or here or America - human beings are essentially the same; they suffer, they have great anxieties, deep problems, problems of relationships, problems of war, nationality, great suffering. So, basically, deeply, every human being is the other human being. I think this is not a theory, a concept, a hypothesis,

but an actuality. This I think is very important to understand; not intellectually, not verbally, but actually feel the reality of it, the truth of it - that we are essentially the same, right throughout the world because our foundation, our existence is based, wherever we are, on relationship, on conflict, confusion, pain, anxiety, great fears and deep sorrow. I think this is a fact; not what I would like to believe, or what I would urge you to believe. But when we know this as a truth, not a conclusion, not a thing that you intellectually contrive, and so believe in, but an actual reality. So you are the world and the world is you. And if there is a radical change in that consciousness, then you affect the whole of mankind.

Can we go on from there? Please, this is not an intellectual gathering - whatever that word may mean - nor is it a form of entertainment. We are fairly serious people I hope, and observing what the world is, what is happening both externally and inwardly - the confusion, the wars, the brutality, and so on and so on and so on, to radically bring about a deep change, which is so utterly necessary and important. It seems to me that our chief problem, or our chief concern is whether it is possible to bring about a radical change in man because we are conditioned. Historically, religiously, by the culture in which we live, our consciousness is enclosed, bound, and we are talking about the content of that consciousness, and the changing of that content. The content makes for consciousness. Doesn't it? Right? Please, though the speaker is expressing this in words we are both of us sharing the thing together. We are not doing propaganda, we are not trying to convince you of anything, because we are not an authority, we are not a guru. To me it is an abomination in matters of the spirit to

have any kind of authority. For authority breeds fear, conformity, acceptance of someone who knows and another who does not know. But when one says, 'I know' you may be sure he does not know.

So, we are sharing this question together; not verbally, not theoretically, but actually in our life in observing ourselves, in becoming aware of our own activities and our own ways of thinking, acting, believing. So we are concerned in the radical transformation in the content of our consciousness. Our consciousness is made up of those things which man has collected during centuries upon centuries of existence - his ideas, his beliefs, his fears, his pleasures, his great sorrow and fear of death, and all the rest of the content, in which is included knowledge - the known as well as the hope to discover what is beyond the known. All that is in our consciousness.

So, please, we are enquiring together into the content of our consciousness which is you, which is yourself, and in that enquiry we are going to discover, if it is at all possible, the nature and the structure of that consciousness, the content of that consciousness, and whether it is possible to empty that consciousness of its content and perhaps come upon a totally different dimension. This is what we are proposing to do during all these four talks and two discussions. So it is not that you merely listen to the speaker, but you are with him enquiring into your consciousness, into your beliefs, into your ideas, fears, pleasures and all the agonies that human beings go through together. So it is your responsibility much more than the speaker's. If you are serious and if you want to go into it we will go together. But if you are not serious, if you

don't want to enquire into all this human misery, and whether it is possible to end it, then please leave! You understand? Leave! It's not worth taking your time and trouble.

So, together we are going to enquire, explore, and to explore there must be freedom. That's necessary isn't it? If you want to enquire into something you cannot come with all your prejudices, with all your beliefs, dogmas, and all the rest of it, or hope, which will prevent your enquiry. So the first thing - and perhaps the first step is the last step - is that there must be freedom to enquire. So, please, we are asking each other in the process of enquiry, that very enquiry demands that one is free to look, free to observe. And it is impossible to observe if you come to it, if you come to explore with all that your previous conclusions, or what you wish it to be. So, there must be freedom to enquire. I hope we are together in this. Shall we go on?

So the first thing is, in enquiry, is the enquirer, the man, the entity different from that which he enquires into? You understand my question? I want to look into myself, into my consciousness. I want to observe the content of that consciousness. I want to be familiar with all the cunning deviations, with all the ideas, thoughts, beliefs, dogmas. I want to look into it. Is the observer different from that which he observes? This is a very important question that you must resolve, otherwise we shall not be able to observe each other. You understand? I hope I am making myself clear.

That is, I want to observe my fear. Or, I want to observe why I have innumerable beliefs, conclusions, prejudices and to enquire into it, is the entity who is enquiring different from that which he is

enquiring into? You understand my question? Am I different from the content of my consciousness? Is this mystifying? Please, question me a little later. If I am different from the thing I observe in myself, then there is division between me and thing which I enquire into. Right? When there is a division between me and that which I enquire into then there is conflict. Then I try to suppress it, control it, or run away from it, or try to wish to change it. But if the observer is the observed then there is a totally different action which takes place. Is this somewhat clear?

We're going to go into a little more. I observe in myself anger. I am angry. Is that different from me who is the observer of that anger? I am that anger, surely. Right? I am not different from that anger. May I go on? Or I am greedy, envious. Is that envy different from me who is observing that reaction which I call 'envy'? Or that envy is me; I am not different from that envy. Or take jealousy: that 'feeling' which we name as jealousy, is that different from me who is observing it? Or that jealousy is me. You are following now? So, when I observe, is there a division between the observer and the observed? Are we dissipating the mystery of it? You understand my question? Are we together in this or am I talking to myself? Because this is very important, right from the beginning. Because we are conditioned to this division as me different from that which I observe. We are conditioned to the conflict of this division. We are conditioned to either suppress it, or analyse it or run away from it. Right? So, we are educated, conditioned to accept this division as me being different from that which I observe, and therefore establish a conflict between me and that which I observe. And when one looks into it very, very deeply -



not very deeply, it's fairly simple - one sees the observer is the observed, therefore, you eliminate all conflict.

So, we are looking, observing our consciousness - the content of it; which is our attachments, whether to a house, to a piece of furniture, or to a person, or to an idea, and so on and so on. When you observe attachment, is the observer different from that which he is attached to? One is attached to an idea. That idea is created by thought, thought which says to itself, "I observe 'what is' and I can change 'what is' by having an ideal, and pursuing that ideal and overcoming 'what is'." This is what we go through. Whereas, the ideal is an escape from 'what is'. No?

And, also, we do not know what to do with 'what is,' therefore we try to create an idea which is the opposite of 'what is' and hope thereby as a leverage to remove 'what is'. Are you following all this? Are we together in all this? Somewhat. So, it becomes very important when we observe ourselves, which is our consciousness with all its content, whether the observer is different from that which he observes. If he is different then there is a division. That division then brings about conflict - the Hindu, the Muslim, the Jew, the Arab, the whole division of mankind. So where there is division there must be conflict. That is a law. So one observes then that in examining, exploring the content of our consciousness the observer is the observed. Right? The fear in the consciousness is my fear, because I am that consciousness, it is part of me which is afraid. Right?

You see we think by this division - the observer being different from the observed - we think conflict is necessary to overcome that which is observed. And we are used to that conflict; it's part of our

tradition, part of our education, part of our culture. And we are saying something entirely different, therefore there is no proper communication. If the observer is the observed then what takes place? You understand?

I am attached to something, to a person, to an idea, to a belief, to a house, or something or other - I am attached - and in that attachment I discover there is fear. I might lose it; the person might run away from me, and so I hold that person or that thing much more closely. So there is conflict going on, isn't there? And we are used to this conflict; it's part of our tradition, part of our education, and we are saying that the division is illusory, is not real. What is real is that the observer, the person who feels angry, the 'feeling' is not different from himself, he is that. Then what takes place? You follow? Before we thought by fighting anger, by suppressing it, by rationalizing it, by analysing it, we would overcome anger. Right? That is, there is a division between me and the feeling that is different. Come on, this is fairly simple. So, what is important is to remove all conflict in observation, then we can go beyond 'what is'. But as long as we are in conflict with 'what is' then we are conditioned by the 'what is'. The observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experienced; so when that is truth, then we can observe our consciousness totally differently; not as an entity who is different from that which he is seeing. Right?

So, what is it in our consciousness, the three principal things, that gather to itself such tremendous energy and importance? One of them is fear. Right. Then pleasure. Then suffering. These are the three principal elements in our consciousness. Right? Fear,

pleasure and sorrow, with all its ramifications, changes, its varieties of fear, varieties of pleasure, multiple changes of sorrow.

So, firstly then let's examine fear - which is part of our consciousness, which is part of yourself. So it becomes very important how you observe that fear. Whether you observe it as an entity separate from fear, or, you observe it as part of you. You are that fear. Right? So, how do you observe that fear. You understand my question? Some of you? Are you at all serious about all this? Does it mean anything to be free of fear? Not only certain forms of fear, but to be completely and totally free of psychological fears; otherwise, we are slaves; otherwise we live in darkness, we get paralysed. So it is very important when you are talking about transformation of man to understand and to be free of fear; not only the psychological fears but when we understand the psychological fears then biological fears can be dealt with differently - the physical fears. So we are dealing first with psychological fears - fear of losing a job, fear of losing oh, god knows what - a dozen things - fear of losing the person whom you think you love, fear of not being loved, fear of loneliness, - a dozen things we are afraid of - from darkness to light, to all the peculiar, neurotic fears that one has; so many forms of it.

Now, how does one be free of fear? Because it is absolutely important, if you want to bring about a deep transformation of the human mind, human consciousness, that one should be totally and completely free of psychological fears.

So what is fear? Fear of something. Right? Is that fear merely a word? I must go into it differently. One is afraid of something; has the word created the fear, or the fear exists separate from the word?

Please, this is very important to capture this. We are used to the implications of words, and the reaction to the word. Death is a terrible thing! So, in the same way, does the word create the fear, or the fear exists independent of the word? What do you think? You understand my question? You don't understand my question?

I am afraid; it is a reaction. I'm afraid of losing my reputation. That's a good idea! Otherwise you wouldn't all be here. I'm afraid of losing it. The fear is there, and that fear is caused by the idea that I might lose my reputation. So, I want to understand the whole problem of fear, not just one aspect of fear - but the whole structure and the nature of fear, the enormity of fear. Now, I say to myself, "Is the fear created by an idea that I might lose my reputation" and therefore I am afraid, and is that fear brought about by an idea; is the idea merely a word? You are following this. So has the word, 'reputation' created the fear, and is there a fear without the word, without the idea that I might lose my reputation? So, is there fear because of a series of words and ideas, or, fear exists apart from the series of words, ideas, implications? Does fear exist by itself? Or, is it a structure of words and ideas and time? You understand?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, fear exists where there are words and ideas and time; time being tomorrow, apart from yesterday. Time, words, ideas bring about this sense of fear. Now I say to myself, "If there was no time, there was no word, no series of conclusions and ideas, would there be fear?" You understand what I am saying now? So, can the mind be free of time, idea and word? If it is not capable of being free then fear will exist. So I have to examine why the mind or the whole thinking process is caught up in words - words, ideas,

conclusions - and all the rest of it. So I must go into the question of "what is thinking"? You understand?

I started out to find out what is the nature of fear, why human beings are caught in this enormous structure of fear and apparently human beings have not been able to be free of fear; they escape from it, they have rationalized it, they do all kinds of things to avoid it but it goes on. We are enquiring, what is the nature and the structure of this fear? Is it the result of thinking about time, what might happen, or what has happened and hoping that it will not happen, which is the process of time, which is a movement of thought; thought is a movement of time. I have discovered that. Thought is a movement in time as from yesterday, through today and tomorrow - what might happen tomorrow, or, what has happened in the past hoping it will not happen again, so all this is a process of time - a movement. Time is movement. And, also, why the mind is caught in words, why words have become of such extraordinary importance - words being the process of thinking, the conclusions, ideas and all that, which is, what is thinking because in thinking I have found out there is fear, in thinking I see time is involved, so I must go into this question of what is thinking?

Please, I am putting it into words; you have to share this thing together, co-operate with this thing; otherwise you will just remain there and I will remain here. Right? So what is thinking? Not what you think about, but how does thinking arise? What is the nature of thinking? Because unless I go into this very deeply and find out the nature of thinking I will never be free from fear. So it is very important to me to find out what thinking is; not what people say is thinking - you understand? After reading books or hearing

somebody, then repeat what others have said thinking is, which is secondhand, and perhaps we are all secondhand human beings.

Whereas we are saying, let's find out for ourselves what is thinking. Thinking surely is the response of memory - right?

Memory is experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain - right? I think this is an obvious fact. So thinking is the response of memory, stored up in the brain through experience, through collective knowledge. Right? So thinking is this movement from the past to the present, modified and going on. Right? We live in the past, most of us, don't we? I had such happy days; it was so nice when I was a boy; oh, it was so nice when we were first married - living all the time in the past, because we don't know what the future is, we are afraid of what the future might be, so, we live in the past. So knowledge is the past. There is no knowledge of the future. There's only knowledge in the past. So thought is a movement from the past. Are we meeting together in this?

So thought is a movement from the past, the past being collected experience - innumerable experiences which have become knowledge; so knowledge is essentially the past. So thought is a movement from the past, modifies itself in the present and goes on to the future. So I have found out - you have found out, not me - you have found out for yourself that thought is a movement from the storehouse of the past. So thought is never free. Right? I wonder if you see this? Thought is a movement from the past, therefore time, and as long as we operate - no, let me put it differently - when we have to operate in thought, where knowledge is necessary, we have to operate there - all the technological knowledge, riding a bicycle, this and that - where

knowledge is essential, there thought operates. Is it possible for thought to remain there and not enter into other fields? You are following my question? That is, I realize I am afraid - fear; fear of not being, fear of loneliness, fear of not being loved, or fear of loving and losing, fear of death, fear of losing a job - you know, a dozen fears. But basically there is only one fear which expresses itself in multiple ways. So that fear is the movement of thought. Right?

Now, in observing that movement, is the observer different from that, different from that which he observes? Are we meeting somewhat together or not? Because you see, please, if we can go into this one question completely and when you leave the tent, the marquee, you are free of fear - you understand - it would be a marvellous thing; that will affect the whole consciousness of mankind if you are free. So, please share this thing together; don't let me talk about it but let us journey into the problem together.

You're afraid of something, aren't you? Every human being is, apparently. Now is that fear different from you? Right? I am asking, is that fear different from you?

Q: I hope so.

K: Or, that fear is you. Please do let us be a little serious, is that fear you? Of course. Like anger - is anger different from you or you are part of that? Obviously. So fear is part of you, but we have learned or been educated to separate ourselves from fear, and therefore we say, I'll control it, I'll change it, I will run away from it, all the rest of it comes into being. But if the fear is you, what will you do? You understand the question now?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No sir, no. First, please, get this one thing clear, at least: as anger is not different from you - which is so obvious isn't it - is not fear part of you? And if it is part of you, what will you do? We are used to separating fear from ourselves and therefore acting upon fear - suppress it, run away from it, and all the rest of it. But when fear is you, action comes to an end. Right? This is very difficult for you to see, because we are so conditioned to this division - me different from fear, and therefore acting upon fear. But we are saying something entirely different; fear is you, therefore, you can't act. Then what happens?

Thought moves from the past through the present to the future. Thought modifies itself through the present to the future, so thought is still the past; it may modify itself, it may change itself, it may put on different clothes, differing colouring - whatever it is, it is still the past in movement.

Please, this is very important, I want to stick to this one thing this morning, if I may. As most human beings are afraid and have accepted fear as part of their life, and therefore live in darkness, therefore live in a kind of paralytic state, and being afraid all forms of neurotic habits, neurotic activities come, it's very important, if there is to be transformation in the human consciousness, that fear must be totally eliminated. And we say it is possible. It is only possible when conflict between the person who says, I am afraid and I will do something about fear, when that conflict comes to an end, that is when the division comes to an end. And that division is artificial, it's an illusion. What is actuality is that the fear is part of you, therefore you cannot do a thing about it - right? - psychologically. Therefore your whole attention undergoes a



change. Before attention was given to the conflict - suppressing, denying, running away. But now when fear is you, your whole attention has undergone a change. That is, you have much greater energy to look at this fear. Before you ran away, you suppressed it, did all kinds of things to it; now, fear is part of you, therefore you observe it with a totally different attention. You get this? Please get this!

Q: You can only look at fear if it is separate, surely.

K: When you look at fear, the gentleman says, then it's apart from you. When fear is you what are you looking at? Do please do watch it. Don't answer me. Do look at it. When fear is you what are you looking at? You are not looking at fear, you are that. So, your attention has changed.

Q: (inaudible)

K: We are coming to that. Attention has changed. Right? Please see that simple thing.

Q: But who is looking at me?

K: I am not looking at you, sir; I am looking at fear.

Q: I am eliminating a part of me.

K: Yes, you are eliminating part of you - which you are afraid of. Part of you is fear. Right? With all the complications of fear. Part of you is pleasure - with all the varieties of pleasure. Part of you is sorrow - different types of sorrow. So, all that is you; you are not different from all that, are you? Or you might think you are god. If you think you are not all that, then you are something different from all that, and being 'different' you are something super human. This is the old Hindu philosophy, that says, "I am not that. We are the soul, we have something precious inside, we are

part of the divine, we are part of the perfect, we are part of the archetype" - you know, all that. So, I personally refuse to accept all that; we must begin with doubt. Right? And when you begin with doubt, completely begin with that, then you end up with complete certainty. But we begin with certainties and end up in nothing. Please give your attention to this question.

As long as there is division between you and fear then there is conflict, there is wastage of energy - by suppressing it, running away from it, talking about it, going to the analysts and so on and so on and so on. But whereas, when you see the truth that you are that fear, your whole energy is gathered in this attention to look at this thing. Now what is that thing which we call fear? Is it a word which has brought fear, or is it independent of the word? You are following this? If it is the word, the word being the associations with the past; I recognize it because I have had fear before. You understand? I look at that fear though it is part of me because I name it, and I name it because I have known it to happen before. So, by naming it I have strengthened it. I wonder if you see this? So, is it possible to observe without naming it? If you name it, it's already in the past, right? If you don't name it, it's something entirely different, isn't it? Is it possible not to name that thing which you have called 'fear', therefore free yourself of the past so that you can look. You cannot look if you are prejudiced. If I am prejudiced against you, I can't look at you; I am looking at my prejudice. So is it possible not to name the thing at all? Then if you do not name it, is it fear? Or has it undergone a change, because you have given all your attention to it. When you name it you are not giving attention to it, when you try to suppress it you are not

giving your attention to it, when you try to run away from it you are not giving your attention to it - whereas when you observe that fear is you, and not name it - what takes place? What takes place? You are doing it now. What takes place?

Q: It's an emotion.

K: Wait, it is a sensation, isn't it? A feeling which is sensation. Please watch it, it's a sensation isn't it? All feelings are sensations. I put a pin in there, and all the rest of it. So it's a sensation. What's wrong with sensation? Nothing is wrong with sensation, is it? But when sensation plus thought, which becomes desire with its images, then the trouble begins. I wonder if you understand all this?

You know, this is part of meditation. You understand, this is really part of meditation. Not to sit under a tree and just think about something or other, or try to concentrate, or try to repeat some mantra or some word - coca cola - or something or other - but this is really meditation because you are enquiring very, very deeply into yourself; and you can enquire very deeply only when you are really without any motive, when you are free to look, and you cannot look if you separate yourself from that which you are looking at. Then you have complete energy to look. It is only when there is no attention that fear comes into being. You understand? When there is complete attention which is complete total energy then there is no fear, is there? It's only the inattentive person that is afraid; not the person who is completely attentive at the moment when that feeling arises. That feeling is a part of sensation. Sensation is normal, natural. It's like looking at a tree, looking at people, you know - sensation. But when sensation plus thought,

which is desire with its images, then begins all our problems. You understand this simple thing? Right? Now can you look at your fear - be serious for five minutes! Can you look at your fear, whatever it is; not separate yourself from that fear, but you are that fear, and therefore you give your total attention to that fear. Then is there fear?

Q: No.

K: Then walk out of this tent without fear. Don't say, no and then go outside full of fears.

Do you want to ask questions about this.

Q: What does it mean to be responsible?

K: Sir, the word responsibility - what does it mean to be responsible. To respond adequately, isn't it? The word responsibility comes from the root respond, to respond. Now, do you respond adequately to this question of fear? Or, do you respond with all your tradition, with your culture, you follow - all that conditioning which therefore prevents you from responding fully to this question?

As we said, this is part of meditation. You don't know what meditation is, but this is part of it. When the mind is not afraid then only is it capable of entering into something totally different, but being afraid to try to meditate only leads to illusion, to all kinds of deceptive experiences. So meditation is the investigation into your consciousness, into yourself; and see if there can be freedom from that, from the fear, and to understand the nature and the structure of pleasure, because we all want pleasure. To understand it, to go into it, to find out what is accurate in pleasure, what is right in pleasure - enjoyment, joy. And also to enquire into the whole problem of

fear, not only your particular fear, sorrow, but the sorrow of mankind. All that is involved in meditation which is to discover the truth in yourself, to discover the truth which is a light to yourself so that you don't follow anybody.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 29TH AUGUST 1976**

May we go on talking about what we said yesterday morning? We were saying how important it is that there should be transformation in the human consciousness. I think it is fairly obvious why it is so absolutely necessary and urgent. One can observe right throughout the world there is great disorder - politically, religiously, economically and in our social relationship, which is society. There are wars, cruelty, every form of distortion and apparently no religious person, or group of people have transformed themselves radically and so affected the whole of human consciousness. And what we were saying yesterday was that when there is human transformation, that is, there is a transformation in the content of your consciousness - which is you - then that very transformation affects the whole of mankind. Which again is fairly clear; and I hope one understands this fact that where there is radical transformation - actual, not theoretical, not an ideational or a hypothetical change - but actual transformation in our consciousness, in you as a human being, then that transformation brings about quite a different atmosphere in the consciousness of the world. I think this is clear; because one can see how people - however neurotic like Hitler, this person and that - have affected the world.

So it is necessary if we are at all serious, if you are at all concerned with human behaviour, human condition, and the urgency of that transformation, we must examine together our consciousness, that is, what you are, what we are. And apparently

very few have applied themselves to this transformation; they have talked about it, volumes have been written about it, by the psychologists, the philosophers and the analysts. But, in fact, very few human beings have radically transformed themselves; they are concerned with the outer trimmings, the frills, the branches, but not to tackle the very root of our existence to find out what is totally wrong with us, why we behave like this.

So, what we were saying yesterday, if we may continue with it today, was that in our consciousness there are three principal factors: fear, with all the complications of fear - please observe it in yourselves, don't merely listen to my words. Description is not the described; the word is not the thing. Unless one observes oneself through what is described - the description - then you can go into yourself and observe the described, the fact. So we were saying yesterday there are three major factors in our consciousness which is fear, pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure and great sorrow. Sorrow implies grief, travail, anxiety, every form of neurotic behaviour, all that is in our consciousness, and is it possible to change that consciousness, to bring about a profound revolution in that consciousness? And if you are really concerned about it we can then share the thing together. But if you are merely playing with words and with theories, beliefs and dogmas, joining this group or that group, this guru or that guru then I'm afraid we have very little in common with each other. So if you are concerned then we were talking yesterday about fear. We said that fear is the movement of thought, movement of thought as time; it is very simple, don't let's complicate it. Time in the sense, one is afraid of tomorrow, or one is afraid of things that have happened in the past

and not wanting it repeated again in the future. So, thought is a movement in time. Right? And fear is part of that movement of thought. Right?

Please look at it; we are communicating with each other. Communication implies sharing not only the verbal meaning but the actual substance of the word, the significance of the word, the depth of the word, so we are together exploring, we are not telling you what to do, because we are used to this habit of following others, therefore we establish an authority and then accept that authority because in ourselves we are disorderly and out of that disorder we create an authority whom we hope will help us to get out of our confusion. On the contrary we are saying that in the matters of the mind, the psyche, in the matters of spiritual things - if I may use that word 'spiritual', it rather stinks, but doesn't matter, we'll use that word - there's no authority, there is no guru, though this country and the western world is inundated by the gurus from India. So we are saying, communication means sharing, thinking together, observing together - together, not the speaker says something, you accept it or deny it, but sharing, actually together what we are observing in ourselves.

So we have said thought is a movement in time as measure and that fear is the movement of thought. When there is no movement of thought there is no fear. We went into it yesterday fairly deeply and perhaps I can go into it very, very briefly again now, which is, fear - the root of fear, not the various expressions of fear, various objects of fear, but the root of fear which is so destructive, which brings about such darkness, paralysis of the mind - that fear, does it come about through the word 'fear' or is it independent of the



word? Please observe, examine your fear in that way as we are describing. Does fear exist without the fear, or does the word 'fear' create fear? That's one problem. Then, how do you observe fear? When you say, "I know I am afraid" - how do you know? Is your knowledge based on past experiences of fear? So you are looking at the fresh fear with the eyes of the past and therefore giving to that new fear, strength. You've understood? That is, I am afraid of something I have done, or something I might do, and that thing I have named as fear; when I have named it, I have recognized it. And the recognition of it only strengthens the fact of fear. Now is it possible to be aware of that fear - the new expression of fear, and not name it, and observe it? You've understood?

Is this clear? May we go on from there? That is, to look at the fresh form of sensation which we call fear, without categorizing it, without putting it into a frame, and thereby giving it vitality. So is it possible to observe that fear without naming, without trying to suppress, analyse, escape from it; just to observe it? And you cannot observe it if you've put it in a frame, because we've already captured it and held it. So what then becomes important is how you observe your fear, how you look at it. Do you look at it as an entity separate from fear? You understand this? That is, do you say, fear is different from me - or the fact is, fear is you? Right? Please this is very important to understand because on this whole thing depends our investigation: how you observe. Do you observe as a separate entity - the observer - and look at that fear, which is the observed, something different, something separated from you? If it is separated from you then there is a gap, there's an interval. Then you try to suppress it, you try to control it, you try to run away

from it, analyse it - and so there is a constant battle going on. Where there is division there must be conflict; like in nationalities, in all class differences, and so on; wherever there is division between the Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Muslim - whatever it is - there must be conflict, struggle, pain.

So, one has to find out very carefully why this division exists; is it an illusion or is it an actuality? Like anger - anger is not separate from you - when you say I am angry, you are anger; it's part of you. But when you are afraid, it's not part of you. You say, I'm going to do something about it, so you have created a division, and hence, conflict. Whereas, when you observe fear, that fear is you, part of you, so the observer is the past. Please understand this very deeply. The observer is the past; he has accumulated a great deal of knowledge, experience and with that memory he looks. So the past meets the present and says, "I am different from the present", whereas the observer is the observed. Right? Please get this. The thinker is the thought. There is no thinker without thought. The experiencer is the experienced.

Let's look into it a little bit more. That is, when you experience something you must recognize it; otherwise it is not an experience. Right? So recognition means you've already known it, so there's nothing new. So the experiencer is the experienced. Like the analyser, when you go to a analyst or the analyser, when you analyse yourself - the analyser is the analysed. See this clearly. If you once understand this basic principle then we can go much further. Which is, you eliminate conflict altogether - inwardly as well as outwardly. Right? So, when you observe fear, are you observing it as a separate person and fear is not part of you and

therefore you are in conflict with it? But when the thinker is the thought, the observer is the observed, what takes place? You understand my question now? You have eliminated conflict altogether. Therefore you have the energy, the attention to give to that fact - which you call fear. It's only when you are not attentive, fear continues. Right. Is this somewhat clear?

So, this is what we were saying yesterday - it took an hour and a quarter - we are trying to make a resume of it in a few minutes.

So we must go on with another factor, which is as we said, in human consciousness which is so limited, so conditioned by these three factors: fear, pleasure, sorrow - it is limited by that; and the content of consciousness is consciousness, isn't it? The house is what is inside. So, our consciousness has these three main factors, and unless these main factors are understood and gone beyond, our consciousness is limited, is conditioned by these three factors, and therefore there can be no radical transformation. We are concerned with radical transformation; not the trimming of the outward edges of life, but the deep problems which confront man, and to change them radically.

So, now we are going to talk about pleasure, which is one of the greatest factors in our life. We are not saying it's right or wrong, good or bad, we are looking at it, we are exploring the content of pleasure, why human beings right throughout the world have pursued pleasure in different forms: pleasure through religion - essentially when you seek what you call god, it is ultimately pleasure. Pleasure in multiple forms - sexual pleasure, pleasure of possession, pleasure of attachment, in which is involved fear - but we will go into it presently - pleasure in achievement, in success,

pleasure in arrogance, pleasure in having a tremendous reputation. So there are these extraordinary forms of complicated pleasure. Why do human beings pursue this? It's not only in the modern age, but also from the ancient of times, this has been one of the major factors. And religion throughout the world has said - organized religion, which is based on authority, belief, superstition and all the rest of it - organized religions have said, you must eliminate pleasure, which is desire, because they said, if you are seeking pleasure you cannot find god, or you cannot serve god. So we are saying let us explore it; not deny it or accept it, nor say, what is wrong with it, why shouldn't I seek pleasure, but we are trying to explore the whole structure and the nature of pleasure - if you are willing. If pleasure is all important to you then don't examine it, because it's going to destroy a lot of things. As we said yesterday also, to understand pleasure deeply, what is its significance, what is its worth, we must examine very closely what is thinking, because part of pleasure is thinking, imagining, making pictures, making images. You understand? So we must go into the question very deeply, if you want to, into the problem, or into the question of what is thinking.

As we said also yesterday, this is part of meditation; the investigation or the examination of fear, the examination and the understanding of pleasure and the ending of sorrow, is part of meditation; not the repetition of some mantra, sitting in a corner and going off into some kind of nonsensical vision - but this is the foundation - please see it - this is the foundation of meditation. If you are not deeply established in this foundation your meditation is bound to lead to illusion - it is meaningless. So we are going to

now together examine what is thinking. Because all our structure all our action, all our beliefs, all our religion - though they say it's revelation - all the rest of it, is essentially based on thought. Right? You cannot possibly deny that. So we are going to look into first, before we examine what is pleasure: what is thinking. Please don't accept what I am saying, what the speaker is saying; look at your own movement of thinking. What is thinking - not, thinking about something, but 'thinking' itself, per se. What is thinking?

Is there a thinking without the word, without a symbol, without a picture, without an image? You understand? Have you ever thought without a word; or are words related to thinking? And if word is related to thinking then the word becomes tremendously important, which it has in our life. When you mention the word, 'god' you somehow, some extraordinary transformation takes place. And when you also say, there is no god, god is dead; it stirs you. So we are slaves to the word. "I am an Englishman." Immediately there's a certain sense of importance; or a Hindu - or whatever it is. So, thinking as we said, is a movement of measure which is time; from the past through the present, modified to the future. That's the whole movement of thought. Thinking then is born out of experience, knowledge as memory, which is stored up in the brain, which is obvious. Please, this is very important because we are going to discuss presently what is death. So you must understand this very deeply, that thought is a movement; movement means time - from here to there, what has been, to what should be - and so on and so on - the ideal and the actual. All this is a movement of time which is thought. Thought is stored up in the brain, in the cells - I'm not an expert, I've just watched myself.

Now, here arises a very interesting problem, if we can go into it. Can time have a stop? Not the chronological time, when you catch a train, and bus - don't confuse it, then you will lose your bus. We are saying, or asking, can time have a stop? Can the movement of thought come to an end? That is, it can come to an end; I'll show it to you, if you would go into it. The past which is all your memories, experiences, remembrances, traditions - all the rest of it - the past, in which we live, of which we are, that movement meets the present, and ends there. What we do is, meet the present, have it modified and move on, so give continuity all the time. You've understood this? I have a problem - sexual, whatever problem it is; I think about it, meet it and end it. So, this is part of meditation which we will discuss when we talk about meditation, because it is very important to find out if psychological time has an end. Because that which ends, only then can something new take place; not if there's constant continuity. Then it's merely mechanical. I won't go into that now; we will come to it later.

So, thought, we said, is a movement of time and measure and it is stored in the brain. That is our process of thinking; so thought is that. Now, what is pleasure? What is the difference between pleasure, enjoyment, joy and there are at rare moments in human life, ecstasy; not hysteria, but ecstasy? So there are these factors: ecstasy, joy, enjoyment and pleasure. Four different factors in this so-called pleasure. What is pleasure? Is there pleasure at the moment, at the second, or, is pleasure after? You're following all this? Please do go into this with me, a little bit. You aren't tired I hope this morning, are you? We are asking, is pleasure at the second, or is it after?

We are talking about pleasure. And it's very important to understand, I think, what a great part it plays in our lives, and we have accepted it as a natural thing and never really examined it very deeply. We were saying that thought is a movement in time and measure. And we are asking what is actually pleasure? Is there an awareness of that sentiment or that feeling at the actual moment of experience, of perception, of observation, or does it come a second after? You understand my question? If it comes a second after then it's a movement of thought. But at the actual second of seeing some marvellous beauty - the sunset, a lovely tree in a field or a beautiful face - at that moment of perception there is no pleasure, there's only perception; but a few seconds later memory begins to operate. That is, thought says I must have more of it. So at the moment there is no recording. Please, this is very important to understand. At the moment of any action which we consider pleasurable, at that second there is no registration in the brain at all; the registration takes place when thought says, I must have more. Haven't you observed this in yourself? So, it is only when thought takes over then the registration process in the brain takes place. Right? And so thought then pursues it - in image in desire and so on. So at the moment of the actual incident, actual happening, the brain is not registering at all.

This is very important to understand, because the function of the brain is to register, and it wants to register because in that registration there is security. Right? And the brain can only operate perfectly when it is secure, either in neurotic action or a neurotic belief, there in that there is security. So registration takes place in order to be secure, or to continue the pleasure of that incident. So

pleasure is non-existent at the moment of action, at the moment of perception, it only takes place after. So can there be no registration after - only perception - and not a continuity of that which you call pleasure. Have you understood what I'm saying? Is this somewhat clear? Wait a minute. You see a mountain, snow-capped, marvellous sight, dignity, stability, endurance - an extraordinary thing to observe. Then the very dignity and the beauty and the majesty of that mountain absorbs all your thought. It's so great you are absorbed in it. But a second later registration takes place - how marvellous that was. The registration and the expression in words, "how marvellous it is", is the movement of thought. So, pleasure is a continuity of that which has happened. This is very simple. Sexually, in observation, it is always after.

Now we are saying, can there be an observation only, and not the movement of thought interfering with that observation? Have you ever tried this in your life: to see something beautiful, observe it and then end it there; not let thought take over and pursue it, through image, through desire and all the rest of it? So, in order to understand the full meaning of pleasure one has to examine not only thought but also desire; one must understand desire. Again, religions have said wipe out desire, control desire, be without desire. I don't know if you have ever been to a monastery, watched the priests, talked to them, and you will see this fear of desire, because desire must be expressed otherwise it becomes a burning flame inside. So one must understand what is desire.

What is desire? When you are asked that question what is your inward response to that question - what is desire? Probably you've never asked it. If you ask it, what is it? It's obviously sensation, the



beginning of it, sensation: seeing something beautiful, a dress, a car, woman, man, whatever it is - see, perception, then contact, sensation, then thought comes. That is, sensation, plus thought equals desire. Desire then creates the image. Right? This is simple. Sensation, thought, desire and the image that desire created. I used to know a chap who used to put aside a piece of sugar for the flies, while he was eating.

So, thought is the response of memory and if there was no memory there would be disorder. Right? Of course. Memory is necessary to function in daily life; technologically, educationally, reading, learning a language, driving a car, and so on and so on. Memory and the remembrance stored up in the brain is necessary, but the disorder comes when there is no order in the structure of memory. I'm getting on to something new!

That is, one recognizes memory is necessary as knowledge - learning a language, and so on - but memory becomes disorder psychologically, because memory is mechanical. Right? So, our relationship with another, if it is mechanical, which is memory, then there is no relationship. I wonder if you see this. Then, therefore, there is no order in relationship. Right? So, one must be aware of this disorder and order. Disorder takes place in relationship when memory operates. I wonder if you get the point of this. You are my wife, or my husband; we have lived together - sex, annoyance, jealousy, antagonism, irritation, nagging, possessiveness and all the strain of relationship. That is disorder. Right? Please see that is disorder because we are operating on memory, and therefore memory which is mechanical in human relationship becomes disorder. Have you captured it? Have you got

it? That is, memory is essential at a certain level, in a certain area, but in human relationship when there is the operation of memory then that brings disorder.

Look at it a little more closely. That is, in our relationship with each other we create images of each other, and the relationship is between these two images. These images are mechanical; they are put together by thought as remembrance - you did this yesterday - I told you that - etcetera, etcetera - memory, which is mechanical. So, when in relationship, in human relationship, there is, mechanistic action taking place there is bound to be disorder, and that's why there's such strain in our relationship with each other. Right?

So, order is necessary for the brain to function properly, efficiently. When there is order the brain is at rest, it hasn't to work to bring about order. Right? That is what takes place when we are sleeping; the memory tries to assert order. When there is so much disorder around us, in ourselves, there is some part of the brain which says, for god's sake, let me put some order in all this mess. So, it puts order in the mechanical activity of life - going to the office, working, all that, the factory, and so on. But it tries to bring order also in our relationship by creating an image of you, or her, and hopes thereby to have an orderly life, which is mechanistic. I wonder if you see this clearly? Therefore, there's always struggle between man and woman. That is, in all relationships, not only with man and woman, in all relationship. When we reduce relationship into mechanical processes there is bound to be disorder. Right? This is a fact. Now to observe the fact. How do you observe the fact? Is the fact different from you? So you are the

fact. So you are the image. You may have a dozen images - when you go to the office you have an image there, when you're working in a factory you have an image there, when you are a secretary you have an image there - and so on and on in your relationships - dozens of images, masks. So, these images are perpetually creating disorder. I am a Catholic - you are a Protestant. Disorder - which is an image, put together by thought, thought which has been conditioned, educated to be a Catholic - as a Protestant, or a non-believer, as a Communist, and so on.

So, there must be order right through life in our relationships, therefore one must understand the process of desire. See how complex it all is - but it's very simple if you once grasp the root of it. There is the disorder of mechanistic relationship and order in the mechanical processes of life, and therefore one has to understand desire. We said, sensation plus thought is desire - with its images. And pleasure is the movement of thought unaware of the whole structure of pleasure. Where there is pleasure there must be fear. I wonder if you get this? It's two sides of the same coin; if you pursue pleasure you are also pursuing fear. Right? Do you see? No?

We are not saying you should not pursue pleasure, but see the implications of it. I seek pleasure and if I don't get it I'm annoyed, I feel frustrated, angry - which then breeds fear. So, they are always going together, fear and pleasure. Right? So thought is the movement giving life to both. If I have no thought of tomorrow I wouldn't be afraid, would I? At the moment of an incident, danger, there is no fear. It's only after. The 'after' is the movement of thought. So, this is very important; can the brain not register at all

and so give movement to thought? I'll explain, just look at it. You see a sunset - I take that as the most simple thing, though it's time worn, it doesn't matter - you look at a sunset. At that moment of perception, the beauty, the colour, you follow, the whole of it - there is no registration, there is just the mere observation of an astonishing sight, which is so. Right? Then thought comes and says, "How marvellous that was, I must write a poem about it, I must write it in a letter to my friend". Or paint it - verbalize it; all the movement of thought. Now, to observe the sunset and not let thought come into it at all, that requires great attention, not to let the movement of thought take over, which is the pursuit of pleasure. Have you got something of this? Do it; you'll find out what a extraordinary thing it is; that the brain which is accustomed to register - and it is necessary for it to register, to bring mechanical order in a certain field - but when it registers and pursues what it has registered then pleasure is the continuity of it which brings about fear also. So, can you observe only without registering. You understand my question now?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I have stated it sir; if you understand it, don't state it in your words. Try to follow, otherwise you will put it into words and then you are merely twisting it. So please just listen. I am aware that I am afraid - psychologically. And not to register that fact at the moment, which requires tremendous alertness. You understand? Doesn't it? Otherwise you mechanically operate. I'm afraid, I must control it, I must run away from it - all the rest of it. But when you observe, in that observation is it possible not to register at all? I see a beautiful face - observe it. That's all! But we don't do that. All the

mechanistic movement of thought comes into being. This requires - as I said - great attention, which is its own discipline, so that the brain is free to observe only and act mechanically.

Now all this is not a process of analysis; to me analysis is a waste of time, whether you psychoanalyse, all the rest of it. It's a waste of time, because the analyser is the analysed. Now, can you see the totality of pleasure at one glance - the whole structure of it? You understand my question? We've said, what is pleasure, we've been through that. Right? Pleasure is the movement of thought after the actuality has gone. Right? We said that; that is the movement of pleasure and the pursuit of it. Now what is desire - and the whole movement of thought. Right? Movement of thought, desire, actual happening of incident and then the continuity given to it by thought. Can you see the totality of the structure of pleasure? Not bit by bit. You understand my question? I wonder if you do. To see something totally, to see something totally is not to have direction. I wonder if you see this? When you look at a map and you have a particular place you want to go to, which is a direction then you don't look at the rest of it; you go from here to Bramdean to London and so on and then it is finished. So, to look at the whole of the map is possible only when you have no direction. Direction means motive. I wonder if you've got it.

So, to see the totality and the nature and the structure of pleasure which is thought, desire and the movement of thought after the incident - to see the totality of it. If you see the totality, then you can describe it in detail, but the description in detail will not give you the whole picture. I wonder if you get it. So, to see something totally - your wife, your husband, your politics, the

whole of it - is possible only when there is no motive that gives direction. So, pleasure is the movement of thought, which is entirely different from that which is enjoyable. You enjoy. If you like food, you enjoy food, but thought comes over and says, I must have the same kind of food tomorrow. Then the habit begins. Then the breakdown of the habit, which thought says, I must break it down, so all the conflict begins. Whereas if you are fond of food, taste it, enjoy it, and end it there. You understand? Not to say, I must have it tomorrow, or this evening. So in the same way to observe your wife, your husband, everything around you without registering and therefore giving it a continuity. Then that gives the brain a tremendous freedom; you have established order where it should be orderly and you have cleared away all disorder in relationship, because then there is no image between you and her, or between another. You've got this? Good!

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **31ST AUGUST 1976**

This is a kind of dialogue - dialogue being a conversation between two friends about something which they are deeply concerned with, and not a mere discussion of ideas, arguments, and so on. But this is a dialogue so that we can converse together over something which we are deeply concerned.

So what would you like to have a dialogue about? And I would suggest, if I may, that we confine ourselves - and this is just a suggestion because you can do what you like - that we concern ourselves with the actual transformation of our own consciousness, how to do it, how is it possible to go into it very, very deeply, in detail. Could we do that this morning? Take one thing, like transformation of a human consciousness, which is the consciousness of the world. I hope you understand that, it is the consciousness of the world, each human being is in essence the totality of human experience, knowledge, misery, confusion, all that he is of which we are, each one of us. So if we can be deeply involved and committed seriously to this question: is it possible to bring about a deep fundamental change in the psyche? Could we stick to that? Would you approve of that, or do you want to talk or have a dialogue about something else? You are perfectly welcome to talk about anything you want.

Q: Could we discuss the question of laughter? Serious people seem to have lost the capacity of laughter.

K: Do you want to discuss or go into this question of laughter? To laugh. Serious people seem to lose the capacity to laugh. That's

one question, any others?

Q: There is a lot of false morality, false assumptions, what it is to be moral, and when we wipe away all the false morality and there is true morality what is its place, and what is its relationship to truth?

K: I understand. Anything else?

Q: Could you go into the structure of thought?

Q: To be an optimist or a pessimist - are they not both a process of thinking? Could we not say that they are two sides of the same coin?

Q: You have explained how the thinker and the thought are not separate and have said that when we accept this a different creative process comes into being without a sense of I. Can we know more of this process and what happens?

K: Can we stop there? Could we take these three or four things? That is, laughter - we seem to lose the capacity to laugh when we become so-called very spiritual - whatever that word may mean; then there is the question of the structure of thought, the nature and the structure of thought; then there is that question of morality and what is its place and what is its relationship to truth; and optimism and pessimism. So shall we take one of these questions because all these questions are concerned with the actual transformation of consciousness, and your question too, which is, when the observer, the thinker is the thought, the analyser is the analysed, then we said all conflict comes to an end, and thereby there is a totally different dimension of observation, or existence, or whatever you like to call it. Now which of these would you like to take as one question and go into it completely to its very end, deeply - which of these



questions do you want to take up?

Q: The last question.

K: The last question, which is, the observer - I think it is a good question, may we take that up? The questioner asks, when we realize, not verbally, actually, that the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, and the analyser is the analysed, when that actual fact takes place, then there is a different dimension because that ends conflict. Would you please go into that much more. Is that your question, sir? And you want to discuss that and what happens.

Q: Is this going to be discussed on a personal level, or an intellectual level?

K: That's what we are going into sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, this is not a confessional. This is not a group therapy, this is not exposing our personal experience to each other, because if you want to do that you are perfectly welcome but I won't be here, because to me that is absurd, exhibitionism and those kinds of things are involved in it - some of them, and I know what the game is.

So, if we may we will discuss this question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going to go into all that madam, that question will answer most of our problems, if we can go into this really with attention, deeply. Please, this is worthwhile. So let's go into it.

First of all we are clear about the question, aren't we? That is, the observer is the observed, and the thinker is the thought, and so on, when that actually takes place, not as a theory, not as a verbal

assertion, but actually as an actual fact, then what comes into being, and what happens when there is no conflict whatsoever? Now we are going to discuss this, go into it.

First of all let's forget the observer is the observed - put that aside, but take the fact, which is we know we are in conflict, most of us are in conflict, most of us are in confusion, most of us have this constant inward struggle - right? That's a fact, isn't it? Could we start from there? This contradiction, this conflict, this sense of constant inward battle that is going on in each human being has its outward expression in violence, in hate, in the lack of a sense of fulfilment, and therefore deep antagonism, all that follows. Right? So where there is division in oneself there must be deep rooted conflict, as between nations, as between classes, as between the dark people and the light people, and the black people, and the purple people, and so on. So wherever there is division there must be conflict. That's a law, it can't be helped. Isn't that so? Do we see that first? Realize it, not the speaker may describe it and you might translate what is the described into an idea and accept the idea. You see the difference. Please this is important, give a little attention please.

We realize there is inward conflict and that inward conflict must invariably express outwardly - outwardly in relationship with each other, outwardly in violence, in wanting to hurt people, in wanting to defend oneself against somebody, we and they, and all the rest of it. Now when you hear that, is it an idea, or is it a fact? You understand my question? Do you translate what you hear into an idea and then accept the idea, or do you actually see your own conflict and the result of that conflict? You understand?

Q: Sir, the problem is that if I look at something...

K: Wait, I am coming to that. First do we realize it?

Q: But for me I can only realize it intellectually.

K: That is ideationally. That is what I am trying to point out.

Our conditioning is, or our tradition is to translate what we hear into an idea, into a concept, into a formula, and live or accept that formula, which prevents us from actually seeing 'what is'. You understand? This is simple. Isn't it? Say, for example, one is hurt from childhood, hurt in so many ways. Does one realize, become aware of this hurt, or you say, "Yes, it is pointed out that I am hurt therefore I am hurt"? You understand? I wonder if you get this. This is very important because throughout the world we translate the fact into an idea and escape through the idea and not face the fact. Right? So what is it you are doing now when you hear that you are in conflict, and being in conflict the outward result is violence, brutality and all the rest of it - is that a fact, or is it a conclusion which you will accept? That's clear, isn't it, from what I am saying? Now which is it for you? This is very important because if it is an idea then we are lost - your idea and my idea. But if we can face the fact then it is something entirely different. Then each one of us has a communication, we are dealing with facts, not with ideas.

Now if that is so, if you really see for yourself that being in conflict in oneself you are bound to create conflict outwardly - bound to. Right? Now when you realize that, what has brought about this conflict inwardly? You understand? There are several factors involved in this. There is a whole group of people who say, change the environment, change the social structure through

revolution, through blood, through any way change it, and that will change man. You understand this? This is a communist theory, this is the materialistic theory: change the environment - the socialist theory - change the environment, the social structure, through legislation, through parliament, through careful analysis and so on, or through revolution, physical revolution, change the environment, the structure of society then that will change man. Then he will be loving, he will be kind, he will not have conflict, he will be a beautiful human being. And they have tried this umpteen times in different ways: the communists have done it, they have not succeeded in making man different; the whole Christian world has postponed the change of man into something else, as the Hindus and so on. The fact is we are in conflict, human beings. And the fact is out of that inward conflict, psychological conflict, he must produce outward conflict. It can't be helped.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have a little patience, sir. I am pointing out something. That is, if there is conflict inwardly there must be conflict outwardly. Now if a man is concerned seriously with the ending of conflict both outwardly and inwardly, we must find out why this conflict exists. You understand. This is simple. Why does it exist? Why is there this contradiction in human beings: say one thing, do another, think one thing and act another - you follow - why do human beings have this thing in themselves? You understand my question, why?

One of the reasons is having ideals. That is, the idea which is the opposite of 'what is', what actually is, project through thought an ideal, so there is a contradiction between 'what is' and 'what

should be'. That is one of the factors of this conflict. Then the other factor is, we do not know what to do with 'what is', how to deal with it, therefore we use conclusions hoping thereby to alter 'what is'. That's the other reason. And inwardly also there are contradictory desires - I want one thing and I don't want another. I want to be peaceful and yet there is violence in me.

Q: I think this is the product of the separateness of the soul rather than the cause of why you are suffering.

K: But we must find out the cause of conflict, mustn't you too?

Q: Yes, but these things are the product, not the cause.

K: All right. If you say, these are the results, the symptoms, not the cause, what then is the cause? Look, sir, either you want to go into this very deeply, or superficially. I would like to go into it very deeply so please have a little patience.

We are asking, what is the fundamental cause of this conflict - the fundamental cause, not the symptoms, we can explain a dozen symptoms, the cause of this enormous human struggle inwardly. Wherever you go in the world - the East, Middle East, America, here, anywhere there is this constant battle going on and on and on. Right? Why? What is the cause of it?

Q: Is it a lack of security?

K: One of the suggestions is, the lack of security. Look at it, please. Just look at it. Lack of security, physical as well as psychological. Right? The lack of security.

Q: The fear of...

K: Please if you examine one thing at a time, not a dozen. We said one of the reasons of this conflict is that there is no security for us, deeply. That may be one of the basic reasons of conflict, the

lack of security, both psychologically as well as biologically, physically as well as inwardly. You understand? Now what do you mean by security? Food, clothes and shelter. Right? If that is not given to us then there is conflict - because you have it and I haven't got it. That is one reason. The other is psychologically I want to be secure inwardly. Right? In my relationship, in my belief, in my faith, in all my action - you follow? - I want to be completely secure. Now is that impossible? Or we are asking a question which is totally wrong? Please follow this.

Psychologically we want to be secure, having a relationship that will be completely secure with my wife, with my husband, with my girl, or boy, we desire to be completely secure - is that possible?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait. Careful now. Think about it a little bit. We say it is possible and we have made it possible, haven't we? I am quite secure with my wife, and she is quite secure with me. But inwardly there is struggle going on. Now this security we seek psychologically is what? What is it we are seeking? Psychologically to be secure with a person. You understand my question? I want to be secure with my wife, or with my girl. Why?

Q: Because without her I am lost.

K: Wait. So what does that mean? Without her I am lost. What does that mean?

Q: I am alone.

K: Which means what? Go on.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't conclude immediately, go into it, sir. You say, I am lost. Why are you lost? Because you are afraid to be alone. Isn't it?

Now, why? Do listen. Why are you frightened to be alone?

Q: Because I cannot face myself.

K: We will come to that presently. I am asking you, why are you frightened to be alone? Look into yourself before you answer it, sir, please. This is a serious thing we are talking about, not throwing off words. We are asking each other: I want permanent relationship with another, and I hope to find it, and I am saying, what do I ask for a permanent relationship with another? You say, I am frightened to be alone, to be insecure. So I am using the other, the woman or the man, as a means to find my anchorage in that. Right? My anchorage in another, and I am frightened if that anchorage is loosened. Right? Why? Penetrate a bit more deeply.

Q: It isn't something like being hungry.

K: Is it like hunger? The moment you give a simile like that you get confused and then you go off to hunger. Find out why you want a relationship to be permanent, a relationship to be secure. Someone suggested because you are frightened to be alone. Why are you frightened, what is involved in this fear? Please look into yourself before you answer it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, we are asking something very simple: why is a human being frightened to be alone? Why are you frightened to be alone?

Q: When I am with somebody I feel I have something, and when I am without this person, it could be a wife or friend, I feel nothing. And I don't like to feel nothing because it frightens me.

K: Which means what, sir?

Q: Insecurity.

K: Go slowly. You say, I am frightened of being insecure, so you exploit another to be secure, which you call love. Please remain with this fact, put your teeth into it to find out. If you can find this out, you will find a great many things.

I want to be secure because without being secure - please listen - without being secure my brain can't function properly. You understand? Efficiently. So the brain demands security. So I want security out of you, and so I depend on you. Right? I am attached to you because I need to be secure, the brain demands it. And if anything happens in my relationship to you I get uncertain, I get frightened, I get jealous, I hate. Right? Doesn't this happen to all of you?

So I am frightened to be alone, frightened of losing my security, and I say, why, what is behind that fear? Is it that I am frightened to be lonely, to be alone, not to have something on which to depend because I cannot depend on myself, I am frightened of myself, I am frightened to face myself. Right? I don't know what I am, therefore I think I know what you are therefore I depend on you because I don't know what I am, myself.

Q: That's incorrect.

K: Incorrect, right sir.

Q: When I am alone and I am drifting around, and (inaudible)

K: Yes, sir that is what we are saying. I don't see where we are disagreeing in this.

Q: Sir, is it really possible to understand completely why we are in conflict, because we are ourselves in conflict. I see that somehow I have separated myself from myself but apart from that I can't see why there is conflict.



K: We are seeing sir, we are examining why we are in conflict. Look, I don't know myself, all my structure, all my nature, my hurts, my ambitions, my greeds, my arrogance, and violence, all that. All that is me. Right? And I have not examined all that. I have not gone into myself very, very deeply. So I want security in spite of all that in something - in furniture, in a house, in a belief, in a faith, in a wife or a husband. I want security. This seems so simple. Do you all want security?

Q: Is there any evidence that security doesn't exist?

K: I am going to show you. It doesn't exist. You don't allow me, let me finish it, go into this. You see you want to jump to conclusions. That gentleman asked, would you describe the nature and the structure of thought. He asked that question. The structure of thought. This is the structure of thought: that we want security because we know very well there is no security. You understand, an earthquake can take place tomorrow we will all be wiped out. Or anything can happen. There is no such thing as security, psychologically. If we realize that once very deeply, that there is no such thing as psychological security then we will not be in conflict. But we don't realize it, we want security in somebody else - we want security physically, having a house, money, position, prestige. I may not have money, a house, but I want prestige, that's my security. I want to be great, and I work for it to be great, I may be poor but I want to be a great man, a famous man. That's my security. And the other says, my security is in faith - I believe, and it may be neurotic - and all beliefs are neurotic. There is security in neuroticism.

So man is seeking all the time security, and we never realize

there is no such thing. Right? Because my wife may run away from me, but if she runs away I hate, I am jealous, but I am going to find another woman, or man, and I cling to that. So this goes on all the time. So I am asking, why do human beings demand security knowing very well, deeply, inwardly, that there is no such thing? Why has the world divided itself geographically, nationally, as Hindus, Buddhists, all the rest of it, why? Because they want security. It feels very secure if you are an Englishman.

Q: It doesn't seem possible to be secure.

K: That's what I am saying, sir.

Q: It seems to me that if this is causing disagreement then we ought to stop there.

K: First, therefore, can we see, observe, that there is no security at all psychologically, therefore no attachment? It doesn't mean promiscuity. It is impossible to be attached to a human being. What are you attached to when you are attached to a human being? You are attached to the image that you have created about that human being, not to the person but to the image that you have about her or him. Please this is so obvious.

Q: Biologically it seems I need security.

K: Biologically I need security. I need food, I need clothes, I need shelter, but that is made impossible by my desire to be secure inwardly. Which is, I am a Nationalist, I believe I am a great Englishman, cut out every other fellow. You follow? So we divide the world and thereby destroy our own security. You don't see all this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. Look, sir, we say physically you must have security.

Right?

Q: No, I don't need to be secure. When I am secure I feel very insecure.

K: Mustn't you have food and clothes and shelter? You have clothes, you have food. Millions of people haven't got food, clothes. Why is it?

Q: When we have got nothing we change our minds.

K: That is just what I am saying, sir. Because psychologically we have established security in nationalities, in division, the biological, physical security is being denied.

So let's proceed. Do we see, not as an idea, but as an actuality, that there is no psychological security? Or are you frightened of it? Frightened of this enormous fact?

Q: I feel insecure in myself.

K: I am showing it to you, sir. Please, we said there is no such thing as security, do you see that? Not as an idea, not as a conclusion, but an actuality, like the microphone. Do you see it?

Q: No.

K: That's just it, why don't you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are coming to that, sir. I am asking, when we come to the point that there is no psychological security, you know that is a tremendous thing to observe and realize because then our whole activity changes. Do we realize it, or is it an idea with which you are going to be convinced? You understand my question? Why don't you see it as a reality? It is a reality you are sitting there, and it is a reality I am sitting here. Why don't we see it as actually as that? Is it part of our conditioning, part of fear - fear being, my

god, I'll lose my wife, I'll lose my friend because in that person I have invested all my hope, my cravings, my demands, sexually and other things, and I suddenly realize there is no such thing as security. You know what it means? That's freedom. And we don't want freedom. We would rather know the state of slavery than the state of freedom. Right?

So, let's proceed. There it is. I do not see that there is no security. I want security, I depend on security in another because it gives me comfort, it gives me a sense of being together, I am then not lost, I am not afraid to be alone, then I am not lonely. For all these reasons I cling to you. And I call this whole process of relationship, love. I am not being cynical, please. And that's our conflict: not knowing deeply, inwardly these facts, and holding on to non-fact. Right? That's our problem. Seeing something as being truth and holding on to something which is not truth. Now how do you bring about the cessation of this division between this and that? You understand now? That is, I observe very clearly that I need security because I am so deeply uncertain in myself, I am so lonely, I am so lost, confused, and I cling to you. That's one fact. That's a fact also. The other fact is you have heard somebody say, "There is no such thing as security, my friend", and also you say, "By Jove, that is so", deeply, inwardly you know it is so. So there are these two facts. So what will you do? How will you bridge these two?

Q: I must look at my fear.

K: Right sir. You must look at your fear. How do you look at your fear? We have come to that point now. You see. That is, human beings are frightened. How do you observe that fact?

Q: We laugh to hide our fear.

K: Of course, that's laughter. Please, I am asking you, without escaping, if you can, how do you observe your fear?

Q: Through relationship.

K: We have discovered through relationship that I am frightened of losing, frightened. So how do you look, or observe, or are aware of that fear?

Q: When I observe I am not frightened.

K: Are you sure of that? Or is that an idea?

Q: No, I am sure.

K: You are sure of it. That means you are sure of something, it is not a fact.

Q: Sir, when I try to observe fear I can't observe it.

K: I am going to go into that, sir, follow it. How do you observe? How do you observe your wife? Have you ever observed your wife, or your husband, boy or girl, have you? What do you say, have you? Observed. How do you observe them? There is visual perception, the face, the colour of the hair, colour of the eyes, the eyebrows and so on and so on, and that's a physical observation. You see that. Then how do you observe her non-physically?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't ask me. Are you sure of that? Just theories you indulge in. Haven't you got an image about your wife?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, we said that, through interaction, through habit, through nagging, through domination, possession, hurt, you have created, through interaction between man and woman, an image about her

and she has built an image about you. That's a simple fact, isn't it? Would you see that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Interaction is very complicated, we know that. So each person creates an image about him or her, and you look at each other through those images, don't you? You have hurt me, I have a picture of that, I have been hurt by you. You have hurt my image about myself. Right? And that picture I hold. So through images we are related. How terrible all this is.

Now we are asking, how do you observe all this? Do you observe it as something outside of you, or part of you? You understand the difference. If it is outside of you then you have to do something about it. Right? Conquer it, suppress it, run away from it, explain it, analyse it and so on, which is all conflict, isn't it? But if there is no division you are that, aren't you? That's a fact, isn't it? You don't do it, that's why you just...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right, sir. I am asking you, how do you look at yourself? We have described what you are - anger, hate, jealousy, neuroticism, peculiar habits, idiosyncrasies, vanity, arrogance, a bundle of god knows what. And you say, right, how do you look at this bundle?

Q: You feel it.

K: Now, you are that bundle, aren't you? You are not different from that bundle, are you? This is our conditioning, this is our training, this is our education, which says, "I am different from that", and that's one of our greatest difficulties. We don't see that is me, anger is me, isn't it, sir? Arrogance is me, vanity is me, but I

like to think it is something outside of me.

Now, the question was, which that gentleman raised, when you see that all those bundles are you, actually, not as an idea, reality, that you are that. That is, the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, what we have analysed is the analyser. Right? So the question was, what happens when this actuality takes place? You understand sir?

Q: You have a good laugh.

K: Have a good laugh, well you have laughed, then what? Oh, sir, do let's be serious, this is not a joke.

Q: Then there is action.

K: No. Is this a fact to you, that there is no division between yourself and the various qualities or things that you have accumulated, you are all that - is that a fact? Then the questioner says, assume it is a fact, then what is the state, what happens? Look at his question. Suppose this is so, then what happens? You want a description of what happens, so you are caught again in a description. You don't say, now I am going to find out, I will put my teeth into it, I am going to find out why this division exists in me, this self-contradiction, why I cannot see that as I see anger is me, why cannot I see that the whole characteristics, the idiosyncrasies, the vanities, the hurts, is part of me, is me? Why don't you see that? If you see that, then what is the action? There is no action, there is no action - you understand. We are used to action, to do something about ourselves, therefore we separate ourselves from the thing we observe because we think we can do something about it - suppress it, conquer it, analyse it, dissect it, a dozen things. That's part of our education, part of our tradition, part

of our culture, but the reality is, that which you observe in yourself is you. Right? When that really takes place all action stops with regard to yourself, which we can't accept because it is quite the contrary to all our ideas, our conditioning. So what happens when you don't waste your energy in conquering, in disciplining, in suppressing, what happens to all that energy? It is all there now, isn't it? Instead of wasting it you have got it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, wait. Just look at what is taking place. I started out by realizing that the inward conflict expresses itself outwardly. That's a fact. I started out with that. I realized that. It is not an idea, it is an actuality, it's a burning reality to me, that this fact that as long as there is conflict in me I will have conflict with my wife, with my friends, with everything in life. I realize it, it is a fact. You can't take it away from me. Then I say, why does this conflict exist. Because there is contradiction, the contradiction is wanting security and finding no security. That's one factor. And another factor is that I am frightened to be alone, frightened to be lonely, therefore I escape through you, through words, through pictures, through worship, through every form of entertainment, whether it is religious or otherwise. I escape. So I don't escape, I want to find this out, I will not escape, so I look.

So I see why this division exists - fear - fear of being completely alone. What is fear? And how do I observe that fear? Is that fear out there and I am looking at it; or the fear is me? If it is out there I can cut it, like a tree, I can operate on it. But if it is here, if it is part of my thinking, what can I do? You understand my question? So our conditioning is to act on something which we see



outwardly, which is fear. When that activity ceases I am lost. So I am frightened. So I say, now I will look at that fear. How do I look at it? I look at it as part of me, it is me that is afraid - me, the psyche, inwardly. Can I look at it, can I observe it? I can only observe it if I have a mirror. You understand? As I can observe my face in the mirror, so I can observe myself in my relationship - you understand? The relationship with another is the mirror in which I see my fear. You understand this?

So in that relationship I see my fear. Then I say to myself, I am part of that fear therefore I am going to just observe it, not act upon it. You understand? Observe it. Therefore there is only one factor which is really important, which is the clarity of observation. That clarity is prevented when the past, which is me, my knowledge, all the past, prevents me from looking. You understand? The observer is the past - his memories, his hopes, his fears. So as long as the observer is observing fear he will not go beyond fear, but when the observer is the observed then you have collected all that energy which you have wasted in struggle, in suppression, in anxiety and all that, you have got now tremendous energy which has not been wasted. When there is that tremendous energy is there fear? It is only when there is the dissipation of energy there is fear. Then out of that what comes next - you are eager to find out what comes next because you don't do it first.

There is lots more because then there is the total freedom to observe, and silence. Observation means silence, doesn't it? If my mind is chattering I can't observe you. Right? If my mind says, "I don't like that colour, I don't like that face, I prefer black or brown, or purple", I can't observe you. So I must first be aware of my

prejudices, put them away and then be free of them and look. But you don't want to do all that, you want to reach instant heaven! Which is transcendental meditation.

Q: I find it impossible, when I try to look at my...

K: No, wait sir, look. When you feel angry, at the moment you are not aware that you are angry. Watch it, sir. At the moment of anger your whole adrenaline and everything is in operation. And you are angry, at that moment you are not aware that you are angry. Then later on comes the thought, "I have been angry" - right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, give me two minutes. I am going to go into it. I will show you, sir, please. You know anger, don't you, most of you, unfortunately. So at the moment of that feeling, that sensation, there is no recognition of it as anger. Right? Then comes the recognition that I am angry, I have been angry. Now how does that recognition take place? Because you have been angry before. So when you say, "I have been angry", you have recognized it because you have been angry before. So the past is dictating what you should do. Right? Careful. Watch it in yourself. When you are angry, at the actual moment there is no feeling of anger, then thought comes along and says, "I have been angry". Thought is essentially the movement of the past. Right? Now can you stop that movement of that past and not name it? You know what jealousy is, when you have been jealous, at the moment there is this feeling, why does thought take it over? You understand my question? Why does thought come in and say, "I have been jealous, I am jealous", why?

Q: Fear of losing.

K: Yes, why does it happen? Why don't you say, yes there is that feeling, and leave it alone? Why do you say, "I have been jealous"? And act from that jealousy, hate and all the rest of it, anger.

Q: One identifies with it.

K: Why do you identify?

Q: You have the feeling.

K: Why does this identification with a feeling take place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes. And also it is my house, it is my name, my form, my country, my god - you follow - it is part of your tradition, culture, which says, 'me', mine. So all the past comes over and takes charge. Now we are asking, are you aware of this movement of the past taking charge of things? Are you aware of it, actually, not as a theory, as an actuality. Which means that you live in the past. Therefore you are dead.

Q: One can't be aware of it until it happens.

K: That's just it, sir. That is just what I am saying.

Q: Then if one has a sensation and one realizes then that you are angry, and then you try and observe that anger, there seems to be nothing to observe.

K: That's all. It is gone. Don't be anxious about it, it is gone.

Q: But you say one should see the totality.

K: That's what I said, the totality - say for instance the totality of hurt. Human beings are hurt from childhood, school, college, you know, the whole business of existence. You are hurt, which is you have an image about yourself which is hurt. Do you see that as

an actuality? If you see that as an actuality, that the very essence of you is hurt, then what will you do about it? There are the past hurts, and you want to prevent future hurts. Can the past hurts be wiped away so that you can never be hurt, which doesn't mean that you become like a stone - never to be hurt. You have never asked these questions, ask them.

Q: If you lose fear are you not hurt?

K: Sir, why are you hurt? You who are hurt, what is the 'you'? The image you have about yourself, no - I am a Christian, I am a Buddhist, I am a Hindu, I am proud, I am vain, all that is you. Or you think you are god, or a superior spiritual something inside you which is above all this - which is again a process of thought. Right? So the process of thought is hurt. And how do you prevent future hurts? Not by resistance, not by withdrawal, not by becoming more and more hard. Do you want to wipe out your hurts, or do you love your hurts?

Q: No.

K: Look at it. Do you want to keep your hurts? There is great pleasure in keeping them because that gives you vitality, energy to hurt somebody else. If you want to be free of all hurts what will you do, so that you are never under any circumstances in your relationship with the world, or with your friends, never to be hurt. Do you know what it means? To have a mind that is incapable of being hurt. Hurt - the other side is flattery. Both are the same. So is it possible to end this being hurt? Do you want to find out?

Q: Yes.

K: I had better stop.

Q: Please go on.

K: All right. Do you really want to go into this.

Q: Yes.

K: All right, sir, I'll do it for you. But do it. You understand, not just live with words and ideas, but do it, because then you are free, you blossom in goodness, you flower in goodness then.

What is hurt? I am going to go into it, don't go verbally but actually look at yourself and go into yourself. You are hurt, your parents hurt you when you were a child, your friends when you were a child hurt you, psychologically, then the school hurt you by saying 'You must be as clever as your brother', or your uncle, or your headmaster, or whatever it is, and then college you must pass exams and if you fail you are hurt. And if you don't get a job you are hurt. Everything in the world is put together so that it hurts you. Our education which is so rotten hurts you. So you are hurt. Do you actually realize that you are hurt? And see the results of being hurt - you want to hurt others. From that arises anger, resistance, you withdraw, become more and more inwardly separate. And the more you are inwardly separate, withdrawing, the more you are hurt. So you build a wall around yourself and pretend, but always within the wall. These are all the symptoms. So you are hurt. And if you really, deeply realize that you are hurt, not only at the conscious level but deep down, then what will you do?

Now how does this hurt take place? Because you have an image about yourself. Suppose if I have an image about myself that I am always sitting on a platform talking to an audience - thank god, I don't - and if the audience disapproves or doesn't come, I am hurt because I have an image about myself. So the fact is as long as I have an image about myself that image is going to be hurt. Right?

That's clear, isn't it? Now is it possible to live without a single image? Which means no conclusions, which is a form of image, no prejudice - you follow. All these are images. And at the moment when you insult me which is at the moment you say something contrary to the image which I have about myself, then you hurt me. Now at that moment when you are saying something that is harmful, hurtful, if I am aware of what you are saying, I give my total attention to what you are saying. You understand? At the second when you want to hurt me by saying something I give my attention to it, then there is no registration taking place. You understand this? It is only when there is inattention the registration of hurt takes place, or flattery.

Now can you give, when somebody says you are a fool, can you at that moment give your total attention? If you do then there is no hurt. The past hurts have gone in that attention. Attention is like a flame that burns out the past and the present hurt. Have you got this?

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **2ND SEPTEMBER 1976**

K: What shall we talk over this morning?

Q: When we do not waste our energy through the conflict of thought, through opposing desires and self-contradiction, how is that energy utilized? How does one live with that energy in daily life?

Q: When fear is so great one is paralysed, or there is a lack of capacity and one loses observation.

Q: Why do we find it so difficult to listen - the art of listening, and observing?

Q: Could we go on with what we were discussing last time?

K: Which was what, sir?

Q: I've forgotten!

K: I've forgotten too!

Q: Could we discuss the problem of sleep and dreaming?

Q: What is our motive and effort involved in coming here to these talks?

K: I should think you would be able to answer that better than I would, wouldn't you?

Q: How are the minority groups in this country, or in various parts of the world, to survive, and what do you say about it?

Q: What is enlightenment, and what does it mean to you?

Q: What do you mean by communion? What is the relationship between communication and communion?

K: That's enough, please. Could we take that first question?  
Which was: when one understands the nature and the structure of

thought, and the things that thought has put together in this world as racial minority, as colour difference, national division and so on, when thought recognizes its limitation and remains within that limitation and so there is freedom from thought, then what takes place? And what is the action of that in our daily life?

Q: And also he said that within normal thought there is a pattern running through...

K: Yes, shall we deal with that question, perhaps we will include all the other questions in it? Can we go on with that question?

I wonder if one realizes, for oneself, how thought is very limited, though it pretends that it is not limited. I wonder if one realizes that first: that all our thinking - politically, religiously, socially, in all directions, at every level of our human existence, do we as human beings realize that thought is very limited - limited in the sense that it is the outcome, or the response of knowledge, experience and memory, therefore it is time-binding, and therefore limited? Do we see that? Thought is a fragment, it is a fragment because it is the outcome or a response of a past knowledge therefore it is limited. Do we meet this? Do we want to discuss this? Shall we go into that first?

Can thought perceive the whole? The whole in the sense, the whole of human existence, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the various divisions which thought has brought about, the various divisions in religion, in political thought and so on and on. So thought is a fragment because it is based on knowledge, and knowledge is experience stored up as memory in the brain. I think most of us would accept this, that thought is very



limited. Could we go from there? And thought, whatever it does, whatever its action, its capacity, its inventions, are still limited, divisive. That is, it has divided the world into nationalities, into minorities, colour prejudices, all that, the divisions between Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, it is the result of thought. Right? I think this is fairly obvious for those who at least think about it.

The next question is: do we see that as a reality? Because we must differentiate between reality and truth, which we are going to now examine. Do we see the reality - reality in the sense, what is actual, not 'what should be', or 'what might have been', but actually 'what is' - do we see actually what thought has done in the world, both technologically with all its vast extraordinary development and what thought has also done - wars, antagonism, and all the rest of it. That is a reality, including the illusions that thought has created. I wonder if we see this? You understand my question? Do we see the reality of thought and its action? The reality that thought has created as war, that's a reality. The reality which thought has created as belief - I believe in god, or, I don't believe in god. Thought which has created the divisions between human beings, that's a reality. So the things that thought has created are a reality, including the things that thought has created which are illusions, which are neurotic. So all that is a reality. Right?

Thought has not created nature, the trees, the mountains, the river. So thought has created the reality, an area in which we live - jealousies, anxieties, fears, pleasures, all that is a reality in our daily life. Right? When one recognizes it and goes beyond it, is that possible? You understand my question? I recognize - one recognizes that thought has created all the shambles, all the misery,

the confusion, the extraordinary conflicts that are going on in the world which are realities, the illusions to which the mind clings, which is a reality, the neurotic actions which one indulges in, is a reality. When one comes to that point and realizes most profoundly then what takes place? You understand my question?

What takes place when I see, when one observes actually that thought has divided man? Right? Isn't that so - that thought has divided man against man, for various reasons of security, pleasure, sense of separate existence, hoping through that to find etc., etc? So when you realize it, have an insight into it, into this reality, what takes place? You have understood my question? Please, this is a dialogue, it's not a talk by me alone.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please answer my question, if you don't mind let's stick to one thing. Do we realize the nature of thought?

Q: I was trying to answer the question.

K: What is the answer then?

Q: I think when one is unaware of reality then it becomes unnecessary.

K: No, no. Does it?

Q: I don't see how it can be otherwise.

K: When one realizes - what do we mean by the word 'realize'? Which means you actually see the fact, or you have an insight into the fact of the movement of thought, what thought has done in the world. Right? The beautiful things, the appalling things, the technological things - what thought has done in the world. When you have an insight into it then what happens to your consciousness? Do you understand my question? What actually

takes place when you realize something? And how do you realize it? I realize, see, observe, have experience, of being bitten by a snake. It's a fact. So what has taken place then? Experience, pain, the suffering, and so intelligence arises and says, "Be careful of that snake". Right? Intelligence arises, doesn't it? The awakening of intelligence is the realization that thought, whatever it has created, is a reality. So the realization of reality, or having an insight into reality, is the awakening of intelligence. You get it? Have you got it? Not I. So you see the limitation of thought. And to see the limitation with all the implications is intelligence, isn't it? I wonder if you see this. Can we go on from there?

So what is the relationship between reality, intelligence and truth? You follow? Are you interested in all this - not verbally, but part of your blood?

How does one realize thought is limited? That was the question that was asked first. We said thought is limited because it is fragmentary, it is fragmentary because it is the response of memory, and memory is very limited. Memory, though it is limited, must be orderly. I wonder if you see all this. Thought must function sanely, rationally, in the world of knowledge, which is the technological world. But when that thought operates in relationship, in human relationship, there is disorder, which is a reality. I wonder if you see that? Because thought creates the image about you and you create an image about another. Thought is the process of creating these images. So thought creates in relationship disorder. No? So disorder indicates the operation of thought in relationship. Right? And when thought operates in the field of knowledge it is orderly. In the technological world it must be

completely orderly.

So do we realize, do you realize, or have an insight into the operation of the whole movement of thought - its nature, its structure, its activity, both at the conscious level as well as at the deeper level, the whole movement of thought? Which is part of meditation - not the control of thought but the awareness of this movement of thought, and seeing its limitation. Can we move from there? I know you are eager to move to something when you haven't actually done it. I am keeping to the one fact, which is, unless this is so you can't go much further.

Q: Sir, I think we can't go further until we see very clearly how this perception can take place of the whole movement of thought.

K: Right. How do you see the whole movement of thought? How do you see the totality of something? How do you see the totality of yourself? Let's begin with that - much better. How do you see the totality, the dreams, the division between conscious and the unconscious, the innumerable prejudices, fears, anxieties, grief, sorrow, affection, jealousy, antagonism, faith in something which is non-existence but you believe, and especially the Christians have this thing, faith - so do you see the totality of all that, not fragmented, not each fragment? You understand what I am saying? No? So is it possible to see the totality of all this? What prevents us from seeing the whole movement of this - my attachments, my prejudices, my beliefs, my experience, my desires, contradictory conflict, misery, confusion, you follow, the whole of that - what prevents us from seeing the totality of this? It is only when we see the totality of this that there is a complete action, otherwise it is a fragmentary action. Are we meeting each other

now?

Our life is fragmented - I go to the office, I am a different person there, fighting, ambition, and all the rest of it, I come home I am a different person there, and I go to church - if I go to church at all - I am a different person there, and so on, I am fragmented, broken up. And so our actions are broken up, and therefore contradictory, and therefore each action brings its own anxiety, its own regrets, its own confusion. So to end all that I must see the totality of it. Right? The totality of my life - my actions, my desires, my relationship, my longings, my fears, all the rest of it. Now what prevents it?

Q: Is it thought?

K: Thought has created all this, hasn't it?

Q: When I look at jealousy I am looking from the point of jealousy at jealousy. I think the two things are different.

K: Yes, that's one point. That is, the observer is the observed, which we went into. I don't want to go into that thing over and over again. It gets rather boring.

Q: I think we can say it is fear.

K: Yes sir. Fear. Does fear prevent you from seeing the totality of life, of your life?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: But the 'me' is the totality of all this, isn't it - my fears, my anxieties, my sexual demands, this, that, umpteen different things is me. You are not answering my question.

Q: When I have got that energy then I see the totality.

K: Haven't you got the energy? Haven't you got the energy to come and listen to these unfortunate talks? You have taken the

trouble, money, all that, you have got plenty of energy when you want to do something. I am asking you a question, please answer. What prevents you from seeing the total existence of your life, of your daily life?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are not answering my question.

Q: What do you want?

K: I don't want anything, sir. I am asking you a very simple question. I am asking you, what is it that prevents you from seeing the totality of your life. You say it is lack of energy. You have got plenty of energy when you want to do something. When you want to earn money you spend the rest of your life earning it.

Q: We don't want to see the totality.

K: Is it that you don't want to see the totality of it, or is it that there is no capacity to see it? And capacity implies culture, cultivating, doesn't it? So you will take time to see the totality of your life, take another year to find out.

Q: Nothing could be more total than...

K: Is it fear? Is it that you don't want to see it? Is it your habit, your tradition, your conditioning? I am asking you, are you saying the fragment cannot see the whole? So you are using thought to see the whole. Is it? And you know at the same time thought is a fragmentary affair, so through the fragment you hope to see the whole - is that it? So you don't realize actually that thought is a fragment. By putting many fragments together, which thought does, which it calls integration, and hoping thereby to see the whole, it can't. So do we realize that thought cannot see the whole?

Q: I understand it, but I don't seem to realize it.

K: He says, I understand it but I don't realize it. When you use the word 'understand' what do you mean by that word?

Intellectually, verbally understand.

Q: I think I see the truth of what you are saying.

K: If you see the truth it is the whole. Please, don't answer me, would you kindly look at it for a minute. Don't answer my questions, but please listen to what I am saying. Listen, you understand, listen, not translate what I am saying into your own terminology, don't interpret it, just listen as you would listen to the wind, the wind among the leaves. Just listen.

I am asking you, what prevents a human being, like yourself, from seeing the total movement of your activities which bring sorrow, pain, the whole of it, at one glance?

Q: I am confused in myself.

K: Yes. So you are saying, sir, aren't you: I am confused therefore I cannot possibly see the totality.

Q: Not unless my mind is quiet.

K: Yes, that's right, the same thing. To observe something my mind must be quiet. So your mind is not quiet, therefore you are not observing. So you are saying one of the factors is that to see something as a whole my mind must be quiet. Then the question arises, how do you make the mind quiet? By repeating words? By controlling the thoughts? Then arises, who is the controller? So you understand? You go round and round in circles.

Q: We are being lazy instead of changing, doing something about it, we are very lazy people.

K: May I put a question differently? Please don't answer me. Are you aware, if I may ask that question most politely, without

any disrespect, are you aware that you are conditioned? Are you? Totally conditioned, not partially conditioned. Your words condition you, education conditions you, culture conditions you, the environment conditions you, the propaganda of two thousand years, or five thousand years, our priests have conditioned you. So you are conditioned right through. When you say, "I believe in god", that is part of your conditioning - like the man who says, "I don't believe in god".

So do we realize that this is a fact: a total conditioning? Then when you realize it what takes place? Do you then say, "I must uncondition it"? You follow? Then who is the 'I' - that 'I' is part of your conditioning. So what do you do? Please stick to one simple thing here.

I realize I am conditioned: conditioned as being a Hindu, broke away from it and become something else, and join Christianity, or whatever it is, I am conditioned - conditioned by culture, conditioned by the food I eat, conditioned by the climate, heredity, by my activity, environment, my whole being is shaped, conditioned, moulded. Do I realize it? That means, do I see the actual fact of it, not the idea of it, but the actual reality of it? That is, it is so. It is raining. It is a lovely day. It is a fact. It is a windy day. In the same way do I see the absolute reality that my mind is conditioned? Then when I realize it, when there is the realization totally that I am conditioned, then what movement takes place? That's what I want to find out. You understand my question now?

Then do I say, "Yes, I am conditioned, it is terrible, and I must uncondition myself"? Then you begin the conflict. The 'I' thinks it is separate but it is part of that conditioning. So what takes place



when you see that?

Q: No movement.

K: That means what? Go slowly please. Don't throw words at each other. What takes place when I realize that I am entirely conditioned? Action ceases, doesn't it? I go to the office, but the action to change my conditioning is not there.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So I am saying, sir, please, look. I have to go to the office, or the factory, or become a clerk or secretary. I have got to work. I work in the garden, or teacher or do something. That is so. But I realize that I am conditioned. My concern is what happens when I realize totally this state? I cease to act in that state, don't I, there is no action. I am a total prisoner. I don't rebel against it, because if I rebel I am rebelling against my own conditioning, which has been put together by thought, which is me. I wonder if you see all this. So in that area of conditioning there is no action.

Q: How do you...

K: Just listen. There is no action, therefore what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, do it, do it. Find out what takes place.

Q: You get tired.

K: Yes, sir, you are tired of the whole thing. So what do you do when you are tired of the whole thing, what do you do? Take a rest from it, don't you? When you are tired of something, or when you are tired you go and lie down, sit quietly. But you are not doing it.

So then only when the mind is quiet you see the totality of your life. Right? But our minds are chattering, trying to find an answer, beating, beating, beating on this conditioning and therefore there is

no answer. But if you say, all right, I'll look at it, I have seen the whole movement of thought, which is my life, and whatever movement other than the conditioning is unreal. You understand what I am saying? So the mind remains with the totality of its conditioning, it remains, it doesn't move. Do we communicate something to each other?

So then I will go back and see: thought is a fragment therefore it is limited. It is fragmentary because it is based on knowledge, experience and memory, which is the movement of time. So whatever is caught in the movement of time is limited. That's obvious. Whatever it is, whether it is a machine, anything that is caught in the movement of time is bound to be limited. So thought is fragmentary and limited. And we think through thought we will see the totality. That is our difficulty. We don't say, thought cannot see the totality, therefore thought becomes quiet. If I can't see through my eyes I become quiet. So thought becomes quiet. Then I perceive the movement of what actually is going on, the totality of it. As we said the other day, when you look at a map you see the totality of the whole map, various countries, the colours, the hills, you see the totality. But if you have a direction you don't see the totality. That is, if you want to go from here to Vienna you have the line, you see that, and you disregard the rest. But here as long as you have a direction, a motive, a purpose, you cannot see the totality. Are we meeting each other now?

So have you a motive for coming here, for enquiry, for trying to understand yourself, have you got a motive? That is, I want to understand myself because I am terribly worried about my husband, and I hope by coming here I am going to solve it. Or I

have lost my wife, or my father, or my son, but I am going to find out whether I can meet him in some other place, or what it means to suffer, so I have a motive. So as long as I have a motive I cannot listen properly. You understand? As long as I have a prejudice I can't listen to what you are saying. Or I have read all the books that you have written and I can repeat all of it, and I repeat, and obviously that prevents one listening.

So one cannot see the totality of one's life because we have never thought about it, we have never given even a single second to look at this totality because we are caught in our little fragments. Right? Now we are together trying to explore, look at this whole unfortunate, confused, miserable, occasional happiness, all of that, we are trying to see the wholeness. It is possible to see it wholly only when you have no direction, no motive, which is extremely difficult because we want to be happy, we want to be rich, we want to have a good relationship with another, we want to have our pleasures fulfilled. Do you follow?

So what happens then, that is from the same question, what happens then when you realize, when you see actually the total existence as you see it in a map, clearly outlined, everything clear, everything in its place, orderly? You understand? The word 'art' means putting everything in its right place, that is the real meaning of the word 'art'. So having put everything in its right place, then what takes place? Putting my office in the right place, my relationship in the right place, everything in order.

Let's come back! Then what happens?

Q: One lives in peace.

K: Do we?

Q: You don't have to think about what you are going to do anymore.

K: No. You see you are ready to answer, you haven't got the other thing, you are ready to answer. Have we put our house in order - not the house, you know, the deeper house, have we put everything in order? We are in disorder, aren't we, unfortunately. We are in disorder. Now just keep to that disorder, let's understand that disorder. Because out of the investigation of that disorder, order comes, not try to bring order. I wonder if you see. Through negation comes order.

Look, politically if there is disorder in the country, out of that very disorder tyranny grows. Right? That's happening in India, that's happening all over the world. Where there is disorder, that very disorder creates the authority. Now we are in disorder, why? Would you tell me why you are in disorder - not invent, just see why this disorder exists in me, why does it exist? Because I have contradictory desires - I want peace and I am violent; I want to love people and I am full of antagonism; I want to be free and I am attached to my wife, to my children, to my property, to my belief - right? So there is contradiction in me, and that contradiction means confusion. Right? I am attached to my wife, to my husband, to my children. I am attached because I am lonely, I am desperate, I can't live with myself, I feel frustrated, miserable, in myself, so I cling to you. But deep down that fear of loneliness goes on. Right? So there is contradiction in me. So can there be freedom from attachment, which is not love? So can there be freedom from attachment, not little, by little, by little - freedom?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am not asking you sir, personally, of course it can be. But is it so, are you free?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Then what is the point of discussing, then it becomes a verbal discussion, what is the point of that? We are serious people here, I hope, trying to understand and bring about a transformation in our daily life, transformation in our mind, in our consciousness. And if there is one thing which I completely see - for example, attachment, what is involved in it, jealousy, fear, pleasure, companionship, clinging to each other, possessiveness, and therefore losing, all that is implied in attachment, which is one of the causes of my confusion. So I can I cut it, instantly be free of it?

Q: We want to be free of attachment, to the different things we are attached to.

K: No. Sir, attachment - attachment to things you like, attachment to things you don't like, all of it, sir, don't break it up too much.

Q: The things are...

K: Attachments to your faith, attachment to your belief, attachment to your gods, attachment to your church - attachment, sir. You understand what it means, you don't have to explain it more. That's one of the cause of confusion, one of the causes of disorder. And to bring order by investigating disorder I find it is attachment - one of the factors. So cut it! Because we are afraid to cut it, because what will my wife say when I tell her I am not attached? Because we translate, when there is freedom from attachment, the wife or the husband understands, or the girl or the boy, that you are free from her, or from him, and therefore she

clings to you and so you are frightened to hurt her, and all the rest of it follows. Let me finish, sir. Freedom from attachment means tremendous responsibility. You don't see that. Right?

Look, we have built this place, Brockwood, for the last seven years. We have worked at it, several of us. Plenty of energy, work, thought, you follow, to create this thing. If we are attached to that thing then we are creating confusion. You understand? So the speaker is not attached, completely I can leave tomorrow. And I mean it, I have done it - not to Brockwood but other places. But being detached means great consideration, great responsibility to see this operates properly. You understand? Not that I walk away from it.

So when there is freedom from attachment there is love. You understand? That means responsibility, so that means order. So can you - realizing one of the factors of confusion in our life, of our disorder and misery, is that attachment to ideas, to beliefs, to ideals, to one's country and so on, to wife, all that - can one be free of that attachment - not tomorrow, now? Because you see the reality of it, what it does in life. I am attached to my country and therefore I am willing to kill every other human being for my love of my country.

Q: You may feel responsible for your country but you must not be attached.

K: No, that's not the point I am making. The point we are making, sir, is not the country, leave the country. You see how quickly we go off to something. I am talking about attachment to your wife, to your husband, to a belief, to a faith, to an ideal, for which you are willing to kill people. So there is disorder. Out of

this disorder there arises confusion, and therefore in you there is confusion. And one of the factors is attachment. Can you break it, get away from it?

Q: The problem is when you say, "can you break it", who breaks it?

K: I understand. Of course, sir. That is a quick way of saying the observer is the observed. We have been through all that. Can there be an end to attachment? Let's put it that way if you prefer it.

Q: If you do are you then an individual?

K: I question if we are individuals.

Q: Yes.

K: No, don't say, yes.

Q: I am saying I would like to think I am an individual.

K: You like to think.

Q: I am not reflecting.

K: Look, sir please. The word individual means indivisible, non-fragmented. That is, a human being who is fragmented is not an individual. But individual means one who is indivisible in himself. Please sir.

Now just take this, attachment. When you see the whole movement of attachment - jealousy, anxiety, hatred, division, possessiveness, domination, you follow, all that is implied in that word attachment - to see the whole of it is intelligence, isn't it? To see the whole of it. So intelligence says, "Be free of it", not you say, "I must be free of it". So intelligence then dictates, tells what is right action, wherever you are. You understand? Whatever your life is, whether in the office, or at home, or anywhere, if there is this intelligence at work then there is no problem, because this

intelligence is supreme order, which has come because you have looked into disorder in your life. Out of that investigation into disorder, which is, one of the factors is attachment, in the observation of that disorder the awakening of intelligence comes. You follow? Intelligence is awakened. And intelligence is not yours or mine, it is the intelligence. Therefore it is not my individual intelligence telling me what to do - then it is not intelligence. But when we have seen our disorder in our daily life, how it comes, observing it, investigating it quite impartially, objectively, without any motive, out of that investigation is the awakening of this marvellous intelligence, which is also love. You understand?

Q: Sir, this will take time because...

K: Does it take time?

Q: It doesn't take time...

K: Does it take time to cultivate love? Do you cultivate love? Say, "I must be kind, I must be generous, I must be thoughtful, I must be considerate, I must give" - and do all those things day after day, day after day, at the end of it you have this marvellous flower called love?

Q: It feels like that some days.

K: That's just it, sir. It is not in one day, now.

Q: It is very difficult...

K: Sir, when you say it is difficult you have already made it difficult. It may be the most easiest thing in the world, you don't know; but you have already come to it saying, "It is difficult, it is arduous, I need tremendous energy", but you don't say, "I really don't know", then you are free to look. You understand? But you



have already come to it with a conclusion. And the conclusion is the bondage, is the barrier which prevents you from actually seeing instantly.

Q: Is supreme intelligence in other words insight?

Q: Is intelligence perception?

K: Is that the question, sir? If you like to put it. What does it matter if you have got it, words don't matter.

Q: Could we return to what you were saying about...

K: Look, I want to go on. You don't know what the beauty of all this is. All right, it's up to you.

Let's begin again. Thought has created this disorder, hasn't it? - my house, my property, my wife, my country, my god, my belief, my sorrow, my pleasure - thought. Thought has also created the centre which holds all these activities, the 'me'. Thought has created the 'me' in which all these activities go on. Right? Thought has created this. And thought has created the problems, and thought says, "I will solve these problems". And thought has never done it. Right? Politicians right throughout the world say, "We will solve all these problems with very careful thinking - party politics, TUC, the whole game." And they won't solve it because the problems are getting worse and worse and worse. So thought has created all these problems; thought is me; thought is my problem; thought is the disorder in which I live. Right?

So I see thought cannot solve the problem. Right? Do you see that, sir? Thought cannot solve my problem between me and my wife. Right? The problem between me and my wife is that I think I am separate from her, I have an image about her, that image has been put together through thought for ten years, or two days, or

fifty years. Right? And she has an image about me. Right? I dominate her, I bully her, or I do this and that, sexual pleasure, antagonism, all those are images between her and me. Right? So these images create disorder. Right? So I can never see my wife or my girl or my boy completely, wholly, what he is. You understand? So can there be freedom from image-making? You understand? I see I have an image about my wife, about the politicians, about my neighbour, about my children, whatever it is, I have an image about them, or about her. The image has been put together when she says to me, "You are an ass", or she bullies me, or she wants something from me, etc., etc. All that. All those activities create an image in me about her. Right? This is simple. I want to get on with it. And she has an image about me. So our relationship is between these two images. Correct? Which is what? The images of thought; thought has built them.

So thought has built these images, and thought which is fragmentary, which is destructive because it is fragmentary, tries to solve this problem. It can only solve it when there is no image-making, then I can look at my wife, and she can look at me as we are. Right? So is it possible not to create an image when she calls me something or other, when she nags me, when she says, "Do this", out of irritation. You follow, all this. You know it very well, you are all married people, I don't have to tell you all this. You may not be married but you have your girl - it doesn't matter.

And I am asking you, can you be free of the image you have about her? Because if you want right relationship there must be no image between you and her, or her about you, obviously. So how to end the image-making? You understand my question? The

image-making is mechanical. Please listen to this carefully. It is mechanical because when the wife says to me something ugly it is registered. Or when she says I am a marvellous man, it is registered. Right? You understand? The registration is the image-making. Right? When you tell me a flattering thing, or insult, it is registered in the brain through hearing and all the nervous system, it is registered in the brain. And so the brain through thought creates an image. Now is it possible - please listen carefully, if you are interested - is it possible not to register? You understand my question? When somebody tells you that you look most beautiful, or that you are a great person, not to register it. The moment you have registered the image begins. And when she tells you, or you tell her, something or rather insulting, it is registered. So I am asking, is it possible not to register the insult or the flattery?

Q: Yes, by listening with attention.

K: You have heard me say that before, therefore it is repeating. Don't repeat what I have said, find out for yourself, sir. Personally I don't read all these things, the whole history of mankind is in you. You understand? You are the repository of a thousand years or more, a million years of human endeavour. You are that. Everything is in you if you know how to read it. So please read this thing. That is, can this image-making end? Find out. First see how important it is that it should end, see the immense necessity both socially, in every way, how important it is for human beings not to have an image - saying he is an Indian, he is a Russian, he is American, he is a beastly this or that. Not to have single image. Therefore there is no minority or majority. I wonder if you see all this.

Is that possible? Not to register. It is very important, please listen, if you don't mind. You have to register when you do technological things, when you learn a language, it is tremendously important to register it, the words, the verbs, the irregular verbs and all the rest of it, you have to register. It is very important when you are learning something, how to drive a car and all the rest of it. And also it is very important to learn very quickly about something and retain it: but not to register in relationship between human beings. There it is much more important than the other. The other is fairly simple. Here it becomes tremendously important because conflict between individuals comes to an end - between wife and husband, man, woman, between nationalities, between groups of people, this continuous conflict between people, to end that. As you are the total repository of all human endeavour, if you can put away image-making then you are a total human being. You understand. So is it possible for you to end the image-making?

Q: Some things I don't want to register.

K: Then don't register it. Just a minute. See what takes place. Registration is a mechanical process because our brains have become, at least part of it, mechanical. We live a mechanical life, don't we? Repeat the same pleasure sexually, or repeat the same old tradition - if you are a Catholic you go to church - repeat, repeat, repeat. We have made our life into a mechanical process because in that there is great security. Right, do you see that? Being mechanical gives a great certainty.

So we are asking, can this mechanical process - in certain areas it is completely important - but in human relationship it is totally dangerous, totally dangerous, absolutely dangerous, not relatively,

absolutely dangerous. So can you end the danger? Do you see the danger? If you see the danger it is over. When you see the danger of a precipice you don't go near it. When you see the danger of a wild animal you avoid it. But we don't see the danger. You don't see the danger of nationalities because they breed war, the selling of armaments. Look what is happening for god's sake to your world, what we are making of it.

Q: I think we do see the danger, we are unattached from it. You say...

K: Not what I say, sir. I have said it, but don't you see that? It's fairly simple, isn't it. You are an Englishman because you have been conditioned from childhood to think that you are an Englishman, you are a Catholic because you have been trained from childhood to think that you are a Catholic with all the beliefs, all the superstitions, the nonsense that goes on. And you are a Hindu - the same thing, conditioned. Every human being right through the world is conditioned. That is a common factor, therefore you are the world.

So is it possible not to register? That means have a mind that is totally innocent. You understand? That can never be hurt, nor ever be flattered. So is it possible? To find that out, to see what it does in human relationship if you have an image about somebody. You have an image about me, haven't you? Therefore that is what's preventing you from understanding the poor chap!

So we are saying, is it possible? I say, it is. Not because it is an idea in my life as a speaker, it is so. I wouldn't talk about a thing if it isn't an actuality, I wouldn't be a hypocrite. I abominate all that kind of stuff. So I say, it is so, it can be done. Then you will say,

"Please tell me how to do it". Wait, listen carefully. "Please tell me how to do it". The moment you say 'how' you want a system. That very system implies a mechanical process. Right? So you are asking a person who denies mechanical process, "Tell me a mechanical process". So we lose our communication. So I say please don't ask how. See all the implications of that word 'how' - mechanical, method, system, practice, which you do when you talk about meditation, which is all nonsense, which we will go into. So don't ever ask 'how', but look. You understand? Look at your image, become conscious of it, aware of it, see what it does.

When you see what it does, are you looking at it from the outside, or you say, "That is me, I am that. I am the image. The image is not different from me". Right? Do you see that?

So the observer is the observed. And then what takes place? There is no movement to make further image. Do you see that? If you see that, the thing is over. So when we are confused, to seek the light out of confusion is to further the confusion. I wonder if you see that. I am confused, whatever I do out of that confusion will still be confused. Whatever my choice, it will still be confused. So first is it possible to clear this confusion in myself? It is possible when - I am taking these two examples: attachment, image-making - when there is freedom from these two there is clarity, absolute, complete clarity, therefore there is no choice. So out of understanding what is disorder comes order. But to seek order when I am confused, as the politicians and all the people are doing, will lead to further confusion. Right?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 4TH SEPTEMBER 1976**

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the other day, when we last met here. We talked about relationship, which is so important, because probably that's the basis of all society. When that relationship is in constant conflict, as it is now, our whole social and moral structure must inevitably be corrupt. And we said - if you remember rightly - that relationship, being of extraordinary importance, breeds conflict because our relationship is based on the movement of thought - the movement of thought being memory, measure, knowledge. And when knowledge interferes with relationship then there must be conflict - knowledge being all that one has accumulated during past incidents, nagging, and all the rest of human relationship - what goes on.

And this morning, if we may continue, we ought to talk about time, sorrow, love and that extraordinarily important thing also in our life, which is death. We have rather a crowded morning with so many things to talk about together - and I hope we are sharing this thing together; not merely listening to a series of ideas, words, and through wrong listening make what is said into a conclusion and agree or disagree with those conclusions. But what we are trying to do is talk things over as two friends concerned with human problems and the importance of bringing about a radical transformation in our consciousness. That's what we have been talking about, and we shall go on with that today and tomorrow.

What is time? I think this is important to understand because that may be one of the factors of our fear about death. So we must

understand the nature of time: not the scientific fiction of time or timelessness, but the actual psychological time that thought has built. So there are two kinds of time: the chronological, the daily events - yesterday, today and tomorrow - and there is the psychological time - the hope, what will be, and the achievement of what should be. All that involves time. Time is a movement. Please, follow all this in yourself; not as an idea. Time is a movement, as thought is movement. So thought and time are very closely related. There is chronological time - yesterday, today and tomorrow - catching the bus, train, going to the office, and all the rest of that - time according to a watch, daylight, night. And, there is the whole nature of time, as thought has built in the psyche, in ourselves; that is, 'what is' and 'what should be', a movement from here to there. Is there psychological time at all, or, is it actually an invention of thought? That is, what is jealousy, anger cruelty, violence - that is 'what is'. And to overcome that we need time. That is the traditional, educated, conditioned thinking that to change 'what is' to 'what should be' - from here to there - you need to cover the distance, time, which is effort. Right? We're meeting each other? Effort, to go from here psychologically towards an end - that end projected by thought, a purpose, a goal, an achievement, enlightenment and all the rest of it. That is, to move from here, 'what is', to 'what should be', the ideal. That's what we have accepted, that is our normal thinking, or rather, educated thinking. It may be perhaps a neurotic thinking. Because we don't know how to deal with 'what is' immediately, so we think we need time to achieve that which should be. Because we don't know, or we are not capable, we don't understand how to deal with 'what is' - anger,



jealousy, hatred, sorrow, and all the immense confusion which thought, man has created in himself, and so outwardly.

So, we need time; at least we think so. That is, if all hope is removed - hope is time. Please follow all this. One is desperate, anxious, frightened, all the things that human beings go through, to transform all that into something which is perhaps totally different, we think we need a process of time. Right? Please understand this clearly. That is, the psychological time - the chronological time and the psychological time. We are talking about the psychological time. Time, we said, is a movement as thought is a movement in time. So, is there an ideal, the 'what should be', something different from 'what is'? You understand my question? I am envious, one is envious. We know all the implications of that envy, with the results of it in society, in our relationship with each other, and to overcome or go beyond that envy I need some days, weeks, months, years. Is that so, or is it total illusion? Can 'what is' be changed immediately, instantly? If it can, then the ideal, that which should be, is non-existent. We are understanding each other?

Please, perhaps some of you are here for the first time and not have listened to all the other talks and therefore this may all sound rather strange, extravagant and quite loony. But actually when you go into it very deeply, into oneself, which is important, because as we said, you are the world and the world is you, and wherever you go every human being, whatever colour, whatever nationality, whatever religion he may be, he has these human problems of great sorrow, tears, laughter, anxiety, pain, that's the common factor of human beings. And so the world wherever you are, where human beings are, they go through the same psychological phenomena as

yourself, so you are actually the world and the world is you. If you can realize that, feel that profoundly then it becomes extraordinarily important that one should transform oneself completely, psychologically, because then you affect the total consciousness of the world. That gives you enormous vitality, energy, strength when you see that you are like the rest of humanity, and therefore there is no separate, individualistic struggle to overcome one's own particular sorrow.

So we are saying - it's very important to understand time. Time is part of our consciousness, time is the division between 'what is' and 'what should be', and the effort made to change 'what is' according to 'what should be', that needs great time, from here to there. I think one has to question that whole process, though it has become traditional we must question it, doubt it. And doubt is a very important thing in life. To doubt. Perhaps one or two religions - like Buddhism - starts by questioning everything. As we said the other day, if you start with certainty, as most people do, then you end up with nothing. But if you start with doubting, questioning, being sceptical, trying to investigate then you end up with clarity. So we are questioning this idea that we need time to change 'what is' into 'what should be', which is a psychologically process. Why is it not possible to change 'what is' immediately - not have the ideal. You understand my question? Ideal is a projection of 'what is' away from 'what is'. The ideal is non-existent. It's a fiction, the ideal. What is actual, what exists is, 'what is'. So we are dealing with 'what is', which is actual, and trying to change 'what is' into 'what should be' which is illusory. So we are always caught between the fact and what is illusion. So, if one is able to think very clearly,

objectively, non-personally then is it possible to change 'what is' without transforming it into 'what should be'.

Is it possible to change, say, for example, envy - with all the implications involved in envy - without having an opposite, which is non-greed, non-envy, to change 'what is'. And you can change 'what is' only when you have the energy which is not being wasted in trying to overcome 'what is'. You see we are again traditionally bound, conditioned to an 'opposite' - love/hate, violence/non-violence. We'll take violence. Violence is apparently in the human nature - anger, competition, ruthlessness, trying to express oneself at any cost against everybody else, the worship of success, either in the business world or in the spiritual world, which is the same thing. Human beings are violent. Violence implies not only physical violence, there's psychological violence, which is comparison. Where there is comparison there is violence. Where there is imitation there is violence. Where there is the acceptance of authority psychologically, there is violence. Imitation, conformity, competition, all those and many other factors are the indication of violence. That's a fact, that's 'what is', and human beings have created the opposite of it, which is not to be violent which is called non-violence. They've talked a great deal about in India but they are equally violent. Is it possible to change violence without having its opposite? You understand my question? That is, not to imitate, not to conform, not to compare, not to seek success. If that is possible then non-violence is unnecessary. So because we cannot or we are not willing to transform violence, we invent the non-violence and we say I will eventually become non-violent. That's a nice, comfortable, lazy, illusory idea. This is what we

indulge in, but if you are really serious, deeply concerned to be totally non-violent, including anger, hate and all the rest of it, if you are deeply concerned to transform that, you've got the energy, because that energy you have wasted in conflict with non-violence. You follow?

So it is possible to transform 'what is' without the idea of time? Is this clear? Please, this is very important because we are going to go into something presently which is, when you are talking about death, time is involved in it. So we must really understand the nature and the structure of time, how time works. When you say, I will be, or, I must be something in the future, that involves time, because you are dissatisfied with 'what is', you condemn 'what is', you suppress 'what is', or try to argue it away and so you utilize all that energy, waste all that energy in this process; whereas, if you look at this violence with all the implications and not have any idea of its opposite, which is illusory, then there is a transformation. You understand this? Do it!

So time in meditation - you have to find out if time has a 'stop'. Therefore it's very important to understand the nature and the movement of time, how our brains are caught in it, our whole consciousness is filled with time - time being accumulated knowledge as experience which becomes a memory, and that memory is the storehouse from which thought begins. From the very beginning, man's very beginning, that's the process. So, one not only has to enquire into the nature of time, but also one has to find out if time has come to an end, a stop to time. This has been a tremendous problem - you understand?

So then we can go on to the next thing, which is - what is our

life? Living and dying. What is our life? When you look at our lives, what are they? Wrong occupation, battle with each other, wars, anxiety, great pain, lack of relationship in the true sense of that word - there is relationship between two images which you have about another and another has about you. Relationship between those two 'ideas' - between those two thoughts. So, what is our living? When you look at it very carefully and very seriously, not pretending, not trying to cover it up with words and clever cunning thoughts - what actually is it? We waste our life, don't we? And from birth to death it's a constant battle, constant effort, constant struggle, to be or not to be; to become something or not to become something; to establish right relationship and always trying, to fail. Wars, hatreds, deep hurts - that's the content of our whole consciousness, it is our life, apart from the biological growth and decay. If you examine as we are doing now - please do it together, if you are at all serious, if you're not serious, don't bother. It's a nice day, go outside and enjoy it. But if you are serious look at your life - pleasure, sexual, other forms of pleasure, fear and sorrow. This is the content of our consciousness, with all its varieties, complex movements in this limited consciousness; and that's what we call living. With faith, with doubt, with anxiety, you follow - a perfect confusion, a mess!

And what is dying? You understand my question? Living, which we think is marvellous, and dying which is the most terrible to happen. And in between these two things there's love and there is suffering. We have talked at some length about fear and the necessity of being completely, totally, psychologically free from fear. We went into that. And also we talked about together - not

I've talked and you've listened - we have talked over together pleasure, and the movement of pleasure, and the pursuit of pleasure. Pleasure is totally different from joy; pleasure can be invited, cultivated; joy can never be invited - it comes. But when it comes memory takes it over and makes it into a pleasure. We've also talked about ecstasy, which is not hysteria, which is not neurotic, but that ecstasy can only come when we understand the meaning of pleasure. And, we are asking, what is love? Apparently that plays a great part in our life. The word 'love' is loaded, like 'god'.

So we have to investigate also what it means to love and what is the difference between pleasure, love and compassion. This has been one of the problems of human beings right through the ages, right through the world wherever human beings exist, they demand, they've wanted to love - or be loved. And when one is not loved there's all the anxiety, the fear, the anger, the jealousy - all that creeps in. So one has to, if you are at all serious, and I hope you are because we are concerned with the transformation of the human consciousness, completely. So one must go into this question of what is love?

Apparently human beings have reduced love to pleasure. What do you say? Yes? Pleasure, sexual - love, it also implies the love of one's country, love of a book, love of a picture - you follow? We use that word in a most extraordinary way. Also, I love my wife, or I love my husband. So we have to go into this question, not only what it means, the word, love, the word itself, I will go into it, is part of desire - the meaning of that word, we are looking at the root meaning of that word, desire. So we have to see what desire is and

what love is. Is desire love? Please we are investigating, we are exploring; we are not saying it is, it is not; together we are working this out. So one has to go into what is desire. Because, apparently, in most of our lives desire plays an immense part. So we have to understand it. What is desire? When you desire a dress, when you desire something, what is that, the movement of it? Surely, there's first the seeing, the visual seeing, the sensory - then there is contact, the touching, the smelling the seeing - then sensation. You're following all this? Seeing, contact, sensation - right? Then thought comes in, and thought says "That dress will look beautiful on me" which is the structure of image. So sensation plus thought is desire and the image. You follow this? You can see this very simply if you look at yourself, this is the process we go through. You see a beautiful woman or beautiful car, or beautiful man - whatever it is - seeing, contact, sensation then thought comes and desire, and the image. Right?

So, we are asking is love desire? Which is sensation, contact, thought or desire plus thought and the image, picture - is that love? Or love has nothing to do with desire, which means no picture, no imaginative projection, not based on sensation. So you have to find out where sensation plus thought is desire with its image. There is sensation; it is natural to have one's senses highly developed, that's healthy. To see a beautiful thing; that's part of sensation. When thought takes it over it becomes desire. Now, please follow this. Can you see a beautiful person, a thing, a lovely tree - whatever it is - sensation, and not allow desire to come into it, which is the ending of thought? I wonder if you understand all this? This is the highest form of discipline, you understand? To see, sensation, and

no thought comes into it at all, and therefore no desire, no image. You've understood what I'm saying? That requires a great sense of awareness. We'll discuss that presently, later. Awareness, concentration and attention. We'll talk about it later.

So is the movement of thought love? Or, love has nothing whatsoever to do with desire. Now, one has to find this out, which means you have to give your attention, be aware of the movement of desire, movement of thought, and the natural sensation. To be aware of this whole movement. Then you'll ask, you must ask, is pleasure love? And if it is not pleasure, then what is love, or desire? Please, intellectually, logically all this is so logical, so-called intellectual, but the intellect is an instrument, a fragment of the totality, and by merely looking at the description intellectually you are then only looking at it partially, and therefore you don't see the whole of it. So, not only you must see the reason, the structure of this thing, but also know its own limitation.

So we are asking is pleasure love? Pleasure being desire, the movement of thought, sensation and the pursuit of it. And if it is not love, then what is it? Can there be jealousy when there is love? Come on sirs. Those of you who have girls and boys and husbands and wives, and all the rest of it, can there be love when there is attachment, when you hate, or are angry, when you are hurt by another, is there love? And since none of these are love then the word is not the thing. You understand? Then the word 'love' is not the actual state, the reality of it, the truth of it. Then what is the relationship between love and compassion? You understand? The word compassion means passion for all, passion for everything living. That's the meaning of that word. But that compassion



cannot exist when you are in yourself fragmented, broken up, when there is hate, and when there is suffering.

So, we have to examine what is suffering. Why is it that we suffer psychologically, not biologically - that we can understand when we go into the question why human beings throughout the world carry this agony of suffering. Are you interested in all this? Not interested, that's the wrong word, are you concerned about all this? How much time are you willing to spend on all this? Or only for this morning you are concerned, for an hour, and then slip back into your old traditions, your old ways of life which have no meaning at all, and remember occasionally what has been said in this tent, in this marquee, and you say, "By Jove, that's true, I must go back and do something about it" and forget the next minute? Or are you really totally completely committed to this? Only then you will understand very deeply what all this means: how to live a totally different kind of life.

So we are now asking why human beings suffer psychologically, which has a great bearing on the physical suffering. If there is no suffering psychologically then it may affect your body completely, there is no psychosomatic disease there. So we must go into this question very deeply why human beings suffer. All religions - the eastern religions and the western religions - the eastern religions have a very clear definition why human beings suffer: according to them they say, what you have done in the past you are paying for it now. It is called karma in Sanskrit. The Sanskrit word 'ka' means to do, to act. If you have not acted rightly, accurately, not according to a pattern, according to tradition, if you have acted rightly in yourself, truthfully, then there

are no regrets in that action, then that action is total. This is what we are saying, not what the Hindus say. The ancient Hindus say, you have many lives. In each life, unless you act rightly you are going to pay for it in the next life, therefore you suffer in the next life. And therefore you learn from suffering how to act properly, rightly, accurately for the next life. You follow?

Here in the Christian world you have given up suffering, put suffering on the shoulders of one man, and very comfortably settled the problem. But actually you are suffering; you have got the symbol, which is rather an unfortunate symbol. You have got the symbol and though you have said that he is suffering for us, and yet we go on suffering. So let's forget the symbol, let's forget all that and see why human beings in the world - you - suffer, go through such agonies, tears, loneliness. You understand all this? What is suffering? What is grief? And why should we suffer, will it purify our minds - may we use that word quickly - will it cleanse our hearts because we suffer? On the contrary, it hasn't done it. So we must go into this question very deeply. What is suffering? There are many forms of it. One of them is loneliness. Right? Great sense of loneliness - loneliness being the feeling, the reality that you are completely cut away from all relationship, from everything, completely isolated. Right? Don't you know all this? Isolated, lonely, and not knowing what to do with that loneliness which is, you run away from it, escape, try to cover it up and do all kinds of things - get attached and all that. So, without understanding that loneliness, suffering is inevitable. You follow this? Are we meeting each other or am I talking to myself in my room?

So, that's one of the factors. Then, the factor that you like somebody, or love somebody - to use that word in quotes - you love somebody and that somebody turns away from you and you are left - again isolated, jealous, hating, sense of loss, frustration, guilt, all that is part of suffering. Then there is the suffering for someone whom you have lost, whom you loved dearly - again 'love' in quotes - and he is dead - son, wife, husband, whatever, another human being is dead, and you suffer, not only through self pity but also you're attached to that person, and you suddenly feel lost and in that moment of death there's a great shock, biologically as well as psychologically. Right? And there are many other forms of suffering. Human beings suffer and find many, many explanations for that suffering - God is just, he knows why I am suffering, eventually he'll solve my suffering. Suffering and seeking comfort in some theory, in some law, in some belief; or, the Christian world says, have faith, and so on. So what is it that is suffering - me. You understand? I am suffering. What is that me, what is you? The form, the name - right? The name, the form, the various characteristics - greed, envy, pain, anxiety, hope, despair, depression - a lot of accumulated ideas, all that is you. Aren't you? Which are all memories, words. So that image of yourself is suffering, or that you are suffering. Now will you please listen to it carefully.

Human beings suffer. And we have escaped from it, through reason, through logic, through explanations, through various forms of comfort, entertainment, religious as well as ordinary entertainment, every form of escape from that suffering. If you don't escape and actually without any movement go outwardly,

remain completely with that suffering. Remain, you understand what I'm saying. That is, not move away from that central fact of suffering - that gives you tremendous stability. You understand all this? No you don't!

Look. You suffer; see, understand that suffering is not resolved through escape, through suppression, through any form of rationalization. Suffering is there. Be with it, completely without any movement. You've understood this now, surely. The explanation, you've understood, intellectually or verbally the explanation - but to do it is quite another matter. Now when you do it, that is, without any movement of thought, any movement of escape, any movement of suppression or rationalization, to be with it completely, then out of that comes passion. I wonder if you understand. And that is compassion. Have you understood something? No. It doesn't matter. Look at yourself and see how you suffer, the urge to escape from it, see the absurdity of escape, the rationalization, seeking comfort, all that's a wastage of energy, moving away from the central fact of suffering. You understand? Remain with it, then, that suffering undergoes a tremendous change which becomes passion. I haven't time to go into this more with you, that's up to you.

And also we must go into this question of death. Do you want to go into this?

Q: Yes.

K: Why? You know, please, all these things that we are talking about are very, very serious; it isn't something you play with, it isn't something you listen to for one day and forget and go on with your daily, useless life. This is something very, very serious, and

it's only the very serious that live; not the flippant, not the casual - you know, all the rest of it. It's only a man who is deeply, profoundly concerned with all this, such a man - lives. So we must go into this question of death, which is very complex. We said we must understand the question of time, apart from the chronological time of yesterday, today and tomorrow - sunrises, sunsets - divided into twenty four hours; we are not talking about that; that's necessary, that exists, and if that doesn't play a part in your life you'll lose your bus. We are talking about something else, psychological. Because we are in despair, fearful, then there is always hope - hope something will take place tomorrow. So that is the movement of time.

What is the relationship of time to death? You understand? One has lived ten years, fifty years, or eight years or a hundred years - a life that has been painful, anxious and all the rest of it, an empty life - a wasted life - and that life comes to an end, both biologically and psychologically. I'm going to go into all this. And one clings to the known and avoids the unknown - the known suffering, the known pain, the known pleasure, the known fears - one clings to all that which you call 'living'. And one is frightened to let go all of that which you have to do when death comes. So there's the interval between the living and the dying, the process of time. Then, what is it that dies? Biologically you have lived so unintelligently; because biologically, physically the body has its own intelligence. I don't know if you know anything about all this, worked at it. It has its own intelligence, if you don't spoil it through taste, through gluttony, through smoking, drink, drugs and all the rest of the business that one goes through. Don't go through that,

that is, through taste, habit, custom, tradition; then the body has its own intelligence. That body, organically dies, the organ dies. We know that. But also we say there is something which is me, which must continue, because after all I've collected so much experience - I want to finish that book before I die. I must be successful, give me another few more years, and so on and so on. So what is it that is 'me' - that says, I don't want to die, I must have some kind of continuity. You understand? This is our craving right through life. From the ancient days the Egyptians up to the present day, and before the Egyptians, the ancient Egyptians not modern Egypt, this has been the problem. A continuity and an ending, the desire, the immense drive to continue. My pleasure, I want it fulfilled tomorrow. When you say "there is no tomorrow" it becomes a tremendous despair. You understand?

So, there is death. We have to investigate together not accepting authority, because I am not your authority or your guru. To me gurus are dangerous in spiritual life. You have to find out for yourself what is it that is 'me', how it came into being, why it has taken such tremendous importance in our life, and why is it that one is so frightened of death? The 'me' has come through words, through experience, through knowledge - the 'me', which is the form, the name, all the bundle of memories, knowledge, experience, the past pleasures, pains - all that consciousness with its content is 'me'. Right? Please see it for yourself. You say that's only not me - only that's mainly memory, therefore it is a material process - but there is a 'me' which is spiritual. The Hindus and others maintain and probably some of you maintain that there is some thing spiritual in 'me'. 'Me' is the essence of that spirit. When

you say the 'me' is the essence of that spirit, covered over by all kinds of darkness, like an onion with many, many layers, that essence of the highest is 'me' - that is still part of thinking. Right? When you feel that the essence is 'me' that's part of your process of thought. Somebody has put it into your mind or you have invented it yourself. I wonder if you are following all this? You may not believe it but thought has created this. But thought is a material process, because thought is knowledge, experience stored up as memory in the brain and that response to that memory is thinking. We went through all that the other day; we won't go into it now. So thought is a material process. Thought can say, "There is spirit in me", but it is a material process. When you say, "I have faith in god", it is a material process. The faith in god, god being your projection of what you think is the most beautiful, omnipotent, it is still a process of thought. So, there is nothing - please bear with me, go into it very deeply - there is nothing but the movement of thought which has created the 'me', or the essence of the spirit; so it is still thought, it is still a material process.

So, one is frightened of the known - one clings to the known and one is frightened of the unknown, which is death. Right? Do you understand this? So, time is the living, a long interval and death. We said time is a movement, movement of thought as measure, so many lives, so many years - which is all measurement. Now, can that time stop? Which means the living and the dying close together. You understand? This takes so much explanation. That is, death means the ending of that which has continued. See how important it is that that which continues becomes mechanical. Right? And therefore there is nothing new; thought may invent

something new, like the jet, it's something new, or the Einstein theories - I won't go into all that. So, thought can invent something new but we are not talking about that kind of invention; we are talking about thought can invent something beyond death - but it's still the movement of thought. So we are saying death means the ending of a continuity, which is time. That which continues means time - tradition, your faith in your beliefs, in your gods, is the movement of time.

So we are saying, to die to the things known to you now. To die to your attachments, now, which is going to take place when you die. You understand? This is really very serious, because when we die, what takes place? The organism with its brain dies, comes to an end, the brain deteriorates. The brain which contained memory in its cells, as experience and knowledge, that brain withers away. So there is the ending of thought. And, can there be an ending of thought while living? You understand my question? Which is dying now; not fifty years later, which doesn't mean you commit suicide, don't jump over the bridge. Which means dying to your pleasure. Of course you will die to your pain, that's very easy, that's what one want to do, but one wants to cling to the pleasure, to the picture you have created about pleasure and the pursuit of it. That, when the brain decays is going to end. You understand what I am talking about? So, to die instantly to attachment, to jealousy - die. That's one problem. Therefore when there is such death there is then non-continuity which means the ending of time, therefore a totally different dimension of consciousness. I haven't time to go into all that. Totally different kind of consciousness, which is not the consciousness with all its content which is 'me', but a totally



different dimension.

Now, I don't die now. One doesn't die because one says, I must have a little more time please - give me a little more time - I want to enjoy my life. I've got a new car, a new wife, a new pleasure, a new job, please don't let me die immediately. So what happens to that man or woman - please this is important for you to understand all this - what happens to that man or woman who says, "I'm satisfied with things as they are; I've got my property, I've got a good wife, a husband, money in the bank, and to hell with everything else!" What happens to that man when he dies? You understand my question? There are two types of beings in the world; the one who dies to everything known - the known is the structure of thought put together as the 'me' - the attachments, the fears, the loneliness, the despair and therefore out of despair, hope - all that he dies to, to all that there is an instant ending. The ending of sorrow is the beginning of compassion. You think about it. Don't think about it, do it! Now what happens to the man who doesn't do all this? He is lazy, indifferent, becomes serious about something which is trivial, or he thinks it is very important to follow a guru - and all that silly stuff - what happens to that man, or woman? You understand my question? Have you understood my question?

There are two types of human beings: the one who is dying every minute of the day, to everything he has gathered, therefore he is never gathering anything - you understand? Psychologically he is never gathering anything, therefore there is no 'me' at all, all the time. And there is the other man, what happens to him? So what is the other man? The other man is the human being or the woman, the human being like every other human being in the

world, who has lived in sorrow, in despair, in agony, tears, like the rest of human beings. So there is this stream of sorrow, the stream, the river of agony, the river of pleasure, the river of violence, all that, he is in that stream, he has always been in that stream. Right? It's only the man who steps out of that stream who is different; otherwise he is like the rest. I know this is a sad picture - you understand? - this is really a great sorrow to see this happening. Therefore, the man who sees this happening is compassionate. Therefore, his responsibility is to convey all this. You understand what I am saying?

So, immortality is not 'me' surviving eternally until the Angel Gabriel blows the horn - but there is immortality that is beyond death, when time has come to an end. You understand? Time as a movement of thought and measure, which is our consciousness. When that consciousness empties itself completely then there is the state that is totally different. The emptying of this consciousness with its content is part of meditation, which we will discuss tomorrow.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH SEPTEMBER 1976**

We have been talking during these four discussions, dialogues about many things; things that are concerned with our daily, human living - the problems of fear, pleasure and the great burden of the sorrow of human beings. And yesterday we talked about, went into together, time, the nature of time, the nature of love and death. I think this morning we ought to talk over together something that is of fundamental importance, which every human being should be involved in, because it concerns our life, our daily activity, how we waste our days and years - and what is it all about, and what is it all for?

We are born and we die, and during those years of pain, joy and pleasure and sorrow, the everlasting struggle and effort, what is it all about, what is it all for? I think this is a very important question one should ask oneself. It's very easy to reply, a rational explanation or a neurotic one, or a very intellectual, emotional romantic explanation. But if you put aside all those naturally, and obviously being rather superficial, however intellectual it may be, I think this is a very important question to ask, and to find an answer for oneself, not depend on some priest, on some guru, on some philosophical concept or formula which do not answer the real question. They offer very obvious superficial, non-realistic theories; and so it seems to me very important to go into this question. What does it all mean - our existence? Has it any meaning at all as we live it - going to the office or the factory for the next forty years or fifty years, trying to climb the ladder of

success, accumulate money, pleasure, experience, knowledge - and so at the end die? And some of the scientists say through knowledge we ascend; the ascent of man through knowledge. Is that so? We have an infinite amount of knowledge about many things - biologically, archaeologically, historically, and so on and so on and so on, but apparently knowledge has not changed man radically, deeply; we are more or less what we have been for a million years and more - struggle, conflict, pain, pleasure, and the everlasting battle of existence. Seeing all that in every country and in every climate, what is it all about?

To find that out, not asserting anything, not believing in anything, not having any ideal, but merely observing very deeply, it becomes necessary to find out otherwise we lead a very mechanistic life. Our brains have become used to a mechanical way of life; part of this brain must be mechanical and it is necessarily so, in the acquisition of knowledge and the expression of that knowledge, skilfully, in every way of life in every action, outwardly, technologically. But this knowledge that one has acquired - and we can pile up knowledge more and more and more, but that does not answer the fundamental question: what is the meaning, the depth of our life?

One sees, one observes that there must be unity of mankind, because that is the only way we will survive physically, biologically; not divisions - the Europeans, the Americans, the Russians, the Hindus and so on, not divisions; the complete total unity of mankind. And politics and politicians are not going to solve that problem ever. On the contrary, they will maintain the divisions; its very profitable. So, as that is an important and

essential necessity of existence that there must be unity of all mankind, and that cannot be brought about through legislation, through bureaucratic dogmas or rules and all the rest of it. So when you observe all this as a human being living in chaos in a world that has almost gone mad - the armaments, the selling of them for profit, killing people, in the name of ideas and countries, for god, and all the rest of it, observing, seeing all this over the world, what is a human being to do and what for?

So I think it becomes very important to find out, to discover for oneself, if one is at all serious - and one must be serious in life, otherwise one does not really live at all; it's only the very, very serious man - which doesn't mean he has no laughter, no smile - but that seriousness which demands a total commitment to the whole issue of life. And religions have tried to offer the meaning to life; that is, organized, propagandistic, ritualistic religion. But, in spite of 2,000 or 10,000 years, as in Asia, man has merely asserted certain principles, certain ideals, certain conclusions, but they are all verbal, superficial, non-realistic. So we are faced, then, when we look at all this, and realizing that our brain is almost mechanical, caught in a groove, caught in a habit, caught in tradition, in the conditioning that education has given, cultivating only knowledge, information and so making the brain more and more and more mechanistic, one inevitably demands or asks, if one is again serious, what does life mean? What is it all about?

If we are to enquire into this very deeply, there must be great doubt. Doubt, scepticism is essential, because that brings a certain quality of freedom of mind, through negation of everything that man has put together, his religions, his rituals, his dogmas, his

beliefs, his faith - all the movement of thought, and thought is a material process, as we've been talking about, which even the scientists accept. And thought has not solved the problems, thought has not been able to delve deeply into itself; thought has merely, being itself a fragment, broken up all existence into fragmentation.

So there is the quality of this brain which is mechanistic - and necessarily so in certain areas, and psychologically, inwardly, in the very psychological structure of the human mind there is no freedom. It is conditioned, it is bound by belief, by so-called ideas, by faith; so when one doubts all that, sets all that aside, actually - not theoretically - factually, accurately, meticulously, puts aside all that, then what have you left?

Many people have gone that far - total negation - and that gives you a certain quality of freedom - total negation of everything that thought has constructed, projected, divided, religiously, economically, socially, and when you negate all this, because they have not answered, they have not solved any of our human, deep problems like sorrow, fear and death. So, is a mind capable, your mind, capable if you are at all serious, to put aside all that, and begin?

One is afraid to do that because one says to oneself, if I deny everything that thought, which is a mechanical process of time, measure, which is the response of memory and therefore a material process, and that material process brings more and more suffering, more and more agony, more and more anxiety, fear to mankind, when you see that, and when you realize the nature of thought and go beyond, negate it, then what is there? And to find out what is there we must begin with freedom, because freedom is the first and

last step, both democratically, inwardly - otherwise man is merely a machine if there is no freedom - not to choose. We think that through choice we are free; because we can choose we are free. But choice exists only when the mind is confused; there's no choice when the mind is very clear. When you see things very clearly without any distortion, without any illusion then there is no choice. A mind that is choiceless is a free mind, and a mind that chooses and therefore establishes a series of conflicts, contradictions, such a mind is never free because it is in itself, confused, divided, broken up.

So if one is willing to go so far then we can begin to find out what is the meaning of all this existence. As we said, during these talks and before, we are exploring together, we are sharing our explorations together, because there is no authority, though the speaker sits on a platform because it is convenient, so that you can see, the platform doesn't give him any authority, and he doesn't accept any authority. So we are together and we mean together, exploring and finding out for ourselves together if there is any meaning to life at all, any depth to life at all - or merely a passing event in a long series of historical processes. So, to explore in any field there must be freedom; freedom to examine so that in that very examination there is no distortion. When there is distortion there is a motive behind that distortion, a motive to find an answer, a motive which you would like to have or which you think would solve our problems, a motive which may be based on past experience, past knowledge - and all knowledge is the past - and if there is any motive there must be distortion. So, can our mind, which is our 'common mind' because we have the same content in

our consciousness, all human beings whether they live in the far east, the middle east or far west, go through this process of fear, agony, torture, anxiety, fear and endless conflict - inwardly and outwardly. That's the common consciousness of mankind. So when you examine your own consciousness you are looking into the consciousness of man, and therefore it's not a personal individualistic examination. On the contrary, you are looking into the consciousness of the world - which is you - which is a fact when you go into it very deeply.

So a mind that is free, which is a tremendous demand, which demands that you as a human being are committed totally to the transformation of the content of consciousness - because the content makes the consciousness. And we are concerned with the transformation, with the total psychological revolution of this consciousness, and to explore it you need great energy. And that energy comes into being when there is no dissipation of energy; one dissipates through trying to overcome 'what is', to deny 'what is', to escape from 'what is', or analyse 'what is'. Because the analyser, as we said during these many talks over many years, is the analysed. The analyser is not different from that which he analyses. When you're envious or angry or greedy - whatever it is - when you analyse the process of greed, the analyser is himself 'greed' - that which he analyses is not separate from him. And this is a fundamental reality.

So, we are asking what is the meaning and the significance of life, if there is any at all? If we say there is, you have already committed yourself to something, therefore you cannot examine, you have already started with distortion. Or, if you say, there is



nothing, no meaning to life, that also is another form of distortion. So, one must be completely free of both - both the positive and the negative assertion.

So, as we said, this is part of meditation. This is the real beginning of meditation. The gurus that come over to this country from India, and are springing up all over the world like so many mushrooms, they have brought to this word a great many meanings. There is the transcendental meditation, and I wish they hadn't used that lovely word - which is the repetition of certain words and there are really in Sanskrit very, very few mantras, which we won't go into now. And the repetition of those words given, at a certain price on the market, give you, if you repeat every morning for twenty minutes in the afternoon, and another twenty minutes in the evening, they bring you a certain qualities of quietness, constant repetition. You can just as well repeat 'Ave Maria' or 'coca cola' or any other mechanical repetition, it will certainly give you a certain quality of quiet, but this is mechanical quietness. Because you have reduced the brain to constantly repeat, repeat, repeat - even if you have tried it for two minutes, how mechanical it becomes, it becomes quiet. But that's no more transcendental than anything else. And, thereby, we think we'll experience something that is beyond the material process of thought.

So, there is this, that man seeks experience, he seeks experience other than the ordinary daily experience. We are bored or tired or fed up with all the experiences we have of life, and we hope to capture some experience which is not the product of thought. And to experience - the word means 'to go through', to go through with

anything and end it; not remember it and carry it on. But we don't do that. To recognize an experience you must have already known it; it's not a new experience. So a mind that demands experience - please listen to this - other than the mere, physical, psychological everyday experience - that demands something far greater and above all this, what it will experience is its own projection, and therefore it is still mechanistic, still materialistic, which is the product of thought. So, when you do not demand any experience, when there is no distortion and therefore no illusion, and one has understood the whole meaning of desire, which we went into many times during this and other talks, which is sensation plus thought is desire with its image. And so desire is also a distortion in the process of examination. I hope you are following all this. Then only the mind, the whole structure of consciousness, being free is capable of looking at itself, looking at itself without any distortion, as you see in a clear mirror, your face. The mirror reflects exactly what your face is; there's no distortion - unless the mirror is distorted. So in that way the mind, which includes the brain and all the nervous organisms, the whole totality which is the mind is now free - absolutely without any distorting movement. Distortion takes place when there is effort - right? Effort implies 'me' and something I am going to achieve - division between me and that. That division invariably brings conflict as in the nationalities and so on; wherever there is division there must be conflict, and so on. Meditation comes only when there is the complete ending of conflict. Therefore every other form of meditation where there is effort, practice, control has no meaning. Right? Please don't accept what the speaker is saying. We are examining together, sharing

together, therefore it's very important not to accept a thing that is being said, but examine it.

So, we have to go into the question of control because we are going to go into the question of control, awareness and attention. All these are necessary to find out if there is a meaning to life, or no meaning at all. We are educated from childhood to control - our feelings - you know, the whole process of control. In control there is the controller and the thing that is being controlled. Right? The controller thinks he is different from that which he desires to control. So he has already divided himself as the 'controller' and the 'controlled' hence there is always conflict. That is, one fragment of thought says to itself, I must control other fragments of thought. But thought which says, "I must control other fragments" is itself a part of thought - a fragment of thought. So when you see all that the controller is the controlled. This is very important because when this is realized completely, deeply, not verbally, not theoretically, but actually, then conflict comes to an end. That is, there is no division in oneself; there is not the controller different from the controlled. The experiencer is the experience; they are not two different entities or movements. The thinker is the thought; there is no thinker if there is no thought. So when one realizes this profoundly as a truth, as a law, then all effort comes to an end. And it's very important in the investigation with which we are concerned now, that this effort comes to an end. Because effort also is a distorting factor.

So, meditation can only come into being when there is no effort of any kind, and it is necessary to meditate to find out if there is any meaning to life at all, or if there is a meaning. And meditation

is also laying the foundation of right conduct; right in the sense, accurate, not according to an ideal, not according to a pattern, not according to any formula - but action which takes place when there is complete observation of that which is going on in oneself. From that, action takes place. So we must establish this through meditation and right relationship. Relationship between human beings, which means no conflict between human beings. The conflict exists only when there is division between the two images, which we have talked about a great deal. The image which you have and which she has about you and you have about her. The images make the division, which we have gone into, we won't go into it now because it would take too long.

And if there is to be meditation there must be no psychological fear whatsoever. Therefore the ending of sorrow - and what we talked about yesterday - compassion, and love; that's the basis, the foundation of meditation. Without that you can sit under a tree for the rest of your life, cross-legged, and you will still be sitting there under the tree for ever and ever. Or, you may breathe properly - you know all the tricks one plays - none of those are going to help.

You may remember a certain teacher, and to him came a disciple. And the disciple took a position - sitting properly, cross-legged, the so-called Indian lotus posture, and shut his eyes. And the teacher says, my friend, what are you doing? He replied, I'm breathing properly, I'm sitting straight, and controlling my thoughts so that I can reach the highest consciousness. So the teacher picks up two stones and keeps on rubbing them. And the disciple wakes up and says, Master, what are you doing? The Master says, I'm rubbing two stones to make one of them into a mirror. And the

disciple says, Master don't you know you can never do that. The Master says, I know that, but do you know you can sit like that for the next ten thousand years - all the rest of it.

So, when you have really, deeply established a way of life, which in itself is not an end. that's only the beginning of it, then we can proceed to find out whether the mind, which is the totality - the brain and all the rest - which is the entire consciousness, is quiet, without any distortion, because it's necessary to be quiet. Because it is only when the mind is quiet, still, you can hear properly. We never hear anything completely, we never listen to anything totally. While you are listening there is already a distortion taking place - what you hear, either you agree or disagree, or you compare what you hear with what you already know, or your mind is chattering. So it is never actually listening either to your wife, to your husband, anything, because you are already crowded. So it is necessary for the mind to be quiet to listen to any conversation, like now. To listen to any person, to a bird, to the wind, the mind must naturally be quiet to listen to the beauty of a bird singing. So the mind must be quiet to find out, to investigate, to look, to observe if life has any meaning at all, or if there is something most profound, which we are doing now, I hope. That is your mind after laying down the foundation of behaviour, conduct, order, in this confusion of existence, naturally the mind becomes quiet. Now in that quietness is there an observer who says, "I am quiet"? You understand my question? When you are happy, walking along a street, or in the woods, or sitting in the sun, quietly happy, when you say, "Am I happy?", then that happiness has gone. Right? Have you not noticed, it is a very simple fact. The moment you are

conscious of something which gives you happiness, that happiness disappears. So when you say, "Am I silent, is my mind silent?", it is no longer. Right?

There are different kinds of silence; the silence between two words, the silence between two notes of the piano, the silence between two noises, the silence between two thoughts - an interval between two thoughts - the silence after a long battle with oneself - the weariness. The silence between two wars, which you call peace. So, all those are silences which are the product of noise - between two noises, between two thoughts, between two notes, between two wranglings. That is not silence; there is silence which is not produced or cultivated, so that there is no 'me' to observe that silence, there is only silence, quietness. Then we can ask that question: in that silence is there any meaning or not at all? You really don't ask that question in that 'silence' but we have started with that question; we are not answering that question; we must find an answer to that question. We have prepared the field, or rather the mind that is capable now of finding out. Have we gone together so far? A little bit at least.

Where do you find the answer? You understand my question? We put a question which is: has life any meaning? We have said various religions have offered a substitute, a symbol; a symbol, a myth is not actual, it's a romantic thing. But when you have started with that question we must find out who is going to answer that question. Am I going to answer it, that is, as a human being - answer that question - or, in that very silence the answer is? You understand my question? Am I making myself somewhat clear?

That is, when there is no distortion - and distortion exists only

when there is motive, distortion exists when there is effort, distortion exists where there is a demand for experience, distortion exists when there is division between the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought and so on, all these are distorting factors - when there is no distortion and therefore no wastage of energy, now in that silence there is this energy, which has been dissipated, but now that dissipation has ceased. So in that silence there is great energy. Is that actual with each of us - or are you still floundering somewhere in the middle? You understand my question? Because there must be that energy, that vitality, that strength to see - words! Because the word is not the thing, the description is not the described. So is there anything beyond this energy and silence? Is this energy a mechanical thing - because mechanical thought has tremendous energy - to go to the moon, to create the instrument to go to the moon there must be a great deal of energy to put all that together, a million parts together. That demands great co-operation of three hundred thousand people to put that thing together. That is, that energy is derived from knowledge, experience, memory, response of thought; and thought in its activity has its own energy which is mechanistic, which is a material process. That energy is totally different from the energy which we are talking about. Am I mesmerizing all of you?

You see, the speaker is very serious about all this. He has spoken for fifty years and more on this, and as most minds are caught in grooves, deep or shallow, one is constantly watching if the brain forms a groove and feels secure in that groove and remains in that groove. We are asking the same thing of each one of us. And when one stays in a groove - belief, dogmas, religions -

whatever the groove be, however beautiful, however pleasant, however comforting, then that mind becomes mechanical, repetitive, so it loses its depth, its beauty. So we are asking, is the silence mechanistic, a product of thought which says "There must be something beyond me - and therefore to find that out I must be silent, I must control myself, I must subjugate everything to find out" - which is still the movement of thought. Right? So we must find out the difference between concentration, awareness and attention, because we are concerned with these three.

Concentration implies, to focus ones energy in a particular direction, excluding all other directions. Right? I concentrate on a page, on a word; the word near or the word very far away, to concentrate on that demands your energy applied to that one particular thing, therefore you are excluding all other things; you are building a wall, resisting. That is concentration.

Then there is awareness, which is fairly simple if you don't give a lot of complications to it. To be aware. To be aware of the marquee, its shape, the people sitting round you, the colour of their dress - to be aware of all this; but that awareness then begins to choose. To choose that colour better than the other colour, to choose what it would be like, what it would not be like. So, to be aware without choice - just to observe the total thing without any choice. I hope you are doing this as we are talking.

And there is attention. Attention implies there is no centre from which you are attending. When there is a centre from which you are attending, that's merely an extension of the centre. The centre is me or you, and if you are aware from that centre that attention is limited. Right? But there is an attention which has no centre; the



centre exists when there is choice in awareness. Right? Are you following all this?

You understand? Concentration, awareness, awareness with choice; when there is choice there is always 'me', my experience, my knowledge - me, separate from you. That 'me' chooses; where there is choice there is me and therefore it is still limited. Now we are talking about attention in which there is no centre at all.

Therefore if you do it now as you are sitting there, you will see when there is no centre your attention is vast; there is no boundary. And this is necessary because the mind is now without choice, completely attentive. Completely. With your nerves, with everything - it is completely attentive, and therefore no centre. There is no 'me', who says, "I am attentive". Now, in that attention, there is silence; silence which contains this energy which is no longer dissipated.

Now let's proceed from there. To proceed from there must be either actual or verbal. You understand? Either your mind is moving, not in time - I won't go into that - is capable of a different kind of movement, and when you describe that movement it's either verbal or actual. If you're caught in the verbal description then you're lost. Right? Then you're playing with words, arguments and all the rest. But if it is actual, real, that which is going on, then that question is still unanswered: is there a meaning to life, or none at all? Which is, to put it differently, is there anything sacred in life? Sacred in the sense - holy? The word 'whole' means health, sanity and a quality of sacredness; that's the word whole; the word 'whole' means that: health, sanity and holy. Now, is the mind, your mind, healthy? That is, both your body and your mind completely

healthy, so that there is no neurotic movement. Right? Even though your body may not be healthy, if it interferes then that illness distorts the mind, the activity of mind, then it's impossible. Right? But even though you can be not completely healthy, you can know you're not healthy, be aware of it, know its limitation and therefore leave it there. You follow?

So, we are now asking if the whole of the mind is whole - healthy, sane and holy? Is your mind like that? Please, this requires tremendous enquiry into oneself, so that there is no false note in it, no hypocrisy, never going beyond actually 'what is'. That requires great attention, great energy to look at yourself. Not to analyse yourself, but to observe what is going on. So, it is only such a mind that can find the answer. It's only such a mind that discovers - unfortunately I describe it and therefore it becomes something unreal - there is something beyond all this travail, all this misery if you are capable, if you give your whole energy, time, capacity to this; otherwise one leads a very shallow, meaningless life - and the inevitable death coming after.

So the whole of this is meditation; from the beginning to the end. The beginning is to understand oneself; not according to any philosopher, any psychologist or any analyst, but for yourself. Yourself is mankind, the rest of the world. When you look at yourself you are looking at every human being in the world. And then after seeing what your consciousness is - your consciousness is its content - the misery, the confusion, the anxiety, the fears, the attachments, the property, the wife - you follow; all that is your consciousness, which is the consciousness of every human being. It may have frills around it, but in its essence it is the same. From

there you can go into the question of fear. Psychological fear must be totally ended. We went into that, and also we went into pleasure; we talked about sorrow and the ending of sorrow. In the ending of sorrow then only there is love, compassion; otherwise there is no compassion. That is the solid earth upon which your feet are firmly established, rooted - so that there is no deception. Then effort. Where there is effort there must be distortion. So can one live a life, a daily life, without a single effort? Find out what it means. It is possible to live without a single effort. That comes only when you understand contradictions in yourself. Observe the contradiction in oneself; not try to change it, not try to alter the contradiction; just to observe. The very observation is its own ending of the contradiction. When there is a total observation in which is total attention then any contradiction in yourself comes to an end. You can test it out actually everyday for yourself. So one can live a life in which there is no conflict. Then only the real deeper meditation begins, and then you have that energy of silence, in which there is no illusion, and that is, as we said at the beginning, the first step is the last step, which is freedom.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 3RD APRIL 1976

We are going together to investigate - I mean by 'together', not the speaker investigates and you listen, but together we are going to investigate into the whole psychological realm of human existence. We are going together to examine meditation, with all its complexity. We are going to examine together if there is anything sacred in life, which is part of meditation. And we are going to look into the question of death, love, whether there is an ending of sorrow, and the complex problem of pleasure, fear and the human relationship, which is the essence of society. And to examine all this one must be serious. This is not an entertainment, a something that you give an hour or two on Saturday or Sunday morning, and forget all about it for the rest of the week. We are going together to look into all these problems. So this is a very serious affair.

And we may use a language which is not modern; we are using the eternal language of human communication. And communication implies a sharing, a partaking together into the immense complex problem of existence. And if you are not serious, if you don't want to examine the whole of it, but only one part of it - you may be interested in meditation and not interested in anything else, or you may be only concerned with relationship, human relationship, between you and another, or you may only be concerned with the question of fear, but you have to take the whole package, not just one bit of it. So please bear in mind through all these talks that we are going to have for the next three weeks, every Saturday and Sunday and dialogues on Tuesdays and Thursdays, that we are gathered here for a very, very serious

purpose: how to transform the human mind, the mind that has lived over many, many millennia, in sorrow, suffering, violence, bitterness, anxiety, fear, wars, violence. And to examine all this one must be very deeply concerned with what is happening in the world at the present time, both now and in the past, how all this has come into being, the wars, the violence, the gurus, with their absurd meditations and so on - we are going to go into all that.

And to investigate one must be free of prejudice, otherwise you can't investigate, then you are starting already from a premise, which you like, or which you have experienced, or which you cling to and therefore you are incapable of examining very closely. So to investigate demands that a mind must be not only aware of its own prejudice but the subject which you are going to look into. And to look into it we must use a language, a language that you and the speaker understand. He is using words which are common according to the dictionary, not according to modern language, specially American colloquialism with all their peculiar jargon. So communication is only possible between you and the speaker when both of us are concerned, when both of us are serious, when both of us share the problem. And you cannot share if you are already full, full of your own prejudices, your own conclusions, your own experiences, you must be free to look into - you may not agree or disagree. When you are examining something you don't agree or disagree, you look into it. So all this demands a certain seriousness, a certain quality of attention and not merely be intellectually or emotionally excited.

So having laid that as the basis of communication with each other, we can then look at what is happening in the world, because

we are the world, the world is you and me, the world is not separate from you and me. We have created this world, the world of violence, the world of wars, the world of religious divisions, sex, anxieties, the utter lack of communication with each other, without any sense of compassion, consideration for another. So wherever one goes, whether in India, the Middle East, or come to this country, in essence right through the world human beings, that is you and another living in India, in America, in Europe or in the extreme Orient, we suffer, we are anxious, we are uncertain, we don't know what is going to happen. Everything has become uncertain. So there is a common relationship between us all, whether we live in a cold climate, or hot climate, or very far away or very near, it is our human problem, therefore we are the world essentially, basically, fundamentally, and the world is you, and you are the world. I do not know if one really realizes that, not intellectually but deeply, basically, that right through the world as human beings we are in sorrow, fear, anxiety, violence, uncertain of everything, insecure. So unless one realizes that the world is you, and you are the world, fundamentally, deeply, not romantically, not intellectually but actually, because then our problem is the global problem, not my problem or your particular problem, it is a human problem. Can we go on from there?

We are dealing with human, global problems, which is you as a human being, living in this monstrous, disintegrating world. So when we talk about relationship, we are talking about the relationship of man to man. And when you understand that relationship then you can come very much closer, which is you and your neighbour, you and your wife, you and your son and so on. So

unless you have a global, universal, the entire whole human being, you will then merely live in fragments, as an American, or a European, Communist, Socialist, Hindu, Buddhist and all the rest of the divisions that man has made. So this is very important to understand if one may point it out: that we are concerned with man, which is you, you are the world, and the world is you. Where you go, whether you go in India, or Europe or come here, man is suffering, man is afraid, man wants to find out if there is some truth anywhere, if there is any god, if there is anything sacred, whether man can ever be free from fear, an end to sorrow, whether there is an eternity or only the ending of life, a fifty year life and that is the end of it. So we are concerned in our investigation of man, man, the universal man, or woman - in this country Women's Lib plays a big part, so I had better include the women in it too! When we say man we mean woman also, don't let us quarrel about words, it becomes rather childish.

In examination together there no authority, there is no teacher and the taught. Please this is very important what we are saying. In examining, in investigating together, sharing the problem together, there is no teacher and the taught, there is no guru and the disciple, therefore there is no authority, this is the basic thing one has to understand. In the world, psychological world, in the world of the spirit there is no authority. One may sit on a platform, as the speaker is, that doesn't give him any authority, and therefore you are not following him, or accepting what he is saying. It is good to have a great deal of scepticism, but that scepticism must be kept on a leash, and to know when to let it go and when to hold it.

So in examining this vast problem of existence and in

investigating it, both of us must be very clear and understand that there is no authority, the one who knows and the other does not know. Together we are going to look into this. Whether you are capable of looking, that is a different matter, whether you are intensely, consistently, pursuing the investigation depends on you. Whether you have the energy, the intention, the necessary persistence. And if you haven't then you make authority. I hope you realize this. If you are lazy, indolent, and then you give authority to another. Or if you are disorderly in your life and you see orderliness in another then you make him into an authority. So please from the very beginning of this talk and right through these three weeks, we are going together to examine without any sense of authority, which means freedom to look. Because one of the causes of this disintegrating society in which we live, is that we are followers - one of the causes. We accept spiritual authority, the intermediary, the priest, the analyst - I hope there are some here! We become incapable when we give ourselves over to another to find out about ourselves. And as we said, one of the causes of this disintegration that is taking place in the world is that we have accepted another as our authority, as our guide in matters of the spirit. We don't seem to be able to look into ourselves and examine very closely the whole human existence, which is yourself.

So I hope we understand each other. That we are not agreeing or disagreeing, we are examining, investigating and therefore there is no authority, only freedom to examine. I do not know if you see the beauty of it? Then you and I have a relationship.

One can look at what is happening about us, which is, disintegration, moral disintegration, politically, religiously,



economically, socially, and in ourselves. One can find out many causes of it, many causes of this disintegration. That is, the word means breaking up, fragmentation taking place, both in the human being and in the society in which he lives. And one of the basic causes of this disintegration, this breaking up, is the utter lack of religious spirit. We are going to examine that word. Each person gives a meaning to that word according to his like and dislike, according to what he thinks his experience is, and therefore makes it a very small affair. The word 'religion' means according to a good dictionary, accumulating all your energy to investigate what is truth. To find out, to come upon that state of mind or consciousness in which there is truth, not invented by thought - which we shall go into presently in one of these talks. But one of the factors of this disintegration is the utter lack of the religious mind. And the other is basically the lack of morality. Not the Christian morality, or the Hindu morality, or the morality of permissiveness; morality implies orderliness, basic order, not according to a pattern, according to the convenience of environment, but an order that comes when you understand the nature of disorder, and therefore morality is a thing that is living.

So that is what we are going to do: to look at this disintegrating world, which is your mind, you who are the essence of society, who are the basis of society in your relationships. And when there is no relationship then there is disintegration. Is this all right? Can we go on from there?

So we are going to investigate what is relationship, what is fear, what is pleasure, what is sorrow, the whole meaning of death, and the very complex problem of meditation, and what is the quality of

a mind that meditates. All that we are going to do. That means you have to be energetic, eager, passionate to find out.

Now first, as we said, there is no authority, therefore freedom to look, no tradition, therefore capable of examining. The word 'tradition' means to hand down, and also that word means betrayal, betrayal of the present; when you bring over a tradition and try to live according to that tradition, habit, then you are betraying the present - which you won't understand. And to examine this question of relationship, which is the basis of our existence, which is the basis of our society, unless there is that deep understanding and a transformation in that relationship, we cannot go further into the question of meditation, what is religion, what is truth and so on. So that is the bedrock upon which we must stand clearly and find out what it means to have relationship, to have right relationship, accurate relationship. Again the word 'accuracy' means factually, correct.

What is relationship? What does it mean to be related to another? This is very important to find out, not to avoid, not to escape, but to find out actually what it means to have a relationship with another - at the physical level, sexually, psychological level, emotional level, intellectual level and at the level of what one calls love. And if that whole nature and structure of relationship is not understood, lived daily - please listen to this - if that relationship is not clear to go and meditate is utterly infantile, it has no meaning because this is the basis of life, then meditation merely becomes a futile, infantile escape. And in this country, the gurus and all the business, the transcendental meditation and all that, becomes utter stupid nonsense unless you establish right relationship between you

and another, that being the very basis of existence, trying to meditate becomes an evasion of the actual. Therefore leads to all kinds of neurotic, destructive results. Right?

You know the speaker has faced this problem of meditation and the gurus for the last fifty years. It is not prejudice but in matters of spirit there is no leader and taught, therefore no authority, no guru. It is the authority that has destroyed the investigation and the discovery of what is truth.

So: what is relationship? What is the actual relationship in our daily life with each other? If you examine it very closely, and are not afraid, what is taking place? You have an image about yourself, first, don't you? A picture, an idea, a concept of yourself, and the person you are related to has his concept, or her concept, her image, her picture about herself. Right? Please you are looking at yourself, you are not merely listening to these words. Words are a mirror, and the mirror becomes useless when you are looking at yourself actually. So you and the other, man and woman, boy or girl or husband, wife and so on and so on, each human being has a picture, an image, a conclusion, an idea about oneself, about themselves. If you have lived with another for a week, or a hundred weeks, you have made a picture of the other, and the other has made a picture of you, That is a fact, isn't it? No? Are you afraid to look at that picture? That picture has been built through many days, many years, many incidents, nagging, pleasure, comfort, fear, domination, possession, attachment and so on and so on and so on. Each one has an image of the other, and the other has an image of the other person. That is an actuality, isn't it? And you call that relationship. That is, relationship between the two pictures,

between the two images. Right? You are not agreeing with the speaker. You are looking at the fact. These pictures or images or conclusions are memories, memories which you have put together, stored up in the brain, and reacting to each other according to those images. You have been hurt, and that hurt is a memory, stored up in the brain, and that reacts. So our relationship is not actual but memorial. Do you understand what I am saying? If one is married you have built a picture about your wife, and the wife has built a picture, an image about you. Those pictures, those images are the nagging, the casual remarks, the hurts, the pleasure, the comfort, the sexual memories, all that. And the relationship is between these two verbal pictures in memory, not actual. I think you have got to understand this. And therefore there is always division and conflict. For instance, you have been hurt in this relationship. The hurt is, the image you have built about yourself has been hurt. Right? Can we go on?

I wonder if you are actually observing it in yourself, or listening to the speaker and agreeing with the speaker? Do you understand? They are two different facts. Either you are agreeing with the speaker and therefore that has very little significance. Or you are actually seeing that you have built an image about yourself, and that hurt exists because of that image. Understood?

So in this relationship of human beings the hurt has taken place. The image has been hurt. Unless you heal that image totally there must always be conflict. Right? There is the past hurts and you may receive further hurts. So there are two problems. Right? The one is that you have been hurt in the past and unfortunately this happens from childhood, in the school, in college, at home,

university, right through life one is hurt. And because one is hurt one builds a wall around oneself to resist, not to be hurt any more. And having built a wall round oneself division takes place. Right? And you may say, 'I love you' but it is just words because a division exists. Right? So is it possible - please listen - is it possible not to be hurt at all? Which doesn't mean build a wall of resistance so that nothing can touch you, but to live without resistance which means never to be hurt. You understand? You know what it means to be hurt? When the child is compared with another, that is a hurt. Any form of comparison is to hurt another. Any form of imitation, conformity, is to hurt another, not only verbally but deeply. And when one is hurt, out of that hurt there is violence. So the problem is: is it possible never to be hurt? And having been hurt how to deal with the past hurts. And how to prevent future hurts. You have understood the problem? So we will find out.

When you say, 'I am hurt' what is this me that is hurt? You say, 'You have hurt me' - by your word, by a gesture, by discourtesy and so on and so on. What is hurt? Is it not the image that you have built about yourself? Please do look at it. That image is one of the factors which society, education and environment has built in you. You are that picture, that image, the name, the form, the characteristic, the idiosyncrasy and so on. All that is you, the picture, the image which you are. And that image has been hurt. You have a conclusion about yourself, that you are this or that, and when that conclusion is disturbed you are hurt. You are following all this? So can you live without a conclusion, without a picture, without an image about yourself? As long as you have an image about yourself you are everlastingly hurt. You may resist it, you

may build a wall round yourself but when there is a wall around yourself, when you withdraw there is a division, and where there is a division there must be conflict. Like the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Communist and the non-Communist - you follow? Where there is a division it is the law, there must be conflict.

So: is it possible not to be hurt at all? That is to have an innocent mind. The word 'innocent' in Latin and so on means a mind that is incapable of being hurt. And this is very important to find out if one can live in daily life, not to go off into some monastery or in some community, limit your - you know, all agreeing together, becoming mushy and sentimental and all that business - but actually in daily life to find out if you can live without an image, and therefore never to be hurt. We are going to find out. We are going to examine whether it is possible to live that way. Which means never to have conflict, never to have this division, psychological division - there is a division between you and me, tall, short, brown, white, black and so on and so on, but the psychological division.

So first to be aware that one has this image. Not to rationalize it, not to say it is inevitable, we must have it, otherwise what would happen, if I don't have an image about myself how can I live in this world when everybody around me has images, they will destroy me. Those are all excuses. But to find out whether it is possible without a single image. Because the image is the Arab, the image is the Jew - do you understand this? And therefore there is eternal war. When I have an image about myself and that is hurt and my wife has an image about herself she is hurt, how can we have any

kind of relationship? So is it possible not to have an image, which means not to be hurt? One has been hurt in the past, one has resisted it, built a wall round oneself, frightened not to be hurt any more, and there may be future hurts and therefore withdrawal, isolation.

Now how will you deal with the past hurts? Please follow all this. Will you analyse them? Do you understand? Analyse why you have been hurt, what are the causes of your hurt, who has hurt you, you know, go into it analytically. Again look at the analytical tradition: we have accepted analysis as part of our life. Right? If you cannot analyse yourself you go to the professional. What is the process of analysis? There is the analyser and the analysed. Right? See the division already. Are you following all this? I hope you are otherwise it is a waste, there is no point in my talking about it. You are examining your analysing your hurts. When you analyse, the process is the analyser and the analysed. Right? So there is a division. Is not the analyser - please listen carefully - is not the analyser the analysed? Right? You follow this? So you have created an artificial division, which is the analyser is thinking differently from the analysed, but in actuality the analyser is the analysed. Right? So there is a fundamental error in the process of analysis. And in the process of analysis you take time, days, months, years - you know the game that you all play, and enriching each other in your own peculiar ways, financially and emotionally and all the rest of it.

So there is a fundamental error in the process of analysis. When the analyser is the analysed, realizing that then how is one to be free of all hurts, of the past, and any hurts that may come

tomorrow, in the future? Is this a problem, is this a real vital issue to be solved by you? Do you feel the necessity of solving it? Otherwise you just play games with it. If it is essential that you solve this problem, which means the problem of man who has divided himself by calling himself a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu, a Muslim - you follow? - me and you and we and they. Now how is one to be free of past hurts? If analysis is not the way, what is one to do?

Q: Make an image.

K: Listen to me for a few minutes - You can ask questions on Tuesday or a little after this talk, but first let's look at the picture first. Not the verbal picture because the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. So what we have done is that the speaker has described, so don't be carried off by the description. Look at the described, which is that you are hurt, it is inevitable. Life hurts you. Another hurts you. By comparing, through imitation, through conformity, through pressure, through propaganda, so all the things around you are hurting you. Now is it possible to be free of hurt? That is, are you aware that you have an image about yourself and that the image is being hurt? If you are aware, if you say, 'Yes, this is a fact, this is an actuality, not a description', then what is one to do, knowing that any division must inevitably lead to conflict. Right? We will go into it together, share together. That is, the speaker is not telling you what to do. The speaker and you are sharing this question, to find out actually, in daily life, whether it is possible to live without a single hurt, because then you will know what love is.

Hurt and flattery are the same, aren't they? I wonder if you



realize it? Both are different forms of hurts - no? You are flattered and you like it, and the flatterer becomes your friend. So that also is another form of encouraging the image. Right? The one you want, the other you don't want. So we are only now dealing with what we don't want. Which is not to be hurt. But we want the other, which is pleasurable, which is comforting, comforting, pleasing to the images that we have. So both are the same. Now how am I, how is a human being to be free of hurt? So we have to go into the question of what it is to be attentive - sorry to expand this question.

What does it mean to attend? Because if you know what it means to attend it may solve the problem. I will show it to you - or rather I won't show it to you, we will share it together. Have you ever given total attention to anything? Complete attention in which there is no centre from which you attend. Do you understand the question? When there is a centre from which you attend then there is a division. I wonder if you follow this? No, I see you don't. Let's put it differently.

All right. You know what it is to be aware - do you? To be aware. That is, one is aware of the trees under which we are sitting, aware of the branches, the colour of the branches, the leaves, the shadows, the thickness, aware of all the nature, the beauty of it. Then you are also aware of sitting on the ground, the colour of the carpet, the speaker, the microphone. And can you be aware of all this, the microphone, the carpet, the earth, the colour of the leaves and so on, the blue shirt and the white shirt, and the desk, aware of all that without any choice? You understand? To look at it without any choice, judgement, just to look. If you can do it, that is to look without any judgement, without any choice, just to observe, in that

observation there is no observer. Right? The moment the observer comes in prejudice begins, the like and the dislike, I prefer this, I don't prefer that, division takes place. Right? So there is attention only when there is no entity who says, 'I am attending'. Right? Please, it is important to understand this. Because if you know, if there is an attention then you will see you will never be hurt again. And the past hurts are wiped away. That is, when there is an awareness in which there is no choice, no judgement, merely observation, but the moment the observer comes in then the observer gets hurt. Right? Do you understand?

So, when somebody says something to the picture that is going to be hurt, when there is complete attention there is no hurt. Have you understood? Somebody calls the speaker a fool, arrogant, or this or that. To listen to that word, to see the meaning of that word and give complete attention to it, then there is no past hurt, or the future hurt because there is no entity who is observing. I wonder if you get this? No, please, this is very important because we are going to go into this in all our talks. That as long as there is a division there must be conflict, because this is very important in dealing with fear, with pleasure, with sorrow, with death, all of that, that as long as there is a division between the observer, the experiencer, the thinker and the thought, there must inevitably be conflict, division, fragmentation, and therefore disintegration. So can you observe the tree, yourself, your neighbour, observe life completely attentively? Then can you observe with total attention the picture that you have about yourself? And when you give that complete attention is there a picture at all? You understand? You have understood it?

So when there is no image, no picture, no conclusion then what is the relationship between two human beings? You have understood? Now our relationship is based on division, which is an obvious fact. The man goes to the office, there he is brutal and ambitious, greedy and all the rest of it, comes home and he says, 'Darling, how lovely'! So there is contradiction in our life, and therefore our life is a constant battle. And therefore no relationship. And to have real human relationship is to have no image whatsoever. Then there is no image, no picture, no conclusion, and it is quite complex this question, because you have memories. Can you be free of memories of yesterday's incidents so that you are - you follow? All that is implied. Then what is the relationship between two human beings who have no images? You will find out if you have no image. That may be love. And that word 'love' has been so abused, so trodden, so sullied.

So can one live, actually in daily life without division? Which means without war, without conflict.

What time is it sir?

Q: Five past twelve.

K: I think an hour of this is sufficient. Do you want to discuss this particular problem, not something else? Do you want to have a dialogue about this? Dialogue being conversation between two friends, not two antagonists, two friends who are concerned about the problem, who say, 'Let's go beyond words, don't let's stick at words' - you may use 19th century words, which I am, or much older, 5,000 years old words, putting aside words, having an exchange, enquiry, friendly, amicable, who are committed to solve this problem. Then it is fun to discuss, to go into it.

Q: Sir, why does one try to protect the images you have of yourself in the first place?

K: Why does one try to protect the image in the first place. That is fairly simple, isn't it? Because we all want security, psychological security. What would you be if you had no image about yourself? Wouldn't you immediately be frightened? At a loss, insecure? We need security, food, clothes, and shelter, we need them, they are necessary, otherwise you can't live. But is there psychological security at all? We want it. It is one of our desires, hopes and longings and romantic demands, but in actuality, really, is there psychological security? I may have a marvellous picture about myself, the most this or that or the other, or I am the least, the opposite of that, that gives me comfort, that gives me security, that makes me feel that I am related, I identify with something or other; but remove all that and I become utterly empty, utterly lonely. And so I have to have an identity, which is the name, the form, the image, the conclusion, an idea, which is a belief. But to have none of those, which doesn't mean you live in a vacuum: on the contrary. Then you are totally related with everything and therefore when there is total relationship with everything there is no fear of insecurity. I wonder if you get this?

Q: Is it necessary to have the cooperation of the mind to transcend itself to arrive at that position of no image?

K: Is it necessary to have the cooperation of the mind, not to have that image. The questioner asks is it necessary to have the cooperation of the mind. What is the mind? Look, you have put a wrong question, you understand? Forgive me if I may point it out. You have already divided - you follow - the mind being different

from the picture. The thought has created the picture. Right? And part of the mind is the whole structure of thought. If thought - please we will go into this perhaps tomorrow - the question of the nature and the structure of thought. It is thought that has created the image, isn't it? You say something to me and I react to it, according to pleasure or pain, and that is the beginning of the picture. The thinking about something is the beginning of a picture. And thinking is part of our mind. So when thought has created the image and when you see thought itself, in itself is the cause of fragmentation, then you have to understand thought. I wonder if you follow all this?

Look, we will discuss it tomorrow, this question, I think it is important. Thought has made this world - not the tree, it hasn't made the tree, but thought has made Christianity, thought has made Hinduism, thought has made all the sex, all the divisions, all the Jew, the Arab. You follow? The world. And thought has created wars - my country and your country. The religious wars. So what is the place of thought? Do you understand? We will go into that tomorrow. It is a very complex question. And you have to go into it whether you like it or not because all your life is based on thought. Just let me finish madame.

Every action you do is based on thought. Therefore, action then is a fragment - business action unrelated to moral action, and moral action unrelated to political action, and political action unrelated to religious action. So there is always in our human existence and relationship conflict, and therefore never a moment of peace. You can invent peace, which is again the process of thought. And is peace the result of thought? We will go into all that tomorrow.

Madame you were going to say something?

Q: I don't know if this is absurd but I don't know that I really understood what you said today. You said to avoid hurt. Is that to accept for the moment without judgement, is that the concept?

K: I never used the word 'avoid'.

Q: Overcome.

K: Oh no. I have never used the word. You can't avoid. Because we have avoided we have all the problems.

Q: I said I...

K: Madame, I made it very clear, that thought, that the image which thought has created gets hurt. To be aware of that image and say, 'Yes, I have an image' to face it, not to escape from it, not to avoid it. I have got an image. I think I am a marvellous man, or a stupid man, or this or the other. I have conclusions that I am a Catholic, Protestant, which are all conclusions. I love Jesus, I don't love Jesus - you follow - they are all conclusions. Now to know, to be aware that you have these pictures, these images, that is the first thing, not to avoid it. Then to look at that image without any choice, without any judgement, of like or dislike, or saying, 'I must have a picture because what shall I do without it?' - you follow? Or rationalize it. Just observe it without the observer. Which is quite arduous madame, it isn't just a plaything. That means you must be very serious in this matter.

Q: In the moment.

K: Of course. At the moment when somebody flatters you, somebody insults you, to give complete attention.

Q: What about if they love you?

K: If they say they love you, what do they mean by love? Has

love a motive? You see that is why one must go into that also. When somebody says, 'I love you', how do you receive it? Which is much more important than the man who says, 'I love you'. How do you share it, how do you partake of it, how do you receive it? Does it help you to wipe away your loneliness? Does it cover up your sorrow? You understand? Is it an escape? Does it breed attachment?

So when one says, 'I love you', or insults you, or flatters you, give complete attention. Then you will find out how to live a life without a single shadow of conflict.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 4TH APRIL 1976

May we go on from where we left off yesterday? We were talking over together the importance of relationship, because that is the basis of our life. And if there is not right relationship there is always conflict. And society, which is in essence relationship, has now become a series of conflicts, and deteriorating factors, which we went into yesterday.

We were going to talk over together this morning the question of thought. All our life is based on thinking. All our actions are the result of thought, either of the deep past, from the deep past, or from immediate necessities according to environment. All thought guides our life. And thought has divided us into nations, classes, into religious sects, beliefs, dogmas, rituals. Thought has built a church, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu and the various Eastern religious structures and propaganda. I think this is irrefutable fact.

What is thought? Why do we exercise one particular part of this whole brain, which is a segment which is thinking, thought, why has it become such an extraordinary important factor in our life? Our education, our relationship as we saw yesterday is based on thought, on image, verbal structure, pictures, all put together by thought. And we are asking why it is that thought has become so persistent, continuous and divisive. As we said yesterday, we are investigating together, we are exploring this fact of thought playing such an extraordinarily important role in our life. And we are going together to examine the importance, or the unimportance, its position, its relative position in our life. So together we are going to share this problem. Together we are going to examine it. So



please it is your responsibility as well as the speaker's, to go into this question meticulously, correctly. Not according to some fanciful philosopher - by the way, the word 'philosophy' means the love of truth, love of life. And in examining this question why thought has become so extraordinarily important, we have also to go into the question of consciousness. Because consciousness is filled with thought, and the things of thought. Whether it is conscious or unconscious, deep down, it is still the movement of thought, from the past, meeting the present, and creating the future. All that is the movement of thought.

Movement implies time. Right? Are we following each other? Movement implies time. Thought, implies measurement. So thought is a movement, time and measure. Right? And what is the process of thought? What is the nature and the structure of thought? Because that is our life. We act, we live according to certain patterns laid down by thought, consciously or unconsciously, deep down. And it seems to one extraordinarily important to understand this question of thought. Because thought has divided people, nationally, geographically, thought has divided people according to their belief, according to their ritual, dogma, thought has built up the whole memorial structure as the 'me' and the 'you', the ego, the personality and so on. All right? Shall we go on with this?

As we said yesterday, this is a serious thing that we are talking about. This is not an entertainment. We are trying to find out if there is another consciousness which is not put together by thought, and therefore we must examine this consciousness as we know it, which is filled with the things of thought. Right?

So what is the nature of thought? What is the source of thinking? And why is thinking, thought, fragmentary? You are following these questions? Is this too much? May I go on? What is the source of thought? From where does it come? What is the nature of consciousness? And why is that consciousness filled with all this movement of thought? So first we are examining what is the source of thinking? Because that seems to guide all our life: in our relationship, in the worship of an ideal, an image, a conclusion, all that is based on thought - the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian and so on. So one must discover for oneself what is the beginning of thought. Isn't thought a reaction to memory? Memory is the stored up knowledge, as experience. Right, this is simple. Experience, knowledge of that experience as memory, and the response of that memory is thinking.

So the source of thinking is in the past. So thought springs from the past. So if you examine, all our lives are based in the past, our roots are in the past. Knowledge is the past. There is no knowledge of the future, or of the present. There is a knowledge of the present only when there is a complete understanding of what the structure and the nature of the past is, and ending it - which we will go into presently, if you are at all interested in it. So thought is the response of the movement from the past. The past is stored up in the brain as experience and knowledge. And why is thought fragmentary? Do you understand my question? I hope you are following all this. Why has thought built a division between people? As a Christian, Buddhist, this and that, communist, socialist, capitalist, the sectarian, the believer and the non-believer and so on. So we are asking: why is thought fragmentary - because

it has created these fragments. You understand? Are we meeting each other?

Audience: Yes.

K: Are you quite sure? Because it is very important to find out. We are going to enquire if there is an action which is not based on thought, which is not divisive, which is not fragmentary - in which there is regret, pain, sorrow and all the rest of it. So it is very important to find this out. Which is: why is thought fragmentary, and this fragmentary process is seen in our daily life as the 'me' and the 'you' the 'we' and 'they', the Christian, the non-Christian, and so on and so on and so on. So thought is fragmentary. Right? Please this is very important to understand. That fragment may think there is god, but god then is still the product of a fragment, which is thought. I wonder if you see all this.

So we are asking: why is it thought is fragmentary, and if it is fragmentary it has filled our consciousness with its own fragments. You understand? And thought says, I must go beyond this fragment. Right? I must find enlightenment, I must find god, I must find truth, I must find Nirvana, whatever you like to call it. A fragment trying to understand that which is whole, that which is sane, healthy, holy - the word 'whole' implies all that. So the fragment has been trying to grasp or come upon that which is whole. So it meditates, it controls, it tries to follow a system in order to arrive at that, but it is still the movement of time as a fragment in measure. Right?

So why is thought a fragment? Why, why has it become a fragment? Why has thought divided you and me, we and they, the Buddhist, communist, socialist. You follow, why? Can thought see

the whole? Can thought see itself as a fragment? Or it can never see itself, see its own limitation, see its own fragmentary movement and therefore it can never see the whole. Now leave it for the moment there. We will come to it in a different way.

Does one realize, see that one's consciousness is its content? Right? The content of consciousness makes consciousness. If you are a Christian, the content of your consciousness, all the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals, the reactions to it, the attachments, the anxieties, the fears, the sorrows, the aspirations, the images which you have built about yourself and about others, all your conclusions, your prejudices, all that is your consciousness, the content. Right? It is so. So your consciousness is made up of the things it contains. And the content of consciousness is filled by the things of thought. Right? Your experiences, your scholastic knowledge, the knowledge of your own experiences, prejudices and so on and so on and so on. So your consciousness is fragmentary. Right? And within that area we are trying to find reality, truth within that area. Right? By expanding it, trying to go beyond it, and so on. I wonder if you are getting this? Do you find all this awfully difficult? No? Are you just accepting my words?

Audience: No.

K: Are you observing for yourself, watching your own content of your consciousness, and seeing that it is filled with all the things that you have accumulated? Not only you have accumulated, the past generations have accumulated, the traditions, the manner of behaving and so on and so on, all that is your consciousness. And because it is fragmentary, and therefore divisive, it must always be in conflict. Right? And thought realizes this and then says to itself,

'I must go beyond it' - through meditation, through control, through suppression, through various forms of enlarging consciousness.

You are following all this? This is the game we are playing all the time, holding on to our content, and trying to go beyond it.

So as thought cannot see the whole, because it is fragmentary - if thought could see the whole it would be the whole, it would not make an effort to be the whole - the whole being healthy, not divisive, sane, and holy. The word 'whole' implies all that. But it is not. Right? Now, the observer is fragmentary. Right? It says, 'I am conscious of the limitations of my thought'. That observer is the past. Right? And therefore the past, which is fragmentary, makes every action fragmentary. I wonder if there is somebody who sees? Right? You see the past is the knowledge, experience, all the things that human beings have gathered together for centuries and centuries, as knowledge. And we think the ascent of man lies through knowledge. Right? One questions that, whether knowledge is the instrument of ascent. Though various professors and experts say knowledge is the way. You are following? And knowledge is the past. So the movement of thought, which is time, we think time will make us progress, evolve, grow. Right? Time is also fragmentary. There are two kinds of time, aren't there. The physical time, the chronological time by the watch, yesterday, today and tomorrow; and also there is time, the psychological time - I will be. There is psychological tomorrow, where I shall be able to achieve enlightenment. Where I will be perfect. Right? So there is chronological time and the psychological time. Now is there psychological time at all? Or it is still the invention of thought? I wonder if you are getting all this?

Please this is rather difficult, because we are trying to find out if there is an action which is not based on the past, and therefore divisive. Is there an action which is complete, whole, not caught in the net of time? Are we meeting each other? A little bit?

Look sirs, and ladies, one wants to find out after seeing the action, the movement that is going on in the world, and in ourselves, which is the world, one wants to find out if there is an action not based on a conclusion. Right? Because conclusion is the movement of thought. Not based on an ideal, which is again fragmentary, action not based on a prejudice, an action which is every moment whole, complete, so that in that action there are no regrets, no sorrows, no pain. Don't you want to find out such an action? Because we live with action which is painful, always there is an uncertainty, regrets, 'I wish I hadn't done that'. So we know such action, action that brings regret, pain, sorrow, confusion, and so on. One wants to find out if there is an action which is whole, and therefore complete, in which none of the regrets, or the poisonous movements, enter into it. Right? I think this is whatever is intelligence, say in the human being, demands, and not being able to find it he invents an outside agency. If I can reach god then I will know complete action. And he will never reach god because god is his own invention! Right?

So we are going to find out if there is an action which is whole, sane, healthy, rational, and therefore holy. That is, why has thought invented an ideal? You understand? The ideal is the opposite of 'what is'. Right? Oh, come on! The ideal is in the future, 'what is' is actual. And I do not - one does not know how to deal with the actual, how to understand it, how to go beyond it, and therefore not

being able to understand it he projects an ideal, which is fictitious, which is not actual. So there is the division between 'what is' and the ideal, and hence conflict. Thought, being fragmentary, is not capable of understanding 'what is' actually in the present. It thinks it will understand by creating an ideal, and trying to follow that ideal and therefore bringing more and more conflict. Right? But if one is capable of looking at the present, the actual, the 'what is', without the principle, without the ideal, without the observer who is the past - you are following all this - then you meet the actual. I will point this out. I will show it to you in a minute.

I have been told by the scientists that in observing the molecule or a cell, by merely observing it the very transformation is taking place in the cell. Some of you must know this, scientists and so on. By observing the molecule the very observation is changing it. I have been told this. Now can I, can one look at 'what is' without a prejudice? Pre-judgement. You understand? Prejudices means that, judging before. Right? Can you look at 'what is' without the observer who is the past? I wonder if you follow this? Look: one is envious, which is a common thing, unfortunately. Envious of people, you know what envy is, I don't have to describe it. How do you regard, look at that envy? Are you looking at it as an observer who is different from envy? You understand my question? Please, you look at it as though you are separate from envy, but the fact is you are envy. Right? You are not the observer who is different. The observer himself is that. So the observer is the observed. Right? This, please, this is really very important to understand. When you have grasped the truth of this, that the observer is the observed then that which is observed undergoes radical change.

What prevents a radical change of 'what is' is the interference of the observer, who is the past. Have you got it? Have you understood? Do please, this is significantly important because this removes altogether all conflict. We are educated to conform to the division of the observer and the observed, and the observer is trying to do always something about the observed. Right? He says, 'I am envious, I will find it reasonable to be envious if I am not envious what will happen in the society', or 'I must suppress it, rationalize it, or justify it'. Right? Which are all a process of conflict, but the actual fact is, the observer is the observed. Right? And therefore the division ends. And when there is observation only of the fact, the fact undergoes radical transformation. This is a scientific fact. You understand? When you are angry, which most people are, a form of violence, when you observe that you are angry, in that observation there is the observer who says, 'I must not be angry', or 'It is right to be angry' - isn't there? Right? You are following this? So there is a conflict between the observer and the observed. Right? Out of that conflict we have all kinds of violence and so on and so on. So can one live a life in which there is no conflict whatsoever? Which is to be perfectly sane. It is the unbalanced, the insane that are always in conflict. Right?

So one wants to find out a way of living in which there is no conflict, in which thought, which is the movement in time as measure, which creates division, and whether thought can realize its own limitation, and function where it is absolutely necessary, and not enter into the psychological field at all. Are you getting all this? No. No, please. You understand? Thought has created the psyche. Right? Do you understand that? Thought has built the



psyche, the psychological states, which is me, my ego and all the rest of it. And thought is fragmentary, therefore what it has created, the 'me', is fragmentary. And then thought says, 'I must integrate with the whole' - which is an impossibility.

So there it is. And our consciousness is filled with the things of thought. Therefore our consciousness is fragmentary. So is there a consciousness which is not fragmentary? Do you understand my question? And can thought find it? You are getting it now?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! By Jove, it takes a long time, doesn't it!

So can thought realize itself, that it is a fragment, and whatever movement it makes must be a fragment, fragmentary, and is there an action which is not fragmentary and which can only take place when the observer is the observed, and watching, that which is undergoes a radical change.

Now the next point is: is there a consciousness which is not put together by thought? You understand? First we have divided the universe as the 'me' and the 'you', 'we' and 'they', good and bad and evil and all the rest of it. We have divided it, which is thought has divided it. And then thought says to itself, is there a consciousness which is not put together by me? Right? Now how are you, a human being, going to find out if there is a consciousness which not put together by thought? Man has tried this for millennia. You understand? It isn't just now we are trying it. He has said there must be another consciousness which is not this kind of consciousness. And so he says, 'I must control thought'. Do you follow? 'There must be a system by which thought can be controlled'. Right? 'And then when thought is controlled, held, then

perhaps I will know what the other is'. And this is the whole basis of meditation, whether Zen or other forms of meditation. Control thought. And they have never said, 'Who is the controller?' The controller is still the thought. I wonder if you see all this.

So, to find out, to come upon that which is not put together by thought, we not only have to understand the place of thought as knowledge - right? - and where thought has no place whatsoever - not suppressing it. Thought has a place as knowledge in our daily, superficial activities; when you drive a car you must know how to drive a car, you must know, if you work in a factory, and so on, how to write - you know, where knowledge is necessary. And it is only possible to give knowledge its right place when you have understood the whole nature of thinking. That is, psyche, the entity as the 'me', has been put together by thought - me, my virtue, my temperament, my desires, my ambitions, my peculiar idiosyncrasies, my experience as opposed to your experience. Those are all the result of thought. Right? And thought has its right place, otherwise you couldn't speak, you wouldn't be able to understand the English language. Right? Is this clear? That thought as knowledge has its right place, but it has no place in the psyche, which means, can the mind, can this whole structure of the psyche cease to be? Do you understand? Then only there is a totally different kind of consciousness - which you will never find through meditation. You understand? Even though you call it transcendental and all that nonsense. That word 'transcendental', you know it is a good word spoiled, by cheap meditation. Do you understand?

Therefore there is time in the right place, as movement of

thought, measurement in the technological field, you must measure otherwise there is no technological activity at all, and all the things that thought has created is reality. Right? All the things that thought has put together is reality. But thought has not put together the mountain or the tree, but that is also a reality. Right? Please follow this carefully. All the gods, all the rituals, all the mischief that is being made in the world by thought is a reality - war is a reality, killing people is a reality, the violence, the brutality, the callousness, the destruction is a reality made by thought, put together by thought. And nature is not reality - is actuality but not put together by thought. Wait, go slowly. I'll show you something else. Right? All the things that thought has put together, including wars, violence, all that is a reality. The mountains, the trees, the rivers, the beauty of the sky is a reality but it is not put together by thought. Belief is a reality put together by thought but it is neurotic. You follow? The neuroticism is a reality. And truth is not reality. I wonder if you get this? Thought can never touch truth. Right? Then what is the relationship between truth and reality? Are you interested in all this? I don't know. You understand?

We have examined the nature of thought. We said thought is a material process, matter, because it is stored up in the brain, part of the cell, which is matter. So thought is a material process in time, in movement. And whatever that movement creates is reality: both the neurotic as well as the so-called fragmentary, they are realities. The actual is a reality, like the microphone. And also nature is a reality. So what is truth? Can thought, which is fragmentary, which is caught up in time, mischievous, violent, all that, can that thought find truth, truth being the whole, that which is sacred, holy? And if

it cannot find it, then what place - or what is the relationship of thought, of reality to that which is absolute? You understand?

You know all this demands meditation. This is real meditation. Do you understand? Not the things imported into this country by the gurus. Whether consciousness, which is its content, can ever expand to include that consciousness of truth. Or this consciousness of the psyche, the 'me' with all its content has to end before the perception of what is truth. So one has to find out what is the nature of the psyche. Do you understand? Which has been put together by thought. What is me, to which one clings so desperately? The vanity, the arrogance, the desire to achieve, to become successful, you know be somebody. What is this, the nature of it? How has it come about? Because if that exists the other cannot be. You understand? If I am egotistic, in its total sense, not in parts, the fragmentary sense, totally, because one is totally self-centred. You may pretend but as long as that psychic centre exists truth cannot possibly be, because truth is the whole and so on and so on.

So how is the mind, the mind being all the senses, the emotions, the memories, the prejudices, the principles, the ideals, memories, experiences, the totality of that, which is the psyche, which is the me, how is that to end and yet behave in a world which is now? You understand? Is that possible? To find that out I must - one must go very deeply into the question of fear, the very complex problem of pleasure, because pleasure is very complex, fear is fairly simple, pleasure is what one demands; and the question of sorrow, whether sorrow can ever end. Man has lived with sorrow for millennia upon millennia. He hasn't been able to end it. And

one must also go into the question of what is death. Because all - and love - all that is the matrix of the me. So this is a very, very serious affair. It is not just a thing to be played with. One must give one's whole life to understand this. To live in this world completely, sanely without the psyche - you understand - not escape, not go off into some monastery or commune, or this or the other, but to live here, in this mad, insane, murderous world where there is so much corruption, where politics are divorced from ethics and therefore there is corruption. To live in this world sanely, without the psyche, the 'me'. Do you understand? This is a tremendous question. That requires a mind that is capable, can think meticulously, correctly, objectively, having all your senses fully awakened, not drugged by alcohol, speed and all the rest of it. Do you understand what all this means? You must have a very healthy mind. And when it is drugged you haven't got a healthy mind - or smoking, drinking, all this destroys the mind, makes the mind dull.

So the next time we meet - what time is it?

Q: Five after.

K: The next time we meet, which will be next Saturday or rather there will be dialogue on Tuesday and Thursday. Next Saturday and Sunday we will go into the whole question of fear. When we go into questions of these kinds, fear, pleasure, you must end it, not carry fear with us afterwards. Whether there is an ending to fear, that is important to find out, not what to do with it, which we will come to. Whether it is possible for a human mind to have no psychological fears at all. And when there are no psychological fears then you will understand the physical fears, which are very

simple to deal with. So when we are going into these questions, as we have done this morning, the whole problem of consciousness, its content, the psyche, whether one can live, a human being can live in this world without the psychological structure. I don't know if you have ever put that question to yourself. Probably you have not. If you put that question, don't answer by saying, 'We must all be one. We must love all people'. That is all just the movement of thought still. But to find out the way of living in which the psychological torment, all the movement doesn't exist at all. That requires tremendous examinations, accurate thinking. So when we discuss, talk over together next Saturday evening, please bear in mind that we go into it so that we end it that morning, completely. Because otherwise we just, you know, we play with things. Therefore this is a very serious affair. Right.

Are there any questions?

Q: What is your impression of the conclusion that truth is the correct perception of reality?

K: I didn't say that, sir. You are saying that.

Q: I am asking for your impression of that conclusion.

K: Truth is the correct impression of reality?

Q: Perception.

K: Would you mind repeating it once more.

Q: What is your impression of the conclusion that truth is the correct perception of reality?

K: Truth is the correct perception of reality. What is your impression of that conclusion. If it is a conclusion, it is not worth examining. No, don't laugh, please. If it is a conclusion, that is thought has examined it, and come to a conclusion, then whatever

it has concluded is still within the realm of fragmentary thought. But perception of and giving reality its place, out of that perception comes perhaps, with all the implications of freedom, fear and so on, freedom from fear and so on, then truth is.

Q: When you talk you used the word 'image' very often. I would like a definition of it. I know the definition, I took a hypnosis class and the definition in the hypnosis class was an image is the ability to reproduce any of the five senses, taste and so on, without that sense being directly stimulated. So I can see the tree with my eyes closed. I would like to see if your definition of it coincides with this definition.

K: What is your definition of an image. I would rather not give definitions. One can look up in the dictionary and it says that it comes from the imagination, to imagine the tree. Right? To imagine what I think I am. To imagine that I want to be a great man, which are all the process of thought. You know, you have an image, a picture, about yourself, haven't you. No? Then why do you want a definition? Do you want to compare your definition with that of the speaker? Or do you want to compare the image - if the speaker has an image about himself - and see whether your image corresponds with that? No, what is important, it seems to me, is to find out for yourself if you have an image about yourself, why you have it, whether it is an actual reality, you understand, actual, or fictitious, whether put together by thought and therefore neurotic, and act according to that neurosis. You understand? So find out please for yourself if there is an image, a picture, a conclusion that you have about yourself.

Q: Can a fragmented mind do that?

K: Can a fragmented mind do that. Of course it can. Are you asking a much more complex question, which is: can thought be aware of itself? Right? Watch it. Look at yourself. Can your thought be aware of its thinking? No? Just a minute. Aren't you aware when you tell a lie? Aren't you aware of the beginning of a lie? Aren't you aware at the beginning of anger - if you have ever looked. If you are a little watchful. So thought can be aware of itself.

Q: In the observation of that is there a change?

K: In the observation of that is there a change. Is that your question?

Now we have to go into the question of observation. Do you observe without an idea? You know the word 'idea' means, the root meaning of the word 'idea' is to observe - not what we have made of it: I observe something, make an abstraction of it into an idea. Right? And I live according to that idea, not according to the fact. I don't know if you see this? So to observe implies no idea, no conclusion, no prejudice, that means no observer, who is the past. So to look without the observer, is that possible? Then only that which is observed undergoes a radical transformation. It is the observer that prevents transformation. I wonder if you have caught this. Because the observer is the past.

Q: The observation of thought not the observer, the observation of thought, is that thought observing itself? Or has it has transcended itself in the truth of observing thought?

K: Are you asking, sir, the observation of thought? How do you observe anything?

Q: Not with thought.



K: No, just go slowly and you will find out. When you say, 'I have observed', what you mean by that? In the observation are all your senses fully awakened? Or only you observe in a limited way? You understand my question? When you see the tree, which is part of the observation, are all your senses totally awake, then only you are seeing. But if you merely look with your eyes and the rest gone to sleep, then you are not observing. So to observe oneself: I want to know myself, what I am. I want to have a full knowledge of myself without any deceit, without evasion, to see actually what I am, not condemning it, or accepting, but to observe it. How do I do it? Do I observe it as an outsider looking in? You follow? Or there is no outsider but only observing? You understand? I wonder if you get this.

Q: If we have created an image of ourself and we lose that image, we are empty.

K: If we lose the image of ourselves we are empty. So you are filling yourself with a lot of things which are not real, which are just words. So when you remove the words - see what you are doing - when you remove the word, the name, the form, the furniture to which you are attached, you are nothing. So you are the furniture! No, please, see it. So you are frightened to lose the furniture and being nothing. See what you have reduced yourself to - that you are the furniture. Can you look at that fact? Observe that fact. Please do it now. You will see what takes place. You are attached to a furniture, husband, wife, whatever it is, attached. You are attached to something - thing. Are you aware of it, that you are attached? Then are you aware why you are attached? Because it gives you comfort, it helps you to escape from yourself, from your

loneliness, from your boredom and so on and so on. So you are attached because of loneliness - suppose that is. Now look at that loneliness, observe it, not translate it saying, 'How ugly it is, how empty it is, how appalling, I am frightened' - just to observe it. Now if you observe it without the observer, which I have explained carefully, then that which is observed, which is loneliness, undergoes a radical transformation. It is the fear, which is the past, that prevents the radical transformation. Right?

I think that is enough, isn't it.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH APRIL 1976

Krishnamurti: A lovely morning, isn't it, probably you ought to be on the hills walking. We are going to have a dialogue. The word 'dialogue' comes from the Greek word logos, which means, words by which to express one's deep inner thoughts. Probably most of us don't want to go so deeply as that or expose ourselves too much but we could have a conversation, not dialectal which is argumentative, but rather a conversation in which we can share the problems however deep, and go widely and deeply into them. So this is not, if I may remind you, an argumentative dialectical conversation. That is, trying to find truth through opinions and arguments. I don't think one can ever come upon that. So we are going to, if we may this morning, spend an hour or so talking over some issue that is of vital interest.

Questioner: Education and may be the approach according to different ages.

K: The lady wants to discuss the question of education according to different ages.

Q: (Inaudible) God thought a tree and there was a tree, or God said, let there be light and there was light and I wonder if we could go into that problem of thought and what is often thought of as the absolute mind.

K: Could we also go into the question of the absolute truth or god or whatever name one likes to give to it and the hurt of everyday life.

Q: In the Bible it says, the wrath of god, the will of god, and it spoke almost as if god things.

K: In the Bible it says the wrath of god and so on, which implies god is thinking. I am sorry god is thinking - too bad! We will come to that. Do you want to discuss, talk over that?

Q: I want to discuss the problem of after you awaken the energy in you and your parents curse you and turn you out, and you have no friends, what do you do then, nowhere to sleep, nothing to eat?

K: When the parents get upset with you and turn you out and you have no place to go, no place to sleep, what is one to do.

Q: They didn't do this until I spoke of and told them that a certain energy had awakened in me.

K: Yes, I understand. So what is one to do.

Q: What is our function as a human being, why are we here, our function?

K: As a human being why are we here.

Q: Why do I desire a mate, why aren't I enough?

K: Oh, why does one desire a mate, why isn't one self-sufficient. Is that it?

Q: Why do you say one shouldn't escape from the world in which one lives actually and not escape into some monastic world?

K: I think that is enough. First of all you want to know what kind of education one should have in a school, not only in one's school, college and university, but throughout life, at whatever level one is at; and also you want to know, to talk over if there is a will of god, if there is the word of god, the wrath of god, so apparently god is thinking; then there is the question of when a person asserts himself with the parents or says something which he wishes the parents turn him out, no money, no place to sleep, what is one to do; and your question, why should one not live alone, be

self-sufficient, one does one desire a mate. Now which of these questions do you think we should take, including yours, sir. No, please, I think they may be all related.

Q: How do we find the way to live?

K: I think if we could take one question, one issue and it may be that they are all related to each other - I think they are, because they are all human problems: being turned out of one's house, without money and food and shelter; and what kind of education one should have right through life, that means what is learning; and also if there is a god who thinks; and is it possible to be completely self-sufficient. I think they are all related, don't you, or not? So can we take one thing, which is learning. I think as we go along we will relate all these to that question - may we? What do you think is learning? Learning. That is - you know what the meaning of that word is - so what is learning? Why have human beings to learn and what to learn? What is the function of learning, why has education, whatever that may mean for the moment, why has it become so important in the world? Whether you go to India, the Middle East, or Japan or Russia or here, they are all being educated, going through the mill of education, the schools, colleges, if they are lucky and university; and then getting a job, getting married, settle down and having all the responsibility of a citizen, an honourable citizen or dishonourable citizen. So why are we being educated? No, please, why are you educated, if you are lucky enough to go to college and university, why?

Q: To accumulate information.

K: He says, accumulating information - for what? Please, go into it. Why should I accumulate information, what to do with it?

Q: I would like to learn to be free of prejudice.

K: We will come to all that. But first mustn't we find out why we are being educated, dozens and dozens and thousands of schools.

Q: To survive.

K: Go into it, don't just say one word, examine it, explore it. We are educated at the most expensive schools or the ordinary schools, why? Is it to conform to the pattern of society - please listen, find out - and become technicians in order to use what we know skilfully? Right? And earn a livelihood. That is one part of survival in a particular given society or culture. Right, that is part of that education. Which is, in a world that is becoming more and more over populated there must be more and more skilled people to do all kinds of things. And one is being educated to conform to that pattern. That's one side of it. And also in learning, what is taking place to the mind? In learning, acquiring information, learning a technique as a lawyer, business man, as a politician, as anything, learning a technique, what is happening to the whole structure of the brain, of the mind?

Q: It seems that it becomes fixed, or frozen.

K: Mustn't you have that?

Q: Yes, technically.

K: Technically you must have it. So what is the function of learning? You follow the question? I am a student, been to college and university, and I have acquired certain information, knowledge, stored up in memory and I use that memory skilfully in any job that I have to do, I specialize in whatever job, as a foreman, a labourer, whatever it is, as a lawyer, politician, a doctor

and so on.

Q: The aspect of the brain is sharpened by functioning.

K: Yes, what takes place? Is that all my life? Is that all one's life? Are we educated in any other direction? You follow my question? We spend twenty or thirty years in acquiring a particular technological activity, learn all about it and disregard or neglect the totality of life. Right? Now we say, is that learning? When you emphasize one part of life, one segment of life, and learn all about it - how to earn bread and butter, to put it very simply - the other part totally disregard. That's what is happening. They don't disregard it but train you in certain beliefs, and dogmas - I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, and all the rest of it. So is this education?

Q: No.

K: No, don't say, no. This is actually what is happening. If you had a son, if one had a son what is one to do in a world of this kind? You don't face the problem. You have children, if you educate them in only one area, small area of life and disregard the rest of it, you must have neurotic behaviour. Right? A life that is broken up, fragmented - no?

So then, what is learning and what is education when we think our children should be educated totally, all round? You have understood my question? I want him to understand not only technological things that he must know but also I want him to know beauty, I want him to know what his relationship is with nature, what his relationship is with human beings, what is death, what is love - you follow? - I want him to know the whole area of life. And no school teaches that. And therefore our problem

becomes more and more complex because we don't know how to live but we only know the technological field. So what shall we do? So we have produced, our parents, grandparents, you and we, have produced a society, a culture, that says, learn that part, that segment of life, disregard the rest. What shall we do?

Q: Can a human being be educated in any other aspects besides technology?

K: Can there be education in the other areas of life. What do you mean by education? To be told, to be given information about the other areas of life? The psychologists are doing it, the anthropologists are doing it, the philosophers, so-called philosophers are doing it - is that what we call learning?

Q: Can education teach people how to learn and then apply?

K: We said that, sir, learn.

Q: Teach you how to learn, not to teach you facts, should not education teach you how to learn.

K: How to learn. That's what we are asking, how to learn. What does it mean, learning? I know we have to have facts about learning, I must learn how to drive a car from another, how to do this and so on. But can I know about myself, the vast area, from another? Please, this is a very important question. Can I learn - please - about not the technological area but the other areas of life from another, from the guru, from the psychologist, from the anthropologist, from all the Freuds and you know, can I learn from another?

Q: Perhaps the artist can help in that direction.

K: The artist. That means, can anybody help me to learn about myself? Come down to brass tacks - go on.



Q: I must first see that all of my education has been one of the accumulation of knowledge which has been passed down to me.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: If my education has been that then I should have learned about myself already, and I haven't, from another.

K: I am asking a much more serious question, sir, if you don't mind, do listen: I can learn medicine, doctors, surgery, how to drive a car and so on, the technology of all that, from another. Right? Can I learn about myself from Freud?

Q: No.

K: From psychologists? From gurus? From philosophers?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, just find out. If I learn from another, from a psychologist, am I learning about myself, or his interpretation about myself? You understand?

Q: He may point the direction so that you can look at yourself.

K: No, do try it, sir. I tell you to look at yourself in this way, in a particular way, and you try to follow my instructions about yourself. Does it mean then that you have learnt about yourself? Oh, this is such a simple question. Or must I learn how to look, not from another but learn what it means to look?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: First of all, sir, look: I am a human being, one is a human being, totally related to the rest of other human beings in the world. That's a fact. I am not an isolated entity, I am related to the rest of the world. And I can learn about myself by reading the book which is me, because I am the world. If I can read that book I don't have to go to anybody. Right? So how am I to learn to look at myself,

which is the vast area which traditional education doesn't explore, traditional education doesn't help me. I wonder if you are getting all this. Are you following all this?

Q: Don't you have to have desire to learn first?

K: Mustn't one have the desire to learn. Do you have the desire to learn about yourself now, here? Would you be a little bit honest, if I may say so, and say, have you the desire, as the lady points out, to learn about yourself, not according to Freud, Jung, the latest psychologist, to learn about yourself because you are the world and the world is you, you are a human being totally related to all the rest of other human beings in the world, whether you like it or not. If you have a desire to learn, or the necessity, or the urgency and you see the importance of learning about yourself because if you don't know about yourself what can you know about life?

Q: Does the image of ourselves prevent us from looking at ourselves?

K: We are going to find out, we are going to find out how to look at ourselves, learn about ourselves.

Q: What is our reaction to stimulus around us?

K: My question, sir, as the lady put it, do we have the desire, or the urgency, or the necessity to see the importance that we must learn about ourselves? Do we have that urgency, or you just say, tell me all about it and I will take what parts I like and neglect what I don't like?

Q: It depends on how serious one is.

K: I am asking a very simple question.

Q: When you are confused you realize that we have that problem but we forget it. We are confused, we make mistakes, we

don't know what's going on, then we have serious concern but most of the time we forget about it.

K: Look, I want to know about myself, so I must learn about myself, so I must find out what it means to learn. Right? And what it means to observe. There are two things involved in it: what it means to learn and what it means to observe. Or put it the other way round: what it means to observe and what it means through observation learning. May we go on from there? What does it mean to observe oneself? You understand, this vast area which has been neglected, which we have taken for granted, which is crowded with a lot of beliefs, prejudices, dogmas, and so on, I want to learn all about that. So I say, before I learn I must look. Right? Now how am I to look, what does it mean to look, the art of looking? You understand? The word `art' means to put everything in the right place, where it belongs, that's the meaning of that word art. The artist is one - please listen - not one who just paints pictures or write a poem - an artist is one who puts everything in its right place. So you are giving a new meaning to art, to an artist. You follow?

So the art of observation, what does it mean? How do I observe, not only myself, the world around me, the politicians, the businessman, the priest, the wife, the husband, the educator, you follow, how do I observe it?

Q: One must be receptive to what is actually there.

K: How do you observe things, sir? How do you look at that mountain?

Q: You look with your eyes, you see outside, but if you look with your mind, you look inwards.

K: We are coming to that. First how do you look at those mountains?

Q: You look with your eyes.

K: Of course, sir. You are sitting there with your eyes open and you see those mountains, that range of mountains. What is your reaction when you look at that?

Q: Silence.

Q: I would say you are not interested most of the time.

K: Sir, now you are looking at those mountains, what is your reaction?

Q: You are paying attention.

K: Out of that attention what is your reaction when you look at those?

Q: I don't think we ever have a reaction, at least very rarely, we are not even looking, I don't think.

K: That's it. Have you time to look at it? Do you, sitting there, say, wait I am going to look at those mountains and find out what my reactions are, what I see and use words by which you express that which you feel, which is a dialogue. What takes place when you look at those mountains? There is visual sensation, there is visual perception, there is sensation, isn't there. Then what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do look, sir, don't.

Q: You name it.

K: You name it. You say, that's a mountain. Right?

Q: The reaction would seem to pass.

K: Yes, sir, I know.

Q: Then you start working on it.

Q: You forget about it.

K: Look, sir, may I go into it? You look at that mountain, you see it, there is the reaction of beauty, the shadow, the depth, the line of it, the valleys and you say, that's a mountain. You verbalize it. Then, it is beautiful. Right? So when you are verbalizing it you have gone away from looking. Right? Oh, do please.

Q: We experience it.

K: Experiencing what? You are experiencing the mountain?

Q: No, our reaction to the mountain.

K: I give up!

Q: When I look at the mountain I see everything, but I don't judge what I see.

K: You just observe, don't you. In that observation when there is verbalization you have already moved away from observation, haven't you? This is so simple, isn't it? So can you observe without verbalizing, just to observe without naming? Now can you look at yourself, observe yourself without saying, good, bad, get depressed, just to observe.

Q: That's so much harder.

K: Don't make it hard or easy. Just do it! Please, this is not group therapy. I have a horror of group therapy, it is silly. So, please, this is not group therapy. What we are trying to find out is the art of learning. The art of observing - can I observe the tree, the things about me, around me, the act of politicians, what is going on in the world, observe there, and observe myself, see actually what I am without any interpretation, without judgement, just to look at myself. Which is, art means, as we explained, to put everything

where it belongs, in its right place. So I look at myself, myself which is the complex structure of my human activity. You follow? My ambitions, my greed, my envy, my deceits, my arrogance, my double talk, at everything, I look. My tradition which says, there is god, and my tradition also says, there is no god. One part of me says, the whole ritual of churches and so on is nonsense, another part is frightened if I say that out, I might lose my job or I might get into difficulties. One part of me says, I must take drugs because everybody is doing it and they say you get experience, the most extraordinary things, and the other part says, don't be silly. And so on and on and on. Can I look at all these various complex activities in myself? Probably one never has done it. Right?

So what am I to do? What is there to learn? You are following? You haven't gone to sleep? Is this all too much of a morning, on a lovely morning?

Q: How does one know what the right place is?

K: How does one know which is the right place. That's a good question, isn't it? How is one to know to put things in their right place? He has asked me that question, I'll show you. I don't know. Wait. He asked me a question, how do you put everything where it belongs, correct, accurate place, he asked me that. And I say, I don't know. Please listen. I don't know but I am going to find out. You understand? I don't say, this is the right place, that's the wrong place, so my mind is free to find out, so I don't accept tradition, which is the right place, I don't follow the authority which tells me which is the right place. You follow? So I say, I don't know. So I begin to observe. I see there is a contradiction in oneself. Right? Now why is there a contradiction in oneself? As long as there is a

contradiction you cannot find the right place, can you? Do please see a very simple fact like this. I don't know but I do know that I am in conflict. Right? So I say, as long as I am in conflict I will never know what is the right place. So I must find out why I am in conflict, what is conflict. And if the mind can ever be free from conflict, then I will put everything in the right place. You have understood? Because I said, I don't know - which is a fact - but I do know I am in conflict. And as long as I am in conflict there is no right place. Right? So what is conflict? Because that becomes much more important than what is the right place. Why is a human being in conflict? Because he is divided in himself, contradictory. Right? Now why is there contradiction? Are you enquiring with me or are you just listening? Why is there conflict?

Q: You are in conflict when you don't trust your feelings.

K: Your feelings also may be contradictory. I want one thing and I don't want another thing, my feeling says, eat more, and my mind says, don't eat more. So feelings can't be trusted.

Q: Intuition.

K: You haven't understood what I said. Intuition, that's one of the most dangerous things, isn't it?

Q: I am in conflict when I am dividing 'what is' from 'what should be'.

K: That's right. But we are educated, trained to 'what should be', so there is a contradiction. So as long as there is a contradiction I will not know what is the right thing to do. So I am in contradiction, therefore one is in contradiction. What is that, what is contradiction? Is it two opposing desires? Or opposing objects of desire? Or being uncertain I say one thing, and do another? You

are following all this? So I say to myself, why does one live in contradiction. Why doesn't one live with `what is', not with `what should be', which is a contradiction. Why can't I live with actually `what is'? Do look at it. One is envious, live with it, not have the opposite - I mustn't be envious, it is immoral to be envious, or it is rational to be envious - live with it. We don't live with it because we don't know what to do with it. You understand? If you knew what to do with it then the opposite wouldn't exist. Have you understood?

Q: If you have a habit you can't learn about it if you are trying to change it - yes?

K: Look at it. If I have a habit, say of scratching myself, or twisting my fingers, something or other, look at it, be aware with all your senses, don't say, `I must not do that', that brings a conflict, that's a duality, that means conflict. Wait a minute. So we come to it, slowly we are learning, it is coming. Which is, as we do not know how to live with envy, what to do with it, we think we should get rid of it, or do something about it if we move away from it. Which is, not to be envious, the ideal of a human being who is not envious, who doesn't have any envy, that must be a marvellous state. So you move away from `what is', from the fact of envy. Right? When you move away from the fact of envy what takes place, when you don't move away what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do look at it, do look at it. You remember yesterday we were talking about the scientists are saying, some of them at least I have been told, that when you look at a cell through a microscope, as you are observing it is undergoing a transformation. Now we are



saying, as you observe envy without its opposite - you understand - without trying to avoid it, rationalize it, just to look at it, the very process of observation is transforming the envy totally. Listen to it carefully, you will get it in a minute. That is - we'll keep to envy - when we have that feeling of envy we either rationalize it, justify it or condemn it. Right? Which is a division, isn't it. In that there is a conflict: the observer says, I must not be envious, the observer says, why shouldn't I be envious, in a world that is full of envy if I am not envious I will be destroyed. Or he avoids it. And so the observer says, I must do something about it. So there is a division between the observer and the fact of envy. When you look at the microscope without the observer, you understand, then that which is envious undergoes a radical change. And I'll show you why. Don't accept what I am saying, I am not your authority, I am not your guru, for god's sake. It undergoes a change because justification, condemnation or rationalization is a wastage of energy. Right? And when you don't waste that energy through that you have that energy, that energy transforms the fact of envy.

Look: I have a habit, twisting my fingers, you know most people have it, they can't keep still, they are doing something or other. Look at it, don't rationalize it, don't say, well other people do it, why shouldn't I do it - just watch it. Which means you are not wasting your energy by saying, other people do it, why shouldn't I do it, I have been used to that, let it go. But when you don't waste all that energy in rationalization, justification and so on, you have all that energy. Right? Then observe with that energy the twisting of the fingers. I wonder if you get it, if you don't it's up to you. Let's get on with it.

Q: The energy of habit is one thing, and the energy of observation is another. But the two energies are not different, are they?

K: They are the same, of course.

Q: It's not just the feeling that they are different.

K: Wait, let's keep to simple things. If you have understood this thing, this principle, that when you rationalize, justify or condemn you are wasting energy, the energy that is needed to observe 'what is'. Whether it is any kind of feeling, any kind of reaction, any kind of prejudice and so on.

Q: A man's action is if you are envious you want to say harsh words, he wants to...

K: Wait, I know all that, but extend a little bit.

Q: This is what I mean.

Q: How does one look at envy?

K: Aren't you envious? Aren't you? Everybody becomes silent. Aren't you envious, can't you look at it, know the feeling of it? Envy means comparison, doesn't it. I compare myself with you who are more intelligent, more bright, more clever and all the rest of it, taller, beautiful, and all that. I compare myself with you. So where there is comparison there must be envy. In that envy there is imitation, the desire to conform to the pattern. Right? All that is implied in being envious. Now you mean to say you can't look at it? Can't you look at the feeling of envy as it arises? Of course you can.

Q: What about judgement?

K: Just look at it. It is a wrong question to ask, how am I not to judge it. But you have been used to judging and therefore you say,

how am I not to do it. If I tell you how not to do it then your old tradition and the new tradition will be in battle. I wonder if you see all this. Whereas if you say, look, I am envious, I am going to watch it, I am going to see if I am comparing myself with anybody. And we are educated to compare ourselves: I am poor, you are rich, both physically and psychologically and I am envious of you because I want to be rich like you. You mean to say you can't know the feelings that arise as they come up? Can't you watch that?

Q: If envy says, I don't want to sit here and be watched, I want to go and express myself?

K: Go ahead and do it.

Q: It won't sit still for you to watch it.

K: Go ahead and do it. Be caught by it. That's what we are all doing.

Q: How is it the same energy that can observe and also that justifies?

K: When I twist my fingers, twiddle my fingers, isn't that energy? When I condemn it, isn't that part of that same energy?

Q: I don't see how that is the same energy.

K: Ah, no. I am afraid you have not understood what I said. I am envious. Envy implies comparison, measurement, imitation, conformity. Right? All those are implied in envy. And most human beings are envious, almost everybody. And am I envious, I want to find out. Of course one is. Right? Are you following this, is this clear madam? Now can you watch it? Are you watching it with the feeling of condemnation, with the feeling of judgement, or just watching it? Because condemnation, justification, rationalization are a wastage of energy, the energy which is needed to focus all

your attention on 'what is' which is envy. Because when you condemn, justify, rationalize, it is the observer, the past which says, condemn, the past says, judge, the past says, it's quite all right. So the past which is also energy, when you don't waste that energy you have that energy to observe. Understood now?

Q: Is that different from the past?

K: Yes, totally different from the past.

Q: Sir, are you saying that one is that energy, the habit, the envy?

K: Of course.

Q: Consciousness is that. I mean it is absurd to say you are the energy.

K: You haven't understood it, sir, let's find out. When you think, you are using energy, aren't you? When you feel, that's a form of energy. When you get angry, envious, afraid, that's all energy, isn't it? Envy, jealousy, anger is you and so on. That whole complex structure is you, which means you, the past.

Q: Sir, when you look at envy and see that you are envious, then you also see you are judging envy. Will that energy of observing the fact that you are judging the fact that you are envious, will that energy transform the judgement?

K: You see you are still judging. For the love of Pete! Why do we judge? Which means you have a preconceived opinion, a prejudice - no? When you look at a picture in a museum, you just judge it, don't you. You judge it by saying, it is by so-and-so, he is already famous, already known, he must be a very good painter and therefore I like it, or I don't like it. You are judging already. You have formed an opinion, your brain is forming opinions all the

time, it is part of your education, part of your tradition to judge. No? So you never look. If it is by Picasso, you say, my god, it is such a marvellous painter - it is already finished. Van Gogh or this or that. So you prevent yourself from looking.

Q: Thought creates the image and through the image I understand. How can I understand without the image?

K: Thought creates an image, image being prejudice. Right? Image being a conclusion. How can I look without a conclusion, without an opinion, without a judgement? You see how we are trained, educated, conditioned to operate always with judgement, opinions. And that you call freedom.

Q: If I pick that up I have to analyse the colour, analyse the size.

K: But can you just look at it without analysing?

Q: That's why I can't see envy because I can't even see the mountains.

K: That's just it, sir. So carry on now. From there, we said learning. We have only learnt about a very small part of existence, the technological existence, and the rest we do not learn about. And we say, how am I to learn about it. By observing it, looking at it myself, which is the world and the world is me, looking at this world which is me without any judgement. Right? Can you do it? As that gentleman pointed out, the parents turn you out because you do something, they are judging you, they are pushing you out of the house, they destroy your affection, the bitterness, and all the rest of it follows.

So there is a vast field, a complex area in the human mind which has not been explored. They have explored it, the psychologists, anthropologists and others have explored it

theoretically, or experimented with animals, gone down to Africa and looked at the gorillas and say, by studying those I will learn about myself. Don't laugh, this is what is happening. You don't have to go to India, or to a Zen monastery to learn about yourself, you can learn about yourself where you are because that is your world. So don't waste money on going to Africa. So this is your world in which you live, with your neighbour, with your wife, with your husband and so on. The small micro world is the large world if one knows how to look at that small little world.

So learning implies when you look at yourself you can learn about yourself only when the accumulated experience doesn't interfere with the actual observation at the moment of 'what is'. Have you understood that? Listen. I look at myself, myself is constantly moving, it isn't static. Right? Have you noticed it? One moment it is peaceful, the next moment it is angry, the third moment it is pursuing some pleasure, it is constantly in action, movement. And I have learnt by looking at myself something about it. Right? That becomes an experience, that becomes the knowledge, with which knowledge I look the next time. See what has happened. I look at the present movement with the past knowledge, therefore I never look. You have understood this? So can I look at the present movement without the past experience impinging upon it? I wonder if you follow all this.

Q: I ask myself the question, can I look without the past knowledge, but I am the past knowledge.

K: Yes, so can you look at yourself without the observer who is the past?

Q: It has to be in the present, it is the only way.

K: Now, what does that mean, you have to be in the present?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just listen to that question, he says, I have to be in the present, what does that mean?

Q: You have to forget the past.

K: What does it mean to be in the present?

Q: You have to observe what is going on.

K: Can you observe without the past?

Q: It will be there.

K: Do it, sir, do it. Find out.

Q: I can see the past pop up. I can see in the present the past coming forward.

K: Sir, be very simple. Look: I flatter you, or I insult you. That is registered in your memory. Right? Now the next time I meet you can you forget those insults or the flattery and look at me? That is the present, isn't it.

Q: Sir, you asked a question, can you watch yourself without the past. Which is the same thing as saying, can you watch yourself without you.

K: That's right.

Q: And I don't understand that.

K: You are the past, aren't you? Your accumulated memories, experiences, knowledge, interests, all in the past, knowledge is the past. Knowledge is the past. Right? Sir, look: I read the Bible and it says, or some book says, god is will - I like that idea, I think it is marvellous and that becomes a prejudice, doesn't it. Whether it is reality, whether it has any truth in it, it doesn't matter, it appeals to me, that god is looking after me. Right? So I get a fixed idea, I am

that fixed idea. And I live with that idea for many years, and you come along and say, 'Don't be silly, that's a prejudice'. And you say, 'I can't get rid of it'. Right? 'It is so part of me'. Of course it is part of you. He says, don't get rid of it but look at it, observe it, don't fight it.

Q: It's observation, sheer observation with no past affecting the state of observation. What happens to the observer and the object observed?

K: That's just what I am saying, sir. What happens when the past doesn't interfere with the thing observed. Right, sir? What happens to the thing observed and what happens to the observer? Wait. Are you answering him?

Q: You asked a question. You don't exist any more.

K: You see this is all guess work. He asked a question, which is, what happens to the thing observed and to the observer when the past is not. Right, sir, that was the question? What is the observer? Is he not the past? Which is his experience, his prejudice, his knowledge. The observer in essence is the past.

Q: There is observation then.

K: There is only observation. Then that which is observed undergoes a radical transformation. I wish you would do it and find out.

Q: Anybody doing it besides yourself?

Q: Yes.

K: Sir, look, there is something I want to find out, which is, I want to find out if there is a way of living without conflict, right through my life, not just for a few minutes. Right? Because if there is conflict there is violence, there are all kinds of things that come



out of that conflict: violence, bitterness, anger, hatred, throwing bombs, terrorism, brutality, comes out of that conflict. No civilization, no culture, can exist in conflict, as the modern world is living, the culture, it is destroying itself. So as a human being related to the world, I say, is it possible to live without a single conflict? Have you ever asked that question? Have you really? Not only between you and me, my wife, without a shadow of conflict in oneself. After having asked that question, I have gone into it because it is a very important for a human being to find out, otherwise he is going to destroy humanity. You understand? I don't think you see the importance of this. You see the conflict between the Arab and the Jew is going to destroy them, isn't it? No? Between the Muslim and the Hindu, that is going to destroy them; the communist and the capitalist, they are going to destroy each other; the Catholic, the Protestant - you follow? And conflict in oneself. As a human being living in this chaos, in this conflicting, mad, insane world you must find out.

So can a human being live in this modern culture, which is no culture, in this modern culture without a single conflict in himself? He can, if one goes into it very seriously you will find out. That is, conflict exists as long as there is fragmentation in oneself. Right? And this fragment is between the observer and the observed. Do you see it? As long as there is a division between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. I am a Jew, you are an Arab, or I want opposing contradictory desires. You follow all this?

Q: If we destroy each other there won't be the problem.

K: If we destroy each other there will be no problem - is that what you are saying?

Q: Not necessarily. If the Jew and the Arab eliminate Judaism and Arab-ism, the conflict, then there is no object and no subject.

Q: It seems that our divine wholeness is covered over by the illusions of self and other things, fragments.

K: How do you know you are covered over by divine intelligence?

Q: I don't. I didn't say I was covered over by divine intelligence; I said, if my divine wholeness is.

K: How do you know you are a divine whole?

Q: I am not a divine whole, I have experienced that there is a wholeness, which gets covered over by the fragments that we examined this weekend, fragments of self and other things. And you were saying that these divisions are fragments and not the discovery of the wholeness.

K: Sir, just take, 'what is', don't let's imagine that we are perfect, just take actually what is going on outside of us and inside, actually.

Q: A life without conflict, without sorrow, without pain, isn't that a statement of perfection?

K: It is not a statement of perfection. Human beings suffer, one asks is there an end to sorrow. But it doesn't mean one wants to live a perfect life, I don't know what a perfect life is. We are moving away from something.

I have asked, is there a way of living in this culture, in this world, in your daily life, in which there is no conflict. We said as long as there is a division, outwardly, like the Arab, Jew, the Muslim, the Hindu, Communist and so on, as long as there is outward division there must be conflict, and as long as there is

inward division there must be conflict. Right? The outward division we have created. Right? I am a Jew, or an Arab, and I won't give up my prejudice, my culture, my etcetera, I stick to my prejudice. You follow? So inwardly there is division as the observer and the observed. But the observer is the observed. If you see that once, the truth of it, then all conflict ends, then you won't be fighting that which is observed.

Q: After you have eliminated the conflict does the division remain?

K: No, of course not. How can it remain?

Q: There is no division, there is wholeness?

K: Don't go beyond, that's just an idea, find out what it means to live wholly. The word `whole' means healthy physically, sane, sanity, to think clearly, objectively, rationally, and holy, sacred. The word `whole' means all that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I made it fairly clear.

Q: We can't be holy all the time you have to live.

K: What time is it?

Q: Twelve thirty.

K: We meet again on Thursday.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 10TH APRIL 1976

I wonder if you realize how serious these meetings are. They are not meant for the intellectuals only, nor a form of entertainment. This is very serious because we are concerned with the transformation of the human mind, a way of living, totally different, a way of looking, observing in which there is complete action. So this is rather a serious gathering. And I hope one realizes the nature of this kind of meeting.

We have been talking the last few times that we met here about the world, the degeneration that is going on throughout the world, and our relationship to that degeneration. For the world actually, if you look into it very, very deeply, is you, and you are the world. This is not just a statement of words, but an actuality because wherever you go there is suffering, poverty, a great deal of sorrow, fear, brutality, violence, man against man, the concentration camps of the gurus, the totalitarian attitude of these so-called religious teachers - all these and other factors indicate a great moral degeneration of mankind. And those who are concerned, not superficially, not doing some good work here and there, or belong to any particular political, social or religious party, but are concerned with the division of man against man, the utter indifference to what is going on. And when you observe all these things it boils down to several factors, which we talked about the last two times that we met here.

One, man's relationship to man, man and woman, and that relationship if it is not properly understood, rightly lived, must inevitably lead to conflict. And where there is conflict between

human beings, whether it be man or woman, there must be violence, brutality. This is manifest throughout the world - the utter lack of human relationship. And we went into that question, pretty thoroughly I think.

And also the last time that we met here we were talking about sharing together the question and the problem of the whole nature and the structure of thought. Because thought has built this world: the divisions, the wars, the conflict, the religious persecutions, thought has been responsible not only for the technological advancement as knowledge, but also thought has been responsible for a great deal of untold misery. Thought has put together our consciousness. The content of one's consciousness is the result of millennia of thought. And this consciousness is a constant movement from the past to the present. And it is not a private consciousness, it is not your consciousness, it is a consciousness of the total movement of man, conditioned according to the culture he lives. That conditioning gives character, tendency, idiosyncrasies and so on. All that is the result of thought, which we talked about last week when we met here.

And we also said, all the things that thought has created, put together, not only externally, environmentally, but also inwardly - all our desires, pursuits, ambitions, corruptions, contradiction, is reality. Please, we are sharing this together. After all that is what communication means, the capacity to listen, understand the words, and the meaning of the word, what lies behind the word, and by attentive listening share that which is being said - not agreeing or disagreeing, but partaking the problems. And one of the problems is this question of thought, upon which man has lived

untold years and centuries. And we consider thought can bring about a radical change in us. Thought, which is the response of memory, knowledge, experience, which is the past, thought we consider is of the highest importance, however refined and the ascent of man through knowledge, which is the accumulation of experience, thought, is in itself going to bring about a great change in man. We are questioning that. We are questioning, enquiring into this problem: whether knowledge, which is the accumulation of thousands of years of experience and the accumulation of knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory, whether that knowledge will transform man at all. Please understand this. We think knowledge, experience, is necessary to bring about a different way of living, a different kind of relationship between man and man. Our brains have evolved through time, centuries upon centuries, millennia upon millennia. And from the ancient of days man has suffered, he is caught in sorrow, misery, conflict, violence, worshipped gods which are his own invention, fought for their gods, for their ideals, for belief - all the product of thought. And we think, still think that thought can miraculously change us. And we are saying, the speaker is saying that thought as knowledge cannot possibly change man. Knowledge has its place in action - driving a car, all the technological knowledge is necessary but the knowledge as experience, the psychological experience stored up as memory cannot possibly change man. Then what will change man? You have understood the question? - I hope.

That is: from the pre-historical times, before the civilization of Egypt, Mesopotamia and the ancient Greeks and the Romans, and the Persians, and all the rest of it, one has observed man crying

because their sons, their wife, their husband have been killed and we are still crying. And we think by accumulating a great deal of information about ourselves as knowledge, will somehow, that knowledge through thought will transform our lives. That is our tradition. And we are saying thought can never change man because thought in itself is a fragment, thought in itself has created a fragmentary way of living, saying one thing and doing another. The contradiction that exists in man is the product of thought because thought itself is limited, thought itself cannot see the whole, thought in itself thinks that it can perceive the whole and act. I hope we are sharing this together. It is necessary that we look into this - not come to it with preconceived ideas, conclusions, either agreeing or disagreeing. That is a non-objective, non-scientific way of looking at life. You must come to it, enquiring, asking, demanding, sceptical and then you will find out. That is why it is important, if you are at all serious, looking at the world about you, which is the world which man has created, the society, the culture, when you observe all that, what place has thought? Because thought has a place.

And also we were talking, the last time we met here that the enquiry into the human problems, psychological problems, is also the beginning of meditation. We think meditation - unfortunately brought over from the East, that is a kind of escape, repeating some silly mantras, paying \$150 or a \$1,000 and you think that by devoting some time to it something miraculous is going to take place. It will only make your minds more dull, more sleepy, and perhaps that is what you all want; not being able to see what life is and be concerned with the transformation of that life, we want to

escape from it and the escape we call meditation. But without understanding - please do pay a little attention to what is being said, because we are concerned with your life, with man's life, with human life, the misery, the anxiety, the fears, the despairs, the hopes - without being concerned with our daily relationship, and bringing about the right kind of relationship between each other, not the relationship of two images, which we talked about, but actual relationship, and without understanding the place of thought, the place of knowledge, and the nature and the structure of knowledge, and without understanding, without laying the foundation meditation has no meaning - in spite of all the gurus.

So it becomes absolutely necessary that we, as human beings, who are serious, committed, involved in the total processes of living, that we understand the meaning of relationship because society is based on relationship, all existence is based on relationship, and in that relationship there is conflict, then society, the culture is still within the area of conflict. And without understanding the immense complex question of thought in our daily life, without understanding it we become more and more confused, more and more dependent on others to tell us what to do. And so we become lost, confused, dependent, either on a guru or a community, or some authority.

And also we have to understand this question of fear, into which we are going. Here again let me point out that we are enquiring into this question together, sharing the problem together, not that the speaker is talking about it and you just listen, agreeing or disagreeing, casually paying a little attention, and come back and enquire how to be free of fear next year.



So as it is a human problem, not only in this country, everywhere - please understand this - if one single human being understands this radically, this problem of fear, resolves it, not tomorrow or some other day but instantly - which we are going into - he affects the whole consciousness of mankind. Again that is a fact. As we said your consciousness is not your private property. Your consciousness is the result of time, of thousands of incidents, experiences that are put together by thought. That consciousness is in constant movement. It is like a stream, a vast river of which you are a part. So there is no particularization, and if you go into it very deeply, there is no individuality. You may not like that, but look at it. Individual means an entity who is undivided, indivisible, who is not fragmented, broken up, a whole being - such a man is an individual. But most of us unfortunately are fragmented, broken up, divided and we have the arrogance to call ourselves individuals. Actually, if you look at yourself very deeply, you are like the rest of the world - unhappy, concerned, confused, miserable, aching, frightened and all the rest of it.

So we are going together to examine this question - please examine, enquire, explore into this question of fear. Whether you can end it, the psychological fear first, and then biological fears. You understand? We are sharing it together. Because fear, whether it be very little or enormous burdensome, fear of losing a job, fear of not being successful, fear of death, fear of not being loved, fear of loneliness, isolation, fear of deep insecurity, the fear of being dependent and losing that dependency, fear of not doing the right thing, or the fear of following the rest of the crowd and being left behind. You know what fears are.

And also let us remind ourselves that this is not group therapy, which is one of the things that the West has invented, or rather America has invented, which is really quite absurd, it is like talking to each other about ourselves, which you can do in another room by yourself, without exposing yourself to a lot of idiotic thoughtless people. (Laughter) And you think you are somehow by confession, by all the rest of it, purging yourself. If you are really serious you can do it utterly, completely, nobly, thoroughly by yourself in your room.

So we are going to enquire very seriously whether psychological fears can end at all. You understand the implications of it? Because man has never been able to psychologically be free of fears. Fear has burdened his mind, darkened his outlook, he does not know how to deal with these fears, therefore he escapes from these fears, into violence, brutality, arrogance, bitterness, you know the whole human bag of tricks. So what is the root cause of fear? Please look into yourself as we are talking. Use the words as a mirror to discover your own fear and find out as you observe the root of it, not the branches, the leaves, the trivialities of fear, which we will also understand a little later, but the fundamental cause of fear. Because if there is fear psychologically, inwardly, every action becomes distorted, there is no meticulous clear observation. So it becomes very important to understand this question of fear. So we are asking; what is the root of fear? Not only is there fear of death - in this country you don't talk about death. It is there but you don't talk about it, you don't look at it, you don't want to find out the nature of it, but we have learnt very carefully to avoid it. And we are going to go later on, perhaps next week, Saturday or

Sunday, to talk about death also, it becomes part of life. It isn't something at the end of life. It may be the very beginning, the ending and the beginning and therefore there is no beginning and no ending, which we will go into later on.

So what is the root of fear? Is it not being able to find complete security, psychologically, inwardly? Complete, total certainty, security. Is it that we don't understand time? Is it that we are seeking permanency, something that will endure, that will last, that is final? You are following all this? Is there the uncertainty of not being? So we will go into it.

First let's look if there is security psychologically. Because we may be seeking psychological security and therefore creating insecurity in the outward world. You are understanding this? We will go into it. I see you don't understand it, we will go into it. What is security, psychologically, inwardly? What do we mean by security, being secure? Firm, certain, enduring, unshakeable, unmovable, so that nothing can shake it, break it down. Is that what you are seeking in relationship between each other? In having complete knowledge and depending on that knowledge to give us stability? Which means, seeking permanency, nothing that can be changed, and therefore eternity in the sense of putting an end to time. Do you understand all this? I wonder if you do. And is time one of the factors of fear? Are we beginning to understand each other, are we? There is time by the watch, time as yesterday, today and tomorrow. Time, the chronological time is necessary, it is there. Is there psychological time? You understand? Is there for me, for you, psychologically tomorrow? If there isn't, there is immense fear. Do you understand? If you are confronted with the

fact that there is no tomorrow psychologically - do you understand? - your whole foundation is shaken because tomorrow you are going to have greater pleasure, tomorrow you will be better, tomorrow you will achieve, tomorrow you will get rid of your fear. So is there psychologically tomorrow?

Tomorrow means time - please go into it, this is rather complex and unless you give a little attention to it you will miss it - tomorrow means time. Tomorrow implies thought, which is in itself fragmentary, has created time psychologically, in which you will move from 'what is' to 'what should be'. Right? You are understanding all this? So is time a factor of fear? We must examine all this and then we will see how to look at fear. You understand? First we are looking at various factors that may be the cause of fear, like time, thought, the desire for certainty, the demand for a relationship in which there is complete permanency, and therefore psychologically total security. And we are asking: are these the factors of the basic cause of fear? Time, which is the product of thought - chronological time is not the product of thought, the sun sets, the sun rises and the calendar was invented 4,500 BC - that time exists but is there time at all psychologically, to make an effort to be something? Or, is fear of not being? You understand? What is this everlasting demand of self-expression, the 'me' expressing itself, the 'me' and the 'you', the 'I', the ego - do you understand? What is that? And without that there is tremendous fear, because in losing that, you have to find out what is this thing that is the 'me'. Are you following all this? Or is it just a lot of words? For god's sake wake up and tackle it. Because it is your life. And if you understand this and free of fear you are - you open

the door to heaven. What is this me? Is it an actuality, or verbal reality? You understand? The 'me' that says, 'I must be'. 'I must meditate', 'I must find god', 'I must realize', 'I must be happy', 'I am lonely', 'I must be successful', 'I am frightened', 'I must be told' - what is that 'me'? Is it not the name? Right? The name, Mr so and so, the form? Right? The form being the body, that which you see in yourself in the mirror, and all the associated memories. Right? All the concepts about yourself, the image about yourself, the image that says, 'I am much better than you are'. Are they not all the product and put together by thought? Right? You are seeing this? Put together by thought. Thought itself is a fragment, and the activity of that fragment is not only you, the 'me', but the fragment it has created right round you. Right? Separate nations, separate classes, wars, the whole of that and thought is a material process in time. Right? Thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain, and the response of that is thought.

So the 'me' is fictitious, to which we cling. It becomes tremendously important. And we say that may be the root cause of fear, clinging to something that is non-existent. So there is that. There is the fictitious, imagined me, a picture, a symbol, an idea, an image, put together by thought in time, which is a material process and measurement; and not being that, being uncertain of its very existence, deeply, in the very depths of one's being, that may be the deep fundamental cause of fear. You are understanding all this? Which doesn't mean if you have no 'me' you cannot live in this world. Right? On the contrary. I will show you in a minute.

Now can you look at this picture? That is, the movement of

time. Time is movement. Right? It is so complex, you don't see the beauty of it. You see the ending of that movement is putting a stop to time, and that is one of the major factors of meditation, so that time comes to an end, psychologically. So we are saying fear, deep rooted fear is the movement of thought in time, which is material process, which has created an artificial structure called the 'me', and having created it thought clings to it, clings to a fragment which it has created, and thought itself is a fragment. Fear in relationship, because in relationship we have created the image of you and me. Right? The man and the woman, each person has an image of the other. A picture, a symbol, put together by time, of many days, many years, or an hour, and the relationship is between these two images. Look into it, you will see the actuality of it. And we cling to the picture, to the image, and we are frightened of losing that image, then we are forced to look at each other totally differently, if there is no picture. And is fear caused by dependency on authority, somebody to tell us what to do, how to think, what to think, following somebody, the gurus, the priest, the authority - they are all tyrants. You follow? In a democracy tyrants are an abomination, but you have spiritual tyrants - don't you? Your pet guru?

So, there is dependency, there is the picture of yourself created by thought, to which you are clinging, and there is desire. What is desire? You have to understand these things, not mentally, actually, not verbally, but actually see, taste it, capture it and look at it. What is desire, by which we are driven? Desire is, isn't it, sensation. Sensation plus thought is desire. You understand? Now you must be sensitive. Right? Otherwise you are dead. Sensation

there must be but the moment thought takes over, and it becomes desire, then the whole problem arises. So can there be - listen to this - a complete sensation, looking at everything with all your senses - the trees, the mountains, the sky, the clouds, the rivers, a face, a picture, everything totally with all your senses and not let thought come in, take it over? You understand? Have you ever tried it? No. You don't do anything.

So after having described all this, and knowing that description is not the described - you understand, we have described in words the nature, the quality, the structure, how it is put together, this thing called fear. We have described it. Now can you look not at the description but at the fact, that which is described? Can you look at it? That is, can you observe it? And it is very important to learn how to observe. There is an art in observation. As we said the other day, 'art' means putting things in their proper place, where it belongs. Everything where it belongs. Art - the meaning of that word. So can you observe this thing called fear, after having described it, can you observe it? So what do we mean by observing? Are you, who is the observer, different from the thing observed? Do you understand my question? When you are angry, or envious, or jealous or whatever it is, are you different from that feeling which we have named as jealousy? Are you different? Or you are jealousy? So the observer is the observed. I wonder if you see that? That is, to put it differently: is the thinker different from his thought? Or again differently, the experience - you are crazy about having experiences, aren't you? Now is the experiencer different from the experience? Right? What is your answer? Is he different? Therefore why do you seek experiences? You follow? If

there is no difference between the observer and the observed, then there is only the observed. Right? Then there is only thinking, not the thinker different from thought.

Look: I see you don't get all this. You want experiences, you are bored with the experiences that you have had already, the daily experience of sex, this, that and the other, you want other experiences. Right? Experience of god, experience of enlightenment, experience of Jesus, experience of Krishna consciousness - don't you? God what gullible people you are! You want it. And you have never enquired who is the experiencer, and is he different from the experienced. You want to experience Krishna consciousness, or the consciousness of Jesus, or whatever it is, and to experience that, and when you do experience you must recognize it, mustn't you? No? That means you have already known it. No? Therefore the experiencer is the experienced. So can you look at fear without the observer? Do you understand? Because you are the fear, fear isn't different from you. Right? Do you understand this? When you are angry, is that anger different from you? If you are different then you try to control it, then you try to rationalize it, then you try to do something about it. Please listen to this. But if the observer is the observed you can't do anything about it, you are that. Right? Now look, observe that, which is fear, without the observer. You understand? What is the time? Audience: Ten past.

K: I'll finish this, then we will go on.

You see there is this problem of fear, which we have described, we can go on adding to that description a great deal, much more, but what we have described is good enough. And one realizes in



observing that fear, that fear is not different from the observer. When the observer is the observed there is fundamental change in that which is observed. I'll show you. When there is division between the observer and the observed - I am not fear, but there is fear - you understand? - the division - then what takes place in that division? Conflict, doesn't it? I must get rid of it, I must control it, why shouldn't I have fear? Why shouldn't I have neurotic actions out of those fears, and so on and so on and so on. There is always contradiction, division, therefore conflict. Right? Which is wastage of energy, isn't it? Right? Do you understand that? It is a wastage of energy when there is conflict. Conflict being I must control it, I must run away from it, I must go to somebody to tell me how to get rid of fear. You follow? All those are factors of wasting energy. Right? Do you see this? Now if you don't waste energy, and that only takes place when the observer is the observed, then you have that immense energy to transform 'what is', the very observation is the energy which transforms that which is. Have you understood this? For god's sake get it. Then you will see that you are completely, totally free from psychological fears.

If you have paid attention this morning, listened to it with all your heart and your mind, then when you get up, walk home, you are free of fear. That means you have listened. That means it is your problem. Your problem - it is absolutely necessary to solve it, not tomorrow, instantly. That is, when you perceive something then you act instantly, and that perception is only possible when the perceiver is the perceived, because there you have total energy. As we explained the other day, some scientists have said that when you observe through the microscope, that which is observed is

transforming itself all the time. So when there is total observation, that is only possible when there is no observer - the observer being the past - when there is that total attention given to observation, that which is observed undergoes a fundamental transformation.

Got it? Do it!

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 11TH APRIL 1976

I am sorry you have been kept waiting for half an hour.

We have been talking over together, the last three times that we met here, the importance of observing our daily life. We are concerned with that only and whether it is possible, living in this rather chaotic, degenerating world, to bring about a radical transformation in the human mind. We are not concerned with theories, speculative philosophy, nor asserting any form of belief. But rather together examine, closely and meticulously our ways of life, the way we live, our contradictions in ourselves, the misery, the confusion, the loneliness, the despair, and all the travail of human mind. With that we are concerned, not with speculative philosophy. Philosophy means, according to the dictionary, the love of truth, or the love of life. And we have been concerned with relationship, because on that the whole of society is based. If our human relationship with each other is not right then our society, our culture, is bound to be violent, menacing, destructive, as it is now.

And also we talked about thought, the importance and the understanding, and having an insight into the whole structure and the nature of thought. And yesterday morning we talked about fear, whether the human mind can ever be free of fear, not only at the conscious level but at the deeper layers of one's consciousness. Whether it is at all possible for human beings who have lived for millennia upon millennia, to utterly be free of this terrible burden of fear. We went into that sufficiently yesterday.

Today we would like to talk about pleasure and sorrow. We are

going to go into this problem, which is much more complex than fear, the pursuit of pleasure. And before we go into this we must understand what is reality, and what is truth. This is not a speculative question. It concerns our life, and therefore we must understand very deeply the nature of reality. When we talk about reality we mean that everything that thought has put together, both outwardly and inwardly. The outward movement is the inner movement, and the inner movement is the outer movement. There is no division between the outer and the inner. And whatever thought has put together, that is reality. Thought has not put together the trees, and mountains, the lakes but thought has put together the whole technological area, with all its enormous complicated machinery, based upon knowledge. That is also reality because it is part of thought. And also reality is all the illusions and the neurotic behaviour, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals - the desire for experiences and so on are reality. We are concerned with the transformation and bringing order in that reality. The reality of the things of thought. I hope we are meeting each other because, if I may point out, this is rather important to understand when we go into the question of pleasure and whether the human mind, your mind can ever be free from sorrow, or must sorrow continue endlessly.

So to find that out we must enquire very deeply into the question of what is reality. We are saying that nature, the trees, the mountains, the lakes and the beauty of nature is not created by thought, but that is reality, that is an actuality. But all the psychological structure put together by thought, the 'me', and the 'not me', the 'I' and the 'you', 'we' and 'they', the communist, the

socialist, the imperialist, the business, all that area of the psyche is a reality, and the neurotic behaviour, the illusions, the beliefs, also that is a reality. And to bring order in that reality, which is the reality which thought has created as the 'me', as the 'you', the divisions between nationalities, beliefs, dogmas, all that, in that confusion there must be order because without order no society, no different kind of culture can come into being. We disregard order. We think that is old fashioned, that it is square - or whatever name you give to it. We think order is mechanical. And therefore we want to be free of mechanical habits, mechanical traditions, mechanical culture and so in disregarding it we are bringing confusion and not order. I hope we are sharing this together, not agreeing with the speaker, or disagreeing, but examining. And in the process of examination there must be no prejudice, or a particular direction in the examination.

We are disorderly people. I don't know if you have watched yourself walking down the road, sloppy, uncombed hair, dirty, unconcerned, all the things that are happening, a permissive, thoughtless society which we have created. Not only in this country, but right throughout the world it is taking place, because America has become the standard of the world, the affluent society is the highest form of society apparently, and the world is copying it. And unless in that reality - please follow this, if you don't mind - unless there is order in the structure of thought, in the world of reality, which is the world in which we live daily, we will not be able to end sorrow. A man who is concerned with the understanding and going beyond sorrow, must bring order in life, in daily life. As we said, order has been regarded as mechanical,

conforming, following a particular pattern, moralistic, laid down by society, by traditions, sanctions of religion and so on and so on. So one has to find out what is mechanical. You understand?

Is the mind mechanical? Is your mind, which is the thought movement, is it mechanical? We mean by mechanical that which has a cause. Any movement that has a cause with its effect, and the effect becoming the cause, which is a process of a chain movement, that is mechanical. You have understood? Please give a little thought to this if you don't mind, because this is really important to understand because we are going to find out if there is any part of the brain which is non-mechanical. Or is the whole structure of the brain, of our mind, mechanical, repetitive? And we say that which is mechanical must always have a cause - the cause becoming the effect and the effect becoming the cause for the next effect. That is a process of enchainment, binding. As long as that process exists there must be mechanical activity. Right? That is, if one acts according to a particular pattern established by experience as memory, and act according to that memory, that is binding, that is mechanical. Whether that mechanical habit is ten thousand years old, or a week old. So there is a part of our brain, which you can observe yourself, we are not a specialist, I am talking as a layman, we can observe in ourselves a part of the brain which is the storehouse of memory, memory being experiences, accumulated knowledge, and according to that knowledge, experience, memory, there is activity, therefore that is mechanical. And realizing that we revolt against it. Are we communicating with each other? I will explain as we go along. It is quite a complex thing.

So our daily life becomes a mechanical process. You have had

certain experiences, certain incidents, which have become a memory, and according to that memory thought responds, and pursues in that circle, in that cycle: that is mechanical. And thought, which is based on memory, is mechanical. You understand, sirs? So thought is mechanical. And the mechanical thought says, 'I must bring order in the things which I have created'. You are following this? In the world of reality, not in nature, but in the world of reality of human relationship, fear, pleasure, sorrow, he says, 'I must bring order'. Thought has created this confusion and says, 'I will bring order to it' - therefore it brings more confusion. Is this clear? Are we meeting each other? No, please, don't accept my words, but look at yourself and watch it. Your thinking is mechanical because it is based on memory - memory is experience, knowledge, and thought says, 'I will bring order in the things which I have created, which is rather messy, confused'. And that is what is happening politically, if you have watched it with all the campaigning going on now, and that is what religions have done, all our human relationship has become mechanical. Right?

Now we are enquiring: is there an action, a way of living, which is non-mechanistic, which is not based on the movement of thought as time? Are we understanding something of each other?

So we are going to find out if there is an action which is not mechanistic and therefore we must understand very clearly what is reality. Reality, as the psychological reality in which we live, is mechanistic. And as long as there is activity in that mechanical existence of our life there must be more confusion, more sorrow, more violence, more everything. Now we are going to find out if

there is an action which is non-mechanistic. Is this clear? Can we proceed from there? I hope you have understood something of it, because it is your life, it is not my life. It is your way of living, your daily existence, which has become so utterly meaningless, so mechanistic, except for occasional freedom and so on. So we are going to go into this question of whether there is an action, a way of living which is not based on the mechanical repetition of memory, conforming to a pattern, a way of living in which there is no conflict - all that is involved.

So there is this world of reality which thought has created, the Christian, the Buddhist, all the rest of it, and what is truth? What is the relationship, if there is such a thing as truth, between truth and reality? That is, I want to find out if there is non-mechanistic action. Because if the human mind can find that then I can begin to enquire into the whole structure and nature of pleasure. Whether pleasure is mechanistic and is there joy, ecstasy, real enjoyment which is mechanistic? You are following this? Please, we are using ordinary English, not American English, or the eighteenth century English, or the twenty-first century English, but English as it is spoken originally according to the dictionary and so on.

So we are asking ourselves if there is an action which is free of regrets, free of any form of corruption, an action that doesn't leave a residue, that doesn't create contradiction, that in itself is the flowering of order? Do you understand? We are going to find out together. We are asking: what is an insight, an insight into the world of reality which thought has created, having an insight into that structure. You understand? Insight means having a sight in. Right? I think this is too complex. We will approach it differently.



First of all let's look at the question of pleasure. We will come back to it in a different way. Why does the human mind pursue pleasure? We are not saying that there should be no pleasure. We are going to investigate into the nature of pleasure because apparently human beings are everlastingly committed to pleasure. Aren't you? Pleasure implies that which is pleasing, in action, in conduct, in relationship, in all the things we do we are pursuing pleasure - why? Why is there this immense demand for pleasure? Which is the easiest way of action, the most comfortable way of living, the easy relationship of sex and all the rest. This enormous pursuit, not only of physical, sensory pleasures, but psychological pleasures, and the ultimate pleasure is for god, for enlightenment and so on. Right? Why? I do not know if you have ever asked that question of yourself. So what is pleasure? Because it is very important to understand, it may be the other side of the coin of fear. You understand? We shared together yesterday the complex problem of fear, and pleasure is much more complex. And we are saying that it may be the other side of the coin.

So most human beings disregard fear, do not know how to deal with fear, and pursue constantly pleasure. So we are asking: what is pleasure? Is it mechanistic? Because, as we said, through culture, through tradition, through our habits, environment and so on, our brain has become, part of the brain, has become mechanistic, as we went into. And pleasure - I am asking - is it mechanistic? So we are saying: what is pleasure? Is it the repetition of a certain delight of yesterday, whether it be sexual or other, which becomes a memory and the pursuit of memory as pleasure? Therefore is pleasure mechanistic? Please bite into it, don't just sit there and say, 'Yes',

bite and find out because we are concerned - please, I am deeply serious about all these things - we are concerned with the transformation of the human mind. We can't live as we are living. There must be a radical change in our minds, in our hearts, in our whole way of living. And it is very important, those who are really serious, to find out why we human beings have been caught in this everlasting pursuit of pleasure.

Now look at it. Yesterday there were some delightful incidents, something that you liked immensely, it happened, which is registered in the brain, then it becomes a memory, then thought says, 'I must have more of that'. Right? Whether it is sexual or other. The repetition of an incident which is over, which was considered by thought as pleasure, and the pursuit of it today and tomorrow. You follow this? Which is mechanistic, obviously. Now what is the difference between pleasure, enjoyment and joy? There are three things: pleasure, enjoyment and joy. Pleasure you can cultivate. Right? Taste, all this cultivated sensory activities and the right pleasure, you can cultivate it. Can you cultivate enjoyment? Or can you cultivate joy? Joy comes uninvited by some curious chance. You find yourself suddenly, extraordinarily, unspeakably happy. Then thought takes it over and says, 'I must have more of it'. So the moment thought interferes with that thing called joy, which is uninvited, it becomes pleasure, therefore it becomes mechanistic. Are you following all this?

So that is our life: a way of living, which is constantly repetitive, constantly going over something that was, that is already dead, making it live through thought and pursuing that as pleasure. Right? Can you look at something beautiful and enjoy looking at

that tree and the clouds, and the light, that's enjoyment. Right? But when thought comes in and says, 'That was a most lovely thing', it is already finished. Right? So can you - please this requires a tremendous sense of alertness, watchfulness, awareness - can you watch the beauty of nature, the beauty of this world, with all your senses and not let thought come in? Therefore enjoyment is completely for the moment, but when thought takes it over, it becomes pleasure and it becomes mechanistic. Have you understood this? This requires a mind - look, experiment with it now, as we are talking: look at the trees, the sunlight, the beauty of the hills, the shadows, the playing of those shadows among the hills, the valleys, look at it. And it is a delight. Can you watch it without thought coming into it? And end it there, not wanting to continue it. Have you understood? What has continuity becomes mechanistic. That which has an ending there is a new beginning. Got it? Have you understood? Right?

Now please listen to this: you had an insight into this, didn't you. Didn't you? Now please just a minute, watch it carefully. You had an insight. Is that insight the product of thought? So you have found something. That is, when there is an insight and action through insight, it is not mechanistic. Got it? Have you understood this? We are coming back to it, because we are going to find out if insight or intelligence is not the product of thought, as we said it is not just now, then acting according to insight and intelligence is non-mechanistic action. Don't say, 'What is intelligence?' We said when we explained very carefully that watching the shadows, the mountain, the clouds, and seeing the beauty of it, and ending it, and not giving thought a movement in that, you had in insight into it,

we said how true that is. Right? That to act according to that insight is non-mechanistic. Have you got it? Oh, my lord!

Look sirs - ladies, or whatever it is: when we pointed out that whenever thought takes over the moment of delight it becomes mechanistic. You saw that, didn't you? The perception of that is intelligence, isn't it. Can you act always according to that intelligence, not according to the repetitive movement of thought? Do you see the difference? Wait, I will come back to it.

So we see the movement of pleasure, based upon desire, desire being sensation; to watch the trees, the clouds, the heavens and the stars and the moon, that is a tremendous sensation if you watch it with all your senses. Then thought comes in. So where there is sensation plus thought there is a desire. You have understood? You see it? That is, the sensations, the activity of the senses at their highest, plus thought is desire. Do you see that? How do you see it? You see it because your intelligence is observing it. That intelligence is not the product of thought. Right? So we've come back to it.

Now we are going to enquire into this question of sorrow. I do not know if you have gone into it, or if you have even considered why there are tears, why human beings suffer, both biologically as well as inwardly. What is this suffering, this sorrow, can it ever end? Or, is it an everlasting movement from the beginning of man to the end of man? Do you follow? Must man put up with it, live with it? Religions, organized religions, based on authority and belief, have never solved this problem. Christianity said, somebody suffers for you and you carry on. Hindus and the Buddhists have their own explanations - which we won't go into now. So man has

lived with this sorrow from the ancient of days, and we are asking something, which is: can sorrow end? If there is no ending to sorrow there is no compassion, there is no love. We think suffering is necessary, or we think there is no solution to suffering, therefore we must escape from it. And we have developed a marvellous network of escapes, which are facts. What is sorrow? When you suffer, when there is this thing called sorrow, which is pain, grief, loneliness, a sense of total isolation, no hope, no sense of relationship, communication, total isolation - don't you know all this? This great thing that man has lived with and perhaps cultivated, because he doesn't know how to resolve it. And we are going to find out, share together this question and find out if there is an end to sorrow, because without the ending of sorrow there is no love. When there is love will you suffer for another? When there is love will there be sorrow? You might have sympathy, kindness, generosity, sharing, but love is something totally different, a different dimension, which only one can come upon when sorrow ends. So it is immensely important to find out as human beings this everlasting torture which is called sorrow.

There is sorrow when someone dies whom you like, love, so-called love in quotes. And you feel utterly lonely when you have lost that upon which you have depended. When you feel that you cannot climb the ladder of success, when someone whom you love, at least you think you love, and it is not returned, when your beliefs in which you have false security are shattered, when your mother, father dies, or son, brother dies there is sorrow. You all must know this thing. And I do not know if you have ever asked yourself deeply whether there can be an end to human sorrow. You

understand.

Now what actually takes place when you suffer? Not biologically, physiologically, we will deal with that, but psychologically, which is much more penetrating, much deeper, much more excruciating. You may shed tears, escape from it, never look at it, but it is always there. And what is sorrow? Please, this is not an intellectual investigation, an analytical process. To me analysis is no answer. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. The analyser is the analysed. I do not know if you have gone into it. When you analyse something of your own nature, when you analyse your sorrow, who is the analyser? Is he different from the thing called sorrow? Or he has divided himself as the analyser, separates himself from sorrow and says, 'I'll look into it'. But in the very examination of it the division exists and therefore he can never understand through analyses the whole immensity and the nature of sorrow. So we are not analysing, because analysis implies time. Analysis implies the analyser and the analysed. And the analyser may be mistaken and his analysis will be useless. So do you - please experiment with me - do you see, have an insight into the question of analysis, the futility of it? You understand? So you have an insight into it, so you will never again analyse. You see? Right? If you have an insight into this question of analysis which the speaker has explained, the analyser sets himself apart from the analysed and says, 'I will examine that thing, which is to be analysed', and the examiner is the past with his prejudices, with his conclusions, with his memories, with his knowledge which he has acquired through Freud and somebody else or other. And then he examines or analyses that. So he establishes a division and

where there is division there is conflict. And we are saying the analyser is the analysed. The man who says, 'I am going to examine my anger' - the examiner is himself anger. Right? Do you see that? Therefore if you have an insight into that you will never again analyse. That insight is your intelligence.

So we are saying, sorrow is the lot of human beings, everyone knows it. And what takes place when we are in sorrow? Apart from emotional sentiment, tears, apart from all that, what takes place? As we don't know how to understand sorrow, what is involved in sorrow, we have not had an insight into sorrow, we escape from it, we rationalize it, we justify it, or say that every human being suffers, I suffer. Or if you are prejudiced religiously, you say it is the work of god. Now all those are ways and means of escaping from the fact, 'what is', which is sorrow. Now if you don't escape, that is, no rationalizing, no avoiding, no justifying, remain with that totality of suffering, without the movement of thought, then you have all that energy to comprehend that thing which you call sorrow. You understand? Have you understood something? That is, to remain without a single movement of thought, with that which you have called sorrow. Then if you remain with that there comes a transformation in that which you have called sorrow. That becomes passion. You understand? Because the root meaning of sorrow is passion. When you escape from it, you lose that quality which comes from sorrow, which is complete passion, which is totally different from lust and desire. So when you have an insight into sorrow and remain with that thing completely, without a single movement of thought, out of that comes this strange flame of passion. And you must have passion otherwise you can't create

anything.

So out of passion comes compassion. Compassion means passion for all things, for all human beings. So there is an ending to sorrow. And only then you will begin to understand what it means to love.

So one has to understand, have an insight into fear, that is, insight into relationship, insight into the whole structure and nature of thought, thought that breeds fear, that pursues pleasure and the ending of sorrow. If you have an insight into all that you have that intelligence that transforms your mechanistic activity into something totally non-mechanistic. Right?

Don't go home and think about it! You have no time. If you think about it, when you think about what has been said, then your thinking becomes traditional, mechanistic, and empty, but as you are sitting there, sharing this thing, it is happening now, it must happen now otherwise it won't ever happen, because thought will prevent it, thought has no insight; but when you look at that picture, or the picture we have pointed out, knowing the description is not the described, and you look at it, and have an insight into that, and it must take place instantly, now, and that thinking about it at home - don't do it, it is just a waste of time. Right? When you are sharing something, you are sharing it now.

What times is it? I think that is enough, isn't it?



## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 13TH APRIL 1976

Krishnamurti: I believe we are going to have a dialogue this morning, a conversation between two friends about a serious subject. And if we could this morning take one subject, one problem, or one issue and go into it thoroughly perhaps that would be worthwhile. So what shall we talk over together seriously and see how far we can go into it deeply, not theoretically, not in abstraction, but an issue or problem that we have to face psychologically every day. So what subject or what issue can we take that will by pursuing it step by step cover the whole field of existence?

Questioner: Sir, I am sorry to be asking you a question about violence, but I have had it with me for over a year and I have never been able to ask you. I thought I would find the reply for myself but up till now it has not appeared to me. The question is very simple: the physical survival of a man or a whole community, not the psychological survival, the physical, if he is threatened with annihilation by the force of arms of another party, what then is the right action?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: I would like to ask why thought persists?

K: Why thought persists, continues, is that it?

Q: What is the relationship between feeling and action?

K: What is the relationship between feeling and action; and the other question was, what is a community or a group of people or a nation to do when a stronger nation uses arms and violence to suppress it.

Q: I am trying to avoid conditioning, and in relation to this question, how does it relate to the school that is being started here?

K: Is there any way of not conditioning a child. Yes, sir?

Q: Sir, could we talk about education, especially the education of the young child?

K: Could we talk about the education of the young child.

Q: Is there a possibility of relationship between a man and a woman in a transformed state, and specifically if desire and the interference of the mind wasn't operating would there be sexuality?

K: I couldn't quite catch the whole question. Could you make it brief?

Q: Yes. Without the interference of thought or desire would there be sexuality between people living in the transformed state, living together.

K: Has somebody heard it?

Q: Sir, she wants to know is there a possibility of a relationship between a man and a woman in freedom, and if they are both free is there any sexuality.

Q: Without desire operating.

K: Yes, yes.

Q: What about resistance towards fear?

K: Resisting fear. Now that's enough. Yes, sir?

Q: What is important to me is to be the wholeness of love, and understanding, without duality, to express the vitality of that.

K: Have you understood the question?

Q: He wants to know, I think, well he hasn't exactly asked a question, he says what is important to him is a feeling of love without the duality of subject and object.

K: A statement was made which is, that he feels love and compassion should exist in life and how to express it in action. Now that's enough. Now which do you think is the most important question in all these questions?

Q: What is the correct action in life?

K: What is the correct action in life. Could we take that and into that question put all the other questions, including one nation oppressing another nation, supporting one nation with arms against another nation which is weaker, and all the questions of love and affection, and how to resist fear, though we have talked a great deal about fear, it is not a question of resisting it, and so on. Can we go into that, taking that one question: what is the correct action in life? Right? Would you like to begin with that and include all the others? May we?

The word `correct' means accurate, right. When we use the word `correct', the meaning of that word, the root meaning of that word also implies accurate, right, meticulous action in life and what is right action from that. What do we mean by action? Let us stick to this one thing, it will include everything if we go into this really earnestly and seriously. What do we mean by action? You know this has been one of the great problems of life. The religious people have said, right action is to have a highest principle and act according to that principle. The Indians call it Brahman, and the Buddhists and so on, various religions have said, right action must conform both morally, spiritually, in every direction according to the principle of the highest thing.

And in the modern world what do we mean by action, to act, to do. Is action in the active present - please listen to this - is action in

the active present, or is it an action dependent on the past according to the future, or is action based on the past ideas, conclusions, knowledge? You understand? The word 'act' means to do now. That is the word, the significance of that word is to act now. Now what do we mean by action in our daily life? Is it based on a principle, on an ideal, on a conclusion; the Arab and the Jew, the Hindu, Muslim, on the conditioning of the human mind according to culture, tradition and so on? And is action based on a past memory, experience, knowledge? So what do we mean by action, which means, what is your action in daily life based on, what is the motive, what is the purpose, what is the intention, what is the background of action?

Q: Self-centredness.

K: Is it based on self-centred activity? Please, this is very, very serious question because we are going to find out if there is an action which is not mechanical. We will go into that but first we must be very clear for ourselves what do we mean by action. Coming here to the meeting is an action, thinking is an action, going to the kitchen and washing dishes is an action, digging the garden and so on, going to the factory, going to the office - what do we mean by action? Is action fragmented: the action of the artist, the action of the police, the action of the engineer, the action of man and woman in relationship? Those are all fragmented actions, aren't they? Right? Please, come with me, move. So you may go to the office and there be ambitious, envious, play all kinds of tricks and come back home and be very affectionate - both are activities. And they are self-contradictory, so it is fragmentary and therefore conflicting: I say one thing and do another, think something and

put a totally different meaning into words. All that is action. The action that is going on killing baby seals, wiping out the whales - a lovely civilization you have! - forming a community, a commune, fighting with each other, wars, everything is action. So what do we mean by correct action? Knowing what the world is, how it is fragmented, the Arab, the Jew, the Muslim, the Hindu, you follow, the Catholic, the Protestant, the communist, the socialist and so on and so on and so on.

First of all, do we see or are aware of what is actually going on in the world? Or have we shut our eyes and live in a small world of our own desires, our own pleasures, our own activities, and say, what is right action in there? Do you follow? So what do we mean by correct action?

Can there be correct action if that action is based on an ideal? Let's take that for example. Can there be correct action according to an ideal? What is an ideal? Please go on. Please, this is a dialogue.

Q: Something from the past.

K: You say, an ideal, what is that, what does it mean? You have ideals, haven't you, conclusions, haven't you?

Q: `What should be'.

K: What should be, all right. What should be, from `what is'. Right? `What is' and `what should be' - that's a fragmentary action, isn't it. Why do human beings have ideals at all, `what should be'?

Q: I think that ideals are a memory of an orderly action according to an order.

K: Which is, `what should be'.

Q: In a sense, however there are ideals as a memory of the order

of the universe.

K: No, sir, look, please, let's be simple, don't let's bring in the universe, let's begin slowly. I am angry, one is angry - the 'should be' is not to be angry. One is not brotherly but one should be brotherly. Right? So why do we have this 'should be'?

Q: Fear.

Q: Trying to change.

K: Please if I may suggest as a friend, look into yourself and find out why you have a 'should be'.

Q: We don't like 'what is'.

Q: Because you are not the real thing.

K: No.

Q: Because one doesn't know what to do with what is going on in oneself.

K: That is what I am saying, you do not know what to do with 'what is', is that it? Do please give a little attention.

Q: We are avoiding looking at 'what is'.

K: Therefore, one avoids 'what is' because one doesn't know how to deal with 'what is'. If you knew how to alter the 'what is' you wouldn't go to 'what should be', would you? Please, it's a dialogue.

Q: 'What is' I will never be able to change though, I don't kill baby seals but people do, I can't change that. What can I do?

Q: She says she doesn't kill baby seals, she is resigned to not being able to change certain things.

K: So you are resigned, you accept.

Q: I don't.

K: You don't accept it?

Q: I don't accept it but I am upset. It seems something that I can't change.

K: I am not talking of changing something out there, changing yourself. We are asking, what is correct action in daily life. That was the question he raised and we said what is action. I can't go back if you don't pay attention to it. Let's go on.

We say our action is based on, one of our activities is based on `what should be'. Right? I am asking you, why you have invented the `should be'.

Q: Because we are fragmented.

K: That's not an answer.

Q: We have certain ideas on how we think things should be handled.

Q: Because I feel insecure.

Q: I don't remember ever inventing this, I am this.

K: How does it come about? Why do human beings have this `should be'?

Q: They are frightened of `what is'.

Q: Because he doesn't understand life in the moment, in this moment, now.

K: Sir, are we answering this question theoretically, or observing ourselves and finding out why you have an ideal, why you have a `should be', which is in the future, why?

Q: It seems that we can achieve some desirable goal.

K: We are all saying the same thing, sir, the `should be' is the goal, the purpose, the end and so on. I am asking you, please consider this, don't move away from it, I am asking you why you have such an ideal.

Q: It takes you to the future.

Q: People think they will receive some reward in the end if they were to conform to what we think is correct action, as opposed to conforming to what may be considered incorrect action though you will be punished. I think that has a lot to do with it, that you are going to receive a reward.

K: I understand that, sir. But we are saying, apparently we don't...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have you got an ideal or not?

Q: Yes.

K: Be simple. Why?

Q: We want a psychological time.

Q: Thought.

Q: When I feel that things should be other than they are it is because I have been taught that I am not what I should be. That I am in some way not adequate.

K: I understand all that, madam. So you are saying, out of inadequacy, out of insufficiency, out of not being able to solve the problem 'as is', we have an ideal as a means of either escape, or as a means of transforming the 'what is' into 'what should be'. So I am asking you - you are the most extraordinary crowd.

Q: Because it affirms us.

K: Affirms what?

Q: I feel more important if I have ideals.

Q: So that we can be something because we are not able to impartially observe ourselves.

Q: We are not living in the here and now.



Q: We don't like what is happening in the world, violence or unhappiness or suffering. And the world is suffering, there is conflict and wars and wrong doings all around us. We believe that it doesn't have to be if we have all the ingredients in the world right here to change the world if we together decided it can be done.

Q: I have an ideal because if I don't have an ideal then I won't be anything. Then I would be nothing.

K: So you have an ideal because without an ideal you would be nothing. Right? How is that ideal put together?

Q: Thought generates a picture of the good in some way.

K: Sir, look, please let's be simple about this. The gentleman asked, the first question, what is the correct action in daily life. What should one do to act correctly, accurately, rightly in a world that is so utterly confused, in a world of conflict, in a world of violence, in a world in which relationship is so fragile, what is the right thing to do?

Q: Pay attention.

Q: Listen to each other.

Q: Change ourselves.

Q: Be still.

Q: `Should be' is a form of escape. Right? No?

K: You should know, whether you are escaping from `what is', you should know, unless one is totally neurotic. Unless one is totally neurotic then you wouldn't know even to find out what is correct action. But not being wholly neurotic we are investigating that problem. What is the right action in human relationship, what is the right action with regard to society, what is the right action when there is conflict, violence and so on and on and on, what is

the right thing to do? Isn't it a problem to you? How do you set about finding what is right action? Would you accept authority when they say, this is right action, obey this?

Q: I guess so.

K: Will you, please look at it.

Q: I would sometimes, yes.

K: So you accept authority.

Q: That is not justifying that but that is true.

K: So you would accept authority to find out what is right action. So you are not free to find out, you have already established in your mind that there must be authority who will tell us what is right action. What happens then? Please follow that one particular issue: if you accept authority and say, authority will tell us what to do, what is the correct action, what is the result of that?

Q: Authority becomes important rather than the actuality.

K: Do look at, sir.

Q: You don't accept the fact that you already know, that you can look within yourself and answer it.

K: If you follow the sanction of a society, the sanction of a church, the sanction of a guru, what happens to your mind? There is no freedom, is there? And mustn't you have freedom to find out what is correct action? For god's sake. So when you accept another as an authority to tell you what to do, or what is the right action, you are denying right action. Ideal is your authority. Right? And that authority is created by an attitude of mind which says, the present, the `what is' I am not able to solve, or I don't know what to do with it, I want to run away from it. And you project the opposite of `what is', the `should be' is the opposite of `what is'. Right? So

you have conflict. Out of that conflict can there be right action?

Are you following all this?

So what is a man to do, or a woman, who wants to find out what is correct, accurate, right action in life? Have you ever given your life to find out, or even ten minutes to find out what is right action? No, I am afraid you have not.

Q: You say that all ideals are essentially the same process of authority in the sense that it imposes upon you.

K: I did not say that, sir. What I said was, if you make an ideal as the authority then there is a contradiction in your life, it is the opposite of 'what is', isn't it, and therefore there is conflict in that. And where there is conflict how can you find out what is right action? So I want to find out as a human being, living in this world, in this almost insane world, what is right action.

Q: Observing without the observer.

K: I say is one's action based on the past, past memory, past experiences, knowledge? This is a very important question, go into it with me please for a while. If one's action is based on the past then I am living in the past. Living in the past one meets the present and modifies the present and creates a future. Right? I live according - one, not I - one lives according to a principle, established either through pleasure or through compulsion or through environmental influence or through ignorance, one projects from the past a principle, which is 'what should be', and one tries to live according to 'what should be'. Right? This is what is happening in our daily life: I must not be angry, I must be this, I must not do that, I wish it didn't happen that way. So we are always living in the past, meeting the present and modifying the present

and that we call action. Right? And in that process action is never complete. Right? Are we meeting each other on at least this one thing? One has had an experience and that experience either pleasurable or dangerous or distasteful, and according to that experience one tries to live and meets the present, doesn't understand the present, becomes confused in the present and creates a future confusion. Right? Do we see this in our life? Right? May we go on from there?

We are trying to find out what is correct, right, accurate action. Accurate means care, attention, otherwise you cannot be accurate. Right? If you want to measure something you must pay tremendous attention to it, otherwise you will not measure correctly. So to act correctly you must give to action great attention. Right? But you cannot give great attention to action if there is an idea which is established in the future. Or you say, I have a measure of my own and I am going to measure accurately something else. You follow? So to find out correct action, right action, accurate action, there must be care. Right? Is that clear? Please, this is a dialogue. Care. Do you care, care, love, committed, to find out what is right action, or is it just theory? Care, you care as the mother cares for the little baby, you understand, it wakes up in the middle of the night and she spends day after day, day after month, caring - do you so infinitely care to find out what is right action? You understand, sir? We know a man, he was a high judge, supreme honour in the great Courts. One morning he woke up and said, 'I am passing judgement on people and I don't know what right judgement is. I know according to legality, I know what it means to pass a judgement, but what is true judgement?' You

understand? So he called his family - this is an accurate story because I saw him, and I am not exaggerating, this is what happened - he called his family, he said, 'I am going to find out what is right judgement, what is the truth in judgement.' So he said, 'I must give up everything, give up my position, my money, my family, this is to me tremendously important in life because I am a judge.' He gave up everything and for twenty five years lived by himself and tried to find out what is the right judgement. And somebody brought him to one of the talks the speaker was giving and he came to see us the next day and said, 'You are quite right because what I have been doing is mesmerizing myself, thinking I have found the right action. But I never started right from the beginning to be free from tradition'. You understand? 'To be free from any possibility of deception. And there must be no illusion in my enquiry'. You follow? And illusion exists when there is a desire to arrive at the right decision. Oh, you don't understand this.

So to find out what is correct action you must care infinitely. If you do then you and I can have a dialogue. But if you say, you know, throw any old idea into the basket and pick something out of it thinking that is right action, I am afraid we shan't meet each other. But if you are really concerned then we can look at it. To start with there must be freedom of enquiry, to enquire, no prejudice, no conclusion. Can you do that? Otherwise you can't enquire, or find through that enquiry what is right action. That's simple, isn't it, but extremely difficult to do because you don't want to give up your prejudices, your conclusions, your ideals. So there must be freedom not only to enquire into what is correct action, there must be freedom to pursue constantly, right to the very end,

until you find the right action.

So to find out there must be care, there must be attention.

Right? So one has to begin by finding out what is action.

Everything is action: getting up, sitting down, walking, looking at the sky, the trees, talking, being miserable, going to the office, quarrelling, violence, everything in human relationship is action, even in the technological world it is action.

Q: But not my action.

K: Is your action different from that of another? Yes, sir, you have to enquire. Is my action of which I am very proud, or I want to find out what is correct action, is my action different from your action? If my action is based on anger, it's like yours; if my action is based on ambition, it's like yours. Right? If my action is based on envy, it's just like any other only I express it in trousers, the other expresses it in knickerbockers or in something else. So there is no 'my action' and 'your action', there is only action. We can't accept that easily because we think my action must be totally different from your action, because I think I am an individual. Am I an individual? As we said the other day, individual means indivisible, not fragmented, not broken up, whole, such a person is an individual but most of us are fragmented, broken up, contradictory. So I want to find out what is action. Action, not right action, I'll come to that presently. What do we mean by action? There are such varieties and multiplications of action. So is there an action not contradictory, not fragmented, but whole, which at any level of existence will be whole always? You understand my question? We know fragmented action. Right? Are you clear on that? Right. And fragmented action must lead to conflict, broken

up. So I am asking myself as a human being, I say, is there an action which is whole, complete, not contradictory, not fragmented, not a business action, family action, artistic action, commercial action, technological action, but action as a whole. You have understood my question?

So my enquiry is not only into fragmented action but observing the fragmented action both outwardly and inwardly, which is the same movement, one says to oneself, is there an action which is not fragmented. That is, I do something at the office, something totally different at home. You follow? Totally different religiously and morally and so on and so on. Is there an action which is whole? The word `whole' means healthy, that means physically healthy, then it also means sane, sanity, not neurotic - neurotic being based on some belief, conclusion, ideas - reasonable, logic, clear. That means sane. And also `whole' means holy, h-o-l-y, sacred. You follow? That word `whole' means all that. And one's mind says, I must find an action which is whole. We know what is fragmented action, the action of a Muslim against a Hindu, the Jew against the Arab, violence and so on, those are all fragmentary actions. Now I want to find out if there is an action which is whole. Right? Are you interested in this, does it mean something to you? Now how am I to find out, how is one to find out when your mind is fragmented? You understand?

Q: When the mind is fragmented? I didn't understand that.

K: Is your mind not fragmented, or are you saying, is the mind fragmented?

Q: He doesn't understand what your question is.

K: He doesn't understand my question. Sirs and ladies, you

know what fragmented action is. Right? Kind and the next minute unkind, generous and not generous, brutal and occasionally kindly, affectionate, saying one thing and doing another - the politicians are doing that beautifully and we are doing it in our daily life also. Those are all fragmented actions. When every religion has said, don't kill, and we have killed everything, and Christians probably have been the greatest killers in the world. You understand? So there is fragmented action. We know that and the result of all that. The dolphins are one of the most intelligent animals in the sea, and they are destroying them. And the people who destroy them go home and say, 'I love you'.

Q: Being annoyed is a fragmented action too.

K: Of course, sir, everything is fragmented action. So I am saying, we know that. Now what is then an action which is not fragmented?

Q: There is one action, sir, that action is overpopulation of the world, all over the world we have one common action and this has started to over-populate the world.

K: I know.

Q: This is the cause of all the troubles we have.

K: Yes, sir, I know, overpopulation. They are doing something at last in India, when it is probably too late. Overpopulation all over the world, five billion and in the next five years - you follow? Geometrically progressive. That's also action, fragmented. Now when a human being realizes that, this fragmented action, and asks, is there an action which is not fragmented.

Q: Action without choice.

K: The same thing.



Q: (Inaudible)

K: We have done that just now.

Q: It seems to me that as long as there is action there has to be someone who is performing the action. So long as there is someone performing the action there seems to be a centre of desire.

K: Quite right.

Q: So long as there is a centre of desire...

K: As long as a human being is fragmented his actions will be fragmented. That's what you are saying.

Q: How can one resolve it?

K: I am coming to that, sir, we are going into it, not escape from it. We are going to understand and resolve this problem.

Q: Is there an unfragmented action?

K: We are going to find out, sir.

Q: An action based on love is not fragmented.

K: Is that an idea? Is that a theory? Is that 'what is'? So when you say, action based on love is not fragmented, you have already fragmented it.

Q: It is an observation of 'what is'.

K: Which is, sir, if we say, look, all that I know is what I call love, in it there is fragmentation. Is there love in which there is no fragmentation? Then it is not a theory. I am enquiring, I am finding, I am caring to find out.

Q: Sir, the growth of a tree, that's a type of action, would you say it's a fragmented action?

K: We said the other day - sir, that cannot be answered. Let's get on. Now a human being says, there is the actor and the action. Right? The actor is the fragmented human being and whatever he

acts must be fragmented. Right? Whatever he does, his god, his love, his relationship, his activity, everything he does must be fragmented if the actor himself is fragmented. Right? That's simple law. It is a fact. So can there be a human being, you, who is not fragmented and therefore his action complete, whole? Now we are going to find out. Because we have no ideals in examination, no conclusion, no prejudice, I am what I am. There is this human being who is fragmented, is he aware that he is fragmented or is it just an idea that he is fragmented. You follow the difference? Is he aware in himself that he is fragmented? Or he has been told that he is fragmented? Which are two different activities. Now which is it? Do you know, or aware, that you are fragmented?

Q: I am aware that I am fragmented.

K: First do you know, are you aware, conscious, any word you like? If you are, then what will you do with that fragmentation, how do you look at that fragmentation? Please, do pay attention, you will find it if you pursue this. How do you look at that fragmentation?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, how do you look at it, sir, don't theorize about it, do it actually and find out how you look at yourself as a fragmented human being.

Q: It is undesirable.

K: So you say, undesirable, so already you are looking at the fragmentation and say it is undesirable, you have already condemned it. Therefore can you look at your fragmentation without judgement?

Q: Without making it pure?

K: Without judgement.

Q: Without making it better?

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: With hope.

K: With hope, which is another judgement. Do please give a few minutes attention to this.

Q: Sir, but if one realizes one is fragmented, one can only know one is fragmented by means of contrast, by having an ideal of what being whole, a unit is and what is fragmented.

K: No, sir, look, don't you know when you are fragmented, when you say one thing and do another?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is that not fragmentation, I say one thing and do something else? On a simple basis, start with that not with heavens.

Q: Inconsistency.

K: Inconsistency, contradiction, simple words.

Q: What about the resistance that kind of occurs when I am sitting here right now, that feels fragmentary.

K: Sir, do look at yourself. I am asking a question, whether you are aware that you are a fragmented human being, aware in the sense watching, looking, that you have a black beard, white hair, purple or whatever it is, watching. You look, you are tall or short. In the same way can you look at yourself and see whether there is fragmentation?

Q: Isn't what is looking a fragment also?

K: I am coming to that, sir, of course. If you will kindly have a little patience you will find out because one must go into this very carefully, sir. I said at the beginning you must care, you must love

the thing you are looking at and find out.

Q: Don't I have to accept that as what I am and `what is' right now?

K: When I see I am fragmented, I have to accept it, haven't it. Why do you accept it? Just look at it. Then from that arises, are you looking at it, or rather, how do you look at it? Take trouble please. How do you look at it? Are you looking at it with judgement? Are you condemning what you see, saying, `I mustn't be fragmented, how awful, I know it will lead to all kinds of trouble therefore I mustn't be fragmented'? How do you look at your own fragmented activities, with what eyes, with what ears?

Q: Realizing that even if you are fragmented still you have to act.

K: Of course, sir, we are coming to that. So if you are observing with conclusions, with prejudice, with all kinds of reasoned thoughts, then you are still fragmented, aren't you? So can you look - please listen to this - can you look without any condemnatory attitude, rationalized, just look? Then is there an observer different from the thing he is looking at? If you eliminate condemnation, prejudice, judgement, rationalization, which are all the past activities, you follow, then is there an observation in which the observer is not? The observer being condemnation, judgement, prejudice, despair, hope, saying, how terrible - all that is the observer's activities, therefore it prevents you from looking at `what is'. This requires sanity, reasoned thinking. So there is only the observation, the thing, not the observer looking. You follow? When you look without the observer who is the past, who is the judgement and so on, what takes place? Q: Contemplation.

K: Experiment, do it please, don't tell me. When there is no division between the Arab and the Jew, what takes place? What takes place?

Q: Conflict ends.

K: Conflict ends.

Q: Acceptance.

K: Not acceptance, sir.

Q: There is nothing to accept, the conflict would be over.

K: Yes, the thing is gone. You understand? When there is no Muslim and Hindu, communist and socialist, and all the rest of it, outwardly, there is no conflict, is there, and therefore complete action outwardly.

Q: We have to cease to exist.

K: Now, please I am going to show you, I am going to look at something. You understand? There is now the Catholic, the Protestant, the Baptist, you know, the division, division, division, all over, not only in the religious world, in the so-called religious world, but also the political world, the geographical world, racial world, there is division that has caused untold misery. Right? That has brought appalling destruction. Now do you see the truth of that? The truth, not, I am a Jew, I must still be a Jew, I'll accept this. Do you see where there is division there must be conflict. See it, have an insight into it. And therefore the moment you have an insight into the truth of that then you are acting wholly, aren't you. Is this clear somewhat?

Q: Sir, any sense of self is divisive, isn't it?

K: Yes. But I don't want to go to that ultimate fact. Now let's look at it the other way. Thought we said is a fragment, do you see

the truth of that? Thought is a fragment, it is not the whole, and thought has divided the world - you are a Christian, I am a heathen, you are godly and so on. I don't have to keep on repeating this endless rubbish. So thought being fragmented in itself, whatever it does it breaks up. That is a truth. Do you see the truth of it? Right? So is there an action which is not touched by thought and therefore it will be whole?

What is the root of all this contradiction? You understand my question? What is the root in one's life that brings about this contradiction? The `me' and the `not me', `we' and `they', my belief against your belief, my experience against your experience - what is the root of this division? We are still asking what is the correct action in life. And we say, what is the root of this division.

Q: Thought itself, the word.

K: We went into that sir, go a little deeper than that. We have said that, thought itself is a fragment and therefore whatever it does creates fragmentary activity. Now we say, go a little further. Is there - no, what is the root of all this?

Q: Desire for profit.

K: Oh, no. The desire for profit, the desire to avoid punishment. We are nurtured, our culture is based on these two principles: reward and punishment. Right? No? Do this, you will go to heaven, do this, you will become successful, do this, you will be representing the country, if you don't do that you will be punished. So our culture is based on this principle of reward and punishment. That's again fragmentary. But I am asking you, what is the root of all this movement of fragments, breaking up, what is the source of all this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You don't even think it out first. I am just asking a question and you are ready to jump. What is the root of all this, sir?

Q: Motive.

Q: Self.

K: We have been through all that. We said as long as you have a motive, a cause, there must be fragmentation. Where there is a cause there must be an effect, therefore there is a division. It is not one unitary movement. You understand. Now I am asking - please listen, I hope you aren't too cold - what is the root of all this?

Q: Egocentricity.

Q: Trying to escape from 'what is'.

K: Are you answering this, please I am not being rude or impatient, are you answering this from your investigation and discovery, or are you just throwing off some words? We want to know what is the root of all this, the root of this misery, confusion, contradiction, unhappiness.

Q: If there is no action then there is no conflict.

K: What? We are saying, sir, life is action, you can't live without action. May I go on asking the same question?

Q: Separation from the moment.

K: Have you discovered that?

Q: The origin of thought.

K: Go on, sir, go on.

Q: We want to be secure.

K: Are you saying the basic cause is insecurity and because we have reduced the world and ourselves and everything around us to such a confusion, which breeds insecurity and therefore out of that

insecurity all fragmentation takes place - is that what you are saying? Why have we reduced this world like this, what has made us? Why do human beings behave as they do? May I ask this, why do you behave as you behave?

Q: Because that's our attitude.

K: Do please listen. Why? Why do you support wars, why do you support all the killing that is going on? Why? Do please go into it, don't answer me.

Q: Ego.

Q: Because I don't see it going on.

K: You mean to say you don't know they are killing each other, throwing bombs, terrorists, innocent people being killed by the hundred.

Q: I see it on the screen.

K: But you mean you see it there but you don't feel it, is that it? Would you feel it if your - not your - if one's son, wife, husband were killed? What a world this is. No, I am asking, sir, please, don't be bored by this question, repetitive question because you are not answering it: why do human beings behave like this?

Q: Sir, we base our actions on thought and it is always inadequate.

K: Yes. So what will you do, what are you going to do about it? If you realize that your thought and all action based on thought is inadequate, incomplete, contradictory, causing great misery, what are you going to do about it? Just escape? Run away into some commune where you won't think at all, you know, carry on? What will you do?

Q: Reunite this half with the other half. We have fallen, when



we are pregnant we are only half what we are, to become whole we have to be reunited with our true inheritance.

K: That's another idea, isn't it, are you doing it?

Q: I am working on it.

K: Not 'working on it'. You see that gentleman said a very simple thing.

Q: Maybe that we have not been separated. We are not separate.

Q: Clearly as thought I can do nothing.

K: Sir, he said thought being inadequate and the inadequacy brings about this confusion, misery, the slaughter of human beings and nature and everything, what are you going to do about it? What will you do as a human being? Join societies?

Q: See it.

K: That would prevent killing?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I give up! You see.

Q: We have to find out if there is an action which is not based on self.

K: So what are you going to do?

Q: Find out.

K: Find out what? You are not relating to yourself as a human being who is the world. Right, sir? You are the world and the world is you, we have created this world, haven't we.

Q: We are related to our thoughts.

K: So please, if thought is inadequate and realizing, if I may point out something, which is, all thought leads to sorrow. Then what will you do? Please listen to what I just now said: all thought, because all thought is fragmentary, all thought leads to sorrow. If

you see this what takes place?

Q: You live it.

K: Do you live it?

Q: Yes.

K: That means you are only giving thought its right place and therefore psychologically free of all thought?

Q: It's logical.

K: Not logical, sir, of course it is logical, but does this take place?

Q: I feel it is logical, I do not think it takes place.

K: Logic goes only so far. Right? Logic is necessary, logic implies clear thinking. Clear thinking has pointed out thought is inadequate, thought being inadequate can't solve the problems, human problems, so what will you do when you realize that, you in yourself? You are the total human being, of all humanity you are, you are the result of all human suffering, of all human agony, despair, fear, hope, you are that, so you are the world and the world is you. Right? Do you realize that, do you see the truth of it, the feel of it? Therefore you give up all nationality. You follow? Right? Then you realize that your thinking is inadequate. How do you realize it? As a rational process? As a logical conclusion?

Q: You feel it.

K: You realize it, you feel it, it is so in you, then what is next?

Q: That's what I feel.

Q: We don't know what is next.

K: What time is it?

Q: Twelve thirty.

K: Look, may I, it is twelve thirty we must stop, may I just

finish this. Sorry, not to take it away from you but we must conclude this. If we realize that all thinking is inadequate to solve our problems, not as a logical conclusion, not as an aphorism, but truth, that it is a law that thought is inadequate because thought is a fragment, thought has created the world and divided the world, all that is seen and also realizing that you are the world and the world is you, fundamentally, basically, because go where you will there is suffering, tears, misery, confusion, hunger, starvation, misery, you understand. It is the common thing in humanity. So you are the world and the world is you. And when you realize that thought, which is thought of mankind, is inadequate to solve the problem, the human problem of living, existence, relationship, fear, all that, then what happens?

Q: We have to go beyond thought.

Q: Before you were asking a gentleman here that if he didn't feel when there was a war, killing, what about if your wife or son was killed. Maybe it will come to feel the same way killing anybody the way we feel about our son or husband.

K: No, madam. That becomes a theory.

Q: I don't mean a theory, I mean deep inside if you really feel the same. Could that be possible?

K: May I finish? I said let me conclude. How do you realize this truth? Is it an intellectual acceptance of an obvious reasoned fact, a theory that one has proposed and you accept it as a theory, or do you make from this statement that you are the world and the world is you, and that thought is inadequate, an abstraction of it, an ideal, or do you live with it? You understand my question? If you live with it, not make an abstraction of it, an idea of it, that thought is

inadequate to solve our human problems in spite of what the politicians say, every philosopher says thought is necessary, they have built marvellous schemes, systems, but you, you are not a philosopher, nor am I, we are just ordinary human beings, and we realize thought is so inadequate, for god's sake, what am I to do when it is inadequate? We say, live with it, hold it, like a jewel, look at it, don't you tell what it should do, look at the jewel that you have, it will tell you what to do. You understand what I am saying? But we are so eager to tell it what to do. You understand? You read a story, a thriller, it's all written there, you don't have to tell it what should be done; so in the same way here is the most extraordinary jewel you have, to realize that you are the world and the world is you, and thought is totally, absolutely inadequate to solve our human problems of relationship - to see that and live with it every minute of the day, then you will find the correct action.

## **OJAI 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 15TH APRIL 1976**

We are going to have a dialogue. The speaker thought it would be a good idea if two or three discussed with me a particular subject and in discussing that please join in. There are three or four people who are going to have a dialogue with me about a particular subject, which I am going to tell you presently. And please join in when you are doubtful or uncertain and want to make the point clear. So it is not excluding you but when we have two or three or four people discussing, having a dialogue, it's much more concentrated. Which doesn't mean we want to keep you out so join in when you think it is necessary.

The subject is: in a disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom? You understand? In a disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom - that is the subject which we are going to have a dialogue about. The more you go into this question the more vital, interesting and has great significance. You understand the question? Please be clear what we are discussing about. We know society is disintegrating, morally, ethically, even economically and overpopulation and so on, religiously, it is disintegrating. Right? And in that disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom? That's what we are going to discuss this morning. There they are, three or four of them; one from Germany, American, one Indian from India and so on. So we are going to start with these three or four, and then please join in when you think it is necessary, not talk about trees and you know some other subject except what we are talking about.

If you realize that the society is disintegrating - we mean by that word to disintegrate, breaking up, not generating, creating but breaking up, a society that is breaking up throughout the world, not only in this country, but in India, in Europe, in every part of the world - what is correct action, correct being accurate, true, right action to survive both physically, ethically, religiously, with a mind that is clear and intense, to survive in freedom. If there is no freedom, and yet you may survive, you have lost the whole endeavour man has been making for millennia, which is to free himself from nature, from the political structure, domination, tyranny and all the rest of it. So the question is - please, if I may repeat it again - in a disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom. Right? You have got the question clear? Now we are going to start.

This is not an arena, you understand. I am not the gladiator and the rest are the lions. You understand? They are not going to attack me, we are going to survive. We are going to go into this question, which is extraordinarily important and very interesting. We were to have discussed this question with the scientists and the psychotherapists who met here about three weeks ago, but unfortunately they didn't, we discussed about something else. So we would thought this would be a very good and pertinent question to ask.

Q: I think in considering that question one must start with the question, is correct action based on thought, or how can I bring correct action about in my daily life?

K: Does correct action come from thought which will affect my daily living. We can theorize what is correct action which would be

of very little importance, very little significance but what is correct action in my life, in daily every day life. Realizing I live in a society that is not only corrupt, immoral, destructive, wars, and living in that society does correct action come from thinking? That is the question.

Q: Shall we not make clear at the outset what is action?

K: If you hear the question, do you want me to repeat it? No? Not necessary? Please tell me.

Q: Some people want the questions repeated.

K: Some want it repeated. Before we, the questioner says, before we discuss correct action, whether it is derived from thought, the question is what do we mean by action, to act. Now, so there are two points in this: does thought bring about correct action, and what do we mean by action? So let's take those two for the moment. So we will say, what is action? We were looking at a dictionary, action means to act, to do, not, having done or will do, not in the past or in the future but doing, which is always in the present. Right? Please let's be clear on this point. Action means active present, acting in the present, not having acted or will act. So action is always in the present. This is very important to understand, at least I feel it is important because we are always acting from an experience, from knowledge, therefore it is based on the past, or, I will act, which is in the future, therefore we are never acting now in the present. So is there such action? You understand the question? We have acted according to a pattern based upon experience, which is the past, according to a system, to a tradition, to a memory, which are all the past, and from that past we act, thinking we are acting in the present. Or I will act, which

means I have laid down a pattern of action in the future, according to that pattern I act. Is this clear? Either action springs from the past or from the future: I will do, I should be, or I have been, which was good, bad, indifferent, or pleasant and I am acting from that.

So is there an action - please listen to this - is there an action which is not based on future or on the past? Just listen to the question first. You understand? We act from the past or according to a pattern of the future - the past is the tradition, is the memory, is the experience, is the knowledge, and the future is the ideal, the 'what should be', 'what must be', which is also another form of tradition and according to these two patterns we act, therefore we are always acting within the time limit of yesterday and tomorrow. So is there an action which is always in the present? You understand the question? It's extraordinarily interesting this, if you go into it.

So we have explained what is action, either having its root in the past, which is a motive, which is a cause, or a fixed or modified pattern in the future and acting according to that, imitating it, conforming to it, that being the example. So always within this pattern we are acting. Now we are asking something entirely different, which is, is there an action which is not based in the future or in the past, which is real action? If I want to climb the tree, I am climbing the tree - not 'I will climb the tree' or 'have climbed the tree'. I don't know if you see. Right?

So we are asking: is there an action which does not have its roots in the past or conforming to a pattern established in the future? Leave it there. That's what we call action.

The other is: is there correct action springing from thought?



That was the first question. Are you following all this? You are interested in this? I hope you are. Though it is cold I hope you like this. So we are going to look at the whole structure and nature of thought, whether thought can bring about correct action. Or there is a totally different action which is not contaminated by thought? So what is thinking? And is the thinking different from the thinker? Right? So the question is: what is thinking? I am asking you this question, just listen, I am asking you this question: what is thinking, what takes place, what happens in your mind, in your brain when that question is put to you, what is thinking? Go on, sir, what is thinking? Watch your mind, your brain, how it responds.

Q: The brain can't find the answer, so in questioning this one realizes that one doesn't know.

K: No. The questioner says when you put that question, I don't know. That's one answer, I don't know what thinking is, but this whole machinery is in operation all the time, I don't know how it works, what is the energy that makes it work, what is the result, how it comes into being. Now I am asking you, please listen, what is thinking? And when somebody puts that question don't you look for an answer? Where? In a book that you have read? Examine it, please go slowly. In a book that you have read or try to remember somebody told you about it, or you say, I really don't know, I never thought about it? I have never thought about it, I am expecting someone to tell me about it, or I am trying to remember where I read about it. When you say, I don't know, what takes place? You understand? Either when you make a statement, I don't know, you are waiting for someone to tell you, or expecting to discover it for yourself. Right? When you say, I don't know, either you are

waiting for someone to tell you, or you are looking for an answer in yourself. Right? Are we following each other? Now what are we doing? Waiting for the speaker to tell you? Or waiting for an answer out of your own observation? So that's one thing. Or you say, 'Well, I read it in a book, I must remember what it said, what the writer said, and I can't remember it, so I say, I don't know', which is totally different from the 'I don't know' of the first. You are following all this? I read it in a book and I have forgotten it, so I say, I don't know. Which is, you hope to remember the author of that book and try through association find the answer in that book. Right? So you are looking for an answer in memory. Right? Right?

Now something else: let's look at it for a minute. If you are asked a familiar question, what's your name, there is instant reply, isn't there. Why? There is memory in operation but it is so trained, your name is so well known to yourself it comes out instantly. Now if one asks a much more difficult question with which you are not quite familiar there is an interval - please watch all this, you can watch it in your own brain - there is an interval between the question and the answer, which is time lag. In that time lag you are enquiring quickly, where was it that I can find the answer, in that book, there is that operation going on, between the question and the answer there is a time interval in which memory is searching. So you take time to say, yes, that's the answer. Right? The familiar question, instant reply; a much more difficult question, an interval between the question and the answer and in that interval you are looking, you go to your book and try to remember; then there is the third thing, which is, you say, 'I really don't know', you are not expecting someone to tell you, when you don't know, you don't

know. Right? Not knowing proceed from there. You understand the three stages?

Q: I didn't get the last one.

K: Sir, I do all the work. Sir, please do pay a little attention because we want to go on, there's much more involved in this question. The third thing is, when I say, 'I don't know', I am not expecting an answer from anybody, memory has no records about it, so I say, I don't know, which is real freedom to enquire. You understand? When you say, I don't know, that's a solid ground upon which you can build, from which you can move. Right. So there are these three states.

So the questioner says, what is thinking. It's memory, response of memory as we saw, response of experience as knowledge stored up in the brain cells, which is matter. You understand? The cells are a material process so thought is a material process. Right? That's clear. So can thought bring about correct action? That's the question. Right?

Q: The relationship between the noise of the thought, the sound of the thought which is immediate and the symbol of the thought. The relationship between the noise, the sound of the thought which is immediate, and the symbol of that sound, the symbol of the word. It is the noise of the thought.

K: I can't hear, make it much louder.

Q: Thought we said is a material process. Right?

K: I mean all the scientists are saying that too now.

Q: Yes. So there is a noise, sound in the active present right now, coming over, and then that sound has a meaning. The sound in a particular mode has a meaning, so what is the relationship of

that sound in the now and the meaning which is from the past?

K: You can see he is from the Orient! No, no, it is very interesting, please. I understand, sir, I understand.

Q: Before you go on could you sort of rephrase his statement?

K: What is the relationship between the sound which the word makes and the meaning of the word. The meaning of the word and the sound of the word. Clear? Now wait a minute. He put that question. Right? He said, what is the relationship between the sound the word makes and the meaning of the word, the significance of the word, what is the relationship. Now he has put that question what is your answer? Take time. What is the answer? The relationship between the sound and the meaning of the word, which makes the sound, what is the relationship? That is, without the sound is there a meaning? You understand? Now you use the word `god', I am taking that haphazardly, god; the word makes a certain sound, that sound creates a meaning, is there a meaning without the sound? Is there a meaning without the word? Go slowly, you are going to find out in a minute. You have heard the word `mantra', have you? Which is now rampant in this country, fifty dollars worth! You know the word mantra, it is a Sanskrit word. Now I am not going to involve too much in it, I will just touch on it. You repeat that sound verbally - listen carefully - out loud, Topatopa, Coco Cola, don't laugh, please, it is the same. You don't have to pay fifty dollars to find that out, you can repeat the word, Topatopa, Coco Cola, repeat, repeat, repeat, loud; then you repeat it without the sound. You understand? Repeat it silently so that you don't hear the sound of the word. I won't go into all this. And when you repeat something without sound, what takes place?

So the question is, his question is: what is the relationship between the sound and the meaning of that sound? Right? Is there a meaning without the sound?

Q: There is.

K: There is. We are enquiring, please, you spoil it.

Q: Is there a meaning without the symbol?

K: That's what I am coming to. What is the source of the sound, the word? Please, if there were no word would there be no thinking? Or is thinking part of the verbalization? You know, this is too difficult, you are not used to all this. Look: let's take the word 'god'. Please I am neither believing it nor saying that there is god, we will just take the word, because that is a common word which you all use. You use that word, that word makes a sound and the word has great significance, which thought has given to it. Right? So what is the relationship of that word to the reality, to truth? You understand? Is there a relationship between truth and sound? Right? Of course not. Right? You have understood? It doesn't matter. This is too complex, I won't go into it.

So is there a thinking when there is no word? Or we are so used to words and when we are thinking we are thinking not only in words, in symbols, in metaphors, in imagination, it's all a process of verbalization. And if there is no verbalization, picture, imagination, what is thinking then? Right.

Q: How would one think if one didn't speak a language, say like English or French?

K: If you did not speak English, how would we communicate with each other? Through symbols, waving fingers? Which is also a form of verbalization. So let's proceed, we must get on.

So thinking, we said, is the response of memory, memory is the past, which is stored up in the brain and therefore thought is a material process. A material process in time. Time is movement, from here to there and so on. So thought is a material process in time. Right? This is simple. Now, can thought produce correct action? That was the question. We said what is action, we went into it, which is action either conforming to a pattern in the future, or imitation or adjusting the present to the past and acting according to that adjustment, and is there an action which is not in the future or in the past but now, which is not held in time, which is not encased in time? Got it? Now we say, is there correct action from thought? Now we have understood the meaning of thought, the meaning of action. Now is there right action in a disintegrating society to survive in freedom, right action? So can thought produce right action?

Q: No, thought cannot produce right action because thought is of the past, or the future, and action is now.

K: So the questioner is saying, thought which is based on the past or on the future, therefore fragmentary, and so it cannot under any circumstances produce right action. Do you understand? This is a most dangerous thing to say when all our actions are based on the past or on the future.

Q: It proceeds from thinking which is not the past or the future. Thinking which is in the now.

K: Yes.

Q: Now does that produce right action?

K: We are going to find out. So we said, thought is a fragmentary process, therefore it cannot under any circumstance

bring about correct action. Do we see the truth of it, not the verbal statement and the sound the verbal statement makes, and the meaning the verbal sound creates, discarding all that do you see the truth of it?

Q: Is mechanical thinking sometimes very necessary?

K: Mechanical action is sometimes necessary. Of course. Riding a bicycle, driving a car, doing a dozen things in the technological world. Right? So that's understood, let's leave that for the moment.

Q: Sir, can correct action, accurate action follow from anything other than accurate perception?

K: That's what we are coming to. Quite right. Correct action can only come into being when there is accurate perception. You follow? He made a statement, which is, when there is accurate perception, from that perception there is action. And that perception is always in the present; it is not I have perceived and act, or I will perceive and act. Therefore perception brings right action. Now wait a minute: do you perceive the truth that thought under whatever circumstances cannot bring about correct action? Intellectually we have examined it, we have analysed it, we have broken it all up, and now we say, do you perceive that, as you perceived the tree which is truth, that's an actuality? So in this statement that thought under no circumstances can bring about correct action, do you perceive in that truth?

Q: How about creative thought? When you are writing a poem, or writing something, something that is new?

K: What about creative thought, when you write a poem, when you paint and so on, what is creative thought. So we must go again

into the very complex question of what is creative, what is it to be creative? Do you want to go into that?

Q: Are not the terms 'creative thought' in itself a contradiction? Creation is birth and that's not creation.

K: You have heard it so I won't repeat it.

Q: Is not creation action and not thought?

K: Is not creation action, I don't know. He says, the questioner says, is there such thing as creative thought.

Q: How can that be, creation is of the now and thought is of the past, then there is a separation there.

K: The lady says it cannot be that because creation is in the present, thought is in the past.

Q: What is creation?

K: What is creation.

Q: Is not thought the vehicle we use to express creatively, express a creative impulse - thought is the vehicle.

K: Thought is a vehicle for a creative impulse. Creative impulse, which is taken over by thought and expressed in a poem, in stone, in what you like; the impulse, then the thought comes and takes it over and expresses it, and you call that creation. Right? Creative thinking. You see, we are going away a little bit, sorry, I must come back, we may deal with it presently because this is much more important than creative thought, creative thinking. What is correct action in my daily life? That's what we are talking about.

Q: Correct action and creative thought implies a sort of direction, for the hand to move from here to there, there's a direction. Now we use thought, a gentleman over there says as a



vehicle, isn't that to give direction. I am wondering if true non-temporal, intelligence, that you have spoken of elsewhere, if that gives direction to action so that one isn't just wandering aimlessly, so that action can be correct and it leads to something.

K: Action implies, the questioner says, direction. And thought gives to action direction, from the past or from the future, direction based on the past or on the future, is that correct action. So please don't let's go back over and over again. So we have come now, we have said thought under no circumstances can bring about correct action. And that gentleman said, perception is action. Do you perceive the truth that lies in the statement that thought under no circumstances can bring about correct action, do you see the truth of it?

Q: I don't see it. I know from the past, from my life, every action is conflict and every action is a result of thought and yet I still do not, that's the only way I perceive that statement that you speak of.

K: No, sir, he made a statement, which is, thought under no circumstances can bring about correct action. Right? After explaining all this, after explaining the process of thought, after explaining what action is, we said thought is fragmentary and therefore there can be no correct action when there is a fragmentary broken up action. Right? That's all.

Q: But you say, you perceive it like the tree, I don't perceive it like I perceive the tree.

K: Do you perceive it as truth, as something real? Not a verbal statement and an abstraction of that statement? Do you understand? I hear a statement of that kind, then hearing it I make an abstraction

of it into an idea. `Yes, I agree, that's a very good idea', so you have moved away from the fact, from the statement when you make an abstraction. So let's move.

Now he said, perception is action. That is, do you perceive in that statement the truth that thought can never bring correct action? You know what it does to one if you see this, a tremendous burden is taken away because we said thought is necessary, thought will bring about correct action, all the moralists, all the religious people, all the churches, all the politicians, thought, thought, thought. Here we are saying thought will never; you have broken a tremendous tradition.

Q: Sir, to hear the question I still have to think.

K: No. I have thought. I have explained to you.

Q: I think, as soon as I hear the question my mind thinks.

K: That's just it, sir. Can you listen without thinking? For god's sake. Can you listen - sir, look, that gentleman asked, what is the relationship between sound and the meaning - can you listen to the sound the word makes and the meaning which that sound is associated with. Now, can you merely listen to the sound first and not associate it with meaning? You have never done all this.

Q: But you know a language.

K: Sir, let's go back, sorry. So we see that thought cannot bring about right action. Now the next question is, in that question, survival. Right? We said the subject was: in a disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom. Right? Now what do we mean by survive?

Q: Sir, is not survival implicit in correct action? How could you have correct action which did not include survival, indeed survival

in freedom?

K: Is not correct action implied in survival.

Q: No, vice versa.

K: Vice versa. Doesn't survival imply correct action.

Q: No, does correct action imply survival.

K: Does correct action imply survival. Now what do we mean by survival?

Q: Biological survival.

K: Now when the world is overpopulated, when there are wars, when there are terrorists' bombs, all that is going on, in that culture, in that society, is survival possible? You understand my question?

Q: Survival in freedom, which is more important, freedom or survival?

K: We will find out, we are going to relate both of those and find out. Biological survival. When nations are divided, like the Arab, Jew, the Muslim, the Hindu, the communist, the socialist, you follow, this whole cycle of division into nationalities, into ideologies, into beliefs, is survival possible? You understand my question? We have had Vietnam war recently, there is a war going on all the time, all over the world, some place or other, and for those people who are caught in that their survival is non-existent. We sitting here having no wars, no immediate threat, we talk about survival. And when you look at this problem as a whole, is survival possible, biologically I am talking about, not psychological, we will come to that later, is biological survival possible when the world is divided? You understand? Nationalities, classes, ideologies, all the rest, is that possible?

Q: If I am lucky.

K: Obviously it is not possible. Right? Which history has shown, for those people who have lived at that period, they have been destroyed.

Q: But when I live here and I am lucky there is no war, then I have a good chance to survive.

K: Yes. Does survival then depend on luck? On chance? No, please. Will you tell your grandsons, or your sons and daughters, 'Your survival depends on chance, old boy', will you tell them that?

Q: We separate biological survival with psychological survival.

K: We will come to that, madam, go slowly. Go slowly, please, we are coming to that.

Q: Isn't it important, it seems to be that it is indispensable to enquire as to the origin of the conditions which have prompted us to ask these sort of questions.

K: Which is, you are saying, shouldn't you find out why human beings have divided themselves into nationalities. Yes, sir, that is what you mean, that is what you mean, why. Very simple. Tradition, custom, hoping to survive as a tribe against another tribe, security, if I identify myself with a community survival is more possible. Right? If I don't I may be destroyed. It is all very simple. So biologically survival becomes extraordinarily difficult when human beings biologically have divided themselves into nationalities, groups, committees, communities based on beliefs, principles, ideals, and all the rest of it. So will you sacrifice, give up your ideals, your nationalities, your beliefs, your etcetera, etcetera, to survive? Which means psychologically will you give up the structure of belief - you follow? - to which you cling as a

means of psychological security which prevents biological security. If I insist that I am an Arab with all my religious feelings, with all my hurts of this and that, and I cling to that, hold on to that psychologically, I am bound to create a world in which survival becomes impossible.

So will you give up psychological securities to which you hold? Your belief, your dogma, your tradition, your prejudice, my experience is better than your experience, I know, you don't know? You follow? All that, can you give it up?

Q: Would that be correct action?

K: Wait, sir, you will find out, you are going to find out. Which means as long as you are seeking security in illusion, biological security becomes impossible. I don't know if you see that. Can you give up your experiences of pleasure? And there is great pleasure in calling yourself an American. Right? Affluent society and so on; or call yourself a Hindu who has lived for five thousand years, long before you were all etcetera, etcetera, and they take tremendous pride in that - 'We are a very ancient race, our knowledge of divinity existed before you were ever born or religion ever came into being'. So to give up all that, which is part of one's arrogance, completely to wipe it out. Yes, sir?

Q: I feel like I am my experience.

K: That's it. You think you are your experience. That's right, sir. I think, my experience is that as long as I remain a Hindu I am completely secure - that's my experience, I am that experience and that's what destroys biological survival. Can you give that up?

Q: Can you carry that same idea to your own name?

K: Sir, they have tried that too, change names into a number, or

if not into a number call yourself Brother John. But it is still the same thing. Oh, for heaven's sake.

Q: I want to make it clear to myself, is what you are saying that any type of allegiance to any whatsoever it might be is false?

K: That's right, sir. Any type of attachment, not allegiance, attachment, attachment to a tree, to a piece of furniture, to a name, to a belief, to an ideology, that is what is destroying survival.

Q: If somebody says, I'll take you home, I say, take me home - that leads to property.

K: So correct action to survive in freedom. You understand? See what is involved. In a disintegrating society what is correct action to survive in freedom? It is all one movement, your understand, it is not correct action, survival, freedom, it's a total movement. I don't know if you see that.

So what is freedom? Are you free because you have got money and can go to India, Tibet, or to a Zen monastery? Are you free because you choose? We said because you can choose therefore you are free, and the people who can't choose, as in Russia, choose different systems, go from village to village, or one profession to another, they are not free. So you think freedom is based on choice. Right? Is that so? What do you mean by choice? When do you choose?

Q: When you are confused.

K: You choose when you are confused. When you are clear there is no choice. So clarity means freedom. I don't know if you see this, not choice. A man who sees things very clearly, clarity, such a man is free, but a man who chooses all the time and thinks he is free because he can choose, he is a slave. I wonder if you see

that? So freedom means freedom - there are two kinds of freedom: freedom from and freedom. Right? We think freedom is always from something - from a prison, from a burden, from a wife or husband who nags or this or that - it is freedom from, which is really a reaction, which is not freedom. So is there a freedom which is not a reaction? You understand what is involved in all this?

Q: Freedom is non-attachment.

K: That's right. Freedom means non-attachment. Now wait a minute. You hear that statement, how do you receive that statement? Do you receive it applying it to yourself, or is it an idea? If that statement is made to the speaker, the speaker says, am I attached to my tree, to my reputation, to my book, to my belief, to my furniture, to my house, to my wife, to my father, attached - am I? And if you say, yes, I am attached, then you have to enquire why you are attached. Why?

Q: Fear.

K: No, no, don't register fear. Just saying fear as though you have solved it. You have to penetrate into it, why. Why are you attached? Do you know what happens when you are attached? You become that to which you are attached? Right? If you are attached to the furniture you are the furniture. Right? You accept that, that you are the furniture? So when you are attached you are that to which you are attached. That means to anything, it doesn't matter what. So why are you attached? Attached to a name.

Q: It seems something outside of oneself by which one can get out of one's emptiness.

K: So you say to get out of one's own emptiness, one's own

loneliness, one's own boredom, one's own insufficiency, you cling to something hoping that it will give you sufficiency. There is emptiness and I have filled that emptiness with my furniture. Wait, don't laugh, that's what you are doing. And you laugh at it, that's an escape. You may fill that emptiness with books, with furniture, with my husband, my house, my experience, my god, my nationality and therefore you feel that emptiness has been filled and you are perfectly happy.

Q: How does freedom relate to survival?

K: We have explained this. How is freedom related to survival. If you are not free from your nationalities and divisions and ideologies as an Arab and a Jew, a Hindu, Muslim, communist, socialist, etcetera, biological survival becomes impossible. And that is made impossible because psychologically we are attached to all this. And if you want to live that way, go ahead.

Q: How is this related to silence?

K: Wait a minute. You see you are off to something.

Q: We do not see that truth in non-attachment, that non-attachment means freedom, then we make a theory of out of and become attached, and again there is no freedom.

K: That's what I was saying. When you hear a statement that attachment to the furniture destroys survival, how do you receive that statement? Is that an idea, or an actual fact in your life? You know the word `idea' comes from the Greek which means to observe. You understand? Not what we have made of it. You observe something and make an abstraction of it as an idea, you hear this statement that survival is not possible if there is psychological attachment to anything, you hear that statement and



you make an abstraction of it into an idea and then say, how am I to carry out that idea. You understand all this? If you don't make an abstraction of it into an idea then you face it, then you are directly observing it.

Q: Sir, the position you take, the premises on which you operate, is that not a form of attachment?

K: Is not the position I take a form of attachment. Is the position the speaker takes, is that not an attachment? I didn't know I was taking a position. What position am I taking? Because I am sitting on the platform?

Q: Because of the statements you make.

K: Because of the statements I make? Those are logical, sane statements, it is not mine or yours. I don't take a position. I am not attached to those statements, I will change them if they are false. But if I said, I believe in god, and stick to it, then you can say I take a position. We are, as I said from the very beginning, investigating together, sharing the problem together, there is no authority in sharing. The speaker happens to be sitting on a platform, a little higher, for convenience, in that there is no authority. If I was attached to a certain position I would crawl out of it very quickly, I assure you.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, we have to live in the material world, clothes, food and shelter, that's the material world, work efficiently, objectively, sanely. That's the material world, but that survival in the material world is destroyed by our attachment, by our belief, by our experience, by our conditioning. If you are born in Russia you are conditioned in one way, if you are born in the Arab world - you

follow? That is what is destroying us.

I think we had better stop. What time is it?

Q: Twelve twenty.

K: I think we had better stop, the wind is coming up.

Q: Freedom from attachment implies freedom from the need for physical survival.

K: No, sir, of course not. I need this warm coat to sit here.

Q: To you have to defend your body to survive?

K: Of course.

Q: Then you are not detached from your body.

K: Now, that goes off into something else. You people. Now wait a minute, sir. Are you the name, are you the thought, are you the body? If I am attached to the body, I am the body, I am then the furniture. If I am not attached to the name, to the form, to the body, then the body has its own intelligence to survive, which we have destroyed through drink. You follow? Destroyed the body, which we will go into when we talk about meditation. We had better stop now. Sorry, I hope you got something out of it.

## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH APRIL 1976

The last four talks that we have had here we have talked about several things concerning our daily life. Because we are concerned, not with abstractive theories, nor beliefs, nor any kind of conclusion about our daily existence, but we have been talking over together, I hope sharing the question of relationship between human beings, which is the very basis of all existence. And if that relationship is not correct, right, accurate, then we produce a society which is confused, brutal, violent, wars and so on, which is the modern culture, modern society. We also talked over together the whole question of what is thinking, what is thought upon which all our psychological as well as the technological world is based. Whether thought is adequate to meet all these problems, human problems. If it is not adequate then what is the activity which will produce correct action? We went into that very carefully, not only at the talk here but also through discussions that we have had here.

Then we talked about pleasure and the pursuit of it, what is involved in it, and also we went into the question whether man can ever end his sorrow, or must we accept sorrow as inevitable and go on with it. This has been one of the great problems of human beings, from the ancient of times, pre-history man has suffered, both biologically and psychologically, inwardly, very deeply through wars, through national divisions, through religions and so on. Man hasn't apparently, human beings, have never been able to resolve this problem of sorrow, and whether it can be ended completely. So out of that ending of sorrow comes passion, which is totally different from lust. We went into that carefully.

We also talked about fear - whether man can completely free himself totally from fear. We pointed out that it is possible: as there is an ending to sorrow there is an ending to fear. And this morning, if we may, we would like to talk about love, and also a very deep problem which is death. We are concerned with living which includes dying also. And in going into all these problems, investigating them, sharing together, is part of this thing called meditation, which we shall go into tomorrow morning. But without understanding, or deeply concerned with the human relationship, fear, thought, sorrow, meditation becomes merely an escape and therefore utterly meaningless. And I think it is very important for us to understand if we are at all serious, and I hope we are serious at least for this morning, that we should face these problems, not in abstraction, not as an idea, but as a daily, everyday fact. And if we merely avoid these facts, as most of us do, as we have developed a whole series of networks of escapes, our daily life becomes not only a great travail, great conflict, struggle, pain, but we produce a society, a culture that must inevitably conform or follow our daily life of misery, confusion, anxiety, sorrow, uncertainty and all that. So we are talking over together, sharing these problems. We are not, though it is a lovely morning after the rather dreary days of wind and rain and cloud, this is not a gathering to be entertained, to have one's intellect stimulated, or emotionally stirred. We are dealing with daily serious problems, and if we don't resolve them as human beings we contribute to future sorrow, misery, confusion, not only your own children but the whole of humanity. So please this is very serious what we are talking about. Either you listen completely, share it wholly, or you merely pay passing attention

and carry on with your daily confused, unhappy lives. So please bear in mind, if I may again point out, that we are sharing this thing together, sharing implies that one must be hungry to find out, hungry to taste the things that are real. So this is not a one-sided affair. The speaker may point out, paint a picture verbally, but that which is painted verbally is not the actual, the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. And unless we go beyond and see the fact, the described, we merely then play with words. After saying all this we are going to now go into this question of what is love.

Again this has been one of the great problems of human beings. Human beings whether they live in the Far East, in the Middle East, or here. It is a question that one must investigate, not accept what love is, or define it, or come to some abstract conclusion what it should be because those things have no value at all. But to find out actually in our daily life what is implied in that word, the content of that word, the full significance of that word, because we are using that word so slackly. We have loaded that word with so much meaning, mostly sensual. So we must, if we may, use that word, knowing all the complications of that word, the meaning of that word, and explore together, share the structure and the nature of that thing called love.

So we are first asking whether love is desire, or love pleasure? When we use the word 'desire' what is the significance of that word, what is the meaning of that word 'desire'? How does it arise? How does it flower? What is the root of it? How does it come into being? So we must carefully go into that when we use desire in association with love. And apparently for most of us it is intimately

connected with desire. Sexually, psychologically, biologically, spiritually, all that is involved in that word. So what is the root of desire, how does it come into being? When you have a desire for something, the objects of desire vary, but the root of desire is the same though the objects vary. So how does desire come into being in each one?

Please, as we said, we are investigating, sharing, we are not laying down the law, we have no authority in this matter, or any matter. The speaker is not your guru, nor are you his followers. That is an abomination, because when you follow somebody, except technologically, you are destroying truth. And through following another you can never come upon that which is truth. So one must, if we may point out, be free of all authority and be sceptical. It is good to be sceptical, doubtful psychologically about everything, including your pet gurus, specially your pet gurus! They are springing like mushrooms in this country. It is a very serious matter. And if one wants to find out for oneself, one must stand alone. And most of us are afraid to be alone.

So what is the beginning of desire? Because most religions, that is the propagandists religions, religions based on belief which are no religion at all, religions of authority and all that, most organized religions have said that you must, to serve god, you must be free of desire. And so the monks, the Indian sannyasis try to suppress desire and in the process of repression identify themselves with an image, with a name and thereby they think they have solved the problem. They are burning inside with desire but they suppress it through rituals, through discipline, through every form of conformity, effort. So this has been a great problem for human

beings who are very serious to find out if there is a reality - if there is truth. Because desire breeds illusion, desire breeds experiences, and when you cling to an experience that becomes an illusion. So one must go into this question of what is desire very carefully, deeply because we have identified love with desire.

Is not desire sensation? Sensation, that is the activity of the senses plus thought. You understand? Sensations plus thought is desire. No? Do we share this, communicate this actuality together? Though one states it, that is, sensation plus thought is desire - is that fact, or just a statement of an idea? Can you look at something with all your senses completely? And in that looking end it and not let thought come into the activity of sensation? You understand? That is, when you look at something, the trees, the mountains, the human being, the face, anything, the endless movement of the sea, to look at it with all your senses, all your eyes and ears and nerves, look at it completely and not allow thought to come, to interfere with it. Then your perception is whole. Whereas when thought interferes with that perception it becomes fragmentary. So desire is fragmentary. Right? And we have unfortunately, or fortunately - it is up to you - identified desire with that thing called love. So we are asking: is love desire? And also we are asking: is love pleasure, sexually, and in all its different manifestations? Pleasure as we went into the other day, is what most human beings pursue endlessly, psychologically, outwardly as well as inwardly. We are not saying that you must not have pleasure, but we are investigating the whole business of pleasure because love is associated with pleasure. Pleasure of an experience, sexually or otherwise, both biologically and psychologically. If there is a

psychological pleasure, which you call experience, and retaining that experience as memory and pursuing that memory, then that experience becomes pleasure. You understand this? That is, you may have had a marvellous, pleasurable experience yesterday. It is registered in the brain as memory and thought comes in and says, 'I must have more of it tomorrow' - that becomes pleasure. But when you have an experience, whatever kind, pleasurable generally, or miserable, then to end it, not let thought take it over. So we have gone into that if you were here the other day when we went into this question of pleasure. I am afraid we won't go into it too deeply this morning.

So we are saying: is love pleasure? And is love attachment? Please do pay attention to all this because it is your life. Is love attachment? You are attached to somebody. What is the process, what is the meaning of this attachment? Because we are asking: is love attachment? You may be attached to your house, to an idea, to a belief, to a person - what is the meaning of that attachment? When you are attached to something you are that - aren't you? When you have totally identified with something, you are that. And why is this urge to identify? To be attached? Please this is not a group therapy, which is an ugly thing, but rather observing actually what is going on in yourself. Therefore you have to give attention to it. Why is a human being attached to another? And what happens if he is not attached? And is attachment love? Does not attachment breed fear - because he may lose it? Being attached you may become jealous, frightened, anxious, which are obvious phenomena. You are attached because of your own insufficiency, loneliness. And so out of your own insufficiency, loneliness, a



sense of lacking, you cling to another. So is attachment love? Where there is attachment there must be exploitation. Are you following all this? And we use that word 'love' to cover up all this. And is love jealousy? Do you follow all this? So when none of these things exist as attachment, because you have understood that emptiness in oneself can never be filled by something else. You have to look at it. You have to not escape from it, observe it totally. Then you will see that loneliness goes completely away. Then there is not that lonely attachment. Then perhaps one will know what love is. Because in that attachment there is fear, there is anxiety, there is hate, all the conflicts in relationship. Where there is conflict can there be love? And where there is ambition can there be love? Do you follow?

So when you strip yourself of ambition, anxiety, attachment, and understand deeply the meaning and the significance of pleasure, and desire, then you perhaps come upon that strange thing called love. And out of that comes compassion. Compassion is the highest form of intelligence. When you have compassion and therefore intelligence, you will do the right thing at the right moment. You understand all this? I hope you are following, not verbally but actually in your hearts, in your minds, doing it.

And there is the question of what death is. It is rather strange to talk about it on a lovely morning like this, but it is part of life. Without going into the full meaning of that word, and knowing what is implied, to shut ourselves away from it, to escape from it, to avoid it, not to talk about it, is to divide life, a total movement. So we must go into this question. Not only for the aged, but also for the young, we are all involved in this. So what does living

mean, and what does dying mean? You understand my question? What do we mean by living, our daily living? An effort, a struggle, a conflict, pleasure, anxiety, uncertainty, fear of losing a job, or having a job try to get a better job, and so on, constant struggle, constant effort, fear, anxiety, with occasional joy, which is totally different from pleasure? This is our life, if you are honest about it, this is our daily, everyday existence. And that is what we call living. Right? Please don't accept what I am saying, I am only stating 'what is'. To that endless struggle we cling, and say that is living. And what then is dying? The ending of this so-called living? You are following all this? Is it a biological ending? Or the ending of this immense stream which man has created of conflict, sorrow, pain, anxiety? You are following all this? Please, it is your life we are talking about, not the description which the speaker is giving about his life, or somebody else's life. It is your life, your daily life with which we are concerned. Unless there is a radical transformation in that daily life we are going to create more and more misery for ourself and for other human beings - which is actually what is going on.

So what is dying? There is a biological death. Right? Through accident, through disease, through an incident, a bomb, an explosion, accident, and the body, the organism wearing itself out, and the organism coming to an end. I do not know if you have ever thought about this question of the intelligence of the body, the organism, the biological intelligence of the body. The body, has its own intelligence, if you have observed it. But we have destroyed that intelligence through drink, through drugs, through constant effort, battle, trying various drugs and various chemicals, you

know, medicines and all that kind of thing, we have destroyed that innate intelligence of the organism. And so the body dies by constant strain, usage. I do not know if you are interested - you should be - whether this organism, this biological instrument, can with its brain ever deteriorate. You understand my question? Our brain as it gets older deteriorates. You have noticed it, it is called gaga-ism, senility. Can the brain be young all the time? You understand? - and not deteriorate? When there is constant friction biologically as well as psychologically, the brain must deteriorate. Right? Constant friction, constant effort, constant struggle, and is there a way of living without effort and therefore have a brain that is always young, fresh, active, decisive. You are following my question? I'll go into it if you are interested because it is possible.

Is one aware daily of the constant battle in oneself, trying to be something, trying to imitate, trying to conform, becoming the ideal, which is the mechanical process. You follow? Is one aware of that, conscious, do you know you are doing this? Not how to stop it, not how to break the mechanical routine, but to be aware of it without any choice, just to look at it, because if you introduce an effort you have already destroyed. So can you observe without any choice the mechanical movement of the brain, or rather one part of the brain which has been so cultivated for centuries upon centuries to act mechanically, just to be aware of it. Not to correct it, not to alter it, because then again, in that alteration comes conflict. As we said where there is duality, difference between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. When there is no observer but merely observation then there is no conflict.

And if one is aware during the day of all the movement,

mechanical movement, the ways of your thinking, desire - you follow - to be totally aware of all this during the whole day, then you will find at night when you go to sleep, though in spite of all the scientists say that the brain is constantly in action, constantly in movement, constantly agitated, there are no dreams. The mind, the brain is quiet because all your problems, all your activities have been dissolved during the day, if you are attentive, you are watchful, aware. So when you go to sleep there is peace, the brain may be in movement but it is a quiet movement. It is not an agitated, anxious movement, therefore the brain in itself brings order. You are following all this? It doesn't matter.

So the brain becomes young, fresh and it cannot be young, and fresh and decisive if there is any form of hurt. Do you understand? Most human beings are hurt from childhood, in school, in college, in university, in offices, they are being hurt all the time. And to be free of this hurt, which we went into the other day, so that the brain has no resistance. You understand?

For after all innocence means a brain that is not capable of being hurt - not biologically, accidents can happen, but psychologically not to have any hurts and therefore an innocent mind. So what is death? What is the thing apart from the biological ending, what is death? What is it that we are so frightened of? Is it the ending of your experiences? The ending of your knowledge? The ending of all the things that you are attached to, psychologically? Biologically when death takes place whatever you are attached to does end. You are not going to carry your house, your furniture, your books and even your gurus - the Catholic guru, or the Protestant guru, or the Indian guru. So what is

it that human beings are so dreadfully frightened of? They are frightened of something ending. Right? Psychologically, inwardly ending. And knowing it is going to end then we want comfort. We say there must be a continuity. And the ancient Hindus said there is a continuity, which is called reincarnation. You are interested in all this because it is your life we are talking about, not somebody else's life. They said you will be reborn next life according to what you have done this life, if you have behaved properly, decently, humanly, not humanly in the civilized sense, morally, that which is called karma, we won't go into all that - next life you are going to be better. So through a series of incarnations depending on the present activity, present behaviour, present morality, through a constant series of lives you will ultimately come to the highest principle. That is a very comforting theory. And millions believe in that. There is the whole Buddhistic attitude, that life is a constant flux. You understand? Constant movement and when that manifests there is an enclosure taking place which becomes the 'you', the 'me', which through time, through constant movement undergoes change, flux, that is their - you understand? The Hindus, the Buddhists, and of course the Christians have their own belief, the resurrection, because they believe that their own deity woke up from death physically. Right? As some group of priests in Europe said, 'I wish they took a photograph of it'!

So there are these things. Now we are saying something entirely different. Please listen because it is very important when you understand it. Because then you will see, if you really understand this thing, that there is a timeless movement, a timeless state which we are going to go into. First we said the world is you, and you are

the world. Right? Whether you go to the Orient, Europe or come here human beings radically, basically are afraid, anxious, in sorrow, confused, unhappy, with occasional joy, psychologically it is a constant movement - it is the same movement whether you have got a brown skin, black skin, yellow skin or any kind of skin pigment, East, Europe or here, it is the same stream. You understand? The same stream, therefore you are the world and the world is you, that is a fact. You may have different temperament, different gifts, capacities, idiosyncrasies, those are the responses of the culture in which you have lived but the basic stream is the same. You follow? Therefore you are the world, and the world is you. Right? Therefore there is no individuality. Individuality implies a wholeness, indivisible entity and you are not that indivisible entity - you are divided, broken, therefore you are not actually an individual, indivisible. That you become totally individual in the complete sense of that word when you are whole, in which there is no fragmentary action. The word 'whole' means healthy, sane, holy, and as you are the world and the world is you, and you are caught in this constant stream, and when sorrow can be ended, fear can be ended - you understand? - not tomorrow, actually now. We went into that question. Then you are out of that stream - not you - there is a manifestation which is out of that stream, or freedom from that stream, because that stream is time. Right? Please get it. That stream is time.

So you have to find out whether time has a stop. Time has a stop when there is no longer that movement of that stream. That stream is fear, that stream is conflict, that stream is sorrow, and all the confusion man has built - built through thought. So then that is

the stream of time. When there is ending to that stream time has stopped, therefore there is a totally different dimension, which we will discuss tomorrow, the whole problem of meditation.

So the thing that we are afraid of losing, when death takes place, is the structure which thought has built as me, the form, the name, and the attachment to the form and to that name, which are pain, pleasure, anxiety, all that is the 'me', you. You can say, ' Well that is not me but there is a higher me' - which is still the product of thought. So when that movement in which human beings are caught, that stream is the movement of time, driven by thought. The greater the volume of that stream is the volume of thought. And when that stream, which is our consciousness, with all its content, when that stream comes to an end then time has a stop and therefore there is a totally different dimension. And when you understand this, not verbally, deeply, live it daily, and it can be done, then you will see death has a totally different significance.

What is the time?

Q: Five after twelve.

You have had an hour of it and I think that is enough.

## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH APRIL 1976

This is the last talk for this year at Ojai. But unfortunately, or fortunately, there will be talks in Europe, and in India, if I go, and in England. One has been talking for the last fifty years and more. Seeing a lot of people, talking over, not only their personal problems, but the global problems of human beings, the vast confusion, the misery, the extraordinary lack of clarity. And through all these days and time and years it becomes more and more clear that unless human beings radically transform themselves we may destroy not only ourselves but the earth, the air, pollution, overpopulation and so on. So it seems to us that there must be a group of people who are utterly serious, who are deeply concerned, not superficially, not adjusting themselves to environment and circumstances, but rather live a life that is whole, complete, noble, full of intensity and clarity. Otherwise we waste our life, the short years we have, we seem to disregard, fall into various traps of non-essential or useless things - and being caught, we extricate ourselves and fall into another trap.

So we have talked about various things, like relationship between human beings, or the utter lack of that relationship; we have talked about the process of thought as a material movement in time; and thought, we said, is inadequate, totally inadequate to solve our human problems because thought has created them, and thought cannot solve them because thought is a fragment, a material process and a movement of measure. We also talked about fear, the ending of it, the ending of sorrow, and the understanding of the whole complex problem of pleasure. Yesterday morning we



talked about love and death. I do not know if one actually lives these things, or merely verbally accepts them, or denies them, and let the things go by.

As we are concerned with the very deep problem of existence, we must not put aside the whole question of what is religion, if there is anything sacred, holy. And the question of meditation, with which we are going to deal this morning. That is, religion, the understanding or coming upon that which is sacred, if there is such a thing, and what are the implications of meditation. So these are very serious matters, not something for a Sunday morning, lovely, listening to some pious remarks, enjoying the sunshine and looking at the mountains, but it is wholly a very serious matter with which we are concerned. So please give, if one may ask, your attention. To hear correctly is an art, to see things as they are is also an art. And to learn, not from others, which is according to technological things, but to learn the whole of human content of one's consciousness, because one is the result of millennia of human endeavour, human sorrow, human agony, anxiety. It is all there in us. And to learn to look at it, to listen to all the content of that consciousness, and in the observation of that consciousness is action. So we are this morning, if we may, going to talk over together, seriously, the question of what is religion, because religion is the creative factor of a new culture. If there is no religion then the culture dies, civilization goes to pieces. So we must, considering what the world is like, with all its brutality, violence, wars, divisions, class hatreds and so on, which all indicate degeneration of the human mind, it beholds us to discover for ourselves what is religion. Is it a gathering of beliefs? Is it

performing rituals? Repeating endless words which have really no meaning at all? Is it going on Sunday morning to a church, or to a temple, or to a mosque, and repeating some chant, words and think one is terribly religious? If one asks oneself seriously what is the necessity of any belief, of any conclusion, because belief, conclusions divide people: you have it in this little village, five or six divisions of Christianity. And throughout the world there is so much division brought about by so-called religions, - the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Muslim, the Christian and their innumerable sects. So what is the importance of any belief at all? Or does belief prevent the understanding of what truth is? And is religion divorced from daily life? Is religion a movement which brings order in our life? You understand my questions? We are sharing this thing together. We are not asserting anything. On the contrary, we are together sharing the investigation that we are doing now, exploring. And you cannot possibly explore scientifically into the realm of psychological demands that put together various forms of beliefs.

And if religion is divorced from our daily life it can only create further confusion, further conflict. So we are asking: what is religion, what is the nature, the depth of that word? Each one will think, he will answer the meaning of that word according to his particular fancy, imagination, or his conditioning. If he is a Hindu he will say, 'Religion is my belief in something' and so on. So if there is no belief, which doesn't mean one is an atheist - I am not at all sure those who believe are not really atheists because their belief is merely a traditional acceptance. So we are asking: what is the nature of religion? If it is none of these things, and it is none of

these things, beliefs, rituals, authoritarian attitudes, division between yourself and your highest god, or no god, if there are interpreters between you and truth, all that is surely not religion. The worship of things made by thought, put together by thought as a symbol, or made by the hand, an image, and the worshipping of that symbol or that image surely is not religion. So what is religion?

And to find that out one must discard completely and be free to enquire. You cannot enquire if you are anchored in a belief. So if you are really earnest to go into this question, and you must go into this question, every human being must enquire, not accept, but explore into the nature of that word, the meaning of that word and the depth of that word, because the word is merely a sound. The sound can produce a meaning, but it is much more than that. So in order to find out what is a religious life - and not surely the monk who is dedicated to a certain form of worship, certain form of acceptance of beliefs and dogmas, and dedicated, given himself over to some idea - an idea is not a truth - such a monk, such a sannyasi is not really a religious man at all.

So what we are asking is much more complex. To find that out you must have order in one's life. Right? Our life is confused, contradictory, disorderly, fragmented, broken up, and how can such a life have order? You are following all this I hope, Order is not the acceptance of a blueprint. Order comes only when one realizes, is aware fully, without any choice, of one's own confusion, one's own daily disordered life - to be aware of that. From disorder comes order. That is, from the understanding, from the awareness without any choice the observation of our daily life

which is disorderly, the observation not based on condemnation, rationalization, judgement, to be aware of that disorder, out of that awareness comes order.

And this order is a living thing, therefore it is constantly moving. So virtue - you may spit on that word, the modern generation does, morality means nothing, morality in essence is order. And without order how can there be clarity? Right? Because part of this is the question of meditation. Without order in one's life, without being totally moral in one's daily activity, how can you even think of meditating? You understand? You may sit cross-legged for the rest of your life, breathe in a certain way which you have learned from that country, India, you can sit like that for the next ten incarnations or a million incarnations, you will never come upon that which is truth because your life is disorderly. Therefore you must bring order into that life before you even think of meditating. If you do, without having order, it is a marvellous escape and therefore without any significance, without any meaning. Please do realize this. Meditation is the most marvellous thing but not your kind of meditation. There must be order in our relationship, there must be order and that can only exist when there is no fear, and order is not put together by thought. If it is put together by thought then it will create further disorder. Please understand all this. It is your life.

So to find out, or come upon that which is most sacred, most holy, there must be a life which is based solidly on order. And the importance of all meditations is to come upon that silence. Because biologically, physiologically, to see anything clearly, to look at these trees, the light on the leaves, the green grass, and the hills, to

see it clearly your mind must be quiet, mustn't it. It is so simple, we make it so complex. To see anything clearly, to observe clearly, you must have a quiet mind, mustn't you? If you are chattering, chattering, you won't see the tree. You won't see the depth of the shadow, the beauty of a trunk or a limb. So you can only see it when your mind is quiet. Right? See the fact of it, the reason of it, the logic of it, first: that you can see something clearly only when your mind is silent. You cannot hear what somebody else is saying if you are talking to yourself all the time. So if you want to hear somebody clearly you must be quiet. So silence is absolutely necessary to perceive outwardly and inwardly. Right? And the outward and the inward are the same movement, they are not different. Right? It is one unitary movement, but we have divided it as the inward and the outer. So by observing clearly the outer you then discover the inner, and then see that it is one movement. And to see this clearly you must look, observe silently.

There are different forms of silence. We are investigating together the meaning of the word and the depth of that thing called religion. Which is, to find out if there is anything incorruptible, untouched by thought, which is not an illusion, which is not the projection of one's own desire, or an experience; but something that has never been touched by thought, something totally original. And to come upon that we said there must be order in daily life, which is the essence of virtue. Right? There are different kinds of silence. Aren't there? The silence between two noises. Right? And is that silence? There is silence between two thoughts - is that silence? There is so-called peace between two wars - is that peace? You are following all this? So what is silence? Is it put together by

thought? Is it contrived? Is it something that is manufactured because you understand if one wants to see heaven, in quotes, you must be silent, therefore you say, 'How am I to be silent? Teach me how to be silent' So out of that desire to find out what is silence people then begin to invent systems, methods, ways to come upon that. Now if once you understand this you will never touch any system. Because what is implied in a system and a practice? Repetition, practise, practise, practise, control, make an effort, which is, become mechanical. Our minds, as we went into the other day, part of our brain has become mechanical. We said thought in its essence is mechanical, because thought is the repetition, or the reaction of memory. And when you already live a life which is mechanical and try to go beyond that mechanical life by introducing another mechanical process, which is systems, methods, practices, you are still mechanical. So when once you see the truth of this, the logic, the reason of this, you will never touch systems, methods, practices.

So anything that is contrived, put together by thought, however beautiful, however logic, however ancient, traditional, makes the mind more mechanical and eventually dull. So can one see the truth of it and reject - or rather, the very seeing of the truth of it ends the demand for systems, methods, 'how am I to achieve'. I hope you are following all this.

So we are asking: what is silence? If it is not put together by thought, then what is silence? You understand my question? Because we said only when there is silence, when there is no noise you can hear properly. In observation silences is necessary. When you are looking under a microphone you must look silently,

discover what there is. In the same way, to see clearly you must be silent, to hear clearly the mind mustn't be chattering. If you see the truth of it, then it happens. You haven't to make an effort to be silent.

So we said order. And the mind, part of the mind being mechanical by following any method, system, practice, furthers the mechanical process of the brain. Right? So what is that which is silent? We will look at it by examining what is awareness. You are following? To be aware. When you are sitting there you are aware of the trees, the shadows, the light on the leaves, the movement of the leaves. Aren't you? If you are looking at the tree you are aware of it. Can you look at it without verbalization? You understand? Just to look without naming it, without giving it a quality, or description, just to observe. First that is, we never observe, we look at it and say, how beautiful, how ugly, how useful - depending on our conditioning. So we never observe things as they are. Right? Now can you observe, see this whole beauty of this land, all the hills, their quietness, their shadows, just to observe without any reaction of thought, without any reaction of like and dislike. Just to observe. That is awareness. Right? Aware of the universe around you, then be aware of the universe inside. The universe inside is much more complex. The universe inside is our whole consciousness. And the consciousness is its content. Right? Please come with me. You are not going to sleep are you?

As I said, the universe inside is much more complex, much more subtle, and if one knows, or has the energy, the capacity, the intensity and the clarity, there is a great tremendous depth in that. So we are saying: to be aware first of the outer, to look at it, and to

be aware of all your reactions to it, and then go beyond your reactions and observe. Now in the same way go into the universe of yourself, which is your consciousness with all its content, with its experiences, with its knowledge, with its likes, with its fears, anxieties, sorrow, pain. You follow? That enormous content which man has added thousands of years, to be conscious of that, to be aware of that. Can one be aware - please listen to it - can one be aware totally? Or take one segment after another, one layer after another, one fragment after another? Will you understand the content of consciousness - the content makes up consciousness, if there is no content there is no consciousness, as we know it - will you look at it, understand it bit by bit? Or is there an understanding of it totally? You are getting my point? Are you following all this? Are we talking Greek? Your content of your consciousness is your conditioning, as a Christian, as a socialist, conditioned by the climate, by the food, by all the things that man has done to himself and to others: his identifications, his beliefs, all that is consciousness. To understand that consciousness will you examine it portion by portion? Or is there a way of looking at it wholly, so that you don't have to take time? You understand my question? Now we said there is a way of looking at it wholly, not fragment by fragment. And that is only possible if you understand what is awareness - awareness of the world outside you, watching your reactions to the world outside you and to observe without reactions the world outside you, and to move from the outer to the inner with all the content, which is your consciousness - to observe it. First you will react to it, naturally. I don't like, I like, how beautiful this is, how pleasurable that was, I wish I could keep a little bit of this,



and so on and so on and so on. To watch that reaction and then to go beyond it. If you go beyond it then you see the whole content instantly.

So this is part of meditation: to see the outer actually as it is, not what you wish it to be, the wars, the antagonisms, the hatreds, the innumerable insults and hurts that human beings receive, the sorrow, the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness, lack of love, all that to observe. Then what takes place? Then you will see that energy is being gathered, because there is order and therefore there is no wastage of energy. Right? When there is mathematical order in your life, daily life there is no wastage of energy. It is only when there is order there is wastage of energy. When there is order there is the accumulation of energy. And with that energy to observe the world and yourself, and to realize the world out there and here are the same movement. So again you are adding to that quantity further energy. Right? And you are adding, not 'you are adding' - there is the accumulation of energy when there is an observation without the observer. The observer is the past, isn't it? The past being all your prejudices, your opinions, your conclusions, your traditional responses, tradition may be two days old or ten thousand years old. So the observer is the past and the observer meets the present, the 'what is', and tries to translate according to his past conclusions, the present. Right? And therefore gives to the past further movement in time, as the future. I wonder if you capture all this.

Look sir: you are the result of the past. That is a fact. Your brain, part of your brain is the result of series of adventures, happenings, incidents, experiences, as knowledge, and knowledge

is always the past. That movement of the past meets the present and translates the present, or modifies the present according to the past and so gives a further movement into the future. Right? Now the question is - this becomes difficult, I am going to make it difficult - the question is, the past meeting the present, the past is a movement, the present is also a movement, the past meeting the present ends there, which means no movement, and therefore time has a stop.

So meditation then is bringing about order in life, and thereby gathering great energy, and ending conflict between the observer and the observed, which adds further energy. You understand? When there is a division between the observer and the observed there must be conflict. Take a very simple example: when you are angry, at the moment of anger, at the second of anger there is no division, is there. But a second later a division takes place: I must not be angry; or, why shouldn't I be angry. Where there is a division there must be conflict. And we live in conflict. Therefore the conflict with all its violence and so on is a wastage of energy. So this gathering of energy, psychological energy, not only biological, the gathering of this total energy is the beginning of - oh, I mustn't - is the beginning of a silence. Not quite.

As we said, we live a confused life, which is our consciousness is in turmoil. I do not know if you have noticed your own consciousness: constantly in battle, constantly choosing, denying, asserting, domination, attached, it is in constant struggle, boiling all the time. And therefore in that boiling there is a wastage of energy. For that turmoil to come to an end is part of meditation. Not by control, the moment you control, who is the controller?

Please, go into this yourself. You understand? Who is the controller? The controller is part of thought. So the controller then tries to control thought which is a wastage of energy. But if you see the truth that the controller is the controlled, the truth of it, then the conflict comes to an end. That means you have further energy.

Right? There is further energy. And this energy is necessary, this complete energy, which is not put together by friction. Friction has its own energy, and this energy which we are talking about, is not put together by thought, and therefore it is not the result of friction. Right? This energy is necessary to come upon that which is sacred, which is the religious mind. Got it? Some of you?

So meditation is - I'll go on whether you understand or not after this, it's up to you - meditation then is the emptying of the content of consciousness, its content. Which means the fears, the anxieties, the conflict in relationship, the ending of sorrow, and therefore compassion. The ending of the content of consciousness is complete silence. Because then that silence is full of energy. You understand? It is not vacant silence. It is not a silence that wants something more. I wonder if you understand all this. You have never done all this. That is why it has all become so difficult. I hope it isn't difficult.

So meditation is not the repetition of mantras, not merely sitting down breathing carefully. Meditation must be totally uninvited. You understand? Not contrived, not put together. Which means there is no measurement. If one has gone that far - no, it is not far or near if one has done this - then there is that emptiness. Do you understand? Now wait a minute. Scientists say, in this emptiness there is energy. You understand? We are saying when there is this

meditative process, movement, there is a totally different kind of consciousness of a dimension in which there is all this energy which has been gathered through meditation, order in life and so on and so on. You have total energy. There is total energy. And in that emptiness there is not a thing. There is nothing. Nothing means not-a-thing. Thing mean thought. We said thought is a material process. So thought in that emptiness doesn't exist at all and therefore there is no experiencer who is experiencing this total nothingness. You understand what I am saying? Oh, gosh, you people!

So we also have to enquire what is beauty. What is beauty? Because that is also part of our life. What is beauty? Is it the line? Is it the shadow? The line of an architectural building? The painting? The marvellous cultures that exist in the world? The mountains? The running waters? The beautiful face? What is beauty? Does not beauty exist when there is not a centre of conflict? I wonder if you understand this? When you say, 'How beautiful it is' - what is the feeling behind that? What is the nature, the quality of emotion, the feeling, the surging of something? Is that beauty? Or is beauty the total absence of the observer? There is only complete observation, in which there is no choice, no division. So there must be this sense of beauty, because that may be that which is sacred. Not the beauty of a form of a woman, or a man - there is the beauty of woman and a man, the beauty of a tree, the beauty of a line, the sheet of water, the running sea but to find out, or come upon that sense of total absence of anything that is contradictory, that is, anything that is whole, complete, sane, rational, such a mind is a beautiful mind - you understand? - which

is the religious mind. Because there you have got the total energy embodied there.

So there is such a thing as something sacred, which is not touched by thought, which is not touched or made corrupt by human beings with their desires and frights and quarrels and mischief. And to come upon that is not only part of meditation, but the ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom. You understand? So wisdom, which is not learning from books, or going to a school to learn wisdom, but when there is an ending of sorrow in yourself as a human being, then out of that comes wisdom. And when a human being transforms himself, you transforms yourself radically you are affecting the whole consciousness of mankind. You understand, sirs, because you are the mankind, you are the movement of mankind - which is a fact, which is actual. If you change you affect the world. So it is your tremendous responsibility - not run off into some fanciful meditative experience, which is illusion. So we must be very sceptical of all psychological experiences, subjective experiences, because they are the most destructive.

So meditation implies a life of great order, and therefore great virtue, moral. And it implies the understanding and the depth of beauty. And it implies the emptying of that consciousness which is you, with all your attachments, fears, hopes, despairs. Emptying all that by observing. Then you have this energy which alone can discover that which is eternal, which has no beginning and no ending.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 11TH JULY 1976.

Krishnamurti: What would you like me to talk about?

Audience: Freedom. Memory. Authority. Urgency.

K: I would like to talk about something that might be of general interest. But before we go into it I would like most earnestly to remind you that these talks and discussions are not a form of entertainment. They are not a gathering of people to be amused, intellectually excited, emotionally stirred and all that nonsense. We are very serious people, at least I am. And we are talking on that level. You can either listen most earnestly, or discard, or use some of the things that appeal to you and then discuss it, but words have very little meaning, though they are necessary for communication, words do not transform man, do not radically change man. And we are concerned principally and deeply and primarily with the transformation of men. That is the basis of these discussions and talks. If you are interested in it, not superficially, but deeply, seriously, then we can go into these questions very, very deeply. So it depends on you very much how you listen, at what level you listen, and if you mean business - not financial business - but if you mean seriously to bring about a radical transformation, then we are in communication with each other, then we can meet each other. If you are merely superficial, want to be intellectually or emotionally stirred, then I am afraid we will have very little in common. So if that is really deeply understood right from the beginning, then we can proceed together to investigate our human lives. Is that all right? Is that all right for me to go on that line?

Audience: Yes.

K: First of all I think it is very important to understand what human beings have made, what they have built, what their social structure is, what their behaviour is in this world. What actually is going on. What human beings, you and I, and our parents and grandparents have built; not only technologically, in the world of science, biology, archeology and all the rest of those sciences, but psychologically, inwardly, which is far more important than the outward activity, because the inward activity generally controls, shapes the outer activity, what man, human beings throughout the world have done. Because I think that is very important to understand; what human beings have created, have built, not only in their relationship with each other, but psychologically, inwardly, their religions, their society, their culture, their wars, their brutality, cruelty, violence and all the rest of it. For perhaps a million years we have lived that way: violence, wars, brutality, in the family, perpetual wrangles - you know all the rest of it that is going on. That is what we have built psychologically. The tribal worship which is called nationalism, the division of churches, the religions, one religion opposed to another religion, all maintaining that they are seeking god, the god which man has projected out of his own image. God has not made man but man has made god. There are national divisions, quarrels, wars, discrimination, and in the cultural society in which we live there is a great deal of violence, terrorism, life has become a great danger. You know all this. Every morning in the papers you read it, the terrible things that are going on.

Who is responsible for all this? Please this is not a rhetorical question, but we have to investigate it. Why has man brought about

all this, this horror? You understand my question? What is the basis of it? Unless we ask fundamental questions and try to find not an answer, but the manner of investigating the question, because answers are fairly easy to give, but the answers will be superficial, verbal. But asking the question and investigating the question is quite a different matter, then it becomes the responsibility of each one of us to find out, as human beings why we live this way, why our society, our culture, our religions, have brought about this present condition, why human beings after having lived for two million, five million, ten million years - I don't know how long - are still going on in the same old way, savagery, complete selfishness, brutality, division, all the rest of it, of which you are quite familiar. And if you ask: is this the result of thought, care, affection, love, of which we talk a great deal?

So we must begin to enquire why man has created this society, this culture, and why we accept it, live with it and not run away from it? We run away from it by forming small communes, or going off to some monastery, or joining some sect, or following some guru, and we think we have solved the whole problem.

So if we can look at all this objectively, sanely, and ask ourselves why - why has man, a human being, created a society, a culture in which we live? Right? So to find that out we must investigate the whole movement of thought - right? Because our society, our religions, our morality, all our relationship is based on thought. I think there is no question about it. Right? So we have to investigate the whole movement of thought. Thought has not only created the extraordinary technological advancement, but also thought has created wars. Thought has created all the religions in



the world, with their images, with their rituals, with their saviours, with their gods - all based on thought. And thought has divided man against man - my country, your country, my god and your god, my belief and your belief, ideals, all that. Right? Thought is responsible for this. Can we see the truth of that, that thought is responsible, and thought says, "I can solve this problem". You understand? Please do pay attention, this is your life. We will ask questions afterwards.

Surely your beliefs are the result of your thought? Your churches, your temples, your mosques, your gurus, the whole system of religions is based on thought; thought which has been conditioned by the interpreters which stand between you and what they call god, the priests. Thought has been conditioned heavily for two thousand years - or in India and other parts of the world for seven thousand years - conditioned, shaped, and thus bringing about a division. So thought is responsible for all this, apart from the technological world, the world of sanitation, the world of medicine, you know, all that, that also thought has created. Now is this a fact? Or do you think there is something else that has created this extraordinary world? You understand my question? If thought has created this - and there is no question about it - then what is the nature of thought that has brought this about?

Now we will have to go into this very, very carefully, slowly, not be dogmatic, not be assertive, not take sides, but investigate, find out, the movement of thought, and whether thought can be aware of itself, and see its activity. Right? Can thought be aware of itself: what it has done: can thought become aware, conscious of its own movement as time: and can thought become aware that it is a

fragment, not a whole? You understand?

We recognize verbally that thought has built this world, the world, the culture, the religions in which we live, of which we are a part. And so we are asking: what is the nature of thought? Thought itself, not what thought has produced, has brought about, the nature, the structure of thought itself. Is thought comprehensive? Is thought a total movement? Or is thought fragmentary, partial? You understand my question? I hope I am not talking to myself. If thought is fragmentary then whatever it brings about must be fragmentary. If thought is broken up, is the factor of breaking up, then whatever its activity must be fragmentary - right? Is thought a total movement? Or only a partial movement? Right? If thought is a total movement of life then whatever it does will be whole, complete. But if thought is limited, fragmentary, then whatever it does, at whatever level, at whatever depth, must still be fragmentary, limited, time binding.

So there are these two questions, you understand? Which is: is your thinking partial? Does it cover the whole field of life, not fragmentary, but whole? So let us examine, investigate, first whether thought is fragmentary, limited. Isn't it limited? It thinks it can cover the whole, it thinks it can be complete, sane, rational, holy - it can imagine all those things, but in fact is thought limited and therefore broken up? Now look psychologically into yourself and you will see that thought is very limited. It can think it can go beyond its limitation but it is still limited - right? It can imagine it can reach god but the god is its own projection. Probably those of you who believe in god won't accept this. So we have to investigate again your belief in god - if you believe in it; or if you don't believe

in it, why you don't believe in it. You understand?

Thought demands, needs stability, permanency, security, and thought sees that there is no security in this world - right? Thought sees everything is in perpetual movement, flux, change; so it projects an idea of what it calls god, there there is security - god is all omnipotent, god is all just, god is all love, god is all, you know, all the rest of it. Which are all the activity of thought - right? So thought is responsible for the gods, for all the churches, for all the temples, for all the mosques, the whole business of it. And thought is fragmentary, as you can see, when it has divided people against people - right? Nation against nation, me and you, we and they - right? You are following all this? So thought is in itself fragmentary, therefore it cannot possibly comprehend that which is whole - the word 'whole' implying sanity, complete, a mind that is without any kind of illusion, without fear, and therefore holy.

So what is thought then? Because that is a very important question to ask. If thought can transform our minds, our hearts, our being, then we must use thought. If thought cannot bring about a radical transformation then what is its place? You are understanding all this?

Look: make it much more simple. I want to change myself. I am part of the world. I am the world, because basically wherever I go there is suffering, pain, anxiety, grief, sorrow, death, conflict, misery, unhappiness - wherever you go: in Russia, China, India, Africa, and so on, in America, in this country, everywhere human beings radically are caught in this. That is obvious. Now I see the necessity of radical transformation. I don't want to live that way. It has no meaning to live that way. So I ask myself: how am I to

change radically? Will thought change me? You understand my question? Please do follow this. Thought sees itself, what it has brought about psychologically, inwardly, as well as outwardly. And I ask myself: can thought bring about radical transformation in myself? So I say, "What is thought?" Can thought be aware of itself? Can the thinking that is going on in myself, in this mind, can it be aware of itself, see its own movement, what it has done, what it cannot do and what it wants to do? You follow all this?

So you ask yourself, and I ask myself, what is thought? Why has thought taken such predominance in the world? So what is thought? What is this thing that is always in action, always in movement, chattering away? Bringing about a division, me and you, my family, your family, my god, your god - you follow? - this whole movement that is going on within me. So what is this movement? Movement implies time - right? Please, is that all right? Time being moving from here to there, covering the distance from 'what is' to 'what should be', both outwardly and inwardly. So time is a movement. So thought itself is a movement - right? So thought is time. Are we meeting each other, please?

So I see, there is an observation that thought is movement as time. Right? So what is thought? Thought is memory - right? Memory stored in the brain, stored up as experience and knowledge - right? Knowledge when I drive a car, knowledge when I say "I know about myself" - you understand? So the accumulation of experience, which has become knowledge, is stored in the brain, and the response of that is thought - right? That is simple, isn't it? Let's move. That is simple, isn't it?

If you have no memory you are in a state of amnesia - right?

You have memory, and that memory is based on experience, past experience, which has become knowledge and stored up in the brain. That is a fact whether you accept it or not accept it: even the scientists are coming to that. So thought is a movement in time, which is the response of memory as knowledge. Right? So knowledge is the past. So thought is the past. It can project the future by modifying the present, but it is still the past in operation. So thought is fragmentary. You get the idea? Do you see this?

Thought we said is the response of memory; memory is knowledge, knowledge based on experience; knowledge is always in the past, there is no knowledge of the future. So thought meeting the present, modifies itself, and projects the future - right? So thought, because it is based on knowledge, experience, which is the past, is always fragmentary. Swallow that pill! Right?

And thought, being fragmentary, has created this culture which is fragmentary: the Arab and the Jew, you know, the whole business of it, and thought says, "I will solve this problem, politically, religiously, psychologically" - all the problems it has created. What it has created is fragmentary and thought says "I will go beyond the fragment" - thought itself being a fragment. You get it? Therefore it cannot possibly go beyond itself. Please see this, even verbally, intellectually, whatever - but see it. Once you see this, observe the truth of it, then our whole process of thinking becomes radically different. If thought cannot solve this problem, human problem, then what will? You understand my question? We have so far, for millenia, depended on thought to solve our problems. All our philosophies, of the great philosophers, are based on thought - the modern philosophers, the Greek philosophers and

the ancient Hindu philosophers. And their philosophy which is the child of their thinking, man hopes through those philosophies to solve the problem. You understand? So we have accepted thought as the complete solution of everything. And when you realize, not emotionally, but logically, sanely that thought is a fragment and therefore it cannot possibly solve the total problem of man, then you have to ask what will solve man's problems? You understand my question? Have you got it? Are we touching each other? Are we in communication with each other? Please.

That is, do you see the truth of this, not the verbal statement of it, the truth of it? Look, I will point out something. The speaker makes this statement that thought, being fragmentary, cannot possibly solve the things which it has created - right? Now I have made a statement. How do you receive that statement? Do you understand? Do you see the statement as the truth itself? Or do you make an abstraction of that statement into an idea and accept the idea, and not the fact? Now what do you do? Has it become an idea? Or a fact? You understand this? What have you done? How have you received that statement: that thought, whatever it has created must be fragmentary, and thought trying to solve the problem, the things which it has created it with its problems, can never solve it? How do you receive that statement? Is it an idea? Or do you see it is so? You understand my question? If it is an idea - now the word 'idea' in Greek means to observe, to observe, not what we have made of it. So is it an idea, or a fact that you say, "Yes, it is so"? You understand? Which is it? Because it is very important to understand this. If it is an idea, it is still fragmentary. But if you see the fact, it is not fragmentary. Can we go on from

there? It is very important.

If you draw a conclusion from what has been said, that thought is a fragment, then that conclusion is the movement of thought - right? But if you see what has been said, that thought is a fragment, it is a fact, then you can deal with facts not with ideas. You understand? We live with ideas, with conclusions, with concepts, which are non facts, and therefore we get completely lost. Whereas if we dealt only with facts then there is a means of communication. You are getting this?

So do you, listening to this fact, do you draw a conclusion, or live with the fact? I can't repeat it ten times. What is it that you do? If it is a conclusion, why have you made a conclusion, why don't you face the fact? You can only face the fact if you are actually listening to the fact. I say to you, as a fact, that it is a lovely day. It is a fact, you accept it. Don't you? It is a lovely day. And so you remain with the fact, you accept it. Don't you? It is a lovely day. And so you remain with the fact. But if you draw a conclusion from a statement it becomes non fact, and when we are discussing non facts there is no relationship between us. You get it? So do you, when you listen to a fact, draw a conclusion, or remain with the fact? And if you draw a conclusion why do you do it? What is the operation of this business? Is it habit? You understand? Because we always live with ideas, with conclusions, with 'what should be', so we are conditioned to that, and therefore we find it awfully difficult to break from that. And to break from that is to observe that you are operating always in that field, to be aware of it. Right? Can we go on?

So to break from this conditioning - it is the conditioned mind,

this idea from the Greeks, all humanity has done this, never look at the facts but draw a conclusion about facts. Our philosophies, our gurus, the whole thing is based on this. And we say why does the mind do this? And we say why is there this instant reaction?

Because it is part of our training, part of our education, part of our lack of energy to break with it. So we are now dealing only with fact, which is: thought is a fragment, and therefore whatever it does will produce further fragments, further misery, further confusion - right? Do you see that as a fact?

Then the next question is: if thought cannot solve our human problems, psychological problems, not technological problems, not how to go to the Moon, or to Venus, or to bring about different kinds of wars, instruments of war, but human psychological problems, inward problems, if thought cannot solve it what will? You have understood the question? So man said, "Thought cannot solve it, god will solve it". You understand? An outside agency, whether it is the outside agency of god, or the outside agency of a better society. You understand? Please face all this. So thought says to itself, "I can't solve this. Therefore there must be an outside guide, outside father, outside agency, god, highest principle, or the highest ideal, or change the circumstances, the environment - which the Communists wants to do, and then human beings will change", which is exactly the same thing. Thought created the god, the outside agency, thought has created the idea that a perfect environment will change man. So thought is still a fragmented activity - right? I wonder if you see this?

So thought cannot solve the problem. So what will? Right? Now when you ask that question, whom are you asking? You understand



my question? Are you asking somebody outside you? Asking the speaker to tell you? Or are you saying to yourself that thought cannot solve this, it is a fact, then what is the next action? You understand? If you ask another, that asking is still fragmentary - you understand? I wonder if you understand this? If you ask another and the other replies then you are setting him up as the authority - right? And the authority is still a fragment. Your gurus are fragments, whether the priest on the corner, or far away. So you are asking this question of yourself. Right? Which is quite different, because when you ask that question there is no authority to tell you. Right? So then you are free of one of the basic principles, which is no authority in spiritual matters. That means no guru, with all their circus going on. So you are asking yourself this question: my thought which has created me, my problems, my anxieties, my fears, my hopeless despair, my sorrow, agony, if thought cannot solve it, what will? So I am not looking outwardly because I see what I am inwardly conquers the outer - right? It has been shown historically, it has been shown every day - what you are inside conquers the outer. The Communists started out with no government, the government withering away, individuals complete - you know, all the rest of it - but the opposite has taken place, which is the inner conquers always the outer.

So you are asking a question, which is: if thought cannot change me what will? So I begin to investigate into myself - right? You understand? Because I am the world, and the world is me, that is a fact. You may have different customs, different costumes, different manner of eating, clothes and all the rest of it, but basically, deeply we are alike. We have sorrow, we have misery, we have confusion,

we are in disorder. So go where you will it is the same human problem, as human beings we are the same, you may call yourself a Swiss, an American, or a Hindu, or a Buddhist, whatever you like, but strip all the labels and you see the agony, the suffering, the miseries, and occasional happiness. So the world is me and I am the world. That is not an intellectual idea, it is a fact. So when I enquire into myself I am enquiring into humanity. You understand? I wonder if you see that? Not myself, I am humanity. It isn't a selfish egocentric movement. Therefore when I look at myself and enquire into myself, I am enquiring into the whole human agony and pain and all that. So it is not a selfish movement - right?

So what will change me, a human being, who is the world? I recognize very clearly that an outside agency will not solve this - right? Nor the transformation of environment, because I have created the environment, through my fears, through my anxieties, through my desire for security, all the rest of it. So what will change this whole movement of thought? Got the picture? So I see thought has its own energy - right? The energy of conflict, the energy of competition, the energy of wanting to succeed, you know, all that - the energy. That thought in its fragmentary activity has got its own extraordinary energy; the energy which has created the whole technological world; and the energy which thought has created in relationship - right? Relationship between two human beings, two human beings which thought has divided as you and me - right? So where there is division there must be conflict. And that conflict gives tremendous energy - right? Outwardly and inwardly. Outwardly you see the Arab and the Jew, what is going on, the energy that is wasted in that. And the energy thought has

created between you and me as man and woman, you know, all that business, in relationship - right? The extraordinary energy it has created. And we think that energy is going to solve the problem. You get it? So I see clearly that energy cannot possibly solve it, therefore there must be a totally different kind of energy? Right? I am enquiring. I am not saying there is, or there is not. I see thought as energy; energy which has created this extraordinary technological world, and extraordinary misery between man and man, human beings (I had better include the woman, otherwise the woman will say "Why did you leave me out?") - between human beings. So one must find out if there is a totally different kind of energy, which is not brought about through conflict - right? Which is not the essence of conflict. Are we meeting each other?

So what is the capacity of the mind that can find this out? You understand? Has it the capacity? Please go into it with me a little bit. The speaker observes the energy of conflict in human relationship, and that energy, which is the movement of thought, that energy, thought says, "I will transform with that energy." - right? I see that. It is a clear observation, it is a fact. Then if that energy cannot solve all my problems, human problems, then what will? Now is my mind, human mind, capable of finding it out? You understand? Because the human mind is frightened, is anxious, is always striving, struggling, in conflict - right? Can such a mind find this out? Or that mind must be quiet before it can find it out. You understand the question? Come on!

If my mind is always chattering, anxious, frightened, seeking its own security, its own happiness, its limited demands, such a mind cannot possibly find something which is not the product of

thought. Right? Do you see this? Is this clear? So to find that energy, if there is, there must be freedom - right? (You asked that question: to discuss freedom.) There must be freedom. Freedom from anxiety, freedom from fear, freedom from sorrow, you understand? Otherwise you cannot possibly come upon the other. This is logical, isn't it? No? So is it possible for the mind, for a human being, to be totally free of all the things that thought has put together - psychologically? Do you understand my question? That is, human consciousness is made up of all its content - right? Your consciousness - right? - yours, is made up of your demand for money, your demand for sex, your demand for power, position, prestige, happiness, attachments to your furniture, to people, to places, to things, it is made up of all your beliefs - right? All that is your consciousness - no? Right? Oh, for god's sake! That is human consciousness with its content. As long as there is that content in the consciousness, which is fear, pleasure, sorrow, and all its complications, that is your consciousness, put together by thought - right? So as long as those contents remain in that consciousness, and that consciousness is its content - right? - you cannot possibly find out if there is a different kind of energy. Therefore one must be free of its content.

Surely if I want to find something beyond my own imagination, illusions, desires, I must first be free of those things, mustn't I? Logical. I must be free of attachment - right? Whether it is an attachment to a person, to a belief, to a piece of furniture, or a house. I must be free from it before I can possibly look beyond. So is it possible for me to be free of complete psychological authority, so that I don't look to another to tell me what to do -

psychologically? Of course the doctor will tell me what to do, or the technician will tell me what to do - that is quite a different matter. But psychologically, inwardly, to be told what to do by another - the other is myself - you understand? - because he is in sorrow, he is in misery, he is in confusion, and he is my guru, or my priest, or my god, or my saviour, he is just like the rest of humanity.

So part of this consciousness is to accept inward authority in the world of the psyche, which is generally called the spiritual world. So can you, can this mind be free of that? You have made the outside authority because inwardly you are in disorder. If there is no disorder you have no authority. You understand? There was a time - if the Italians will forgive me - at one time Italy was in confusion and Mussolini came to bring order. It is happening in India; it is happening all over the world. Where there is outward disorder, that very disorder creates the authority - right? That is a law. So when there is disorder in you, you are bound to create the outer authority. The gurus are multiplying by the dozen, with their systems - you know all that filthy business.

So can you be free of this search for an authority which will give you security? That is part of your consciousness, which is based on fear. So we come to a very complex problem of fear - right? As we said, our consciousness is filled with these three principal factors: fear, with all its complications, ramifications; pleasure, which is very complex; and sorrow. Our consciousness is filled with that. So can the mind, this consciousness empty itself of itself to find out if there is a totally different kind of energy? Unless it is free from that you will never find it. Right? Logically.

You can talk about freedom, we can talk about authority, and all the rest of the things, but it has no value, for a man who is very serious. And we have to be serious in a world that is so disarranged.

So I had better stop there and perhaps you will ask some questions with regard to what we have talked about. We will go on the day after tomorrow, we will go on with all this. We are going to have seven talks and five discussions, so you will have plenty of time to tear me to pieces! Or rather tear to pieces what you have heard, or not heard! So would you like to ask some questions on what we have talked about? Before you ask questions please bear in mind that you are asking the questions of yourselves aloud, because we are not your authority, we are not your guru. You have to find truth for yourself, which means you have to be a light for yourself. There is no other light except the light which you have for yourself. Then when you find that light then it is the light of the world. You understand? So.

Questioner: You say that thought is the problem. I am finding that there is a lot of fear in me and all the rest. (Part of question inaudible on tape)

K: May I answer that question? The questioner says thought existed before fear - fear existed before thought. Pardon.

Q: Thought to me is not the problem but the symptom.

K: Oh, the symptom is the problem and not the cause.

Q: Fear existed before thought.

K: Do let's be clear about your question sir.

Q: Well I am saying that thought is not the problem. There is a lot of pain in me.

K: The questioner says, if I am representing him rightly, the questioner says thought is not the problem. The problem is fear and pain. And he adds also those are the symptoms.

Q: They are not the symptoms.

K: Oh, they are not the symptoms.

Q: Thought is the symptom.

K: Let's be clear.

Q: O.K. I'll say it again. Fear - when I was very little, I had a lot of fear.

K: When I was little I had a lot of fear.

Q: But I didn't have thought.

K: When he was little he had a lot of fear, but he had no thought.

Q: A little baby doesn't have a mind to have thought.

K: No. So don't let's go back to babies. Let's find out if fear is independent of thought. Or thought has brought about fear. Right sir? Whether fear is the result of thinking, or fear independent of thought. That is the question, isn't it?

Are the opposites independent of each other? You understand my question? The opposites, the opposed, are they independent of each other? Or are they essentially related to each other? Wait, I'll show you, go slow, go slow! There are opposing desires - right? I want that, I don't want that. There are opposing desires. Are they independent of each other? Or they have the same movement? Do you understand? So they are not independent of each other.

Now is pain the opposite of - what? - non-pain? Or both are the same. They are like the two sides of the same coin. Therefore there is no question of independence. That is what I want to get at first.

We think the opposites are independent - right? The opposite desires, we think they are independent of each other, are they? Desire is common to both - right? I desire that and I don't desire that. So desire is the common factor - right? So the opposites are never independent. Is that clear sir? If you see that then fear is thought. We will go into that the day after tomorrow morning. Please let's get this clear first. That any opposite - bravery and cowardice - are related to each other - right? That is simple isn't it? Cowardice and bravery are related to each other, therefore they are not independent of each other. So there are no opposites at all, except man, woman, dark, light - that is a different matter. Psychologically there is no opposite. This leads to quite a lot. When there is an opposite there is a conflict - right?

Look: just look, I am envious - if one is envious - one is envious. The opposite is non-envious. What is the opposite? How has non-envy come into being? Because I have been envious. Therefore being envious I see it brings a lot of trouble, so I will be non-envious. But I have been envious, therefore the non-envy is related to envy. In the same way violence and non-violence. We say they are two opposites. They are not. There is only one, which is violence. But as human beings don't know what to do with violence they invent non-violence in the hope of achieving that, using that as a lever to get rid of violence. You understand this? Come on. Move! So psychologically there is only one factor: that which is, not the opposite. That which is, is envy. If my mind is capable of dealing with that envy why should I have non-envy? Because it can't, therefore it invents the other, which is an escape from the fact. Right?



So thought and fear: he said fear is independent of thought. Is it? If you had no thought at all would you be afraid? Of tomorrow? Of the past? Of death? Of your neighbour? Your wife? So thought is fear. We will go into all that the day after tomorrow.

Questioner: Fear is in the body, not only in the head.

K: I know.

Q: You can feel it trembling.

K: I know, you get almost paralysed, you shake. We will go into all that the day after tomorrow.

Any other questions? We will deal with it sir.

Q: (Question in French)

K: The question is this: it is a question about death and the person that is left behind - right? This loneliness, the solitude, the lack of companionship, the sense of utter loneliness, being left alone.

Is this the occasion to discuss that question of death? You know it is one of the most complex problems that man has faced from the time he began, this question of death, survival after death, and this utter sense of loneliness. To answer that question really very, very deeply, we must spend a lot of time on it, not just two minutes at the end of a talk, because death is something which all human beings have tried to avoid. Or having accepted it, like the ancient Egyptians perpetuated the daily living eternally. Or there is the whole problem of reincarnation and so on and so on. So if you don't mind at the end of an hour and twenty minutes or so, if you will forgive me madame, we will discuss this question at another time. May we do that?

You see you ask a question and you don't go through with it.

You ask what is the mind, what is fear, what is thought, you don't take time, you don't give the other fellow time to explain and go into it. You say, "Answer me quickly". These questions cannot be answered quickly because they are immense questions, which human beings have worked upon for millenia and you want it all said in a few words. We have to find out what death is, if there is immortality, and what is it that is immortal, why there is that immense sense of loneliness, left alone completely. That means, please we are not being harsh or anything but you have to give time, you have to come and listen to it, find out. But if you say, "Sorry I can't, I have got to go tomorrow, I have got to see my friend in Geneva, or somewhere else, sorry, tell me quickly". These things cannot possibly be told in a few seconds. So you will have to forgive me.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 13TH JULY 1976.

We were talking the last time that we met here about the movement of thought. How thought has built this modern world, both technologically and psychologically, what it has done in the field of science and in the field of psychology. And it has built various religions, various sects, beliefs, dogmas, rituals, saviours, gurus and all the rest of that business with which you are quite familiar. And we said, thought has its place, limited, fragmented but thought cannot possibly comprehend or understand or come upon that which is whole. Thought can never find out that which is timeless, if there is a reality, if there is truth. Thought can never, under whatever circumstances, come upon that immensity. And without that comprehension of that totality, of that dimension in which time as thought and measure does not exist. Thought must find its own place and limit itself to that space. That is what we were talking about last time when we met here.

We were going to talk about the great problem of fear. But before we go into that I would like, if I may, to go into the problem of observing ourselves. When we observe ourselves we are not isolating ourselves, limiting ourselves, becoming self-centred, because as we explained, we are the world, and the world is us. This is a fact. And when we, as human beings, examine the whole content of our consciousness, of ourselves, we are really enquiring into the whole human being - whether he lives in Asia, Europe or America. So it is not a self-centred activity. That must be very clear: that when we are observing ourselves we are not becoming selfish, self-centred, becoming more and more neurotic, lopsided;

but on the contrary we are examining when we look at ourselves the whole human problem, the human problem of misery, conflict and the appalling things that man has made for himself and for others. So it is very important to understand this fact, that we are the world, and the world is us. You may have superficial mannerisms, superficial tendencies, but basically all human beings throughout this unfortunate world go through misery, confusion, turmoil, violence, despair, agony. So there is a common ground upon which we all meet. So when we observe ourselves we are observing human beings. I hope this is clear, and not make this observation into some neurotic, lopsided, selfish affair, as most people are apt to do.

So the problem then is: is it possible to observe oneself - please listen to this for a minute - is it possible to observe oneself without further recording? I will explain what I mean.

We are conditioned. That is an obvious fact, as Christians, Communists, Socialists, Hindus, Muslims, whatever it is, we are conditioned with all the beliefs, with all the dogmas, with all the rituals, with all the fears, what human beings are, their appetite, their sexual demands, their desire for power, position, money and so on. This is what human beings right throughout the world want. And god or truth plays the secondary part. So we are conditioned, and we are always operating in that area, changing the design, the shape, the form, always within that area of the conditioned mind, which again is obvious. I hope this is clear. And the brain is always registering - that is the function of the brain, to register. If you observe your own brain in operation, if you can, and it can be done - we will talk about it in a little while - then you will see that it is

always recording, registering like a computer. Of course a computer is mechanical, this is much more subtle, much more alive, but its function is to register, because through registration there is certain security. If you have had an accident, physiologically as well as psychologically, it is registered as a memory, and that memory gives security, not to have further accidents. That is again very simple. So our brain is a registering machine, which is experience, knowledge and memory, and the response of that memory is thought - which we talked about the other day when we met here.

So all our activity is within this area, registering and remembering, and acting skilfully according to what you have registered, or not skilfully, logically or illogically, sanely or with insanity. That is what is going on if you observe all the time. May we proceed? You are following all this? You know this is really very, very serious. If I may point out this is not a plaything, something to be amused by, something to be entertained with; it is a matter of life and death, it is a matter of enormous importance in our daily life, because our daily life is such a confusion, such a turmoil, and to bring about some kind of order in that chaos we have to understand how to observe ourselves and to see how the brain acts, not from books, those are just the explanations of some philosopher or some psychologist, or some phoney guru. I am sorry I put all gurus as traditionalists, bringing their own jargon, their own idiosyncrasies, their own beliefs and foisting it on others.

So if you observe yourself, and therefore you are observing all humanity, the history of humanity is you, and that you is the history, you have to read that history, be capable of reading it, not

from the books published by others about human beings but as you are the total essence of all human beings in the world, one has to learn the art of observing oneself. As we said, the word 'art' implies, means to put everything in its right place. That is the actual meaning of art. Not what he produces, pictures, poems, we are not concerned with that. The meaning of that word is to place everything in life in its proper place; and when you do that you are the greatest artist, you may never paint, you may never write a poem, you may never produce a sculpture, but if you know, if you have observed yourself and have learnt the art of observation and put everything in your life in its right place, you are the greatest artist in the world. I hope you understand this.

And when you observe yourself you see that all your activity, which is registration, recording, is the process of conditioning - right? You understand? Are we meeting each other? Communication is important. Communication implies sharing, not only a verbal sharing but to go beyond the word, to capture the significance of what one is saying, then we are in communion with each other, because we are supposed to understand either French or English, or Italian, and if one speaks in English we are using certain words which may not be modern words, which may not have the jargon of the modern world, but it is the language of five thousands years and more, because man has used words like fear, sorrow, pleasure and the immensity of something that is beyond all registration.

So we are always registering, remembering, storing up as knowledge and acting always within that area. The acting within that area is to strengthen our conditioning, obviously - right? Are

we meeting? If I am a Hindu and I am conditioned by centuries of tradition, centuries upon centuries of dogma, belief, and I act deeply within that area, the activity strengthens the conditioning. That is clear, isn't it? So there is no freedom from that conditioning as long as I am operating in that area, psychologically as well as biologically depending on the psychological demands. Clear, isn't it? If I am a Communist and I have certain dogmas, certain dialectical conclusions, thesis, antithesis and synthesis, you know the game, and live within that, I strengthen more and more my conclusions, they prove my conclusions, so I never break out from that. So there is no freedom within that area. It's clear isn't it? Can I go ahead?

So my question is: is it possible - please listen - is it possible not to register? You understand? Because if I keep on registering all the time, the brain is always conditioning itself. I wonder if you understand this? If I am always acting within the field of knowledge, what I have learnt, what my experiences are and I am always acting within that limited area, the conditioning becomes stronger and stronger and stronger, which is what is happening with all of us - right? And so one asks: is it possible not to register psychologically? You understand my question? This is a very, very serious question. Is there a part of the brain which is capable of not registering? You understand? If a human being is always operating within the field of the known, which is his conditioning, then the very activity of that produces greater volume of resistance. So we are asking a most fundamental question, not an idiosyncratic question, or a neurotic question: is it possible for a brain not to register at all? Is there a part, or is there a quality of brain that

understands the need of not registering? You understand? The need. Are we meeting each other - please?

Now we are going to go into that first because when we come to discuss fear you have to understand the meaning, the word, the significance of all that, fear. And as long as we are operating within the field of the known, fear is strengthened - right?

So is it possible not to register at all, psychologically? Biologically you may have to register, you have to register, record whether you drive on the right side or on the left side of the road, depending upon the country you live in; you have to register many, many things physically, but what is the need to register psychologically at all? If it is not possible then we are everlastingly condemned to live in this area of knowledge, in this area of continuous strengthening the conditioning - right? We have understood this? Now we are going to find out if it is possible. Please you are not listening to a talk. You are listening to yourself. You are listening to the operation of your own brain, watching your own thoughts, watching your own registration, the remembering and then acting, skilfully, not skilfully, you are watching yourself, which is you are sharing with the speaker - right? So you are watching not what the speaker is talking about, which becomes an idea, but you are watching yourself in operation.

We are asking: the brain traditionally has been educated, gathering strength through knowledge and always living in that area, therefore registration becomes tremendously important for its security. And we are asking something: that unless there is freedom from that area we are condemned forever to live there, fighting, quarrelling, all the misery that goes on.



Now we are going to find out, not through the speaker, but for yourself, as a human being representing all humanity, we are going to find out whether there is a possibility of not recording at all and therefore breaking down the conditioning. You have understood? From childhood through the parents, through all the environment of society and so on, we are being hurt - right? You are hurt from childhood, aren't you? You have got many hurts psychologically. That hurt is brought about through the image that you have about yourself, obviously. Right? May I go on? Are you sharing this?

You have an image about yourself, haven't you? You are marvellous, or not marvellous, or you are very sensitive, you are most extraordinary, you have more intelligence than somebody else, or that you are very near god - you know all that bilge! So you have got an image about yourself, and that image is constantly being hurt from childhood, psychologically, which affects biologically, which is psychosomatic. Now when there is that hurt you are withdrawing, isolating, resisting, therefore that resistance, that isolation, that hurt strengthens the conditioning - right? And being strengthened you act neurotically, because you feel you are terribly sensitive, because you have built a wall around yourself, and you withdraw at any remark, any insult, any flattery - flattery is the same as insult, they are two sides of the same coin. So as long as you have that hurt, as long as there is that feeling of isolating yourself, resisting, the strengthening process of conditioning goes on. And you act from that hurt, from that resistance, from that isolation neurotically - right? Now is it possible not to be hurt? - which is not to register the insult? You understand? You insult me, or flatter me - some people have

insulted me but most people have flattered me unfortunately. And not to resist either - is that possible? You understand my question?

Now you are watching yourself. That is, you are watching through the words I am using, the speaker is using, watching through those words yourself as a human being, not a human being somewhere else, but actually sitting there in front of us, watching himself. He knows the hurts, he is aware of the isolating process of that hurt because he doesn't want to be hurt more, therefore there is resistance, there is isolation and from that isolation there is activity, logical, illogical, stupid and all the rest of it, and that activity strengthens him more and more. Now we are asking: is it possible when that insult or flattery is made not to register it? Bearing in mind that the brain is trained, accustomed, educated to register - you have got the picture? Are you working as hard as the speaker is working? I hope you are!

How do you answer this question? The speaker has put forward a question which is: is it possible not to register when the hurt or the flattery is made? Now how do you answer that question? How do you listen to that question? How do you listen to it? Is it an idea? Or is it a fact? You understand? Come on! Do you draw a conclusion from what you have heard? Or do you actually observe the hurt, the activity of that hurt and ask yourself if it is at all possible not to receive any hurt at all, and therefore not register the hurt, not to register the word, the implication of the word, which means that you have no - the image is getting hurt, because the image is you? You understand all this? All right sirs? Because if the brain is capable of not registering, except physiologically, then it has quite a different movement, quite a different activity, quite a

different energy. I insult you - I hope I don't, but suppose I do. Can you listen to the insult, the word, the meaning, and the desire to hurt you, all the implications, listen to it completely and the brain not take it in? I will show you how to do it - not how. How it operates.

Are you interested in all this? Does it mean anything to you? Because this implies a tremendous revolution inwardly. But most of us are frightened of that revolution inwardly, and therefore resist it. You may say, "Well if something deeply changes in me I may do nothing. I may lose my family" - you follow? Fear arises. Now to find out whether it is at all possible not to register, to listen to that insult or flattery with all your senses totally at the highest. Have you ever done that? To observe the moving waters of a river with all your senses, including not only the senses but the sensory perception of the brain itself, because the brain is sensation? To listen to that insult or flattery with the brain, with all the senses heightened - can you do that? We never observe anything with all our senses. We observe either intellectually, which is part of the senses, or orally, partially, hear the word, translate the word, pleasurable or not pleasurable, and so we are always observing partially, with part of our senses awakened. We are asking something entirely different, which is: to observe, or to listen to that insult or flattery with all your senses. Can you do it? Do you know what it means?

Questioner: Then you don't register.

K: The gentleman says then you don't register. You see? Please I don't know who the gentleman is therefore I am not insulting him. He has already drawn a conclusion. Has he done it? Or he has said

by listening that will happen if you do that. I am asking you to listen to something very, very carefully to find out the truth of it, not the conclusion, not an idea, but to find the truth of it. That when you listen to an insult or flattery with all your senses highly awakened - the senses being not only the brain but the quality of the mind, which is part of the senses, the totality of all the senses, then you will find that there is no registration whatsoever. Right? Just listen to it. Don't draw a conclusion. Don't say, "If I do that it will happen". If you listen to what is being said with all your senses you are then free from the conditioning. Have you understood something of this?

Have you ever observed a picture without comparison, who painted it and all the rest of it, just to observe it? Then you are beyond that picture, beyond, gone away from it.

So it is possible. The speaker asserts, not you, because you don't do it. If you do it then you can assert that is the truth; but to merely repeat what somebody says means nothing. We are saying that it is possible not to register, there is a quality in the brain that does not register if you give all your senses, which is total attention.

So then when there is no registration then thought, which is the response of all registration, then thought takes its proper place - right? Which is, thought puts itself in its own place. It doesn't flow over where it is not needed.

Now bearing all that in mind we can turn to the discussion, or to the dialogue of fear. May we go on? You aren't tired are you after following this? We are going to go into the question of fear. Which is, to observe the fear in yourself. You are the humanity, you are not Mr so-and-so, with a name and a form. You are the essence of

all human beings. For god's sake do realize that. Because you, like anybody else in the world, go through agony, he knows what sorrow is, what death is, frustration, loneliness, the lack of love, compassion, violence; this happens all throughout the world. So you are the essence of all humanity. That is a fact. So when we are discussing or having a dialogue about fear, we are discussing human fear, not Mr so-and-so's fear - or Miss so-and-so's fear. When you understand the global fear of humanity then you can see your own little fears; but if you are only concerned with your own little fears then you lose the greater fear altogether. You understand this? So we are having a dialogue about human fear.

Can you, as a human being, observe your fear. Sitting there, you know your fears, can you observe it very carefully? Take time, we have got plenty of time. Observe it. Fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of tomorrow, fear of losing a job, fear of losing your wife, or your girl, or your boy, losing your position, losing the vitality, the energy, fear of not being as intellectual, verbal or clever as another. To be aware of it, to observe it.

Now listen to this carefully, if you don't mind. Does the word fear create fear? Or does fear exist without the word? You have understood my question? Does the word fear awaken fear? Or without the word does this thing called fear exist? Please this is very important for you to find out if you are serious about the freedom from fear, total freedom from fear, psychologically. Then if one can understand the freedom psychologically from fear, then the biological fears become a totally different thing. Don't they? If there is freedom from fear inwardly, then biologically there is the activity of intelligence which says, do this and don't do that, which

we will discuss after. First we must have a dialogue about psychological fear.

So we are asking: when you observe your fear you use the word fear instantly, and the word is not the thing. The word 'tent' is not the actual tent. So the word is not the thing - right? So is the word fear the actuality? Or the actuality exists without the word? It is very important to find out because we are caught in words. Words and their symbols, and their meanings have become tremendously important. So can you separate the word from the fact - the word 'tent' and the actuality? I use the word tent to describe this, to communicate, but the communication, the word, the description is not the thing - right? So similarly the word, is it fear? Or is the word separate from the feeling? This is tremendously important to find out because every human being is caught in this fear, of tomorrow, or yesterday's misfortunes, of guilt, what he has done, or not done, what he hopes to do and he may not be able to do. He wants to succeed and he fails - you know the constant dread of pain, psychological pain, psychological demands and frustrations, all that, because we live with it. We have lived with it for a million years. Man has not been able to solve it, he postpones it, he avoids it, he runs away from it.

So here we are asking: can you separate the word from the feeling? Or the word has created the feeling, and without the word there may be no feeling, and if there is feeling what is it? You understand? Please do understand this. Suppose I am afraid of not being able to talk to an audience, to you, because I have cancer or something - I haven't got it, don't worry, or it doesn't matter if you worry, I haven't got it. Suppose I have cancer and I am frustrated

because I want to express, if I am silly enough to want to express. I am frightened. And I am afraid not only of biological pain but frustrated, deeply wounded, hurt by not being able to communicate, because that is what I have been doing for the last fifty years or more, so I am frightened. I am not but I am supposing. Now that fear - I am asking myself: is the word making the fear? Or does this feeling exist by itself? If the feeling exists by itself, what is that feeling? The feeling is no tomorrow - you understand? - pain and all the rest of it. So the feeling is sensation, isn't it? Without the word the feeling is a sensation, but with the word it becomes fear. I wonder if you capture it. Do you get it? It must be in your blood. I'll repeat it once more. See it.

You see we associate always the word with the thing. The moment you use the word 'tent' you have a picture of the tent - small, big, coloured, you know, whatever it is, you have a picture of it instantly. To separate the word from the fact, the fact is not the word. Right? That is simple. Fear we all know, every human being right through the world knows this appalling thing called fear, and that has burdened man for a million years. And when you are frightened you shrink, you become blind, you are paralysed, you have lost everything. You know that feeling, I am sure of it. So you have to find out for yourself, not repeat what the speaker is saying, that is of no value, find out for yourself whether the feeling is separate from the word, the word being fear; and find out also if the word is creating this feeling. If there is a separation of the word from the feeling, then you have the feeling. But the moment you name that feeling it becomes fear. And when you don't name it, it is a sensation - right? And look at that sensation with the totality of

all your senses. You understand what I am talking about? Have some of you understood what I am talking about?

So part of the brain, part of the mind and brain is sensation - right? But the moment you name a particular sensation by a particular name you have already created the response according to your conditioning. My conditioning - suppose - a person's conditioning is that he is anti-Communist. And he is trained, he is educated to be anti, anti, anti Arab, anti Jew, anti this or that. So you respond according to that conditioning. And part of that conditioning is the association of the word with the thing, never realizing that the word is not the thing. Now the word fear is not the feeling. So you have only that feeling left. That feeling, that sensation is part of the brain, part of the mind. To observe that feeling with all your senses, then you will see, if you do it, not theorize about it, not speculate about it, but actually do it, then you will see that fear, which is a movement of thought, which is a movement of thought as the word, ceases. Have you understood all this?

Then psychologically when one is free of fear, actually, then what effect has it on the physical instrument? You understand my question? If you are not frightened of any danger psychologically, what effect has that depth of the realization of truth on the physical? If you are free of that fear now, what effect has it on your physical state? You know the psychological fears dominate the physical. That is obvious. And therefore the body, the instrument, the organism loses its own intelligence. If the fears of the psyche are constantly in operation, as with most people, then there is a tremendous strain on the organism. It is frightened, it is nervous, it



is always apprehensive, always guarding itself, never open. And so those psychological fears affect very deeply the physical organism. And the inner affects the outer and therefore its own native intelligence of the body is being destroyed, as you destroy the organism through the pleasure of a taste - smoking, drinking, drugs, eating a lot of meat, you know all the rest of it that goes on. You are trained, you are educated along these lines, therefore that is always destroying the deep organic intelligence. So when there is no fear inwardly the organism operates with its own intelligence, and therefore it is quite a different operation - you understand? Nothing is dictated to it.

So you must lay the foundation of all this, because then only you will understand later on, when we discuss about meditation, what is implied in it. But if you don't lay the foundation, which is not to be inwardly, psychologically afraid, and if you are afraid and you still go after meditation then you are caught up in illusions, in stupidities, in absurd activities, because the root, the essence of destructive activity goes on and you pile on it all kinds of idiotic ideas. Meditation is something that comes naturally when you have laid down the foundation - right?

So what we are talking about, or having a dialogue, is laying the foundation, not only the biological foundation but the psychological foundation. When that foundation is deep, strong, healthy, sane, then meditation then becomes something extraordinary. But without that, meditation becomes rather childish, meaningless, leading to illusion.

Would you like to ask some questions, of what we have been talking about. Or do you want to sit quietly? If you want to sit

quietly, do it by yourself when you are alone in your room, because when you sit quietly with a lot of people, then you depend on those people to make you quiet. You understand? You know when you sit with others quietly it helps you to be quiet - right? Naturally. Because you are watching others, you feel others are sitting there quietly, so you feel you mustn't disturb them, so you become naturally quiet, and gradually you begin to depend on others to help you to be quiet - right? Quietness, stillness comes naturally, if you understand the whole process of thought; all the movement of thought, thought as fear, thought as pleasure, thought as time. When you have gone very, very deeply into that question, then silence is as natural as when there is no wind among the trees.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH JULY 1976

May we go on with what we were talking about the last time that we met here? We were saying: why do human beings, right throughout the world, live this most extraordinary, conflicting, sorrowful life? We asked that question and we went into it fairly thoroughly.

I think we ought to ask also whether it is at all possible for the content of consciousness to free itself from its own limitation? We are using words - the meaning of the words - that are probably thousands and thousands of years old. Though English didn't exist then, but the content, the meaning of the words existed. So we are using a language, which is English, using very simple words, words that have meaning in themselves, not what you attribute to them, a significance of words that convey their meaning, if one is willing seriously to listen. Because at a Gathering like this there must be some who are quite serious, they must at least comprehend the deep meaning of all that we are talking about.

You see religions throughout the world have lost their meaning completely. They are a lot of mumbo jumbo without much meaning, and rituals, dogmas that have lost their - if they ever had it - their significance. Now people who are so-called religious go to these rituals, get stimulated, feel rather good and come away from it and then live their ordinary daily life. We are talking of religion that is totally integrated with life, with everyday activity, not something that you put away on Sunday morning and live in a peculiar, illusory, fantastic mundane world. So we ought to consider very deeply what is the meaning of religion, and if it has

any meaning at all, and if there is in life something sacred. After all that is what all religions are supposedly concerned with: to find out if there is something totally sacred, uncorrupted by thought, by our sentiment, by our human vanities and all the rest of it. And to come upon that, or to enquire very deeply into that, which a very serious person must enquire, because without the basis of a religious life no political action, however cunning, however worthwhile, has any meaning, because they ultimately lead to war, to confusion, to man's agony. So it becomes very important if one is very, very serious, and I hope some of you are, to find out through very careful investigation, not through romanticism, not through imagination, not through some theory, but actually come upon this, and therefore it behoves us that we do seriously enquire whether there is something original, uncontaminated, not touched by culture, civilization. And to enquire into that one must go into this question of what is consciousness.

Are we aware of our total content of ourselves, of our consciousness? Our consciousness is what we are, what we think, what we feel, what we demand, our failures, miseries, confusion and all the rest of it is part of that consciousness. I hope this is clear. Because please bear in mind again, if I may repeat it, that we are using words in order to communicate. Communication implies thinking together. Thinking together to find out the limitations of thinking, thinking together to find out the illusions that we have cultivated, thinking together so that we share, not verbally, not theoretically, ideationally, but actually share. When you share something with another, the other is responsible, totally responsible with regard to what he shares, not with regard to what he thinks, or

believes, that he already knows. But sharing implies a commitment, a sense of gathering together our energies to participate in that which is going on. That demands on your part, if I may point out, a certain quality of attention, a certain quality of urgency, and intensity, because otherwise you can't share. If you are not meeting the speaker at the same level, with the same intensity, then there is no possible communication. That is an obvious fact. If I want to tell you something you must listen, or if you want to tell me something I must pay complete attention, otherwise there is no communication.

But there is a further form of communication, which is communion, which is to go beyond the word. To see the meaning instantly, the truth of it, or the falseness of it, or see the falseness as false, and truth as truth. That demands that you must give attention, care, affection, give your whole sensory attention. Then only can we share, something together, then it becomes great fun, then it becomes worthwhile, because we are concerned with our life, with our daily living, and not with some abstraction, not with some ideals and so on. We are actually dealing with daily activity, because unless you lay a right action in life - have right action in life, meditation, the search to truth, if there is something utterly sacred, cannot possibly come about. That is what we are doing.

We are asking if there is something that is beyond the measure of man, beyond the structure of thought, beyond time. And to find that out, as we said, it is very important to observe what is taking place in us: how we think, what we feel, our anxieties, our depressions, our jealousies, hatreds, sorrows, all that. Because as we pointed out previously each human being, wherever he lives,

whatever his circumstances, whatever his environment, pleasant or unpleasant, he is the total summation of all humanity, because he is in sorrow like the other, he is as confused, as miserable, anxious, frightened. So you are the world, and the world is you. That must be an absolute truth to each one, not just an idea to be investigated. Because you can see this as a fact when you travel around and see human beings under various circumstances, lack of food, lack of proper environment and all the rest of it, those human beings are still suffering, tearful, anxious, uncertain - oh, you don't know what miseries they go through, just like every other human being right through the world. So this is a common fact, basically.

And we are concerned with the transformation of that factor, transformation of the whole psyche, the whole psychological structure of a human being - that is what we are concerned with. Not with the environment, with the social structure. When there is complete transformation within the human being then the social structure, the religions, everything is transformed. So this is of the highest importance, not merely the social goodness. So we are asking whether it is possible to transform the total structure and the nature of our consciousness?

So what is this consciousness? When are you conscious of yourself? That is the beginning of consciousness - you understand? We are not conscious of ourselves if there is no problem - right? If there is no conflict, if there is no anxiety, uncertainty, when there is no battle between you and me. Then we are not conscious of ourselves at all, which is a very, very simple fact. We are only conscious of ourselves when there is a problem, whether it is a sexual problem, an ideological problem, or a problem in

relationship, a problem with another, with the community, and so on and so on. So there is only a consciousness that comes into being, as we know it, when there is an issue, when you are in conflict of some kind, both biological as well as psychological. Otherwise you are not. This is very important to understand. Though it sounds very simple, it is a very complex thing. A human being is only conscious when he has some kind of issue, problem, a certain quality of fear and so on. When there are none of those things he is not conscious of himself. So consciousness is self-centred. I wonder if you get all this? (May I take a breather?)

So consciousness, with which we are concerned, which is to transform what it is into something totally different, which is when there is no problem. You understand? Both biological as well as psychological. And is that possible? That is our enquiry for this morning.

This is a great thing to discover for oneself, that there is a totally different kind of consciousness - perhaps we won't even use that word consciousness - a different dimension which exists naturally, it comes into being when we, with our consciousness become self aware. Now we are asking whether that self awareness, with all its self-centred activity, can be resolved totally completely? So we are going to investigate together, examine the nature and the structure of our consciousness. You understand? (Why am I struggling so much for you?)

So first: what is our consciousness? What is the meaning of that word consciousness, according to the dictionary, not what you think, what you would like to give to it, but the common usage of that word to be found in a good dictionary? It says "to be conscious

of, to be aware of, to understand, to grasp, to see the significance, to have an intelligent perception" and so on and so on. That is, to be aware of what is happening. Not after it is over, or what will happen; to be conscious implies an active present observation. You understand? All right sirs? Good. That is, to be conscious of what actually is going on. That is the meaning of that word: I am conscious that you are sitting there. Not "I have been conscious" or "I will be conscious". You understand what this implies? When you are actually conscious what is going on there is no time. There is time only when I have been conscious, or I will be conscious. That is: where there is an action taking place there is no time - right? Only when that action is controlled by the past, or shaped according to the future, then time comes into being - right? You see this? So to be conscious implies what is actually going on. Therefore there is a freedom from the past and the future. By golly, I am getting it. Right? This is fun! We are investigating.

So: you as a human being, representing the total human entity, are you actually aware now of that consciousness? Or do you say, "I will think about it"? "I will investigate into it", "I will examine it" - you follow? All that implies you are not actually being conscious. So awareness means to be actually conscious, to be aware actually of what is going on. Not how to be aware, or the practice of awareness, or that you will achieve awareness. I wonder if you see this? So that is clear: that we are observing actually our consciousness, what exactly it is. That is a very difficult thing to do because we are used to the idea that I will be conscious, or I will become aware, I will examine to find out the content. We are saying quite the opposite. Because when you say, "I will examine"



there is a time interval between the actual examination and the determination to examine. There is a time lag - you follow all this? In that time lag all kinds of other activities go on which interfere with your examination. Have you got it sirs? Got it? Good, at least somebody gets it.

So we are actually examining, looking at our consciousness, the content of it - because the content makes up consciousness. You understand? Without the content there is a totally different thing. The content is our consciousness. Right? That must be very clear. The content makes up our consciousness. When you are angry, that's your consciousness. When you are jealous, petty, narrow, all the rest of it, that makes the total content. So we are looking at the consciousness of a human being, which is yourself, actually as it is. Right? Now I said it becomes difficult because to observe for most people implies observation through the knowledge which you have acquired - right? Is that clear? I observe you because I know you. That is, I have met you yesterday, and I have talked to you so there is a memory, and that memory observes you. Right? That is, there is the observer, who is the past, observing the actual, which is the present. Right? Do you see this? Am I making it terribly difficult? No? Good.

I want to see myself. I want to be aware of my consciousness, what it is doing, what its activities are, what it demands, pursues, and all the rest of it. Now how do I observe that consciousness? How do you observe it? You observe it from what you have learnt about it - right? Either from some philosopher, analyst, or you have examined yourself and have stored it up as a memory and with that memory you are examining, you are looking. So the observer who

is observing the consciousness is the past - right? So with the past he is observing the present, the fact. So he twists or adulterates the present. That is obvious. If you have insulted me and you have hurt me and I remember that hurt, then I look at you with that hurt. The observer is the hurt. So when we observe consciousness, as we are doing now, the actual consciousness, your observation is from the background of a conclusion right? So there is a division between the observer and the actual fact which is. Hence there is a conflict between the observer and the thing which is. Got it? Are we together somewhat in this?

So when you have a gap between the observer and the observed, then there is a time interval and during that time interval other factors enter, conflict arises and so on. Therefore it is imperative to remove this gap, otherwise you cannot observe actually the present - you get it? You see the logic of it at least.

So is that possible? That is, the observer who is the past, the past being knowledge, his experience, his hurts, his demands, his ideologies, his memories, and the actual fact, which is the present consciousness in which may be included the past and the future. So actually is it possible to observe without the interval, the gap? You understand my question? That is, it is necessary that one looks at the present, this present consciousness, with its activity, without the past. That means the observer is the observed. I wonder if you see that? Because the observer when he is different from the observed, then there is an interval of conflict.

Now I will make it much simpler. Is anger different from you who are angry? Do you understand my question? The man who is envious - is envy different from the man who says "I am envious"?

Or the observer and the observed are the same - right? While you think about it I will take a rest, while you look at it for yourself. When you hate somebody, when you are angry, envious, is that feeling different from you? Or you are that feeling? If there is not that feeling, you are not. Just see the simplicity of it. Do you understand?

So to observe the present, which is the content of consciousness, one must come to this realization that the observer is the observed. The observed is not different from the observer. This is really most important to find out. Because when you understand this deeply then meditation, into which we will go, becomes something entirely different. I can't tell you the importance of understanding this: that the feeling is not separate from you, you are that feeling. The observer though he may think he is different from the observed, he is still the observed. That is the observer - I will go slowly - the observer is the past - right? The observer, which is the result of thought, thought being experience, knowledge, stored up as memory in the brain, all that storehouse of memory is the past. And with that past there is observation. Thought says, "I am different from the observed". So thought breeds this division because the past is security, the past is certainty, the past is vital to thought, so it must keep itself separate from the observed. But when you examine it you will see that the observer is the observed. I can't go much more into it unless you drink it in, absorb it, put your teeth into it.

So: now you are observing without the observer your consciousness. That is you don't look at it with like and dislike, saying "This is right", "This is wrong", "This should be", "This is

good", "This is bad" - which is all the past, your past being your conditioning, the background. But when you realize that you cannot look at what actually is with the eyes of the past then the very demand to look removes the past; not the effort made to remove the past, but the very demand to see the present frees the observer from the past, therefore there is only the observed. Right? See this, please. Right, can we go on from there?

So now we are observing without any judgement - right? Judgement is the past. So you are looking at this whole consciousness of the human being without judgement, without comparison, without any form of distortion; any form of distortion takes place when you judge, when you compare, when you say, "This is right", "This is wrong", "This should be", "This should not be". So the mind is free now of all distortion. And the distortion takes place when the movement of time, as past, comes into being. You understand the point?

So now we are observing the content of consciousness without any attitude, without any prejudice, just to observe. Now what is the content of consciousness? There are three obvious principles in that field, which is sorrow, pleasure, fear, with all the ramifications, with all the complications of each one. We are looking at it, not saying what to do about it. If you say, "What am I to do?" then you are looking with the eyes of the past. So you are observing without any sense of effort, therefore when there is no effort there is tremendous attention. You understand? Come on sirs.

We said the content of consciousness is consciousness. And the content of these three principal activities of human beings - fear,

pleasure, sorrow. We went into the question of fear the other day - I won't go into it now because there is lots more further to be said. We said the word is not the thing. The word fear is not the feeling. Does the word awaken the feeling of fear? Or does the feeling exist without the word? If the feeling exists without the word then it is sensation, like any other sensation. And when you observe that particular sensation with all your senses that which you call fear no longer exists. This is very important to understand, which we went into the other day.

(Why am I working for you so hard? Eh? C'est mon metier! No it is not, so let's get on with it.)

So we look now at the content to observe pleasure. Not that it should not exist, or that it should exist. What would you do without pleasure, what would you not do without pleasure. Just to observe. That very observation brings its own peculiar discipline. You understand? The word 'discipline' means to learn, not what we have made it into, which is to conform, suppress, identify and drill oneself into a particular pattern. That is generally what is understood by the word 'discipline'. The root meaning of that word discipline means to learn, discipline - it comes from that, disciple, learn from the master - here there is no master, we are learning. So to observe without the observer brings its own order. You understand? Order means discipline. So we are observing this thing called pleasure. So we are asking: why man, throughout the world, at what ever level of society, class he may be, this is one thing he is pursuing, in the name of god, in the name of religion, in the name of politics, pleasure; with which goes power, position, prestige and all the rest of it - why? You understand? Why are you, as a human

being, representing the world, which you are, why are you pursuing pleasure? Observe it, not whether it is right or wrong. Why is there this demand? You understand? When you go to church, when you go to a temple, it is another form of pleasure; sexual pleasure; the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of denial; the pleasure of austerity; the pleasure of abundance; the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of detachment; the pleasure of achievement; the pleasure of renunciation; the pleasure of completely controlling your body. This immense structure of pleasure is one of the factors of our consciousness, perhaps it may be one of the major factors. So why? You understand? You can't answer, not a verbal answer. Observing this fact of pleasure, why we are asking, man has pursued it upon millions of years, which is you?

Knowledge is a great factor of pleasure, the pleasure of having read a great many books, all the information, able to talk about it, inform people - you follow? - the whole pleasure of knowledge. Why? Observe it please in yourself. Why you, as a human being, pursue this pleasure? And what is pleasure? There are different kinds of pleasure: the pleasure of sensation, biological, organic sensation; there are the psychological pleasures? And the pleasure of thinking very clearly. And what is this pleasure? Is joy, that thing which comes uninvited, is that joy pleasure? You are wandering by yourself, if you ever do, in a wood, or you walk along and suddenly without any invitation, without seeking it there is that peculiar sense of ecstasy, joy. That is wholly different from pleasure. But thought recognizes that joy as an extraordinary state, then remembers that state - please follow this - remembers that

state and wants more of it. So pleasure is the movement of thought. I wonder if you see it?

I have had a pleasure of a good meal and I remember it, and I say to myself, "I must have it tomorrow". The pleasure of domination, pleasure of having power over others. All that is the movement of thought over an incident which has happened and stored up as memory. And the movement of that is pleasure. So joy is entirely different from pleasure. The moment you remember that joy then it becomes pleasure.

And enjoyment: when you see a mountain, listen to the running waters, or see a green field and the lonely tree in a field, there is delight, there is a sense of fulness, appreciation of this vastness of this marvellous earth. Again that feeling of enjoyment is taken over by thought and pursued. Therefore that becomes pleasure. Is this clear?

So pleasure is the movement of thought in time, and we are conditioned to that. We seek enlightenment, a religious life, basically because it will give ultimate pleasure. Right? So pleasure is one of our basic principles in life, which is the pursuit of it. Not seeing the immense importance of seeing something extraordinary and not storing it. You understand? I wonder. This is, please if I may point out to you again, this is very important because the brain is recording all the time, recording every incident, every happening, every experience, every - you follow? - it is like a computer, storing, storing, storing. Because in that storage there is great security. If there is no storing up you are lost. So the brain needs security to function safely, intelligently, actively, efficiently. And so the brain stores up, as it stores up to act skilfully in the

mechanical world, so it stores up memory, knowledge, as a means of its own security, which is obvious.

Now as long as that is operating there is nothing new - right? As long as the brain is operating, functioning, using its knowledge in skills, it is limited, it becomes mechanical. In that there is no basic freedom. So we are saying: is it possible to see something lovely, look at it, give your complete attention to it and not record it? The moment you record it, it becomes the pursuit of pleasure. You understand? So is that possible? You have a most pleasurable happening, extraordinary pleasurable; to observe it and to be so completely attentive that the brain doesn't record. Then that incident is over and not carried over. So it is important to find out because it is part of meditation. This is real meditation, because to find out if there is in the area of the brain, or in the mind, in the universe, in the global existence, a state, a dimension in which thought has never entered, therefore culture, civilization has never touched it. To find that out, and that is real meditation, that is the real religious life, one must find out why this recording process goes on all the time. Do you understand? If the process goes on all the time then the brain becomes mechanical. Our brains are mechanical - part of them. Is there another part of the brain which is not mechanical? To find that out, registration must come to an end - you follow? See the sequence of it for yourself. Not because I am capable of a good argument or anything of that kind, but see it for yourself how important it is to find out if there is an area where thought, with its mechanistic activity has never entered. And you can only find that out if the registration process comes to an end. That is, can the brain observe, be fully completely attentive, with



all the senses, to that particular happening, to that particular incident, be fully aware? And when it is so completely aware there is no recording. You can do it for yourself. You can see it. If you can look at something, it doesn't matter what it is, with all your senses, not intellectually, not visually, not merely hearing but with every nerve, with every sense fully awakened, to observe that incident, however pleasurable, however painful, then you will see there is no record. Don't agree with me. Don't say, "Yes, that is marvellous" - do it. That means you have to find out what it means to be aware. What is implied in that word. Is it something that can be practised? "I shall become gradually aware, I am not now but I will be the day after tomorrow." Or go to classes to learn how to be aware. Oh that is all so silly, cut it out.

So: you are only aware now or never. You understand? Either you are - you can't cultivate it, then what you cultivate is the desire to achieve something. And when there is the desire to achieve something then you have lost totally the beauty, the perfume of awareness. Do you understand?

So what is it to be aware? When you sit there, are you aware of your surroundings? The man or woman next to you, just to be aware without any judgement, evaluation, choice. Just watch it. Aware of the tent, aware of the colours round you, the faces, and is it possible to observe without any choice? To look. Because the moment you choose, the past with all its demands, with its illusions, with its distortions, comes. So to be aware implies not only to be aware of all your environment, circumstances, the colours of nature, you know, aware of everything around you, just to observe for a second or two, then move from that awareness, in

which there is no choice, to see with all your senses. Can you look at something completely? And it can only be done now, not as a result.

Then from there you can go into the question of attention. Where there is attention there is no centre. Have you noticed it? When you are completely attentive, say for instance, you are listening to me, fortunately or unfortunately, you are listening to me, to the speaker. And the speaker says to you, what it means to be attentive. He says, where there is complete attention, which is the understanding of awareness in which there is no choice, the observation of something with all your senses, then moving to attention. And when there is that tremendous attention, really effortless attention, then you see there is no centre as the 'me' who is the observer. Now you listen to that. Are you giving your total attention to it? Or do you say, "There is that train going by, that blasted train I wish it wouldn't"? And so on and so on.

So is it possible for a human being to give that total attention, the movement of awareness, senses, and attention - one movement. It is not I learn first awareness, then senses, it is one unitary movement. With that attention, complete attention, observe an incident, a happening. Because there is no centre there is no registration. You understand? You have got it?

Have we met this somewhat? The centre is the 'me', the ego, the I. That is put together by thought; put together by thought as name, form and all the attributes it has collected around itself. That is the centre, the 'me'. Now when that centre is operating it is operating in the field of registration, it is always registering - I am hurt, I am not hurt, how good I am, how bad - you follow? - what a marvellous

morning that was, etc. etc. etc. So where there is a centre there must be registration. Where there is complete attention, and therefore no centre, there is no registration. This is a fact.

So can you observe the content of consciousness - the content - observe that with all your attention, which is your fear, and the immense pursuit of pleasure? That is, organized religions, religions of belief, religions of propaganda, whether it be two thousand years or ten thousand years, have always said, "Destroy pleasure. Deny pleasure, because you can't serve god if you have pleasure". So they have destroyed it and become distorted. What we are saying is something entirely different: which is to observe that pleasure, and the pursuit of pleasure with all the capacity of attention. Then in that state there is no registration. Then you will find out that there is a quality of mind where no registration takes place at all.

Incidents on the peripheral existence of life goes on, noise, buying a ticket to go to some place, meeting, talking here, it is all peripheral action as far as the speaker is concerned. But there is a place where there is absolutely no registration. Now that is part of meditation, which we will discuss another time. And also we will have to discuss in the next three meetings, gatherings - sorrow, love, death and meditation. They are all implied when we began at the beginning of the talks, the implications in those talks were meditation. It is not at the end you will learn how to meditate. It is a total thing. Right.

## **SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1976.**

We were talking over together the problem of consciousness. As we said, it is a very complex question. The content of consciousness is the whole nature and structure of consciousness. That is what we were saying the other day. One is only aware of that consciousness of oneself when one has any kind of problem, strife, contradiction, anger, jealousy and so on, it is only then that one becomes completely conscious of oneself. Otherwise there is no consciousness of the 'me' - which we talked about sufficiently that last time that we met here.

And I think it is important this morning to talk over together the question of suffering, and the word 'love', which has been so misused, and what is the real significance, or meaning of that word. And to go into these questions rather deeply, one has to begin with what we call relationship, human relationship. Otherwise love becomes an abstraction, without much meaning and remains something printed in a book, or talked about in a church or a temple, and completely forgotten.

So we should begin, I think if I may point out, that relationship is the whole structure of society to put it very, very simply; it is a very complex problem this question of relationship. But to enquire into that question one must begin very near. That is: very near, our human relationship with each other. And then discover from there what is right relationship - if there is such a thing - and move from there to the question of what is the nature of love. And whether love can exist as long as human beings suffer? And if there is an end to suffering, specially psychologically? So we are going to go

into this very complex problem.

As we said, we must begin very near to find out actually what our relationship is with each other, because on that our whole social, moral, ethical structure is based. That is society, society which we have built, a society which is utterly at present immoral, degraded, destructive. And if we would change the social structure it must begin from within, not merely change from outside. I think that is fairly obvious as one observes more and more the attempts made by Communists and other reformers; they think that by altering, reshaping the social environmental structure human beings will radically change. And when one examines the various experiments made in India, in ancient times, in China and in recent times, basically human beings don't change even though the environment changes. And it is very important, it seems to me, that we should understand the relationship of ourselves in our relationship to society, and whether in transforming the human mind, human consciousness basically, whether a new social order can come into being? That is one of our problems, because social order must change inevitably. There must be radical transformation of it - the Terrorists, the Revolutionaries, and the Idealists, some of them at least, think by changing the environment, throwing bombs and all the rest of the physical revolution, it will somehow transform the nature and the structure of human consciousness. And we think that the radical transformation of society can only take place when there is a radical transformation in human consciousness. I think we have made that very clear from the beginning of these talks.

So we must find out what is our human relationship to society,

human relationship with each other, human relationship with the whole of humanity, a global relationship. So what is actually, in our daily life, our relationship to each other, and what is it based on? As we said, the word is not the thing, the description is not the described. What we are doing now is a verbal description but if we are caught in the description and don't go to the described, the fact, then we will merely skim on the surface and will lose all its meaning. So one must be aware, conscious, or whatever word one may use, not to be caught in words, not to be caught in descriptions, conclusions, but rather look, observe what actually is our relationship in daily life, and whether that relationship can be transformed into something other than 'what is'? That is our question: to transform 'what is' one must be concerned and observe completely 'what is', and not imagine 'what should be'. Right?

What is our relationship based on? Is it on knowledge? Is it on experience? Is it on various forms of intellectual, emotional, sentimental conclusions? Please, as we are saying, observe, if you do not mind, your own actual relationship with another - actual, not what you think it ought to be, not an ideal relationship, but factual, daily, everyday relationship, because that is what we live with, and if we understand that then we can go much further. But without deeply delving into that, merely to imagine, or have a fanciful relationship has no meaning, because we are dealing with facts and not with ideational abstractions, because that will lead nowhere. So what is our relationship actually?

Relationship - the meaning of that word - means, does it not, to respond. To respond completely to another - the meaning of the word, not what we have made of that word, the root meaning of

that word is to respond, like responsibility. And do we ever respond totally with each other? Or it is always a fragmentary response, a partial response? If it is a partial, fragmentary response, why is it? You understand my questions? I hope we are communicating with each other because this is really very important. Like everything else that we have talked about, human relationship is one of the most radical, basic, essential things that we have to find out, because from that we may find out for ourselves what love is, really what love is - not what we have made of it. So it is really most important for each one of us to find out what actually our relationships are, and whether they can be transformed, and is it possible to transform them radically?

Is not our relationship based on memory, memory piled up through various, emotional, irrational, sexual responses? That is, there is desire, plus thought, and thought creates the image - right? Desire, that is sensation, plus thought and thought creates the image of myself and of you. So there are two images: myself and that which I have made out of you - right? Go into with me please, this is your life and for heaven's sake give some thought to this thing, because we are destroying each other, we are destroying the earth, the air, everything we touch we have destroyed. And I do not think we feel utterly responsible for all this. So please give your attention, which means your care, your affection, to find out what actually our relationships are.

We said our relationship is sensation plus thought, which is desire, and the image which thought has shaped according to that desire. So I have an image about myself, various images - the business image, the intellectual image, the emotional image and

various images which I have built in myself, which society has helped me to build, education has helped me to build, I have an image. And my relationship with you is another image which I am making from you - right? That is an absolute fact. Right? The image or the picture, or the form is you, and I am related to you through that picture - right? I am attached to that picture, as you are my wife, my friend, my girl or boy, or whatever, I am attached to the image which I have made about you and I am holding to that image. And that image is projected through the various incidents in our contact with each other - right? Please. And you have an image about yourself, various images, and you add me to another image. So your image and my image of you are related - right? Go into this, please go into this. Look at yourself. You may have been married for five, or ten years, you have a girl or a boy, and slowly the images are built, consciously or unconsciously - generally unconsciously. So the image has taken root through nagging, through domination, through assertions, insults, possessiveness, attachments - you follow? - all those incidents have built this image in me of you. And you do the same about me. This we call relationship, and this we call love. I love you - which is, I love the image which I have built of you. It sounds rather cynical, but it is not, but this is actual fact.

So why does the brain build such images? Do you understand my question? I have built one about you, and you have built one about me. I am asking, this is a fact and I am asking: why does the brain do this? Which is, thought. Why does thought create this division between you and me through the image? Is that clear? Let's get going. Why?



As we said, the brain needs security - right? From childhood, children need security, they must be protected. We don't protect them, but that doesn't matter. We destroy them. That is another issue. So the brain needs complete security. It may find security in an illusion, god, fanciful images, all kinds of things and therefore neurotic. Or it may find security in the image which it has built as knowledge. You are following this? So the brain has made this image through thought, this image to be completely secure. I know my wife - you follow? - I know her. A positive assertion. That is, the image which I have built about her gives me that feeling that I completely have her, she is mine. And the other way round, and so on and so on. So the images are built through the desire to be completely secure. That is one of the factors.

And having an image is very convenient, because you don't then have to look at her, or him, you don't have to bother. You feel utterly responsible to that image, not to the human being. Watch yourself, please. And having an image, you having an image of each other, you live in your daily life at a very superficial level. The superficial level being sexual, and one goes off to the office, comes back - you know this very superficial life that one lives. That is one of the reasons why the images become tremendously important.

Now when one becomes aware of this process - the image maker and the image - when one becomes conscious of this, then one asks: can the image making stop? You understand my question because this is very important? Please look at yourself, look at your relationship. You have an image and I have an image, and our relationships are based on that.

And the next question is: we said why does it do it, we find some reason for doing it. And the other question is: is it possible not to make an image at all? If that can be prevented then our relationship becomes tremendously significant - you understand? Are we meeting each other? We are asking: is it possible not to build the image? The image maker is thought, obviously. Right? Thought as time, the remembrance of many incidents of yesterday, which is time, and through time the image has been formed, day after day, day after day. And thought has built the image through desire, sensation and so on. Now we are asking whether this whole momentum can stop, which is the traditional momentum?

We are slaves to tradition. We may think we are modern, very free, but deep down we are very traditional, which you can see when we accept this image making and establish our relationship with each other on those images, it is as ancient as the hills. That is one of our traditions, we accept it, live with it, torture each other with it. So can that tradition come to an end? That is - we go back to what we were saying yesterday and the other days - when an incident within our relationship takes place, a happening, not to register it at all? Have you understood? All right, it's not clear.

In our daily relationship you say something in anger, in irritation, and the brain registers it and adds to the image that it has already built about you, and that insult, that irritation, that anger, that something which you said that you want to hurt me, hurt the image, can that stop? You understand my question? It can stop only when you understand the whole process of registration. The brain registers everything. It is now registering what I am saying. And when an incident takes place it is registered. Now we are

saying can that registration stop? You understand this question? I insult you in our relationship, and immediately reaction takes place, which is the registration. Now can that end, because otherwise our love is merely emotional, sentimental, sexual and rather superficial? It is only a mind that is not hurt that is capable of loving, isn't it? You see the meaning of it? Come on, please. So you hurt me, which is you hurt my image which I have built about myself. And can that insult not be registered at all so that my brain is not hurt. And then I will know the full meaning and the beauty of something which I feel exists but I now realize. So I am going to find out whether it is possible to stop that hurt being registered at all.

It is possible only when the image is not - right? Is that clear? When I have no image about you and you have no image about me, it is only then whatever you say leaves no mark - which doesn't mean I am isolated, or I have no affection, but the registration of hurts, insults, all those movements of thought, have come to an end. Which is, at the moment of insult to be completely, with all your senses attentive. You understand what I am saying? Am I talking to myself? Or are you all with me? Because you see our brains are hurt, various shocks, incidents, a sense of tremendous damage is being done to our brain. It wants security, therefore it finds security in abnormal and normal things, like a nation - the worship of a nation is abnormal, a tribal instinct, but it finds security there - and so on and so on and so on. The very desire to be secure is destroying itself - you understand? I am secure with my family. With my family there is a battle going on all the time between me and you, with my children - you follow? - constant

conflict, agony, despair, annoyance - you know all that is going on day after day, day after day. That is a great shock to the brain. And so we are saying: as long as there is an image maker there must be hurts, there must be registration. It is only when the image maker is not then no registration takes place. Which means there is no me who is the image which gets hurt. You understand? There is no me - me is the image which I have about myself, an extraordinary human being capable, or "I am going to be successful" - you know, the things that thought has built around itself as the me, which is the deep conscious or unconscious image that it has built.

Now we are saying: in our relationship the image making becomes an extraordinary everyday activity and therefore there is actually no relationship. Relationship can only take place when there is no image - you understand what I am saying? Have you got something of this? Not verbally, for god's sake not verbally, actually in your blood. Then it brings a truth into our relationship.

So: then what is our relationship if there is no image between you and me - you understand? - then what is our relationship? Come on sirs, investigate it. I have no image about you - which is the most important thing - you understand? I actually have no image about you. Then what is my relationship to you? Have you an image about me, in our relationship? If you have what is our relationship? You have no image, and I have an image - then what takes place between us? I am in battle, because I have an image about myself and therefore I am in battle with you who have no image, therefore you are not in battle with me. You understand?

So can you in our relationship bring about in me a state of mind in which the image making has ended? You understand? That's

your responsibility to me. Come on sirs. You have no image, and I have an image about you. What then is our relationship? You have the responsibility in our relationship to see that I don't make images about you. That is your responsibility - you understand? Then you are watching, you are alert, you are fully alive, and I am half asleep all my life. So it is your responsibility to see that I have no image. So two people having no image - if it ever takes place, which is a most miraculous thing, greater than any miracle in the world, if that takes place then there is a totally different kind of communion with each other. Which means never quarrelling - you understand sirs? Never possessive, never domination, shaping each other by words, threats, innuendos. Then we have a relationship of the most extraordinary kind. I know it can take place. It has been done, we have done it. It is not just a lot of words.

So we are saying: when there is no image then there is love. So we have to find out what that love is actually. What is it that we call love now in our life? When you say you love somebody, what does it mean? Is it sexual love, a biological affair, and the memory of it, the demand for it, the pursuit of it? And that apparently plays an extraordinary significance in our life. Blown up in every magazine, in every cinema, and all the rest of it. Is it sexual love? Is it love when there is jealousy? You understand? Is there love when - please listen - when I go off to the office or factory, or become a secretary, or whatever I do, and you do something else also because you want to fulfil yourself - the wife wants to fulfil herself, and the husband wants to fulfil himself, and the children want to fulfil themselves, where are we? You understand? So all this is called love, responsibility. So to find out what love is there

must be no fragmentation. No fragmentation in my work and the implications in that work, and there is no division between my work and my family, my wife, my girl - you understand what I am saying? It is not broken up. I go to the office, there I am very ambitious, greedy and envious, desiring success, you know, pushing, pushing driving, competitive, and then come home and say, "Oh, darling I love you". It becomes all so cheap. And that is our tradition.

So we are asking: is it possible to live a life that is totally harmonious, whole, so that when I go to the office I am still whole there, not something different from my family? You understand? Is that possible? Not say it is an idea, it is a Utopia, it is this - one has to make it possible, one has to work at this thing, put your teeth into it to find out, because we are destroying ourselves.

So we are saying love comes into being only when there is total harmony in oneself, in whatever action one is doing, and so there is no conflict between the outer and the inner. You understand? To find out how to live that way. How to live a life that is not contradictory, that is not broken up, that is not convenient, comfortable - you follow? - that is total, whole, harmonious. To find that out one must go into the question of sorrow. They are all related, you understand? Relationship, love and sorrow. They are all interrelated.

Man has lived with this thing called sorrow: from the ancient of days man has carried this burden. And we are still carrying that burden, we are very sophisticated, highly technical and so on, but inwardly there is this grief, this ache, this loneliness, this sense of isolation, this sense of the great burden of sorrow, not only the

sorrow of one's own little life, but the sorrow of humanity - you understand? We are meeting each other? The sorrow of humanity, sirs. They are suffering in India, in Asia, in the Arab world, in the Jewish world, in Russia, human beings are suffering, there is a global suffering. And our little selves are also suffering. So we are asking: is it possible to end that suffering? If there is no end to suffering then there is no compassion, then there is no love, then there is no relationship. This is what is actually happening in our society: no relationship, no love, no compassion, no ending of sorrow, therefore we are making a hideous mess of our lives - you understand?

So we are asking: is there an end to sorrow? Do you understand? This is a question which every human being has asked, when he is at all serious, when he has looked at his own sorrow and the sorrow of another. He asks this question: "Can it ever end? Or is it an everlasting misery of man?" We are going to find out, not in abstraction, not as a theory, but actually to find out if you, as a human being who represents the world, and the world is you, whether you can end that sorrow. We are going to find out.

This is a very serious matter, like everything else in life, and very complex; to find out what love is one has to shed every tradition, every sense of emotion, sentiment, all the things that one has built round oneself, to put away all that, then to come upon something that is whole, total, harmonious. One has to work, look, observe. So we are going to do the same with sorrow.

There is a biological pain, a physical pain. And that pain is registered in the mind, in the brain. And there is the fear that it might happen again tomorrow. And that brings sorrow also. There

is loneliness, deep isolation, unrelated to everything in life, and the sense of complete withdrawal, complete sense of nothing to which the mind can be related. And that is a tremendous sorrow. I do not know if you have not known this. Most human beings do. Then there is the sorrow of death, the person you have lost and you left behind. The loneliness, the sudden cessation of that person whom you thought you loved, cared for, companionship, in whom perhaps you may have invested all your immortality, all that. There is sorrow there too. And there is the sorrow of all the people in the world who have been killed, so-called wars, wars of religions, wars of nationality, wars of security, killing millions and millions for your own particular nation, for your own particular security. There is all that immense untold sorrow. You understand all this? And we are responsible for all this - not the Americans in Vietnam, or the Arabs in Beirut, human beings are responsible for this, because their primary demand is: please give me security. And the security takes the form of nationality, the form of religious beliefs which goes very deeply and they hold on to that, that is their security, for which you are willing to kill and destroy. All that has brought about thousands of years of sorrow - right? We are describing this, so please don't get emotional about it because this is what we have to face and to understand.

So there is this sorrow of man. Can it end? If it doesn't end we are chained everlastingly to this misery. The suffering may be conscious or unconscious. So we have to look at the unconscious, the deep down, the hidden, as well as the conscious. So we have to go back into the question of what is consciousness.

The western world through Freud and others have divided



consciousness into the unconscious and the conscious. The unconscious is the racial, communal, heredity, tradition, memories, all that, motive. And the conscious is the highly sophisticated, educated, technical mind. So there is a division between the conscious and the unconscious - right? That is your tradition again. It may not be at all that way. What has divided it? Thought - right? Unless we understand the deep meaning of the movement of thought every movement it makes must be divisive - right? So in the deep layers of one's consciousness is there sorrow? Is there sorrow of thousands of years of human suffering, stored up, brought from the past to the present in a human being, deep down in the very deep recesses of one's mind? We said that is part of the content of consciousness - you understand? Because the part makes the whole. So the part is consciousness. So there is in us the past suffering of man as well as the present suffering of man in consciousness. And can that thing end? If you see the importance that it must end, the importance, the essentiality of it, not accept it, not say, "Well it has been going on for a million years, what about it, a few more people suffering, a few people not suffering, what importance does it make?" It makes tremendous importance because when a human being transforms himself totally, radically, then he affects the whole of the consciousness of man. You understand? I'll show it to you.

Your consciousness is affected by all the things of the past, isn't it? By Hitler, by Stalin, by all the tyrannies, by all the brutalities, all that is the past. The content of that consciousness is the human consciousness. You are affected, as you are living in the western world, by Christianity - that Christianity is put together by priests,

saviours and all the rest of it - that is part of your consciousness.

So suffering is part of this consciousness, whether hidden or one is aware of it. Now we are saying can all that immense burden of loneliness, despair, isolation, withdrawal through various forms of hurts, building a resistance around oneself, all that, can that come to an end - not gradually, not over years, but end now? You understand my question? You understand what I am saying? We are used to and we have been trained, educated, it is our habit to say, "Well I will gradually do it." "It may take time but I will do it." Which is, I am suffering now, gradually I will end suffering. There is that vast gap between the ending and the beginning. And in that gap various other forms of incidents and accidents take place, therefore there is always postponement of that. You are following all this? Therefore one has to break down this tradition of eventuality, of eventually I will come to that.

So we are saying: sorrow, which is part of human conditioning, part of our consciousness, can that sorrow end? Not in some distant happy future, but now? The now is the most important - you understand? So to find out what that now is (I wonder if you are meeting this? Are we meeting each other?) - what is the now so that it ends? The now is the past meeting the present - right? The past meeting the present, and if the past meeting the present modifies itself and goes to the future, then there is no now. Have you understood this thing, this very simple thing? That is, the past, my memories, my anxieties, my hopes, my remembrances, pleasures, pains, all that is a movement with the present. That is, I meet you, there is the challenge of the present and it modifies itself and proceeds to the future - right? So time is a movement from the

past, through the present to the future. This is what we are accustomed to, this is part of our tradition. The Communists say, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, which is bit by bit, bit by bit. So the past meeting the present, modified proceeds further to the future. We are saying that the now is when the past meets the present and ends it. You understand? And it can only end when you know the whole structure of memory. You get it? Memory as experience, as knowledge, and the response of that knowledge, experience, memory, is thought. So when thought brings the past to the present and for thought to end it there and not proceed to tomorrow. I wonder if you capture all this. Some of you get this because it is very important for your life so that there is an ending all the time - you understand?

So: that is, when you are feeling lonely, isolated, which brings great sorrow, on the death of another, or losing a job and so on and so on, ten different sorrows that human beings have created for themselves, facing that loneliness, which is brought about by self-centred activity of daily life - you understand? - that loneliness is the synthesis, the essence of our daily self-centred activity - right? To face that loneliness and not give it a future - you understand what I am saying? That is, to look at it, to observe it completely, with all your senses, with complete attention, then you will see the past meets the present and ends it, so that there is no future to loneliness, it has ended. So in the same way sorrow, with which you are quite familiar, for most of us we have built various escapes from that thing: escapes through church, through reading books, you know, a dozen ways. The very escape from it only strengthens it, obviously. So to be aware of the escapes, which means giving it

time to flower, to be aware of the escapes and meet that suffering completely without any sense of distortion by thought, then there is an ending to suffering. Only when there is an ending to suffering there is compassion, because the word 'suffering' is related to compassion. Compassion means passion for all things - you understand? For all things. That means no killing. But Christians are used to killing. They have probably killed more people than anybody else. So no killing, which means to live on things that you have to kill like vegetables - you have to kill, you understand? - but not to kill animals. When there is this sense of compassion then you don't kill a thing, by word, by gesture, by an idea.

So what we are saying is: in the understanding of relationship love comes into being, and in the understanding of love we alter the structure of society, and there is an ending to sorrow. And it is only then there is compassion. You know compassion is the most extraordinary thing in life, because there is no 'me' who is compassionate, there is only that state of compassion which is not mine of yours.

Do you want to discuss anything? Ask questions?

Questioner: Are emotions rooted in thought?

K: Are emotions rooted in thought. What are emotions?

Emotions are sensations aren't they? You see a lovely car, or a beautiful house, a beautiful woman or man, and the sensory perception awakens the senses, doesn't it? Senses, then what takes place? Contact - right? Contact then desire. Now thought then comes in. Can you end - please listen to this - can you end there and not let thought come in and take over? I see a beautiful house, the right proportions, with a lovely lawn, nice garden, all the senses

are responding because there is great beauty. Well-kept, orderly, tidy, all the sensations respond. Why can't you stop there? You understand? Can you stop there and not let thought come in and say, 'I must...' and all the rest of it. Then you will see emotions, or sensations are natural, healthy, normal. But when thought takes over then all the mischief begins.

So to find out for oneself whether it is possible to look at something with all the senses and end there, and not proceed further. Do it. That requires, as we said, an extraordinary sense of awareness, in which there is no control - you understand? No control, therefore no conflict, just to totally observe that which is, and all the senses respond and end there. There is great beauty in that. For after all what is beauty? We won't discuss that now.

## **SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND JULY 1976.**

We have been talking over together many psychological problems, complex human relationships in which there is such conflict, pain, anxiety. We also talked about fear, not only in our daily life, but also the fear of tomorrow, which may be death. We also talked about the pursuit of pleasure and compassion which is so rare a thing in this world, and the ending of sorrow.

I think we might also talk over together this morning - and the weather is appropriate - about death. It is a very complex problem in which many things are involved. Unless one goes into it rather deeply, very wisely, with great insight into it, if you are merely seeking superficial comfort, a belief that will be most satisfactory, then I am afraid those who are expecting such things will be disappointed. But if you will kindly listen with some affection, care and enquire seriously then we can talk over, have a dialogue, about this very complex and perhaps the most important thing in life apart from living, which is death.

To understand it, not verbally, not intellectually, without any emotion, or sentimentality, because sentimentality, emotion, belief do not solve any of our problems. We have to approach it most objectively, rationally, without any fear, and therefore with sanity. And so perhaps if we can talk over together this question; the meaning of death, then perhaps some of us can penetrate into that which is so mysterious, frightening, and that brings about such great sorrow in human life.

First of all there are several things which we must understand before we go into the question of death. First is having an insight,

or having a deep understanding of the world and ourselves, the society and ourselves, the community and each one of us. The society, the world about us is not different from us. We have made this world what it is, with our fears, with our ambitions and greed and violence and destructive demands, we have built this society, this culture, both religious and non-religious. This is our way of living, our daily living that has produced this society, this culture. And so we are the world, and the world is us. That must be clearly understood from the beginning if you are to enquire very deeply into the question of death: that you as a human being, are not different from the humanity of the world. We have gone into this question, and if we may repeat it again, that wherever you go in the world you find human beings, apart from their environment, apart from whether they are rich or poor, whether they believe or not believe, all throughout the world human beings suffer, go through great anxieties psychologically, always in conflict in their relationships. There are fears of various kinds. So human beings right throughout the world have fears of various kinds. So human beings right throughout the world have a common factor apart from their culture, their superficial behaviour. So we are the world, and the world is us. The individual or personal tendency, character may depend on heredity, environment, and culture, but when you strip this off, move all that, below, deep down, in human beings there is this struggle, pain, anxiety, a great sense of frustration, misery, confusion. So there is a common factor in every human being. So basically, fundamentally we are the world, and the world is us. If you really grasp that, feel that, not merely intellectually argue about it, but deeply when you feel it our whole outlook changes

completely. So that is the first thing one must grasp fundamentally: that you are not different from another human being. You are the essence of all humanity. If you know how to read yourself then you read humanity. You understand? If I know how to look at myself, observe myself, then I am observing the total human being, which is you, me and another, however far away they are, or however close they be.

When that is clear then the next point is we must consider time. This is very important because we are slaves to time both chronologically as well as psychologically. There is chronologically tomorrow and many years ahead, chronologically. And psychologically is there time at all? We are questioning it, we are enquiring into it, we are having a dialogue together, so please share in this. Don't let me, let the speaker show you and then agree with it, or disagree with it. We are sharing it together. Time is also another great problem in life. Time chronologically exists. That is obvious. There is no question of argument about it. We are asking: is there psychological time at all? And if there is psychological time as we have it now, what is that time? Psychologically we have time, that is tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, a year hence. I will be something, which is the movement of time, from this to that. Right?

We are enquiring what that time is. When we say, "I will be that" psychologically, or "I won't be that", "I shall reach a state of perfection, a state of bliss" and all the rest of it - all that implies from this to that. To move from this to that demands time, both biologically, physically as well as psychologically. That is clear. I hope it is clear.



So what is this time to which we are so attached? That is, tomorrow is very important for us psychologically because I do not know how to transform 'what is', so therefore give me time to understand it and go beyond it - you follow? You understand this? I am angry as a human being, one is angry. And to get over that anger time is necessary. That is, give me tomorrow, or a week, and by then I will be able to be free of anger. So we think time is necessary to transform 'what is' into 'what should be'. Right? So we are enquiring what is that time, the movement from this to that? Please, are we meeting each other? At least some of us. Please. Don't encourage me, I don't want your encouragement. But we must understand each other.

So what is that time that human beings demand in bringing about a change from that which is to that which should be? What is that time? Is it a movement of ignorance? Please go slowly, we are enquiring. Ignorance. Is it the lack of capacity to meet 'what is' entirely, and not having the capacity, that energy we need time to capture that energy? You are following this? Is time the product of thought apart from chronological time? So don't mix the two together. We are talking entirely about psychological time, because chronological time is very easy to understand. If I want to catch a bus I must be there. We are talking about psychological time. Is time from 'what is' to 'what should be' the process of thought? Is time thought? Is time measure? You understand? Now go slowly into this, very carefully.

Time as measure has become very important technologically. To go from here to Mars you need time. And to bring about that technological knowledge and use that technological knowledge

skilfully, to put together this thing that can go to Mars, needs time; technologically you need time. Thought has put together technology, and thought is time - right? Thought is the movement of time. Thought is measurement - right? Are we meeting each other? Please don't agree with me, just look at it, not only verbally but actually. Human beings have ideals - I don't know why but they have ideals - ideals which have been projected by thought, noble ideals or whatever the ideals be. Why do human beings invent ideals? What is the cause of it? Is it because they do not understand, or go beyond their own anxiety, their own greed, sorrow, and therefore they project the opposite of 'what is' as the ideal and try to live according to that ideal? Therefore to live according to that ideal you need time. Are we following this? So being incapable of dealing with 'what is' we say we must have time to achieve and to change that which is. That is simple. I have explained that.

So time is a movement of thought as measure - right? The Greeks were responsible for this. I am not a Greek scholar, I don't read books and all the rest of it, psychological books or philosophical books. I read other books. They bore me in fact. None of the sacred books or any other books, so-called religious books, I have a horror of all that stuff. So the Greeks said in their thinking: measurement is absolutely necessary. Thought is measure and the whole western world is based on that, the whole technological world is based on measurement. That is simple. And measurement means time. Time implies thought - right? To move from here to there I need time. So why does a human being invent, or see the necessity of that which should be? You follow my

problem? Because he can't deal with this, with 'what is'. If he knew how to deal with 'what is' the future wouldn't exist. You capture it?

So man - or rather thought has invented time as a movement to achieve that which should be, the ideal. So we are saying: is there such time, psychological time? If a human being knows what to do with 'what is' tomorrow doesn't exist. You follow? So measurement implies comparison. Comparison between this and that, comparing that with this, and that is much more hopeful, much more pleasurable, much more inviting than this. So time has become an extraordinarily important thing to us. And the ending of time, the putting a stop to time is death, for most of us. This is rather important to understand, because we are talking over together a very complex problem which is called death. To really go into it very, very deeply one has to understand not only that you are the world and the world is you, but also you have to understand time. Death means the ending of time, as it is generally understood. Right? That is, you have lived a life for fifty, or thirty or ninety or a hundred years, or whatever it is, you have lived a life of struggle, conflict, misery, confusion, occasional joy - you know what human life is. All those fifty years, or sixty or thirty, is a movement of time - right - in which all these complexities have taken place. For most of us the ending of that complex life is death - right? - which is the ending of time. Are we meeting?

So to us time has become extraordinarily significant. To learn a language one needs time. To learn any skill one needs time. But we think also psychologically to change 'what is' needs time. It is the same movement as learning a language, we have transferred it to changing ourselves into something. And the ending of time, or time

must have a stop, means death. Right? We are coming back to it a little later.

And also we must understand, when something ends there must be a new beginning. Right? Because if there is a continuity there is no newness, freshness, no radical change. So ending is a new beginning, the ending is a new creation. The ending of a tradition is freedom to something else. So we human beings are frightened to end - the ending of what we know, what we have achieved, what our personal relationships are, our knowledge, all the things that we have accumulated. If that continues it is a mechanical movement - right? The ending of that is a new movement. Do you see this?

Look: a human being is attached to another, dependent on another. When there is attachment, is that love? In that attachment there is pain, there is suffering, there is fear, there is jealousy, there is a sense of losing and therefore feeling empty, loneliness, therefore the greater the attachment becomes. So when there is an ending to attachment there is something totally new. We are meeting each other?

So we are going to find out if there is not an ending only but is there no beginning and no ending? You understand? What is immortality? The ancient Egyptians sought immortality in stone. They said life is eternal. That is, life, which I live every day, will continue for ever and ever and ever. You see it in their tombs and all the rest of it. And they try to cheat death that way. They said life is eternal, which is, my life, with all my goods, with all my property, with all my power, with all the slaves that I have - the ancient Egyptians said that is all continuous. So they sought

immortality through the assertion that life continues as it is. Which is, they thought there is no beginning and no ending. We must find out if there is an ending - you understand? - ending to attachment and this and that, and when there is an ending is there no beginning and no ending? You understand? This is something new which I am discovering myself now. You understand? I am investigating together. So we have to find that out because we have sought immortality as the perpetuation of our own self: myself, my name, my form, my character, my desires, etc. etc. - we want that made immortal, that is beyond death. By Jove, this is very, very difficult to explain all this to you, verbally. We will go into it.

And so we are frightened of a name which is called death. So man says, "No, you won't die but life after life if you live properly, you will become more and more perfect, until you reach the highest principle, the Hindus call it Brahman, till then you must go through various lives, called reincarnations and other forms of continuity". So man has always sought immortality, something which death can never touch. That is, he is always frightened of an ending, an ending of himself. So one has to ask what is it that man hopes continues? You follow? The me, the ego, the person, to which he clings, and he is so frightened to lose that. So we are asking: what is that? The me, the I, the ego, all that, what is that? Has it any reality? Or is it put together by various social, environmental, ideological, verbal structures - you understand? When you say 'me' - what is that me, I? It is a name, it is a form, it is various characteristics, memories, experiences, knowledge - right? The 'me' is a colossal image put together by thought - right? When thought, which is a material process, comes to an end, the

'me', what happens to that? You are following all this?

We said thought is a material process, which we have been saying for many years and the scientists are now saying the same thing; not that I want their encouragement, I am just stating it. A material process. And thought has put together the 'me'. When thought, which is a material process, comes to an end with death - is there a me? You understand? So what - please listen - what is the origin of thought? You understand sirs? The beginning of thought? Is it not, the root of it, is it not man living with his senses, knowing the thing and all the senses are moving - no I must be careful with you, you are not meeting me.

We are asking what is the origin of thinking, thought? Life being uncertain, in flux, in movement, changing, the origin of thought must have its beginning in reaction, reaction to environment, and so on, reaction. Thought is reaction because it is the reaction which is memory. And when there is a memory there is reaction to that memory, which is thinking. I have got it! I'll stick to that, not stick to it, that is the truth. That is, thought is reaction. Understood sirs? That is, knowledge as experience, experience which is stored in memory, memory stored in the brain, and the reaction to that memory is thought. Very simple. I ask you, "What is your name?". You reply instantly, because you are familiar with it. I ask you a little more complex question and you take time. And I ask you a question which you cannot possibly answer and you say, "I don't know". So it is a process of reaction. So thought, which is a reaction and therefore fragmentary has created the 'me', which is a total reaction. Please do see this, it is very important because we are going to find out if death is an ending of thought,

which is a material process, and therefore the ending of me - is there something more? You understand?

So we have talked, we have gone into the question of the world and you - you are the world, and the world is you, time, and the desire for continuity, and the fear of ending, and the ending is the 'me', which is put together by thought, and the origin of thought is reaction. So when life as we know it, that is our daily life of confusion, misery, attachment, pain, anxiety, that is all we know, with pleasure, occasional joy, sexual and all the rest of it - we don't have to repeat it over and over again. All that comes to an end: is there a totally different dimension in which there is no beginning and no ending? All that we know is a beginning and an ending, and the fear of ending - right? Are we meeting each other? Fear of ending, which is death.

So we are asking: can the life that one lives end, can all the attachments, beliefs, experiences, knowledge, end now? That means dying now. You understand the question? I wonder if you do. Look sirs: our life, our daily life, which has been a continuous stream from the very beginning of humanity, until now, a river, a rushing river of sorrow, misery, confusion, quarrels, violence, bestiality, wars, utter selfishness, lack of compassion - all that is a vast stream flowing, of which we are. Either that can end, or it will continue for ever. I wonder if you understand this. Either there is an ending to that stream, that means the mind which has lived in that stream, which is of that stream, can that consciousness completely empty itself of all that, and therefore dying to all that, ending to all that? Therefore if there is an ending to all that there is a totally different beginning in which there is no end or beginning.

I wonder if you capture this? Have you got it sirs? Have some of you got this? I'll go into it again.

Death, the Christians have made death into one thing; the Hindus, the Buddhists have made it into another thing. And human beings whatever their beliefs, whatever their beliefs in reincarnation, whatever it is, it doesn't affect their life, they are frightened of an ending, the ending of everything they have known. Death means losing all that, your family, your houses, your insurances, your attachments, whether they be to furniture, to people, to houses, to beliefs, to ideals, to gods, losing everything that you have known, which is the ending, obviously. We cannot face that, because thought is a material process and thought has put together that thing which is me. The 'me' is the known. I may not know all the content of me but it is the known when investigated and discovered, self-knowledge. All that is a continuous movement of time as thought and measure. That is what we live with and that is what we are attached to, and when that ends there is fear of death. You have understood? So we would rather live with the known, that is our misery, our confusion, our struggles, our pettiness and all the rest of the ugliness, we would rather cling to that than say, "End it". That means putting an end to time. That is, there is no tomorrow. You understand? So the living is the ending of what is known as life, which is our pain and all the rest of it, and to that we cling desperately. And being afraid we seek shelter, we seek comfort, we seek some palliative. And we then have innumerable beliefs that I will continue, and I will meet my brother, my sister - you follow?

So long as a human being lives in that river of sorrow and



doesn't end it, humanity will go on endlessly in that stream. But when there is an ending to that there is a totally different dimension in which there is no beginning and no ending. And that is absolutely timeless. This you have to come upon by living it; not talking about it, that has no meaning, but when you attach to something, end it today, not tomorrow. And one can. Because there is pleasure in attachment, in possession, and to look at that pleasure and see what all the implications of that pleasure bring about, which is fear of losing, fear of not having that same thing tomorrow, jealousy, anxiety, hatred, all that comes out of that attachment. Seeing all that as a whole and to end it instantly, is dying to all that now, and therefore there is a totally different dimension in which there is neither an ending, nor a beginning, which is eternity. Do you understand what I am talking about? Please you have got to live this in your daily life. Which means you are greedy, a human being is conditioned to be greedy, conditioned by society, by education, by endless years of tradition. That is part of his tradition, that he must be greedy. And not being able to meet that, how to dissolve that greed, he invents a world of non-greed. Therefore he says, "Give me time to achieve that." But if he knows how to observe greed, then there is only that feeling. There is not the other non-greed. To observe it means one has to find out if the word 'greed' brings the feeling, or the feeling exists apart from the word. This is really important to find out. Do I exist apart from the word, the name, the form, this, that and the other? So in the same way, is greed encouraged by the word? Or is that feeling, sensation independent of the word? If it is independent of the word it is just a sensation, and you must have full sensations,

therefore you are completely out of that category of belonging to the word of 'greed' - do you understand this? So if there is an ending of your pleasure of tomorrow, then you will discover for yourself that death means in everyday life a beginning in which there is no ending and beginning.

Man has sought this everlastingly. I don't know if you have gone into it. I do not know if you have gone into yourself very deeply, because you are the history of mankind, you are the essence of mankind, and if you know how to read that book you don't have to read any other book in the world, apart from technological books, or something or other. There is this vast unread book of yourself, and to read it you must have the capacity to observe it, to look into it. You can only look into it, not page after page - please listen to this - but to read the whole book in an instant. And you can do that if there is no observer or reader reading a book. You have got it? That is, the book is yourself, and the reader is that which he is reading. But if the reader says, 'I am different from that which I am reading', then he is translating what he is reading according to his prejudice, his knowledge, his previous history. And therefore between the reader and that which he reads there is always distortion, conflict. So if there is the art, to put everything in its right place, therefore when you read that book of yourself there is only observation, not retention, not acquiring knowledge and with that knowledge read the book. You understand? There is only observation of that book, and it will tell you everything, literally it will cover the whole psychological world.

So the ending of life, which is your daily life, of which you are

so frightened because we want something permanent. You understand? And we think the 'me' is permanent - right? The 'me', identified with the house - the house is permanent, semi-permanent - you understand? So through what it thinks is permanent it has made itself permanent. So that has become our greatest illusion that I am permanent. When you look at that I, it is put together by thought, and thought is a material process. Until you see that deeply you will always be frightened of death. But if you see that the 'me' is totally impermanent because thought is impermanent, and that which thought puts together is impermanent, then there is no fear of ending, because it is thought that says, "I will continue". But thought itself knows that it is also an end. So the ending is not only a new beginning, but it is that movement which is not of time, in which there is no beginning and no ending.

But the question arises: how is it that there are manifestations from that stream? You understand? Are you interested in all this? You understand my question? That stream, which is a million years of human sorrow and anxiety, fear and despair, hope and all the rest of it, that stream is always manifesting itself, isn't it? Which is you - no? You understand what I am saying? Having manifested itself as you, then you are born in a family, you have a brother, you have a wife - the brother, the son, the wife dies and you are left alone, you are left lonely. That is, you have separated yourself from the stream, thinking you are different from the stream, and therefore feel completely isolated when death takes place. Are you understanding all this? I am sure, unfortunately, with each human being, there have been deaths, the loss of someone whom you think you love. The love is that attachment, that image that pleasure. And

when you lose that person in death, the organic death, you are left alone. You are not only crying for that person who is lost but also you are crying for yourself, self pity, loneliness, isolation, left alone to do all the things which the other one helped you to do. And you are left. And one sheds tears, or one goes to seances, or one believes in meeting them in heaven, or meeting them in the next life, reincarnation and so on. So all that is avoiding the observation of the sense of loneliness - you understand? - the sense of complete isolation. The more you move away from that isolation, that is, avoid it, run away, escape, the stronger that thing grows. But when there is total observation of that loneliness, then you will see that loneliness transforms itself completely.

So there is not only the losing of someone, but also the incapacity to meet what actually one is, and so one goes through depressions, sorrows, misery, moods, bitterness - you follow? - all that, which is part of the human stream, you are caught again in it. You understand what I am saying? So when you see an attachment in yourself, end it immediately. That is to die instantly to that. You understand? It is easy to die to something that is painful, but it is extremely unpleasant to die to something that you like, that you are attached to. But when you see this thing, how extraordinarily important it is that time must have a stop, then death has an extraordinary meaning, it has a most significant meaning; which means the ending everyday of everything that human beings have put together. Then you will see for yourself - not that, you won't see for yourself but there is a totally different thing altogether.

# SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 28TH JULY 1976

I think there is a difference between dialectical questioning and dialogue. Dialectical questioning, or investigation, implies, according to the dictionary, to find the truth through opinions. That is the literal meaning of dialectical approach. Whereas dialogues are between two friends who know each other fairly well, know their vocabulary, the usage of words, and together, with a spirit of real enquiry find truth - by enquiry, not by asserting opinions. So it is up to you to choose which you want: either through opinions to investigate if there is truth, which I question very much because opinions imply prejudices, personal idiosyncrasies and so on; whereas dialogue implies that both of us are deeply interested in a problem, we are not prejudiced, we don't want a certain definite answer, but together we are investigating to find the truth of the problem. You see the difference? One is dialectical approach, the other is approach to truth through careful, non-personal, objective investigation. That means we both of us start with no opinions, no conclusions, no assertions, but together, as two friends, and I mean by friends, who are really concerned with a problem, to investigate it together by sharing it, and thereby perhaps coming upon what is truth - right? So if that is clear during all these dialogues which we are going to have, which is, not asserting opinions, or prejudices, or conclusions, "I believe", that is a conclusion, whereas if you are investigating we are both open and we can go very far if we both are free to look objectively into things.

Now what are the questions you would like to ask?

Q: I would like to ask a question. Very often I feel closed in, and out of that state of feeling so much closed in I wish to come out and I am afraid. My question is, is it possible to naturally come out of this and flower?

K: Just let me repeat the question. He asks, one feels held in, bound, enclosed, and is it possible naturally to come out of that and flower. That is his question.

Q: (In French)

K: May I repeat the question briefly, otherwise don't make it too long. The questioner says, as far as I understand it, that there is a state of attention which he has come to, which is partial, which is fragmentary and during sleep does it become more full. Is that the question, sir?

Q: Conscious of my sleeping state.

K: Ah! He becomes conscious of his sleeping state, which is fragmentary. I understand now. What other questions? Just a minute, sir.

Q: I find the fears are so huge, and the sorrow is so huge, that the body has its own intelligence, the nervous system, it takes like physical time, the body says, "I can only take so much".

K: There is so much fear, and so much sorrow, that biologically, organically the body cannot stand it.

Q: It can only tolerate so much.

Q: I would like to discuss the 'me'. I would like to know whether it is hunger, the 'me', the image-maker, and not thought, not memories. For example, if I am hungry for food, I think of food. I am not referring to food hunger so much as hunger for love as being the 'me'. I think frustration of this love-hunger breeds fear,

and they both breed thoughts and images and then they nurse the fear.

K: What is the question, sir?

Q: Is the 'me' merely the past images, or do you think it is love-hunger?

K: Like love and hunger?

Q: Yes, a hunger to be loved, or a hunger for food.

K: I see, I understand the question. Is the 'me', the ego, an image created by thought, or is it like hunger, like hunger for love?

Now just a minute, that's enough questions. Can we take one question amongst several and investigate that one question to the very end so that we all are of the same movement, going along the same way, keeping up the same speed. Which is, I am asking can we take among these questions one central question and work that out completely so that at the end of it you will know for yourself - right? Can we do that? That is, either we discuss that gentleman's question, which is, attention, fragmentary and the state of sleep in which there is a different state of attention; or is the primary demand love, as hunger, and the 'me' is only the result of thought; or do you want to discuss that question which is, most human beings are enclosed by their activity, by their sorrow, by their problems, by their inhibitions, by their education, and so they are held, as it were, in a fortress, bound and they want to release themselves completely, break through; or the sorrow and fear are so great the organ can only stand so much, tolerate so much. Now which of these questions do you think, if we took one question out of these four, we can investigate together? That is, is the primary urge for love, which is not the ego, the 'me' put together by

thought, therefore the primary demand of every human being is to love and to be loved. And why do human beings enclose themselves, enclosed by their education, society, by their frustrations, all that, enclosed and not being able to get out of that enclosure naturally. And is there an attention, which is totally different in the state of sleep and therefore can that attention be maintained during waking hours - if I understand the question rightly. And the other is, fear, sorrow, the physical organism cannot stand too much of it. Now which of these?

Q: The one of being enclosed and wanting to find freedom.

K: All right, let's begin with that, and perhaps we will include all the others. The questioner says please discuss, or go into, why human beings are enclosed, held in, and never free.

Q: It is a lack of awareness.

K: But that is a conclusion, that stops investigation by saying you should be that, it is lack of something - finished. But if we say, look, suppose the speaker, I, am enclosed, I am not free, I can't express myself, there is not an easy flow, there is not a freedom, why are human beings right throughout the world, this is not his question, it is the question of humanity, why human beings are so encircling themselves, why have they this burden of tremendous weight so that they don't ever feel free? Can we discuss that, discuss it in the sense investigate it, not say, "Yes, you should be free", or 'Because you lack awareness' or this or that. So please we are going to go into this question, why human beings, practically everyone in the world, unfortunately, have allowed themselves, or as it happens that they are living within four walls, as it were. Now can we investigate it.



How would you approach this problem? You understand my question? I am enclosed. I have been hurt, I have been shocked, I have had a great deal of pain, both physical and psychological, I have had a great many insults and so on and so on and so on. I am enclosed. And I feel I am a prisoner. Now how shall I approach this problem - you understand? What is my approach to it? Is my approach wanting to be free from this? You understand my question? Is my motive, which says, be free from this, therefore I have already started with a direction, therefore I am not investigating. The direction is going to guide me - you understand? I wonder if you grasp this. I am a prisoner, psychologically, specially psychologically and I have a motive which is to break through this. The motive gives a direction, doesn't it? Be quite sure. Wherever there is a motive it obviously gives a particular line, particular direction, therefore I have already started in a direction, therefore I have stopped investigating. Is this clear? So am I free of motive in my investigation? If I am not free then why if I understand that any motive gives a direction and therefore it is impossible to investigate, that is if I have a certain belief and I am rooted in that belief and I want to investigate I can't. I have already started with a tremendous prejudice. So if I have a motive for my investigation then that motive makes the investigation in a particular direction, therefore it is not investigation at all. So am I free from motive in my examination why human beings are prisoners, psychological prisoners. You understand my question? First, are you free from it? You will be free from it when you see the truth - the truth that a motive gives a direction, therefore you stop investigating. And hence you say, "That's absurd, I'll drop it",

it is a natural thing to drop a motive. I wonder if you understand this. Have you understood this, sir?

That is, please be clear, if I want to be free from psychological prison which I have created, or others have created, or society has created, or my parents and so on, if my motive is to be free from the prison, then my eyes are focussed in a direction therefore I am not looking - right? So I see I want to understand why I am enclosed, and I see also that if I have a motive it is not possible to investigate. That's simple. Therefore I have not motive. Right? Are you in that position? That any psychological investigation demands, it is necessary, that there should be no direction. That means you start with no belief, no - you are free of all that and therefore investigate. You understand? If I am a Buddhist and I have a certain direction, certain prejudices, I have read a great deal, and I am convinced of that, it is finished. Or a Catholic, it doesn't matter who it is.

So it is very important in order to investigate that there should be freedom to observe. And you can only observe when there is no direction, when there is no motive - right? So have you dropped the motive? If you have dropped the motive then what is the prison? You understand, I have no motive, I am looking at 'what is', which is my prison - my various hurts, wounds, all the things we go through life which make us shrink, become like a snail that draws in. Now that is the fact, we are looking at that. What has happened? Is it that I have been hurt from childhood, at home, school, college, university, all through life, being somewhat sensitive a human being is hurt. So he begins to withdraw - right? He begins to enclose himself. So one of the causes of this withdrawal, with this

isolation, with this sense of imprisonment, one of the factors is hurt - right? Now all human beings are hurt - right? Now when we generalize all human beings it gives us much more vitality - you follow? I wonder if you understand that? When I am hurt, it is a very small affair, but when I see all human beings are hurt it becomes something tremendous. I wonder if you understand this. So is it possible not to be hurt - never? You understand? One has been hurt when one is young and the hurt remains through life with most people - right? We carry that burden, and therefore we resist people, we withdraw, we isolate ourselves, we become bitter, from that violence and so on. Now we are asking, is it possible to be free of the past hurt or hurts and so being free one is never hurt - you understand? There is the curing process of the past and the prevention. I wonder if we are meeting each other? Oh, come on sirs, this is a dialogue.

You understand my question? There is the past hurt, and is it possible to be free of those past hurts, and to prevent future hurts so that the brain is never hurt, so it remains young? I wonder if you understand. And therefore innocent. The word innocent - it comes from the Latin - which is, incapable of being hurt. So we are going to look at it. I have been hurt, suppose I have been hurt as a human being from childhood. I know what happens when there are these hurts, I am aware of it - that I withdraw, that I resist, that I isolate myself in order not to be hurt more - right? Are you aware of this process? Please, come on!

Q: It is very difficult to be aware because there is so much agony involved in it.

K: It is difficult to be aware because there is so much agony

involved in it. Let's keep to that one word - there is so much agony involved in becoming aware that I am hurt. You understand what he is saying? Don't go to sleep please. This is your problem, you understand, it is not only his problem, it is the human problem. We are all hurt from childhood. The greater the hurt, the greater the violence.

Q: Would you say that a human being from childhood on experiences this being hurt? Apparently, to me at least, it looks like an essential dimension of being a human being. So then I think, for my part at least, I feel it is not the intention, the purpose of my existence to refrain from being hurt. Apparently it is part of my existence. So I have may be to cope in a more creative way with being again and again hurt. I feel being hurt is part of the progress of growth.

K: It is natural to be hurt. It is natural to be hurt as a means of growth, as a means of evolution, as a means of progressing, you must be hurt.

Q: There is a difference in being hurt and carrying that hurt over, making that hurt something psychological. If someone pushed me I am hurt at that moment, but that is a different hurt from psychological hurts.

K: Sir, look that gentleman says part of human existence is to be hurt, it is natural. I am questioning that. Why should we be hurt? And look what damage it does psychologically, inwardly, how it affects our brain. It is not, "I think it is a part of life to be hurt", but see the result of it.

Q: How can you prevent being hurt?

K: I am coming to that. We are coming to that: how to prevent

hurt, and what to do with the hurt that we have. But if we say, hurt is part of life, war is a part of life, killing each other is part of life, disease is part of life, psychological disease, then that's the end of that argument. But if we say, is it possible to prevent being hurt and what to do with the hurt that one has, then we can go into the question.

Q: How do we know we are hurt?

K: How do you know you are hurt - don't you know you are hurt? Oh lord! Come on!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, when in the school, or in the family, the child is told, you are not as good as your brother, or your sister, you have already hurt that child - right? And in class, in a school where A is compared with B, and the teacher says A is not as clever, or intelligent as B, you have already hurt the child. So where there is comparison and competition there is hurt. This is so obvious. Now are we - the gentleman asked too - are we aware that we are hurt? Come on sirs. Be simple about it, don't complicate it. Are you aware that you are hurt?

Q: Yes.

K: Thank god! At least somebody is fairly frank and comes to it. Do you see the result, are you aware of the result of this hurt, what happens? That is isolation, resistance, and the resistance implies violence, and a sense of gradual isolation. From that all kinds of bitterness, lack of love, lack of sense of freedom, all that arises. Are you aware of this? Of course, any person is aware of this, aren't you? Right.

There is that past hurt, how do we wipe that out? If you say, "I

must not be hurt", or "I won't resist", it is already another form of resistance. I wonder if you see that. You understand? I am hurt, and I am aware of that hurt, and the results of that hurt, and if I say, "I won't be hurt, I'll forget my hurt", therefore I am already resisting. Right? Therefore that is another form of resistance. Oh, come on!

Q: One should change the focus onto something else.

K: One could change the hurt to something else, to love.

Q: The focus.

K: The focus onto something else, which is love. You see you are not - how can I, you don't go into this, how can I when I am hurt, very deeply wounded, it is there and try to focus on something else. That would be an escape. This is a fact, that is non-fact. Right?

Q: Isn't it only the image that we have of ourselves that is hurt?

K: We will come to that madam. Sir please listen. What am I to do with the hurt which I have, and I see the results of it, what am I to do with that hurt?

Q: Experience it.

K: But I am experiencing that, I have got it.

Q: I have an idea if you experience it thoroughly it will disappear.

K: You are saying if I can experience it thoroughly. I did not experience it thoroughly at the beginning, the result is there now. If I really paid attention at the beginning there would be no hurt, but I have not paid attention so I have got this hurt. What am I to do?

Q: Try and understand why you are hurt.

K: I will tell you. I can understand why I have been hurt. I have

got a marvellous image about myself and that image is hurt - right? I have an image that I am a very clever man, and you come along and tell me I am a fool, that hurts me. My image is hurt - right? My image is me. I am not different from my image - right? Am I different from my image?

Q: What is the solution to it?

K: You want a solution before you have gone into it. How impatient you are really, you want a quick way out of everything - a quick pill, quick Nirvana, quick meditation, quick everything. Please listen. When we say, "I am hurt", who is hurt? The image which I have about myself is hurt, isn't it? That is simple, no? Now is that image different from me? So I am that image. Wait sir, wait, I am coming to your question a little later. I am that image. I have created that image, that image has been built through the parents, society, through environmental influences and so on and so on, so that image is me, I am not different from that image. So when you say something which is not pleasant that image gets hurt, which is me.

Q: Every time that we are hurt our image is changed, because of that our image is another one. Shouldn't we accept this change of images?

K: Images change after hurt, but the hurt remains. I may change my image, but the hurt remains. But you don't even investigate this thing.

Q: Isn't it possible that a small child is being hurt before they have images?

K: I am afraid I can't answer the question because I don't know enough children. But you can see for yourself madam whether you

are hurt, you. If you are hurt, and we are asking who is hurt, the image you have about yourself, or you different from the image? You must answer this question.

Q: It is right what you say but my past hurts...

K: Which is what? Your past is the image which you have had about yourself. How extraordinary this is! Look I am only interested in freeing myself from hurt and nothing else, I don't want all kinds of theories, tell me how to be free of my hurt, if I have it. And that hurt remains in spite of everything else. I may go to Japan and Zen Buddhism and all the rest of it, but the thing is there inside, I can't escape from it. I try to escape from it, it is there. What am I to do?

Q: Observe it.

K: I am putting that question to find out. What will you do? Because I see the necessity of being free from hurt because that brings all kinds of ugliness. So I must be free from it, there must be freedom from it, what am I to do?

Q: Why do you want to be free from it?

K: Oh, sir, come on, I explained that. I see the result of it, and what am I to do?

Q: You can't help what gives the hurt, it is the potency, what is the memory.

K: Yes, the memory, the experience, the knowledge, which is the past, in the past there is that thing called 'me', the image, which has been hurt. Now I am asking you what is one to do? Just look at it first before you answer. What is one to do?

Q: Why does hurt continue?

K: It is part of memory. One cannot wipe out memory, the



experience or the knowledge of it, you can't get rid of it, it is there.

Q: But when you want to be free from it, it is there. You also have a continuity.

K: Sir, I explained to you. That is putting it quickly. Look, I have been hurt for various reasons and I see the result of those hurts, and I see the importance that these hurts must go, what am I to do?

Q: I can only do something about the hurts when I am different from the hurts. But we are not different from the hurts, so I can't do anything about the hurts.

K: The gentleman says, I am the hurt, the image is the hurt, there is no difference between the image and me, I am that image. And that image has been hurt. And as long as I try to do something about it I am creating another image - right? I wonder if you see that.

Q: The image is what is hurt, you can't separate yourself from your images, so you can't separate yourself from the hurts.

K: Therefore what happens? If I am the hurt - you are not meeting it - if I am the hurt and the image is not different from me, which means the observer is the observed, then what takes place?

Q: Stay with it.

Q: If I see that, I stop dividing my mind.

K: That's right sir, that's right. If I see the truth that I am the image and the image is me, therefore there is no division, then quite a different process takes place. Which is, there is only observation, not freedom from hurt. There is only observation when you observe without the observer, if you will go into it - do you want me to go into this very carefully, follow this. The

observer is the past - right? The observer is the memory, the experience, the knowledge, which is the past. So with the past he is looking at everything - right? And with the past, as the observer, he is looking at the present. Right? Therefore between the present and the past there is a division created by the observer. You get it? So there is conflict between the observer and that which he observes. He says, "I must change it, I must control it, I must suppress it, I must run away from it" and so on, but when the observer is the observed the conflict comes to an end. And this is the most important thing to discover, this truth: that the experiencer is the experience - right? The thinker is the thought. There is no thinker if there is no thought. So the thinker is the thought. Though the thinker says, "I am different", but in actuality the thinker is the thought. Right? The experiencer is the experience. I will show it to you if you are willing to listen.

I experience something. To know that I have experienced something I must recognize it, mustn't I? Of course. I must know what it is. Otherwise I can't say, "I have experienced". So recognition implies the past, doesn't it - the past, with its knowledge, with its memory, is the experience, and he says, "I am experiencing something". So the experiencer is the experience. Until you see that you can't move away from it. Look, the gods, the gods that you have created, human beings have created, whether in Christianity, Hinduism or whatever it is, those gods are the projections of one's own thoughts, one's own desires. Do you accept that? If once you accept that, do you know what happens? You understand my question? The image that you have made of god is the image that you have built. God hasn't made you into his

image, but you have made god into your image. For god's sake, this is so simple. No, you agree but the whole of Christianity, the whole world of religious thought is based on that. Once you see that, you deny the whole structure of thought in religious matters.

So the hurt is not different from me, the 'me' is the image, and that image gets hurt, so I am that image. That anger is not different from me, I am anger. I might think I am different but in actuality I am anger. So do you see the truth of it - not the idea of it? The actual truth that when you are angry that anger is you.

Q: It seems that I am angry.

K: Don't go off to something else. You don't see the first principle of this, sir. When you are jealous, is that jealousy different from you? It is only different from you when you say, "I am justified in being jealous. It is right to be jealous, my wife..." - you follow? Then there is a division between the statement and the fact. So the fact is that you are that feeling, which you call jealousy. That is simple. Now if that is an absolute truth which you see, you see, not I, then conflict comes to an end between the observer and the observed. You understand?

So there is hurt and that hurt is me, and the 'me' is not different from the hurt. Therefore what is to take place? All the energy which I have used in conflict - you understand, between the observer and the observed - is not wasted - right? I wonder if you see this. I have wasted energy in dividing the observer and the observed, the 'me' and the not 'me' - right? I wasted that energy in conflict, in suppression, in trying to run away from it and all the rest of it. But when I do not run away and I see the truth that the observer is the observed, then what takes place?

Q: The energy is available.

K: Then energy is observation - right? So I have found something: when there is complete energy there is no recording. You understand? When I give complete attention to your insight, there is no recording. It is only when I am not completely attentive there is recording. You get the point? Have you understood this simple truth? For god's sake get it. You understand? I have wasted my energy in conflict, I say, "I am not that hurt, I am different from that hurt", therefore I try to do something about that hurt - right? I try to run away from it, suppress it, resist it, isolate and so on. But when I discover the truth that I am that hurt, then I have gathered all that energy, which I have wasted, in observing 'what is'. In observing 'what is' the thing undergoes a radical change. You have got it? So there is no hurt, that is, no hurt from the past either. So with that complete attention next time you call me a something or other it is not registered. Where there is complete attention, where there is complete energy of all the senses, there is no recording.

Q: What is the source of the attention?

K: There is no source of attention. Please sir, don't bring in that question yet. Do you see this thing, this marvellous thing, sir, it is so simple. Traditionally we are trained in this formula, that is, I am different from that. I am different from my anger, my god is different from me, my belief and so on. That is, we traditionally accept that the experiencer is different from the experience, and so there is a constant division and conflict. Where there is division there must be conflict - right? Do you see that? Nationally, religiously, economically, socially, wherever there is a division there must be conflict. That is a law.

And here I am. I have been hurt and traditionally I have said I am different from the hurt, therefore I will do something about the hurt - run away from it, escape from it, justify it, build a wall of resistance, and so on and so on, which are all wastage of energy. And when there is a perception that the observer is the observed, the wound is the 'me', then I don't waste any energy, with that energy I observe, which is complete attention. Now if you give complete attention if I flatter you, it has no meaning; or if I insult you, it has no meaning. Now can you do it at the moment of insult, not afterwards? You understand?

Q: (Inaudible, in Italian)

K: Sir, if you give your attention there is no hurt, or the mark of flattery. You understand? That means you have to go very deeply, as the questioner points out, into the whole problem of consciousness. You understand? Where the building of images goes on, where in the unconscious deep layers of one's mind the image building is going on. I may say, "Yes I have no image", but down there there are images. So can I be conscious, can I be aware of the totality of my consciousness - the hidden as well as the open? The total area, field of my consciousness, can I be aware of the totality of it? Let me finish, you can question me afterwards.

We are used to dividing consciousness into the upper and lower - right? Subconscious, conscious, this division takes place because of thought. Thought is fragmentary because thought is the result of time, time being memory, time being the past, therefore thought is fragmentary - right? I wonder if you see that. So the fragment can never see the whole. And we say, unless there is an observation of the whole there can never be freedom from that. Can I observe, can

a human being observe the total content of consciousness, the total, not one segment, or one part, or partial, the totality of consciousness? The totality of consciousness is all that it contains, naturally - attachments, desires, the images which thought has put there, the sorrows, the pains, the anxieties - you follow - the whole human endeavour, all human sorrow, misery, confusion, chaos, all that, at one glance. Can you see that as a whole? Can you see the tent - please listen - see the tent as a whole? Look at it, look at that tent and see if you can see the whole of it. I can see the whole of it, what is inside. I can't see the whole of it on the outside. You understand? I wonder if you grasp this. I can see this in its entirety, it is fairly simple. But I can't see what is the outside of it - right? So I can only see something entirely if I understand space. Can I go on? I am talking, you are not joining me. I can see the totality of something when I have space - right? I can only see the tent from the inside, the whole of it, but I can't see the tent from the outside. To see the whole of it I must not only observe the inside but the outside. Naturally.

Q: Can you see the whole?

K: That is the whole. Just a minute, just a minute. So I must find out to observe this human consciousness, to see it as a whole there must be space, mustn't there? To look at anything, to look at you, I must have space between you and me. If I am right up against you I can't see you - right? So I must have space. What is space? Are you interested in this? What is space? If there is a centre the space is limited. You may extend it as far as possible, but it is still limited if there is a centre. If there is no centre space is immense. Right? We measure space from the centre to the circumference, but if

there is no centre there is no measurement. Get it? There is no measurement. So when there is no measurement what have you, as your consciousness? I wonder if you see it. Don't state it.

Look: I am attached to my furniture - there is a very nice table in my room at Brockwood, a beautiful table. I am very attached to it - if I am, I am not but if I am attached to it, it is a measurement, isn't it? I wonder if you see it. I am attached. I don't want you to touch it, I don't want you to harm it, no sunlight must come on it. So where there is a measurement as attachment, the space is very limited. Of course, sir. Because I am measuring from my centre of pleasure to that table, and that measurement limits it. Right? If there is no measure, which is from the centre to the table, then there is vast space - right? Is that so with you? Don't agree. Is that so with you, that there is no centre? And if there is no centre you see the whole of consciousness. I wonder if you do. It is marvellous. You follow, sir. I am getting excited about this, I must calm down.

Measurement, we said, is thought. Measurement is a process of time, from here to that table. That is, thought is a movement in time - right - in time as measures from me to that. Right? If that movement is not, then what is my consciousness made up of? Nothing. I wonder if you see all this. No, you don't see it. It is too difficult, you can't see this.

Q: If there is no centre, is there a whole, is there a part?

K: When there is no measurement then there is the whole. Just a minute, I will show it to you in a different way. Human consciousness is from a centre, isn't it? I am attached to that, my family, my house, my anger, my jealousy, my hope - from a centre

the whole of consciousness is built. No? I am attached to that furniture, I am attached to that house, I am attached to that belief, to that idea, and my sorrow - you follow? Always from a centre moving out. That is my consciousness. Look at your own, it is simple. And that consciousness is divided into the unconscious and conscious, which the western world has done, and the eastern world does it in a different way, that is irrelevant. So as long as this division exists there must be measurement - right? I wonder if you see that? Then I begin to examine what is inside, underneath. I wonder if you see. So when there is no measurement there is no centre, and therefore the consciousness which human beings have known disappears and then there is a totally different dimension, a boundless dimension, because there is no measure. So as long as there is measurement, space is very limited, from me to that table, because it is very narrow. But if there is no table or the centre, space is immense.

Now can the mind observe the totality of consciousness? And it can only observe when there is no centre saying, "This is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be" - you follow? I don't think you get this. Do you get it, sir?

Have I answered your question? That is, your question was: why human beings are so enclosed, self-enclosed, why they have built a wall around themselves, why they never flower and in the flowering end, end to attachments - you follow, all that, why? And we said - we took one part of that, which is human beings are hurt, and they think that hurt is different from me. The 'me' then says, "I am different, therefore I am going to control that hurt, I am going to change it, I am going to suppress it, I am going to run away from



it, this is ugly, this shouldn't be". But when the 'me' is that image, and that image is the hurt then I have all that energy, which I have wasted, to look at that hurt. And when there is complete energy in that observation there is no hurt, naturally.

Q: I don't understand that, sir.

K: Is it a question of English? I will try and put it differently. Is the world different from you? Don't answer me, please. It is not a school examination! Don't answer me please. Is the world different from you as a human being, the world which is outside, not the physical world only, but the psychological world, the world of anger, the world of violence, the world of sorrow, the world of pleasure, the world of nationalities, the world of religious differences and beliefs, is that different from you? No. See the truth of it, not the verbal description, the truth of the matter. Go to India, or Japan, or Asia, or America, human beings may put on trousers, or put on kimonos, or dhotis in India, or this or that, but there essentially deep down they have sorrow, anxiety, misery, uncertainty - you follow - the agony of human existence is the same right through. So you are the world and the world is you. That is a truth. Do you see that? Or do you say, "No, I am different from that Indian" - psychologically? Of course you are different, you are a woman or a man, lighter skin, dark hair, brown, white, socially, more food, more clothes, whatever it is; but inwardly, deep down you have the same agony going on. So you are the world, do you see that? Do you know what happens when you say, you are the world and the world is you, it gives you tremendous strength, tremendous vitality, because then you are not 'me' alone fighting the rest of the world. You understand this? Then you are

not. In the generalization there is vitality, if you know how to see the generalization actually.

So in the same way the world is you, and you are the world. You are the experiencer and you think you are different from the experience. Again that is our prejudice, our tradition, our education, whereas you are that experience, the experience is not different from the experiencer, therefore there is no searching for experience. You understand? You are free of experience. And a mind is free of experience only when it is a light to itself - you understand? Which is truth. Got it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The questioner wants to know, this is the last question please, we must stop in five minutes. He want to know about T.M. - the good old stuff! Transcendental Meditation. You know, please, we are looking at it objectively. We are not condemning it, we are not putting it aside, but looking at it. The word mantra, which is involved in Transcendental meditation, mantra means a form, a formula, a series of words that will help to bring about concentration. The root meaning of that word, mantra, the root meaning of that word is to help to bring about concentration, through a picture, through a word, through repetition of something, a formula, is to help you to bring concentration.

Q: It is not a concentration.

K: Please, sir, I said the root meaning of the word. The root meaning. Please sir, don't take sides, you may be a Transcendental meditation person or whatever it is, don't take sides, we are looking at it. So the root meaning of that word is to bring about concentration, to help through words, through sentences.

Concentration is bringing all your energy to a certain point - right? And resisting any encroachment on that point. To concentrate on a book, or on a page, means I resist every other movement. Right? I am not saying about Transcendental meditation, I am just saying what is implied in concentration. Put away every other thought but this particular thought - right? And in that way there is a division, concentration and non-concentration. I concentrate for ten minutes and resist every other encroachment and therefore I create a division. That is implied in concentration. And in various forms of concentration there is the controller and the controlled. Right? I try to control my thought, which is the controller is different from that which he controls. What he is controlling is the other thoughts, and the controller is also part of thought. So when you see the truth that the controller is the controlled, the whole phenomenon of concentration undergoes a total change.

Now in this Transcendental meditation, the word transcendental is an unfortunate word because it means to transcend all human conflicts, transcend above everything else. That is the implication. To transcend, to go beyond. Now by repeating certain words, first loud, second silently, third repeat without the word so that the mind becomes more and more quiet. The idea being through being constant repetition of a certain word you reduce the mind to be quiet. This is the idea of mantra and all the rest of it, to make the mind quiet. Which is, through a method, through a system, through somebody saying, "Do this and you will get that". The authority and acceptance of authority and gaining something. As we said earlier, in spiritual matters there is no authority because you have to be a light to yourself. There is no guru. There is no teacher.

There is no leader.

Q: You don't need to accept any leader if you practise Transcendental Meditation. You become calm very soon and very naturally. And my experience is I was reading Krishnamurti many years. I was reading Krishnamurti before I was practising Transcendental meditation, and it was very beautiful. And then I read Krishnamurti after twenty minutes of Transcendental meditation and it was much more quiet and beautiful. There is a probe of sensitivity during Transcendental meditation, you haven't got any goals during Transcendental meditation. You watch the mantra like you watch the river, and as the mantra has no meaning neither the past nor the future extends, so that you learn to live right in the moment. Then when I read Krishnamurti the first time I always wanted to tell him that it was just what he wanted us to live, we learn it very naturally, without accepting any authority if we practise Transcendental meditation. It is not something different from what Krishnamurti is teaching us. It is the same, it is not suppression, it is not control, it is very natural. There is nothing different.

K: I am afraid it is a great deal different, sir. Forgive me for contradicting you!

Q: You are a student of Transcendental meditation, I am sure.

K: You are sure I did TRanscendental meditation?

Q: No, I know it by reading your books.

K: Don't read the books! Sir, you are not getting what I am talking about. Look, the first principle in a religious life is no authority, which implies that you must be a light to yourself, therefore non-dependence on anything - gurus, mantras, books,

persons, ideas, nothing. That means to be light to yourself it implies that you have to be totally alone. The word alone means all one. You understand, sir? The meaning of that word alone means all one, all made into one. Oh, you people don't know all these things.

So when you are alone in that sense you have abundance of compassion therefore you are a light to yourself, then you can forget all the gods, all the mantras, all the teachers, nothing matters. But we are afraid to stand alone, to be a light to ourselves, making mistakes, failures, find yourself to have a light to yourself. That demands great attention, great care, and you can't get attention, love, care through books, through people, mantras, nothing.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 29TH JULY 1976

And we said yesterday, we are having a dialogue, which means a conversation between two people, or with many, who are interested, or concerned with certain problems of human beings and want to go into them deeply, with care and affection, not with any form of assertion or argument. And a dialectical method is investigating through opinions to find out the truth. So we are not dialectically investigating. We are, as two friends, talking over together their human problems and hoping to solve them and to discover truth.

And I am afraid there is a great deal of misapprehension that we are trying to find a technique to truth - a technique, which means learning the method, practising a method, learning a certain form of technique that will help you or another to come upon this truth. We are not advocating, or saying, that there is any technique to truth. Please be very clear on this matter. Technique implies learning a method. I mean, to go to Mars, as they have done, which is a most extraordinary feat, you need a great deal of technological knowledge, a great deal of accumulated knowledge of the 'know-how'. But as truth is a pathless land, please bear this in mind, it is a pathless land, you can't lay down a line, a direction, a path to it and practise it, discipline yourself, learn a technique.

So please bear in mind that we are not giving or offering, or telling a technique, a method, a system. We are already so mechanically minded, our minds are already sufficiently mechanistic, and by practising a technique, a verbal repetition,

silence, you know the whole business that all techniques will somehow loosen, or free the mind from all mechanistic activity. I am afraid it won't. What we are saying is, that you must have the interest, the drive, the intensity to find out - find out for yourself, not be told how to do it. Then what you discover is yours, then you will be free from all gurus, from all techniques, from all authority. Please bear that in mind while we are having a dialogue about these matters.

So what shall we talk about, or have a dialogue this morning?

Q: Could we talk about the nature of understanding?

K: Understanding. The nature of understanding.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are afraid, the questioner says, to be vulnerable, to be open, because the more you are vulnerable the more likely you will get hurt. And so we fear to be open. You see the word vulnerable means, doesn't it, like a leaf in the wind it is vulnerable to wind. So could we discuss that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The responsibility of a human being with regard to the images he forms about another. Could we discuss that, responsibility.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The relationship of speech, words, thought and the silent mind.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: How can we live without a motive - is that the question?

Now that is enough for the time being. That gentleman wanted to discuss or have a dialogue about understanding. The relationship

between speech, word, thought and silence. The responsibility of not forming an image in relationship. Those were the questions that were put. And to be vulnerable. Can we live without a motive. Now what shall we take out of those questions, one of those questions so that we can think or observe or trace it right to the end, not be diverted in other directions, go to the very end of one questions which may include all other questions.

Q: Understanding.

K: Understanding, right. I think that is good, I would take that too myself. Understanding. What do we mean by that word understanding? Please go slowly into it, not quickly. To understand something, what is implied in it? Is it a verbal understanding, a comprehension through verbal description, a comprehension through affection - I like you, I am friends with you, I tell you something, therefore you understand what I am saying. Or is it an insight into something which is rather complex and confused? Or how does understanding take place? You understand my question? Does understanding take place through verbal communication, which is description? Because you and I if we are speaking English, then it is something, French, Italian, whatever it is, through verbal communication and the description is there an understanding or an insight? Or does understanding take place not merely through words, not merely the description, but going beyond the word, which means both you and the other are free of the verbal structure which is the nature of thought, and penetrating and having an insight? You understand?

When we talk I understand how the cars run, that is very simple. I have observed it, I have undone it, I have played with it and I



know how it works. I understand how to climb that mountain, I know. But we are talking of understanding psychologically, aren't we, deeply, not the mere worldly understanding but much more the understanding which brings about an insight. An insight means having a sight in something, which then becomes the truth. And I can never go back from it. When I understand something, which means I have an insight into that and therefore that very insight will wipe away any misunderstanding, any complexity, you have clear sight in that.

Therefore understanding implies, does it not, a mind, or a brain, the whole structure of the mind listens not only to the word but goes beyond the words and sees the deep meaning of that particular statement, and then there is an insight and then you say, "I understand it", "I have got it". So insight implies a mind that is quiet, willing to listen, go beyond the word, and observe the truth of something. Say for instance, the speaker makes a statement like, 'The ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom.' He makes a statement of that kind. Now how do you receive it? Please listen to me. The speaker makes that statement: "The ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom". How do you receive it? What is your reaction to that statement? Do you make of it into an idea, an abstraction, and with that abstraction, which is an idea, try to understand what he said? Or you listen, that is, you listen to the word, the meaning of the word and go beyond the word and see the truth of that statement, or the falseness of that statement? Not how to end sorrow, or how to have wisdom, but whether that statement conveys a truth or a falsehood. To observe the truth or the falsehood your mind must be quiet and then you have an insight

into it, then you say, "By Jove, how true that is". So in the same way, understanding implies having an insight into a problem. Right? So that you go beyond all arguments, all dialectical approaches, it is so. It is immovable. Like say, for instance, the speaker says, "There is no technique to truth, truth is a pathless land". He makes that statement, he has made it fifty years ago, and how do you receive that statement? Go on sirs. How do you receive that statement? This is a dialogue. Do you receive it with opinion, saying that can't be true because everybody talks about technique, the method, the system, and this man comes along and says, there is no path, there is no technique to truth. So you say, well who is right in this, is this man right or is that man right. So are you arguing, comparing, judging, or do you listen to that statement, not knowing what is right and wrong, because you don't know, actually you don't know? Ten people, or a million people have said there is a technique, and some person comes along and says, there is no technique whatsoever. You understand? This man may be totally wrong. And he explains: a technique implies practice, time, a mechanistic process. Our minds are already mechanistic enough and you are making it more mechanistic. So he explains all that and you still say, a thousand people have techniques. Do you balance these two and then say, well I prefer that rather than that? Or you receive what he said with complete objective silence, quiet, not knowing what is truth? And when you listen quietly, which means complete attention, then you discover, have an insight into what is being said, then it is yours, not mine. I don't know if you see. That is, to find out what is true and what is false. To find out the truth in the false - right? So your mind must

be extraordinarily open, vulnerable, otherwise you don't know. I wonder if we are understanding each other.

You see, is love an intellectual thing? Technique is an intellectual thing, a method is an intellectual affair, and can you love through a technique? Right? Can you? By practising being very nice, very kind, very gentle, and all the rest of it, and at the end of a year after having practised a method will you love? Right?

Q: No.

K: It is impossible, isn't it? So why do you say, no?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right. Why do you say that? Now just a minute, why do you say that? When I said, will there be love if you practise kindness, gentleness, non-violence, etc. etc., will you have at the end of it love? Will you have it?

Q: No.

K: What makes you say, no? Do listen to it carefully.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. Listen to me. We said, can love come into being through any form of intellectual effort as technique, and you said, no. What makes you say, no?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What makes you say, no?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You have an insight that techniques is a method, it is an intellectual affair, and we said, how can that produce love? You follow? There is instinctive response. Now if someone says - listen carefully - the observer is the observed - the observer being the past, and what he observes is through his past background,

therefore what he sees is seen from the background. The observer is the observed - he makes that statement. And you say, "I don't understand that - right? I can't see it, please tell me in a different way". So the speaker says, the thinker is the thought. If there is no thought there is no thinker - right?

Q: Right.

K: And why do you say right? Because you see the obvious thing, don't you? And he says further, the experiencer is the experience. And he says the experiencer must recognize the experience otherwise there would be no experience. So recognition implies the past. So the past experiences what it wants, or experiences that which he has projected. And you say, yes, quite right. So you instinctively - or rather when it is put very clearly you say, perfectly right. So understanding takes place when both of us have a common language, the words have the same meaning for you as well as for me, and we are talking about the same thing, with the same interest, with the same intensity, then there is a direct communication - right?

Q: Only with words.

K: We have been through that. Words are only means for communicating, but we must go beyond the words. We have said that ten times.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: A monkey? There is a very famous story, I don't know if you want to be told. A very famous story of a monkey going to the Buddha, and the monkey says to the Buddha, "I have practised meditation for the last twenty years", or fifty years, "and I can do most extraordinary things. I can go right round the world in a few

seconds." And the Buddha, stretching out his hand, the monkey is sitting there, and he says, "Do it". The monkey says, "I am going to make a tremendous effort to go right round the world." And he opens the eyes and he says, "You are still there". You get it!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Right. One has built a wall around oneself, the questioner says, and one desires to jump over that wall, because that wall becomes a prison, that wall becomes a wall of resistance, which implies isolation, bitterness, lack of love and all the rest of it. And so the verbal description makes you want to jump over. Just a minute. Right? The verbal description that you are a prisoner enclosed by your own desire not to be hurt, you have built brick by brick this wall and the speaker describes the wall, the effects of the wall - the bitterness, the sorrow, the isolation, the loneliness - and from that violence and all that, he describes it, and you say, "I want to get over that wall". Which means you have no insight into what has made you build that wall. All that you are concerned with is to get over it. And you will never get over it. Whereas if you had an insight into the whole movement of hurt, resistance, isolation, see the whole picture, observe the whole picture then the wall doesn't exist.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is why I want - please let's be clear what we are saying. Having an insight means complete observation of the whole movement of hurt. We are taking that as an example. The understanding of the complete movement of hurt.

Q: Why?

K: Wait. I'll tell you. Let me finish. I'll tell you later why. Do

we understand, or observe the whole movement of hurt, the whole movement, not just building a wall? Why we are hurt, the image that we have about ourselves, and that image is me, and then I am hurt, and then I build a wall round myself not to be hurt any more because if I see if I am vulnerable I will get hurt more likely, so I build a wall round myself. And by building a wall round myself I resist and in resistance I have become more and more enclosed, more and more isolated, and from that isolation I feel desperate and I see you who are not desperate, I am angry with you, I become bitter. And all the rest of it follows. Do I see, is there an observation or awareness of this whole movement of hurt?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand. I understand your question. First let me finish with this.

Do you observe, are you aware of this whole movement? Or you are only partially aware, and therefore you say, "How am I to get over it?" When there is a partial awareness of this movement then the reaction is, "Tell me how to get over it". Then the 'how' becomes the method. But when there is the total observation of this whole movement of hurt there is no 'how', you see it. There is an insight into it. You have got it?

Now the question is, the lady asks, why do I bother with it? Why should I go through all this business of insight, and awareness? Because human beings are violent, human beings are bitter, human beings are enclosed, tight, everything is self-centred, the more activity the more self-centred it becomes - in the name of god, in the name of social work, in the name of etc., but the thing becomes tighter and tighter and tighter and therefore more and

more anxiety, greed. And a man observing this says, "Why should I live like this?"

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. You have not - forgive me for repeating - I am afraid you haven't understood. I said insight is not a movement. It is direct perception in which there is no movement.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have you listened to what I said?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I said no movement, not somebody moves. Please madame, we are old friends, we have known each other many years. We are saying, insight means non-movement. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Nowhere! No, you are missing my whole point, please.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No madame, you haven't understood. Please you are not listening, forgive me for saying so, but you are not listening to what is being said.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look I say something which is very applicable to you and to me, and words, description, have no meaning, and you say then, "I understand it". That understanding is non-movement, isn't it, you have understood it.

Q: Here we part company.

K: I am sorry. Don't let's part company, which is what everybody does when they don't agree or understand. Just a minute please. Don't use 'we part company', that is the worst...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just listen to what I have got to say. I know what you are saying, I have understood what you are saying. You haven't understood what I am saying. I have understood what you are saying. I have understood it, please believe me. Don't ever say, "We part company". That's the first thing to learn. That means you and I are opposed to each other. You and I, or two human beings when they say, 'We part company' it is the worst thing to say. Please listen to me, you are not listening to me, you are listening to yourself. Don't let us ever come to that point when we say, "You go north, I go south", because what we are trying to do here is to understand our human problems, to find out what is true and what is false. Not my truth or your truth, or your falseness or my falseness, but what is truth, which is non-personal, it is not yours or mine, it is truth. And that is what we are trying to understand. So if you and I are concerned with the enquiry into what is truth, there is no parting. We may go slower, somebody may go faster, but we are on the same path, we are in the same direction - no path.

So please that's the most ugly thing to say to somebody else, "We part", it is like a divorce.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Leave it alone.

Q: Insight and knowledge, can we discuss that please?

K: Yes. And also there is lots more to discuss. That lady pointed out the responsibility of image-making, and living without an image. And also about vulnerability and to live without a motive. All those questions are involved.

We began by asking, because that was the first question we all agreed to, what is understanding. If I am fixed with a certain point



and you are moving away from that point, there is no understanding between you and me, because I am fixed in my opinion, in my belief, in my experience, in what I think. And therefore communication between you and me comes to an end. Because the speaker has no belief, literally has no belief, no opinion, he is only investigating, penetrating, tracing out. But if you take a stand then it is finished, you do not investigate it. We said investigating into what is truth, and to enquire into that we must not only understand the verbal meaning - English or French or whatever it is, German - then go beyond the word and you can only go beyond the word when you understand thought which lives on words. You understand this? Which lives, breeds on words, and to go beyond that is to have real communion, which then perhaps will bring about an insight. That is what we said. An insight into what is false and what is truth. And that requires very alert capable observation, not based on prejudice.

So we will go to another question which is: human beings get hurt because they think they are vulnerable, because they are sensitive, and the question is: does not vulnerability bring more hurt, and therefore don't be vulnerable, don't be open, because then you get more and more hurt. Right? That was one of the questions.

Now, what brings about hurt? We said hurt comes into being when there is an image of myself and that image gets hurt. That's fairly simple, right? I have an image about myself, that I am a great man, or a silly man, and whatever image I have about myself that image gets wounded, that image is me. The 'me' and the image are not different. Now as long as I have an image about myself, and myself is that image, getting wounded is inevitable. Right?

Obviously.

Q: Because there is resistance.

K: That's right. Because there is resistance, because I have assumed a position, I have assumed an image which is very pleasant to me and when you come and disturb it I get hurt. So if there is no image there is no possibility of getting hurt. Right? We went into the question of how to go beyond the image. We went into it the other day very carefully. Now to have no image is to be completely vulnerable. Please listen carefully. It is only when there is resistance then there is hurt.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You can't. If you have an image it must resist. That's natural. It is like having a wall.

Q: But you have a body.

K: Wait. You go back to the body. That is the organism can tolerate so much and no more. All right. A body, the organism, the biological thing, can tolerate fear up to a certain point, beyond that it can't tolerate, it can't hold, it goes to pieces. So then you have to make the body healthy - right food, right exercise and all the rest of it. What is the question, sir?

Q: When the image is not I have nothing.

K: That's right.

Q: And when I have nothing, nothing can hurt me.

K: Not, 'nothing can hurt me'.

Q: That is a problem of mine.

K: I understand.

Q: Only vegetables can live in that state.

K: I am not a vegetable. Please, I have lived, this entity has

lived for almost eighty years. There have been all kinds of insights, every kind of devotion, every kind of flattery, every kind of usage of words, calling the person all kinds of names, ugliness, terrible. And no image, therefore never being hurt. I am not a vegetable. You may say, "Oh, that is an illusion you are living in". I say, no, I have investigated how illusions come, which means sensation, plus desire, plus thought, image. When you have that process there is bound to be illusion. I have not that. I have gone into that thoroughly. So I am not vegetable and other human beings can do this.

So let's proceed. Where there is image there is hurt. When there is no image at all, and that is essential, that is possible, and it is possible only when you understand the whole movement of building images, having an insight into the building of images, then there is no building images and then only there is complete vulnerability. It is only when there is partial vulnerability then there is hurt.

To go to the next question is, which is: what is our responsibility to another in this image-making? Right? After finishing this we will go to the next question: can one live without a motive in love?

What is responsibility? What is one's human responsibility with regard to another, when both of them are building images about themselves. You are building an image, and I am building an image, and our relationship is based on those images - right? If you have observed yourself for two seconds this is an obvious fact. I live with a human being and with that human being, out of our living, I begin to build up an image - hurt, irritation, pleasant

companionship, you follow, I gradually through years I have established a strong image; as the other person has established a strong image about me. So the relationship is between these two images. Whether you like it or not it is a fact. Then if one of them is free of all image making, literally all image making, what is his responsibility towards the other? That is the question as far as I understood it. Right? Is that right?

Q: One is not free actually of images.

K: Yes, one is not actually completely free of image making. So we have to be concerned with that, not the responsibility. We have to be concerned why we build images. It is fairly simple.

K: Why do you have an image about yourself? You have images about yourself, haven't you? Don't be shy, it is simple. You have an image about yourself, how does it come into being? You have an image about yourself - not you sir, I am not personally asking you - you have an image about yourself, why do you have it, and how does it come into being?

Q: Through thought.

K: No, look at it simply.

Q: From childhood.

K: From childhood you are told you are not as good as your brother, that you are not as clever as your elder brother, so you begin slowly to build the image. Your friends help you, and you help your friends to build this image, society helps you, your parents help you. So gradually school, university, college, you build this tremendous image of yourself, that you are clever, not clever, that you are this or that, so you have an image. And one very rarely is aware of this - right? One is not aware of this image.

That image is me, and one is not aware of it. Now to become aware of it is the first thing. Can you become aware of it? Not say, "I don't like it", or like it, be aware of the image that you have about yourself - can you?

Q: When I am hurt, yes.

K: Now, now. Not when you are hurt. Now I am asking. You have an image, don't let's beat round the bush. It is so simple.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madame, we are not talking of love. Be simple.

So to become aware of that image: then are you aware of it as though it were different from the observer? Please answer these questions simply. Are you aware of that image as something different from you who are looking at it? Is the observer different from the image? Naturally not. So the observer is the image - right?

Q: You can see this if...

K: Not 'if'. Do you see or have an insight that you are different from the image. When you have an insight you then say, "I am the image". Obviously. Now, careful, just go slowly from here. You are the observer and you discover for yourself that the image, the observer is the observed, the observer is the image. Then what takes place? Don't guess. Don't say, "Yes, if that happens this will happen". That has no meaning. What takes place when the observer realizes what he is observing is himself? So the observer is the observed. That is, having an insight into that, then what happens? Go slowly. What takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are not watching it. You are too complicated, keep it

simple. When it is very simple you make it very complicated.

Q: I am lost.

K: You are lost. Please look at it. This is really most important. Once you have this key, the real thing that you have, then you will find out so much. When the observer is the observed, the experiencer is the experience, the thinker is the thought, what has taken place? What has actually taken place? The division between the two has come to an end. Right? Before we had this division, the observer said, "I am different from the observed" - right? So in that division there was conflict. The observer then says, "I must do something about the observed. I must control it, I must suppress it, I must run away from it". So when the observer sees he is the observed, conflict comes to an end. Right? When the Arab realizes he is the Israeli, the war is over - you understand?

So when the observer realizes he is the observed then the conflict, the division, the struggle, all that has come to an end because he can't do anything else, he is that - right? You have understood. He is that, therefore conflict has completely come to an end. When a Hindu realizes he is the Muslim - you understand?- the Muslim may have different customs, but essentially he is himself then he says, "For god's sake, don't let's fight, don't let's be silly". So conflict comes to an end. Is that a fact with you? Or you are accepting my fact?

So if it is a fact to you then you have come to a way of living in which there is no conflict whatsoever, which means no opposite. You understand? No opposite. That is, opposing desire, wanting to do this and not wanting to do that, which is in opposition to each other. When you realize desire has different objects that are still

desire then the opposition goes. There is only desire. Then what is desire? Then you go into it and see desire can come into being only when there is sensation, plus thought, and desire. From that arises the image. I wonder if you follow all this? Sensation, thought, desire, then the image-making. I see that car, observe it, sensation, then thought says, "How nice, I wish I could drive it" - desire, and the image, which is me sitting in the car and having fun. Right?

So as long as there is image-making there must be hurt. When there is no image-making there is no possibility of being hurt at all. And to have an insight into that frees you from image-making.

And the next question is, which the lady didn't put, which I am going to put: what is the relationship between two people when one has really no image and the other has image. What is then the relationship between the two? You understand? It can happen - you understand? It does happen. You may be married and your wife may be free of image-making - my god, that would be marvellous! And she would call it marvellous if you had no image. So what is her relationship to you - she, who has no image, and you have image? It is your responsibility, not mine.

Q: I can't answer.

K: You can't answer. Quite right.

Q: She has love.

K: Ah, you don't know. You see, you have already formed an image. If you have no image, what is your responsibility to the world, to another, and what takes place when there is no image in this relationship of human beings? You don't know. Right. That is the truth. You don't know. Any formation is just an image-making. You don't know. Remain with that fact that you don't know, which

is an extraordinary discovery. You understand sir? You always have an answer, but to say to oneself, "I really don't know what would happen if there was no image making, but I am going to find out". You follow? When you start with certainty you end up in doubt. When you start without any certainty you end up completely certain. You understand? So you don't know. From there move, find out, whether you can be free of images and what is implied, and the responsibility to others - you follow? It is a marvellous thing that is growing, flowering, you discover it.

And the next question is: can one live without a motive? That is, we said, where there is a motive there is a direction - right? The direction set by thought - right? I have a motive of wanting to get rich. Thank god I haven't got it, but suppose I had it. I have a motive, therefore all my life is directed towards that particular thing - getting money, because then I can have a son, I can travel, I can have a house - you follow? So we are traditionally trained, brainwashed to have direction - heaven, Jesus, Buddha, whatever direction, economically, socially, religiously - we are trained to have direction. Right? And so we don't know how to live without a motive. Then we ask, is it possible to live without a motive? Right? Not knowing, we can find out. I don't start by saying, "I mustn't have a motive", that's silly when I have got it. But to say, "Well I have got a motive, I see what is implied in a motive, I move in a certain direction, pleasant or unpleasant, profitable or not profitable, worthwhile and not worthwhile and so on." The direction is set by thought, which is desire, image, sensation and particular direction. That is the motive operating. And we are trained traditionally, educationally, socially, in every way, even



religiously - you follow? You have directions - having directions, motives, then you can find out why thought sets a direction. You understand my question? Are you following this. Why thought sets a direction in life. Direction means non-comprehension of the whole. Right? It is like looking at a map - please give me five minutes, don't get tired, if you are tired then go to sleep and don't listen, but keep awake for five minutes at least. We will finish with this.

Why do we have direction in life? Because one of the reasons is it gives security, at least thought assumes it gives security. Right. If I have no motive I don't know what to do, I am lost. So the fear of getting lost, fear of not being secure, both financially, psychologically and physically, thought says, "I must have a direction in life". So it sets a direction, which means pushing away all other things, like one of those athletes we saw in the Olympic Games, he was completely in one direction, diving, running, whatever it is, completely absorbed, trained, concentrated. And the rest of life is, you know - politics, religion, everything is a side issue. There he is completely secure. So thought sets a direction in order to be both biologically and psychologically secure. That is a fact. Right? So it discards the whole map of life. It only sees one direction which is towards that particular village and the rest is denied. So when you have a direction, which is tradition, accepted as normal, then there is division between the one who has a direction going north and the other fellow is going south east, south west, you know, break it all up into fragments. You follow? The moment you have a direction you are breaking up life into fragments. I wonder if you follow. I have just seen it now. I have

got an insight into it. No, see it for yourself. The moment you have a direction you have broken up life into fragments. So your life has become a fragment because you have a direction. You see it?

Then the question is: can I live without direction? You understand? I see the whole of the map and the map says there is no motive, no direction. Now just a minute. I'll go slowly into this. When there is direction there is a fragmentation of life, of living. That is clear. Fragmentation implies conflict - you in that direction, I in another direction, she another direction, so we are all breaking up and therefore there is no co-operation, except for profits and all the rest of it, so there is always conflict when there is fragmentation. Right? Can we go on? And the mind says, 'Is it possible to live without fragmentation, without direction?' It can only say that when it has seen, or had an insight into the fragmentary way it is living because it has a direction. Have you understood what I am saying? If I see, observe, am aware that having a direction implies fragmentation, where there is fragmentation there must be conflict - Arabs, Jews, Hindu, Muslim, Catholic, Protestant, the whole business of living. Where there is a direction there is fragmentation, and therefore division and therefore conflict.

Do you have an insight into this reality? It is a reality. It is an actual factual daily reality: where I have a direction - I want to be the Prime Minister and so on, so there is conflict between you and me. Where there is division there must be conflict, that is a law. Have I an insight into that? Then only I can say, "Can I live without motive?" Not before because it has no meaning. So I don't know. You understand? I don't say, "I can", or cannot, I don't

know. But I do know where I have a direction there is fragmentation, conflict and all the rest of it follows. So that I am fully acquainted with, I am familiar with it, everyday of my life. From that I ask myself, because I have an insight into that, I ask myself is it possible to live without a motive. I really don't know. But I do know the other but I don't know this. So I am going to enquire. I am watching, there is an observation in my action, in my speech, when I have a motive. And I say "Yes, I have got a motive there, why?" You follow? So I begin to bulldoze it, bring it all out. So at the end I can say, "I have no motive". You know what that means? No conflict, no fragmentation, a life which is whole, healthy, sane and holy. Then only you can say this, but to say it before means nothing.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: There is no motive, I said, I have no motive. To quickly say it, actually what it means. There is no motive for living. You know what that means? That means real compassion, you understand?

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 30TH JULY 1976

It seems to me that we never actually observe what is taking place. To know what is exactly taking place is a great revelation. To see exactly, accurately, what is going on, both in the outside world, technologically, politically, as far as we can know politically, and observe in ourselves the actual movement of thought, our responses, the motives, we are so unfamiliar with ourselves. And all our dialogues and talks have been to bring about a transformation - we are using the word 'transformation' correctly, an inward revolution psychologically, so that human beings are really different, basically, not carry on the same old way, same old routine, boredom, loneliness, suffering and all the rest of it. So it is very important, it seems to me, to observe accurately, correctly, rightly, what is going on. And if we can so observe, I think we will learn enormously, we will discover so many things. But when we observe we generally don't like what we see, or like what we see, so we run away from it. Whereas if we could stay with what actually is going on, not imaginatively, or in any way suppress it, but observe it meticulously. Then we will find out for ourselves an extraordinary lot of things.

So after saying that, what shall we have a dialogue about this morning? - bearing in mind that a dialogue means conversation between two friends who are concerned with the same problem, who are interested, deeply involved, and therefore a certain affection, care, hesitation in enquiry.

Q: Can we talk about judgement?

K: We are always judging ourselves. That is one of the questions.

Q: What are emotions?

Q: What does it mean to behave?

Q: Can we talk about death and dying?

Q: (In Italian)

K: The gentleman asks in Italian, forgive me if I do not put it rightly, he asks, it is not only that we cry, when someone whom we like dies, for ourselves, but also what happens to the other person, what is involved in death with regard to the other person. Even our tears may be for that person.

Q: What prevents observation.

K: Do circumstances, relationship, all the impingement of the outer environment, does that prevent observation - is that your question, sir?

Now what shall we discuss. We have asked several questions: your question which is, why we are always judging, and so we never observe accurately ourselves, before we even look at ourselves there is always a judgement taking place? That is one of the questions. The other question was: would you talk about death? And behaviour, what do you mean by behaviour? And we cry, not only for ourselves when there is a death of someone whom we like or love, but we cry for that person also, so there is this tremendous sense of sorrow, not only for the one who is gone, but also for oneself. So what shall we discuss or have a dialogue about?

Q: Judgement.

K: Judgement.

Q: Death.

K: Death. Do you want to talk about death - really?

Q: No, judgement.

K: Judgement. We will begin with that, judgement, and go on to the other questions. Because that is very important because we are going to find out whether we judge death, or see it as it is. We will come to that.

The question is: why human beings always judge, or condemn, or approve, or accept, why is there this constant movement of appreciation or depreciation, why is there this state? That is the question. Why do you think you judge? It is our tradition, partly, isn't it? You are brought up from childhood to judge, to evaluate - right? This is good, this is bad, this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this should not be, I am not good, I am bad, all the rest of it, this constant repetition of judgement. Is that an avoidance of facing oneself? You understand my question? I project judgement over everything - politics, economics, religion, god, no god, about everything - and projecting that I hide myself from myself. It is like a smoke screen I throw out and behind that I refuse to look. Is that one of the factors? And is it another factor that it is much easier to judge? Judgement being opinion, prejudice, or previous knowledge, and that reaction to previous knowledge is almost instantaneous, and so it is much easier to judge than to withhold judgement, and observe, which becomes much more difficult.

So is it avoidance, an escape from looking exactly at 'what is'? And judgement in religious matters is tremendously potent because all religions judge. When you die there is an entity who is going to judge you. You know the Greek idea. All this is a form of judgement about you. When you go to appear at the gate of St.

Peter then he is going to judge you, and so on and on and on. Is that part of our great tradition - religious, social, and also partly avoiding observing what is actually going on?

If some of these are the facts, and perhaps more, is it possible not to judge at all but to observe? I like that red shirt, or I don't like that red shirt. But without that reaction, just to observe it. Then I learn much more and see that colour totally differently. I don't know if you have noticed that.

So in behaviour - that gentleman asked the question, what is behaviour - what place has judgement in behaviour? You understand? One judges behaviour according to a traditional pattern - I get up when the ladies come in, open the door for the ladies, this or that, various forms of behaviour. Now what relationship is judgement to behaviour? You understand my question? And what is behaviour, to behave? To act really, isn't it, to act in my relationship with another, or with my friend. In relationship to act. Now to act rightly, correctly, accurately, which is not judgement, is it? I wonder if we see that. We said behaviour is action - right? Of course. Is that action based on judgement? Or is it accurate, correct, right? I am using those three words which have the same meaning. So when we use the word 'accurate', is that accuracy based on previous memories, previous activities, previous patterns, and then judge my action - right or wrong, good or bad? Or in correct action there is no judgement? I am finding something.

What is correct action? Can I say, previously before the act takes place, "This is correct action, this is the wrong action"? You understand my question? Are we meeting each other? I want to find out, as a human being living in this world, what is correct

action - politically, religiously, in every way, completely. Now how am I to find out what is correct action? First I must enquire if it is based on judgement - judgement of others, or a judgement which I am going to impose on my action according to the pattern which I have developed. So is correct action based on a judgement of others, or on my own judgement based on experience, knowledge, and all the rest of it? You understand, are we meeting? Yes? Am I acting because of environment correctly? Or am I acting correctly because I have previous patterns of behaviour? Or is action independent of both? Action means the doing now - right? The doing now, active present, isn't it. The verb, to act. And acting is the moment of action. If that action is based on the future - ideals, hope, judgement - then it is not acting. Or if that action is based on my previous conclusion, it is not acting - right? If I act according to the past it is not action. If I act according to the future it is not action. Action being the active present of that verb to act. Right? Action is only in the present. So where does judgement take place? You understand my question? If I am acting without the pattern of the future or the past, then it is complete action. You may say, that is wrong action, or another may say, but it is action. I wonder if I am making this clear. So behaviour is not based on the past pattern, or a future ideal. It is acting now, whatever that action be, in the present. And please see the importance of this. If there is no pattern of the future, according to which I am acting, or a pattern of the past according to which I am acting, then I am acting without motive, without the idea of a reward or punishment. So acting is now. So where action is in the present, free from the past and the future, it is the right action. I wonder if you have got it -



have you understood it, sir? Have I conveyed something?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, on criteria, yes, patterns. That's what we said. So we have answered those two question, judgement and behaviour.

And then there is the question of death - do you want to discuss that?

Q: There is also the question of emotion.

K: Quite right. What is emotion? What is the relationship of emotion to thought? Is emotion independent of thought? Or is thought part of emotion? Emotion, what does that mean, the word itself?

Q: To move out.

K: It comes from the word motion, motive, and emotive, out. Now just a minute. I am asking, is emotion feeling, sentiment, sensation, have they have any relationship to thought? Sentiment, emotionalism, romanticism, what is their relationship to thought? And emotion, sentiment, romanticism, what relationship have they to love? You understand my two questions? Which is the relationship to thought and the relationship to love.

Is love sentiment? Is love romanticism? Is love a sensation? Right? So what is emotion, to move out? I feel very strongly about something. What does that imply? You feel something very strongly about Hinduism, it doesn't matter what, or communism, or dictatorship. Let's call it not communism, dictatorship, communism is now becoming bourgeois! Have you emotions? Now what is its relationship to thought? Go carefully, carefully.

Q: It's without relation to thought.

K: That's what I am going to find out. Don't categorize, let's

play with it. If there was no thought would you have emotion? Or you would have sensation. So we are asking, what is the relationship between thought and emotion? I see something very beautiful: perception, seeing, contact, sensation, desire, then thought. And thought builds the image, which is established. So there is perception, seeing, then contact, sensation. If thought doesn't interfere, it stops there, then there is only sensation. I wonder if you are meeting my point. Please don't accept this, I may be totally wrong, so examine it, investigate it, question it.

That is, I see something which is most pleasurable. The seeing awakens the senses, all the senses are awakened, and can it stop there and not allow desire, thought, image? Then is emotion merely sensation, untouched by thought? Therefore it is no longer a movement of desire. Have you understood. It is fairly simply. I see a beautiful - what? Tell me something.

Q: Woman.

K: Woman! I thought so. You all love that, don't you? There is the perception of a beautiful woman. Religions have condemned desire because by perceiving that woman, seeing that woman, all the sensations arise, then thought comes in, the image is formed, and the battle begins. Right? So throughout the world the religious monks have said, cut out desire, suppress it, control it, don't look at a woman - right? I don't know if you have walked behind any priests, or any group of monks, if you have you would have noticed it - they look and promptly look away. Because they daren't, the whole tradition says, suppress it, deny it. But what we are saying is something entirely different. Seeing that beautiful woman or a man, sensations awaken, which is natural, and to stop there, not let

thought come in, then the desire begins, then the image making begins. You follow? You understand? You try it, do it some time and you will see the extraordinary discipline it demands. Discipline in the sense not imposing a pattern, but the act of learning, which is discipline. The seeing of beauty, the sensations arise, and withering away. They do not wither away when thought comes in, then desire begins and all the problems. You follow? Right.

So let's go now, if you want to, to discuss death. It is an immense problem this, you understand. Do you really want to go into it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: His question is localized, a particular question, which is: when there are tears when somebody dies whom you like, or love, those tears are directed towards that person and towards oneself - oneself and the other. That is particular question which we will come to in the course of the dialogue about death.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Some people have noticed, the questioner says, that at the moment of death there is a smile on the face of the person who is dying - some of the cases. Some other people die with great agony, in accident, old age, crippled, unconscious, and then perhaps the smile doesn't come in. Or, as the gentleman says, sometimes it happens there is a smile on the face of the person who is dying. What is the significance of that smile? That is the question.

Q: What is the difference between fear, sorrow and happiness?

K: Do we want to discuss that question?

Q: Could we first discuss death?

K: Could we first discuss death and then that question

afterwards? Is that all right, sir?

So we are going to have a dialogue about death - dialogue being a conversation, an enquiry between two friends, between two people, or a few people who are really concerned about it, not theoretically, who actually want to find out. So we are enquiring, we are not dogmatically stating anything, we are enquiring. And when we enquire rightly then we discover the truth of it, you understand? To enquire correctly there must be freedom - right? If I am afraid of death then I can't enquire because that fear is going to warp my investigation - right? Is that clear? Or if I have a belief about death and after life, that too distorts investigation.

So to investigate about a human problem, as death, which is very complex, there must be freedom to look. And you cannot observe, or investigate if there is any kind of prejudice, belief, hope, fear. Therefore are you prepared for that? You understand my question? That to enquire very seriously there must be no prejudice, otherwise it distorts, no fear, no desire for comfort, hope, none of that. The mind must be completely empty to look. Right. That is the first thing to have to find out about something.

First of all, every human being has a desire for continuity - right? Every human being. The ancient Egyptians did it in one way, and the modern people do it in another way - they bury them, or incinerate them, or in incinerating they hope something will continue. So there is this solid demand on the part of every human being that there must be some kind of continuity - right? It is there in you, isn't it, look at it. So what is it that continues? Is there anything that continues? Is there anything permanent? Or everything is impermanent? You understand my questions? So I

must find that out. Before I can go into the question of death I must first find out, a human being, or you, must find out if there is anything permanent that continues. Continuity implies permanency - right? Now is there anything in you as a human being that has a continuity?

Q: There is a desire for continuing.

K: No, sir, careful. No, apart from desire, apart from it, is there anything permanent - permanent being continuous, which is a movement without an end? You understand?

Q: May be.

K: No, not, may be. First look at it. There is the desire for continuity - desire being, we said very carefully, sensation, and thought is desire and the desire creates the image. See the sequence of it. Sensation, thought, desire, the image making. Apart from desire is there something that is permanent, which means time doesn't touch it. That is what we mean by permanent. Time will not change it. And therefore it is a movement continuously. So is there anything in a human being which is permanent?

Q: What is the psyche?

K: We will come to that, madame. Please don't put questions which are not related actually to what we are discussing. Please, I beg of you because then you are not paying attention then to what we are saying. We will include the psyche and all that presently. But this is what we are asking: is there anything permanent in human beings?

Q: Continuity implies time.

K: That's right, sir. Continuity means time, and also it means there is no time. If it is continuous from the beginning, never

ending, it is beyond time. Just a minute. I don't want to investigate that yet. Is there anything in a human being, in you, in me, that is permanent?

Q: There is a feeling of existence, of the self.

K: There is the feeling of existence, there is the feeling of the self. The self and the feeling of living, from childhood until you die. Existence, the feeling of living. So what is the 'I'? He said the 'I' is permanent - somebody said that. So what is the 'I', the 'me'? The psyche, the personality, what is that? Please, be serious, don't fiddle with this thing, it is much too serious if you really want to go into this question.

Q: Thought as memory.

K: You are saying, thought as memory. Are you repeating this because you have heard somebody say it, or is it a truth to you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, sir, do listen carefully. We are having a conversation, or enquiring into what is the 'I' - the 'I' being the feeling that you are living, that you are existing. Now what is that 'I'? Is that 'I' permanent? The ancient Hindus laid down that that 'I' is evolving, life after life, until it reaches perfection, which is the highest principle, Brahman. So that 'I' has a continuity till it makes itself perfect and is absorbed into the highest principle. That is the idea of reincarnation - re-incarnating. Please listen to that word. Re-incarnating. That is, born over again. Now we are asking, what is that 'I'? Is that 'I' permanent? Don't repeat something which you do not yourself find. Then you are merely repeating what somebody else has said, that is of no value. Is that 'I' permanent? Which means, what is that 'I'? How does it come into being? Is it a

spiritual entity, therefore continuous, or is it a momentary affair, in a flux, in constant change? You understand? Is it at essence a spiritual thing which is a non material process? Or is it a material process? Material process being, thought as being matter, it has built through various incidents, accidents, impressions, impingement of environment, family, all that is a material process put together by thought, and thought says, "I am different from thought". You are following all this? So the 'I' and thought have separated themselves and said, "Thought will go on, my thought will go on". Right?

So you have to find out for yourself, in this enquiry about death, if there is anything permanent, or everything is in movement, everything, both the material process and the idea that you are a spirit, both are in constant movement - movement being time, time being from here to there, chronologically, time also being the cultivation of the psyche. Movement. So is there anything permanent, or everything in a human being is undergoing change?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: He says, we are something permanent. Which is, there are certain moment in life when there is a realization or a happening that is beyond time. That happening is permanent. That is what the gentleman says. When that thing happens, if it has become a memory...

Q: It isn't a memory, sir.

K: Wait, listen. I said, if. If it has become a memory then it is a material process, and you can call that permanent. Or if it happens, that extraordinary state of timelessness, and if it is not a memory, the question then is, will it continue? You understand? Just a

minute, let us finish, keep your question, sir. That is, you have an experience of something - I won't use even the word 'experience' - an happening of something which is beyond time. When it is not registered as memory it still remains beyond time: the moment it is registered it is made of time. That is simple. Then is that happening a continuous thing? Or does it end? If it is continuous then it is of time. Please, I have gone into this very carefully because we are going to go into something which requires great attention, real sensitivity to find out. We are asking, is there something permanent? It is for you to answer.

Q: We want something to be permanent.

K: There is the desire to have permanency - my permanent house, my permanent name, my permanent form - you follow? - the memories, the attachment, we want everything permanent. All insurance is based on permanency. So, just a minute, sir, we have to find out for ourselves if there is anything permanent.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, sir. Do look, please. For myself there is nothing permanent. I am not imposing this onto you. Nothing permanent. Then what is death? You understand? If there is a continuity of the 'me', the 'me' putting its structure, put together by thought, thought being the word, the word being the name, the name being attached to the form. The name, the form of its body, the organism, and the whole structure of the psyche is put together by thought, obviously. Do you see that? Or do you say, "No, no, there is something much more spiritual behind that"? If there is something much more spiritual behind that, and if you say that exists, it is still part of thought. You understand? If you say, that behind the veil of time -



which is a good expression - the veil of time there is something utterly timeless, then you have recognized it - right? If you have recognized it, it is part of your memory, if it is memory it is a material process of thought. Either that something behind the veil is real, true, therefore unthinkable. Right? So you don't know. But when you assert there is something spiritual, a spiritual essence, you have already contaminated it, therefore it is no longer spiritual. Grasp this once and you will see. You see this is an old trick of a great many of the Hindus that there is god within you, Brahman is within you, and all that you have to do is to peel off, like onion skins. You understand? That is, you have established by thought god in you, of the Brahman in you, and then thought says, I must get at it, therefore let me operate. You follow?

So if all thought is a material process, and whatever it has put together is still a material process, even though it says, there is a permanent me, it is still part of the structure of thought. Then what is an ending, which is death? You understand? I wonder if you are following all this. Just listen to this, sir, look at it, don't answer me, look before you answer it. As most of us desire continuity and therefore are frightened of death, then what takes place when there is an ending called death? You understand?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir. We said, sir, that everything is in movement, and I said when there is an ending - look, let me put it very simply: I desire to continue, that's my hope, that's my longing - I don't, but I am just taking that as an example, as a human being, an ordinary human being, he says, "I must continue, I am frightened of death", but there is an ending. I die. I may not want to die. I may cry at

death, I may fight against death, that is inevitable - right? So I am saying, when there is the desire for continuity and there is an ending, then what takes place? You understand my questions? Are you getting tired?

There is the death of the organism, and death of the psyche. They are interrelated, psychosomatic, all that business. So I am asking, a man who says, "I must continue, I want to continue, it's my life, for god's sake help me because my one desire is to continue." And I am asking, all right my friend, what happens when that end comes, which is inevitable? Either it ends through accident, through disease, all kinds of endings, what happens? So to find out what happens you must investigate if the psyche, the 'me', is a permanent thing, or impermanent thing. If it is impermanent then the ending - what happens? Please, don't answer, look at it, find out for yourself. This is tremendously important because man says, I must find immortality - you understand? The ancient Egyptians found immortality in the tombs through a continuity of their daily life eternally. If you have looked at the Egyptian tombs and read about them, that is their desire, that they must continue for the next thousand years, or million years because the Nile valley was protected - desert on both sides, and therefore that Nile valley gave them a sense of permanency, and that permanency they translated as, continuous life. You can read about it, or if you are interested you can look at it. And the ancient Hindus said, the self, though it is impermanent, must continue until it reaches the perfect principle, the highest principle, which is Brahman. Or they said, there is god in you, and through various incarnations you will make that ego perfect until it reaches the

highest principle - you follow? And the Christians have their own way of resurrection and all the rest of it.

Now I want to find out, as a human being, though my desire is for continuity, I know there is inevitably death - inevitably, whether you like it or not it is there. And I say to myself, what happens when there is an ending?

Q: It is a great shock.

K: That's not my question, please. We will discuss it in a different way, just a minute. You are not answering my question because you are not facing it, you are not looking at it, not putting your teeth into it to find out.

I want to continue, that is my hope, my desire, my longing. I have continued for eighty years with my family, with my furniture, with my books, with all the things I have collected for eighty years and please give me another thousand years with the same things. But death comes along and says, "No, my friend, you are going to die" - what happens after that? You follow my question? I desire - human beings desire a continuity and there is an ending. Continuity being all that the human mind has collected - knowledge, things, ideas, attachments, all the things human beings have collected - property, things, ideas, beliefs, gods, all that I want that to continue for the rest of eternity. But death comes and say, "End it". So I am asking, what is it that ends?

Q: The psyche.

K: Are you sure? Sir, be careful, don't just speculate. I really don't like to discuss this, or go into it with many people because they are not serious. This demands great seriousness, not just verbalizing all the time. I said, the desire comes into being through

sensation and thought; then thought, which is desire, has a name, as K, the form of K, and there is all the content of my consciousness, which has been put together by thought, that I want to continue. I want thought with all its content, with all the attachments, with all the pain, with all the suffering, with all the misery and confusion, that I want to continue.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: When the physical body dies, the material process which is the brain structure, which is the thought process, dies. You understand. I wonder if you see this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I am the world, and the world is me. That is a fact. Right? The world is me, not as an idea, not as a theory, but an actuality, as if I put in a pin there is pain, as real as that, that I am the world and the world is me. The 'me' is put together by thought. It is a material process. Thought is matter, a material process, because it is the response of memory which is stored in the brain as knowledge, and so when that brain dies the material process dies - right? Then what takes place? You understand my question?

Q: The material process dies.

K: Madame, if I may point out without being rude, when you say the material process dies, have you died to that now? Not when death comes. You understand, sir? I'll show it to you.

I am the world, and the world is me. My consciousness is the consciousness of the world. The content of my consciousness is the content of the consciousness of the world. And that content is put together by thought - my furniture, my name, my family, my bank account, my belief, dogmas, all that is in my consciousness, which

is the world's consciousness. Unless you see that you can't go further into what we are enquiring. Then that consciousness, which is a material process, comes to an end, because the organism collapses through disease, accident and so on, so the brain decays and so the thought process comes to an end. Right? So the thought process which has put together the ego, the 'me', has come to an end. Ah, you don't accept that. So I say, is it possible to die now to everything that thought has put together as consciousness, which is me, and me, the world. You understand my question? I wonder if you do.

Q: We can't accept what you say, that is annihilation.

K: He says, we can't accept that because it means total annihilation. That we can't accept. Why not, if that is truth? That's why you want something permanent, you want something that will be endless, which is yourself, with all your miseries, all that business. So I say to myself, as I am the world and the world is me, my consciousness is the consciousness of the world, and all that content of that consciousness which makes up consciousness is put together by thought - beliefs, dogmas, rituals, everything is put together by thought. I say to myself, can all that die now, not fifty years later, now? Which means can that content empty itself now? You understand my question? That is, death is now, not fifty years later.

When you die your body withers away and your brain ends. And all the content of your consciousness cannot continue as it is, because it is the thought process. So I am asking myself, and you - I am asking you, not myself, I am asking you as a human being, seeing the reason of all this, the reason, the logic, and therefore

going beyond logic, the truth of it, that we are the world and the world is you, and your consciousness is the consciousness of the world. I don't know if you see that. And when you see that, have an insight into that, then the things that have been put together by thought can all that come to an end, not fifty years later, but now? You understand the question? Have you understood my question? Please this is dreadfully serious.

Look sir, part of my consciousness is, I believe - belief is part of my consciousness. Right through the world they believe in something - right? God, I believe in perfect state, I believe in my experience, I believe in god, I believe in Jesus, I believe in Buddha, I believe, which therefore is a common factor for man. That belief is put together by thought, which is a material process. Can you end that belief now, as you are going to do when you die? You follow my question? To end your belief in something immediately, and see what takes place. Not say, I am frightened to drop my beliefs, because beliefs give me tremendous security. So you are seeking security in an illusion, therefore it is no security at all. So can you die to that now? Then only you can answer what comes next. But before you can answer what comes next you must act. Which is, words are not action, theories are not action, but when there is this perception that belief is one of the most common factors of human desire, which is, they find in belief great strength - I believe in god - that gives tremendous strength. It may be an illusion, and it is because it is put together by thought. So can I die to that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I said that sir. I said that. So can you die to that belief, to

belief, not to a particular belief, to belief? And as most people have ideals, and it is one of the most extraordinary phenomenon in the world that wherever you go every human being has ideals - ideals of something or other, it doesn't matter what it is, noble, ignoble, actual and so on. Now ideals are obviously put together by thought, it is a material process in opposition to what I am. So can you die to that?

And unless you die to that, you cannot possibly answer the next question. And we want to find out the next before we die. That's what we are clinging to, you understand. If that can be told, verbalized and then made common, you will all believe in that. It becomes vulgar - I am using the word 'vulgar' in the ordinary sense, common, not insulting it, derogatory. Then it becomes a belief and we are all happy. But to die not knowing - you understand? No, you don't understand.

So we are only dealing with facts, not with theories, not with projected ideas, comforting or ennobling, but we are dealing with actual facts of daily life. Our daily life is made up of things put together by thought. Thought is a material process.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand sir. He is talking about ectoplasm, that is quite a different problem.

Look sir, let me put it round the other way. A human being doesn't end his sorrows, his miseries, his confusion. Then he is like the rest of the world. He dies, but sorrow, confusion, misery as a vast field goes on. You understand this, this is a fact. Like a vast volume of water in a great river there is this immense sorrow of man. For god's sake, do see all this. There is such violence, hatred,

jealousy, that is the vast stream. And we human beings are part of that stream. Unless I die to that stream it will go on, the stream will go on, which is the world. You understand. So the man who steps out of the stream, the human being who steps out of the stream, will know what is beyond 'what is'. But as long as you remain in that stream, one foot in and one foot out, playing, which most of us do, you will never find out what is beyond death. Which means one must die to everything without hope. You understand all this? That is one of the most difficult things. I believe Dante in his Inferno said, Lose all hope before you enter - it is not that kind of hope, we are not entering into Inferno. But a man who dies to everything will know what is eternal. You understand?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, that is just a - you go back into theories. Sir, you understand?

Look, you see sir, please. You know it is one of the most difficult things to talk or discuss, or go into things with tremendous attention right to the end. Only very few people can do it. This is a subject that demands all your attention, not verbalization, theories and all that but continuous attention. And few can do this, few want to do this, they can do it but they are too lazy, too uninterested. If you are really captivated, caught by this, wanting to find out, you will give complete attention, therefore no words but constant pushing, pushing, pushing, not knowing where you are going. And that is death. When you die there is an ending to everything that you know. So can you not die now to everything that you know? You follow? So then you will find out for yourself what is truth in which there is no illusion, nothing personal, it is



not my truth or your truth, it is truth.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 31ST JULY 1976

As we were saying yesterday, and the previous talks, I think it is very important, if I may point out, repeat it again, that one should be a light to oneself and not follow anybody. Naturally in the technological world you have to follow, you have to accept, you have to do all kinds of things there, but in the world of the mind, or if you like to use the word, spirit, authority cripples, destroys that light. One must come upon it for oneself. Truth is something you can't find through another, nor through any technique. And it is becoming more and more evident throughout the world that because the technological world has so extraordinarily advanced we think that the same kind of technology can be applied for ourselves, for our psychological well being. So we are apt to think, or feel, or accept, that a technique of some kind is necessary for deep understanding, having an insight, or coming upon that truth. So if I may point out again this morning that one should be most advisedly careful not to accept anything from anybody psychologically, but to investigate for oneself if one is at all serious. And from there one can learn a great deal because one is the world, as we pointed out, if we know how to read the book of ourselves, then everything is there.

Now what shall we talk about?

Q: Can we talk about energy?

Q: Can we talk about self deception and be aware of it?

Q: If I observe my sorrow, it disappears. Would you please go into it much more?

Q: What do you think of suicide?

K: What do I personally think about suicide? And what other things would you like to talk about?

Q: Can we talk more, or have a dialogue about being a light to oneself?

K: Shall we start with that? And perhaps we could include all the other questions in it.

What does it mean to be a light to oneself? So can we start from the beginning? We are not a light to ourselves now. That is a fact - right? We are confused - politically, religiously, in all our relationships with each other, there is a certain strain, confusion, conflict, and from that this question of sorrow and so on. So we are, as human beings right throughout the world, dreadfully confused. There are so many guides, so many philosophers, so many gurus with their systems, asserting, persuading, hoping that you will follow and so on. So there is this immense confusion outwardly and inwardly. That's a fact. Can we start from there?

And there are many throughout the world who think or assert that this light, or this wisdom, or this truth, god, whatever name you like to give it, is abiding in each one. That is an assumption, a theory, a traditional acceptance of what someone has asserted, or because you are conditioned to that you accept it. So the fact is we are very, very confused. Right. Could we start from that basis? We may be sometimes not confused, sometimes see things very, very clearly, and having that perception once it becomes a memory and we want to capture it, hold on to it, and fight to get it back again. But as human beings, wherever we live, in whatever clime, and whatever circumstances, this state of confusion and conflict exists.

That's a fact from which we can start. If we are a light to ourselves now conflict wouldn't exist. So we must start with actually what is.

Obviously if there is any kind of confusion, whatever choice we make out of that confusion will still be confused - right? Out of my confusion - suppose I am confused - I choose a certain path, certain direction, certain gurus, certain activity. Because I am confused, out of that confusion whatever I choose will equally be confusing. I think that is equally a fact. So it becomes very important not to choose. Right? I wonder if we understand that. Not to follow a certain direction, or a path, or a system, or a method, or a guru, or this, or that, because it leads us to much greater confusion, to greater division, which is what is happening in the world - there are your gurus and my gurus, mine is better than yours, mine knows more than yours. You follow, this battle going on all around us.

So to find a light for oneself, action out of confusion leads to further confusion - right? Can we not accept it as a fact - it is like the blind leading the blind. So the first requirement, seems to me, is to be free from the desire to find truth, to find something away from 'what is'. Right? Are we meeting each other? So are we aware that we are confused? And if we are confused, then what is the action, or is there any action which will not lead to further confusion, or is there an observation of this confusion which, by the very observation is the action?

Now let me go into it a little bit more. Suppose I am confused as a human being. And I realize that whatever I do out of that confusion will lead to further confusion, further conflict, further misery. I am very clear on that point. Then I must act. Life demands action. I can't wait until I have completely unconditioned

myself and then act. You follow? I must act because action is life, like relationship is life, activity, action, the doing, is part of life. So what am I to do? I know I am very confused, and is there a part of me which is not confused? You follow? Or is the whole of me confused? Is there a part of me, or somewhere in me is there clarity, is there a sense of freedom, total freedom in which there is no confusion, conflict, and all the rest of it? You understand my question?

Q: One must be very careful not to put it into words.

K: I understand. But I am enquiring into this. I am asking myself, if I am confused, I am asking myself, am I totally confused in all my consciousness, the whole of it; or is there a part of that consciousness, which is me, which is not confused? And if I can hold on to that part which is not confused, then out of that action will be right. You understand my point?

So I must find out if there is anywhere within me, not imagined, not caught in an illusion of desire, I must find out if there is anywhere within me some spot which is really beautifully completely free of all this confusion. Right, you have understood? Or the whole of me is confused. Can a confused mind, confused consciousness, ask such a question: is there a part of me which is not confused? I wonder if you see the point of this. I am confused, my mind is troubled, in conflict, broken up, fragmented, and that mind which is fragmented asks, is there a part of me which is clear, not fragmented? You follow? It is a wrong question. Of course. It is a wrong question, but we put that question. I don't know if you see the importance of this. I am confused and I know I am very confused, but my desire is, there must be somewhere within me,

some spot, some area, where there is tremendous clarity. My desire wants that, and so it creates an illusion and is caught in that illusion and says, "Yes, there is an area which is very clear". You follow?

So one must be aware at depth that this idea, or this desire to have an area where there is clarity, which is an illusion, one must become very careful about that, not be caught in it. So I am asking then, I am totally as a human being confused - religiously, politically, in my relationship, in my activity, there is regret, there is sorrow, there is pain, there is anxiety - you follow - all the human agony with which I am surrounded, of which I am part - now life demands action, life says, without relationship you cannot exist. And I discover in my relationship too there is confusion, there is conflict, there is battle between the sexes. So there it is. So what shall I do? You understand now my question? I am not admitting, or desiring an area within my consciousness where there is some clarity. I have totally put away that because I see it is the activity of desire, hope, wanting, which inevitably leads to illusion. So I completely discard that. Please this is a dialogue, I am not talking only. We are sharing this thing together, therefore you are participating in this.

So I am only confused, and I must act, and I see I have relationship - wife, husband, boy, girl, whatever it is, relationship, father, parents, whatever it is - and there too I am confused. Confusion implies conflict. Confusion implies uncertainty. Confusion implies a sense of division. I am aware of all that. So what shall I do, knowing that whatever I do will lead to further confusion, further misery, so what shall I do? Shall I wait until I have cleared all my confusion, withdraw into a world of

monasteries, retreats, ashramas, you follow, communes, and all the rest of it, shall I withdraw into all that? And that implies I have to choose there too - which commune, which guru, ashrama, which retreat, but I am still confused so whatever I choose will be... right? I wonder if you see all this. So I say to myself, joining a group, retreating into a monastery, following somebody else is still part of this confusion so I will not follow anybody, I will not join any group, or retreat into any monastery, or into a commune. So I am left with this confusion. You understand what we are doing? We are brushing everything away - desire hopes to find some clarity and therefore creates illusion. So we are cleaning the deck, as it were.

And what shall I do? I am related, I have relationships, I have to earn a livelihood, I have to write, read, I have to act in life. What shall I do? Dialogue please!

Q: Who is it that wants to do something?

K: My girl or my wife or my parents say, "Do this". Society demands that I do something, earn a livelihood. It is not, I want to do something, because I realize whatever I do is confused, but society, parents, everything says, you have to act, you can't sit still on a chair and look at your neighbour. So what shall I do?

Have a dialogue with me please, it is a dialogue, a conversation between two people who are interested in the same thing, with same intensity, you understand, and therefore a communication takes place easily.

There is an unconscious desire, or a belief, or a longing, that there must be a way out from this confusion - right? So we have to go into that question. Please, we have to go into this question,

which is: is the content of my consciousness, whether it is conscious or deep down, hidden, is there anywhere within the hidden area an actuality which is clear? An actuality, not an imagined actuality. So I have to examine what is hidden within the consciousness - right?

Now first of all who has divided this consciousness into the unconscious and the conscious? Who has divided it? Why does this division exist? Let me put it that way.

Q: (inaudible)

K: No, don't jump to it, sir. The whole Freudian, the whole psychological world and the analytical world, psycho-therapeutic world say that there is an unconscious - right - and the conscious, there is a division. And I say to myself, why is there this division? Who has invented this division? Why should I accept the division? A million people say there is a division - professors, highly qualified people, MDs and all the rest of it, they say there is a division - the unconscious, conscious. You all may be wrong. I am not saying you are right or wrong, but you may be, I don't know, but why should I accept this division? You understand.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, the human mind demands to know, and there may be something in consciousness which is hidden. That's all you can say. Something hidden, not divided - you understand? I am objecting to the division. I am objecting rationally, not because I am prejudiced against division. But I say, why do we accept, millions and millions of people now in the western world and partly in the eastern world because the west is conquering technologically in every way the east, why has humanity accepted this?



Q: It is incapacity to see the whole.

K: The incapacity to see the totality of consciousness. So you say because there is this incapacity there has been this division. Watch it very carefully in yourself please. Look at it yourself. Because I am incapable of seeing the totality of my consciousness I resort to dividing it, thereby hoping I will see the whole. First I fragment it, then I put it together in the hope of seeing the whole. You understand? So first we divide and then we join them together. I say to myself, why do you divide it first? And you say, well I can't see the whole. How do you know you can't see the whole? Is it because you have divided it and you are conditioned by this division, which is your accepted tradition that it is divided? I wonder if you are following all this.

Now my question then is: as I, an outsider, if I may point out, I don't accept this division, though a million people accept it I say, no. Because what is important is to see the whole of consciousness - right? Then there is no necessity for a division. Now is that possible? You follow my next question, sir?

Q: As I live a superficial life and occasionally I delve deeply, and that delving deeply gives the idea that there is the unconscious and the conscious - the delving deeply, because I live a superficial life.

K: That is one of the reasons. One of the reasons is the incapacity to see the whole and therefore divisions take place. The other is, one lives a very, very superficial life and occasionally one digs deeply. It may be a dream, or it may be a conscious act, then you realize there is something much deeper than the surface, and therefore there is a division. Right? Go on sirs, this is a dialogue,

please.

Q: It gives great strength if you believe in something.

K: Belief brings great strength - right? Now if there is a neurotic belief, that very neurotic belief gives you an enormous vitality. I don't know if you have met many neurotics. Perhaps most of us are neurotic. So they are extraordinarily vital people - 'vital' in quotes. But that is not the question here for the moment, if I may go into it.

So there are many reasons, or several reasons why there is this division, and having been made mankind is now generally accepting it. And an outsider, like the speaker, comes along and says, "Why does this division exist at all? Is it not possible to see the whole of consciousness?" You understand my question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: He says, in ourselves we are fragmented, in ourselves there are various divisions, and that those divisions help us to divide this consciousness and unconsciousness. So it is part of our whole life, living, which has brought about this division. Right? We accept all these reasons. Right?

Now is it possible to see the totality of one's consciousness, including that which is hidden, including what you call the unconscious? So I am asking, is it possible?

Q: The more I demand to find out if there is a possibility of total observation the more conflict arises.

K: I understand. But I am asking, is it possible - I am not saying it is, or it is not - is it possible for us to see the totality of consciousness in which is included the unconscious, the hidden? The general agreement is, that it is not possible - right? The psychologists, the professors, the MDs, all of them say, that is not

possible, it is only given perhaps to the few loonies, but actually that is not possible.

Now what do we mean by seeing the totality, the whole? Do we observe anything wholly? Do we observe something completely? Or is it only partial observation?

Q: Partial.

K: I am coming to that sir, just look at yourself. Can you see, for instance take greed, or envy, can you see the total movement of greed at once? The total movement. You understand my question? What do you say?

Q: I don't know.

K: The lady says, "I don't know". All right, you have stated that, then what? You are going to enquire, aren't you, first. You don't know, but it is important to find out if it is possible to see the totality of consciousness, including the unconscious. Why isn't it possible? What prevents us from observation of the totality?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madame, we have answered that question, please. Look our question, madame, is: can you see, observe, the total movement of greed? All its implications, why greed arises, what is the source of its continuity, why is it condemned, and so on and so on, the whole movement of greed, can you see it at one glance - not only the active greed, conscious greed, but also the hidden greed? Can you see the whole of that?

Q: What is hidden greed?

K: Hidden greed? I may say, I am not greedy, but deep down I am terribly greedy. Please listen to my question first. Can I see the total movement of greed?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no, I am not telling you anything. I am asking you if you can see the whole movement of greed?

Q: I can't and I don't know why.

K: You cannot. You say you cannot and you don't know why.

Q: If you are interested in something you can see the whole of it.

K: Yes. I am interested in seeing the movement of greed, the whole movement. But I haven't got the energy to go fully into it. I am interested, but the vitality, the energy, the intensity is lacking. So what shall I do? Take drugs, smoke, drink, all kinds of stimulation to have more energy so that I can watch the total movement of greed? It becomes rather silly, doesn't it. So what shall I do? May I go into it? I go into it, you are not helping, find out. Can I observe the total movement of greed, total movement, the hidden as well as the conscious greed? What is movement? I said total movement of greed. Greed is a movement, it isn't static, it is constantly moving, more, more, more. So can I observe the movement?

Now what do we mean by movement? Movement means from here to there. So movement means time. Right? Time is movement, whether chronologically or psychologically, it means movement. So as long as I have this idea of movement, which is time, time is going to prevent me from observing the whole. You get some of it? If it is not clear we will go into it.

Q: It is clear but...

K: Wait, wait, I am coming to that. He asks, you are not answering the question. He says, you have moved away from the

question, which is, you have introduced a new factor which is time. And then you will say, how am I to stop time? I am not stopping anything. I am merely observing. And that is the difference. I am not asking myself, how am I to stop time; I am just observing the whole factor, the whole map of greed. And one of the points which prevents me from seeing the whole map of greed is this movement - movement to end it, the movement to pursue it, the movement which says, "I must stop". I am observing all that. This observation of movement, I am not denying it, I am not trying to stop it, there is only observation of this movement.

So as greed is also a movement - right - it is part of time. I haven't got it, but I will get it. Right? So I have to find out if my mind is caught in this movement. I wonder if you are understanding all this?

Q: Yes.

K: No, sir, don't agree, it is very difficult, go slowly. We said, consciousness contains both the conscious as well as the unconscious. And part of that consciousness is greed - or take any other thing. And so I ask, can we see the totality of greed, the total movement, the nature of it, the structure of it, how it arises? To see it clearly, not theoretically but actually - right? Can you see this - the origin of it and the end of it? Is there an end to greed? I am not greedy for wealth, or money, position, status and all the horrors, but I am terribly greedy to have truth, to find truth. That to me is the most important thing and I am terribly greedy, which is part of greed. I know you don't like to think that, but it is still greed.

So can I see the whole of it, this movement? I can only see - please this is simple - I can only see the total movement of greed

when there is no direction - to get rid of it, to stop it, to suppress it - all that prevents me from looking at greed totally. Right?

Because, as we said the other day, direction is fragmentary, which is a motive. Motive is fragmentary. The motive gives you direction and therefore it is fragmentary. When we have a directive, that I must get rid of it, greed, then I have moved along a certain direction, therefore direction prevents me from seeing the whole. You understand this? That is, to suppress greed, to rationalize greed, to escape from greed, or to say, "I must stop greed", any activity which is directive prevents the seeing of the whole. Right? So as long as a human being, wants to see the totality of consciousness with its hidden layers, he must understand, have an insight to the fact that wherever there is a directive, that directive is divisive, therefore fragmentary, which will prevent the perception of the whole.

Q: That's all there is to it.

K: No, no, there is lots more to it. Directive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I said, sir, greed is part of consciousness, as violence, as hope, despair, anxiety, all that is part of our consciousness. Your consciousness is the world consciousness, and so on. Part of that consciousness is greed. Can you see the movement of greed totally, not only the hidden but the obvious greed? We are saying you can only see the totality of the movement of greed when there is no direction. Which means, only when there is no motive, because motive gives direction. Right, that is simple. So if there is the demand that it is only by seeing the totality of consciousness then also the unconscious is revealed, then you have to observe without

any direction. And that demands a certain attention, seriousness, because then you end greed - you follow? Then you don't play with greed. So you are then aware of the totality of it. But most people don't want to give up their greed, they like their greed. It is a tremendous pleasure to possess. So we are asking something quite different. That is very clear.

And also to see the whole, it may reveal itself through dreams. Do you want to go into all that? Are you interested in it?

Q: I'd be interested.

K: You'd be interested in anything.

So fear is part of our consciousness, and as long as there is fear, which is a directive, therefore you can't see the whole. Dreams. There are obvious dreams, obvious physical, biological pressures and dreams. We are not talking about that. What are dreams and why should we dream at all? You understand my question? During the day the brain is very, very active - observing, you know what it goes through, thinking, chattering, denying, accepting, quarrelling, conflict, that is going on all the time. Registering insults, registering flattery, the whole movement is going on during the day. And during the night the movement still goes on - no? Right? Unless there is an end at end of the day of all this movement of chattering, quarrelling, seeking prestige, power, position, all that, if that doesn't end at the end of the day it then carries on - right? This is a fact. Are we moving together?

So dreams are the continuation of our daily activity, only in different forms, through pictures, ideas, you follow, all that, symbols. So the same movement of confusion, conflict, misery goes on. So our question is: can this movement of our daily life, as

we know it, the conflicts, end each moment? You understand? Not at the end of the day because the brain can only function when it is absolutely in order, properly - you understand? So it demands order. You can find this out for yourself, it is very simple.

Q: We don't have the time to go into the bottom of every question.

K: I am going to show it to you. The lady says, we haven't time to go into the bottom of every problem, every question, every conflict. We haven't got time. We have got plenty of time: as each thing happens, look at it and end it. You have got instantly plenty of time. But we like to play with it. We won't go into that for the moment.

Q: What about psychologically?

K: Even psychologically, please. We are saying, dreams are a continuation of our daily conflicts, miseries, confusions, carried over during sleep, during which the brain is still active because it is trying to bring order while you are asleep. You understand? Because it says, "I can only function if there is order. If there is disorder I get disturbed, I get neurotic, so I must find order." To have order means security for it. This is obvious, all these questions. Are there psychologists here, they would tell you.

So it demands order, which means security, for it to function healthily, normally. But as our daily life is so disorderly it tries during the sleep to find some kind of order. So is it possible during the day, any problem that arises, psychological, human problem, as it arises to let it flower, end? Let it flower - you understand? Suppose I am angry, I let it flower, it doesn't mean I go and beat you up, or say words, but I watch the anger flowering in myself



and withering. You follow? So when there is such activity of appearance, manifestation, flowering and withering as you go along during the day, at night the brain has order so it can rejuvenate itself - you understand all these things - so that it is clear.

So we are asking, as the human being living in modern society, with all its complexities, becomes so confused, and life demands, and relationship demands, that he should act, what shall he do? You remember that was our first question. So in exploring what to do, we say, can you see the whole? It is only when you see the whole there is correct action. We cannot see the whole of consciousness because we have always got some direction - unpleasant, or pleasant, hidden or open, but it is always there. And therefore that prevents the observation of the total map.

Q: I have a feeling that I need to understand.

K: Understand who? Understand the speaker? I am afraid so. The speaker is only a mirror in which you are seeing yourself - right? When you see yourself the mirror becomes unimportant, break it up, throw it away. And I mean it.

So we are observing ourselves, not what the speaker says is ourselves, which you have to understand, but you have to understand, know, look at yourself. Yourself is confused. Please, that is simple. Totally confused. And as long as you do not perceive the totality of that consciousness, whatever you do will lead to further confusion and misery. To perceive the totality of that consciousness there must be no directive. You understand? Directive means motive, the motive says, "I must understand my consciousness, I must get rid of this, I must..." and all the rest of

that childish stuff. So when there is an observation without a direction the unconsciousness is open. You understand? It is all revealed, with one breath you see the whole thing.

Q: We don't do it.

Q: If I have no motive why should I do anything?

K: If I have no motive why should I do anything - is that it? If you have no motive, you say, I have no desire to do anything. You have a motive when you want to have shelter - right? Shelter, a home, a roof on top of you. There is a motive when you want to be clothed, because it is cold. There is a motive when you are hungry, food. Is that same movement carried over to the psyche? You follow my question? There are motives biologically, organically. It may be that we are so conditioned by that, we carry that over to the psychological area, where we say, "I must have a motive to live, otherwise I can't act". You see the difference? Biologically, organically, there is a motive for food, clothes, and shelter, money, I must work, there is a motive. It may be that we are so conditioned by that we move that same urge into the psychological field. And when in the psychological field there is any motive then you divide up life, break it up, and therefore you don't see the totality of life - not my life, or your life, the totality of human life.

Q: We are fragmented.

K: You are still fragmented. So we are asking: can this totality of consciousness be observed? And we are saying, it can be observed totally, including the unconscious, all the travail that is going on in the unconscious, as well as in the conscious, a lot of worms squirming! And all that is revealed when we are observing without the observer - you understand? The observer is the past,

the observer is the motive, the observer says, "I must not do this", etc., etc. The observer is the past and the observer gives motive for observation, and therefore it can never see the totality of it. The observer is the observed - right? That consciousness which is observing is himself, but he likes to divide it and say, "I am different from my consciousness", which is obviously silly. So observation takes place only when there is no observer as the past, who gives direction. Then when there is perception of the whole there is action, not fragmented.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, sir, just a minute. Is the good opposite of the evil? You understand my question? The good. Is the good opposite or different from the bad, the evil? You understand my question? The gentleman says, I am always attempting to identify myself with the good. And we are saying, is the good different, or opposite, opposed to evil?

Q: I identify myself with truth.

K: No, you can't use the word truth, please just a minute, we will come to that point, sir. We are asking a much more fundamental question, which is: is the good opposed to evil?

Q: Good and bad are part of the same thing.

K: Please, just stick to one thing. This is really a very serious question. You understand? Because this has been one of our battles in life - the good and the bad, the beautiful and the ugly, the evil and the beneficial, and so on and so on.

Q: They are different, but not separate.

K: I don't understand that. Is the good, when you say opposite, is it related to the bad? Or is good totally independent of the bad?

Do look.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, not avoidance, just look at it per se, in itself. Do we know the good because we know the bad, the evil? Do you know you are dull because you compare yourself with someone who is bright? Please, this is one of the...

Q: We always do that.

K: The gentleman says, we always do that, we compare ourselves with somebody who is bright and then call ourselves dull. That is what we do all our life. But we are challenging, we are questioning that. I know that is the normal, traditional thing, we know all that, don't bring that up. It is so obvious. But we are asking, is the good opposite of the evil? If it is the opposite it has roots in the evil. No?

Q: They are two aspects of the same phenomenon, two sides of the same coin.

K: Two aspects of the same phenomenon, two sides of the same coin. But sir, that is just words. I want to go much deeper than that, you are just sticking at words.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are not looking, you are not investigating, you are just saying something. Do please investigate, that is the purpose of these dialogues which we have had for the last four days, and tomorrow is the last dialogue. We are saying, please investigate, don't say, it is pleasure, it is this, it is that. We know all these things. Is the good opposite to the evil? If it is the opposite then the good has roots in the evil. Right? I only know that I am dull when I compare myself with you who are bright - right? So my dullness is

rooted in your cleverness. Or, are the two different? If they are different, how do I know what is evil? And what do I know about the good? The good, not the relative good, not the opposite of evil. Then how do I know what is good? I only know what is good in comparison. If I don't compare - you understand - if I don't compare myself with you who are bright, and then through comparison I find myself I am dull, if I don't compare, then am I dull? I don't know.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't think we have understood. This is too difficult. Look, sir. All religions have this problem: the devil, the good angels and the bad angels. The good and the bad. This has been right through all religions, from the ancient Sumerians to the present day. Which is, there is this conflict between this and that. There is only conflict between this and that if they are related. If they are not related, how do I know what is good if they are not related? Only by comparison. And comparison means measure, measure means thought, is thought the product of good? You understand what I am saying? No, you don't. If the good is the product of thought then it is merely a fragment and therefore not the good. But there is a good which is not the product of thought, therefore it is nothing to do with the opposite, it is.

Are we in communication with each other, sharing something with each other, have you got something this morning? Or are we just carrying on in the same old way?

Q: (In Italian)

K: The gentleman says, you are at one level, we are at another level, can't you come down to us? Or can't we come up to you?

And we can only come up to you, the gentleman says - I don't say this - when we have the same interests, at the same moment, with the same intensity, then we meet each other. That is, we meet each other when both of us have got the same interest, same intensity, and energy. So there is never communication, the questioner says, because we are always bobbing up and down. And can't you see our difficulty and break through our difficulty and do something about it? So you are putting the burden onto me. And as I have said many times, I am not your guru, I am not your leader, and I am not your teacher. You are the teacher, you are the guru, you can learn everything about yourself if you know how to read your book, which is yourself. But you don't want to read it, you won't take the trouble to look at it. And it is all there, because you are the world and the world is you, and therefore the whole thing is buried in you - the agony, the suffering, and all the rest of it.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 1ST AUGUST 1976

This is the last discussion or dialogue, and before we ask questions may I say something?

We have talked about a great many things related to our personal life, a life which is common to all humanity, with all the problems, the confusion, the misery, the conflict, violence; and many other things we have talked about. And I hope it will not be merely a verbal description, but each one of us will face the actuality of our daily life and find out for ourselves if these teachings have any direct relationship in our life. Otherwise it would be such a waste of your energy and time and money to come and sit here on a damp day. And, if I may suggest, one should take these teachings as a whole, not take bits of it, what you like and reject the others, it is a total package, if I may use the modern word. And considering what is happening in the world - politically and all the appalling things that are going on - unless one radically as a human being changes fundamentally we will not be able to help humanity.

And it is very important, it seems to me, that we should not follow anybody, join any group, belong to any sect, but be concerned with the whole of mankind, the global problems of life. And to understand that, this enormous complex problem, one has to be, as we said, a light to oneself. And this light cannot be found through another, whatever they may say, however popular they are, whatever circus, one has to be free from all the authority, fear and so on. And what is important is, the first step is the last step. I hope

you understand that. The first step that one takes is really the last step.

Now we can ask questions.

Q: Could we discuss, or talk about together, the question of awareness without following any particular system or practice? Go into the question of awareness.

Q: Can I ask a question? In understanding the problem of greed, it seems greed, or any other particular problem, there is a sense of deep relief. Now how can we sustain the drive without forming it into a practice? How can discovery not prevent other discoveries?

K: Yes. How is one if one discovers something not to make it into a memory, into a knowledge and so make it into a routine, and so lose the energy of that first discovery, and to maintain that all the time? That is the question.,

Q: Sir, can we go into what prevents this first discovery taking place, on the spot observation, now?

K: What prevents us from observing the fact and going beyond it?

Q: Is that also what leads to laziness?

K: Yes, is that part of laziness, indolence, and weight of tradition.

Q: Not part of that, is it the same movement?

K: The incapacity to observe what is actually going on now, is its root laziness?

Q: No, is it lack of energy on our part to observe immediately and act on that observation, is it lack of energy, laziness?

Q: Could we talk about love?

Q: Is it possible to have a technique without being conditioned



by that technique?

Q: Do you have to be alone to be free, and in that freedom what is relationship with another human being? Cannot there be freedom in human relationship?

Q: Could we talk about what makes relationship creative?

Q: For many, many years you have talked about awareness. Is there any relationship between the language and awareness?

K: What is the relationship between the word awareness and the actuality of it? That's enough.

Q: (Long question, inaudible)

K: I understand. Sir, in one question you are putting so many things, sir. I think we are misunderstanding each other. I am sorry.

So which question shall we discuss? You have several questions: please talk about love, go into it much more deeply; what is the nature of energy that sustains constant discovery, constant moving; and you asked, what prevents observation and action; and does aloneness imply freedom; and can there be, in relationship, freedom? Now which shall we talk about?

Q: Love and compassion.

Q: The danger of words and being attached to words and not seeing the reality behind the word.

Q: The other way, through words one can come into awareness.

K: Also there was a question: please go into it in much more detail, what it means to be aware without a technique. Now which shall we discuss?

Q: Start with the words.

K: Do we want to go into this question of words, awareness, and include all the other questions which have been put to us?

What is the function of a word? If we use, or know English, or French, or Italian, or whatever it is, we use a word to communicate, to point out. When we say, 'door', we mean a particular door, to point it out. And words have made the mind accept and build a prison around itself. That is, we are prisoners of words - right? You dislike certain words and like certain words, words condemn or help, and so on. So what is the function of a series of words, or a sentence? Obviously to communicate. That is simple enough.

And is there a thought without a word? If there is no word, is there thinking? Or the words help to think? You are following this? Is thinking related to words? If there were no words would there be thinking? Is there a thinking without words - word being symbol, image, picture, all that? So is thinking part of the structure of words? I want to tell you something, can that be communicated without words? And it can be communicated without the word if we are both at the same level, at the same intensity, with the same interest, then there is a communion which is non-verbal. We understand it instantly by a gesture, which is not a word.

So part of thought is the verbalization to communicate what one thinks. I think about something and I want to communicate it to you. Either we are both telepathically in communication, which is dangerous, misleading unless we are both at the same level, with the same interests, with the same energy - so there is a non-verbal communication, a gesture, a look; and a verbal communication. But both are involved in thinking. Right? I think something. I may not put it into words but I make a gesture, and that gesture conveys a great deal, or a look. So words become important only for communication. And if we both understand the meaning of the

word then communication is fairly simple. But if I spoke in Russian and you didn't understand Russian, then we can't communicate.

Now move from there. So thought is part of verbalization. That is, in thinking, the whole process of thinking, are words necessary - to make it very simple - are words necessary to think? You understand my question? Or is there a thinking without words? Is this all becoming too intellectual?

So we must go further into it. That is, is there a thinking without image, symbol, word? And if there is no symbol, word, image, what is then thinking? There may be no thinking, or a different form of thinking. We won't go into that because that leads somewhere else.

And what relationship has the word to actuality? The actuality of a word like the 'tent', is not the tent. The word is not the thing. That's simple. But for us the word is the thing. We identify the word with the thing, we don't separate the word from the thing. That's part of awareness. You get it? To separate the word from the thing. The tent is not the actual tent, the word. The word 'tent' is not the actuality. But for most of us when we use the word 'tent', the imagination is there already, you see the tent, so there is no separation. So part of awareness is to separate the word from the thing. Is this clear? So that makes a tremendous difference because I am going to show you something in a minute. Just hold on.

The word 'fear' is different from the actuality - right? The feeling of it. So we have to find out if the word creates the fear, or the feeling of fear is independent of the word. That's part of awareness. You understand? To separate the word from the actual.

Then if the word is different from fear - the word fear is different from the actual, then what is the actual without the word? That's part of awareness. Are you following all this? Is this too complex?

So - please I'll repeat it again - is the word 'fear' the actual, and does the actual exist without the word? If it exists without the word, is it fear? That's part of awareness. You understand? So if it is independent of the word, then what is it that we call fear, if that feeling is independent of that word, what is it? It is just sensation - right? There is nothing wrong with sensation. So all that is part of awareness - to separate the word from the actual. You understand? To do this all the time. The word 'wife' is not the actual, but the word 'wife' instantly is identified with the actual. To separate the word from the actual, then there is quite a different process of observation, awareness. You understand? Are we getting somewhere?

So the word 'awareness' is not the fact. And to be aware, does it need a technique? That was one of the questions. Obviously not. Because if you practise awareness, it is just a mechanical process of verbalization, and not separate the word from the actual. You can do that now as we are sitting. Right.

So the whole significance of awareness, part of it, is to separate the word from the thing. Because the word 'Mr Smith' is not Mr Smith. But if I look at him without the name he is quite a different entity. So this is a tremendous process of awareness, which needs no practice, no technique, I can instantly see the truth of it.

Then in awareness is there choice? You understand my question? I am aware - the speaker is aware of all of you sitting there, with different coloured shirts and blouses or whatever it is.

To observe, or to be aware without choice, observe the colours without saying, "I like", or "Don't like", "This is good,", just to observe. Right?

So to be aware implies the separation of the word from the fact, and in which there is no choice whatsoever. And this awareness is not concentration. Is it? Concentration implies exclusion, focussing one's desire on a particular thing - to concentrate, to focus one's observation on a particular thing, excluding other things. So concentration implies building a wall round yourself in order to exclude and concentrate - right? Now what is the relationship of awareness to concentration and attention? You follow? We are moving further into attention.

So when there is an awareness is there a concentration? Am I putting the question? Concentration, we said, is focussing one's desire, one's wish - I won't use the word attention - on a particular thing, and so exclude anything that interferes with that concentration - right? Awareness is not concentration. And is attention concentration? It is not. Where there is attention there is no centre from which to attend. Whereas in concentration there is a centre and therefore exclusion. I wonder if you get it? So we have talked about it enough.

So to be aware implies the separation of the word from the fact; and in that awareness there is no choice but only observation. You can see this happening in daily life, if you observe it, when you are interested in something very much you observe without any word. And attention is that. Attention implies no centre, therefore no border, therefore attention is tremendous, vast.

Now the other question is: does freedom imply aloneness?

Right, that was the question that was asked. The meaning of the word alone means, all one. The dictionary meaning of that word means, all made into one, all one. Now how can there be freedom if there is self-centred activity, which prevents aloneness? Right? If I am concerned everlastingly about myself - my problems, my worries, my wife, my cooking, you know, worried, worried, concerned all about that, occupied, if my mind is occupied with many things, which is self-centred, there cannot be aloneness, can there? So freedom is a non-occupied mind. A mind which is occupied, it doesn't matter with what - god, with worries, with money, with sex, with pleasure - occupied, which most of us are, with something or other we are occupied - as long as there is this occupation with something there cannot be freedom, obviously.

And when there is that freedom, the questioner asks, what is relationship then? What is then relationship in that freedom - if you have such freedom? First have that freedom and find out. But without having that freedom we are asking, what is relationship. I am not trying to belittle it. But the fact is, our minds are occupied with chattering, with vanity, arrogance, all kinds of things, self pity and so on. Can that mind be free of all that? And when it is free isn't it alone? Because it is something totally different from the other whose mind is occupied. I wonder if you see that. Right?

So if a man, a human being, is free from this tremendous occupation that is going on, then what is his relationship? Can a human being find that out? To find that out he must unburden himself of all the content of occupation, the content of one's consciousness, which then is freedom. Then what takes place? You are free and another is not. You, as a human being, may be free

from all worries and all occupation, and the other is not, then what is your relationship between the two? What is the responsibility of the man who is free and the other who is not?

Now you wanted to talk about love. What place has freedom, which is a man who is not occupied, burdened with tremendous occupation, problems and all the rest of it, what is his relationship with another who is not free, is there in that relationship love? Or it is only then there is love? Now look, what do we mean by the word love? Be careful! To separate the word from the thing. What is that thing when you separate the word, the feeling? You love another - what is it that you love? Please, you love another, don't you - your wife, your husband, your girl, your boy, or whatever you call it - you love. What does that word mean to you when you use that word? Has love a motive? Please, don't shake your head, for us it has. Because you give another sex, or give him comfort, or cook his meal, or depend on him, possess him, dominate him, push him around, or her around - possess, attachment, all that is implied in that word. Jealousy, anger, hatred, a sense of anxiety, fear, because you may lose that person, all that arises, and that we call love. Right? We are not being cynical, we are just looking at facts.

Q: Is there one moment when there is something else?

K: We will come to that, sir, an instant. We will come back to that.

To discover what it means to love, mustn't one be free of all that? Free of attachment - let's take that for the moment. When one is attached, what are you attached to? Suppose one is attached to a table, what does that attachment imply? Pleasure, sense of possession, and the utility of it, the feeling that it is a marvellous

table I must hold it, and so on and so on. So when a human being is attached to another, what is going on? One is attached to you. What is this feeling of the other who is attached to you? In that attachment there is pride of possession, a sense of domination, fear of losing it, losing that person, therefore jealousy, and therefore greater attachment, greater possessiveness - right? And jealousy, anxiety, all that comes up. Now if there is no attachment does it mean no love, no responsibility? You understand my question? So for most of us love means this terrible conflict between human beings, and so relationship becomes a perpetual anxiety. You know all this, I don't have to tell you. And that we call love. And to escape from this terrible strain of what we call love, we have all kinds of entertainments - the television entertainment, the - forgive me if I use the word - religious entertainment. Marvellous we quarrel and go off to church, or the temple, and come back and begin again. So all this is going on all the time.

So can man, or woman, be free of all this? Or is that impossible? If it is not possible then our life perpetually is a state of anxiety, and from that all kinds of neurotic attitudes, beliefs, actions take place. Now is it possible to be free of attachment, which implies a great deal? Is it possible for a human being to be free of attachment, and yet feel responsible?

Now to be free of attachment doesn't mean its opposite - detachment. You follow. This is very important to understand this. When we are attached we know the pain of attachment, the anxiety of it, and we say, "For god's sake I must detach myself from all this horror." So the battle of detachment begins, the conflict. Whereas if you observe, are aware of the fact and the word, the word



attachment and freedom from that word, which is the feeling, then to observe that feeling without any judgement - to observe it. Then you will see out of that total observation there is quite a different movement taking place, which is neither attachment or detachment. You understand this? Are you doing it as we are talking, or are you just listening to a lot of words? You know you are attached, don't you - to a house, it doesn't matter to what, to something or other, to a belief, to a prejudice, to a conclusion, to a person, to some ideal, tremendously attached. Attachment gives great security, which is an illusion - right? It is an illusion to be attached to something because that something may go away. So what you are attached to is the image which you have built about that. I wonder if you get it.

So can you be free of this attachment so that there is a responsibility which is not a duty? Then what is love when there is no attachment? You understand my question? Look: if you are attached to a nationality, you worship isolation of nationality, which is a form of glorified tribalism, you are attached to it. What does that do? It breaks it up, doesn't it? I am attached to my nationality as a Hindu, tremendously, and you are attached to Germany, France, Italy, nationality, England. We are separate. And the wars, and all the complexity of all that goes on. Now if there is no attachment, and you have no attachment, what takes place? Is that love? I wonder if you are getting it? Are we understanding each other a little bit?

So attachment separates - right? I am attached to my belief, and you are attached to your belief, therefore there is separation. Just see the consequences of it, the implications of it - which we can't go into now, it is too much. So where there is attachment there is

separation, and therefore there is conflict. Where there is conflict there cannot possibly be love. And what is the relationship of a man and a woman, or a man and whatever it is, what is his relationship to another when there is freedom? You understand? Freedom from attachment, all the implications of it. Is that the beginning - I am just using the word beginning, don't jump on it - is that the beginning of compassion? You understand? When there is no nationality, and there is no attachment to any belief whatsoever, to any conclusion, to any ideal, then that human being is a free human being. And his relationship with another is out of freedom, isn't it, out of love, out of compassion. I wonder if you are getting all this?

So what next? You see all this is, isn't it, a part of awareness. Now must you analyse, as we have done, analyse what attachment means, the implications of attachment and so on; or can you observe the totality of it instantly, and then analyse? Not the other way round. I wonder if you see. We are used to analysis. Part of our education is to analyse, and so we spend a lot of time on that. So we are proposing something quite different: to observe, then see the totality, and then analyse. Then it becomes very simple. But whereas if we analyse and try to reach the totality you may go wrong - which you generally do. But to observe the totality of something, which means no direction, as we went into yesterday, then analysis either becomes important or unimportant, you can analyse or not analyse.

Now I would like to go into something else from this. Which is, is there something sacred in life, which is part of all this? Is there something sacred in your life, holy? Remove the word, separate the

word, the image, the symbol, which is very dangerous, and when you do that, ask yourself, "Is there anything really sacred in my life?" Or is everything so superficial, everything so put together by thought? And thought is not sacred, is it? Do you think thought is sacred, and the things that thought has put together are sacred? And yet we have been conditioned to that - as a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian, we are conditioned to worship, adore, or whatever one does, pray, to things that thought has put together. And that we call sacred. I wonder if we are meeting each other.

So one has to find out, because if you do not find out if there is something really sacred, which is not put together by thought, life becomes more and more superficial, more and more mechanical, and utterly meaningless at the end of one's life. I wonder if one realizes this. You know we are so attached to thinking, and the whole process of thinking, and worship the things that thought has put together. Thought whether through the mind as an image, as a symbol, or through the hand, a sculpture, a symbol; the image made by the hand or by the mind is the process of thought. And thought, we said, is memory, experience, knowledge, which is past. And the past becomes the tradition, and the tradition becomes the most sacred thing. So are we worshipping the tradition, or is there something which has nothing to do with thought and tradition, with rituals, you know, all the circus that goes on? So one has to find out. How do you find out? Not the method - sorry, when I use the word 'how', I am not using it as a method. Then let me use a different word. Is there something sacred in life? There is the whole block of humanity which says, "There is absolutely nothing. You are the result of environment, and change the environment

then you will never talk about anything sacred. Then you will be a mechanical, happy individual." You know the whole block - the communist world, the tyrannical world and all the rest of it. So if one is very, very serious about this matter, and one has to be really profoundly serious, whether you belong to one that says, "Please, nothing but matter" - matter being thought process; that is materialism in the deep sense of that word. And the other calls itself religious, which is actually material. I wonder if you see that. Because that is also based on thought. So if you belong to neither then you have to find out. You don't assert anything. Then you begin to enquire.

Now what does it mean to enquire into oneself so as to find out if there is anything deeply sacred, holy, in one's life - in life, not in one's life, in living? Is there something marvellously, supremely, sacred - or there is nothing at all?

Are you interested in all this? Because we are becoming more and more materialistic. You may go to churches, temples, mosques, but it is all the structure of thought, put together by very clever cunning thought. Because thought wants security, and therefore it finds security in those things which it has created. And what it has created it says, is sacred - the gods, you know, the whole business of it. Can one be free of the movement of thought and what it has created as sacred, put that aside, and also not say everything is completely materialistic - you follow? So when you are in that position, neither this nor that, then what is the mind to do to find out? You understand my question? If you are very serious - and this demands that one must be profoundly serious otherwise you will play, it becomes a game and leads to illusion -

so what will happen? May I go into it? Please share it, for god's sake share it, otherwise it becomes another messy word, sentimental nonsense.

It becomes necessary to have a very quiet mind, doesn't it. Because it is only in freedom you can find out - right? There must be freedom to look. But if you say, "Well, I like my belief, I'll stick to that", you are not free. Or if you say, "Everything is materialistic", which is a movement of thought, then also you are not free. So there must be freedom from the imposition of civilizations, personal desires, personal hopes, and then observe. And you can only observe when the mind is completely still. If there is no stillness in the mind movement takes place - right? Movement being time, thought. So it is absolutely necessary to be free to observe, free from one's prejudices, from one's longing, from one's fears - all that which we have talked about endlessly during these seven talks and four or five discussions. Can the mind be completely without movement? Do you understand my question? Because if there is movement there is distortion. So can the mind be completely still? And one finds it terribly difficult because thought comes in immediately, so one says, "I must control thought." The controller is the controlled - we have been through all that, I won't go into it. When you see that, that the thinker is the thought, the controller is the controlled, the observer is the observed, then there is no movement. You understand? When one realizes anger is part of the observer who says, "I am angry", so anger and the observer are the same. That is clear, that is simple. In the same way, the thinker who wants to control thought is still thought. When one realizes that the movement of thought stops. I

wonder if you see that.

So when there is no movement of any kind in the mind then naturally the mind is still, without effort, without compulsion, without will, without all that, it is naturally still, not cultivated stillness because then it is mechanical, which is not stillness, which is just an illusion of stillness. So there is freedom - freedom implies all that we have talked about - and in that freedom there is silence, which means no movement. Then you can observe - then there is observation, then there is only observation, not the observer observing. Get it? So there is only observation out of total silence, complete stillness of mind. Then what takes place? You understand? I can go further into it, but you won't. Then it becomes a theory. You follow. Then it becomes something and you say, "I will argue about that". We can argue and show that I am wrong or right, or this or that, But if you have gone that far, which is, freedom from one's conditioning, and therefore no movement, and complete silence, quietness, which is what? Then there is the operation of intelligence, isn't there? I wonder if you get it?

Look, I'll show you. We said attachment implies great pain, anxiety, fear and therefore deepening of possession. To see that is part of intelligence, isn't it? Is this clear? To see the nature of attachment and all its implications, to have an insight into it, is intelligence - not the cunning intelligence of thought, I am not talking of that intelligence. The intelligence which says, "How true that is". It is this intelligence that is now in operation. You understand what I am talking about? I wonder if you follow what I am saying?

Q: Sir, I am afraid it is only theoretical.

K: Theoretical, I know. No, no. If you see it - listen sir - if you see attachment, all the implications of attachment, and see the danger of attachment, the perception is intelligence. That's all. That's all.

Q: That intelligence is going on.

K: No, I am relating it, I am going to relate it. You will see it in a minute.

Q: Why doesn't one realize that the observer is the observed?

K: Why doesn't one realize it? Part of our tradition is that the observer is different from the observed - right? That is part of tradition, part of education, part of our whole social, religious structure, that the observer is totally different from the observed. But can you see the observer is the observed? Do you realize it? Not only now for the moment because I am pushing you into a corner, but actually do you realize it? That there is no thinker without thought? So the thinker is the thought. Is that terribly difficult to see?

Q: It is very difficult to see that for us.

Q: Are you speaking of self observation?

K: No, no, we have gone beyond that. He raised a question madam, which is, do we actually realize that the observer is the observed, or are you accepting it as an idea? Then the idea becomes important, then you will ask how is that idea to be carried out. Then we are lost. So, now please, just try this: listen to what is being said, listen, don't translate it, or refute it, or argue with it, just listen. It may be wrong, but listen. The speaker says, the observer is the past, the observed is the present. The observer meets the present with the eyes and understanding of the past, therefore there

is no meeting of the present. That is simple enough, right. I am trying to explain something, please listen. We said the observer is the past, and our life is based on the past, because we remember, all our knowledge, all our experience is stored as the past. That background, that conditioning, meets the present, and translates what is meets in terms of the past. So the observer maintains separation - right? But if there is no observer there is only the present. Right? Obviously. So the thinker thinks he is separate from thought - right? But is there a thinker without thinking? So the thinker is the thought. That's simple. Now do you realize that?

Q: If I am not the one looking who am I?

K: You are the thought. You are thought. You are thought because you are the form, the name, and all the psychological build up of thought - my belief, my anxiety, my pain, the whole movement of thought. This is simple, sir. We have been through this a hundred times.

So do you actually realize that the observer is the observed? When you see a tree, or a car, the observer is not the car - I hope not - or the tree. We are not talking of that, we are talking psychologically, inwardly. The observer separates himself, so he says, "I am different from the observed", but they are essentially one. Anger is not separate from the person who says, "I am angry". Anger is the person, is the psyche, and so on. We have gone into this. So do you see this fact that the observer is the observed? If you don't see it conflict then will continue between the observer and the observed, anger and the entity who says, "I am different from anger". Then he controls it, suppresses it, tries to change it, you know the whole business you go through. That's a wastage of



energy. There is no wastage of energy, and therefore no conflict when the observer is the observed. That's simple. What is the difficulty, I don't quite see.

Q: Why don't you see for us it is so difficult?

K: Because it is fairly simple, isn't it, for most people because they are so traditionally bound. It is a simple fact, you are bound to that separation. You won't let go and say, "Let us find out".

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't know about individuals, sir. The word individual means an entity who is not divided. The meaning is, indivisible, then he is only an individual. But we are so fragmented, so broken up, so distorted, we may call ourselves individuals, but we are not. But that is irrelevant.

The first thing then is to eliminate conflict which is a wastage of energy. And to eliminate that wastage is to realize the observer is the observed, the Arab is the Jew, the Hindu is the Muslim - only in name, you follow, it is so silly.

Q: But it is much more difficult to realize the conditioning is the conditioner.

K: That's right, sir. So much more difficult to realize our conditioning. Our conditioning is to live in the past - right? Our life is based on past memories, past hurts, past anxieties, everything is somewhere behind us. That is our life. And we don't see when we live in the past we can never understand what is going on inwardly. So unless one realizes the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, or the experiencer is the experience, there is no freedom from conflict. The god that one worships is surely put together by thought, isn't it? But the man who say, "No, it is God",

you can't argue with him, you can't even open the door, he is firmly part of the tradition, and bound by his conditioning. But those who say, "All right, I am enquiring, going into it," then one has a communication with them, which is to observe, to see that the observer is the observed and so end conflict. The ending of conflict means freedom. In that freedom is intelligence. You understand? Because I have seen the observer is the observed, which is intelligence to see that. And that intelligence is part of this freedom, isn't it?

So to have this silent mind, which is necessary, if one is serious, to find out if there anything totally uncontaminated by thought and humanity. All the religions have said there is, and the priests all over the world have said, "We are the interpreters of that", and that is their market value and so on. So if you discard all that, really discard because your intelligence says, that is all too absurd, then your mind is completely still. Is it still now? Or are you still chattering? Go on sirs, it is for you to answer. If it is not still, then find out why it is not quiet, spend some time, energy, not 'how to make it still', that becomes too absurdly childish, find out why it isn't still, enquire. You understand? Because you are attached to a shoe, and what you are going to do tomorrow, or have for dinner, I have this, I have that, I must do that, I must read, I must do my exercises - you follow - chattering, chattering, chattering. Now the chattering is part of the thought, part of the chatter, isn't it? The one who chatters is the entity that says, "Yes, I am chattering", they are not separate. The chattering and the entity who says, "I am different", the entity who says, "I am different" is actually the chatterer. Now if you see that, actually see it, then it is finished.

Then there is no conflict not to chatter. Unless you come to that point, which is, to be free and therefore the operation of intelligence going with it, then only you have a quiet, healthy, sane mind. And in that quietness you will find out if there is something really sacred, or nothing at all.

# MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 24TH DECEMBER 1977

To communicate with each other is quite important. Unfortunately we must use words. And we rather interpret each word according to our like and dislike. And during these talks here we are going to use the English language, and try to use the words with exactly the meaning in the dictionary, not what I would like it to be, or you would like it to be, but actually the word, not only its common usage, but also words that have a special meaning. And as we go along we will try and explain these words, and please if you will kindly listen to the language, the word itself, not what you think the word means, or your reactions to the word, but actually listen to the word itself, because it is going to be rather amusing and worthwhile if we could really communicate, not only verbally, but also through the words catch an insight into the full meaning, to the significance, to the depth of that word.

But to have a verbal communication with each other we must both first be free to observe, free to listen. And that, I am afraid, is one of the most difficult things to do, to listen. Because we are going together during these talks, discussions, to investigate into the actuality of our daily life. We are not going to discuss theories because they are utterly meaningless, nor speculative ideas, which are equally absurd, or accept some authoritarian traditional outlook. We are going together, if we may, to investigate what actually is.

It is one of the most difficult things to observe actually, which means what is actually taking place now, to observe that and to

investigate, if it is possible, that which is being observed. To observe one must be free. That's an obvious fact. If you want to observe the beauty of the evening, the light on the clouds and looking through the leaves at the blue sky, you must be free to look, you must not be preoccupied. You must not be concerned with theories of how to look, how to paint, you must look. So, what we are going to do, if we may this evening, and the following talks, is to learn the art of investigation into the actual, not into what you experience, which may not be true - all your religions and all the rest, we are going to investigate all that; but what is absolutely necessary to examine, to investigate, to explore, is there must be freedom. If you are tied to a particular belief or to a particular dogma, to a particular tradition and are bound by it, intellectually as well as emotionally, or tied so deeply in your daily lives, then you cannot possibly investigate, obviously. It is like an animal that is being tied to a post, and can only wander within the radius, the length of its rope. So what is important, if I may suggest, I hope you will follow this, to examine, to explore, there must be freedom. That is, you are exploring now, not when you go home, or when you feel inclined, but sitting here, talking over together, communicating with each other, we are actually investigating. This is one of the most difficult things to do: to observe, to examine, to explore what is actually going on. Of course, you cannot possibly explore, or investigate politically. That's absurd, nobody can do that because everything is so uncertain, lopsided, and crooked, dishonest, theoretical, so it becomes impossible. Nor the economic condition, the world as it is, because there are constant changes going on. But we human beings, who are riddled with our

problems, not only political, economic, but social, individual, relationship with another, if we are really very, very serious and honest, also we have to enquire into what is truth. It is one of the most extraordinary things if you go into it. If you are really seeking truth, compassion, that which is timeless, if you are really deeply concerned and persistently understand what is implied in that, in that pursuit, you are never alone. When you are seeking truth, you are never alone. You are never lonely. You are not approaching as an individual. When you look at life as an individual, as a separated, fragmentary entity, then you are lonely - which we will all go into presently, all this.

So, if we may repeat again, to investigate, to observe, to listen one must be free. Freedom is not at the end but at the beginning. If you are not free, you cannot examine, obviously. It sounds very simple, but it is very, very complex, because our minds, our brains are so conditioned, it is almost impossible to listen, to investigate without pressure, without the distorted outlook. So that is our first concern, if you are at all serious, if you want to go into this matter deeply. One must be free from prejudice, from your own particular experience, from your own dogma, belief or your innumerable conclusions. So one must be free of all that to examine. Right? Are you now free to examine what we are going to look at? That is the first thing, if I may keep on insisting on it; the world is so utterly confused and each one of us, if we are honest and observing our own actions, we are also very confused, uncertain. That is why there is the increase of authority, increase of gurus, increase of those who are certain that they know. So you are caught in all this which prevents you from examining logically, reasonably, sanely.

So these are the things we require to examine: freedom; to be able to think clearly, that means logically and to see the limit of logic. But you must proceed logically before you see the limit of it. And also one must have sanity. That word 'sanity' is rather a difficult word. Each one will interpret it according to his own inclination. Sanity implies good health, first. So that having good health, the illnesses, all those ailments that one has, does not distort your examination. So one must have health, but if one is not well, to know one is not well and to observe that it does not interfere with your observation, with your examination and therefore to bring about sanity, which means health, clarity and to observe without any distortion. If you are a Hindu and caught in that ancient tradition, with all the superstitions, theories, and all the nonsense that is going on, then obviously you are not sane; or if you are a Christian, with all the dogmas, rituals, beliefs, and again you are not sane. Sanity implies having a capacity to observe oneself clearly without distortion, without any form of deviation from that which is actually going on. All that means sanity and much more.

Now we are communicating with each other. We are seeing the meaning of sanity. Now to communicate, you and the speaker must both be sane, otherwise you will think something totally different, distort what is being said. So I hope when we are talking over our innumerable problems, human problems, which we will as we go along, that we are both at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity; otherwise there is no possibility of communication. Right? You understand? That is, to meet each other linguistically, as well as non-linguistically, at the same level, because there is no

authority here, we are both examining and therefore if one assumes authority then the communication ceases. So at the same level, at the same time, at the same intensity means love. Otherwise you can't meet. You understand? It is simple, but very complex if you go into it. Because, after all, what is love? I am afraid there is no such thing in this country. They know what is kindness, perhaps, generosity, a little bit, tenderness when it suits them, affection, when it is fairly convenient; but that word, not just the meaning of the word, but the whole content of that word. Love implies no division. Love implies that all forms of jealousy, antagonism, vanity and so on have gone from one's heart. So love is when there is communication, to be at the same level, at the same time, at the same intensity. And that is what we mean by communication.

So we'll begin. First of all, we must understand each other very clearly. The speaker wants to tell you something. To him that is very, very important, and being important it is very serious. Not casual seriousness, but persistent and continuous seriousness because we are going to investigate that wherever one goes, no matter what country, what type of person, whether they are scientists, philosophers, so-called religious leaders, businessmen, the sannyasi, the monk, and those who are disciples of these people, it is a common factor throughout the world, human beings suffer, uncertain, in agony, in despair, lonely, anxious, frightened. And that is the common factor. If you really observe, whether you may call yourself a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Christian or this or that, but behind that screen of words, one is anxious, one is frightened; there is no happiness; there is constant struggle bringing about great self-importance, self-centred activity. This is the common



factor so you are the world and the world is you. Right? Please understand this, not as words or theories, but as an actuality. That is, if you look at yourself, and I hope you will, you will see how extraordinarily complicated your life is, how extraordinarily, uncertain it is. There is always anxiety, jealousy, confusion, misery. This is a fact. This is what is actual. All the theories about them, what you should do about them, how to deal with them, are all unnecessary. As long as you live in the world of theories as I am afraid most Hindus do, that is a marvellous escape. As long as you are dealing with theories, you will never face the actual. When you do face the actual, then you realize that you are like the rest of the world, and that brings you an extraordinary sense of communion. You understand this? When you know that you are suffering and your neighbour is also suffering, whether the neighbour is next door a few feet away or thousand miles away, then there is a certain sense of being together. Haven't you noticed all these things? And so non-verbally, non-theoretically, but actually, as a fact; that there is this microphone, which is a fact, there is the tree, it is a fact, and in the same way, it is an absolute irrevocable fact that you are the world and the world is you. Do you see this? Do you see the actuality of it, not the theory of it. There is no theory. Theory is when you listen to a statement like that, which is, you are the world and the world is you, you make an abstraction of it. You understand what we mean by abstraction? That is, you listen to those words, you don't quite understand, or agree with it, or you don't want to agree with it because you like to think that you are extraordinarily separate, therefore you make an abstraction of it. That is, you make it into an idea, and then theorize

about that idea. You understand? Argue back and forth, invent new theories and so on and so on. Which is away from the fact. Right? We are understanding each other?

So please don't make an abstraction of it, make it into an idea, but see the fact only, the actuality. The word 'actual' means that which is taking place now. The word 'actual' means that which is happening now. What is happening now is this extraordinary common factor of every human being. When you realize that, not as a theory as you accept or reject, but something which is fearfully actual, then your whole attitude towards life changes. Then you are not alone because you are like the rest of humanity. Which means you, as a human being, represent the totality of all humanity. You understand this? You, as a human being, are the representative of all humanity because you suffer, you cry, you are frightened, you want pleasure, you are seeking god, and not knowing if there is god, belief, rituals that have no meaning, so you are like the rest of them, the Christians, if you go into a church and there are a lot of words, meaningless words, symbols, and inwardly the monk, the sannyasi, you, everyone is burning with desire, with pain, with sorrow. So that is the first thing to understand, that you are the world and the world is you. If - no, that is so, not 'if', I withdraw that word. That is so.

Then the next question is: is it possible to change, to transform that which is? You understand? That is, human beings throughout the world from childhood get hurt psychologically. You are aware of this, obviously. You are hurt. You are hurt by your parents, by comparing you with somebody else. Please follow all this because it's your life. Because we are going to see whether it is possible at

all to wipe away all this factor and have a brain which is pristine, a brain that is never damaged, never deformed. It is possible, I'll show it to you. But you must also have energy to do it, passion, the urge to find out.

So as we were saying, every human being right throughout the world from childhood psychologically is wounded - aren't you? Wounded through comparison, through imitation, through conformity. All those are the instruments of getting hurt, and more. Now, please see, a brain that has been hurt psychologically can never act freely. Therefore it can never act rightly, accurately, precisely. Right? Please see the fact. That is, if I am hurt, because somebody said I must be like my elder brother, some idiotic teacher tells me that, at home or in school. And I try, make an effort. And throughout life that goes on. You are being hurt and the consequence of being hurt is that you resist, that you build a wall around yourself. Are you being aware of all this as I am talking, otherwise we cannot communicate. It is very important for you to understand. A psyche, a human mind that is hurt, therefore distorted, its activity will become neurotic, violent. So you are hurt and the consequence of it is you resist, you build a wall around yourself, gradually you become more and more lonely, withdrawn and from that you act. Therefore your action is distorted. Your action then is violent and so on.

Now the question is, if you are at all aware of being hurt, see the consequences of it, the result in your human relationship - if you are hurt you will never have a relationship with another. So that is a common factor of every human being right throughout the world. Now, since you are the world and the world is you, is it

possible for you to be free of hurt? You understand my question? Have we gone together so far? That it is very important for a human being not to be hurt at all. Right?

Now, what is hurt? Please examine what is hurt and who is hurt. I say I am hurt. When you call me a fool, I am hurt. When you say anything that is contrary to what I think, or I have an image about myself and that image gets hurt. Right, do you see this? Actually see it, please for your own sake just observe it. Obviously each one has an image about himself, that you are clever, not clever, that you have a certain status - you know, I don't have to go into all that. You have an image about yourself. That image is challenged and gets hurt. And is it possible not to be hurt at all? You know, how can you love somebody if you are hurt? Do you understand? How can you have sympathy, care, affection when you are hurt, and frightened to be hurt more? So it is very important to be free of hurt. Which means to be free of the image which you have about yourself. The image may be conclusions, opinions, your perception of yourself as being somebody or not being somebody. So can you live without any image at all? Do you understand what that means? To have no image about yourself: that does not mean that you are lost, that you become insecure, uncertain. On the contrary when you have an image about yourself, that image creates uncertainty. That image denies security. So that is the first thing in realizing our inner human behaviour. We are talking about human behaviour in our daily life because that is the only life you have, not the theoretical life, whether Brahman exists, or what Shankara said, or some philosopher said, they are all worthless. They have no meaning at all. What has meaning is what you are, what you are

actually doing, whether you are suffering and the rest of it. So let's proceed from there.

So our consciousness is made up of all these things, fear, hurt. Please listen. It is not something mysterious, your consciousness. Philosophers and others like to make it mysterious, but in actuality your consciousness is made up of all the things that thought has put together. That is, your jealousy, your attachment, your fears, your longing for something or other, pleasure; having been attached, pain of attachment and try to be detached. All that is the content of your consciousness. And that content has been put together by thought. So one has to go into the question of this very complex problem of thought. You understand?

Everything that thought has put together is reality. This is a reality, the microphone because thought has gone into it, put together, and we have name it as a microphone. The churches, the cinemas, and all the technological world, the motor car, your gods, your temples, all the rituals, everything is put together by thought. Right, is this clear, because please understand this very carefully. I am going to go into it very, very slowly, in detail, because it is very important to understand.

We are saying that thought has divided the world into nationalities, into classes, into religious differences - Christ, Buddha, Rama or Sita or whoever it is. All that is the creation of thought - the rituals, the pujas that you do every day is put together by thought. There is no denying of that. It would be silly to deny that. But thought has not put together the tree, nature, the forest, the rivers, the mountain, the skies, the stars, the birds - nature. But thought has used nature in making a chair, a microphone, all that.

Please see the difference. Thought whatever is has created is reality. This is a reality, you can't dodge it. And thought also created illusions, which is a reality. All the gods, which are illusions, created by thought are reality. The temple there in the corner is a reality, but it is the product of cunning thought. And thought has not put together nature, the universe. Right? Be very clear on this. And also thought has created the illusions that one lives with.

So thought is the response of the brain that has recorded. That is, the function of the brain is to record. If it did not record, you would have not thought. It is like a registering machine there. Everything is recorded, which is our knowledge. From knowledge there is memory, and the response of memory it thought. These are facts. You cannot say that thought is the ripple of god or the ripple of some invention. If you say it is a ripple of god, it is still a product of thought. So please see how human beings are caught in the product of thought, in the things thought has created, and make it into something super extraordinary. Right? Please see this, it is very important because we are going to find out what is the brain.

The speaker is not an expert on it but he has watched it in himself and discussed this matter of the whole movement of the brain with specialists and they agree what is generally accepted. Which is, the brain is the instrument of registration. You register your experience; you register, your brain has been registering all the traditions, your grandmother, your great-grandmother and so on. So it registers nationality, your religious beliefs and so on. So your brain is under pressure all the time. I haven't discussed this matter except with one or two and they are beginning to agree with

what I am saying. Which is, a brain is under constant pressure. All propaganda is pressure. When you say, I believe in god, it is the result of pressure. When you say, I am a Christian, it is still propaganda imposed through two thousand years of constant pressure, believing that there is Jesus the Saviour, Virgin Mary and so on. Constant pressure. Just like the Hindu for 10,000 years or 5,000 years he is being under pressure saying you believe you are a Hindu, you are a brahmin, this, that, pressure, pressure, pressure. Are you aware of this fact? Are you? To be aware, conscious, not something extraordinary, that you are constantly under pressure, at home, in the office, and when you go off to amuse yourself, still under pressure. Everything, you are under great pressure. Now what happens to a brain that is under pressure? Ask yourself this question. I believe in god. That is a pressure. I go to the temple every other day. That is a pressure, because you have been told. Or you are under pressure as a good lawyer to hold your position, and so on and so on. Do you know that you are under constant pressure? Now, if you are aware of it, any form of pressure is a distorting factor. Your brain is deformed. You mightn't like to think so but it is a fact. Deformed, damaged, distorted. When a Hindu says I believe, I do this because it is right, I have accepted, all the things that they are doing, it is under the pressure of propaganda. Right? It may be ten thousand years or two thousand years. This pressure does damage the brain. The brain has the capacity of highly polished, pliable steel that moves in any direction but always comes back to the centre. Right? If you had no pressure - I wonder if you understand all this? This is part of meditation, to free the mind from all the pressure, which means no

practice because that is a pressure. You won't agree to all this because all of you are practising meditation, forcing yourself, controlling yourself. All that is too childish.

Now the question is this: is it possible to register only what is absolutely necessary and nothing else? Have you understood this? Have you understood my question? Have you, sir? Somebody say, yes, or no. Are we working together? Yes? Or are you just listening and meaninglessly going away afterwards? Are we working together to find out the full significance of this word 'pressure' on the brain? You understand?

Then, the problem arises: why should there be registration at all? That Nagra machine is registering now - they are going to make a cassette out of it. So we are asking why does the brain have to register? Please enquire, find out. I am going to go into it with out. Because it is very important to have a brain which is not damaged, to have a brain that is not distorted, deformed through constant pressure. If you have a deformed brain, damaged brain, then your actions are crooked, untrue, there is no validity in your action. It is like a diseased man trying to be healthy. He is diseased. Therefore he must clear up the disease then he will be healthy. In the same way, we are saying, is it possible to register only that which is absolutely necessary? I'll show you. Let us go into it. Because then you have a mind, a brain, that has never been damaged, like having a body that has been healthy from the beginning to the end, never has gone to a doctor, never operated upon. So a brain that is pristine, young. So that's what we are going to discover.

Why does the brain register at all? You understand my



question? Register? Why does the brain register? If it does not register, you couldn't talk, you couldn't learn any language, you couldn't learn any technical knowledge. So the brain registers because it finds in registration security. Right? I am going to explain. See the first statement: the brain can only function healthily, happily, sanely when it is secure, like a baby, it must have security, every mother will tell you. So please listen to it and when we have a discussion you can bring it up. I don't think you will bring it up at all because I am going to make it very, very, clear. The brain can function happily, easily, without effort, if it feels completely secure. Right? So it has found security in knowledge, knowledge being technological knowledge, in book knowledge. So it says: as long as I have knowledge, I am secure; which means knowledge implies accumulating information and gathering information, storing it up as memory and in that memory it is quite safe. That is, to be safe in this world, the world economically I must become a doctor, a scientist, a lawyer, a businessman, there there is a certain security. Are you following all this? No? And that same security has spilled over into the psychological security. You understand? No, I see you don't understand. What sir?

Q: Go on.

K: I am going on. I want you to understand what I am saying, not just rattle along. This is not theory. Carefully listen. This is not theory, watch it, careful, listen to this, it is not theory, what I am saying. You can test it. Theory you can't test. But this you can test in your life.

So it needs security. Right? Do you see that? And it has one

security in the world - knowledge, information, job, technological capacity. There it is completely safe. And that same movement of searching for safety has spilled over into the psychological field. It says: I am safe as long as I have got a name, as long as I feel I am this or that, I feel safe. That is, the brain has created an image about itself. There it feels completely safe. Right? I wonder if you see this. Psychologically, that is, inwardly, is there safety at all? You may believe in something. That belief may be questioned, therefore there is uncertainty and so on. So we are saying, is there security in your psychological world, in your world, inside world? Is there security in your gods, in our theories, in your going to the temple every other day, or whatever you do, puja and all the rest of it, is there security? Be tremendously honest about this. And when you say, I am angry, I will achieve a state of mind which will never be angry. Watch it. You have projected an idea and in the future you will not be angry. Therefore, in the future you are seeking security. You understand the subtleties of all this? You understand all this, sir, the subtleties?

So we are saying: register only what is necessary - language, technological information, and don't register anything else, your hurts, your attachments. You follow? Is that possible? First see the problem, don't say, yes, or no. Because I will show you, if we go into it that one can do it.

I am asking, why should the brain register your hurts? You understand, I started with that, you are hurt from childhood, why should that brain register that hurt at all? Is it possible not to register your hurt? Is it possible not to register this tremendous attachment - attachment to your wife, to your house, to your gods,

to your theories? Attachment, being attached. And that attachment is a pressure and therefore it is damaging your brain. Please understand why it is necessary to have a brain that is not deformed, because in meditation any form of distortion, any form which is pressure, prevents the clarity of perception of truth. If you want to meditate, the brain must be free of all registration except that which is absolutely necessary, otherwise it is damaged. Therefore a man, a woman, who really wants to go into this tremendous question of meditation, the full meaning of it, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the timeless quality of it, must understand the whole nature of thought. So is it possible not to register your hurts, your desires, your longings? It is possible only when you know the art - the art, when you learn the art of observation. The word 'art' means to put everything in its proper place - the true meaning of that word, the dictionary meaning, from Latin, Greek and so on. That is to put everything in its right place. Then you have order. If you put everything, you put your socks, your shirts, your trousers, your ties, your saris, or whatever it is, in the right place, there is not need for searching, wasting your energy, everything is in order. Similarly, to learn the art of observation, to learn the art of observation, to register and not to register, I wonder if you to capture this. Now we are registering everything, therefore, the brain is overburdened, damaged, deformed, and it cannot think logically, clearly, sanely.

To observe, to see. To observe, it is again very simple: when you observe you must have clear eyes. To look at the trees you must have unclouded eyes. You may have to wear glasses, but it makes your eyes see clearly. So to observe the outward things of

life. Right? How the world is divided, why it is divided, the Hindu against the Muslim, the Muslim against somebody else. You follow? To observe all the facts, what is actually happening, which does not demand theories, but it requires that you observe. So from observing the outer you come to observe the inner. But if you do not know how to observe the outer, you have no criterion to see if you are observing correctly in yourself. You understand how important it is to start observing the outer and from the outer moving to the inner. Not moving suddenly to the inner, because you will misjudge.

So, one must learn the art of looking, observing. You cannot observe what is happening actually in the world if you are attached to one particular part of that world. If I am attached to this country saying, I am a Hindu, I am proud of being a Hindu, I am ancient, all that, if I am attached to that, I cannot possibly observe the division that is going on in the world - the Arab, the Jew, the Communists, the Socialists and so on and so on. So, to learn to observe without personal distortion entering into the factor? Can you do it? That requires tremendous alertness, watching. Observe what is going on inwardly, what is actually going on. This becomes extraordinarily interesting. Can you watch, can you observe inwardly what actually is happening, actually at the moment of happening? Not after the event. That is, to observe my violence - violence in different forms. I won't go into that, we will discuss it much more in detail tomorrow. That is, to observe that which is actually taking place, which is at the moment of anger to observe it; not after, or train your mind so carefully that you watch before it happens; but actually as it is flowering, beginning to grow, the

actual movement of it. Which demands a mind, a brain that is not caught in the past, which is not a slave to words, which is violence. That very word is a distorting factor, and therefore when you observe with that word, you have already distorted. You understand how subtle it is? So to learn the art of it, therefore, you are watching the movement which is out of time. So the brain is capable of observing without distortion.

## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 25TH DECEMBER 1977

I wonder why you are all here. I really do wonder. We are talking about something which is very, very serious, which demands not only a capacity to think clearly, but it demands that you give your life to it, your heart, your brain, your whole outlook on life. Unless one is very, very serious, in the right sense of that word, one really doesn't live a life at all. One becomes rather flippant. Flippancy has its own place, but when you are all here, so many of you, one wonders how serious you are. And we accept things as they are - politically, perhaps a little more slightly revolutionary, politically, economically we hope things will stabilize themselves. And spiritually - if I may use that word, which is rather an ugly word, because it has been so misused, spiritually, morally when one looks around, there is so much hypocrisy, so much playing a double game, saying one thing and doing something entirely different. The modern 20th century is technologically, tremendously advanced. You are advancing with it, technologically, but at the same time you go to the temples, do puja, do all those absurd things that have no meaning at all. So we kind of play a game, I don't know with whom, but we are playing a kind of game. One wonders how serious, how tremendously honest one is; not honest to some ideal, to some concept, to some theory, but an integrity, an integrity that is inviolable, that does not change according to circumstances.

So I ask, and you must also ask yourself, why one is here. I know why the speaker is here. He feels as he has travelled all over the world for the last fifty years, and more, that human beings

change very little, psychologically. There is a vast technological revolution going on, of which we have no concept whatsoever. But there is tremendous technological advancement, which may, if we are not very alert and careful, destroy us. And being technologically advanced, morally, ethically, deep down in our heart, we remain as we are - slight modifications here and there, going from one guru, perhaps to another guru, doing all kinds of absurd things, hoping by some miracle to bring about a moral, ethical, a deep, profound religious transformation. That is why we are asking how serious one is, because we are talking about communicating with each other, about something that you give great attention, care, affection, love.

We were talking about what it is to live a religious life, that is the basis of all these conversations, dialogues, meetings here, whether it is possible for human beings like you and a million others, whether it is possible to free oneself from all conditioning and not belong to any group, any sect, any particular religion, because all religions have lost their meaning. And to come upon, to investigate a way of life, which is neither Hindu, Buddhist, American, Christian or Communist, but a way of life that is profoundly, deeply religious, and so it affects all activities, all our thinking, all our ways of life. That is what we are concerned with. And if you are serious, and I hope you are, deeply, not superficially, then we can go on with what we were talking about yesterday. If I may I will repeat, somewhat briefly, what we talked about yesterday evening.

We were saying that each human being, you, represent all humanity, psychologically. You may have fair skin, dark skin,

black, be educated, have jobs but basically, deeply, you are like other human beings - in sorrow, in misery, in confusion, frightened to face the unknown, death and so on. This is the common factor of all of us. So you, as a human being, are the representative of all humanity, which is an absolute, irrevocable fact. And so you are the world and the world is you. And if there is a fundamental transformation in the whole structure and nature of consciousness, in those who are willing to listen and learn, then it affects the whole of mankind. Which is again a fact. I do not know if you have not noticed how one person affects the rest of mankind. He may be evil and such a person does affect the rest of mankind. Hitler, Stalin, and all the ugly people that have lived in the world brutally, we are all affected by them, as we are affected somewhat by the good.

So what we are trying to do in these talks and discussions is to communicate with each other and find out for ourselves whether it is at all possible to bring about deep psychological revolution. Mankind has tried various kinds of institutions and organizations to change man. Communism has been one of them, Capitalism, Socialism, various forms of organizations and institutions, through compulsion, through tyranny, through reward and punishment. But none of them have solved the question of poverty, peace, war. We need a totally different kind of mind to solve the poverty of this country; not a political solution or economic adjustments and so on, but a totally different kind of mind which is a global mind, not a Hindu mind or a Christian mind, or a Communist mind, but a mind that understands the whole implications of man, the totality of man, not his mere biological existence, but the psychological



understanding of himself, the totality of the man, totality of a human being. This requires a different kind of mind and it is only such a mind that is going to solve all our economic, social and political problems, not new theories, new way, new communism, or eurocommunism and all the rest of it.

So we are going to talk over together what we said yesterday. That is, the brain, your brain, is under constant pressure, the pressure of tradition, the pressure of education, the pressure that exists in relationship, between man and woman; the pressure - economic, social, environmental pressure. Every form of pressure does affect the brain. You can watch this for yourself. If you watch yourself, you can see any pressure - and we are being subjected to innumerable pressures, all the religious pressures - pressure does distort, deform the mind, the brain, and so the whole of consciousness. That is, the brain, consciousness and the mind: it is really one movement, not three separate activities going on. The brain registers, cultivates memory, from that memory there is response as thought, and thought has put together innumerable factors psychologically, which becomes our consciousness. And the mind is the part of that. So, the totality of human existence, human beings, that is what we are talking about, not merely consciousness, not merely the activity of the brain, not merely the separate thing called as mind. It is all one unit, separated for convenience but actually one movement of the pressure of thought. Please don't agree with what the speaker is saying. That would be really too bad. Then we destroy our relationship. Then we can't commune with each other, we can't have a conversation, a dialogue together. I am only sitting on a platform because it is convenient

for you to see the speaker and for the speaker to see you. But that little height doesn't give him any authority, and I really mean it.

So, together, and I mean together, we are going to investigate into this problem of how to bring about a fundamental revolution in the psyche. That's the basis of our conversation. And we must communicate, we must use ordinary language, no special language, ordinary daily usage of English. Perhaps some of you speak French, or Italian, then that's a different matter. We are speaking English so that you and I understand that language, probably we all speak English.

So we are investigating together into this question whether the brain which has been so damaged through pressure, through the pressure of propaganda, environmental pressure, religious pressure, economic pressure, the pressure of all the gurus that exist in the world telling you what to do, what not to do, how to meditate, what not to meditate, and all the absurd things that are going on, levitation and so on. All that is pouring great pressure on your mind. One may be conscious or unconscious of it. Now we are trying together to bring it into the open, to bring about an awareness of these pressures. Right? Are we meeting each other? Because to me this is very, very important to have a brain, and therefore a consciousness, which is not contaminated by time, not perverted or deformed through various disciplines, various relationships between human beings and so on.

So we are going to enquire together into this question. Enquiry, investigation implies there is no investigator, only investigation. If you as a Hindu, or a something or other, examine, your examination will be coloured by your prejudice, by your lust. So

we are only investigating, there is no investigator. I hope you understand this question. Do you? You are not investigating, there is only you and I examining. You know, a first-class scientist, a really good scientist, not one of those people who are employed by the government, but really a first-class scientist is concerned with observation, not whether he has got a Noble prize, or this or that, but he is just concerned to observe through the microscope, see what is actually going on. We must be like that because we are investigating into something that demands a mind that is free to look, a mind that is only concerned with what it sees; not tell what it sees, what it should be. So, there is only investigation and not an investigator. So we move from there.

We said yesterday one must learn the art of observation. I am not teaching you, you are not my disciples, I am not your guru, which would be terrible, most destructive. But together we are looking. Is it possible to observe without prejudice? Go into it yourself. To observe the tree, your wife or your girl friend, your neighbour, and so yourself without any prejudice, without any conclusion? Please listen to this, do it as we are talking. We are investigating together, we are walking together. We are walking together on the same road, with the same speed, with the same intensity. So, to learn the art of observation implies that which is observing is free, free from all you Hinduism, otherwise, what you see will be distorted by your conclusion, by your beliefs, by your ideas. This is logic, this is reason, this is sanity. If I want to look at you, understand you, I mustn't have all my prejudices. So in the same way, to observe without any form of previous conclusions. Can you do it? Without any prejudice, without any thought for a

conclusion. You understand? To come to it fresh, otherwise you can't see. This is simple, isn't it? So logical, so reasonable, so sane.

So if you can do that, then we can examine the content of that, then you can examine the content of consciousness, the content, the various things that thought has cultivated and put together which becomes consciousness. The word 'conscious' means to be conscious of, to be aware of, to understand, to have an outlook that is whole. So first let's be clear on this point. That is, consciousness is made up of its content. Your consciousness is made up of your beliefs, your prejudices, your opinions, whether you are Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Communist, Socialist, left, right or centrist and so on. And also it is made up of your fears, your beliefs, your daily rituals, the pleasures, both sexual, sensory and other forms of pleasure; and also sorrow, the fear of death and living in a world of illusion. All the gods are all illusions put together by thought. So all that is your consciousness. Right? Don't agree with me, just see the fact. That is, if you are a lawyer, you have spent years and years and years of studying law and so on, so that is part of your consciousness. If you are an engineer, that is part of your consciousness. If you follow somebody, that's part of your consciousness. So the content makes consciousness. If you had no content, if you had no fear, if you had no sorrows, no belief, no sectarian, narrow outlook, if you had none of these things, what is your consciousness? Have you a consciousness, if the whole content is emptied? You may have a totally different kind of outlook, different kind of dimension of consciousness, but what is actual is what is its content. Right? Do we see this together? Do you? No? Not quite. All right. We'll have to go into it again.

When you examine your being, your self, what you are, what are you? You understand my question? A name, a form, tall, short, this or that, physiologically. Psychologically you are all the things that are - culture, education, environment, the parent, all that you are, aren't you? Your belief in Christianity, belief and so on, all that is what you are. Right? But you may think that there is in you some supreme light. But that is still part of your thinking. Right? So you are the result of the past, the result of time, the result of all the prejudices, hopes, fears, anxieties, all that you are. So your consciousness is all that. You are not separate from your consciousness. You are that. Is this clear now, somewhat? We can go very deeply into it, but at least let's understand each other verbally.

We are concerned with the observation of the content of your consciousness. Right? The content. Can you observe the content? One of the contents is violence. Human beings are by nature violent. That may be the result of the evolution, from the animal and so on and so on, the result of all that is that you are violent. Now we are going to observe violence, observe it. Is it possible to change violence without bringing about another pressure on the brain? That is, the pressure on the brain is one form of violence, violence in the sense get angry, hate people, jealous. And violence also means physical violence. That has been the result - if you want to go very deeply into this question of violence - that has been the result of self-centred activity. Right? When you are thinking about yourself, when you are concerned about yourself, your advancement spiritually, your advancement economically and so on, you are so deeply concerned about yourself, aren't you? Right?

Aren't you? Don't be ashamed of it, it is an ordinary fact. Now this self-centred activity brings about a resistance, pushes everybody away from yourself. Right? May we proceed? So from that results, when you are completely enclosed, and being tremendously concerned about yourself, any response from the outside to break up that enclosure is an act of violence. Right? Do you understand this? I won't go into the deeper causes of it, which is, violence comes into being when there is conformity, violence comes into being when you are imitative, when there is comparison. All these are attributive factors of violence. We can go on and analyze it much much, that's good enough. Now, can you observe that violence without putting another pressure on the brain? You follow what I am saying? I wonder if you understand what I am saying.

Look sir, one is violent. The tradition has said: control it, suppress it, analyze it, take time over it. All these factors have been a kind of pressure on the brain, to control violence or practise non-violence, which is, of course, sheer nonsense. So the tradition has said, control. Let's keep to that one word for the moment. And the brain has been pressurized to control, trained, educated, it lives in the culture which says: control. So that is a pressure, isn't it? Be clear on this point. It is a form of pressure on the brain.

Now, if you observe violence and try to bring about a change in it, that is another form of pressure. You understand now, you are understanding what I am saying? So to observe violence without any pressure, which is without control, without suppression, without running away from it? To run away from it is to practise, or cultivate non-violence, that is another escape from the fact. Can you observe - please, this is very important for you to understand -

can you observe without any pressure of the tradition, without any pressure of what you would like, or dislike, just to observe? Then, if you so observe what is actually going on, then that very observation transforms what is being observed without any pressure. I wonder if you get this? Are you following? Do it, not verbal agreement. Any child can play that kind of game. To see your violence, to be aware of it. And the response to that is the whole activity of your educated tradition - say, I must control it, I must change it, I mustn't be violent, or excuse your violence, justify it, and so on and so on. So you are acting according to a brain that has been under the pressure of tradition, and therefore you respond naturally by suppressing it, controlling. Right? We are saying, observe without any pressure - the pressure being your tradition, your hoping to go beyond violence because it is one of your religious conditionings and so on, but just to observe.

Let me put it very, very simply - do you understand what I am talking about, some of you? To look without the movement of thought. Can you do it? Try it. Play with it. To observe the tree, the moon, stars, the clear beautiful nights - to observe without naming it, without saying 'What a beautiful evening!' because the moment you have said 'what a beautiful evening', the beauty has stopped. The moment you verbalize, you have moved into a different realm altogether. It is necessary to communicate it if you want to say to you friend what a lovely evening, but to observe the sunset without a single movement of word or thought. Please, I'll keep at this until you really understand this.

Then we can examine the content of your consciousness, one by one. Because unless there is radical transformation, man will go on

the same way as he has gone on for the last millennia. So how do you observe? How do you observe your girl-friend or your wife or your husband? Have you ever asked that question? If you are married, or have a girl friend, have you ever asked that question, how you look at them? Right, sir, can we go into it? Do it together. How do you observe a human being? Do you observe him, or her, without the previous conclusions, understandings, recognitions? Do you understand what I am saying? Can you look at your girl friend, or wife - please do it - without saying, 'My wife'? Or associating that woman, or that man, with all the things that you have gathered - your sexual pleasures, the images of all that, the pictures, the excitement, all the sexual responses. Do you look at her, or him, that way? Go on, look at it. Or do you look at her or him with the images or pictures that you have built about her or him? Come on, sirs, watch it. Do you? So what happens? When you are looking at another, however intimate it may be, you are looking with the images, conclusions, ideas, that you have built about her or him. So, what is your relationship with that person then? Come on, sir, this is your life, this is what is happening in India. Because if you have this picture, cultivated through time, through days, months, through years, you are then living in a world of images, and therefore you lose all human contact. Right?

Therefore there is no love in that. Right? You are living in a world which is over, which is past with all the images, sexual pleasures and so on and you have no actual contact with that human being.

So, that is what has happened, when you observe another.

Therefore you have no direct relationship with another. Look, you are all sitting there and you are watching me. Why? Answer it



yourself, why? Because you have accepted a reputation about this man, you have read something about him, you have found out how he lives and what he thinks and what he has done, this and that, ten different things. So, you have the pictures of this man talking. So you are really not looking at the man, but at the pictures you have created about the man. Right? Oh, be honest, for god's sake. So is that love? So what happens? Can you observe your wife or your girl friend, can you observe without any picture? Can you? You understand what I mean by picture, so I won't go into it. Can you observe as though you are meeting something for the first time? That is, the brain has got used to you, to each other. So you never look at anybody as though you are meeting him for the first time. Then there is immediate contact, immediate relationship. Now, can you observe this phenomenon without the movement of thought? Can you observe the speaker without all the things you have built round him? Which doesn't mean that you become indifferent, callous, or impolite. You observe something much deeper than the word. Now can you observe your violence without the pressure of tradition, control, or justifying it, just to observe it without any movement of thought. Then you will see, if you do that, that the thing that you are observing undergoes a radical change. I have discussed this point with some of the scientists, they have agreed that when you so observe in the scientific world, they see that which they are observing through the microscope is changing all the time. You understand, sir? Then if you can do that, then the brain is releasing itself from all the pressures. It is no longer functioning in tradition. Right? Are you doing it? Therefore one has to go into this question, as we did yesterday, of the nature of

thinking.

What is the origin of thought? You all think a great deal, you read a great deal. And I am asking you a very simple question, which is the question is simple but to go into it demands a great deal of enquiry. Now what is the origin of thinking? And can you observe the arising of thought? These two things are very important to understand. You can observe the arising of anger, can't you? Can't you? No? Come on, sirs. You can see the movement of anger coming up, the response. In the same way, can you observe the arising of thought and the origin of thought? Because all our lives is spent in thinking. Right? That's obvious. Whatever you do demands thinking. But we have never asked, what is the beginning of it; and not only what is the beginning of it, but also the arising of thought, as the arising of anger. Right? Because you have to answer this question, because that may solve a great many problems. The origin of thought is the beginning of remembrance. Right? Just listen to it, don't agree, just listen it. You may never have given your thought to it, enquired. The origin of thinking, the first man, is when he had an incident, painful or pleasurable, and that has been registered in the brain. That is the origin of thought. Do you see this? It doesn't need that you read lots of books and go to lots of gurus and philosophers, it is very simple when you observe yourself. You had an incident a few days ago; that incident is registered in the brain, and that is the response of that registration which is memory and thought begins. Right? Is this simple, clear? There's nothing to agree to, it's a fact. Don't make a lot of ado about it. A very simple fact.

Now, the next question is: can you observe, after registering, the

arising of thought? You register pain. You have been to a dentist, and he has hurt you, and that hurt has been registered. Now can you observe the arising of the memory of that pain, now? You follow what I am saying? You have had pain, you have been to the dentist a week ago, he has hurt you, and it has been registered, and can you observe the fear of that pain arising, the fear that it might come back, can you see the arising of that fear? Can you? This is important to understand because the arising of thought when there is an awareness of it, there is only thought, not the thinker who is thinking about the thought. This is a little bit difficult.

Traditionally we are used to the idea that the thinker, the experiencer, the analyzer is different from the analyzed, the thought, the experience. Right? Please understand this, give your attention to it. I hope you aren't too tired, are you? So there is the thinker and the thought. The thinker says, I'll control thought, I'll change thought, I will bring about a different way of thinking. So there is a division between the thinker and the thought. Right? Now how has this division arisen, and is it a reality? This is what we are used to: the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experience. Now why has this division existed, who has brought it about and is it an actuality?

Now first, is there a thinker if there is no thought? Go on, sir, answer this thing. If you don't think, there is no thinker. So the thought has made the thinker. Right? Because thought has said, the thinker is more permanent than me. Right? Because thought sees itself as being impermanent, changing, moving. But the thinker, which thought has put together, becomes a permanent entity, because in that permanency there is security. You are following all

this? Right? There is this whole idea in this world that there is something superior - atman, god, anything you like - in each one. This is what you are all brought up on. And that thing has been put there by thought obviously. So thought recognizing itself as being impermanent, in a flux, creates a thinker who says, I know I am permanent, I am the past, I have got a tremendous accumulation of knowledge and I will say what thought should do. Are you following? Is that what you are actually doing?

So when you meditate, so-called traditional meditation, you are always trying to control thought. Do please be simple and acknowledge this. You are always trying to control thought, aren't you? Who is the controller? Is it some divine entity? The higher self? The higher monkey? You never even question it, you never even find out, you accept it. So the controller, which is me, you, then tries to control thought and the battle is on - fighting, fighting, fighting for the rest of your life to control thought. But if you see the fact, the actual, that thought is the thinker, and the thinker is the thought, then the whole relationship changes. Right? You understand this? Right?

Look: I am greedy, suppose. I am greedy. Traditionally, culturally, I have been educated not to be greedy. I am just taking that very lightly. You must not be greedy. My background, my culture says, don't be greedy, but I am greedy. So there is a contradiction going on all the time inside me. Right? I am greedy but yet I am trying not to be greedy. So the entity, the thinker, says, I must control greed - is the controller different from greed itself? Are you following all this? They are both the same, aren't they? What kind of game are you playing? So you are never free of

greed, you are always battling with greed.

So if one learns the art of observation, the observer is the observed. Right? You don't see that. Is anger different from you? At the moment of anger there is no you, is there? There is just this reaction called anger. Right? A second later you say, I have been angry. So the 'I' is supposed to be different from anger. Right? Oh, come on. Whereas if you see you are anger, not that you are different from anger, then if you can observe that movement, that you are not different from the thing you are observing, the observer is the observed, if you can see the truth of that, conflict comes to an end. You understand?

Because as I said, our tradition has said: control, suppress, run away and the brain has been pressurized to this conditioning, so, it is damaged. It is always responding according to the pattern, the pattern which has been brought about through pressure. Now if you do the same thing again, you are increasing the pressure, whereas if you recognize the pressure, see what it has done and therefore observe without any pressure, that which is observed undergoes a fundamental change. At least intellectually understand this. That's good enough for the time being. But if you really go into it very deeply and see this thing, then you will see that you can bring about a fundamental change without any effort. Effort implies pressure, and we are so used to change under pressure - the pressure may be reward and punishment. So, we are saying, in learning the art of observation, you will find there is no pressure and therefore no effort, and therefore the thing that is observed, like violence, undergoes fundamental change. It has transformed itself totally.

## **MADRAS 1ST DIALOGUE 27TH DECEMBER 1977**

K: Is it possible to have a dialogue, which means a conversation between two people? That is not possible because there are so many of us. So how shall we communicate with each other about things that apparently, or seriously concern our lives? So since you have taken the trouble to come so early in the morning, what can we talk over together that has real significance in one's life. Not some theory, not some abstract subject, but actually concerns our daily living, our daily relationship with each other, our sorrows, affections, and pains, and anxieties, amongst all these things what shall we talk over together?

Q: Often I am subjected to insults and feel really hurt. And you were kind enough to say that an innocent mind is incapable of hurt, but I cannot understand innocent.

K: You are often subjected to painful things in life and you don't understand what it means to be innocent. Is that it?

Q: What is the difference between sleep and meditation? Can sleep be converted into meditation?

K: Lovely questions!

Q: One question more, sir. Seeing the content of the consciousness is not the emptying of the consciousness? And if it is so why has not the essence come into being?

K: Seeing the content of one's consciousness, doesn't that very observation empty consciousness. Right? Yes, sir?

Q: In the life of the usual man there is dilemma in the form of 'I', the separative self-sense. Its dominant activity in consciousness

serves to contract everything else in consciousness, or severely distort it, most unfortunately the heart, the metaphorical heart. It seems to me that traditional methods have failed, and theories have failed to bring about a lasting release of this contraction, or dilemma because they are in themselves only contracted. My question then is, sir, can we this morning find some movement, some natural event in consciousness to bring about the cessation of that thought, or thinking, which is the separative self-sense?

K: You have all heard the question, so I don't have to repeat it. Is it possible - if I understand the questioner - to eliminate the self which is brought about by thought, and live or be at a different dimension of consciousness. Isn't that right, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Do you want to discuss that?

Q: Sir, what do you mean by pursue thought to the very end?

K: Sir, forget what I mean, because it's your life, not my life. How do you live your life, what does it mean? You have a number of years to live in which there are so many complications - jobs, pressure of overpopulation, all the vulgarity, the noise, the brutality that is going on in the world - what is your life. Instead of talking about meditation and all that - we will come to that - but first shouldn't we understand our daily life, what it means, why we live the way we are living. Aren't you interested in that?

Q: We are fed up with up daily life.

K: We are fed up with our daily life.

Q: Sir, I want to know a how to prevent the problem of poverty.

K: The problem of poverty, with all its degradation and so on. Is that what you are really concerned about?

Q: Poverty.

K: Sir, what you are really concerned about?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I would like, if you don't mind, I would like to put you the question, and please be good enough to answer it.

Q: It seems to me...

K: Wait, sir. Let me first ask you something sir. I am not preventing you from asking questions but first may I ask you something. What are you, each one of you sitting here, concerned about? Seriously. What are you concerned about?

Q: With my life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking you something and you are answering something else. Would you kindly listen and find out what I am asking. You may be full of your own questions, but first please kindly listen. What are you concerned about - your life, not poverty, this and that, what are you concerned in your daily life?

Q: My own happiness.

K: Are you concerned about it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just listen sir, and find out, don't be clever and just answer anything that comes into your minds. What are you concerned about if you look into yourself, and ask this question, what are you concerned about?

Q: What is the purpose of life?

Q: I think we are only concerned about ourselves primarily.

K: The questioner says he is concerned primarily about himself. Is that a fact? Could we start from that? No? Aren't you all



concerned about yourself?

Q: There are a number of pressures on the brain...

K: Sir, just a minute, sir. It is the most extraordinary audience. I am asking you something very seriously, and apparently you don't take my question very seriously. I am asking you what is your daily concern in your life. Is it that you want more money?

Q: Well...

K: Just listen, sir. Listen to somebody, what he has to say first.

Q: Mental peace.

K: He wants mental peace. Is that your concern?

Q: I am not concerned about that for the time being.

(General discussion amongst audience)

K: I wonder why you have come this morning. You must have got up rather early, taken the trouble to come here, and apparently you just go on talking to yourself. So please would you kindly listen, try to find out what I am asking you. What is in your daily life, going to a factory, office, business, law, and so on, what is your chief concern in your daily living? Just think about it, don't answer it immediately. What's your chief concern?

Q: Relationship.

K: Don't invent something, sir. Apparently it is one of the most difficult things for you to pin down and find out what you are deeply concerned with in your daily life. Is it sex? Is it money? Is it relationship? Is it that you are unhappy? Is it that around you there is so much poverty, so much degradation? And are you concerned with searching, or trying to find out what truth is? What are you concerned about?

Q: A sense of reality.

K: I wonder why you come here at all really. You are not answering my questions at all.

Q: I am concerned with my life.

K: Concerned with your life, yes. What do you mean by that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Find out what he means. Your life, what does it mean? Your daily life.

Q: I am concerned with dharma, duty.

Q: The lack of love is difficult in the human.

K: Is that your problem, sir?

Q: It is the lack of love.

K: No, your problem.

Q: Lack of love.

K: Just a minute, sir. Wait, sir. You have made a statement. If you want to sit here and talk to the audience, come and sit here, sir. Apparently you have never asked that question of yourself: what is my/your deep problem while you are living in this world, what is your problem? One says it is lack of love, somebody says lack of relationship. Any old thing you trot out, but you have never said and looked at yourself to find out what it is you are deeply concerned with. Are you concerned with death? Are you concerned with living a life that is righteous, that is honest, that is sane? What are you concerned about? Just carry on as you are?

Q: Sir, I feel I am concerned with sorrow.

K: You are concerned with sorrow, and is it possible to be free of it. Is that it? Are you really? Would you answer that question: are you concerned with sorrow, all of you?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't say, yes quickly.

Q: No, sir, we are not concerned with sorrow all the time, while we are sitting here. But there is a lot of misery everywhere. All the time everyone is seeking pleasure.

K: Sir, don't read you question, please.

(General discussion amongst the audience)

K: Sir, would you mind, talk amongst yourselves, get over it, and I'll wait. Talk over with yourself, with your friend, and look all around, who is here, and then answer my question after you have talked to your friends and looked to see who is here, and find out what you really want to find out. Why are you here, sir? Why are you here? Would you kindly answer me, it's simple enough. Why are you sitting here, so early in the morning, having taken all the trouble, why?

Q: I recognize the whole movement of my life is distorted, not truthful, not real.

K: Yes, sir. So the questioner says, I see my whole life is distorted, dishonest and I'd like to lead a life which is correct, which is honest. Is that right, sir?

Q: That is correct.

K: Is that what you are all interested in?

Audience: Yes, sir.

K: No, don't laugh, sir, for god's sake, what is there to laugh at.

Q: We are coming here to learn.

K: Sir, please, just listen, sirs. Don't you know that one leads a terribly hypocritical life: say one thing and do another, go to temples and cheat somebody, talk about god, this, that and the other, take vows and go to Tirupati, or some awful little temple and

lead an ugly, brutal, daily violent life, that is contradictory, that is a way of hypocrisy. Are you aware of this? Don't you know this is happening in your life daily? You read the Gita, or the Upanishads, repeat mantras, and do puja, and the next minute go down the street and kill somebody, violent, spit, class divisions. Don't you know all this? So there is contradiction in your life, isn't there? Right, sir? Which means unless you lead an integrated life you live a life of hypocrisy. So can we talk about that?

You see how silent you are when it comes to real brass tacks, when you are really concerned with a way of living in which one's life is a hypocritical life, a contradictory life. Shall we discuss that? Sir, if you discuss with me, don't pretend, don't try to slur over, cover up your ugly life. We are going into it if you want to find out how to live a life that is whole, that's not broken up, that's not hypocritical.

Sir, don't take notes please. Please don't take notes, then you can't listen. You can't listen and take notes. So if you don't mind, either take notes or don't listen and go out.

We know, as that gentleman pointed out, that one leads a very dishonest life. That one has contradictions in oneself. We know this, don't we, sir? No? So can we start from there?

Q: Start there.

K: We are starting from there. First, are you aware, just conscious that you lead a double life? You understand? Are you aware of it?

Q: Yes but I don't...

K: Sir, may I ask you - don't duck your head sir - may I ask you why you are sitting there and asking these questions? Are you

interested in what we are talking about? Be serious, don't be flippant. Are you?

(General discussion amongst the audience)

K: Sir, I am asking you to kindly listen to what I am asking, and enquiring. Does one know, do you know that you lead a double life, a contradictory life, a hypocritical life?

Q: Many of us know.

K: All right, if you know what will you do about it? Just put up with it, carry on everyday leading a double life like this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand, sir. So what will you do, sir, if you know that you lead a hypocritical life, what will you do about it? Just talk about it? Don't you want to break it, live a different way of life? Do you? I am asking a simple question. Please, does one know first that one leads a double life, say one thing, do another, think something and do quite the opposite. That way of living is a hypocritical way of living, isn't it, sir? Now, that way of life brings a lot of problems, doesn't it.

Q: Actually I do understand, but I don't understand that I am a hypocrite, although I can see it intellectually.

K: Intellectually, the gentleman says, I see my way of life is hypocritical, my way of life is distorted, confused - intellectually. Now what do you mean by that word 'intellectually'? Verbally?

Q: I see what you say but when I am involved I just react.

K: I understand this. I am asking you, you use the word 'intellectual', what do you mean by that word? I intellectually understand that there should be brotherhood - intellectually. But actually, in daily life you contradict that. Now when you say, I

understand intellectually, you mean you understand verbally what is being said. Right? You don't feel it, you don't live it, you have an idea and you accept that idea and say, yes, that's a marvellous idea. Is that what you are all doing? That you verbally accept certain facts, but actually you have no relationship to it at all. You just repeat the words and live quite differently. Are you aware of this? Do you know this? Put on whatever you do, puja, which has no meaning, but carry on.

Q: That is so.

K: Right. If that is what is happening, what shall we do? Don't you want to break that pattern - a pattern of hypocrisy. How do you break it? You understand? All your tradition says, carry on. Right? Carry on, go to temples, do puja, it doesn't matter what kind of life you lead daily. So we are now reversing the process and saying: look, what matters is how you live daily. Right? So are you serious enough to be concerned with your daily life? Are you seriously concerned in the change of your daily, miserable, contradictory, hypocritical life? Then if we are, then we can discuss, then we can go into it, help each other to break down. But if you are not interested then it becomes very difficult. So I want to be quite sure that you are really interested in what we are talking about, which that gentleman raised. He said, my life is distorted, untrue, not straight, and I would like to change the pattern of that so that I lead a life that is true, that has no sense of contradiction, that is whole. Isn't that right, sir?

Q: Correct.

K: So can we go into that. Please, can we all of us go into this?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't casually agree, but find out if you really deeply want to go into this problem because it means changing your whole life. If you say, I want to live the way I am living, complete callousness, brutality, indifference, without any affection, hypocritical, then you are perfectly welcome to live that way. I am not saying you shouldn't. It's up to you. But if you want to find out a way of living in which there is no contradiction, which is not hypocritical, which is whole, then it's worthwhile talking about it. We will help each other. Right, sirs? Is this what you want? Is this what you want, sirs and ladies, to find out a way of living that is not contradictory, opposing, hypocritical, honest, a true way of living - do you want to find out? What do you say, sirs?

Q: Yes, we do.

K: Right. Why is there in our life contradiction? Why is there contradiction? In your life, sir, why is there contradiction? Please tell me.

Q: It is the experience we live.

K: Sir, would you kindly listen. I said, why is there in one's life a contradiction.

Q: Because we listen to other people, then we get confused.

Q: Because we apply the teachings.

K: Because you apply my teachings? What the dickens are you talking about? Sir, just look at yourself. Why do you say one thing and do another? Very simple, keep it at its simplest level. Why is there this contradiction, opposing desires? Right? Opposing wants, opposing purposes, why? Why is there this division in one's life? Think, watch it, find out, not from me, find out, we will help each other.

Q: The brain and mind are in conflict.

Q: Possibly because we have desires, and at the same time we have an idea that we should not have desires.

K: You understand, sir, you want something and you fight against it. I am asking you, why do you fight? Why do you have an opposite desire? If we could understand this one thing then perhaps it would clear up a great deal. You know what desire is, don't you. Don't you, sirs, you know what desire is? Wanting a shirt, wanting a car, wanting a woman, wanting pleasure, wanting to have better position in the world - desire. You understand, desire. Now, please listen: how does desire arise? Not for a car, or for good clothes, desire itself, how does it arise?

Q: Fear.

K: No, no, please. Desire, sir. I want a better house, more money, better wife, or god knows what else - desire, desire. Right, you know this, don't you. So I am not asking the objects of desire, but what is the source of desire?

Q: Could it be thought?

Q: Comparison.

K: Yes, comparison. Compare your little car with a bigger car, your little house with a bigger house, comparison. That is not what I am asking, if you will forgive me. I am asking, how does desire arise itself, not for a something, not for a big house, but the desire. What is the beginning of desire?

Q: A mental image, a thought.

K: You haven't even listened, sir.

Q: The search for happiness.

(General discussion amongst audience)



K: Look, sir. Finish all your... and then let's come back. You have stated all that you want to say, now let's come back and find out how desire arises. This is - please be good enough to listen - this is very important to find out, then you will know how to deal with it.

Q: There is something that you desire.

K: But sir, the origin, the beginning, how does desire - desire being wanting something, wanting or not wanting, this movement of desire - what is the origin, the beginning of desire?

Q: Thought.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's just the point, sir, I am trying to go into that. How does desire arise. Because unless you find out contradictory desires, then you battle with contradictory desires, but if you find out the beginning of desire then we can go into it further and deeply. Now I am going to go into it if you will kindly listen. You are ready to listen, you are not ready to find out. That's your culture, that's your training, that's your religious up-bringing - listen. You don't want to think for yourself but accept what other people say - Shankara, this person, that person, it doesn't matter, your pet guru. All that you are concerned with is, tell me what to do, not find out.

Q: It is sensation that brings desire.

K: Just a minute, sir, go slowly. We are trying to find out, enquire into the problem of desire, not the object of desire - woman, man, position - not the object of desire but desire itself, how it comes into being. I'll show it to you, and do it. You follow? There is nothing complicated about it.

Q: Sir?

K: Yes, sir?

Q: Does not the arising of desire happen simultaneously with the arising of time?

K: We will come to that, sir. First there is perception, isn't there? Seeing something, seeing a better house. Right? The seeing, then there is sensation - go slowly, do it, watch it. You see a car, you see a woman, you see a man in a big position, in authority and so on, you see that; from that there is sensation, then you touch it, contact. Seeing, contact, sensation. Right sir? Right? I see a car, touch it, like it, sensation; from sensation thought says, I like that, I want that. So please listen. Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought saying, I like that, I'd like to have more of it. So the whole process is: seeing, contact, sensation, desire. Right? That's very simple, you can watch it yourself. You see a nice house, then there is sensation, from that sensation identification with that object and you say, I would like to have it. Right, that's very clear. Right, sir?

Q: Can a blind man see?

K: A blind person doesn't see but he feels. You are not blind so please don't - you are not applying this to yourself, you run off to talk about a blind man. A blind man may not see but he touches, from the touching he has sensation, from sensation the feeling of like and dislike and all the rest of it, desire. So desire arises, seeing, perception, contact, sensation, then thought comes in and says, I like, I don't like and so on and so on. Have you got this simple fact?

Now why is there an opposing desire? You understand my question? Is desire in itself contradictory? Please think about it for

a little. You see how desire arises, why is there a contradictory desire, opposing desire? Answer me, all of you.

Q: The difference in...

K: No, I am asking, sir, first listen to find out. We understand the nature of desire. I am asking a very simple further question: why is there an opposing desire? Wait, listen. And is desire in itself contradictory? Or the objects of desire vary, desire is not contradictory in itself but the objects of desire vary. You understand my question? That is, I see a car, I see a woman, I see a man in a good position, power and so on, so the objects vary. But desire itself doesn't vary, it is desire. Right, sir? So the contradiction exists with comparison, change of objects, one is more attractive than the other, but it is desire. So desire in itself is not contradictory. Is this too much? Do you understand this, sir? Discover this extraordinary fact that desire in itself is not contradictory. Desire can never be contradictory, but the objects can be contradictory. Right? Is this clear?

Q: Not clear.

K: Are you saying this is not clear? There is a fundamental thing that one has to understand that desire in itself is never contradictory. That's a marvellous thing to discover for yourself.

Q: Sir, perhaps if you would explain not the power of desire but the 'why', perhaps it would be clearer.

K: Why?

Q: Yes, the 'why' of desire, not the 'how'.

K: The 'why' of desire. That's our whole nervous organism, everything is geared to sensation, sensory perceptions, and from sensory perceptions desire arises. We went into that.

Q: It makes no sense to me, what you say. I'm sorry. I cannot put that together logically. There is some other element that I cannot touch.

K: No, there is no other element, sir. You see, don't you, you see a big house - let's take that. From that there is sensation, isn't there, the seeing, there is sensation, a natural sensation, like putting a pin in your leg it hurts. So there is seeing, sensation. Right? Then there is contact, either you touch it, or sensory touch it, then from that desire arises when thought says, I'd like to have that.

Q: Why does thought say that?

K: Why - because all our education, all our conditioning is to identify ourselves with what we want. Right? I want that big house. So desire is identification with the object of desire. The object of desire, there is nothing complicated, there is nothing that is not logical.

Q: Sir, in the child who has not yet been fully conditioned into the desire for a car or a house, or any of that business, there is still the activity of desire.

K: Of course, sir.

Q: How does it arise?

K: The activity of desire is immediately you give a toy to the child and the child possesses it, 'It's mine', and he will fight for it. This is very simple, sir, don't elaborate a simple thing more and more. There is seeing, contact, sensation. Right? From sensation there is the image-building, if you want to go much more deeply into it. The image of a big house and the identification by thought with that big house, is the whole movement of desire.

Now I am saying desire in itself is not contradictory. One has

been told that to achieve god or enlightenment, or whatever it is, bliss, or whatever you want, you must become a sannyasi, renounce the world and follow a narrow path. But that is an idea, a concept, a thing which has been put forward and tradition says that's the way to achieve god, or whatever it is. But you have other desires. Right? You have sexual desires, you have desires for money, position, and so on. So there is contradiction. Right, you follow this? To serve god you must become a sannyasi, but your daily life is much stronger than the other, so you have a contradiction. Right? Now why do you have the image or the picture of a sannyasi? That is, a monk can only achieve the godhead, why? Why do you accept it? It may be totally wrong. Right? Why do you accept it?

Q: It is a reasonable thing.

K: Sir, look, look: the ideal of a sannyasi is non-existent. What is factual is your daily desire, not to serve god you must become that. That may be totally wrong, probably it is. So you have to say, first I will only deal with the fact, the actual, not the supposed way of living. The actual is one is burnt up with desire. Right? Therefore deal with that and not with the other. The other makes you a contradiction. I don't know if you follow this.

Sir, look, I'll explain. Tradition in India has established for thousands of years that to find enlightenment, to find god, to find whatever it is they promise, you must become a sannyasi, that is, renounce the world. Right?

(General discussion amongst the audience)

K: The tradition says this, sir, I am not saying it. Tradition says this. Now that has been established. But human beings are

devoured by desire. Which is the fact, which is the actual?

Q: We are full of desire.

K: That is the fact and not the other. So you have invented something opposite from your daily life and therefore there is a contradiction. Whereas if you say, look, I am only concerned with desire and all the implications of it, dealing with facts, then there is no contradiction at all. I wonder if you see this. Have you understood this simple thing, sir? Look sir, suppose I am violent, angry, jealous, full of hatred and all the rest of it, now why can't I deal with that without having the opposite of it? You understand my question, sir? I am violent but all of you, including the gurus and the mahatmas say, live a way of life which is non-violent. The way of non-violence is fictitious, it is not real. What is real, actual, is I am violent. Right? I have to deal with that, not with non-violence. But your whole tradition says, deal with a fictitious non-violence. I wonder if you understand this? That's simple, sir, isn't it? So you have eliminated the contradiction. So you are only dealing then with facts. That is, I am violent. I am violent. Therefore my mind is free of the opposite because I am only dealing with what actually is going on, not with supposed non-violence, which is nonsense. You follow? So I have eliminated contradiction. I wonder if you see this.

Do you see this, sirs? If we are dealing with what is actually going on then there is no contradiction. Suppose I have cancer, and the doctor says, the surgeon says, you must be operated, but I am frightened, I hesitate and I talk. But the surgeon says, my dear chap you have to have it, you go on the table tomorrow, otherwise it will be the worse for you. I accept the fact. But if I live in a world of

non-fact, as most of you do, then there is contradiction. As most of you live in a world of ideas and not with facts there is contradiction. I wonder if you see this. A simple fact. Right sir? Can you eliminate all ideals, which are fictitious, which are not real?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand all that. I am asking you something different, would you kindly listen. Which is, eliminate that which is not factual, actual. Ideals are not actual. Right? This is obvious, isn't it, sir? Non-violence is not actual, it is an ideal opposed to violence. Right? Right, sirs? So if you had no ideals but only facts, you are only dealing with facts, then there is no contradiction. I wonder if you see this. I'll show it to you, sir.

I am violent - suppose I am - suppose I am violent. I have been told, my culture, my tradition, all the people have said, try to be non-violent. That is the ideal. So I have been conditioned to that. Which is, there is contradiction between what is happening, which is I am violent, and the ideal of non-violence. And I see that very clearly, so I say to myself, I have to deal with facts, not with ideals. So I put away all ideals and only deal with facts, which is the actual sense of violence. You follow? I have eliminated altogether a thing which brings about contradiction. Therefore I am dealing only with facts, which what is actually happening. That is, the actual happening is that a reaction has come into me which I have named as violence. I wonder if you are following this? There is a reaction. You have called me a fool and my reaction is to get annoyed. But my conditioning says, suppress it, go beyond it, control it. Which is the ideal interfering with the fact. I wonder if

you see that.

So I see very clearly that any form of interference of ideals distorts, or makes me escape from the fact. Then I have no contradiction. See the beauty of it, sir. I have no contradiction because I am only dealing with facts. But when you are dealing with ideals - your ideal, my ideal, his ideal, there is contradiction. Right.

Now I am concerned only with the actual happening of violence. That is, a feeling has arisen because you have called me a fool, and I have named it, that reaction, I have named it as violence. Right? Now can I watch - is there an observation of that feeling without naming it? You understand? Try and do it, sir. Do it as we are talking. That is, not to name the reaction as being violent, because the moment you use the word 'violent' it has a great many connotations, associations. Which is, you mustn't be violent, you must be kind - again unreal. So can you observe that feeling without calling it violence? So can you observe without the word? You understand all this, sir? This requires tremendous observation, not discipline, just observation. Are you following all this? Following in the sense, are you doing it?

That is, we have become slaves to words. A Hindu is a category of a group of people called Hindus, and there is a category, a group of people called Muslims. The Hindus have their own conditioning, that they are this, that they are that, and the other fellow has his own conditioning, so there is battle between them. So to remove the contradiction deal only with facts, not with fictions, not with ideals. Right, sir? That is, I am violent...

Q: (Inaudible)



K: First see the problem as a whole, then we will deal in detail. That is, desire in itself is not contradictory. The objects of desire vary and therefore the contradiction lies in the objects. So that's one point.

The second point is, contradiction exists when we are not dealing absolutely with what is actually happening. Which means elimination completely of ideals. Which is very difficult because you are conditioned from childhood to have ideals - ideals of non-violence, ideals of nobility, ideals of a sannyasi, you follow, ideals. So can you see the falseness of ideals and therefore they have no value, not fight them. Seeing that they make life extraordinarily complicated, false, can you see the truth of it and therefore let it disappear. Like when you see a cobra, you know it is dangerous, it's finished, you don't play with it. So in the same way ideals are fictitious, they have no reality. What has reality, what is actually happening, is the fact.

So the fact is you call me a fool - please follow this - you call me a fool and the word 'fool' has many, many associations, and I get angry. There is anger. And that word 'violence' is applied to that feeling. Therefore in that very word there is contradiction. I wonder if you see this. Right, sir? So is there an observation of this arising of a sensation of reaction, but not naming it? Then you are dealing with fact, not with the word. I wonder if you see that.

Q: It is not easy.

K: Don't say, difficult. You are used to it, you are habituated to it, you are conditioned to it. See you are conditioned when you say, a Muslim. To a capitalist, communism is something terrible. So you are a slave to words. Your mind functions with words and you

are used to a certain set of words. So find out whether you can observe without the word. That is, can you observe the tree without the word? Find out. Then you will see that you can observe a woman, a car, a tree, a sunset, without the word.

Sir, let me go into it a little more to make it really simple. The word 'microphone' is not the thing. Right? The word is not the thing. Right? Do you see this? I wonder. I wonder why you come here. You want to learn about all this, therefore find out, sir. Nobody is going to tell you all these things, no book, no guru, they are too damn silly. So find out. The word is not the thing, the 'door' is not the actual door. Right? The word 'tree' is not the actual tree. So the word is not the thing. That's one fact. Right? I can describe the mountain - beautiful, the beauty of the valley, the blue light, the clear line against the marvellous sky, the quality of the air, I can describe it, but the description is not the actual. Right? Now most of us are caught in descriptions. Right? In the word. So you have to eliminate the description, the word, and look at the fact. You see then you have eliminated so many contradictions. I wonder if you see this. See for yourself, or rather, learn, not memorize, but learn, which is, that there is a possibility of observation without the word. That means you have learnt a tremendous lot, that your brain is now active without the word. We function within the word - Gita: there is immediately some kind of absurd reaction. And if you say, the Bible, you don't pay so much attention to it. It's just the words. So are you aware that you are a slave to words? And a mind which is a slave to words battles with unrealities. But whereas if you say the word is not the thing, never, then you move into a different dimension altogether.

Q: You say the door is not the word. If you remove the word 'tree' then the tree and the door are the same.

K: What a crazy question! I said, sir, please listen, don't let's become terribly clever. The word 'microphone' is not the fact. Right, sir? The word 'door' is not that door. When I point to that and say, 'That's the door', then the word identifies itself with the fact, the door. But the door remains when the word is gone. So go into it a little bit. This is very, very important because you will see for yourself if you go into for yourself and learn, that for us the word has become much more important than the fact. God is tremendously important for all of you - if you believe in all that rubbish. And suppose you meet a man who says, 'I don't believe in god', you are fighting over words. You don't know what god is, you know the description, which is not the actual fact.

So first please see how important it is for yourself, and learn that the word is never the thing. The wife, the word 'wife' is not the wife. Perhaps you will understand that better. (Laughter)

K: So I am asking please learn. Learn, not memorize, but learn to observe how the thing arose, how the thing comes out. Which is, we have contradiction only when we are not dealing with what actually is going on. Right? Because we don't know how to deal with what is going on we invent the ideal, which is an escape from what is going on. And if you want to change what is going on don't have contradiction. You understand the point? It's so simple. Then you have the energy to deal with 'what is'. Instead of wasting that energy in contradiction, having ideals and all the rest of it. Do you see this? Look, sir, I am violent, and my conditioning has been by all the gurus, the mahatmas, the whole culture says, don't be

violent. And I try all the time to be non-violent. But the actual fact is I am violent. So I am wasting my energy in trying to be non-violent. So when I remove that I have the energy to deal with 'what is'. You understand? But that energy is still wasted when I am using the word 'violence' and getting intoxicated with that word. So I have the energy to observe the fact of being angry. And I won't use the word 'anger' because the word is not the thing.

Q: Sir...

K: Wait, wait, let me finish, don't interfere. The word is not the thing, therefore there is only that reaction. Not named it. The moment you name it becomes stronger. You are strengthening by naming it, by associating through that word the past, therefore you are giving it strength. But if you don't name it, it soon dissipates. You have got this? So you have eliminated altogether contradiction. You are only dealing with what is actually going on. What is actually going on is poverty. Now please listen to this. The communists say, do this, the ideal. The congress people are all dealing with ideals, never dealing with the fact, which is poverty. Can poverty be solved by this country alone, or is it a global problem. If it is a global problem, which it is, then no nationalities, no division. We are concerned with facts. You understand sir? Then you and I can meet. I am not interested whether you are a Hindu, or a beastly something or other, I am not interested. Let's deal with the fact. But now economically we are divided, politically, religiously, and we fight over that and not with the facts. I wonder if you see this. It's so simple, it becomes extraordinarily clear. Because then you will find out what is right action. There can be no right action as long as you have ideals.

Right, sir? Good!

Have you learnt something this morning?

Audience: Yes.

K: No, learnt, not memorized. See the difference between memorizing and learning. You memorize by listening to what I have said like a schoolboy learning mathematics. But that's your tradition, that's your conditioning, everything turned into memory, and repeat, repeat, repeat. Whereas if you are listening and learning, it is not accumulating memory, you are learning, you are moving. I wonder if you see that.

So if I may ask, have you learnt something this morning?

Q: Learnt to think.

K: I am very glad if you have learnt to think. If you have learned to think, sir, you won't belong to any society, to any group.

Q: I am a Theosophist.

K: Then drop it.

Q: Sir, may I ask a question. You have said when I look at a flower and I see the flower, I am conditioned to say, flower, and that's what I end up seeing, not the flower. So you have said if I recognize that I have done that, just see the flower without saying flower, then I see the truth, I am dealing with facts. The fact is in my case that I am conditioned to respond always with the word 'flower', or whatever it is, and I can see that and say, 'Ah, I see that I am saying, flower'. You see the problem?

K: I understand. That is, we are conditioned by words. We are conditioned by environment. Right, sir? One is conditioned by the culture one lives in. We are conditioned by the religion, all that is going on around us from childhood. Right? Now is one aware of

this conditioning? Right? Which means you have no opposite to that conditioning. Please listen to it, just listen to it.

The gentleman asked a question, very simply: I am conditioned by the word 'flower', I am conditioned by the culture in which I live, I am conditioned by the religion, by the parents, by education: I am conditioned. Right? Now are we aware, know that we are conditioned? Right, sir? That's a simple fact. Do you know that you are conditioned? When you call yourself a Hindu, you are conditioned. Right?

Q: We don't know that.

K: I want that fact to be clear. You don't know it. You don't know it because it has become such a habit. It's like repeating, repeating, repeating, like your name, it's a habit. And the gentleman says, I cannot break down, or go beyond this habit. He is aware that he is conditioned, as most of you are not aware. He says, I know I am conditioned because of the flower, this, and that and the other. First be aware of it, and if you have an ideal, please listen, if you have an ideal that you must go beyond it, then you have contradiction. Right, sir? So remain only with the fact that you are conditioned. Right? Now, how do you observe that fact? Learn, please learn. How do you observe that fact that you are conditioned? Do you observe it with the desire, with the motive that you must be free of it? Then if that motive, that desire is to be free of it, you have created a contradiction. So can you be free to observe without a motive? The moment you have a motive, that motive is born out of your conditioning. You follow, sir? I am as good as any lawyer!

Q: I see that I am always conditioned.

K: Watch it, sir. I am saying, we are dealing with facts. See that clearly. So are you free of motive?

Q: No.

K: Therefore you don't see for yourself that when you have a motive you are introducing a factor which is non-actual.

Q: I am conditioned to have the motive though.

K: No. The word 'motive' means to move. Now let me go into it myself, I'll explain it and perhaps you'll see it better. I realize I am conditioned, actually realize, not just verbally say, I am conditioned. I am conditioned because I was born in India, as a Hindu, as a Brahmin and all the rest of it, I am conditioned by the western culture, I am conditioned by etc., etc. Now that is a fact. That is an actual daily fact that I am conditioned. Now I explained I am conditioned and the result of that conditioning is, I am separate from humanity. Right? I know all the reasons why that conditioning is dangerous, but it is still descriptive. So can I look at my conditioning without any kind of motive, which is to be free of it, which is to rationalize it, just to observe it without any motive. Unless I do that I will only move from one conditioning to another conditioning. So the importance is to find out if it is possible to observe without motive. If you say, that's impossible, then you give up, throw in the sponge and walk away. If you are serious, if you are really honest, want to find out the truth of it, you have to find out if you can live without a motive.

So when you have no motive then you are free to observe. You understand sir?

Q: I understand.

K: The very motive is more conditioning. So when you live in a

motive you are also living in a conditioning.

Q: It is too difficult.

K: Ah, it is too difficult - never to use the word 'difficult'.

It's nine o'clock. I would like to ask, if I may, most respectfully and politely, whether you have learned, not memorized, anything this morning.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have you learnt anything, sir? Which means you have really understood in your heart, not verbally, in your heart, that contradiction exists when you are not facing facts. If you learn that one thing you have learnt a tremendous lot. That means you have eliminated in life the conflict of opposites.



## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 29TH DECEMBER 1977

K: What do you think would be worthwhile to talk over together this morning?

Q: I think sir, what is the difference between sleep and meditation?

Q: How can one learn about fear and be free of fear?

K: All right. How can one learn about fear and be free of fear; and the other question was, is it possible while you are asleep to meditate.

Q: Could we talk about what causes distortion, distortion such as fear and aggression.

K: What brings about in our activity, in our thinking distortion, a deformed neurotic way of thinking.

Q: Yesterday, you talked about contradictions and is it possible to be free of contradiction?

Q: Sir, most of us in this world are dishonest, do not do our duty and most of us exploit others. Even a few people who are free from all this see that other people are in conflict. Is there a solution to all these problems?

K: Is there any solution to all our problems of dishonesty, contradiction, exploiting each other and so on.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't quite understand your question, sir. So what is the question sir? So, what shall we discuss? Do you want to talk about sleep and meditation? Do you want to talk about fear? Whether the thought produces the thinker, and so that the observer produces the

observed, and how can we with all our complication in life and dishonesty, contradiction, unhappiness how can we solve all these many problems? Which one would you like to discuss?

Q: The last one.

K: The last one.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You said that to observe trees, nature, the skies, the rivers, the waters, observe people, and observe oneself, there must be freedom; will not this freedom lead to chaos? That is what the lady asks. So what shall we talk over together? Together, not I answer and you just listen, but together go into the question, which question would you like take?

Q: About fear.

K: You want to talk about fear? Now please don't ask any more questions, let's find out which one of these questions you would like to talk about. That to observe one must be free and if there is freedom will not there be chaos in the world? The other is, we live such a complicated contradictory life, rather stupid, exploiting, hurting people, with all our problems, is it possible to resolve them all? And to talk about meditation and sleep, and fear. Now just a minute, which of these questions would you like to discuss very carefully?

Q: Freedom.

K: Which is that? (Audience laugh) Why do you laugh? I am just asking.

Q: Is it possible to be free?

K: Can we be free, would you like to discuss that? That is, with all our complications of our life, poverty, exploitation, conflict,

suffering, all our life which is so miserable, so unhappy, can we be free of all this? Shall we discuss this? Do you really want to go into this seriously, including fear. What do you think is the central factor, which causes all these disturbances, contradiction, misery? What is the central root of it? Do you understand? We can discuss the pruning of a tree and we go on talking about pruning, pruning trees. But if the root is rotten and is not healthy, whatever it produces must be rotten, inedible, useless. So, are we discussing, talking over together, the pruning of the branches, the peripheral activity or going to the very root of the matter?

Please understand my question, first: shall we talk over together the peripheral. You know the word peripheral, which means the outer; the branches of a tree or should we concern ourselves and find out what is the root cause of all this? Disturbances, hypocrisy, fear, the invention of gods and all the rest of it, the misery that man lives in. Which shall we discuss? The peripheral activity or the root cause of it?

Q: The root cause.

K: You want to discuss the root cause. How do you find out? How do you find out the root cause of all our misery, confusion and all the rest of it. The root cause. Now just a minute, let me explain a little bit. Is there a cause? We say there must be a cause for all this misery, for all this confusion, for all this uncertainty, fear and so we are trying to look for a cause. Right? Is there such a cause? We are looking for it. But there may not be a cause at all. You understand my question? Let us find out. Where do you begin to enquire? You understand? We want to find out the cause, the beginning of all this confusion. Right? The beginning, and if you

could understand it, eliminate it, be free of it, then perhaps life will be a marvellous affair. So how do you try to find out the root of it? You understand my question? Do you take one branch and go to the root - you understand my question - take one branch like fear, like pleasure, like sorrow, like confusion, take one issue, and work it down to the root. There is a tree, do you take each branch and go down to the root, there are many branches, or do you see the whole of it? Is this clear?

Would you kindly listen: sir there are spokes of a wheel, collecting the spokes will not make a wheel. Right? Are you clear on this point? Collecting the many spokes will not make the wheel. Do you have a perception of the whole or do you want to discuss a particular and then through the particular come to the whole? You have understood my question? Through the particular come to the whole, or you have a perception of the whole and then take the particular. You see the difference? One is to analyze. Right? Analyzing the particular, through the analysis come to the root, or without analysis see the whole and work out the particular. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am going into it sir, have patience. First, please understand my question, this is very important. We are always taking a particular like fear and then try through fear to understand the whole movement of our life. Or you understand the whole movement and then take a particular thing. Like, an architect - any architect here? Like an architect, he has a perception of the whole building. The whole building; the nature of it, the structure of it, the beauty of it, the line of it, the proportions, the shade and depth

and so on, and having the perception of the whole he work out the details. Right? You understand this? Now which is it we are going to do? Have you understood my question? Please be good enough to understand my question first. We are used to work out from the particular, deduce, whereby there may be a different way of looking at it. Take the whole of life, and see the very root of it. You are not used to that, so you have never done that, you are not used to it, so let us begin with the particular. Right? What would you take up? Fear? Or confusion or unhappiness?

Fear: in the understanding, exploring, going into the whole movement of fear, will you find out - please listen - will you find out the root cause for all the confusion, all the misery. Do you understand what I am saying? I will explain, I am afraid - I will go into fear later. I am afraid. By understanding and being free of fear, will I have solved all the other problems? - confusion, uncertainty, sorrow, anxiety, greed, hatred. You understand my question? By understanding, going very deeply into fear, will I resolve all the other problems? Be clear on this point. So it is very important to understand, whether by discussing one particular aspect of our life, will you understand the totality of our life? You understand? Am I making my question clear? You, sir, you are looking at me. You follow what I am saying?

Q: No.

K: You don't understand me. You follow what I am saying? So, you are not used to taking the whole of life and looking at it, but you are used to, through education, through tradition and so on, you are conditioned to take one aspect of life and hoping thereby to resolve all the other problems. Right? So let us do that. Fear, you

want to discuss fear. What is fear? You are afraid; aren't you? At least be honest with yourself. You are afraid. Afraid of losing your job; afraid of death; afraid of not reaching god or whatever it is, afraid of not doing the right thing; afraid of not being respectable. We have many, many forms of fear, which is the fear that you have?

Q: Fear of the future.

K: Fear of tomorrow, is that it? One is afraid of tomorrow.

Q: Fear of wasting life.

K: Fear of wasting life, your life. Find out, sir, what is your fear.

Q: Afraid of ignorance.

K: Oh, come off it! Are you afraid of ignorance?

Q: No, but generally.

K: You, sir. Just listen we are talking seriously. This is not a matter of laughter. You said fear of ignorance. Are you really frightened of being ignorant?

Q: No sir, I am not at all sir.

K: Sir, I am asking you a question: are you afraid of being ignorant?

Q: No, sir.

K: Then why do you bring that up?

Q: I see it's a problem.

K: Whose problem?

Q: Generally, sir.

K: No, sir. I asked - either you are not courteous enough to listen to my question, which is, what is your particular form of fear? Yours, not somebody else's.

Q: I have no fear.

K: The gentleman says he has no fear. We can't say anything more about it.

Q: I am afraid of public opinion.

K: So, you are afraid of public opinion, afraid of tomorrow, future. So, what are you afraid of?

Q: Afraid of suffering.

K: Afraid of suffering. Go on, sir, unless you are all marvellously free human beings of fear.

Q: Afraid of death.

K: Afraid of death, afraid of suffering.

Q: Afraid of losing security.

K: Afraid of losing security both physical and psychological.

Q: Afraid of doing the wrong thing in relationship.

K: Afraid of doing wrong things in relationship.

Q: Afraid of not being able to forget.

K: Afraid of not being able to forget, that is, regrets. Now which of these do you want to discuss?

Sir, have the courtesy to listen, politeness to listen. You have so many fears. Fear of tomorrow, fear of insecurity, fear of death, fear of wasting one's life and so on. Which if these do you want to go into? I am waiting sir. You tell me!

Q: All fears.

Q: Fear of security?

K: Shall we go into that?

Q: Yes.

K: You see you agree to anything. You are not responsible for yourself. You are not thinking out for yourself. I am asking you

most respectfully: what is your particular form of fear? Are you aware of it? Do you know it? Do you know your particular fear sir?

Q: Yes.

Q: Fear of I don't know what.

K: Fear of the unknown, which is death, tomorrow, which is the unknown. You don't know what might happen tomorrow. There might be an earthquake. The building may fall down and kill you. You see, it shows, sir, you have not looked at yourself. You do not know your particular fear. You want to discuss fear as a generality. You don't say, look, I am frightened of death; I am frightened of loneliness; I am frightened of losing wife. I am frightened of losing my sex; I am frightened of losing the property I own; I am frightened of not getting a better job; which of these are you aware of? You follow sir?

Q: The ending of life before I know myself.

K: Fear of death before knowing the whole nature of myself. That is your fear. Now which of these fears do you want to discuss? Your fear, not mine or somebody else's.

Q: I love a particular girl. I want to marry that particular girl. My parents won't allow it so I am afraid.

K: Throttle the parents or run away with the girl. You are all grown-up people, I believe, educated, and apparently fear doesn't mean a thing to you. You just talk about it. You really don't know what fear is. Do you? You are all well fed, good jobs, or money, and you have never found out for yourself what you are afraid of. Look at the tragedy first. The tragedy of so-called educated grown-up people, who have studied sacred books or whatever it is and do not know for yourself what you are frightened of; that is a



tremendous tragedy. You understand sir?

Now let us take one thing: you are afraid of tomorrow, the future, shall we discuss that for the moment? What is the future? Just investigate, don't answer. What is the future? When you use the word 'future', tomorrow, or ten years, hence what do you mean by the word 'future'?

Q: Planning.

K: Wait, wait. What is the past? What do you mean by the word 'past', what do you mean by the word 'present'? What do you mean by the word 'future'? The past, the present, the future, what does it imply? Sir, don't be nervous sir.

Q: Time.

K: The past, the present, and the future, somebody said, it is time. Just listen carefully. What do you mean by time? Just listen, I am not quibbling about it. If you understand this you will understand so much, you learn so infinitely. So we are talking about the past, the present and the future. All this implies time, that is, there was yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Right? That is, according to the calender, it was 29th yesterday, 30th today. So according to the calender, according to the sunrise, sunset, that is one kind of time. Right? There is another kind of time. Which is, I have done something in the past which I regret; I am doing something in the present which is coloured by the past; and the future is shaped by the past. This is simple. Have you lost me? So past, present and the future is a movement. It is not static. It is not fixed. It is a movement. So time is a movement. Right? Time is a movement. This is clear sir. Time is a movement. Are you afraid of this movement? You are afraid of the past. What is the past? Don't

introduce karma and all the rest of it, but just the past. The past being how you were educated, your memories of what you have learnt, memories of your pleasures, sexual and others, memories of what you should do and what you should not do. So the past is the collection of memories, remembrances, whether pleasurable, painful or regretful. You are following all this, don't get tired, we are just beginning. You are investigating with me. I am not talking to myself. The past is all those memories accumulated during the time, whether it is 10, 30, 50 years or a hundred. During this life time, that's good enough. During this life time. I won't enter into the problem of reincarnation and all that. I am only taking this short period of life which one is actually living. Which is, the past is all the collections of memories, painful, pleasurable, regret and so on. So all that is the past. Is this clear? In this life time not whether you are born previous life and all that, we won't enter into that for the moment. During this life time you have collected all the experiences, memories, knowledge, which is the past. Right? So knowledge is the past. All knowledge is the past. Please see the truth of this, not agreeing, see the truth of it for yourself. All knowledge, scientific knowledge, knowledge you have gathered through experience, knowledge that you have gathered through information, all knowledge is the past. Right? Are we learning together? Not memorizing what the speaker is saying, learning. So in the past we live, don't we. All your living is in the past.

Q: When you are actually living memory doesn't interfere.

K: Is that what you are saying? Is that a theory or an actuality? Don't please, if a may ask you, most kindly, don't theorize, don't speculate, find out actually what you life is.

Q: (Inaudible\_

K: What do you mean by living? actual living is the operation of the past in the present. Right? The past shapes, controls, changes, modifies the present. This is obvious sir. So, if you look at your daily life, you are actually living in the past. You may think you are living in the present, or complying according to the pattern of the future, but actually you are living in the past. Your name, your recognition as so-and-so, and the familiarity of your habits, of your surroundings, everything is collected, stored in the past as memory. It is simple. So you are living in the past. You won't like that but it is a fact. Right?

Q: The habit and conditioning comes from the past.

K: Habit, conditioning, tradition, everything is from the past. The past meets the present, modifies it and goes on. The future then is the modification of the past, meeting the present, and shaping the future. This is a simple ordinary daily fact. That is, I have collected lots of memories, unhappy, pleasurable, confusing and so on and I meet the present. The challenge of the present. The challenge. And I respond according to my knowledge, memory and so modify my memories and go on. So the past meeting the present modifies itself and goes on. This is a simple daily fact. This past, which is, you as a Hindu, or a Brahmin, or whatever it is, the past meets the present 20th century with all its technology, with all its economic problems, and you modify your Brahminism or whatever it is and go on. So life is a movement from the past, through present to the future. Now what is it that you are frightened of?

Q: The unknown.

K: I explained madam, the future is the result of the past. The

future: you are afraid of the unknown. You are afraid of the unknown because you are afraid of losing what you know. Is that it?

Q: Being trapped in that movement.

K: Sir, you haven't understood, sir, please. I am asking you, please, sir, what is it that you are afraid of? You say, 'I am afraid of the unknown, the future'. Please listen. You are afraid of the future. What is the future? It's a movement of the past, modifying itself and going on. This is your daily life. So, what are you afraid of? Ending this movement?

Q: The past has become the present. And the present is going to be the future, so there is nothing to be afraid of.

K: Is that a fact with you? Don't laugh sir please. I am asking you most respectfully. When you have understood the business of past, present and future, you have ceased to fear?

Q: Yes sir.

K: Actually?

Q: The more I explore the concept I am afraid I have not used my time in the past correctly.

K: It is not a concept. It is a fact. Don't make a fact into a concept. It is very important to understand this. The fact is we live in the past, we are jealous, we know hatred, it is all in the past. And that past is all the time moving in the present, modifying, going on - like a river that is going on. It is not a concept. It is a fact of our daily life.

Q: But even then...

K: I am going to come to that sir, first please listen. You are this movement. Aren't you? You are not separate from this movement

of the past, the present, and the future. You are that. Right sir? You can say, I am the higher self, there is god in me, but it is still the past tradition, saying that, and all that is the past. Even your higher self, even your atman, Brahmin, the whole works of theology is still in the past. Which you have accepted, which has been, through propaganda of years, impinged on your brain. You are the past. You are being modified in the present. You are the future. Right? That is a fact. That is an actuality. Now what are you afraid of?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please sir, you have not accepted. Please listen sir. Kindly listen. You have not accepted an idea. You have seen the fact. There is no need for acceptance. The sun rises and the sun sets. You don't say, I accept that idea. You are all so cuckoo, you don't think. You just live in ideas, words. So I am saying you, Mr Smith, you Mr Roa, or whatever it is, you are the past, you are the present, modified by the present activities and you are the future. This whole movement is you. You are not separate from time. Time is the past, present, and future. You are the channel of time, you are that time. Right? That is a fact like a microphone. Now, wait a minute, what are you afraid of?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait sir, you have not even listened to the question. Please have the courtesy, politeness, to let the speaker finish his sentence. Think it out before you answer my question. I said, you are this, the whole movement of time. Sir, see the beauty of it. You are missing so much; you are this whole time. And what are you afraid of? This movement coming to an end? Are you afraid of that?

Q: Pleasure coming to an end.

K: So, you are afraid of losing pleasure. Just a minute sir, go into it quietly. You are afraid of losing your pleasure. Pleasure - sexual pleasure, right? Pleasure of having clothes, possession, power, car, money - if you have all that - pleasure of your family, pleasure of achievement. So all this pleasure you are afraid of losing. Now, wait a minute. What is pleasure? See, you use the word, and think you have understood it. What do you mean by that word 'pleasures? You look at a sunset, if you ever do, I am afraid you don't, but if you do look at a sunset, and see the beauty of the sunset, the colour, the streaks of light, the quietness of the sunset and so on, when you do look at all it, it gives a great pleasure. Like looking at a beautiful tree, like looking at a beautiful woman or a man, it gives you pleasure - sexual excitement, sensory and all the rest of it. Now, at the moment, at the second of that pleasure, you don't call it a pleasure, do you?

Q: Well...

K: Have the courtesy to listen to my question. At the moment of anger, at the second of anger, there is only anger, there is no 'I am angry' - that comes a second later. Right? So, at the moment of pleasure, at the second of pleasure, there is no saying, 'I am seeking pleasure'. Right? So, always a second, or a moment later, you say, how happy I was, I want more and more of it. So watch it carefully, sir, please have the courtesy, the politeness, to listen. That is, at the moment of anger, at the moment of greed, or jealousy there is only that fact, that reaction which we have named as anger, jealousy, pleasure and so on. At the second, there is no identification. But a few seconds later comes the identification, and we say 'That was pleasurable. I must have more of it'.

Now what is implied in that? At the moment of its happening there is no 'I'. A second later the 'I' comes in and says, how lovely that was and I must have more of it. And the pursuit of it. Now, what is that, this movement? Is it not the movement of time? Just look at it. The movement of time. The second it happens, there is no time. There is no saying, ah, how happy I am. A second later you say, how happy I am.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do listen sir, have the courtesy, the politeness to listen to the speaker till he has finished. Find out what he wants to say. And then you can say whatever you want to say. I am not preventing you from saying anything you want to say. So, this second of happening, then identification with that happening with myself and wanting more. If it is pain, at that moment of pain there is no you. A second later you say 'how awful, I have an awful pain'. Then the avoidance of it. It is the same movement, as pleasure, same movement as pain. So all that movement is time, isn't it? Time is involved.

So what you are afraid of is not being able to pursue the pleasure that you have, and the ending of it. You are afraid of you pleasure ending. Right? So what are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about your pleasure and the pursuit of pleasure and the fear that it may end? You are faced with the problem. Right? What is your response?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You haven't understood, sir. Time must go on? The sun rises and sun sets. There is light and darkness. This will go on even though you don't exist and I die, but this will go on. Right? So time

will go on. Wait sir, listen to what I am saying. I must have the patience of the devil. You don't seem to have a little patience. You go on with your own ideas, with your own thinking. That is, time by the clock, which is chronological time, sun rising, sun setting, the stars, the moon, that is so marvellously orderly that will go on. Right? Even though you die. So what you are afraid of is the ending of you, with your pleasures, with your anxieties, with your memories, with your pain, with your sorrow, with your losing attachments, all that is what you are afraid of. Right? No?

Q: Sometime back you said there is a gap between the two, I want to know how the link happens.

K: I don't understand your question.

Q: How does the 'I' which lives in time operate on fear? How does the brain record time? Sir, I see a beautiful sunset, at that moment I don't record.

K: Sir, that is not what he is talking about.

Q: Fear arises in me. For a split second, I recognize that fear, the recognition of fear is in time. But fear itself is out of time. What is the difference between fear in time and fear out of time?

K: All right, I've got your question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, that gentleman has asked a question and you are going on with your question. You have not the courtesy to listen to his question. How impolite we are. The question is, as far as I understand it, please correct me if I am wrong: fear arises, and the arising of the fear is out of time. Then, I recognize it by naming it and so make that into time. Right? What is the relationship of fear, which existed before I named it and the fear of time. Right? Is this



your question sir?

Q: The last sentence is not correct.

K: What is not correct sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I have repeated what you have said. May I repeat it again, sir. At the moment of arising fear is out of time, according to you. Then, the naming of it, the giving it a recognition, that is in time. So what is the relationship.

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: He is saying that it is according to you, is it not according to him?

K: Will you move out of your position, sir, if I correct you? If you will change your position, if I show you. Right. Let's be very, very simple. Anger arises, then you name it. Right? At the moment of the arising of that thing called anger, there is no time. When you name it then it becomes time. Right? So are you asking, is it possible to be aware, or watch the arising of anger, and not name it. If you don't name it, it is out of time, the moment you name it, you bring it into time. Right?

Q: He said, what is the link?

K: Of course sir this is a little complicated. Go into it with me, if you are interested, if not go and jump, skip a rope, or whatever you like.

Q: Absolutely there cannot be a link between the two, then how the link happened is my question.

K: How does it happen, what?

Q: By saying, the very act of naming. the very act of recognizing, which is naming brings...

K: He doesn't listen, it is purely an abstract thing, you are not doing it. Let us be simpler. What are you afraid of? All the past is you, all your memories, all your pains, all your pleasures, and your aspirations and your idea of atman, god and this and that. all that, the past which is you, you are not different from the past. So, what are you afraid of? Ending this? Which is death, isn't it? Right? Right sir? Ending. Now wait a minute. Have you been ended; please listen, have you ever ended while you are living now, a particular attachment? You are attached to something, aren't you? Right? Yes sir? Wife, house, ideas, beliefs, you are attached to something. Can you end it without argument, without saying, why should I end it. You won't discuss this with death. You understand? He does not give you time to discuss, 'Wait wait, old boy, give me time, let me detach myself'. He says, end. Have you ever ended a particular attachment, ended it? Have you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't be flippant sir, this is very serious. Have you ended any pleasure? No. Find out. Find out if you can end a particular pleasure. End it, not say, I will end it today and pick it up day after tomorrow. Your attachment to your wife, to your children, end it. And see what happens. That is what is going to happen when death comes. Right? You have no time to argue with death. Probably you will die of some disease, or unconscious, so I am saying while you are living find out what it means to end something completely end, not pick it up next year. Then you are facing fear. Right? Then you are actually facing fear and frightened of what might happen if you detach yourself from something. Do it! You leave your order of monks, leave your gurus, leave your traditions, leave your beliefs.

End it with a sharp knife so that it is finished. Then you will know what fear is. Then you will find that you are tremendously lonely. You understand? That is great fear. But without ending something you are trying to discuss theoretically. And you will go on I am sure of it. You will go on being attached, go on talking about all this and next year when we meet you'll say, let us talk about attachment.

So, you never in your life, living, face fear. You talk about fear, and I say you will know the nature of fear when you free yourself from any kind of attachment. Give up your Hinduism - you might lose your job, you might not be able to marry your daughter. You follow? So, you are frightened. So if you are serious, if you go into this matter of fear very deeply, you have to test it, you have to find out for yourself; not play around with words. You are attached to your wife, aren't you? Or to your girl friend, aren't you? Or to your job, or to your opinion? Or something or the other? Will you naturally, happily end it? Go on, sir.

Q: When you try to end a habit, conflict is produced.

K: Because one has not understood the nature of the habit, why the mind, the brain functions in habit. You function as a Hindu, which is a habit. Right? You function as a specialist, as a doctor, an engineer, or a businessman, and that's a habit. Why does the brain function in habits? What a tragedy it is, sir, how you are wasting your life. That is what that gentleman asked: he asked, how I am to prevent myself from wasting my one life, the precious life, I have. Please help me to prevent the wastage of my life. Right? Aren't you wasting your life? Consider it sir, aren't you wasting you life?

Don't take notes sir, please apply it to yourself sir, not notes, for

god's sake. What is the matter with all of you? When somebody tells you, he loves you, do you take notes? That is what I am telling you. I am telling you, I love you, and you say 'Yes sir, very interesting', or, you think about something else. Aren't you wasting your lives sirs and ladies? If you are living in a world of ideas you are wasting your life. The word 'idea' you know, comes from Greek, which means to observe: Just to observe, not make an abstraction of what you observed and that abstraction becomes an idea. You understand. The word 'idea' means from Greek, Latin and so on, pure observation. Now have you observed how you are wasting your life. Aren't you, aren't you wasting your lives sirs? Which means you are living in a world of ideas, world of make-believe, world of suppositions and theories. Right? Or some conclusion you have come to and you live with that conclusion; all that, if I may point out, is a waste of life. Life is to be lived, to be understood, gone into very, very deeply. It's your life? Why you are so colossally selfish - aren't you, colossally selfish? Right, sir? And how can a selfish man live without conflict. He must live in conflict.

There you are, you are taking notes again. Why do you waste you time coming here sir? Look sirs, the speaker wants to tell you something: tell you that there is a different way of living, actually in daily life, not in heaven or in some future, but in daily life there is a way of living where live isn't a problem, life isn't a struggle, life isn't a beastly everyday boredom, and I want to tell you, I want to communicate with you. That means let's talk it over together. Not you accept or agree with whatever I say, but let's talk it over. But you, you are not willing to do that. You sit there, accept or

reject what is said, or you are mesmerized by your own ideas. You understand sir. So, please don't waste your life. This is the only life you have. You may think you have a future life - reincarnation, but what you do now will control the future, obviously. So, don't waste your life. Which is like a person who has got tremendous affection and says, please don't waste your life.

Q: Talk.

K: No sir, it is finished.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What has this to do with what we are talking about. He is talking about some Soviet Union books. That gentleman has not listened at all. I don't know why you all come. Sir, don't you know life is the most precious thing? You understand? And how you are wasting it, destroying it. We will go into this when we talk in the public talks. We will go into it very, very carefully sir, please have the courtesy to listen.

## **MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 31ST DECEMBER 1977**

May we go on talking over together what we discussed the last time we met here, last Sunday? If I may, I would like to point out something: we were talking about the art of observing, observing the world, what a chaotic, confused, brutal world it is actually, factually. And also we said through the outward observation, the same movement turned inside, which is to observe oneself, actually, what one is; not theoretically, but factually, what is actually daily going on within our own confused, miserable, rather frightened existence. We went into the question of what it means to observe. I think we went into it fairly thoroughly, but this evening, if I may, if one may, I would like to begin with the art of listening, whether one really listens at all, not only to what the speaker is saying, but also to everything that is going on around us - the nature, in our families, when we are talking to a friend and so on, whether we even listen or we only listen casually, paying a little attention, rather bored, know exactly what the other fellow is going to say. And so, gradually one gets into the habit of partial listening, whether at home, in the office or anywhere else. I think there is an art in the way one listens. Perhaps in the very act of listening, the whole problem may be solved. If you have gone into it very thoroughly, what it means to listen, not merely respond to verbal communication, not only understanding the words, and so on, but also to listen to what is behind the word, to listen between the words, to see the depth of the word and have an insight into the meaning of that word before it is almost spoken. That requires

great deal of attention, sensitivity and alertness to capture what the other fellow is saying. And, listening implies, doesn't it, not to make an abstraction of what is being said - and abstraction being to draw a conclusion from what you hear, which is actually an abstraction. I don't know if we are meeting together on this point.

Please let me again, if I may, remind you most respectfully, that we are sharing the thing together. I am not making a speech, throwing out a lot of ideas. But together we are exploring, together in exploration sharing, we are walking together, and we must keep at the same speed, with the same elan, with the same movement. Otherwise you cannot share. You may be far ahead and I may lag behind. So sharing implies, doesn't it, that both of us together investigate into the art of listening first, because we are going to investigate into a great many other things this evening, but first I think it is important to learn for ourselves the art of actually listening. When you listen to that statement of any kind, the instinctual response is to either agree or disagree. And therefore you stop instantly from listening. Or, compare what you hear with what you already know. So, comparison in listening prevents you from listening. I hope we are meeting each other in this point. And also listening implies, doesn't it, that in our enquiry both of us are not coming to any conclusion. As we said, the word 'art' means putting everything in its proper place.

So I think it is very important to learn for oneself the art of listening. If one listened really very, very carefully, not interjecting your own personal opinions and conclusions and prejudices, but listen with your heart, with your mind, with your being, and perhaps a deeper form of communion can take place, both verbally

and non-verbally.

So, having stated that, I would like to go into the question: what place has knowledge in our life? I don't know if you have ever asked this question. Knowledge implies, doesn't it, that which is known, that which has been experienced, gathered, collected, stored up as memory in the brain. That is a fact. And as we are living, more and more information about everything is being gathered, about the whole universe, matter, movement of stars, time, eternity, and so on. And also we have information according to the psychologists and philosophers about ourselves: what we are, what we should be, how we are evolving towards something or other, this constant information is being given, gathered and distributed. So we live with extraordinary accumulation of knowledge; knowledge not merely from books, whether they are so-called sacred or holy but also from our own experiences we have gathered a tremendous lot of human knowledge about ourselves - if you gone into it.

So, we are asking what is the place of knowledge with regard to right action? Are you interested in this? Are you sure? Because, in a confused world, a world that is becoming more and more insane, more and more destructive, one must, if one is at all serious, fairly intelligent, deeply concerned to find out for oneself what is one to do, not only as a human being but as a collective representative of all humanity. We went into that the other day, because every human being, you as a human being, is a representative, is the totality, of all humanity. Now will you listen to that statement, that you are actually the representative of humanity, will you listen to it? Or will you draw a conclusion from it, make it into an idea and



discuss about that idea, argue back and forth? So, when you do that, you are moving away from the act of listening. If you listen totally, completely, with all your being, then a deep transformation takes place, because to realize that you as a human being, no longer petty individual, worrying about his little this or that, but you are the entire humanity, if you listen to that, it is really a most profound awakening - I won't call it experience. It brings tremendous clarity, a great deal of vitality and strength. And so, I am asking, if I may ask, are you listening to that statement completely or have you already gone off making an abstraction and an idea and observing the idea? I don't know if I am making myself clear on this point. The word 'idea', it comes from Greek and so on, means to observe. See what we have made of that word, which means to observe - not a conclusion, not a fixed opinion, but to observe what is actually going on, both outwardly and inwardly. So are you, if I may ask, listening that you are actually the representative of all man, humanity. You see, that means when you listen so completely, the idea of petty little individuality disappears altogether. You are concerned with the whole global human being. I wonder if you get this?

So, we are asking what place has knowledge when there is an enquiry into what is right action? Right action means correct action, accurate action, precise action, not right action according to you or to me or to some action based on some pattern, some conclusion, some ideal. Those are not actually correct action. So we are trying to find out, if you are interested in it, and you must be as a human being, when there is so much confusion, both outwardly and inwardly, what place has knowledge with regard to

right action? You have understood the question, sir? Because we have got tremendous knowledge, and knowledge implies, by the very word, that which has been known, which has been acquired, which has been accumulated through experience, through education and so on and so on - this whole accumulation of knowledge. There are a whole group of scientists saying man can ascend only through knowledge. The ascent of man through acquiring more and more knowledge. Knowledge we said is always in the past - there is no knowledge of tomorrow. The tomorrow is dictated by the knowledge of yesterday, passing through the present. That is obvious. So we live in the past, if you observe yourself: you might have had marvellous experience a couple of years ago or yesterday, and that experience, the residue of that beauty, or that love, whatever it is that you think that experience is, and it is gone and you are searching for it, longing for it, longing which is again moving in the field of knowledge - always functioning within the field of the known. I hope you are following all this.

So, what is right action? You understand? What is right action, which will be true, precise, accurate, correct under all circumstances, whether you are at home, the office, whatever you are doing? It is very important to find out. Does knowledge bring order? Because action, correct action is based on order, not of choice, not on accumulated information called knowledge. So one asks, does knowledge bring order? Are we in communication with each other, or are you off somewhere else and I am off somewhere else? Because I feel we are not in communication because for some of you it is all new. And so you are hesitating, questioning,

worrying about it. Sir, let us make it very, very simple. Knowledge implies storing up of experience, gathering all the known facts and storing up in the brain and acting according to memory. That is simple. Right? Acting according to memory. Acting according to that, does it bring order? Please be clear on this point, because we are investigating. I am not telling you it does or doesn't. But through exploring, investigating, we'll find out whether knowledge, which is always the past, can bring about order? You understand my question? Can tradition bring order? The word 'tradition' means to hand over, hand across and also, if you go into that word deeply you will find the meaning, it also means being treacherous. Please listen carefully. The word 'tradition' not only implies the accepted meaning: to hand over from father to son, the whole movement of tradition, but also it implies to be a traitor, traitor to the present. You understand? No, you don't.

So let us enquire into the word 'knowledge', whether knowledge brings order, or when you are functioning within the field of the known you are repetitive. And you may think repetitive existence is complete order. Please enquire into it, because we are all very traditionalist. You may think you are very modern, but your whole background, the unconscious, the deep layers of your mind, is very traditional. Not merely following some silly guru, but also going to the temples, but also the desire to conform to a pattern, whether you have created that pattern or it is imposed upon by society, culture and so on. So we are asking: what is order? If it is not related to knowledge, knowledge being the known, and functioning within the area of the known is repetitive, and that brings a great comfort, because you are always safe - at least you think you are

safe.

So, what then is order? You understand my question? Because we are enquiring very carefully to find out what is correct action in life, what is right action with regard to your relationship to your wife, to your girl friend, to your neighbour, as a citizen of the world, what is right action? Because unless you find out for yourself, you will always be in a turmoil, always be either regretting or frightened and therefore never acting wholly, completely. I wonder if I am making this clear? So, may we go on? I hope you are also exploring.

What is order? Is your life in order? A sequential order not occasional order, like in mathematics: sequence. If you go into the whole problem, which we won't now - mathematics, when it is a sequential movement is pure order, ultimate. So, is one's life orderly, sequential, following one thing after the other, logically, sanely, reasonably? Please enquire. And if it is not in order, then one has to enquire, why there is so much confusion in the world and in us. Right? I hope you are following. Right, sir? Why is there so much confusion? Why is there so much uncertainty, such fear of insecurity, such sense of choosing and the choice may lead to further confusion? Because, presently if we have time, we want to go into the question of fear, so we are leading up to this tremendous problem of every human being which is fear, but to understand it deeply and to be free of it, one must find out not only the sequential clarity of thought but also find out for oneself whether choice ever brings clarity. I wonder if you understand all this. May we go on? Why do you choose? You may choose between black cloth or a white cloth or between a certain quality of

material, between two cars, between this or that. There it is in order, isn't it? You must. But why do you choose in any other psychological direction? You understand my question? Why do you choose at all? Between various gurus - if you do choose but generally what one does is you like what he says, you like his blah, blah, blah, and then go after it - but when you are enquiring into confusion which means disorder, how does disorder come about in every human being? Disorder implies contradiction. Right?

Disorder implies, saying one thing and doing another in which there is no integrity, no honesty. Disorder implies the incapacity to see clearly, and when you see clearly there is no choice. So choice exists when there is confusion. I wonder if you accept all this. It is only a man that is confused who says: I am going to choose. When the thing is very clear, there is no choice, you just do according to that clarity. But if you notice, our existence is based on choice and the pursuit of will. Will is the very essence of choice. I wonder if you follow all this?

So what does clarity mean? You understand sir? When you look at a map, an ordinary map, if you want to go into a particular place from where you are, you look at it in one way. You measure up the distance, you know exactly where the road is, and you take that road. So there is no confusion there because in front of you is the map. Because you have a direction. Right? Because you have a direction where you want to go, there is no choice. You just take the best road and go. So where there is direction, you think there is order. I wonder if you get this? And have you a direction? You understand? Direction, not getting a job, becoming a professor or something or other, but psychologically, inwardly a direction. And

the direction is brought about through motive. Right? So as long as you have a motive, the direction is distorted. And so that is one of the fundamental reasons of confusion. Right? So can you observe the map without direction, which is not the map of road and villages and towns, but the map of your whole existence without direction. I wonder if you meet this point - because the moment you have direction, you are discarding the observation of the whole. Look, sir, can you look at life as a whole, not as a businessman, as a scientist, as a specialist, or a religious person or an atheist, or communist, but life, this immense thing, with all the complications of anxiety, fear, greed, envy, sexual demands, you know, take the whole picture? You can only do that, to see the whole, when you have no direction. And therefore, the perception of the whole is order. I wonder if you see this. Are we communicating with each other, are we travelling together, or are you far ahead or I am far ahead and you are behind, are we moving together?

That means, order implies a way of living in which direction as a motive comes to an end. Therefore, you are looking, observing the whole of existence, not as a doctor, as a philosopher, as a religious man, who is a cuckoo or whatever it is. You are looking at the whole of life. So, order means the understanding, the actual fact of a life, daily life, in which there is no contradiction, there is no following a particular pattern. There is no action of a direction. Therefore, there is no choice. I wonder if you get it. It does not matter. If you don't get it, it is your misfortune. Let me go on.

So once you have established order, not following a pattern which is not order, not following a blueprint, not following what a

guru says, those are all total disorder - but order means the observation of the whole of your life, the totality of your life. It is like observing something like the tree wholly, not get delighted at one particular branch or one particular leaf or one particular fruit, but the whole of the tree. That means your mind must have the capacity to look without direction, without prejudice, without personal problems, to look. All right.

So when one asks this question: what place has knowledge with regard to correct action, knowledge has its right place. Learning to drive a car, learning a language, learning a technique, learning a skill, all that you must have knowledge. Otherwise you are not a capable person. But knowledge has no place when there is correct action. This is difficult to understand, so let me go into it a little bit. Because action is not having acted or will act. Action means in the present. Action is the movement in the present. But if you are acting according to a pattern which is the past, then you are not acting at all. I wonder if you see this. Or following a particular ideal which is in the future and then acting according to that ideal in the present, it is not correct order, correct action. Right? I wonder if you see this. But we are caught between the past and the future. Right? So we live in the past. That is our life. And the past is guiding, shaping the challenge of the present and shaping the future. That is our daily life. So we are saying - please listen, you may not agree or disagree, these are facts - that knowledge has no place where right action is to take place. Knowledge then merely becomes mechanical. Action is not mechanical.

So to find out the art of living in which knowledge has its right place and seeing what the implications of actions are, not

according to some book or some personal experience but action which is not mechanical, which is not repetitive, which is not pleasurable or rewarding or painful, but correct, right, that can only take place when you have placed knowledge in its right place. Shall we go, move on? You are only too willing to move on.

We want to go into the question, because if there is fear there is no right action. You may talk about right action, you may write books about right action, but as long as there is this immense fear within one, there is no right action. So we are going to enquire together - please together - what is the nature and structure of fear. You understand? Because every human being in the world is frightened about something - he may be frightened about his wife, may be frightened of not living rightly, he may be frightened of the future, he may be frightened of losing the job or all the neurotic fears and so on and so on and so on. Right? So we are going to go together, investigate whether it is possible to know what one's fears are, and when you leave this evening, when you walk out of here, to be completely free of fear. Because otherwise it is not worth talking about it. Whether it is at all possible to be both physiologically as well as psychologically, to be completely free of fear. You understand? Can we go together in it?

First of all, is one aware of fear, your particular fear, or you slur over, not wanting to enquire because you don't know how to deal with fear? So we are going to deal with fear, not run away from it, not escape from it, not rationalize it, not say 'It's all right, let's have a little fear because that keeps us in order'. We are talking about complete, total freedom of fear, because otherwise there is no order in life. Otherwise you would accept the authority of the guru, of the



politician, of your priest or of the psychologist or the analyst. So it is a very fundamental question which each one has to face and find out and totally eradicate it. We are going to do that now.

So please listen, not only listen but also move together. Have you ever faced fear? Please listen to my question. Be acquainted, live, know the actual fact of fear? Or you think about something - the future, you may lose your job, you may lose this and that, and the other thing, and therefore you are artificially creating fear. You understand the difference? I wonder if you do. I am asking, if you will kindly listen, whether you ever know what fear is? Or you only know fear because you think about the past or the future? You understand my point, question? So please listen. Is fear caused by thought, thinking about the past or thinking about the future, the past pain that you had whether at the dentist or other pains physically that you have had and thinking about it, hoping that it will not recur and get frightened about it? Which is the movement from the known, the known pain of last week, and projecting a non-state of pain in the future and getting frightened about it. Have you understood what I am saying?

So what is it we are doing? Please be clear on this point because it is most extraordinary if you go into it. Am I frightened of what I did yesterday? Am I frightened of losing a job, though I am not losing the job, I may lose the job, or I am frightened because my wife is more dominant than me and I live under her domination and I am a little frightened, or I am frightened of death, which is the future? So which is it I am doing: actually know what fear is, the fact of fear - do you understand? - not the fear caused by thought. Please, this is your life, it is important for you to understand this.

Has fear a cause, the cause being that you had pain last week and you are frightened that it may happen again. Right? Or is there a fear by itself without the movement of thought bringing about fear? No, no, don't say yes, sir, you haven't gone into the whole problem of fear. First of all, sirs, aren't you frightened? Frightened about something, aren't you? Darkness, wife, the boss, the authorities, and also frightened of not fulfilling, frightened of not having loved, frightened of being lonely, frightened of being never on top of anything, aren't you frightened of something? Now when you look at your fear, is thought creating that fear? Do you understand my question? So is thought the root of fear? Do you understand? That is, I am living now. At least I think I am living - a shoddy, stupid, miserable life - that I call living. And I am frightened of the unknown. I don't know what is in the future, I only know what is now in my knowledge. So I am frightened of the unknown, so I cling to the known. Right? I don't let go the known and say, let's find out. But I am so frightened that I cling to the known. Which means what? That thought says: I am accustomed to live with the past, the known, and I am frightened to move out of that. Right? So the origin of fear, is it thought? Not how to control thought, that is not the point, not how to change thought, how to stop thought. But is the beginning of fear, the beginning of thought? Do you understand my question? So how is one, knowing that thought is the movement of time, past, present, the movement of time, and this movement of time coming to an end, is fear. I am putting it a little more complicatedly which is, look: don't you think all these things out? From yesterday I move, live through the present. The yesterday's memories are modified and go on. So the past through

the present being modified goes on. So the past is going on all the time, modified somewhat polished, somewhat less and more, but the past is the river that is moving all the time. That is, knowledge is moving through the present, modified, changing, but knowledge is still going on. So thought which is the response of memory, which is the collection of various experiences, knowledge, and so on, from that is the storehouse which is the cultivation of memory, and the response of that memory is thought. This is a fact. You don't have to invent, discuss. Look at it.

So I am asking myself and you, we are exploring: is the origin of fear thought? If it is, then what relationship has thought to action? Do you follow what I am saying? I wonder if you do.

I have got a quarter of an hour more. The speaker's intention, his communication with you, is that when you leave this place that you are totally free of fear, both physically as well as psychologically, because a man who lives under fear, lives in darkness. It is a tremendous burden, and in darkness trying to find something that is dark. He will never find anything. So that is what I want to discuss with you, to make you to see the reality that there can be freedom from fear.

So we are saying: is there a fear independent of thought? Do you understand? Or, all fear is related to thought? Right, sir? Now which is it? Obviously thought which is the response to memory and so on, thought, thinking about what happened yesterday, that pain, not wanting that pain, and that pain may come back and be afraid of it - that is, physically. The same thing psychologically. I am attached to you and that attachment I consider as love, which is nonsense, it is not love; where there is attachment, there is no love.

Obviously. We won't go into that for the moment. So I am attached and I am afraid if I let go my attachment I am facing a greater fear of loneliness. Right? Are you following all this? So thought is attached to a belief, to a person, to an idea, to a conclusion, to an opinion and is afraid to let go, because if you let go, where am I?

So fear is related to thought. I am afraid of dying, coming to an end. I may believe in all kinds of surviving - reincarnation, future life, resurrection and all that, but the fact is that I am coming to an end, and I don't know what will happen at that moment when I have to let go everything, so thought says: push it off further away, as far away as possible and do not even think about it. But there is always this worm going on, afraid of the future, afraid of letting go, afraid of not knowing, afraid of loneliness, and so on. So thought is the origin of fear. Right?

So the question then is: why does thought - please listen - why does thought have such extraordinary importance in the field of the psyche? You understand my question? You understand my question? Why does thought, thinking, take such supreme command in the field which is me? You understand? Is the 'me' the result of thought? Are you understanding what I am asking? Is your self, including the higher self, the supreme self, the atman, the super-consciousness, the ultra-consciousness, consciousness beyond, beyond, beyond, beyond, all that is still within the field of thought. Right? So what relationship has thought, if it is the origin of fear, what relationship has thought with regard to correct action, right action? You are following all this?

So, we will have to go into the question: what is the origin, the beginning, why has thought become so tremendously important? If

thought creates fear, if thought has made the past so tremendously important, which is knowledge, and if thought, in spite of knowledge, in spite of everything, breeds fear, is it possible to give thought its right place and therefore, thought does not enter into any other field? You understand? Are we communicating?

So what is thinking? When I ask you that question, are you thinking? Or, please listen, are you listening? Which is it that you are doing? I am asking you. Giving thought its right place gives you freedom from fear. Are you actually listening to that statement? Or are you saying, how am I to put thought in its right place, please tell me what to do? So you are not actually listening! You have gone off, right?

So, I am asking you: please listen, find out, learn the art which is to put everything in life in its right place - sex, emotion, everything in its right place. So, we are asking: can thought realize itself and its activities and so bring about in itself its right place? You understand my question? Thought is now moving in all directions. And one of the directions is fear. So to understand fear, you must understand the place of thought - not stop thought. You can't do it. You may try to do it, but you can't stop thought. But if you can put it in its right place - not you - when thought puts itself in its right place, then it has understood, it knows its limitation, it knows its capacity to reason, logic, and so on, but in its right place, right? So we are asking: can you - can thought see itself, its own limitation, its own capacity and say, this reason, capacity has its place and it has no place anywhere else? Because love is not thought. Is it? You say, no. I think your heads must be very loose! Is love the product of thought, remembrance? Please listen

carefully. Remembrance, of your sexual pleasures, other pleasures? Is that love? We will go into what the nature and the beauty of that thing is later. First, we are saying: unless you learn, learn not memorize, not repeat after what the speaker has said but actually find out for yourself whether thought has its own, realizes its own place, and when it realizes it, it won't move in any other direction, and therefore no fear. You understand this? This requires, please, application - test, not agreement or verbally, but daily test that you know that - not you - thought has created the you. Right? Thought has made you different from itself, and that is our problem, one of our problems. Thought, the origin of thought is the beginning of remembrance. Whether it is the most savage man, the most primitive animal, the anthropoid apes, remembrance is the beginning of thinking. Like that tape is registering now, the brain registers; registering means remembering. And the origin of thinking is remembering. That is a simple, ordinary fact. So can thought - please listen - can thought, your thinking, can your thought awaken to itself, know itself as the cause of fear and therefore realizing that, says: I know my right place. You understand? You know this requires great, not concentration, great awareness, implications of the whole movement of fear, the understanding of the movement of thought.

You see, if you do this, if you go into it, if your thought goes into it, this is part of real meditation, because you cannot meditate if your life is not in order. Right? If your daily life is not perfect order then meditation is something cheap, an escape, a meaningless illusory pursuit. That is why we are saying if there is to be real meditation, the full meaning of that word, the depth of that state,

the beauty and the clarity and the compassion, you must then begin by laying the foundation of order in your daily life. But you find that extremely difficult. Therefore, you go off and sit under a tree or hold your nose and do all kinds of stuff thinking you are meditating.

So there is a tremendous possibility of being completely free of fear if you have listened very carefully to what the speaker has to say, because we are journeying together, we are walking together, we are sharing together in our walk, in our exploration. Therefore, there is no learning from somebody. You are learning as you walk, as you explore. So there is no authority. So have you, after an hour and a quarter, realized - has thought realized its place? Meditate upon it. Think about it. Go into it. Give half an hour of your life to find out - not half an hour, give your life to find out. Because, then you will see for yourself as a human being who represents mankind, whose consciousness is the consciousness of humanity, when there is no fear in that consciousness you, who have understood and gone beyond it, change the consciousness of humanity. This is a fact. So if I may ask, have you learnt the art - has thought learnt the art of putting itself in its right place? Then, once it has done that, the doors of heaven are open - heaven, you know. All right.

# MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 1ST JANUARY 1978

We have been talking about the art of listening, and the art of observation, and I'd like a little bit to talk about the art of learning. We said, the art of listening is not to translate what you hear into your own particular jargon, into your own particular vernacular, or Sanskrit English, or your own particular language, but to listen actually to what is being said without making an idea of it, which I am afraid most of us do. We never listen to the thing itself, but make something out of it, either to suit ourselves or make it fit into our own particular way of thinking. That obviously prevents actual listening.

And also we were talking about the art of observation. To observe without distortion, without our particular prejudices and all the idiosyncrasies and tendencies to interfere with what we observe. We talked about that at some length also. Because when you observe something, specially yourself, without any distortion, without liking or disliking, without the idea of punishment and reward, then that which you observe freely, yourself, undergoes a radical transformation. I do not know if you have experimented with it, if you have tested it, or you are merely listening to a talk just as you would listen to other talks. Probably you are all professional listeners! So it becomes rather difficult when we are talking about serious matters that you are not testing it in your own daily life, that you are not going into it fully and deeply to find out if what the speaker is saying is true or false.

And the art of learning. I think this is rather important, perhaps



for some of you it is rather new. For most of us learning implies, doesn't it, memorizing, storing away what you have heard, or what you have learnt, store away in the brain and trot it out when it is necessary. That's what we call learning from school days, through university, if you are lucky enough to go through university and so on. That is, gathered information, store it up as knowledge and act, either skilfully or not skilfully according to that knowledge. This is what we call learning. Isn't that so? I am not saying it is something extraordinary. But all of us function in our daily life from stored up memories, as knowledge, either very, very skilfully, or not at all. I think there is another way of learning, which is not only to store up knowledge, because we must have knowledge to function in daily life, technological, engineering, mathematical, professorial, scientific, doctor and so on, must have that kind of knowledge. But there is, I think, a way of learning which is not repetitive, which is not routine, which is not institutionalized way of thinking, tradition, but entirely different. This, I would like to begin if I may to talk about it, and perhaps we can both communicate with each other what the speaker means by learning.

That is, to learn apart from acquiring knowledge and storing it up and acting according to that, but learning without storing up knowledge. Learning to have an insight into the problem of existence, or problem of poverty, problem of religion and organization, to have an insight into it which is not intellectual, not analytical, but to have clear sight in that and act instantly according to that. Am I making any sense? Please help me to communicate to you what I am thinking about or feeling. Don't just go off to sleep. Just help me to convey this to each other. I think this is very

important because to us skill, a capacity, has become extraordinarily important because it encourages the self, the 'me'. Right? The greater the skill the greater power, greater position, greater influence and all the rest of it, which is essentially the expression of the 'me', the self, ultimately selfishness. It encourages deep rooted selfishness. And if one is in search of what is truth, the truth, then one must be free of those activities that are merely memorial.

To have an insight into, say, tradition. To have an insight into it, not learn all about tradition, all the arguments against or for tradition, but have a deep insight into the whole nature and the structure of tradition, how it acts, what are its dangers and so on, to have immediate insight into that, and acting from that insight. So that you are acting without calculation, without personal demands, without personal prejudices and so on. You have got an insight into something that is true and are acting from that, then it is ultimate skill, which does not build up the self. Am I conveying something? Are we meeting each other on this?

So there is a way of learning which is not only the storing of memory but also freedom from the repetitive activity which memory cultivates. So when the speaker makes a statement, as I am going to make it now, that the ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom - the ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom - how do you receive it. What is your immediate reaction to it, not calculated reaction, not argumentative reaction, you hear a statement of that kind, how do you respond to it? Do you say, I have heard this before, who said it, I don't quite remember, is it so, it sounds rather good, but has it any validity? Are you comparing

what is said, that statement, with somebody else's, or you have immediate insight into it and see the extraordinary truth of it and therefore the perception of that is a total action, not a fragmentary action. Am I conveying this?

So we are saying, that there is a way of learning which is having insight. When one has an insight it is not remembered. Each new insight is something fresh. Therefore action then is constantly not repetitive but constantly creative. I wonder if you get all this.

We will go into it as we go along, because we are going to talk about, as we talked about yesterday, fear, how every human being has this burden of fear. And we went into it. We said that fear is the movement of time. Just listen to it. The speaker says, fear, you know fear, don't you, fear is the movement of time. Now how do you receive it, share it, what is your response to it? Is it a response of insight and therefore total comprehension of it, or is it a fragmentary approach? You understand? Am I making myself clear, somewhat? I said fear is the movement of time. Thought is movement. Right? So thought is the movement of time. Thought is the response of memory, knowledge, which is the past. So thought springs from the past, modifies itself in the present and goes on, which is a movement from the past through the present to the future, it's a movement. All movement implies time. To go from here to Bangalore, your next village, or whatever it is, requires time. So thought is the movement of time. Right? At least verbally be clear on this - intellectually if you would prefer. I personally don't like that word 'intellectual' because it is rather a shoddy word. The intellectuals have done great harm, I'm afraid, in the world. Because they first encourage you to be communists, say a

marvellous thing will happen, and then later on they get disillusioned with it, they withdraw and you are stuck. This is happening all over the world all the time. So I am rather wary of the intellectuals.

So when one says, as the speaker says, fear is the movement of time, do you capture the significance of it and see the depth of it instantly? Or your mind is arguing with it, or drawing a conclusion from it? You see the difference? So we ought to go into the question a little bit of what is time. There is obviously the time by the watch, chronological time, there is time by the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, time as tomorrow when you are going off to do something; time as yesterday; time as future. Right? That's simple. Now we are questioning - please listen - if there is psychological time at all. Do you understand my question? Psychologically we think we have time. When you say, I will be good, I will achieve a state of mind when I will have peace, I will become the prime minister, I will become the executive, the top dog. So that is a movement of time. Right? Physically there is the movement of time, and we are questioning whether there is psychological time at all. Do you understand my question? Am I making my question clear at least? Do say yes, or no. Question, not the answer, not the explanation, which I am going to go into, but the question itself.

Now it matters very much how you approach a question. Perhaps in the very question is the answer. So it matter very much how you come to question and how you approach the answer. Right? Now how are you approaching this question? That is, is there psychological time at all? That is, I will become something.

Right? That is time. I am violent but I will not be violent. That is in the future. So that means time. I am unhappy but I will become happy, granted certain things and so on and so on. So all that implies time, psychologically. That is, I have had an experience which was extraordinary, lovely, beautiful, etc., and it has gone and I hope to have it again, and I go after gurus and all the lot. So all that implies psychologically time. Right? The moment you use the words 'I will', that implies time. Psychological time. So I am questioning, the speaker is questioning whether such time actually exists at all. Do you understand my question? How do you approach that question?

Please, sir, just listen, don't question, we are going to have a discussion the day after tomorrow, under the trees in the morning so you can bombard me with questions then. But I am asking you how do you approach this question, please listen to it, learn from it. The question is - first of all why do you put such a question. I am putting it, probably you have never put it, I am putting it, and you will ask me, why do you put such a question. I will tell you why I put it. I question the whole evolutionary psychological process altogether. Do you understand? That is, biologically we can't grow a fourth arm, or a second head, man's biological evolution has come to the highest possible, physically. That has taken a million years. And we may be under that misapprehension that psychologically it is the same. Inwardly we will make progress, eventually reaching enlightenment, god, whatever you like to call it. Now the speaker says, such time doesn't exist at all. You understand? So I put this question to you and how do you approach it. Obviously if you are articulate, and I hope you are, you will say,

I doubt it. Because if you say there is no time at all, psychologically, then I have no hope. You understand the question. That is why I want you to find out how you approach it. The speaker is denying all hope, therefore you must receive it with a shock, it must be a shock to you if you really understood it. So are you approaching the question with a shocked mind or are you saying, now let me listen? You understand? Let me find out, let me learn, not memorize, let me have an insight into this enormous truth. It may be an enormous truth or an enormous lie. You understand?

So it matters immensely how you approach the question, any question. Because in the very question itself and the approach is the answer. I am going to go into it. Are you working with me? We are working together? Or are you merely casually listening? You understand? Are you ploughing all the time and never sowing? Or, you are ploughing and sowing together? You understand? Which is it you are doing? Sowing means action in daily life. But if you all the time plough, plough, plough, which you probably do, intellectually, argumentatively, traditionally, then you never sow. So what is it that you are doing? Sorry to put so many questions to you.

So we are asking is there psychological time at all? Do you understand my meaning now? Or is there only fact, the actual and therefore no future to the actual. I wonder if you see that. Look, sir, we are educated from childhood, religiously as well as sociologically and in every way to live in a world of duality. Right? Not only duality of man, woman, darkness and light, but psychologically, inwardly to live in a world of opposites. Right?

And these opposites are endless corridors. Right? Now the speaker is questioning whether there is an opposite at all - though all your sacred books say there is an opposite, you have to find it - forgive me, I don't know all the names of it. So you have been educated, and the speaker says there is no opposite, only 'what is'. Right? Just go into it, play with it.

The opposite of violence is non-violence. Right? But non-violence is not factual, is not actual, but violence is actual. Right? Oh, my lord! Are we meeting each other somewhere? So the opposite is the invention of thought because it doesn't know how to deal with 'what is'. I wonder if you understand this. Are we meeting each other somewhere. Please, I must go on because I have a lot to talk about.

Is there an opposite to hate? Or only the fact of hate, the actuality of that feeling, and not the opposite of it. For most people the opposite exists. And I am saying, why does it exist. Why is there the opposite of hate? Call it love, call it goodness, whatever - why? Is it because we don't know how to deal with the fact of hate, 'what is', and so we think by having an opposite to it it will help us to get rid of hate. Having an ideal, which is non-factual, non-actual, we hope that will help us to get rid of that which is. Right? I wonder if you understand, it's simple enough. So we have invented the opposite, but the fact is 'what is'. When you are concerned only with 'what is' there is no opposite, there is no conflict with the opposite. Right?

So we are enquiring into whether there is time psychologically at all. Which means, is there an opposite of 'what is', now? You understand? I am in despair because I have lost my son, I have lost

my job, I have lost my grandmother, whatever it is - I'm in despair. And I don't know how to solve this thing. Right? I am in despair, I cry, I am miserable, unhappy, and you come along and tell me, 'Look, old boy, you have to go through it, and come out of it and you will be happy, it is an experience, it is a lesson, it is your responsibility' or whatever, you give me all the explanations. Which is what? You are giving me hope. So out of my desperation you help me to escape from it and give me a hope. Now giving me hope is psychologically time. Right? So the speaker says such time doesn't exist at all, you have to deal with the fact of desperation. Right? Not try to achieve a state in which there is no desperation. So psychologically there is no evolution, there is no 'I' becoming better and better and better. Which is sheer nonsense, anyhow.

So time exists only in relation to knowledge and its action where it is absolutely necessary, otherwise there is no other time. Do you understand what it means? Either you live totally complete now and never again, which means a terrible statement to accept. I wonder if you see that. Because it takes away from you every sense of hope, which means you have to face actually 'what is', and not try to cultivate its opposite. Do you understand now? So you are now confronted with actually what is going on. And, as I said, if you can observe it without any distortion, if I can observe my despair, without any distortion, that means without any hope, without wanting to transform it, without wanting to run away from it, suppress it, but actually observe as though through a microscope without any conclusion, direction, just to observe, and that very observation transforms my desperation. I wonder if you get it. Will you test it out? Will you? And not go off into the opposite, because



your whole habit, tradition is to go off to the opposite. So when you realize that psychological time doesn't come in at all.

So we said, fear is the movement of time. And time has a stop. This is, again how do you receive such a statement. You understand? Is this all too much for an evening? I must go on because I want to tell you so many things, learn from each other.

And now we must go into the question of the other side of the coin of fear which is pleasure. Right? Do you want to go into it? What is pleasure, and why does man throughout the centuries, millennia, pursue this thing at all costs, pleasure, why? Why do you, as a human being, pursue pleasure and avoid fear, and all the rest of it? Not only sexual pleasure, but pleasure of a position, status, pleasure of having a very good body, pleasure of achievement, pleasure of success, pleasure of possessing money and so on and so on. You are following all this? Why do you pursue pleasure? And it has become tremendously important in life, why? Go on, sir, answer these questions. When you go to a guru and obey all the silly things he trots out, and it gives you great pleasure to follow him - why? And does it give you pleasure now, sitting here, listening to the speaker? I doubt it!

So I am asking, it is the other side of the coin, the whole pursuit of pleasure, what is pleasure. When at the moment of pleasure, the moment, second, there is no idea, or thought of pursuing pleasure. Right? It is only after the event, whether that event be sexual, event be seeing the beauty of a sunset, seeing the sheet of water with the light on it, reading a phrase and seeing the beauty of the phrase and the pleasure of that phrase, a dozen ways we seek pleasure. What is pleasure? And why has man, you, who are the representative of all

humanity, why have you made pleasure the greatest thing in life? Right? Why has sex - I hope you don't mind talking about it a little bit - why has sex become so extraordinarily important. The pleasure of it, the remembrance of it, the cultivation of it, the attraction towards it. Why has love been attached to that act, sex. So I am asking you, is love pleasure? Is love desire? Which is a form of pleasure. I desire to have a car, and that gives me great pleasure in possessing the car. So desire, which is so condemned by all religious people, and because of this condemnation it is said for any man who would be a religious person they must be free of desire - which is absurd.

So we are going to question everything and find out a way of living where there is only immediate action from insight. Not from calculation - we have been through that. So what is pleasure? Why has man throughout the ages given that as the greatest thing? Look into yourselves, sir, don't just listen to me, find out, learn from it. Is it because senses, sensory perception, sensory activity is much more important than clarity? You understand my question? Must I explain every question. Sir, to us senses, taste, smell and all the rest of it, give us such tremendous satisfaction. Right? So is pleasure a form of deep satisfaction and therefore the cultivate of desire and pleasure, which has nothing whatsoever to do with love. You follow what I am asking? So I am asking you, if you are thinking at all, following what the speaker is saying, is love desire, is love pleasure? If it is not, then either love has tremendous significance, or pleasure dominates that. You are following all this? Which in your heart, if you are honest, look at yourself, which is the most important thing to you? Not love, because you don't know anything

about it. I question whether in India they know anything about love. They know a great deal about pleasure, a great deal of devotion, reverence, which is a form of self-worship. Right? And since you have give pleasure such tremendous importance, why has the mind, the brain given such significance to pleasure? Come on, sirs. You understand? The pleasure of having had an extraordinary experience last week, and I have lost it and I must have it. Pleasure of position, pleasure of - you understand, pleasure.

So is pleasure the movement of thought? Right? As we said, fear is the movement of thought and time. Right? So we are asking, is pleasure also the movement of time? Come on! I see a beautiful thing, a beautiful house, a beautiful woman or a man. The perception of beauty is natural, otherwise you would be dead, paralysed. To see something beautiful and to see it completely, that's natural. But the perception is interrupted by thought: I would like to have that house, it's so beautiful, I wish I could live there. Right? So see the beauty of the house and not let thought come into it at all. You understand what I am saying? Do you understand this? Because the moment desire comes into existence pleasure begins. But if you see the beauty of something and remain with it, and not move with the flow of desire. Sir, can you look at a car, a really good car - they don't exist in India, it's a monopoly here in this country, you play havoc with it - a really good car, beautiful lines, look at it. Because it's natural to look at that car, the line, all the rest of it. To look at it and not let thought say, how beautiful, I wish I could drive it, I wish I could be in it, own it, and drive it. You understand? Then begins the pleasure. You understand what I am saying?

Let me put it the other way: I see a beautiful sunset, lovely, with all the colours of the evening, the extraordinary sense of light and gaiety and beauty and strength. To look at it, enjoy it, look at it, and end it. Not say, I must remember it, and I wish I could have more of it, I'll come back tomorrow and look at it. Which is the perception translated into action of tomorrow, which is the cultivation of pleasure. I wonder if you see it.

So to look at something completely, end it. And not carry it over. You understand? The 'carrying it over' is the pleasure. Right? This requires a great sense of attention, and that attention itself brings its own discipline - not the discipline imposed. Right? So we are saying, fear is the movement of time. Pleasure is a movement of an event which is over and demanding that event, which is always pleasurable, to continue. Whereas if you can look, if that pleasure can end, there is no continuity, therefore there is no pursuit of pleasure. You understand this?

So the next thing is - we have got twenty minutes, so we can go into it. I want to find out what love is. Don't you? Don't you want to find out what the true factor, the true nature of love is, don't you? Do you? I will go into it. First of all, when there is fear, is there love? When there is pleasure and the pursuit of pleasure, is there love? When there is attachment, I am attached to my wife, I am attached to my husband, attached, is that love? Go on, sir, find out. You are attached to your wife, why? What is attachment? The pleasure she gives you, sexually or otherwise, and the image you have about her, gratifying or not, and all the rest of it, and you are attached. And because you are attached, and because of the pleasure of that attachment, and possession, there begins the act of

cruelty. The cruelty of jealousy. Right? The cruelty of anxiety, fear, hatred. Right? You know all this, don't you. So I am asking, is attachment love? If you are not attached, would that be love? Then you might chase another woman, or another man. And when there is jealousy, is that love? And to come upon that extraordinary state, and the nature of it, the beauty of it, obviously fear, the movement of pleasure, which is remembrance, attachment, jealousy, all that must completely end. Will you do that? Or, you say, yes, quite right, it's a marvellous idea, I agree with you - and so you live in a world of words. And apparently because you live in a world of words you are starved, decayed because you have no love. Right? Would that be an accurate statement? Right?

Look at yourselves, sir, and find out whether you love any human being, whether you love any stray dog, whether you love the skies, the beauty of a tree and a flower, or you are so tremendously caught up in your own cocoon that you have no time or regard for anything else. Well, sirs, find out. Because if you have no love you are dead people. You may be very clever, you may be great pundits, scholars, specialists, but if that thing is not you have no right to exist as a human being. I know you will smile at this, you will see the reason of it, the logic of it, the sanity of it, but you will go on your old way. Right? And that's the tragedy of this country. They are very good analyzers, they are very good at arguments, theories, but when it comes down to action they are dead. Right, sirs?

So what will you do? Without love - if you have love then you can do what you will. Because you have no love, with all the gods, all the gurus, all the nonsense that is going on in this country. Do

you understand all this, sirs?

So as love is not to be cultivated, not something that you plant and water it and let it grow, with care. As it is not something to be argued, discussed about, which means is it possible for the mind, for the brain to be free of the word. You understand? The word, not love, I don't mean that, the word. Is it possible for the brain not to function always with words? Because we are a slave to words - the Hindus, the Muslims, the Christians, the communists - words. So can you observe the slavery of the mind to words? And the word is not the thing. Right? The word 'love' is not love. So the word is not the thing. So the description is not the described. But to you the description is satisfactory. That's good enough. Right? So the symbol, the shadow, is more important than the fact.

So how will you, as a human being - please listen, sirs - how will you, as human beings, have this thing, this perfume; how will you come by it? You have suffered enough. Right? Humanity has gone through hell, tremendous wars, tremendous agony. Apparently that has not brought this thing. All your reasons, your theology, your gods, your gurus, your scriptures, have not brought this thing to you. You understand, sir? Do listen to me for god's sake, listen to me. Your organizations, institutions, none of them have brought this to you. So how will this happen, this miracle? Nobody can give it to you. Right, sir? You can't buy it. The gods that you have won't give it to you. The gods that you have are created by your mind, by your thought, by your hand. So thought won't give it to you, all your reason won't give it to you, all your selfish activities won't give it to you - your position, your authority, your status, nothing will give it to you. But you must have it. So

what will you do? Sir, please, what will you do? I will tell you.

Sir, are you hungry for this? Do you abandon yourself to have this? You understand what I mean - abandon? Will you give up one thing - attachment - give it up and face what happens if you give it up. You understand? Immediately fear will arise, won't it. Right? Right, sir? Fear will arise when you let go. Then face it. Don't escape from it, deal with it, understand it, go into it. In the same way, if you really deeply are concerned with the nature of love and beauty, then it will come. But you must do something for it.

You see, unfortunately, we are educated in terms of reward and punishment. Right? That's our outlook on life. A merchant's outlook, a commercial outlook. I'll give you something, give me something in return. That's why you go to the temples. Now as you cannot buy love, reward and punishment, can you naturally, easily, happily, let go your particular form of pleasure, knowing pleasure is not love. You understand, sir? Will you do it?

Sir, look, if you have no love there is no possibility of meditation. Meditation means first putting everything in its right place, so the mind, the brain is free. You understand? Putting everything in its right place: your knowledge, your sex, your relationship and so on, in its proper order, in its proper sequence. Like an engineer, everything must be in sequence otherwise he cannot build a bridge. So meditation implies that you have established order in your life. Otherwise when you meditate you go off into an illusion, and it may be a very exciting illusion, and one of the things in meditation that comes is the desire for power. You understand? Desire for various forms of occult processes. You know there is a whole group of people practising levitation. Right?

It's much simpler to take a lift!

So unless you have laid the foundation in your daily life, the foundation is order, and out of this order, please, comes love. Not out of your chaos, confusion, not giving such tremendous importance to sex, to pleasure. Sex has its place, pleasure has its place, but when that becomes supreme you have chased away love. Right, sirs?

So we said fear is the movement of time, pleasure is the movement of a remembrance of an incident that has given you delight - which is also the movement of time. And where time exists there is no love. Time being, I will become something, I will become non-violent, I will become good. So the speaker says there is no such time, there is only 'what is'. Understand, observe 'what is', and 'what is' then undergoes tremendous change, but you must observe it without any distortion, which means you observe it with care, with love. You understand? So can you observe your violence with affection? Can you? Because then you don't condemn if you observe something with affection. You don't deny it, you don't suppress it.

So from the beginning of this talk we said the art of listening, the art of observing, seeing, the art of learning. Art means to put everything in life, in our daily life, in its right place. Then when you have put everything in its right place order comes. Order in your daily life. Then when there is order the mind then is free. Right? And only when the mind - the word 'mind' we are saying is both the activity of the brain, the content of our consciousness, which is consciousness, and all that is the mind - when you have put everything in order the mind is free. And it's only a mind that is



free knows, has that extraordinary quality of love. So we will talk about what is implied in this question of what is sorrow, whether there is an ending to sorrow and what it means to die. All this is part of meditation.

## **MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD JANUARY 1978**

Could we this morning take one problem, or one issue, and work it out in great detail completely and fully; not just hear what the speaker has to say, but together take one issue, whatever it is, in our daily life and go into it step by step deeply and sanely. Could we do that this morning? You understand my question? What would you like to take as an intimate problem of one's life that you would like to talk over with each other and find a complete and total answer for it? So would you kindly say what kind of thing you would like to go into freely. What would you like to talk over together?

Q: Sir, there is an intellectual understanding of all that you are talking about but there is no fundamental understanding therefore it doesn't produce a transformation of my life. Could you please go into that question.

K: The questioner says, intellectually - I think he means really verbally - we understand more or less what you are saying, logically, reasonably, and fairly sanely, what you are saying. But after hearing you somehow we don't seem to be able to go very deeply into ourselves and transform ourselves completely. That's the question. Would you like to go into that question?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Oh, for goodness sake, they are just words to you. Haven't you got a problem? Haven't you got a problem, sir, daily life problem?

Q: All of us are oppressed.

K: We are oppressed, is that it?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: By society, by our friends, by your wife, by your husband, by your culture, you feel totally oppressed. Is that a problem? Or something to talk about? Please, as this is the last discussion, or dialogue, please don't waste your time and my time in talking about something that doesn't affect your life at all.

Q: Can you teach us about the wholeness you speak of in daily life?

K: Yes, not teach you but I will go into it. The question is, is it possible in our daily life to live a whole, complete full life. The word 'whole' means healthy, first; healthy body, healthy mind. Then it also means sanity; a sane mind, a mind that is capable of reasoning logically, objectively and so with clarity and therefore sanity. The word 'whole' means also holy, h-o-l-y. All this is implied in that word 'whole'. And the gentleman wants to know how to live a life that is whole.

Now which do you want to discuss? Which is the real problem to you, sir, not what I say to you, or you accept what I say, but an actual daily problem in your life.

Q: I have one such problem, sir. Irritation. I am easily irritated.

K: I am losing my temper and irritated. I am glad you get irritated!

So what shall we discuss?

Q: We should take the first question: we understand what you say intellectually.

K: Shall we go into that.

Q: Everything is covered in that.

K: Everything is covered in that question. So shall we go into that? We understand what you are talking about, intellectually or verbally, but somehow it doesn't seem to affect us very deeply. Somehow it doesn't penetrate widely and deeply our entire life. That's the question. So we are going to discuss that, talk it over together.

When you say, we understand what you are talking about intellectually, is that a fact?

Q: Not for me. I would like you to say something in a definitional sense about the words you use, brain and mind and consciousness. You use those three words and I would like you to say something about the words brain and mind.

K: I will, sir. This is what we are discussing now, we will go into it perhaps. I am asking, if I may, when you says, we understand you intellectually, verbally, what do you mean by that. Are you understanding me, the speaker, what he is saying, or are you trying to understand yourself, using the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing yourself? Do you understand the difference? Right, sir? Which is it you are doing? Are you trying to understand what the speaker is saying, or are you perceiving yourself, seeing yourself in the mirror which the speaker is putting before you? Which is it you are doing? Understanding the speaker, or understanding yourself by seeing in the mirror which he puts before you? This is a simple question, so don't complicate it. So which is it we are doing?

Q: We try to apply what K is saying.

K: Yes, we are trying to apply what is being said. Do you know what he is saying? Before you apply something the speaker is

saying, do you know what he is saying? He is saying, look at yourself. Use the speaker as a mirror, and then look at yourself. Right? That's what he is saying. Have we understood? Look at yourself. Do you see yourself, or do you see the picture that the speaker is painting? Do you understand my question, sir? Which is it that you are doing? Are you seeing yourself as you are, or are you trying to understand something the speaker is saying, therefore it becomes intellectual. I think this is a fairly simple question, and please answer it. Which is it that we are doing? If you are hungry, any amount of description of food will not satisfy you. Right? So are you hungry, or are you merely satisfied with the description of food, because you have already eaten?

Q: I am really hungry.

K: So you are really hungry, you want some food: who is going to supply you the food? Metaphorically speaking, I am not giving you food, you are not hungry, but in a different sense. Who is giving you the food that you want?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, don't just casually answer this, sir, go into it. You are saying, I am hungry and I want some food that will appease the hunger. Now wait a minute. Appease the hunger. Are you hungry intellectually, deep down, are you hungry? No?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: And from whom are you going to get the food? From the guru? From your books? From your culture? From some politician? Where are you going to get the food?

Q: From everybody I have ever seen.

K: I know, sir, you say that very casually. Is that a fact that you

are really hungry, not in the physical sense, that you are really hungry and you want that hunger to be appeased and you don't mind getting it from anybody. Right?

Q: From everybody I have ever seen.

K: Yes, from everybody, anybody - from your wife, will you get it? You are all so casual.

Q: I am looking...

K: Wait, sir, we will go into it. First of all, let's be very clear what we are talking about. You are searching. Right? You are searching, you go from guru to guru, from temple to temple, or from philosopher to philosopher, and you happen to come here this morning and say, 'Please help us in ourselves to find truth'. Right? Is that right? Are you quite sure? So first of all, are you clear what you are searching for? Are you searching for satisfaction? Are you searching to escape from this dreadful life, monotonous, stagnating, dull, boring life, and so you want an escape, a drug? When you say, I am searching, and we are asking, what is it you are seeking? Happiness?

Q: Yes.

Q: Contentment.

K: Contentment.

Q: Peace.

K: Yes, sir I can supply all the words and you will all agree. So what is it, you want all this: happiness, contentment, peace, love - what?

Q: Everything.

K: Everything. Are you capable of receiving everything?

Q: Order, sir.

K: I said, are you capable of receiving everything that you want.

Q: No, sir.

K: No, sir you have not even understood my question. Your capacity is very small, it's like going to the well with a small pitcher.

Q: Sir, I want to...

K: Just a minute, sir, be good enough to listen to what the speaker is saying, have the courtesy to listen first. You might go the well with a small pitcher, and be satisfied what you collect in that little pitcher. Is that what you want?

Q: I need a vessel that will hold everything I hold.

K: Sir, you haven't even listen to what I am saying. If you are seeking everything, that is, happiness, contentment, enlightenment, wisdom, ending of fear and so on, you must have a vessel that can contain the enormity of life.

Q: I...

K: Sir, sir. Is this the first time you are here, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Oh, then that explains it. Good enough sir. Is this the first time that you are all here? Please have the goodness to listen. I am asking, if I may, what is it you are seeking. It's no good saying, everything. Are you seeking contentment?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Are you seeking contentment?

Q: We don't know what we are seeking.

K: Yes, sir, I am taking one example, one factor, let's go into it, sir, and then spread it out. Are you seeking contentment? Would you kindly answer.

Q: Sir I think it is...

K: Sir, are you seeking contentment? If one could go into that one question, that will perhaps open a great deal. But you won't even go into that. Are you asking, because I am discontented, unhappy, I find no satisfaction in anything, so I am greatly discontented, disturbed, and I would like to be free from that disturbance, from that dissatisfaction, insufficiency, and find some place, or somewhere where I can be completely contented. Is that what you want? Go on, sirs. Is that what you want?

Q: Yes, it is.

K: Right sir?

Q: We want to know what we are.

K: One of the factors of what you are is discontent. Right? One of the factors. Through one factor, the understanding of one factor, and opening, going into it very deeply we may cover the whole field. You understand, sir? So if you will kindly find out for yourself whether you are so discontented with life, with your job, with your environment, with your culture, with everything, discontented. Discontent. Are you? With your guru, with your religion, with your Vedas, with your Upanishads, with your politics, your economic environment, and so on, discontented with everything that you have about you? Is that a fact?

Q: Yes, sir it is a fact.

K: To you? Right. So you want to find a way out of this discontent. Right? Now please listen, first listen. Who is going to help you out of this? You have tried the Vedas, you have tried the Upanishads, you have tried the gurus, you have tried puja, you have tried god knows what, and you are not out of it. Right? Are



you? Are you out of it? Be honest to yourself, I don't want your agreement, nodding your head, but be honest to yourself. You have tried so many things and you say, I cannot find contentment, and therefore I am burning with discontent; please help each other to see if it is possible to be free of this discontent. Right? So it is a legitimate question to ask you. Do you know the meaning of that word 'discontent'? Discontent with something - please listen - with something, with my husband, with my wife, with my girl friend, discontent with something; or is there discontent by itself? You understand my question, sir? Which is it? I may be discontent in the house I am living in because I want a larger house, I may be discontent with my wife, who is dull, a bore, or my husband. I am discontent with that. I am discontent with my job and I want a better job. I am discontent with what I am - my ugliness, my pettiness, my brutality. Which is it? You understand? Discontent, being discontent, dissatisfied with something and is there a discontentment in itself. You understand? You have understood my question, sir? Now which is it?

Q: I am discontent.

K: You are discontent not about something, but it is a flame that is burning in you, not fed by another, by faggots or wood of not having this, not having that, wanting more, wanting less. So you find that there is a discontent by itself. Is that so?

Q: It is not a fact, sir. It is discontentment with something.

K: That's all. I understand, sir. So let's be very clear that you are discontent with something. Right? Right, sir? With my relationship, I am not good at exams, I am not this, so you are discontented with something. Now what is it that you are

discontented with? Then if you know what you are discontented with then we can proceed, we can go into it. But if you casually say, I am discontent, it means nothing. Do you want - please listen - do you want that discontent smothered, put down, - die down, let it wither away? Or do you want that discontent which is like a flame to burn, to burn everything round out? You understand my question? Which is it you want: to suppress that discontent, to hold it down, to put a lid on it, to run away from it; or do you want that discontent to keep on burning? Why shouldn't you be discontent? Is it a good thing to be discontent? No? Yes. So it is good to be discontent. Right? With what? With your husband? With your children? With your society? With your culture? With your tradition? With your government? Or, dissatisfied in yourself, what you are - petty, small, narrow minded, ugly, quarrelsome, jealous, anxious. Which is it: discontented with things outside, house, husband, or discontented in yourself with regard to what you are?

Q: With what I am, sir.

K: You are discontented - please listen, sir - you are discontented with what you are. Right? Is that it? Not with husband, wife, society, the world outside you. Please. So you are discontented with yourself. Right? Would that be right, sir?

Q: Only rarely am I discontented with myself.

K: So we will accept that: you are very rarely discontented with yourself, what you are. Mostly we are discontented about the world outside of us. Now just a minute, just a minute, go slowly. Is the outside different from you? You understand? The society which you have created - the society which is around you, are you not the product of that society? Are you not the product of the culture? Are

you not the product of your tradition? Of your economic condition? So you are the outside, which you think is separate from you. Right? So don't divide the world and the 'me'. You understand? You are the world. Right? Because you are the result of your society, you are the result of your conditioning, you are the result of your tradition, you are the result of your father, mother, who believe and so on and on. All that is the outside world, and that outside world has made you. Right? So you are the outside world. Right, sir? Not only logically but factually, it is so. Right? So don't divide, saying, I am different from the world, I am dissatisfied with myself and not with the world. You understand the question? So you are dissatisfied not only with the world but what the world has made you. At last, it takes such a long time. Right? So you are the world. Right? Right, lady? So the world is you, so you can't say I am not dissatisfied with the world but only with myself. When you are dissatisfied with yourself you are dissatisfied with the world: the culture, the religion, the puja, the house, you follow. Right? So you are discontented with what you are, which is the world. Right, sir? Right?

Q: I am unable to see that.

K: You are unable to see that. All right, sir. Aren't you conditioned by the religion in which you have been brought up? Right? And that religion has been passed from father to son, to son, to son. Generations of superstition. Right? So you are the result of that superstition. Right?

Q: And education.

K: I said, that, education, superstition, the culture, the Vedas, the books, you are the result of all that. So you are discontented

with yourself therefore you are discontented with the world. So you are the world. Right? Don't say, yes, until you really understand it, even verbally. A Christian is conditioned by the propaganda of two thousand years, as you are conditioned by propaganda of five thousand years or more. Right? So you are the result of that propaganda. Obviously, lady, don't take time. So when you say you are discontented, you are discontented with the world, which is you. Got it?

Now, let's proceed from there. So you are the world and the world is you, and you are discontented with everything that the world has put together. Right? So to what depth is this discontent? Is it just superficial? You understand? Just under the skin, or does it go very deep?

Q: It is rather superficial.

K: So you say it is rather superficial. Right?

Q: No.

K: With you it is not, so I am going slowly, we will go into it slowly, have a little patience. How is it that you are so bright? This discontent, someone says, is rather superficial. Why is it superficial? Please go into it, sir. Why is it superficial? When you say, superficial, it is on the surface - the word 'superficial' is on the surface. Why is it on the surface? Go into it a little bit. You see poverty round you, people deprived of everything, degradation of poverty, you see this round you, dirt, squalor, misery, confusion. So how can you see all that and say, 'It's all very superficial'? Or is it that you are not - forgive me, I am just suggesting - that you are not sensitive. Right? You are not sensitive. Now what do you mean by that word 'sensitive'? One is sensitive to one's own feelings. Are

you following this? One is sensitive to one's own desires. One is sensitive to one's own demands, longings, loneliness, to oneself. Which means you are so self-centred that you are not sensitive to the beauty of the trees, you are not sensitive to the beauty of the sky, you are not sensitive to that starved dog, the poverty. You are just sensitive to yourself, about yourself. Therefore you say, I am superficial. Have you understood? So which is it? Why are you not aware of what is taking place around you? The squalor of your house, the untidiness of your house, the way you eat, the food, everything, why aren't you sensitive to all that?

Q: Sir, I am bothered about what I am going to be all the time, sir.

K: Yes, so you are all the time concerned about yourself and your future. Right? So your discontentment is a very short little affair. Isn't it? Because I am so concerned with the future, about my dresses, about my looks, about my - you know, about myself. So I am asking why are you superficial, when there is so much agony around you, so much misery, how can you possibly be superficial? That's one point.

When you say, it is not superficial but very deep - right - now what do you mean by that word 'deep'? Is it measurable? Please go into it carefully. Is it measurable? So the word 'depth' means it is possible to measure. Right? The very word implies a measurement. Now, wait, look. May I go into it a little bit?

Q: Go on.

K: I will, sir. The whole western world, from Greece, the whole western world said, measurement is absolutely necessary. That's why they have developed technology to its utmost extent - they

will go on - but measurement was necessary. Right? You are getting this? Now the ancient Hindus - which you are not, so don't identify yourself with them - the ancient people said, measurement is very limited - I haven't read the books, but you can see it. So to find the immeasurable you must be free of measurement. Of course. Which means, you must be free of that capacity to compare, to measure, the more and so on. You understand what I am saying?

So there are these two approaches to life: measurement, the whole of the west is based on that, if you have gone into it, if you have discussed with people you will see that from Greece, which exploded over Europe and so America and so on, you will find that the principle of their outlook was measurement, to measure. And the Asiatic world said, measurement is not enough, one must go beyond the capacity to measure, because measurement is very limited. So you have these two. Now which is it you are thinking of when you say, deep? Are you interested in all this? I am sorry the sun is in your eyes, what am I to do? Would you like to come and sit here, sir, any of you?

So which is it when you say, I am deeply discontented, is it that you have compared, measured and therefore you use the word 'deeply'; or you merely say, I am totally discontent, not using the word 'depth'? Does somebody follow all this?

Q: What is discontent?

K: That's what I want to know: are you totally discontent, or measurably discontent? That's good. Which is it?

Q: Totally.

K: No, no, be careful, sir. When you say, I am discontented with

the world - the world being my house, my property, my wife, my children, my culture, my gods, outward, and therefore that is measurable, and also you see that you are that, you are the result of all that. Therefore are you saying, my discontent is comparative, I have compared? I wonder if you see all this. I have compared my discontent with other people's discontent and therefore I am measuring it? Or do you say - please listen - I am totally, completely discontent? You see the difference? So which is it?

Q: Total.

K: Be honest, you don't have to be dishonest with me because it doesn't matter. So are you totally or partially discontent?

Q: Partially.

K: Partially.

Q: Totally.

K: Totally. Wait. One at a time.

Q: It means that the centre is not there if you are totally discontent.

K: Yes, so you are totally discontent. Are you actually? Or is it just words, totally?

Q: We are in a trap.

K: Yes, you are in a trap. The trap of the rat race, the trap of what humanity is doing - wars, talk about peace, prepare for wars, armaments. Right? Talk about non-violence, go to temples, do everything to prepare for war. Right? All your money, your taxes, go into that. Don't you know all this? Of course. So what are you discontented with, and why are you discontent? You understand? You say, I am discontented totally - why?

Q: Because there is no transformation.

K: You are not answering my question, sir. Think it out. Why am I discontented. Is it because I want deep satisfaction? Is it because I have ideas what the world should be? Is it because I see that it's monstrous to have a poor country where there are rich countries? So why is it you are discontented?

Q: Unlimited wants.

K: Unlimited want. I am discontented because my want is so stupendous, wide, unlimited, and I am discontented.

Q: The means are limited.

K: Yes, sir, that's what it means. That's why I said at the beginning of the talk, of this discussion, are you going to the well with a little pitcher, or you have the well itself. You understand my question? No. You know when you go to a well if you have a little pot there's not much water. So how do you go to the well - with little minds? With wanting to change a little - I wish my husband was a little different, my wife a little bit better, nicer looking, not so stupidly dull, or this or that. With what energy, with what capacity, with what spread of your arms - how do you go to the well? You are doing that now. You understand? You are coming to the well. How are you coming to it? And also, why are you coming to it? Both are important: why you go to the well - you understand what I mean by 'well', I don't have to go into it. Why do you go to the well? What is the motive, what is the urgency, why do you want to go there? And if you are there can you drink enormously the waters, or you just slake your thirst? You understand my question? So which is it you are doing? Please, sirs, this applies to all of us, for god's sake, to all of us. Please find out.

Look: I want to meditate, so I go from one guru to another, to



try to find out how to meditate, but my mind, my heart is like a little peanut. Right? Like a monkey nut, a groundnut. And I say, 'By Jove, with that little mind I am going to meditate'. Right? Your meditation then becomes the same size as the peanut. So in the same way, are you coming to the well with a little pot, or with a tremendous thirst?

Q: Have we all got the capacity to transform totally?

K: Sir, I am not talking of total transformation. I am talking about how you come to the well which will perhaps quench all your discontent. Wait, sir, I haven't finished. And you are asking a question, has each one of us the capacity. It's up to you. Right, sir, it's up to you. If your discontent is tremendous then you go to the well with a tremendous vessel. If your discontent is the size of a groundnut, peanut, then you go to the well with a little vessel. And I am afraid that's what you are doing. Not you, lady, but most of us.

Q: The desire to change, is that also not measurable?

K: Of course it is. So you have to find out what you mean by change. Change from the known to the unknown? Or change from one corner of the field to another corner of the field? You understand? So please be good enough to find out for yourself why you are discontent, and whether you go to the ends of the earth to find the water that will quench completely the whole discontent.

Isn't this discontent good, like a flaming that is burning? And if you smother it you just become mediocre, a bourgeois little entity. That's all. But you keep that flame burning, burning, burning, not be satisfied with anything - communism, socialism, Maoism, or Krishnamurti-ism, anything. Now what is it you are doing? This is very important to find out, is it not.

Q: It is importance to have the energy.

K: Yes, sir, the importance of energy. Is not energy part of this discontent. But if you are discontented with little things - bigger houses, little more, little less, bigger car, more money, more this, more that, that discontent, that energy is dissipated in little things. Right, sir? Are you doing that? When I ask you that question, are you doing it - you all become silent. Yes, sir?

Q: If one has discontent you reject everything.

K: You can't reject Krishnamurti-ism because he is talking about yourself. It means you reject yourself.

So please for your own sake, don't waste your life. Right? You waste your life when you are satisfied with little things. Right? Little car, bigger car, better house, better garden, better this and that. So don't waste your life. If you want to find out what meditation is, give your life to find out.

Q: Does it help to be always discussing, always hunting?

K: Hunting, or searching. It means both, sir.

Q: Is it useful to be always burning?

K: Is it useful - for whom, I don't know - to always be in a state of burning. What do you mean useful?

Q: Burning means wastage.

K: This is quibbling over words. Sir, may I ask a question of all of you? Forgive me if I ask you a question. Aren't you wasting your life? Aren't you? What are you going to do about it?

Q: That's is what we want from you, sir.

K: That is, I am becoming your guru. I refuse to be your guru. Followers destroy the gurus, and the gurus destroy the followers.

Q: How do we know if we are wasting our life?

K: Sir, that's what I am asking, sir, please find out. You have got another half an hour, ten minutes, or more, to find out whether you are not wasting your life. You have only this life - the other life, the future, may be, or may not be, but you have got only this life - thirty years, forty years, fifty years, or whatever it is, aren't you wasting it, which is such a precious thing?

Q: The concept of wastage presupposes some kind of goal.

K: Not in the least. Sir, I'll show it to you, what I mean by wasting, there is nothing presupposing a goal. Am I not wasting my life when I am following somebody, when I accept authority, except the authority of surgeons and so on? Am I not wasting my life by following somebody? Because when I follow somebody that somebody is created by me. No? So I am following myself in the name of the guru. Right? So isn't that a waste of time, this pretension to follow some ideal which you have projected and of which you are part? You are following yourself, your desires, your wantings, all the rest of it. So isn't that a waste of your life?

Q: What if the relationship between the disciple and the guru is of its very nature non-dual?

K: Oh, no, no. I don't want to go to some beastly guru, sir, we have gone beyond that, I hope.

Q: Gone beyond what?

K: I hope we have gone beyond the gurus and authorities.

Q: I thought you were talking about guru relationships.

K: No, no, I am not talking of dual relationship. I am only saying, aren't you wasting your life when you accept spiritual authority.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please find out. We are talking about wasting your life, and the gentleman says when you use the word 'waste' it implies a motive, it implies an end. I am refuting that statement: I say it does not. I waste my life, sir, when I am bothered about my little corner of myself, my goodness - you follow - thinking about myself, myself, myself. Isn't that a waste of life? No? Yes. So are you wasting it? You see you become silent.

Q: You follow a spiritual authority for a particular reason.

K: I explained all that, sir. Sir, I don't want to go into that question now because we have dealt with it umpteen times, a thousand times. So that is not the point now being considered. We are considering whether we are wasting our life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: First find out if you are wasting it.

Q: We have to have a goal or...

K: No, no, no, not goal.

Q: Can you please explain that?

K: I will, I will. You understand, sir, first of all our life is very short. Right?

Q: Life is not so short.

K: Good god, sir, you may live another ten years, fifty years, hundred years, but it is short. What is the matter! Your life is short, isn't it? Now it may be relatively short or a little bit longer, but it is still short. Are you aware of that?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Need I go into that? No. I won't go into, you can discuss it with somebody else. Do we know we live during these years a very short life. Right? And it matters enormously how we spend that

life. Right? Spend in the sense, whether we are sane, whether we have got a very good body and keep it healthy, otherwise you are finished. Where you have got a good clear capacity to think. And it implies a life that is not merely superficial. And also it implies that when you are talking about whole, is your life sacred. You understand? Is your life sacred? That's what I mean, your life is not sacred if you are not sane, reasoned, capacity to think clearly, objectively, not about yourself, yourself all the time, and to have a good body, good mind, good brain. And also that implies to love, to love, to have compassion. All that is implied when we say, your life is very short, are you wasting it.

So I am asking you, if I may, is your life sacred? Not the temples, those are all the inventions of thought, all your temples and your gods, your books. But I am asking you, is your life sacred. No, sir, please sir. Holy? That you are acting rightly under all circumstances? So if you are not, you are wasting your life. Right? That's why I said it is very important to find out whether your life, which is not your life, it is the life of humanity, because you are the representative of humanity because you suffer like the man who suffers in America, or in Russia, your anxiety is like the man in America, or Russia - he is full of sorrow, anxiety, pain. Right? He is like you. So you are actually the representative of humanity. Right? So if you really understand that, not intellectually but deeply, then I am asking, is your life sacred? It doesn't mean putting on robes and all that circus. Because if your life is sacred you affect the consciousness of mankind. You understand? Because you are the representative of all humanity. Your consciousness is the consciousness of all humanity, because all

humanity, all human beings suffer, lonely, despair, hope, live in anxiety, in uncertainty, no security. You understand? This is happening right through the world, and you are part of that. Therefore if your life is changed radically, if your life is sacred, you affect the consciousness of man. You understand? So that means, your discontent has no depth, it is discontent, not with something but the flame of it. Then that energy, which is so tremendous if you don't run away from it, the energy of discontent, that energy will find the right action always.

Well, sir, where are we now at the end of an hour and a quarter, where are we? Go on, sirs, where are we?

Q: Do you want us to face reality even if it is evil. The problem is how to face it.

K: How to face...

Q: I think you want us to...

K: I don't want you to do anything. I don't want you to do anything. Right? It's your life. If you say, help me to understand this, we can then, but if you say, tell me what to do, then I become your guru, I become your authority - please listen - which I absolutely refuse.

Q: Can we together find a solution?

K: I am doing it now. We are doing it now. Are you aware, know, conscious that you are wasting your life? Don't say, relative, positive, so much - wasting. And I said, wasting implies that this discontent, are you smothered in it, are you running away from it, or try to find such deep satisfaction that discontent disappears. I consider that a waste of life, just to run away from discontent.

And also I said, is your mind sane, clear, objective, not

concerned all the time about your little self. And also I said, if you are in constant battle with yourself, struggle with yourself, that's a waste of life because you are wasting energy. So find out if you want to, why you have conflict in yourself all the time. Why are you in conflict, sir? Aren't you in conflict, why? Didn't you hear what he said the other day at the talk? Facts, fact has no opposite. When you have the opposite then you are in conflict. Have you understood? That is, when I am angry the opposite is not to be angry, so there is a conflict. Right? So I only deal with fact, which is anger, not, 'not to be angry'. So I say, anger. That anger is me. I am not different from anger. Right?

So I observe - there is an observation of the fact of this reaction named as anger. Right? Are you following this? By observing without distortion that which you have named as anger undergoes fundamental transformation. Experiment, test it, don't agree with it. You know you are envious, don't you, that you are much nicer looking than I am, more intelligent than I am, envy. Now the opposite of that word 'envy' is what? Not to be envious. Which is the fact? Which is the fact? Envy, isn't it? Not, 'not to be envious'. So you look at the fact. Right? How you look at the fact is tremendously important. Whether you look at it with distortion, that is, wanting to go beyond it, or wanting to suppress it, or wanting to say, 'Why shouldn't I be envious?' All those are factors of distortion. Where there is distortion it means you are moving away from the fact. Right? So can you observe the fact of that reaction which you named as envy without the word, just to observe it? Then, as I was explaining, when you look at something through a microscope, if the observer is conditioned by his

hypothesis, conditioned by his desire, then the object at which he is looking through the microscope, it doesn't do anything. Whereas if he looks through it without any distortion the thing which he is observing undergoes a change. You understand? So there is no conflict. Conflict exists only when you move away from fact. When I see myself in the mirror and say, I am ugly, that's a fact. But when I say, I want to be more beautiful, more this and more that, conflict begins. You understand. The observation of the fact removes completely conflict.

Q: I want to ask a question.

K: In relation to what we are talking about?

Q: Yes. Act if you have no choice, if you have a choice don't act.

K: No, no sir. Just a minute. Go into it. Sir, why do you choose? Choose between yellow cloth and white cloth, between blue cloth and red - you choose there naturally, that is inevitable. If you want a good car, you choose it. You choose, that's all right. But why do you psychologically choose at all? You understand my question? Why do you choose? Doesn't choice come when you are not clear? When I know the road to Madras, there is no need for choice, I just go. Where there is clarity there is no choice. It's only the confused mind that chooses. You won't accept all this. So before you choose be free of your confusion, then it's finished. Can you be free of your confusion? If you are not free then you are wasting your life. You understand? So can you be free of your confusion? What are you confused about? Whether to choose one politician or another, one group of politics, congress, this, that. Do you know the facts about these gentleman - politicians the world over are a strange



people. Right? This is so obvious. So where do you choose? Do you go all round the world and say, 'I am going to marry the most beautiful girl' and so go round the world and choose. Come on, sirs, when you use the word 'choice' what do you mean by it? Choose between various gurus? One guru better than the other guru, one god better than the other god? So when there is choice it indicates a mind that is utterly confused. We think because we choose we are free, which is a fallacy. A free man doesn't choose, he is clear.

Well, sirs, if I may, it is five minutes to nine, if I may ask, not as a teacher in a school, what have you learnt this morning? You understand my question? What have you gathered? Will you be the same tomorrow? The same dull, stupid, traditional, repeating, repeating - will you be the same tomorrow?

Q: It will be the day after tomorrow.

K: Yes, sir very clever, the day after tomorrow. So I am asking, you have spend an hour and a half listening, what have you gathered which is yours, not mine?

Q: Understand life better.

K: Understand life better - your life? Your life? When you use 'better', when you use the word 'better', the better is the enemy of the good. Right? Either you are good or not good, either you flower in goodness, or you don't flower.

## **MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH JANUARY 1978 'WHAT IS THE INNERMOST NATURE OF THE SELF?'**

In spite of what is going on around here, we are a gathering of serious people. This is not an entertainment. And so I hope you will not mind if we go on talking about what we have been discussing or going into in last four talks.

I think we ought to go into the question of sorrow and death. We ought to go into it fairly thoroughly. But before we go into it we should consider seriously what is the whole nature of thought, because we live by thought. All our activities are based on thought. All our relationship with each other is based on thought, though we call it love and all the rest of it, but essentially it is based on thought. Our religions, the whole psychoanalytical process of the Freudian, the Jungian and all the rest of it, and all the rituals, the pujas, the gods that man has created throughout millenia after millenia, is based fundamentally on thought. I think we ought to go much more in detail about that, if you will.

I wonder if one realizes thought in itself is fragmentary, very limited. It may expand that limitation thinking it is going to cover the whole universe, but it is still fragmented, limited. It is limited because it is born of time; time being memory, experience, knowledge stored in the brain, and that memory responding. And so it is always limited, fragmentary. It can imagine, it can think, it can say to itself, that I can perceive the totality of man, of love, or of the immeasurable, the timeless. It can think it can conceive of it, but being itself limited and fragmentary, whatever it creates, puts

together, must be limited and fragmentary. And that's why when all our relationship is based on thought, our relationship is never whole, complete.

So we are going to find out, if it is possible, whether there is a perception, an insight, an innermost way of living which is not fragmentary, which is not limited. I hope we are understanding each other. As we said the other day, we are exploring together, we are investigating into this problem, which is: is it possible to live a life, a daily life, which is not broken up, fragmented, but a life that is complete, whole? I am sure most of us must have asked that question. Because when there is an action of the whole then it is never repetitive. It is only a fragmentary activity that is always breaking up, limited, boring, repetitive. We are going to go into that for a little, if you don't mind.

Because thought has divided the world into nationalities, geographic divisions, class divisions, religious divisions, ideological differences - communists, socialists, ultra left and ultra right, and so on and so on. Thought has done this. And also we live a fragmentary life. Our life is broken up - businessman, religious man, a monk, a lawyer and so on and so on, specialized entities. And that too is the result of thought which is in itself limited and fragmentary. Now we are going to find out if it is possible not to live a life which is fragmentary, but which has no regrets, no grief, anxiety, sorrow.

So we have to investigate together into the question of what is the self, the 'me', the ego, the entity that identifies itself as being separate from another? If you will we are going to go into that to find out whether one can lead a daily life which is not based on you

and me - me first and you second. Our whole culture is that, social, moral, ethical, religious and so on. Right? Can we go on with it? What is the self, the 'me', the ego, how does it arise, what is its inmost nature of the self? Inmost, the very depth of it. Is that very structure, the nature of the self, fragmentary? Or is there in the very structure, in the very essence of it, a quality which is not fragmentary? You are following all this? I ask because - please sirs, I ask because I am not sure we are meeting each other. Please, sir, I am not sure we are communicating with each other. I rather doubt that we are, because it is a very serious thing that we are investigating. Because man has always lived with sorrow, and is acquainted with grief, whether it is possible to end that sorrow, not in some distance future but in our daily actual life now.

And also to find out, not intellectually or verbally, or emotionally and romantically, the nature and the beauty of love, what is the depth of it, the meaning of it, the fulness of it. And also what is death? So it is very important, it seems to me, that we examine together, share together, walk together, investigate together, this question, which is: what is the nature of the self, the identity of a particular individual opposed to the community, opposed to the many, and what is the inmost nature of the self? Without speculating, without asserting, without accepting the traditional verbiage - I am using the word 'verbiage', it is just words. So we are together, please bear in mind, we are together exploring. So you are not just sitting there listening to the speaker but actually working with him. That means you will have to give your attention, you have to listen to each other, though all of you can't speak and I am the only person unfortunately who speaks at

the moment. We have to be very alert, watchful, heeding that which is being said, and our response to what is being said, and how we receive or accept, or listen to what is being said. All this is the responsibility of those of you who are willing to listen seriously.

May we go on? If the self, the 'me', is put together by thought then whatever it does at the highest so-called conscious, or super-conscious level, is still fragmentary. Right? If it is not put together by thought, the 'me', the ego, the self, then it is something sacred, inviolable, unaltered, something that is beyond time. So we are questioning these two factors: whether it is put there, the nature and the structure of the 'me', the ego, the self, by thought and therefore fragmentary, and whatever it does, however it might imagine, long for, hypnotize itself that it is the whole, that it can perceive the whole, it can come upon truth, either that is a total illusion and deception; and if the self, the 'me', the ego, the you, is something that is not of time, that is not born of thought, then it is capable of perceiving totally the nature of truth, that which is beyond words, which is not measurable by words. So these two are factors which we must examine. Right?

So we are trying to find out the inmost nature of the self because all our activity is based on self. The me first and you second. In all our relationships, in all our bureaucratic activities, social activities, in our relationship with each other, the self, the self-centred activity is constantly in operation, even when we are meditating, even when we are supposed to be religious and all the rest of it. Right? So what is the self? Unfortunately most of you probably have read philosophy, sacred books - I won't call them sacred because they are just books - or somebody has told you,

your guru, or your religious leader probably has told you the self is something extraordinary, it is to live everlastingly from the beginning to the end.

So we are asking a very simple question, which is really tremendously complex. How you approach that question matters a great deal. Whether you approach it with fear, you approach it with a conclusion, or accepting the authority of others, and your approach then is already limited, circumscribed. To investigate one must be free otherwise you can't investigate. Right? If you are prejudiced, if you have some ideals, some conclusions, some wish, then that very wish, conclusion is going to dictate your investigation. So can you, if I may ask, be free to go into this matter very carefully, logically, sanely, and freely, to find out the nature of the self, and the inmost essence of the self?

Because if the self is merely the operation of thought, put together from the very beginning of time then death has a certain meaning. If it is not, then death is a beginning. We will go into it. The individual, the identity of a human being who feels, or thinks he is separate, is he actually separate though his form, name, may be different, his idiosyncrasies, his character, his peculiar, if I may use the word without being misunderstood, genius, peculiar genius - not in the great sense of the word genius - peculiar excentricities, tendencies, qualities, are they the result of culture, the culture in which you are born, the development of character, the resistance to the culture, which may be the idiosyncratic outlook on life. This is very, very important for us, if I may point out over again, to go into.

So first, what are you? Your activity is based on the self, self-

centred activity from morning until night. So what is that centre from which you are acting? The centre from which you are meditating, if you meditate - I hope you don't - that centre from which all your fears, all your anxieties, sorrows, griefs, pain, affections, arise, that centre from which you are seeking happiness, enlightenment, god, or truth, or whatever you like, the centre from which you say, "I take a vow to be a monk", the centre from which, if you are in business, trying to become more and more and more powerful, more money. That is the centre which we are examining, the self. What is that self and how has it come into being? That is, to know yourself. You understand? That is, knowing yourself as actually what you are, not what you think you are, what you hope to be, but the self and the knowing of that self, whether it is possible to know it completely, the essence of it. And whether it is possible to go beyond all the fragmented activity of the self. Right?

So is the self that centre put together by thought? Please think and investigate, reason, as though for the first time you are thinking about it, then it is fresh, then you can investigate. But if you say, "I already know what the self is, I already have come to certain conclusions about it", you will prevent yourself from examining it. Right? That's fairly simple.

So what is the self? You, what are you? Not, who you are, but actually what are you? There is a difference between who you are and what you are. I don't know if you see semantically the meaning of the two. The one, when you say who you are, you are investigating somebody leading further and further away from the centre; but if you say what you actually are, 'what is', then you are dealing with actuality. The actuality is that which is actually

happening. Right? You will see it in a minute. So what are you? You are a name. Right? A form, the result of a society, a culture which has emphasized throughout the ages that you are separate, something indefinitely identifiable. Right? You have your character, your peculiar tendency, your character, either aggressive or yielding. Is that not put together by the culture which has been brought about by thought? It is very difficult for people to accept a very simple, logical examination, because they would like to think the self is something most extraordinary. We are pointing out the self is nothing but words and memories. So the self is the past. And to know oneself means to observe yourself, actually what you are, in our relationship with each other. Then the reactions of the self come out - right? - in our relationship, intimate or not intimate. Then you begin to see what you are, your reactions, your prejudices, your conclusions, your ideals, your this and that, all that. Is not all that a result? Right? Are you following? That which is a result has a cause. So is a cause a series of memories, remembrances, and so a centre that has been created by thought to which thought clings. Am I off by myself?

Let's begin differently. Don't you want to know about yourself? If you don't know about yourself, actually what you are, you have no basis for any action which will be true, not fragmentary, not miserable, regretting, and so on. Don't you want to know what you are? To know yourself. Now how do you begin to find out about yourself? You can only know yourself either through observation in relationship, or through analysis. Right? Are you following this? Oh, come on! I can know myself. I will talk about myself. I can know myself watching my relationship with others, with my wife,



if I am married, or with my girl friend, or with friends, in that observation I see myself reacting - as a Hindu, as a Buddhist, as a Christian, as a non Christian, or imagine that I love people. You know, I find out. Or through analysis. Right? Analysing myself. Now to me analysis is paralysis. And the Hindus are very good at it, and therefore they are totally paralysed because they don't act. They analyse, analyse, analyse, therefore gradually this analysis leads them to paralysis. You watch them as they walk down the street. So either you analysis, or you observe in relationship, observe yourself, what you are, how you think, how you react, what are your responses, what is the centre from which you are moving. Always a fixed point and from there move. Therefore the movement is very limited. So we are going to find out.

In the process of analysis who is the analyser? You understand my question? The analyser thinks he is different from that which he is analysing. But is that so? The therapeutic analysis by a professional - you understand what I am talking about, do you? All right. Probably they have never questioned this: who is the analyser? Is the analyser different from the analysed? You understand? Am I different from my anger, from my greed, from my anxiety, from my ugliness, brutality, cruelty, hate, am I different from that? If that is different from me then I can analyse it. Right? And each analysis, if I am good at it, each analysis must be complete otherwise the remembrance of that analysis is going to interfere with the next analysis. Is this all Greek to you? I'll go on, it doesn't matter. I am afraid you are used to listening, not investigating.

So is the analyser different from the analysed? Or they are both

the same, the analyser is the analysed. Right? Need I go into that? When you go through the process of introspection, analysis, and all that, what is happening when you analyse? You are taking time, aren't you? Time. You investigate in the morning and go off to your job, and come back, and again investigate yourself, or you investigate very, very carefully, slowly, minutely, all that implies time. And who is the analyser? Is he something different from that which he is analysing? Is anger different from you? Is jealousy different from you? Your cruelty, your hate, different from you? Or you are that? You understand? You have divided this thing: you are different from that, therefore you think you can analyse that. But when you observe very closely you will find that you are anger. At the moment of jealousy, anxiety, you are that. Only a second later you say, "I have been angry". Which is the movement of thought dividing anger from you. Oh, come on! Right?

So the analyser is the analysed. And if you realize that you will drop totally, completely all analysis. But when you talk to psychotherapists they won't drop it because they have got Cadillacs, cars and all the rest of it, their life depends on it. And probably it is the same with you, because you are so conditioned that you refuse to see this simple fact. If you drop completely analysis then how will you investigate the self? You understand my question, you are following all this? How am I to investigate, look, observe, understand this very, very complex thing called me if I don't analyse, because I see it is stupid to analyse, it will lead nowhere. Therefore I reject it completely, entirely. Are you in that position? Or you have got one foot there and one...! You understand my question?

So I can only find out about myself by observing my reactions in my relationship. So relationship becomes tremendously important. Right? Because it is going to reveal to me what I am. Whether I think I am divine, or there is some part of me that is divine. I am going to discover it in relationship. If there is some part of me which is divine then that part must act. So we have invented a very clever thing, which is, there is something very divine but it is all clouded over, so I have to peel off, like an onion, then I'll find myself. Self-realization - I don't know what that means. They use that a great deal in this country, and I am sure they don't know what it means either. So I realize I can only understand myself in relationship therefore I observe. Do I observe - please listen - do I observe with the memory of previous observation? You understand my question? I have observed myself in my relationship yesterday, with my wife, with my friend, with my boss, and I remember that. Then with that remembrance observe myself next day. Do you understand? So what is happening? I am not observing myself at all. The memory is operating, remembrance is operating, therefore there is never penetration into the very structure and nature of the self. Are we getting together somehow, in spite of the words, in spite of your intellectual bla?

So is it possible to observe myself each moment as though as it was fresh? Not having remembered my observation and let that remembrance operate. Do you see the difference? To let the remembrance operate, or observe from moment to moment, afresh each response, see what it does to you. Then that response becomes extraordinarily important because it is fresh. But the moment you

name it, it has already become the old. So you have to have an alertness to watch that you do not name it, that it is not an operation of remembrance, therefore you are observing with a clarity that is penetrating, that has an insight. Right? So which is it you are doing, actually now, please, I am asking you. This is very important for you to find out, to learn, not memorize, learn from listening to find out. Gosh, I have got so much to talk about yet. Which is it that you are doing? If you are analysing then you are going to end up being paralysed completely, and become neurotic, if you are not already. Then if analysis is completely out because you see the futility of it, not because I tell you, but you yourself have an insight into the whole structure of analysis, therefore you can drop it. Then to observe yourself in relationship, to observe without the gathered knowledge of previous observation - if you do that then you are merely repetitive, therefore you are not learning, watching yourself in operation. And if you can not name that reaction.

Now, put it round the other way, a little bit. May I go on? I will go on. Have you observed anything - your wife, your girl friend, or the tree, or the movement of water - with all your senses, with the totality of your senses, your smell, your hearing, your taste, all your senses heightened and observing? Have you ever done that? Oh my lord, what a generation. If you have done it there is no centre from which you are looking. You understand? Because then thought is part of that observation, then your senses are part of that observation. Therefore thought is not separate from the senses, therefore there is no division as the 'me', the observer and the thing you, the observed. Are we getting somewhere? I won't even ask

you that.

So the nature, the inmost nature of the self, when you have gone through all the layers of the self, the essence is nothing. You are nothing. Right? On that nothingness thought has imposed the super structure of consciousness. Consciousness being the content, without the content there is no consciousness - the content being you are a Hindu, Buddhist, your religion, your particular god, your puja, your anxiety, your sorrow, your pain, your hate, your love, all that is the content of your consciousness. Obviously. And the idea that you are super atman, or super, super consciousness is part of that content. You understand what thought has done. We are absolutely nothing. All this super structure has been built by thought. And thought is the response of registration. Of course. You understand registration, like a tape. See what thought has done.

So what then is love? You understand my question? I am going to discuss tomorrow, what is meditation, what is the real meaning of meditation. Is it the emptying of this consciousness with all its content - fear, greed, envy, nationality, my god and your god, my rituals and my possession, emptying the whole of that? That means facing, observing nothing. That nothing is not a thing. You know nothing means, not-a-thing. Thing is that which has been put together by thought. I wonder if you see all this. Nature has not been put together by thought. The tree, the stars, the waters and the lovely evening and the beauty of sunlight, it has not been put there by thought. But thought has made out of the tree a chair, a table, that is a thing. So when we say nothing it means not a thing put there by thought. It is not negation. I wonder if you see.

So then what is love? Is it a thing of thought? Is it a fragmentary affair? Or when thought is not then love is. And what relationship has love to sorrow? And what relationship has sorrow to passion? And what is the meaning of death? Love is not a thing, a thing. We said a thing is something put together by thought. If thought is love then that love is fragmentary, is something that thought as desire made that love acceptable, which is pleasure, sensory pleasure, sexual pleasure and other forms of pleasure. So if love is not thought then what is the relationship of love to compassion? Does compassion come into being with the ending of sorrow? And what does sorrow mean? Please you have to understand, this is all our life, our daily life we are talking about. Because we all go through great sorrow - sorrow of the death of someone, different forms, the multiple forms of sorrow, the agony, the loneliness, the utter despair, without any hope. How do you think all those poor people without any hope...

So one has to go, explore into this question of sorrow, whether it is possible to end it completely. This has been one of the things mankind throughout the ages has tried to understand, accept, tried to go beyond, or rationalize it, explain it by using various Sanskrit words, or putting all sorrow, as the Christians do, into one person. Right? If you don't do any of that, which are all escapes, you are faced with your sorrow. You know the sorrow of loneliness, don't you, the sorrow of frustration, the sorrow of loving somebody and not reciprocated, or the sorrow that comes into being when you love somebody and he has gone, the sorrow that each one has, feeling that he is totally inwardly empty, worthless, without self sufficiency. You know the various forms of sorrow. Is sorrow self

pity? I have lost somebody, and that brings great agony. In that agony there is self pity, loneliness, lack of companionship, sense of being left completely without any strength, vitality, dependence. You are totally lonely. That is, we all know this kind of sorrow. By rationalizing, explaining, seeking escapes, which we do, we are caught in this network of escapes. If you don't escape because you understand the futility of escapes, suppression, going off to temples and taking... all that nonsense, then you are faced with the fact, and not move from that fact. You understand, not move. That means thought wants to run away from it, but to remain with it, to observe the thing growing, flowering and decaying. And it can only flower, decay when you watch it, when you care for that thing which you call sorrow.

You know when you care for something you watch it with great tenderness, with great care, with great attention. Your baby, how the mother looks after it, gets up at midnight, many times during the day, weary, but she cares, she is watching. So in the same way if you watch this thing called sorrow with care, with the hesitancy, with affection, then you will see there is no escape from it, therefore that very thing that has been called sorrow turns into some totally different thing, which is passion. Not lust but passion. And without passion life has no meaning.

So the self and the structure of the self is based on nothing. The innermost depth of the self is absolutely not-a-thing. And love is not nothing, not-a-thing, but love is only possible, the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the magnitude of it, only when thought realizes it has no place in relationship and therefore love is. And the ending of sorrow, the ending of sorrow is passion.

So the next thing is to find out what is the relationship of love to death. What is the relationship of our existence to death? We are tremendously concerned with what happens after death, but we are never concerned before death. We are never concerned with our life, how we live our life but we are always concerned how we end life. Right? Now we are going to reverse the process. That is, how you live your daily life, whether in that daily life there is an ending, ending to your attachment. You know what your life is, don't you? It is one battle from the moment you are born until you die, a series of endless conflicts, a series of hopeless endeavour leading nowhere but more money, more pleasure, more things - things including your gods because they are made by hand or by the mind, which is thought, anxiety, depression, and elation, confusion, uncertainty, always seeking security, and never finding it. This is your daily contact, your daily life, controlling yourself, controlling your sex, or indulging in sex, ambition, greed, power, position. Right? This is your daily, ugly, brutal life. And you colour it by calling it various names and giving peculiar meaning to it. But in actuality this is your daily life. You know it very well, and you are afraid to let that go. You are bound to let it go when you die, you can't argue with death. Death through accident, disease, old age, senility, you know, you face all that.

So this is your life and we are saying this is far more important than death - not at the end but now. Death means - please listen - ending. I know you would like to go on. We think there is reincarnation, maybe. That is totally, completely irrelevant whether there is life hereafter or not. What is totally relevant is what is now. Right? Whether you can alter the way you live now. Even if you do



believe in this idea of reincarnation, born - you see, what is being born next life, who is being born? Yourself, your greed, your envy, your brutality, your violence modified? And if you believe in that then what you do now matters enormously, but you don't really actually go as far as that, you play with the idea, but you are greedy, you are envious, you are brutal, you are competitive, and all the rest of it.

So we are asking: death means the brain without oxygen, without blood, decays, ends. Now can you end in life now something which you hold most dear, which is yourself? Right? Can you end your attachment? Go into it. End it, not argue, why not this, end it and see what happens. So if you end all the things like greed, envy, anxiety, loneliness, now, death has a totally different meaning. Then there is no death. The body will decay naturally because you live so wrongly. So you are living with death all the time. You understand? Death is life. Ending is a beginning. If you keep continuously the same thing going on, there is nothing new. You understand? Only when there is an ending, a flowering takes place. You understand? Do it, sirs, please, in your life do it. Test it out. That's what I mean that you must be serious. It is only the serious man that lives. Serious in the sense he knows he is frightened, he knows he is greedy, he is aware of his own peculiar pleasure, and without argument, without suppression, without - end it with ease, with grace, with beauty. Then you will see a totally different beginning. Because then there is an actual facing of nothing, which is death, which is the invitation to death while living. The invitation is the ending of all your attachments and all the rest of it.

Then out of all this comes a strange factor, the factor of supreme intelligence. And that intelligence is based on compassion, clarity, and because of that intelligence there is great skill. So if you are serious then act, do, not some vague theory, or ideals, the ending of something that you hold most dear, your ambition, your spiritual ambitions, your physical ambitions, your business ambitions, end it. Then you will see yourself a new flowering takes place.

## **MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 8TH JANUARY 1978**

I am not casting a spell, I am just looking around! I believe this is the last talk, at least for the time being.

As we said the other day this is not an entertainment, an intellectual game that we are playing with each other, or a theoretical investigation into ourselves or into some philosophical outlook or ideas. We are here, if I may point out, for a very serious purpose. We are concerned with the transformation psychologically, inwardly, of human beings. We human beings have created this monstrous world, almost insane, destructive, violent. Unless our consciousness undergoes a radical transformation psychologically, really there is no hope for man, obviously. So it is a serious thing that we are talking about. It is a serious thing to take a journey together into this whole problem of our daily existence, and see if it is possible to transform, to bring about a radical psychological revolution in the very structure of our thinking, of our acting, of our behaviour and our outlook. That's what we are concerned with, not with some superstition, not some philosophical ideas, or some hypothetical examination, but actually we are concerned with our own lives, understanding our lives, our daily miserable, conflicting, unhappy lives, almost criminal lives and see if we cannot possibly bring about a deep abiding transformation in ourselves.

We said, we are the world and the world is us. You, as a human being, represent the entire humanity. You, because wherever one goes, unfortunately, one meets these human problems of suffering,

utter lack of love, confusion, sorrow, and everlasting conflict within and without. Wherever you go this is taking place in every human being. And so this is the common factor, and therefore, if I may point out most seriously, that you are the world and the world is you, you are the representative of all humanity, past and present. I do not know how you receive such a statement. Whether you translate it into an idea and therefore pursue that idea logically, illogically, opposing one idea by another, or you see the fact of it, the truth of it, have an insight into it, therefore you become totally responsible. Not as an individual opposed to a community, but as a human being without labels, without particular idiosyncrasies and so on, which we talked about yesterday.

So together the speaker and you are going to explore the problem of whether the brain, our human brain which has been so damaged, so deformed, so distorted through constant pressure of propaganda, of our culture, by our ambitions, by our greed, anxiety, fears, and also by our pleasures. There has been constant pressure on the brain. That's a fact. And when there is pressure on the brain there must be a distortion, unless the brain has the capacity to renew itself, come back to itself after the pressure is over - which very few people are capable of.

A nice evening, isn't it, I hope you look at the skies some times, the beauty of the trees and the light on the sparkling waters, and enjoy it. There is a great deal of difference between enjoyment and pleasure. When you enjoy a thing you are at the moment delighted with it, the beauty of a leaf, with the beauty of a face, or the curve of a branch, but looking at it, having registered it then you want to pursue that, then it becomes pleasure. And joy is something

entirely different from pleasure. Pleasure can be cultivated, pursued, run after, hunted, but joy you cannot hunt or pursue. It happens. But unfortunately when it happens thought comes along and says, I must have more of it - then it becomes pleasure. So I hope you look at these trees and have a delight in them.

We were saying the other day that there is an art of listening, the art of observation, seeing, and the art of learning. Please understand this, it is very important because perhaps through this art of listening, observing, learning, the pressure on the brain may never be felt at all, so that the brain remains pristine, pliable, young, fresh, innocent; because only a mind that is innocent can see the truth, not a complicated mind, not an intellectual mind that is concerned with theories, impracticalities and all that. So through the understanding of what is the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning, if we can capture the full significance of these three arts then when pressures occur on the brain, such as ambition is a pressure, violence, or resistance, anger, propaganda, tradition, all these are tremendous pressures on the brain. And therefore a brain that lives in these pressures must inevitably be distorted, deformed and damaged.

So we are saying that by understanding the art of listening, the art of seeing, observing, and the art of learning, then that pressure on the brain can be understood and not be affected. This is, please, a serious affair, not a matter of agreement or disagreement, quoting one authority against another authority, but we are investigating, exploring together, sharing together, this question, which is of tremendous importance, because our brains, if you have gone into it yourself, not that the speaker is a specialist in the structure of the

brain but one can observe the effect of various forms of pressure on the brain, by observing oneself one can see it. The extreme pressure leads to neuroticism, and probably most people whose brains are deeply deformed are neurotic, like most traditionalists are neurotic.

You understand all this? Understanding verbally is one thing, and having an insight into the fact is another. The insight brings about transformation, but mere agreement with words has very little effect - none at all. Please together we are investigating into a very complex problem, which is essentially meditation. Because a brain that is damaged can be caught, and is caught, in illusion, and it may meditate for ten thousand years, it will not find truth.

So it is very important to understand whether it is possible for a brain that has been damaged to make it bring about its original quality of freshness, clarity. A brain that is capable of instant decision, not based on logic, reason. Reason, logic, thought, has a certain value but it is limited.

So what we are doing now is together to go into this question whether you are aware for yourself, whether you are a lawyer, engineer, scientist, physicist, businessman, or just an ordinary man going to the office every day, whether you are not under great pressure in the family, outside the family. Whether you are aware of this pressure, that is, to be cognizant of it, to be conscious of it, to know for yourself, not because the speaker points it out but to know for yourself whether your conscious thinking is not the result of various pressures, and therefore that thinking is the outcome of a distorted brain. So please look at it for yourself and find out.

Then the problem arises whether it is possible to bring the brain

to its original condition, undamaged, not distorted, and therefore able to function freely. If you have gone into this question, at least some of you, I hope, have gone into it. Not just repeat, repeat, repeat. If you have gone into it the question must inevitably arise whether it is possible for a human being to remove this pressure, this weight, and be free. Then the question is, what is one to do. You understand my question? If you are concerned, then what are you, who is a human being, who is the representative of humanity, whose consciousness is the consciousness of the entire human race, and that consciousness is damaged. When it calls itself a Hindu, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Christian it is dividing itself and fighting everlastingly.

So we are asking, is it possible? We say it is possible only when you understand, or learn the art of listening, how to listen. When you listen and when there is resistance to what is being said, that resistance is the outcome of your pressure, you don't listen. Not that you must accept, nor must you reject but just to listen, without resistance, without translating what is said into what you would like it to be. So to learn the art of listening. I think if you know that the thing is very simple, it is almost over, because there is a great miracle in listening. Because in that if there is no interpretation of what you are hearing, or make an abstraction of what you are hearing, or turn it into an idea, and pursue that idea, then you are off the mark entirely. But if you listen with your heart, with care, with attention, with affection, then that very listening is like a flowering. There is beauty in that listening because as we said the other day, art means to put everything in its right place.

In the same way, to observe. To observe the world as it is, the

outer world, with all the misery, poverty, degradation, vulgarity, the brutality and the appalling things that are going on, in the scientific world, in the technological world, in the world of religious organizations, the crookedness, the ambition, money, money, money and power. To observe all this without bringing your personal condemnation, or acceptance or denial, just to observe it. Have you ever observed a cloud? Have you? A cloud of an evening is full of light and colour, great beauty, just to observe it without verbalizing it, without wanting to see the beauty, just to observe. And then from the outer to observe equally that which is going on inwardly - your thoughts, your ambitions, your greed, your envy, your violence, your vulgarity, your sexuality, all that, just to observe. And then you will see if you so observe that the thing flowers, your greed flowers and dies. There is an end to it. You are never greedy again because the flower is dead, withered because you have let it come out and die naturally.

And also to learn the art of learning. Learning implies generally for most of us, accumulation of knowledge stored up in the brain, like a computer, and act according to that knowledge. That's what we call learning. It is generally accepted, the meaning of that word is generally that. But we are introducing something entirely different, which is to learn without accumulation. That is - now just a minute, I'll show it to you now. I said to learn without accumulation. To learn means to have an insight into the fact. Now insight implies grasping the full significance of, say for instance, your greed. Grasping the full nature and the structure of greed, having an insight into it, a comprehension, a total comprehension of that reaction called greed. When you have an insight there is no



need to learn, you are beyond it. I wonder. I won't even ask whether you understand, I am going on.

Because it is very important to understand these three because then if you have really captured the full significance of these three then the pressure on the brain can be understood and removed as you go along. And pressure exists on the brain when there is no space in the brain. I hope we are communicating with each other, and I am not talking to myself. Everything exists in space: the trees, the fish, the clouds, the stars, the birds and the human beings, they must have space to live. And as more and more the world is getting overpopulated space is becoming rather limited. That's an obvious fact. And so that may be one of the factors of violence. That human beings, not having enough space, living in a city, in a town, and this pressure is one of the factors of violence. Leave that, for the moment.

And as inwardly we have hardly any space at all. Right? That is, our brains are so occupied, our minds are so concerned with ourselves, with our progress, with our status, with our power, with our money, with our sex, with our anxiety, we are so occupied, the very occupation prevents space. The people may be occupied with meditation, say, do please come to that quickly, talk about it, not about all this. And you are occupied, your mind is occupied to find out how to meditate. You are occupied with it, as a woman is occupied in the kitchen, with her utensils, food and all the rest of it, so your brain is occupied. If you are a lawyer your brain is occupied, concerned with all the law and so on and so on. All our world, inner world, inside, psychologically, is in a state of constant occupation with something or other. Right? So there is no space.

And because there is no space the pressure of occupation becomes greater and greater and greater. Does all this mean anything to you? Like those people who have taken drugs for a short period, or a long period, their brains are affected, obviously. If you drink alcohol a great deal, naturally the brain is damaged. In the same way any human being who is completely occupied with something or other, whether the most sublime ideas, or with sexuality, that occupation prevents space and therefore the brain becomes more and more damaged. You can this for yourself.

The word 'leisure', or rather the word 'school' comes from the word 'leisure'. It is only when you have leisure that you can learn. Right? But when the brain, or the mind is so occupied you have no leisure, therefore you can never learn anything new. So that's one of the problems of meditation. Whether the mind - I am using the word 'mind' to indicate the brain, consciousness, with all its content, all that is the mind, I am using it specially that word. I may be wrong. I am using that word to communicate with you what I mean by the word 'mind'. The mind that is capable of reason, logic, sanity, a brain that can react, a consciousness with all its content of greed, envy, brutality, violence, ugliness, affection, all that, the whole structure of all this is the mind. So we are saying when the mind is so occupied, as most people's mind are, there is no space, no fresh air can come into it, and therefore the damage on to the brain through pressure becomes greater and greater and greater. Right? So that's one of the problems of meditation. Whether the mind, the brain, the consciousness can be free of all pressure. Which means a mind that is free. That's one thing.

We are investigating, please bear in mind what we are doing,

we are investigating into what is meditation, not how to meditate. That is the most silly question you can possibly ask: tell me how to meditate. That means you want a system, a system of meditation. The word 'system' implies perceiving the whole by collecting the parts. A system of railways, the system of political parties like the system of communism, socialism, capitalism, all that implies a state of statecism. System goes with the word 'static'. So when you say, teach me, or, teach us, or, help us to understand or to meditate, you want a system which will help you to meditate. System implies also, stare, to stand, not move. For the speaker there is no system of meditation because you can practise, practise, practise, like a man who practises on the piano the wrong note all the time. And that's what you are doing.

So we are asking, looking into this question of meditation, that the mind must be totally free from any pressure. Which means no pressure of will. Please this becomes rather difficult and I hope you don't mind if I go into it very deeply. Because in meditation the act of will has come totally to an end. Will is the essence of desire, a heightened form of desire. Desire we have gone into, I won't repeat that, we haven't time. So it is the heightened form of desire, will. And we act all our lives through will - I will do this, I must not do that, I will become something great. The very essence of will is ambition, violence. Right? Is it possible to act in daily life without the act of will? Which means without control, which doesn't mean you act without control. But to understand the significance of will and control.

For most of us, all our life we are trained, educated, cultivated, conditioned to control. Control your anger, control your sexuality,

control your whatever you are controlling. You have never enquired into who is the controller. And if you say, who is the controller, you will say, it is the higher self. But is it? The controller is put together by thought - right? - is the permanent centre - or rather, the semi-permanent centre, a centre which thought has created as the controller who knows a great deal, who has experienced a great deal, who is much wiser and so on. So that controller controls all our action. And we are questioning the controller itself, whether he is not also a part of thought. Therefore if he is a part of thought, which he is when you go into it, the contradiction between the controller and the controlled comes to an end. I am not going to ask if you understand; I don't care if you understand. You must travel together. You must give your heart to all this, not just stare and listen, listen, you are used to being lectured to, talked at. We are not doing that, we are investigating together happily, easily, with some care, affection, and then you will begin to see this for yourself.

So is it possible to act in life, in daily life, without will, without control? See the significance of that question. When specially you have been educated to control. You will say, if I have no control I will do everything I want to do. The world will become more chaotic than it is. Perhaps the world is more chaotic as it is because it has learnt to control. So you must go into this question. And the controller is the essence of desire, varying from time to time. Therefore there is always conflict between the controller and the controlled. I'll show you in a minute. That is, when you traditionally accept meditation, and try to concentrate, try to control your thoughts. That's what most meditation are about, first,

begin, that you control your thoughts. Right? Isn't that so? No? Have you ever done any kind of meditation? If you have - not that I have done it, because I reject the whole thing in toto - if you have, your thoughts wander off all over the place, and then you say, 'I must think of this', and so there is a battle going on, with thought wandering off and you pulling it back, the controller pulling it back, and this battle goes on for the rest of your life. And you think you are a tremendous person when you have controlled your thoughts so completely you are master of it. But you never ask, the controller itself is the product of thought. So you are playing games with yourself.

We are saying in meditation, if you are interested in it, if you pursue it to its utmost depth and height, mind must be completely free of all action of will. The action of will exists when there is choice. Right? I choose that and go along there. When there is choice there is confusion. Right? When you are confused you begin to choose. Right? Only when you are clear there is no choice. So choice, will, control, go together and prevent the total freedom of the mind. That's one point.

The other is, our consciousness. Please follow all this. I am going into it step by step. Our consciousness. We think our particular consciousness is different from mine, or from another. Is that so? Your consciousness contains all the culture that has been poured into that mind, the tradition, the books that you have read, the struggle, the conflict, the misery, the confusion, the vanities, the arrogance, the cruelties, grief, sorrow, pleasure, all that is your consciousness - as a Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, that's your consciousness. Right? The content of that makes your

consciousness. The book is its content. That's simple. So consciousness is its content. Now is it possible to be free of the content? That is, not being a Hindu, not being a Muslim and all the implications of it, not having greed, envy, anxiety, fear, the pursuit of pleasure, sorrow, all that, can the mind, consciousness as we do it, be free of its content. This is very important if you want to take a long journey into meditation, it is very important to understand this. Not how to empty the consciousness of its content but to become aware of it first. To become aware that you are a Hindu, with all the implications of it: the superstition, the dogma, the tradition, the puja, the meaningless things that you do in religion. Are you conscious of your envy, your greed, your ambition, your utter lack of relationship with another, lack of love? Are you aware of this content?

Now, awareness implies, to observe the world as it is, to know the world, the trees, nature, the beauty and the ugliness. And also to be aware of your neighbour, their sari, dress, to be aware. And also to be aware inwardly, what you are actually - not what you think you are. To be actually aware of what you are. If you are aware, so aware, you will see that there are a great many reactions, like and dislike, punishment and reward, in that awareness. So can you be aware without any choice, a choiceless awareness? Just to be aware without choosing, without direction, without prejudice.

So, to become totally aware of our consciousness. That means, please, it will become a little more difficult, which means can consciousness become aware of itself? Not being asked to be aware and that then becomes a pressure, but to naturally become aware choicelessly of your consciousness. Can consciousness become

aware of itself? Which means also, can thought, your thinking, become aware of itself? That is, the brain is like a computer, it is registering. Registering your experiences, your hopes, your desires, your ambitions, it is registering every impression, and from that impression, from that registration, thought arises. That's the original man - not original man - the anthropoid ape for example, the nearest to man, it registers, it remembers, therefore it begins to think. From registration thought arises. Now we are asking can there be an awareness of the thought arising. As you can be aware of your anger arising - you can be aware of that, can't you. No? Are you all asleep? Or am I putting so much in this talk? It doesn't matter.

So as one can be aware of anger arising, so can we be aware of thought beginning? Which means to be aware of the thing flowering, growing. In the same way, is there an awareness of consciousness, the totality of it? This is part of meditation, this is the essence of meditation, to be aware without any choice, of the world outside you and the immense complex world inside you. So when you come to that point you will see that the world is not separate from you, the world is you. So by consciousness becoming aware of itself then the parts that make up consciousness disappear, consciousness then becomes quite a different thing, it is a consciousness of the whole, not of the part. You won't understand, it doesn't matter. That's one point.

Then as most of us are accustomed to systems, various forms of yoga, various forms of government, various forms of bureaucratic rule, they are all based on systems. You go to your guru and he will give you a system of meditation. Or you pick up a book and learn

from that book a system. As I said, system implies the comprehension of the whole through the part, collecting the part you hope to understand the totality of existence. And also system implies stare, to stand, not move. System is the opposite of dynamism. Right? So all your brain, mind is trained to follow systems: political systems, religious systems, yogic systems, your guru's systems, or your own invention of systems. Therefore when you are following a system you are static. And that's the easiest way to live, to follow a system, like a railway that keeps going along the lines. And we are never aware that we are like the railway, running on lines, grooves.

So, concentration, as we said, is resistance to all other forms of thought. Right? Concentrate. Therefore you cultivate resistance. Whereas we are saying, concentration at a certain level is necessary, like a schoolboy, even there if he can learn how to attend then concentration becomes very easy. So we are going to find out now, that is part of meditation, what it means to attend. Right?

So we have talked about awareness, concentration and attention. Do you attend anything? Attend. That means give your heart, your mind, all your senses completely to something. Do you? When you so attend, that is, when all your senses are completely awake and observing, then in that process, or in that quality of attention there is no centre. Right? When there is no centre there is no limitation to space. Because most of us have centres, which is the form of the 'me', the ego, the personality, the character, the tendency, the idiosyncrasy, the peculiarities, there is a centre in each one, which is the essence of the self, which is selfishness. Wherever there is a



centre the space must always be limited. Right? Just see it. And if there is no centre there is no idea of border. And that is why we are saying a mind that is occupied is forming all the time a centre. And therefore its occupation is limiting the space. So we are saying when there is total attention, that is, when you observe, hear, learn with all your senses awakened there is no centre.

So we will move on next. From this arises, when you have done all this, if you have done it, in daily life, with your relationship, with your wife, with your neighbour, with everybody, relationship with nature. Relationship means to be related. You can only be related to another if you have no image about yourself or about another, then you are directly related, but we have images, pictures, sexual or otherwise, pictures. And these pictures, these remembrances prevent relationship. So out of this comes compassion. That is passion for all. And that can only take place when you know - not, when you know - when there is this perfume, this quality of love, which is not desire, which is not pleasure, which is not the action of thought. Therefore love is not a thing put together by thought, by environment, by sensation. Love is not emotion. Love is not sensation, but in this country, if I may point out, there is no love because you have been living for centuries and millennia on theories and words. And also each man is out for himself. Don't say, does this love exist abroad. That's not the point. When the speaker speaks abroad he will then tell them what he thinks there. But you don't have to say, does this exist in Europe. It's like asking a politician, this country is very corrupt, isn't it, and the politician says, yes, but no so corrupt as my neighbour. So that's an evasion, not facts.

So in this country love doesn't exist. Love means the love of rocks, the love of trees, love of a strange dog, love of the skies, the beauty, the sunset, love of your neighbour. Love, without all the sensation of sexuality with which it is identified now. Love cannot exist when you are ambitious, when you are seeking power, position, money. How can a man love you if you are a wife or a husband, when all his mind is concentrated on becoming something, power in the world. He can sleep with you, have children, but that's not love, that's lust, with all its misery. And without love you cannot have compassion. And where there is compassion there is clarity, clarity of the mind, not logical clarity, which is another thing, to think clearly, objectively, non-personally, to reason sanely, that also brings certain clarity. But we are not talking of that clarity. The light that comes from compassion, therefore every act is clear. And from that clarity comes skill. Skill in communication, skill in action, skill in the art of listening, learning, observing. But for us skill has become a means of self-expression. Skill of an engineer, of a chemist, he is concerned about himself, how his skill is helping him to strengthen himself. You see all this round you.

And so we are saying, meditation is the awakening of that intelligence that's born out of compassion, clarity and the skill that intelligence uses. The word 'intelligence' means not only what is to be read between the two lines, horizontally as well as vertically but much more than that. That intelligence that is non-personal, non-cultivable, that comes only out of compassion and clarity. All this is meditation, much more. And the 'more' is when the mind is free and therefore completely quiet. It cannot be quiet if there is no

space. The stillness of a night, because there is vast immense space.

So silence can only come not through practice, not through control, not the silence between two noises, not the peace between two wars, silence comes when the body, the mind is in complete harmony, without any friction. Then in that silence there is a total movement which is the end of time. That means time has come to an end.

There is much more in meditation, which is to find that which is most sacred, not the sacredness of the idols in a temple, or in a church, or in a mosque - mosques don't have idols but they have their own form of peculiar idols - those are man-made, handmade, made by the mind, by thought. So there is sacredness which is not touched by thought, that can only come about naturally, easily and happily when we have brought about complete order in our daily life. When there is such order in our daily life - order means no conflict - then out of that comes this quality of love, compassion and clarity. And meditation is all this, not something that you escape from life, from our daily living. And those who know the quality of this meditation are blessed.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 2ND APRIL 1977

I don't quite know how to begin these talks. As there are going to be six talks and seven discussions, I'd like to point out, if I may, that we are going to think over together our problems, we're going to use reason, clear thinking, and not any kind of assertive beliefs, opinions, judgements, or any form of conclusion. And therefore it becomes rather serious. It is not an entertainment, a morning off or an afternoon, Saturday and Sunday, but rather a serious gathering to consider very deeply the many human conflicts, problems, sorrows, pleasures, fears, and the nature of meditation and so on. We're going to go into all these talks, into all these matters.

But first I'd like to point out, if I may, the speaker is not trying to convince you of anything. Please believe it. He's not persuading you to think along his particular line. Again, please believe it. He's not offering a particular set of ideologies, nor beliefs, nor conclusions, because these have separated the world, human beings, one against the other. So we're not in any way concerned with any of those matters, neither belief, conclusion, opinions or judgements. But we are going together, and we mean together, you and the speaker, carefully, objectively, to look what is happening around us, not romantically, not sentimentally, but just to observe, without any conclusion, without offering any opinion, but just to look and reason together, think over together. And I think it's very important to understand that word 'together'. Most of us are accustomed to go to meetings or gatherings of this kind, either to accept what the speaker is saying or to reject, one opinion or one idea against another. Or persuade you through clever

argumentation to follow or accept what he's saying. And therefore we are thinking together over these problems, sharing together. And this is really very important to understand, if I may go on with it, because one is apt to listen as though somebody was talking out these, and you're casually accepting or denying.

So it seems to me, that's your responsibility, responsibility being that you undertake seriously, to think together, to find out the accurate, true solutions to these problems, that we human beings are tormented with. So it behoves, on the part of each one of us, that reasoning, the capacity to think logically, sanely, wholly, becomes very important. We're apt to think anything that is the product of reason, clear thinking is too intellectual, and therefore not for each one of us. But on the contrary, I feel if we can think, observe, reason together, putting aside our personal conclusions, opinions, evaluations, what we like and what we don't like, what we're attracted to and so on, if we can put aside all those things, and able to think together, deeply, sanely, that is, objectively, wholly, then I think we shall be able to deeply transform ourselves. Because, when one goes round the world, as the speaker does, from India, Europe, and here, one sees great sorrow, wars, violence, all kinds of stupidities, terrorism, killing, drugs. You know what is happening as well as I do. And we are accepting these as though they are inevitable. And as most of us are traditionally minded, we naturally and easily put up with these things. Or we revolt against them. But revolt is a reaction, like Communism is a reaction to Capitalism, or Fascism.

So, without revolt, without going against something, and forming our own little group or communes, or following a

particular guru or another guru, from India or from this country, and they are bursting like mushrooms all over the world, these gurus, unfortunately. But if we could, without accepting any kind of authority, because in spiritual matters there is no authority, there is no guru, there is no priest, there are no sanctions. And this is very important to understand if we are going to go together, investigating into all these problems that we human beings have had, centuries upon centuries, generation after generation. So first, if one may point out, there is no authority here, we are friends, two friends talking over together our conflicts, our uncertainties, our travail, the things that we human beings go through in our life, and end in death, without understanding what it is all about, or committed to a particular action, thinking that will solve all our human conflicts and miseries and fears.

When that is clearly and definitely understood, that there is no authority, the speaker has no authority whatsoever, though he may be sitting on a platform, because that's merely for convenience, so that we can all see each other. But a little height doesn't give him any authority. And so don't put him into authority, place him into, give him authority. And I really mean this, because in psychological matters, which we are going to investigate very deeply together, there is no authority, whether it is the European psychologists or the modern psychologists or the gurus or the books, or the saviours, ancient or modern, in that field of psychology to accept authority is to deny clarity, clear thinking, logic, and to be sane, and therefore whole. The word 'whole' implies having good health, having sanity, and also it implies h-o-l-y, holy. So when we use the word 'whole', holistic, it implies all

that, health, sanity, clarity, and that which is holy, complete. So, as we were saying, in the psychological field, as there is no authority, we are putting aside all that people have told us, if we can, which is very difficult, and examine, step by step, again, if we can, into the enormous problem of existence, our daily living.

Psychologically, inwardly, we human beings, wherever we are, are the world - psychologically. The world is us, the world is me and I am the world. And that is a psychological, absolute fact, though you may have white skin, brown skin or black skin or whatever it is outwardly, affluent, rich, prosperous, many cars, all the rest of it. Or you may be very poor. But inwardly, deep down, we're all the same, we suffer, we're lonely, we're in sorrow, conflict, misery, confusion, depending on somebody to tell us what to do, how to think, what to think. We are slaves to propaganda, from the various churches and various religions, sects - that's what's happening all over the world, not only politically, by the experts, by the governments and so on, but inwardly, deep down we are slaves to propaganda, we are conditioned human beings, whether we live in India, in America or here.

I hope that one realizes that, not intellectually, not verbally because that has very little meaning, but actually see the fact of it, that you living in America, with all the riches, marvellous country, crazy people, drug-minded, you know, all that's happening in this country, the violence, the brutality, the divisive communes, based on their beliefs and so on. But when you sweep all that aside, put all that aside, whether here or in India or in Europe, we go through the same mill of misfortune, uncertainty, deep sorrow. So we are actually, psychologically, the world, and the world is you. Once

you realize this fact, not verbally, not ideologically or as a statement of fact, but actually, deeply feel the fact, realize the fact, that you are not different from the other, however far away he is, inwardly, because he suffers enormously, he's terribly frightened, uncertain, insecure, both physiologically as well as psychologically.

And when you realize that, and in examination of that realization you're not concerned with your little self, you're concerned with the total human being. You understand this? With the total humanity, which is you, because you are the world. So when we are talking about these matters, we are concerned with the human being, not with Mr X or Y or somebody else, because he is the total psychological entity as a human being, wherever he lives. I hope this is clear. This is factual. You may be conditioned in a particular way, you may be Catholic, a Protestant, god knows what else you are, Baptists and, you know, Jesus-minded - you're conditioned. And in India, which is the same, they are conditioned by thousands of years of certain kinds of beliefs, superstitions, ideas, gods and all the rest of it. But below that conditioning, in the depth of their human mind, when they're alone, when they are facing life, there is sorrow, there is pain, there is grief, there is anxiety.

So you are the world and the world is you. And when one sees that as an actual irrevocable fact, then you begin to think entirely differently, then you begin to observe, not personal, as a personal individual having troubles and anxieties, but the whole entire humanity is having it. Then it gives you an extraordinary strength. I don't know if you follow all this. It gives you extraordinary



vitality, then you are not alone, you are the entire history of mankind, if you know how to read that book which is you.

And that's what we are going to do, we're going to read together the history of mankind, enshrined in you, as a human being. This is not rhetoric, this is not a verbal explosion, but a serious factor we're deeply concerned with, a fact which we deny, because we think we are so individualistic, we are so concerned with ourselves, with our petty little problems, with our little gurus, with our little beliefs, but when you realize an extraordinary fact, then either it gives you tremendous strength, a great urgency to investigate and transform oneself because you are mankind. And when there is such transformation, you affect the whole consciousness of man. I don't know if you realize this. You actually affect the whole consciousness of man because you are the entire humanity, and when you change fundamentally, deeply, when there is psychological revolution in you, then naturally as you are part of that consciousness of a human being, which is the rest of the humanity, the consciousness of the world is affected. You see the reason of it, the logic of it. Your consciousness is affected by the various prophets, the various warmongers, Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, you know, all those people have affected mankind, but we're not aware of it.

And what we're going to do together, during these talks, is to penetrate the layers of our consciousness, and investigate whether it is possible to transform the content of our consciousness and out of that a different dimension of energy and clarity may come into being. That's what we're concerned with, and therefore it's a serious matter, not to be played with. If you're not interested, if you are not

serious, don't waste your time coming here, it's a waste of your energy, and I really mean it, because this is very, very serious, and it is voluntary, not a thing that you are persuaded or rewarded - because our conditioning is reward and punishment. But in investigating our consciousness, which is the entire consciousness of mankind, we are delving into ourselves, and from there discover, come up on what is truth.

Having laid that, said all that, which is necessary, which is probably one of the most important things, which is the first step and therefore the last step, let us begin by investigating what human beings demand, what human beings basically, fundamentally, inwardly demand, ask. Which is, what is it that as a human being who is the representative of the world, and therefore he is the world, psychologically, what is the most, innermost demand of such a human being. Don't answer me, please - this is a question we are put so that we can think about it together.

Most human beings in one part of their consciousness, want to find both biological, physiological, as well as psychological security. You must have food, clothes and shelter. That's an absolute necessity. But also we want, we demand, we crave, we search for psychological security. To be psychologically certain about everything. Look into yourself, observe, use the speaker, if I may point out, as a mirror. The words which he's using are merely description, but the description is not the described. Right? Therefore you are looking at yourself and finding out what is the innermost demand that you want, that human beings want. And this whole struggle in the world, both psychologically as well as physiologically, is to find security. No? The word 'security' means

to be secure, your physical permanency, physically to be well, physically to continue, advance, grow, whatever it is; and psychologically, inwardly to find security, to find something that is permanent, because everything, psychologically, if you observe very carefully, is very impermanent. Your relationships, psychologically, are terribly uncertain. You may be temporarily secure in your relationship with another, man, woman, all the rest of it, temporarily. But that very temporary security is a danger of it being, becoming completely insecure.

Do please examine it, don't accept it, we are thinking over together, we are reasoning. To see the logic, the reason, the sanity of it, not because the speaker asserts it, not because he has some beastly reputation, because all those things are irrelevant when you are really going into something very, very serious.

So one asks, is there any security, psychologically, at all? That is, one seeks psychological security in the family. We'll go step by step into it - in the family, the family being the wife, the children. There you try to find in the wife, a relationship that will be secure, lasting, permanent, permanent being relative, because there is always death. And not always finding it, there are divorces, quarrels and all the misery, jealousies, anger, hatred that goes on. You must be aware of all this, aren't you? And also one tries to find security in a community, with a group of people, with the communes, large or small. One tries to find security in the world, a nation. I'm an American, I'm a Hindu, that gives a tremendous sense of identity with a group, and therefore security. Do please, as we said, listen to it, not reject it. There may be reason behind it, or there might not, but a serious man examines it, doesn't reject or

accept.

And so when you try to find security psychologically in a nation, and therefore that nation is different from another nation, naturally there is division, and where there is division between nations, in which you have invested psychologically your security, there are wars, there are economic pressures, divisions - that's what is actually going on in the world. Right?

And if you seek security in ideologies - Communist ideology, the Capitalist ideology, religious ideology, conclusions, images, crosses and all the rest of it all over the world - again there is division. You believe in one set of ideals which you like, which give you comfort, in which you seek security, with a group of people who believe the same kind of nonsense. And another group believe another thing, and the same thing, people are divided. Religions have divided people. Right? The Christians, the Buddhists, the Hindus, the Muslims, you know, the Baptists, divide, again they are at each other, each believing something extraordinary, romantic, which is unrealistic, unreal, not factual.

So, seeing all this, not as a theory, not as something to be avoided or becoming supercilious or intellectual, or being attached emotionally, but seeing all this very clearly, one asks, is there psychological security at all. Right? You understand my question? And if there is no psychological security, then what is a human being? It becomes a chaos. Right? He loses his identity, because he's identified with America, he's identified with Jesus, he's identified with Buddha, he's identified with a nation and so on and so on, when reason, logic says how absurd all this is. Then does one go into despair or - please listen to this - or because you have

observed the fallacy of these divisive processes, the unreality of these fictions, myths, fantasies which have no basis, and the very perception of that, is that not intelligence? Not the intelligence of a clever, cunning mind, not the intelligence of book knowledge, but the intelligence which comes out of clear observation. Right?

In that observation which brings about extraordinary intelligence, there is security, therefore that means that very intelligence is secure. No, please, you must have it, not agree with me and say, 'Yes, how extraordinary, I didn't think of that before,' but it must be part of you, it must be you that are finding it, not me that have found it and tell you and therefore you accept it or reject it. You see the difference?

As we said at the beginning, I'm not out to, the speaker is not out to convince you of anything - I'm not a propagandist - I don't want you to think as I think, because I don't think at all. And I mean it. We'll go into that later on, because that's an extraordinary fact, the capacity to observe without thought, therefore in that observation have a tremendous insight, and that insight is supreme intelligence, and that intelligence acts - which we'll go into, when we are discussing the whole structure and the nature of thought.

But as most of us will not let go, will not, are so frightened to let go and not finding security. You understand? I can let go, one can let go being a Catholic, Protestant, Communist, all the rest of that nonsense very easily. But when you do let go, when you cleanse yourself of all this, either you do it as a reaction, or you do it because you have observed intelligently, holistically, with great clarity, the absurdity, the fantasies, the make-believes. And because you observe without any distortion, because you're not out

to get something from it, because you're not thinking in terms of punishment and reward, because you observe very clearly, then that very clarity of perception is intelligence. In that there is extraordinary security, not that you become secure, but intelligence is secure.

Are we meeting each other? Is there communication between each other? Or is it merely a verbal communication?

Communication verbally is necessary, to use the correct word, and unfortunately in America the correct word is not being used - they use any old sloppy word and think they convey. But we're using correct words. And communication implies not only the usage and the comprehension on both sides, the meaning and the significance of the word correctly, but also it implies that we share, share what is being said, which is the responsibility of sharing, partaking together. So we are not merely communicating verbally, but also deeply sharing the fact: the fact being, the absolute fact, not relative fact, the absolute fact that there is no security in anything that man has invented, psychologically. All our religions are inventions, put together by thought. All our divisive endeavour, which come about when there are beliefs, dogmas, rituals, which is the whole substance of religion, when you see all this very clearly, not as an idea, but as a fact, then that very fact reveals the extraordinary quality of intelligence, in which there is complete, whole security. Right? I hope you see this fact of intelligence now, not tomorrow - don't go home and say, 'I'll think it over.' When you think it over tomorrow, you've already distorted it, but we are thinking together now, using our reason, our capacity to think clearly. So communication of the fact between you and the speaker

is now, not eventually, not when it's convenient for you. Then you have lost time, you have wasted days and months. You don't do that when the house is on fire, you do, act.

So when you are concerned, as we are, I hope, all of us together, when you are concerned deeply with the transformation of man, because man must radically transform - when I use the word 'man' I am also including the woman, we are not talking about equal rights, women and men, the Women's Liberation, and all that. We are talking, when we say 'man', man - woman, so please forgive if I use that word 'man'. Don't write me letters, say, 'Why don't you also use woman'. As it has been done - which means they are not really listening, which means they are not, they are still thinking partially. We are thinking together holistically, as a whole, not you and I, separate human beings thinking together, we are looking at something together. You know, when you feel that we are doing something together there's a great deal of care, there's a great deal of attention, there's a great sense of sympathy, affection. And I'm using that word in all that sense together.

So in our consciousness, one of the factors is this demand and the search for psychological security. And when we are seeking psychological security in nations, in beliefs, in gurus, in books, in ideas and so on, in leaders, then because it brings about division, therefore physiologically there are divisions - Hindu, Buddhist, different nation, Englishman, American, Dutch, German, you know, division. And therefore when there is psychological attachment to a belief, to a nation, there is insecurity, physiologically. You understand, sir? Isn't that so? Isn't that a fact. When I'm attached to India - I'm not - when I'm attached to India

and all that nonsense which represents India, just the image, the romanticism, you know, all that bilge - so when I'm attached to that, I separate myself from the rest of the world, psychologically, and therefore division invariably brings conflict. When there is division between man and woman - you understand? You are married, you've got all this misery in you. When there is division there must be conflict, inevitably, that's an absolute law. And this division is brought about by the attachment to psychological ideas. Therefore there is poverty, degradation, wars, terror in the world, the world is becoming a dangerous place to live.

So is it possible then for a human being, you, who are the world - please, that is the central issue in this matter - you are the world and the world is you. And the world out there and out here, inside, traditionally has been conditioned to be a fragment, a fragment - American fragment, Indian fragment and so on, Catholic fragment - therefore outwardly there is no peace. Right? And man cannot exist without peace, he cannot create, he cannot have affection, he cannot have compassion, love.

So part of this consciousness of man is the fact of the search and the demand and the attachment to a fragment, in which he hopes to find security. And to transform that fragment in which man has invested, hoping to find security, to completely transform that, can only come about when there is intelligence, intelligence which is perfection. I went into that. Right? Right, sir? Do you see it? And is there now, not tomorrow, when you go home and think about it - then you're lost - is there now, as you're sitting there, listening, using your reason, capacity, energy, affection, care, and attention, is there that transformation taking place? If not, you're not



listening, you're not exercising your capacity to think clearly. Or you're caught in verbal images; or in a symbol to which you are attached, because if you let go that symbol you're frightened, and therefore you're lonely and all that begins. We'll discuss fear later on.

But as we are listening together, reasoning together, gathering our energies, is there that transformation, which is the freedom, complete freedom from trying to find security in a fragment. You understand? Is there freedom? Please ask it, demand it, because we're going to go into very complex matters - this is only just the beginning of it, because we're going to together go into this whole problem of what is consciousness, and the content of consciousness. Without the content there is no consciousness. Because part of the content of your consciousness, human consciousness, is this demand for security. Right? Security in god, which again is a word, a symbol, a belief, security in a nation, security in a group, security in a commune, security in the wife, the children, security in ideas, you know. That is part of our consciousness, that consciousness has been put together through millennia upon millennia, which we call evolution. A fragment cannot evolve, it will always remain a fragment. I wonder if you see this. A fragment cannot become the whole.

So part of our consciousness, which is the human consciousness of the world, a fragment of that consciousness is the demand and the search for psychological security. And that's one of the fragments of the content of our consciousness. Therefore the content makes for consciousness. See the truth of it, the reason of it. Part of one's consciousness says, 'I am an American, I am a

Buddhist, I am this, I am that.' Or I've identified myself with something or other. And this identification is the demand or the desire to find security. That security either temporarily or permanently, there is no permanent security. And if there is temporary security, then that leads to havoc, as we pointed out.

So, can you, as you have listened for an hour, with your heart and mind, can you actually be aware of the fact that you're free of it? If you're not, either you haven't exercised your capacity to reason or to listen to somebody who says, 'Do please, for god's sake, look at this.' And you won't look. And if you don't look, nobody's going to persuade you, certainly not the speaker. Persuasion, propaganda, threats, offering rewards or punishment will never help you to look. If you look under compulsion it is distorted.

So can you, as a human being, after talking over together for an hour, see this extraordinary fact, and seeing the fact and the reality of it, free part of that consciousness of the fragment which is the demand, the search for security. Therefore the mind becomes extraordinarily awakened. You understand? It can then go into the problem of fear - which we will tomorrow and so on - into the enormous content of our consciousness. And ultimately the question is, can the content be completely emptied? You understand, sir? Emptied so that - empty, not something else. That means, reward.

So we'll stop today, if you don't mind, because we've talked for a hour, and to listen for an hour about serious things is quite difficult - probably you're not used to this kind of thing. I can go on but not you. So if you don't mind, we'll stop and meet again

tomorrow morning.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 3RD APRIL 1977

I'm sure most of you will understand the importance of leisure. Because it's only when you have leisure that you learn. The meaning of that word 'leisure', according to a very good dictionary, means not having any occupation. At the time when we are talking over together, not to be occupied all the time, psychologically, physically or intellectually, just have plenty of leisure so that one can learn. That's really the meaning of a school, where one can learn easily, without conflict, when your mind is not occupied with so many other problems. So if I may suggest this morning, and the rest of the other mornings that we meet here, that you are not occupied, that your minds are not filled with problems, anxieties, occupations, trying to solve problems. But that we are here together to have actually leisure, so that when we talk over things together, as we're going to, that leisure, which is the mind not being occupied, not chattering, not trying to find out, just having plenty of leisure, so that in that state one can learn.

There are two types of learning, either memorize what is being said, which is what most of us call learning, or learning through observation, and therefore not storing it up as a memory and then looking, observing through memory. I'm going to explain it. Then, as we said, there are two types of learning. One is to learn something by heart, so that you store it up in the brain and act according to that, knowledge, skilfully, or not skilfully. That's what most of us do. When we go to school, college and university, we store up a great deal of information called knowledge, and according to that knowledge, act, beneficially for oneself or for

society, skilfully or incapable of acting, simply, directly. That's one type of learning, with which we are all very familiar, which we do all the time, every experience is stored up as knowledge, and acted according to that, action taking place according to that knowledge. So that's very clear. I expect for most of us, it is so.

Then there is another kind of learning, which probably you're not quite accustomed to, because we are such slaves to habits, to tradition, to every form of conformity. There is the other type of learning, as we were saying, which is, to observe. Observation implies, to see without the accompaniment of previous knowledge, to look at something as though for the first time, afresh. And if you observe things afresh, then there is not the cultivation of memory, because each time you observe through that observation you learn, store it up as memory, then the next time you observe, you are observing through the pattern of memory, therefore you never see anything fresh.

So as we were saying, leisure is extraordinarily important, not to have a mind that is constantly occupied, constantly chattering, because it's only in that unoccupied mind a new seed of learning can take place. Which is entirely different from the memory, cultivating memory, storing up as knowledge and acting from that knowledge.

As we were saying, there is another kind of learning, which is, to observe, the tree, the skies, the mountains, the beauty of the mountains, the light among the leaves. And that observation if stored up as memory will prevent the next observation being fresh. You get this point - it's quite simple. That is, if you observe your wife or your girl friend or boy friend, if you observe, can you

observe without the previous recording of the incidents, and all the rest of it, in that particular relationship. If you observe or watch the other without the previous knowledge, then you learn much more. I wonder if you're understanding what I'm talking about - am I conveying anything or nothing at all?

You see, for me, the most important thing is, among a great many other things, is to observe. And we mean by observe, observing not to have the division between the observer and the observed. Most of us have this division; the observer who is the total summation of past experiences, knowledge and all that, which is the past, then that past observes, so there is a division between the observer and the observed. That is the source of conflict. Right? I wonder if you see this.

As we said yesterday, wherever there is division there must be conflict, between races, between people, between two individuals, husband, wife, boy or girl, nations, divisions of belief, division of churches, any form of division must bring about conflict. That's clear. Now, is it possible, not to have that conflict at all, right through one's life? You understand my question? We are traditional, we traditionally accept this conflict, this struggle, this everlasting fight, not only physiologically, that is, to survive, but also psychologically, the good and the bad, and so on, the division.

So is it at all possible to live a life without a single effort, because if there is constant effort, there is no peace. Right? Please, we're communicating with each other, you're not listening to a speaker agreeing or disagreeing, but we are sharing the thing together, we are travelling together, we are concerned about all this together, therefore it is ours, not mine or - it is ours.

So we're asking, as man has lived centuries upon centuries a life of battle, conflict, both outwardly and inwardly, constant struggle to achieve, and then fear of losing, dropping. We are all familiar with all this. Now we're asking, is it possible not to have any conflict or even a shadow of conflict in one's life, otherwise you can never have peace. You may talk endlessly about peace, but there will be no peace as long as man is conditioned to the acceptance of conflict. So we are asking, is it possible to live a life, daily life in all stratus of life, both outwardly and inwardly, a life that is absolutely without conflict.

Now when you listen to that, don't please, if I may suggest, accept it or deny it. Don't say, it is not possible. Or say, it is possible. If you say, it is possible, then it's just an idea and therefore valueless. But if you say, it is not possible, then you block yourself. So we are together investigating this question. And investigation can only take place when you have leisure - leisure being your mind not being occupied with other problems. We are here together, because you have leisure this morning, you came. Near or far, from far, and together, having leisure, which means, a mind that is not occupied with daily problems and therefore willing to learn and see if that is possible to live that way all of one's days. Are we meeting each other? Somewhere? Not verbally, I hope, but actually, because it's our problem, because life is becoming more and more difficult, mere survival, physical survival is becoming enormously difficult - over-population, national divisions, economic qualities, you know, all the rest that is happening. Life is becoming extraordinarily difficult.

And the mere physical survival, one is conditioned to the fact

that one must make tremendous effort to achieve a position and hold it. You know all this. And if you don't hold it, if you don't struggle, you might lose everything, you might be crushed, you might fall down and all that. So we're asking a very, very serious question - do please give your attention to it. Is it possible to live without a single shadow of conflict?

Conflict exists when there is division, the 'me' and the 'you', 'we' and 'they', the American, the Russian, the ideology of this group and the ideologies of that group and so on and on. Psychologically first, which is most important, not physiologically. If one understands very deeply the nature and the structure of conflict psychologically, and perhaps end it there, then you will be able to deal with the physiological factor. But if you are only concerned with the physiological factor, biological factor, to survive, then you'll find it enormously difficult, you can't probably do it at all.

So we are concerned as we have leisure this morning sitting down together in a beautiful place, with a lot of shadow, green trees, mountains and the cool breeze - I hope it's not too cold - and having leisure we are examining, exploring together the fact whether one can live a life that is really without conflict and therefore with deep care, affection, attention. Right? Have you got the question?

So we ask, why is there this conflict, psychologically. First psychologically. Why? From ancient days, both historically and religiously, and economically and so on, there has been this division between the good and the bad. I do not know if you are aware of the ancient caves in the south of France, north of Africa, in their caves, where there is a painting, probably, they say it is



25,000 years old - don't write to me and tell me, 'You are wrong about the date.' - where there is this constant, in symbolic form, the fight between the good and the evil. It existed in Sumeria, 7,000 B. C., and down to the present time. The good opposed to the evil, the righteous and the unrighteous, the angel and the devil. We are all familiar with this. We are conditioned to this division. And, as we have leisure, and I'm going to insist on that during these talks, we're going to investigate the fact, whether there is this division at all. Or only 'what is', and not it's opposite. You understand? There is, suppose there is anger, that is the fact, that is 'what is'. But not to be angry is not a fact. So the fact and the non-fact, that is, the good opposed to the evil. And we are asking why human beings have divided this, how has it come about, this division, god and the devil, you know, the whole mythological as well as intellectual and so on - why this division. Is it because we look at everything from the past - one of the factors. The past being all that you have learnt, all that you have experienced, and living in the past you look at the present, not as the present but from the past. I wonder if you see it. Are we communicating with each other - I do hope - let's - if we're not I would like to go over it in a different way.

We're asking why human beings live in this division, therefore in conflict. We are saying, one of the factors is, this constant living in the past, which dictates all our action, which is the factor of the unconscious. I won't go into that for a moment but later on, and I hope that a lot of prominent psychologists are here, analysts, I hope they'll go well along with me slowly. We have never questioned this division, we accept it, because we are very traditional by nature, habit, we don't want anything new. And that being a factor,

another factor is, that there is a division between the observer and the observed. When you look at a mountain you are looking at it as an observer, so there is an observer and the thing observed, which you call a mountain. The word is not the thing. Right? The word 'mountain' is not the mountain. But to us the word is very important. So when you look at that, instantly the response is, 'That's a mountain,' - the word. Now can you look at that mountain, at the thing called 'mountain' without the word, because a word is a factor of division. I wonder if you're getting all this. When you say, 'It's my wife,' the word 'my' creates the division. We'll go into it when we talk about relationship.

So one of the factors of this division is the word, the name. And the word and the name is a memory, is part of thought. And when we look at a thing, the man or the woman or the mountain, the tree, whatever it is, division takes place when the name, the memory, thought comes into being. Right? So is there an observation, without the word, without the name, without the attachment to that particular form and symbol, and to observe without all that.

Is this getting difficult? So can you observe without the observer, who is the past? You understand? Who is the past, who is the essence of all the memories, experiences, the reactions and so on, which are the past. And look at something without the past, without the observer. When you do that, there is only the observed, so there is no division. You understand? And so no conflict, psychologically. Are you doing it or are you just memorizing what is being said? Can you look at your girl friend or wife or whatever, your nearest intimate friend, can you look or observe her or him without the name, the word, and all the experiences that you have

gathered in that relationship, which is memory, which is the past, and look? And when you so look, what takes place? Then you're looking at him or her for the first time. You understand? For god's sake, get this. Don't please learn it, but actually, as you are, leisure and we are talking over something which is tremendously important, and learning implies doing it now, not tomorrow, not another day.

So that the observer is the observed, therefore there is only the observed. I wonder if you get this. Nobody's going to tell you all these things, no books, no gurus, no philosophers. You have to learn this from yourself. And you can only learn this from yourself when you have time, leisure, the mind not being occupied with all kinds of things.

So we are saying, it is possible to live a life that is completely, psychologically free from all conflict. Has it happened to you? Please, this is not group therapy, which is an abomination to me, personally, exposing our dirty laundry to each other. It has no meaning. But what we are actually doing is learning, not memorizing, but learning, observing the fact. And the fact will do everything if you let the fact alone. You understand? So the fact is that human beings live in the past, and therefore there is always division between the past and the present, and the future. The past being the time.

So we're saying, as long as, if I may go a little further, as long as there is a time interval in your observation, between the observer and the observed, there must be conflict. Please, don't agree with me, see, find out if this is an actual fact to you. If you have really understood this, not verbally but actually doing it, because we're

talking about a very, very serious problem which is conflict, struggle in life. And when you do not struggle, you think you're lost, and thereby be afraid of losing, which is another form of conflict.

So if you really have gone into this with the speaker, together, and discovered for yourself, not from the speaker, but discovered it for yourself that as long as there is a division between the observer, the image-maker, and the fact, which has no image but only fact, as long as there is division there must be everlasting conflict. That's a law. And can that conflict be ended. And we're pointing out or talking about it and learning that it can end.

So when there is a psychological ending of suffering, ending of conflict, which is part of suffering, then how does that apply to our livelihood, how does that apply in our relationship with each other? If this is a fact that you as a human being who is the world and the world is you, which we went into yesterday very carefully, if this is a fact, that you are actually now living a life in which there is psychologically no conflict whatsoever, then how does that ending of psychological struggle, with all its conflicts, pain, anxiety, fear, how does that apply to our daily living? You understand? To our daily going to the office etc., etc. What's your answer? If this is a fact to you, that you have ended psychological conflict, then how will you live a life without conflict outwardly?

What am I to do, if I live this kind of life, no conflict inwardly? You know what that means. When there is no conflict inside, there is no conflict outside, because there is no division between the inner and the outer. You understand? It's like ebb and flow, the sea coming in and the sea going out, but when there is this

psychologically no conflict, the ebb going out, also no conflict. You understand? What shall I do? I have to earn a livelihood, unfortunately - personally I don't. I don't because I've no problem about earning a livelihood. But you have a problem about earning a livelihood. Why haven't I a problem about not earning a livelihood, because, very simply - you're all waiting? You're a strange people all right. I've no problem because I don't mind what happens. You understand? I don't mind if I fail or succeed, I don't mind if I have money or not - personally I have no money, thank god. I don't want money, but I need food and clothes and shelter, and if somebody gives me, it's all right, if somebody doesn't, I live where I am. You understand my question? I have no problem, because I don't demand anything from anybody or from life. I wonder if you understand this.

So, I've explained, but my way of living is entirely different from yours. So if I had to earn a livelihood, what should I do? Having psychologically no conflict of any kind. You know what that means? How has it happened that I have no conflict? Is it a theory, is it a desire which has been fulfilled, is it an illusion, is it something that I've hypnotized myself into? You understand my question? Or is it an absolute, irrevocable fact, which nobody can touch, it is inviolate. You know what inviolate means? That which cannot be damaged, which cannot be touched. So if that is so, then what shall we do together - it is together - what shall we do together to earn a livelihood? Because there is no conflict, therefore there is no ambition. Because there is no conflict, there is no desire to be something. Right? Because there is no conflict, because inwardly there is absolutely something which is inviolable,

which cannot be touched, which cannot be damaged, then I don't depend, psychologically on another. Therefore there is no conformity, no imitation and all that.

So not having all that, then I will do what I can in the world, be a gardener, a cook, anything. But you're so heavily conditioned to success, and failure. Success in the world, money, position, prestige, you know, all that, and that's what we are struggling for. But if none of that exists - you understand what takes place in a human being. In consciousness, in human consciousness, which is so heavily conditioned - right? - heavily conditioned to success, and the fear of failure. To be something, not only outwardly but inwardly. That's why you accept all the gurus, because you hope he'll lead you to some illumination, some kind of illusory nonsense. Not there is not something absolutely true, but nobody can lead you to it.

So our whole consciousness or most of it is conditioned to accept, to live a life of constant struggle, because we want to achieve, we want to become, we want to play a certain part, we want to fulfil, we want, you know - which all implies, the denial - please listen to this - the denial of 'what is' and the acceptance of 'what should be'. Because we deny 'what is', and have created the ideal of 'what should be', there is conflict. But to observe actually 'what is', which means, you have no opposite, only 'what is'. Look, if you observe violence, the word 'violence' is already contaminated, the very word, because there are people who approve of it, people who don't approve of it, so it's already warped. So take, for instance, violence. And the whole philosophy of non-violence, both politically, religiously, and all the rest of it.

That is, there is violence, and its opposite, non-violence. The opposite exists because you know violence. And the opposite has its root in 'what is'. Right? So we think by having an opposite, by some extraordinary method or means, we'll get rid of the 'what is'. Which is, 'what is' and 'what should be'. To achieve 'what should be', you need time. See what we go through, the misery, the conflict, the absurdity of all this. 'What is', is violence, and 'what should be' is non-violence. So we say we need time to achieve non-violence, because I'm conditioned to violence and to non-violence - I must have time, I must make an effort, I must struggle to be non-violent. That's the philosophy, that's the conditioning, that's the tradition, the good and the bad.

Now can you put away the opposite and just look at violence, which is a fact. The non-violence is not a fact. Non-violence is an idea, is a concept, is a conclusion. But the fact is violence, that you're angry, that you hate somebody, that you want to hurt people, anger, jealousy, all that is the implication of violence, that's the fact. Now can you observe that fact without introducing its opposite. You understand? Then you have the energy, which is being wasted in trying to achieve the opposite, you've all that energy to observe 'what is'. In that observation there is no conflict.

So what will a man do who has understood this extraordinary complex existence based on violence, conflict, struggle, who is actually free of it, not theoretical about it, actually free, which means, no conflict, what shall he do in the world? Will you ask me, or are you asking yourself this question? Will you ask this question - please listen - will you ask this question if you are inwardly, psychologically completely free from conflict? Will you?

Obviously not. It's only the man in conflict who says, 'If there is no conflict, I will be ended, I will be destroyed by society.' Because society is based on conflict. But the society is what you have made of it, you have made the society, you are responsible for the society, because you are greedy, envious, violent, and society is what you are. So there is no difference between you and society, you are society. These are facts. But when you separate yourself from society and say, 'I am different from society,' which is such nonsense, then if there is complete transformation of the structure of society which is violence, immorality and all the rest of it, in you, you affect the consciousness of society. And when you are so free inwardly, do you ever ask that question, 'What shall I do? In the outward world.' Do answer it yourself, sir, find out what the answer is, for yourself, because inwardly you have completely transformed something which man is conditioned to, that constant battle, battle, battle.

Have I answered the question? I've answered it for myself, long ago. But will you put that question to yourself and find out, without any illusion, without any fantasy, without any desire to be or not be, which all brings conflict, find out for yourself the fact of it. That is, a complete transformation, inwardly, of something which man has held as the most important thing, which is struggle, fight, conflict, you know, all the rest of it.

So, the next thing is, if I may go on to something else, that our consciousness, if you have observed it, and because we have leisure we can look, now. If you observe your consciousness, if you are aware of your consciousness, that is, are you aware of your consciousness, what you are? If you are aware, then you'll see that



your consciousness is in total - I'm using the word 'total' in its absolute sense, not relative sense, in its absolute sense - your consciousness is in total disorder. Are you aware of that fact? To be aware implies very simply, to be aware, you are aware of the trees, you are aware of where you're sitting, I am aware of the sun on my head, which I don't like, I'm aware of the various colours and so on - aware, outwardly. And inwardly, to be aware implies, to be aware without any distortion. You can't distort that tree and say, that's an elephant. But you can very easily distort what you see inwardly.

So to be aware implies to be aware without any distortion of what is going on inside. Right? Are you so aware of your consciousness. If you are, you will find, don't you find, that it is contradictory, saying one thing, doing something else, wanting something - you follow? The total movement within an area which is so small and so, no space, and in that little space there is disorder. And are you aware that you are in total disorder? And ultimately that disorder leads to neuroticism, obviously, and all the factors of modern society with psychologists, psychoanalysts, psycho-therapists, you know, all that stuff going on. If you are aware in the sense that you watch yourself, which is your consciousness, without any disorder, without any distortion - is that possible. That is only possible when the observer is the observed. You understand? When the observer is the observed there is no distortion, he sees 'what is'. But if the observer exists, then he distorts what he sees. You understand? Is this clear?

So can you observe - is there an observation of oneself which is our consciousness, and see the actual fact of its disorder, of one's

disorder, in daily life, not only outwardly, but much more deeply, inwardly. Outwardly we're very orderly, some of us at least, because it's compulsive, it's becoming more and more, you have to be orderly etc., I won't go into all that. But inwardly, are you in order? Or there is disorder? Can you observe this fact? And what takes place when you observe choicelessly, which means without any distortion, what takes place? You understand my question? Because where there is disorder, there must be conflict; where there is absolute order, there is no conflict. And we're saying there is an absolute order, not relative order. And that can only come about naturally, easily, without any conflict, only when one is aware of oneself as a consciousness, observes the confusion, the turmoil, the contradiction, outwardly and inwardly, and observe without any distortion. Then out of that comes, naturally, sweetly, easily, an order which is irrevocable.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 5TH APRIL 1977

K: Every Tuesday and Thursday for the next two weeks we will have dialogues. The word 'dialogue', I looked it up in the dictionary, means putting our thoughts into words. And a dialogue between friends, and I hope this is that way, implies that there are no arguments, no assertions, that two friends are talking over together their problems, amicably, frankly and easily, because they are friends. So perhaps we could approach these dialogues that way. That is, if you could ask a question and go into it very, very deeply, patiently, and see the whole implications of those questions. And so what shall we talk about this morning together?

Q: I wonder if we might talk about mysticism, and whether or not there actually is mysticism or is this inevitably an escape.

K: Mysticism. Could you talk about mysticism. Anything else?

Q: I have a problem which I have been exploring for weeks and weeks and weeks and it is this: to see the false as false, to see the true as true, and to see the truth in the false. It is this that I'm searching.

K: That's your question, is it, sir?

Q: Yes, I don't understand it.

K: All right, we will go into that. Anything else?

Q: Is there such a thing as sacred or timeless thought, or is all thought conditioned?

K: Is there something sacred, unconditioned, not touched by thought. Is that it sir?

Q: Yes.

Q: I am asking a question not about religion, or the meaning of

religion, the traditional religion because it is shown that it strengthens the self. Instead I am asking why does the whole belief and create divisions in the first place.

Q: I would like to talk about reality, the nature of it.

K: I should like to talk about reality.

Q: In your writings you refer to 'the Beloved', what is this beloved?

K: All right, sir. Look, it is not what I write and what I think, what is your question, it is not my question. Don't say, well you have written this, what do you mean by that. Could we honestly, simply and easily talk about what we are concerned with, each one is concerned.

Q: How can I bring about a psychological revolution?

K: How is it possible to bring about psychological revolution.

Q: What is the content of one's consciousness?

K: The content of one's consciousness. Now just a minute, that is enough questions. Let's see. Now what shall we take among all these questions? Shall we take the question, if you are really concerned not with what somebody has said, but your own problem - you understand, sir - your own concern about what is truth, why religions have so separated themselves and we are caught in it, what do you mean by the false and the true, could one talk about the unconditioned, is there such a thing as the unconditioned, sacred, untouched by thought, and is it possible to really bring about a transformation in oneself. These are all the various questions, more or less, that have been put to each other. So which shall we take first?

Q: What does it mean to be serious about those questions?

K: What does it mean to be serious. I don't know. I do know for myself when one is very, very serious, for oneself, but I don't know what you mean by being serious, you may translate it in so many ways, that in seriousness there is no humour, no laughter, seriousness committed to a particular ideology, and also one can be quite serious neurotically and so on and so on. I think we generally mean by seriousness that one is really concerned, deeply concerned with something that we want to solve, we want to understand, go into.

Q: I'd like to go into the question of fear.

K: I'd like to go into the question of fear.

Q: Could you please say something about the relationship of individuality to consciousness. I think there is lot of confusion about this. For example, consciousness and all its contents are made, and where does individuality fit in?

K: Now, I don't know how many questions to answer, all these questions, how is one to answer them, all the various questions. Perhaps if we take one question amongst all these which might cover the whole field.

Q: Reality and truth, the relationship between this.

K: I am afraid that is a too abstract subject.

Q: How does one start to transform oneself?

K: How does one start to transform oneself. May we start with that question? Would that be all right with all of you?

How does one start to bring about a radical, deep psychological revolution? That's the question, isn't it, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: One has to go into this question rather carefully. First of all

we have to understand what do we mean by change? Change from this to that. Right? We generally mean that. Change from what one is into what one should be. Is that change at all? You follow my question? I want to change from what I am, with my greed and all the rest of it, and change that into something much better. Right? Right sirs? This is a dialogue, please I am not talking by myself. So please. And when there is such change, is it really a transformation? Or is it merely a reaction? Or is it a premeditated desire, end to which you want to change - change. You understand? And is transformation inward psychological revolution, is that totally different from change? You understand my question? Please, let's talk over as two friends, please. You understand? Wait a minute, sir, let me finish.

There is capitalism and communism. The communism is change from capitalism - at least they think so, but all political things are becoming the same, more or less. Is that change? They talk a great deal about revolution, outward revolution, and is that revolution based on a change which is preconceived? You understand? And therefore conforming to a pattern already established, and therefore it is not radical change. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

Q: They seem two forms, communism and capitalism, of the same conflict.

K: No, no, forgive me. Don't - forget communism and capitalism. I want to change from greed to non-greed. The non-greed is already established in my mind, is already put into words, there is a pattern to which I am conforming. Or I will conform when there is change.

Q: The idea of change.

K: No, just listen. Please, go slowly, please. First I want to be clear on the difference between change and transformation, a mutation, if you want to use that word. Change implies changing 'what is' into 'what should be'. Right? Into 'what should be' is already established, by thought, by environment, by circumstances, by pressures and so on and so on. It is already established. And when I change I am changing from 'what is' into 'what should be' which is conceived. Therefore I say to myself that is no change at all. Right? It is still pursuing the same pattern only in a different field. So I see that very clearly. I hope you do too. I see that fact, that change implies a continuity of 'what is' modified. Right? Whereas transformation is something entirely different. The ending of 'what is', not 'what should be'. Am I right? This is a discussion between two friends, I am not being logistic or reasoned and all the rest of it, do we as two friends, please I really mean it, as two friends see this, the difference between change and total ending of something.

Q: Change is something like totally non directional. In other words when someone...

K: That's right sir, that's right. One is directional, the other is non-directional. But sir, just get it, what it means. Because we have operated, our mind is always directional. Whereas we are saying, the ending is non-directional and therefore it is something tremendous and not limited.

Q: I see very clearly intellectually that always change leads to no change at all, there is no transformation. How is it that we don't feel it inside?

K: We are going to go into that, just a minute. If we see clearly

the meaning of these two verbally, even verbally or intellectually, that is, change implies continuity of 'what is', modified, directional, and transformation, mutation, total psychological revolution has no direction, is not modified, it is the ending of something. Right, is this clear? Verbally at least.

Q: Isn't it true that if someone is in a situation where they want to move out of where they are, like someone is standing in the middle of the planet, and he wants to go somewhere, he has to seemingly at least, at some point he has to have some point of direction because...

K: Wait, sir, wait. Don't particularise yet, we are going slowly. First let's understand this - please, to understand this psychologically is more important than merely verbal understanding of it. The 'better' is the evil. The whole mentality - our whole mentality is, 'becoming better'. The 'better' is directional, 'the better' is modification of 'what is' into 'what should be'. It's all directional, preconceived, modified. Whereas the other is a total ending of 'what is'. Now if that is clear, now which is it you, please, as a human being, want, or demand, or are seeking - sociologically, economically, psychologically?

Q: Prayer for something and meditation is to listen.

K: Prayer and meditation - we are not quite discussing that, sir, if you don't mind. Now which is as a human being, actually, not theoretically, is caught up in: a directional movement or the ending of that directional movement? You understand my question?

Q: What is directional?

K: You don't understand my question? Sir, when you have a direction - look, you are looking at a map, a map of America, or



Europe, or India, a map, and if you have a direction from this place, Ojai, to Nebraska, whatever that is, you have a direction. Right? So when you are concerned with the direction you don't see the whole map. But we are trying to see the whole map, not a direction. Right? Is that all right?

Q: Yes.

K: Thank god! So, now which is it as a human being you are caught in?

Q: I feel that when I am caught in that situation I am very scared.

K: No, madam.

Q: We are always seeking temporary solutions.

K: No, I am asking - please don't go off to something else. We are asking each other, as two friends, I am not sitting on a platform, we are walking together, or sitting under a tree, we are asking, which is it you, as a human being, actually are caught in, directional, or non-directional?

Q: Directional.

Q: Are we seeking a temporary direction?

K: Directional, isn't it. Now if it is directional, and you are aware that you are caught in a directional movement, how do you end that movement? That's all the question, not how to transform that movement into something else. I am going north - sorry, I am going south, and I really want to go north, so I turn round and go. You see the difference? I break the movement of going towards the south and turn and go north. But I must know, be aware by the sun or by the compass that I am going south. Now if we agree, or if we see actually that we are caught in a direction, a modified continuity

of 'what is', I am asking, how do you end that.

Q: As soon as there is a way to do it...

K: All right. Is it possible - put it not the 'how', the method, the system - is it possible to end that.

Q: You become objective, step out of the circle and look at this circle.

K: I can't quite hear.

Q: Step out of the circle, become more objective.

K: Are you doing it?

Q: Trying.

K: Ah, no, no, you can't try. The compass says, go south, and you really want to go north, you don't say. 'Well, I'll try and turn round and go north', you turn round and go north.

Q: Sir, when you use words like tremendous and revolution, we could forget.

K: Sir, that's what I am asking, sir, please listen quietly, sir. As two friends, are you aware that you are caught in a directional movement? And if you are aware of it, is it possible to end that directional movement? It is a very simple question. The complication comes a little later.

Q: You stop making comparisons.

K: I don't quite follow. I am going, sir, please, I realize that I am caught in a directional movement, which is modified - the continuity of 'what is' modified, directional. Am I aware I am doing this? I am violent, I should not be, non-violent; I am greedy, non-greedy; I am this and that. And all that is a modified continuity of 'what is'. Is that clear? If that is clear then I am asking myself, can that end. That is the change, that is transformation - not

transformation of 'what is' into something else.

Q: When the mind is...

K: No, no, stick to this one question, sir.

Q: The mind can't answer it because having never not been going in a direction, it seems impossible to tell if it is possible not to go in a direction.

K: All right, sir. Are you saying our memory, our brain is so conditioned, that it is always moving in a direction. Which means what?

Q: You are always trying to be somewhere other.

K: No. Which means our brain is conditioned generations after generations to go in a direction. Right? Have you observed it? Have you observed your brain, your whole process of thinking is directional - directional either lateral or horizontal, or vertical, it is always a direction. Right? Are you aware of that?

Q: Is the non-directional a fixed point?

K: Is it because we are talking about it and therefore temporarily it is non-directional? What is temporary is not actual. Right?

Q: Doesn't it all seem that when there is no longer someone who wants anything to change, anything to be different.

K: Madam, that comes a little later. But we are already ahead when we have stated that, when we have not actually realized the directional movement, which is modified continuity of 'what is', can that end. That's all I am asking. Actually not intellectually, not verbally and say, 'Yes, finished'. Wait. And see the implications when you say, it is finished.

Q: How can I see that I am moving in a direction?

K: Don't you, madam, don't you want to be better, to be - if you are fragmented, don't you want to be integrated, don't you want fear to end? That's a direction.

Q: Looking at the fear as attachment...

K: Don't take fear as an example. It is so difficult.

Q: Sir, aren't you saying that it is not fair to be non-directional, you should be directional but know what your direction is.

K: No, no, no, no. We are not saying that. To know your direction - when you use the word 'know', what do you mean by that word?

Q: You see the whole map.

K: Yes sir. You have used the word 'know', what do you mean by that word?

Q: It is a conclusion.

K: No, please, two minutes. When you use the word 'know', what is implied, what is the significance, what is the meaning of that word, to know?

Q: To be sure of it.

K: I know you because I met you yesterday. Right? You were introduced to me, and I say, yes, I know you. Which is what?

Q: You recognize.

K: To recognize. How does that recognition process take place?

Q: From memory.

K: Which is what? Your name, you were introduced to me yesterday - your name is registered in the brain, and therefore it is memory, therefore it is already known. Right? So when I say, I know, you are already speaking from the past. You don't see the complications of this.

All right. So we are asking, is it possible to end the directional movement? Not have a new direction, but have no direction at all. Because to have a new direction is another modified continuity. I wonder if you see.

Q: We don't know because if I am driving a car and I have never stopped, I have always kept going and I don't know how to stop.

K: So you have always been going in a particular direction and you don't know how to stop. Let's take that. You have always gone along a particular road, a direction, and you really don't know how to stop. Can we start from there? Now what is the impetus that makes you want to stop? What is the motive?

Q: Desire.

K: No, please, don't.

Q: See you are going the wrong way.

Q: The fact that I have crashed into one horrible thing in life against another makes me begin to see.

K: So your motive is the horror, or you have seen the results of direction. Is that so? Or is it a conclusion? You see the difference? I can conclude it is a wrong direction. I can think it is wrong. But I may want another direction.

Q: Before you go in another direction you have to stop the one you are on.

K: All right. Before you go into any other direction you have to stop. What makes you stop, sir?

Q: Crisis in consciousness.

K: No, please don't complicate it. Crisis in consciousness. Madam, do you know what that means? Crisis means a challenge,

it is such a great challenge, and your response must be equal to that challenge. This is what is going on now. So I am asking, when you say can you stop moving in a certain direction, and I am asking what makes you stop, what is the motive, what is the urge, the desire, the necessity.

Q: I see I am getting nowhere.

Q: The direction is hazardous.

Q: You crash into the wall of reality, you see my desires did nothing for me.

K: So when you crash into reality and you say, 'I get nothing from it', so your motive is reward and punishment. Be simple about it sir. Your motive is punishment and reward. That is directional. That is what we are brought up on from childhood. Modern psychologists - I don't read their books, but I have friends who talk about it, who have come to see me and we discuss it - they are saying we always punish people, now let us do the other, reward people. Which is the same thing. So do you want to stop because you want a reward?

Q: Discontent.

K: Do you want a reward and therefore you stop? Or you are frightened of punishment and therefore you stop?

Q: Stop because you are aware.

K: You stop because you are aware. Now please, what do you mean by being aware? I am not being facetious, I want to understand each word that you use so that you and I are both on the same level. I may have a different meaning to that word, and you may have a different meaning to that word. So what do you mean by being aware?

Q: By seeing the futility of making effort.

K: Do you see that actually? That means you no longer make effort of any kind. Do you see it?

Q: You realize that the thinker is fabricating the whole sense of direction.

K: Agreed, madam. I agree, but when you say, I am aware of that fact, what do you mean by aware - we are asking. When you see thought, or when you realize the whole fabrication is brought about by thought, are you aware of it. And what do you mean by that word 'aware'?

Q: You see it clearly.

K: Now when you use - I am sorry, I am going to push this point if you don't mind - when you see, what do you mean by seeing?

Q: Understanding.

K: What do you mean by understanding? Madam, understanding, how? Intellectually?

Q: No.

K: Therefore what do you mean by that?

Q: It is sort of like a dawning.

K: All right. It dawns upon you, which means what? Go into it. Don't stop.

Q: I see the difference between being the thinker and fabricating an illusory sense of things, and being the wholeness that hears the very living that life is, right now, everything.

K: Which means what? That you have an insight. You see the actuality of the falseness of moving in a certain direction. You are aware of the total implications of moving in a certain direction, you

have grasped it, you have got it, it's in your blood. So you don't go back ever again in any direction.

Q: Just be.

K: No. You see that's what I want to prevent. Being.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You see the point sir, what she is saying. The lady there says, I see it. Either one sees it verbally, intellectually and therefore it is not actual seeing. And when you say, 'I see', she meant, I understand. When you say, I understand, what do you mean by that word? Understand what is explained. I understand verbally, intellectually, grasp the meaning of words and I understand that. She said, no, I don't mean that. I said, have you really grasped the falseness of direction, that it leads nowhere? Do you actually as you perceive that tree, is it as actual, as real as that, therefore you will never knock against that tree again. So when you use the word 'direction', when you use the words, 'I understand', it means you have finished altogether moving in a modified continuity, in a direction, which means that you have ended it. Now is that a fact? Please, if it is a fact, what has taken place in daily life? What has taken place in the movement of the brain? You understand? Because our brain is conditioned for centuries and centuries, generations after generation, millennia, to move from this to that. Right? Improve oneself, change oneself, become oneself, identify yourself, fulfil yourself, be yourself, if you cannot, then achieve god, move always in a direction, direction. Now when you see that direction is false, is there the brain free of that movement? You follow? Or it's merely superficial capture of the meaning. I wonder if I am making myself clear?



Q: It's stopping.

K: You understand? Which means - go slowly - which means the brain has broken away from the past conditioning, so it will never function in that direction at all, because it has captured the danger of it. Because the brain demands security. I won't go into all that for the moment. The brain demands security, and it thought it had found security in a directional movement. You are following this? You are following it, madam? And the brain sees the danger of it, therefore says, 'I can't go in that direction'. So the brain itself has understood the movement, the danger, not merely a verbal understanding. I wonder, am I explaining something sir?

Q: The next time it happens...

K: Oh, it never happens. That's what I am trying to show you. It can never happen.

Q: The momentum of all this...

K: No.

Q: It will come up though.

K: That's what I am saying sir. Unless the brain itself, the structure, the whole - sir, you know the brain, please I am not a brain specialist, I haven't read a book about brains and so on, but I have watched this movement of the brain, which is really part of meditation. I won't go into all that. The brain is conditioned. And it is conditioned to go in a certain direction: change 'what is' into 'what should be'. It is always modifying. And in that modification it finds security, because the brain can only function when there is complete safety, properly. So it will find safety in some neurotic belief, or it says, I have achieved something - you know, all the rest of it. Here when the brain sees the danger of a directional

movement, it itself stops naturally, it can never go back. Now does this happen to you?

Q: Are you saying stop directional movement, but not movement, are you saying stop movement altogether?

K: No, no, directional movement.

Q: Is directional movement preconceived?

K: Sir, I won't go into movement. Movement means time, time means - I won't go into all that for the moment.

Q: If that did happen we wouldn't be here.

K: No, sir. Sir, two friends are talking over together this question.

Q: We would not be here because we were seeking something.

K: It's up to you. If you are seeking something, and the speaker has nothing to give.

Q: We...

K: Wait, wait. The speaker has nothing to give. But the speaker says, let us talk over as two friends - that's completely different. You are used to - not you, sir, particularly - you are used to being given something, told something, what to do, that is the whole function of the priest, the gurus, the authority, to me all that is absurd. I deny all that. So I can't give you anything. But I say to you, please, let's talk it over together, which is entirely different. You understand, sir?

Q: Are you saying that if you don't seek anything, and you allow the brain to basically just to see.

K: No sir, no. Don't go on with it. No, no. It's much more complex than that sir, please. The brain itself is conditioned. We are taking one small section of the brain, as it were, which is

functioning in a direction, that's all. I am not touching the rest of it. The rest of it we can go into later - the rest of it is fear, pleasure, the whole human structure. So we are asking - it is really a very important question, if you once grasp this - that the ending of direction is the complete transformation. That means you will never seek direction, psychologically. Of course if I want to know how to go to Santa Barbara I will ask somebody who knows the direction and so on. But we are not talking on that level.

Now I am asking, if I may ask my friend, I say, look we have talked about forty minutes, have you really got this? Have you really grasped this, does it mean anything?

Q: Sir, suppose you will occasionally you will perhaps be at this timeless place, a place where you can work and see. Perhaps at one time it is seen, but then as you lose that vision...

K: No. No, sir. Would you once you realize the rattler, once you have seen the rattler and seen the danger of it, would you go back and play with it?

Q: No. But it stops being a rattler, it looks like something else.

K: You see that means we haven't really actually seen the danger of a directional movement. That's all. Yes sir?

Q: Directional movement seems to be inconsistent with nature.

K: No, sir, please. I explained at the beginning, if you don't mind if I repeat it again, we said: change and transformation. Don't forget what we started out with. Change implies modified continuity.

Q: Does a caterpillar change...

K: Leave the caterpillar, poor thing, it's a marvellous thing, leave it alone. I am talking of human beings. Human beings think

they are changing, when actually the change is modification of 'what is'. That's all we are saying. The modification of 'what is', they consider is change. I say, that's not change at all. The ending of 'what is' is radical transformation.

Look sirs, make it much simpler. One is violent, human beings are violent for various reasons I won't go into - from the beginning of the animal until now, we are violent. Now we have a direction, which is to become non-violent. There has been the philosophy of it in India, Tolstoy has gone into it, you follow, the whole mess of all that. Sorry, I consider it a mess, you may not. So we are conditioned to a modified change, and I say when we discuss transformation, how to bring it about, I say, look at these two words first: the word change implies that, the word transformation implies the ending of this movement of change, the ending, psychologically - not the caterpillar and so on and so on.

Now after talking over together for forty minutes or more, or less, as two friends say, please, have we understood each other.

Q: Verbally we understand.

K: No, wait. So you have not understood?

Q: I have not understood.

K: So we say, now let's begin again. I have not understood. Why? Look sir, careful. Wait, wait. You and I are great friends - I am your husband or your wife, we are holding hands. You would say when I tell you something very extraordinary for me, deep, would you say, I don't understand - would you tell her that? Wait. What is your relationship first? She is trying to tell you something she feels most profoundly. And you say, sorry, I don't understand - would you say that?

Q: I would say nothing.

K: Why?

Q: Because I would.

Q: Wouldn't you have to feel it?

K: Feel it. What do you mean by the word 'feel'? You see, I am very critical of words - sorry, forgive me. Which is not avoidance, which is not escape, which is not merely argumentation or avoidance. I am saying one has to be terribly careful in investigating, the usage of words.

Q: If you can't understand a thing, and you can't feel it, then what?

K: Which is what? Either you feel, touch, smell, taste, or you think. Now when you say, I don't understand, we are saying is it emotional that makes you understand, a feel that makes you understand? Please, you are not answering my question. After forty minutes, we are holding hands together, and I say to you, please, listen to what I have got to tell you. It's most tremendously important, because it will perhaps change our relationship entirely. And listen to me, paying attention to what I am saying, and it tells you, and at the end of forty minutes you say, sorry I don't understand what you are talking about - would you say that to your girl friend?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes.

K: You would?

Q: Do you know?

K: I don't know, don't jump on me! What kind of relationship have you then?

Q: Honest.

K: You have no relationship at all, apparently.

Q: When I say I don't understand, that's the point, I do have relationship.

Q: There's no love.

K: That's it, sir. There is not even affection to understand something. If you and I had affection - if you had affection and I had affection for you, and I say, look, for god's sake, do look at this, and because you have affection for me, love for me, what I say is important to you.

Q: That's...

K: So our relationship, sir, is that we are not friends. I tell you I am your friend, you say, 'Buzz off'. And I say, 'Look, this is one of the most fundamental things in life that you must understand', and I tell you as a wife, as a husband, as a girl friend, as a boy friend holding your hand, kissing, everything, I say, look. And you don't even say at the end of forty minutes, 'I don't really see what you are talking about'. I don't think you say that to your girl friend. She would leave you the next minute.

Q: That's words.

Q: You wouldn't say it because you wouldn't want to hurt.

K: So it's not a question of hurt. We don't understand what relationship is.

Q: Krishnamurti...

K: Do think about it a minute. We don't understand what relationship means. Because I come along and say, look, let us talk as two friends, which implies care and affection, love, consideration, involvement, commitment, and you sit there and

say, 'You go on talking, but...' - you would never say that to your wife or husband or girl friend or boy friend, because you are involved in it.

Q: Please explain it again.

Q: I don't agree.

K: What is it you don't agree with, sir?

Q: If I don't understand someone, I don't care if I love her or not, I'll tell her that I don't understand. That may be the end of our relationship but I have to take that chance.

K: Therefore you are not concerned with relationship.

Q: Not as much as I have understanding.

K: Ah! No, relationship is the only thing in life.

Q: What is relationship?

K: That's just it. We will go into that. What is relationship? It's a very complex question. What is relationship? To be related to somebody. Is it merely a physical attachment, sex and all that? Are you related then? What do you mean by relationship? And you say to my wife, my girl friend, boy friend, husband, whatever it is, father, what do you mean by this word, what is the significance, the depth of those words.

Q: Relationship is loving and caring.

K: The actual fact. What do you mean by relationship?

Q: Sharing. Relating. Experiencing.

K: Are you sharing? Are you sharing?

Q: Trying.

K: I don't try, sir, please.

Q: To give your attention to someone.

Q: To be free of attachment to another.

K: I am related to my wife, what does that mean? Facts, not theories, suppositions, and hopes and what I would like, but facts, everyday facts.

Q: We share the last name.

K: We share the bed?

Q: Sometimes.

K: That's about all.

Q: No, we share the name, the name.

K: Sir, you are not being... you are not going into it.

Q: It feels like we are all part of the same. Each is part of each other and you are part of humanity.

K: Oh, that's just theories.

Q: We don't know.

K: Please, madam, as somebody has said we really don't know what relationship is.

Q: Relationship is relating to the other as yourself, I see you as myself speaking.

K: That's just an idea.

Q: No, its a fact.

K: Wait, go into it slowly, madam. You all have conclusions about it. I haven't. I refuse conclusions. I refuse - forgive me, as a friend - I say, my friend, my lady, please, don't come to conclusions. Let's look at it. Let's start as though we don't know about it. Then we can learn an infinite lot. But if you say, yes, I know. You know if you start with certainty, you end up in doubt. Right? But if you doubt, you will end up in certainty. But we start the other way, we are all certain.

So let's find out, if you are willing - what time is it?



Q: Five to twelve.

K: Five to twelve. Briefly. You haven't yet solved this problem which we started out with. This always happens. I want to find out deeply, with your help, and you want out deeply with my help, in exploring what does it mean to change, and what does it mean to transform - transformation. We said any form of change is a continual modified continuity, which is the essence of mediocrity. Ah!

Q: Krishnamurti, what happens if we end direction.

K: I am saying. What happens when there is an end.

Q: Aren't we in a vacuum?

K: Oh, no, no. That's just it, sir. You haven't ended it and therefore you have never found it, you have already come to a conclusion. Do we enter into a vacuum, is there nothingness, is it annihilation. You follow? You haven't really answered the question whether you have ended it. Then you will find out something totally different.

So I am asking after an hour, holding your hand, we have been friends - and I really mean it, we have been friends, and you feel probably, temporarily, poor chap, let's be friends with him because he is talking so much about it - and I say, look we have talked forty minutes, have you understood this simple, fundamental fact? Understood in the sense not intellectually, but it's in your blood so that you will never again go in any direction.

Q: Isn't that we move together when we are talking.

K: Have you done it, madam?

Q: I think I have.

K: That means you have ended direction. After an hour. See the

importance of it. For god's sake, see the importance of it. We want success; that's a direction - sociologically, politically, religiously, in every way we want to achieve something, become something, gain something. That's a direction. When we conform, imitate, that's a direction. I say that is the very core of mediocrity. That's what we are - except the present company - you are all mediocre.

Q: How do you stop being mediocre?

K: Which means, can you end direction.

Q: You can end direction, but you establish non-direction.

Consciousness which is non-directional, then you experience non-direction and direction at the same time, then you solve the problem.

K: No, no, you are off the mark. Forgive me sir. You are off the mark. You haven't even listened.

Q: I don't know...

K: Look, sir, when you go to school, in the school you are told you must be as clever as A. You are given marks. All directional. You understand? Competitive, which brutalizes children. You have seen the American children - oh, you are all Americans, sorry! So from childhood until you die, be something, become something, achieve something, be a millionaire, become the president, become the governor - you follow? Move out. Which is all directional. And if you are religious you say, well I must be the right hand of Jesus, or god, or whatever it is. So you are all trained, conditioned to accept this norm. Somebody comes along, like me, poor chap, and says, look, just look what you are doing. You haven't the time, you haven't the patience, you won't even listen, just look what you are doing. This produces - directional movement produces violence,

hatred. You follow, the whole thing, which is modern society. And you say, yes, I understand that but I don't know how to stop it. Which means you really don't want to stop it. You follow? You want to go on because that is your conditioning. Or you are frightened. Frightened, if you stop what will happen. Which means you are seeking a reward. When you are frightened you are seeking. If you don't get your reward, you say...

So here we are together as friends, and I really mean it as friends. And I say please this is a fundamental thing to understand, the beauty of it, it is really most extraordinarily beautiful if you understand. When there is no direction it is - the heavens. So at the end of an hour I ask you as a friend sitting under a tree, holding hands or whatever you will, very close friends, say, have you really understood this thing.

Q: We are...

K: Just listen sir, have you really understood it in your heart, in your blood, in your nerves, in your brain, it captures something. If you have, then you will never again seek direction. That means you will never again want to be something, socially, psychologically.

Q: That cannot be.

K: There we are.

Q: If you have no direction, it will always be with you as a shadow until the concept is removed, until the concept is gone into the essence, it shall be with you.

K: What?

Q: Direction or non-direction. It doesn't matter. If you ask a bird how it flies...

K: Oh, no, sir. You can ask a caterpillar which foot it puts first

and then it stops. If you ask a caterpillar whether it puts the first leg then he will be paralysed, he will be looking at it and won't move. Please, sir, don't fritter it away, please.

Q: Sir, may I ask for an answer, for confirmation or denial. Last night when I was coming up here, somebody told me I was a whore, I was very upset. She said you sleep in your car. Yes, I said, I will if I have to. So I was very upset. So I sat down right there. I saw I was trying to do the impossible.

K: Madam, this is not what we are discussing.

Q: No, I wanted her to accept what I do and she couldn't. The trouble was if I had enough feeling what...

K: You see what the difficulty is at the end of an hour. Each man is going on with his own, so that means you and I have no relationship whatsoever. Which means if you haven't with me, you have no relationship with anybody, because I am an ordinary human being. You understand, sir? I am a human being, if you have no relationship with an ordinary human being how can you have relationship with another human being?

Q: Is relationship directional?

K: No, sir. That is a complex question, perhaps we will discuss it the day after tomorrow. But see what we have done. We don't care. Right sir?

Q: When you talk and say you, and I talk and say I, who is you and I?

K: We.

Q: The body, what is it?

K: Sir, when we say you, I am talking as a human being to another human being, not as I and you. You understand? We are

talking of human beings. I've explained very carefully that every human being is the total history of mankind. It is a fact. And if you know how to read that book you don't have to read any other book in the world, because everything is contained in it - man's misery, confusion, sorrow, death, love, sex, all that is you. You are the world and the world is you. Therefore there is no you and I when there is that.

Q: Isn't that...

K: Please sir, when I say you - we are talking quickly, en passant.

Q: You say there is direction.

K: Yes, sir I said that. Sir, don't you see the end of something, something new is born. Don't you see if we go on in the same way over and over and over again there is no ending to something, it is only when something ends a new beginning can come. If we were satisfied with the piston engine, we would never have had the jet. Right? The jet came into being when the man said, I know all about pistons, let's stop it. Let's look in other directions - directions, you know what I mean!

Q: Would you share a moment of silence with us?

K: Would you stop talking and be quiet for a while together. To be actually quiet, an unoccupied mind. (Pause) Right sirs.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 7TH APRIL 1977

K: Perhaps there are some new people who have come this morning, so we are having a dialogue. The word 'dialogue' means putting into words one's thought. And as two friendly people talking over together their problems perhaps we could this morning discuss or have a dialogue, a conversation, in that spirit, that we are together examining, exploring, investigating our problems. This is not a group therapy. Group therapy implies exposing one's own dirty laundry to another. I don't think that's worth it. Whereas if we could examine deeply our problems perhaps we could resolve them this morning, and not carry them over year after year until we die. So what shall we talk over together?

Q: I would like to ask you will thought and experiencing always remain, or appear to be as opposites, or is there an understanding which can bridge this gap?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Can we talk about violence and cruelty in human beings, and what is the relationship between that of violence and cruelty in the animal kingdom? Where does that relationship end?

K: I don't quite follow your question, sir.

Q: I am asking what is the relationship between cruelty in human beings, violence in human beings and violence in animals, and where does that relationship end between us and violence.

K: The first question was, thought and experience, are they different, and can they be brought together; and the other question is, what is the relationship between human beings and animals, who are both of them violent. Any others?

Q: I was wondering, we ended our conversation last Tuesday on a particular point, you mentioned that after forty five minutes of our discussion that say between two loved ones, if one did not understand after that period of time there would be no relationship or love between the loved ones. I just wondered if you would somewhat go over that, I personally I don't agree with this in the sense that in your descriptions of a certain people, you have talked about the observer and the thing to be observed being one. That particular example, if I may use an example, say the audience here and trying to understand your philosophy and so forth - it may not necessarily be a philosophy - K: I think I understand your question.

Q: One other thing, just an observation, it seems to me that during the course of people asking questions and so forth, the question is somewhat irrelevant to what is going on in your discussion. You seem to get at a certain point frustrated, and I just wondered, you know in your talks about infinite patience, in your books and so forth, does there seem to be a paradox or a contradiction there. That's just an observation. In a sense people here said they didn't really understand a lot of what you said on Tuesday, and they were asking questions, those questions did not reveal understanding, so it may not be to the point for you to tell us we don't understand. You know, you just seem to get frustrated.

K: Sir, I don't quite follow your questions that you have asked. I don't quite...

Q: I just wondered...

K: Why I am frustrated?

Q: Why you are frustrated by the questions that are asked.

K: All right, sir. Why are you frustrated by the questions asked

by the audience.

Q: If one really cares about another what does that imply?

K: If one cares for another what does that imply.

Q: Could we talk about relationship?

K: Could we talk about relationship.

Q: Just to repeat what I asked, it was thought and experiencing.

K: Thought and experiencing, I understand, sir.

Q: Could you explain how we can have a relationship without fear and jealousy.

K: Can we have relationship with another without jealousies, fears and anxieties and all the miseries that come in relationship.

Q: Is there something to be learnt from the experience of having been in a place before, because I have experienced deja vu, when you feel as if you have been through a particular action before, even though now in the present it is all new experience you feel as though you have been there before. Is there something to be learned from that?

K: Is there something to be learnt from?

Q: From the feeling of having been here before.

K: Learnt from having been here before, the feeling of it.

Q: Could we talk over the question of me?

K: Could we talk over the question of me. That is enough.

First of all to answer that question, I am afraid I don't feel frustrated. Perhaps you think I should, but I am not frustrated. So let us drop that question. Should we discuss relationship, what is the significance of relationship, the depth of relationship, should we discuss that; or shall we go into this question of thought, what is the relationship of thought to experiencing, and what is



experiencing without thought? Should we go into that?

Q: Yes.

K: You want to go into the question of experiencing and its relation to thought. Relationship of experiencing and thought. All right. Do you want to go into it very deeply?

Q: Yes.

K: First of all, let's find out together and I mean together, we are both of us exploring, we are both of us trying to understand what we are talking about. We are using words which we both understand. I am not speaking in Italian, or Russian, but in English. So together we are going to examine this very complex problem. First of all, what is thinking? What does one mean by the word 'thinking'? How does thinking arise, what is the significance of thinking, what is the source of all thought? All thought, both scientific, religious, the thought of everyday, the business thought. We are discussing, talking over together this question of thought.

Why has thought played such an extraordinary part in human life? Does thought exist without the word? And is the word 'thought' - please, all these are implied in this question. So please, if you will kindly go together in this.

So first we will begin by asking is there a thinking without words? Is there a thinking without a symbol, an image, a picture? You understand my question? Or the word is the thought. Or does thought bring the word in to action? You see it is a very complex question, this. So we are going to go into this very, very slowly and find out the whole nature and the structure - the structure of thought. That's what you want, don't you?

Q: Yes.

K: At least you want to discuss that and we will come to that presently. Sir, when one asks you what is thinking, what is your response to that word? If you observe what is going on, that is, the speaker asks you a question, what is thinking? Your immediate reaction, if you are aware of it, is to search out in your memory the correct answer. Either the accumulated memory through books, the information that you have received by reading psychological books and so on. So your immediate response to that question, which is, what is thinking, your brain is tremendously active, looking, asking, searching. Right? And what do you find? May I put it this way: when one is asked a familiar question, what's your name, where do you live and so on, the response is immediate - why?

Q: Because the thought is in your memory bank.

K: Yes, sir but I have asked a question, just a minute, sir. I have asked a question, which is, I have asked what is your name, your response is immediate. Right? I am asking you why is it so immediate. Don't answer it, look into it, first find out, sir.

Q: We are more concerned with labelling than investigating, it's right there.

K: No, sir. I am asking - I asked your name, and your reply very quickly, why? I ask you something a little more complex. You take time. I ask you something and you reply, 'I don't know'. So there are at least three factors: one, immediate response, what's your name, where's your house, etc., etc; and a little more complex question you take time, a lag, an interval between the question and the answer; and if there is a question about which you have never thought, or investigated, you say, 'I really don't know'. Right? That's clear. So there are these three factors. The one familiar,

quick answer because you have repeated your name a hundred thousand times, you are very familiar with it so the response is quick, there is no time lag. There is a time lag if I say, what is the distance between here and Timbuktu, you say, 'By Jove, let me think' and you are calculating. And you say, so much, or I don't know. Or I ask you a question, do you know if there is god. You don't answer. If you are sane, rational, not committed to any form of belief, you say, 'I really don't know'. So there are these three things.

Now I ask, the question is, what is thinking? You will not be able to reply to it quickly because you haven't thought about it. Now I ask you a question, what is thinking, your brain is searching. Right? Asking, looking, watching, where can I find that out, where is the answer to it. Isn't that what is going on? So you are looking into memory, the bank of memory, and trying to find an answer to it. Have you found it? Have you found an answer for yourself, which must be rational, logical, objective, can stand up against any questioning, which can be doubted, not easily accepted. So have you found such an answer?

Q: Yes.

K: So we are asking, what is thinking. Is not thinking the response of memory? Right, sir? Memory as knowledge, as experience, stored up in the brain, in the very cells themselves and that knowledge, experience, memory, responds. So the experience, knowledge, the memory, and the response of memory is thinking. Right? Right, sirs? No, don't please accept because this poor chap talks about it. See it for yourself.

Q: They are all one and the same.

K: I coming to that. That is the experience, knowledge, memory, thinking, it is a tremendously rapid movement. Right? It's one unit. Not separate banks. It is one united movement. Right? So thinking is based on memory, which is the past. Right? So thinking can never be new. Right?

Q: There are inventions.

K: Inventions. Wait a minute, sir. Don't go off. We will answer that question presently, but first see what is happening to you, not to the person who is inventing a new thing - we will go into that. What is happening when you ask this question, that applies to yourself, please, not to the inventor. So do we see this fact, the nature and the structure of thinking - the structure, like a building. The structure of thinking is the movement of the past as memory. So memory, thought and thinking can never be under any circumstances new. Because it is the response of memory, the past experience, stored up as knowledge, so thought is coming from the past.

Q: Do not the thought process, this knowledge, do they not come together into a new thought, a new realization, a combination.

K: Thought can never realize anything new because it is the response of memory, the old. There can be the new only when thought stops.

Q: Who would stop thought?

K: Please, do first of all let's get this clear. See what we are doing; our whole social, moral, political, religious structure is based on this movement of thought. All our gods, all our churches, all our rituals, all our saviours, everything, is based on thought.

Right? Sir, if you say, yes, see the danger of what you are saying. If there is the urge to find the new, totally new, thought must totally come to an end. Which means you must abandon everything that is based on thought, which you won't.

Q: Is it possible to abandon thought?

K: Is this possible. The lady asks, is this possible, to end thought.

Q: If you answer in either way you block yourself.

K: So without blocking oneself let's find out. Our relationship with each other, man, woman, husband and wife, boy and girl, and so on, is not that relationship - please listen - based on thought?

Q: What is the capacity of combining images.

K: What is the capacity to combine various images.

Q: And...

K: Listen carefully, don't add more to it. What is the capacity - I am not trying to stop you, sir - what is the capacity that combines, that adds, that brings together various images. Right? What do you think it is, the capacity? I have got an image of the country, I have got an image of my wife, I have got an image - if I believe - of god, I have got an image of my boss. Right? Now what is it that combines, that brings about relationship with each other? Is it not thought itself? Wait a minute, sir. We will go into it differently, you will see it in a minute. We will see each other in two minutes.

I am asking, what is the relationship between human beings, what is that relationship based on?

Q: Feeling.

K: Feeling. Is there a feeling without thought? You are all so quick. If you did not recognize a feeling would there be a feeling?

That is, one is jealous, that's a feeling. Right? Right? And if you did not recognize it, which is the word 'jealousy' is stored up in memory, representing a particular feeling, and when you use that word 'jealousy' it is recognized, otherwise it is a feeling. So there is no feeling without thought. Please, I don't want to go into all this, it is very complex thing - we will go into it presently. I am asking first of all, what is the relationship of human beings, what is it based on - husband, wife, boy friend, girl and so on, what is it based on?

Q: Can there be direct perception as well as thought in a relationship?

K: Can there be direct perception as well as thought in relationship. We are going to find out. I am asking - we are asking each other, what is our relationship based on.

Q: Images.

Q: Relationship is based on thought.

K: When you say your relationship is based on thought, do you know what the implications of that are?

Q: There is no relationship.

K: No, sir. Can you say that to your wife, there is no relationship? Or to your girl friend, 'Oh, it's all just thought'. Please go into it together, let's go into it. We are asking what is this relationship based on.

Q: It is based on love.

K: Based on love. Is it? If it is based on love then there can be no jealousy. Right? There can be no attachment. Right? There can be no possessiveness, no domination, no sense of belonging to me and belonging to another. So we won't, please if you will forgive

me, we will go into that word and it's a very complex business, so let's begin very simply. We like to think our relationship is based on love, on goodness, kindness, affection, care, love and all the rest of it. But it is not. That's a fact. Let's look at the facts. So we are asking, what is it based on.

Q: Fear.

K: Is it based on fear?

Q: Mutual exploitation?

K: I don't know, sir, you are all involved in it, I am not.

Q: Is it based on desire?

Q: It is based on need.

K: Please, sir, look at your wife, find out what your relationship is with her instead of just throwing out words. Or your girl friend, find out, look at it.

Q: It is based on need.

K: Need. Which is what? I need you, for what? Comfort, sex, dependency.

Q: The laundry.

K: You don't go into this. Are you frightened to go into this?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It is based on our past conditioning.

K: Jesus!

Q: Sir, I don't really know, but it seems like there is a force involved, if there are two people they are two, they are opposite, they are male and female, or simply that if there are two there is you and there is me, and this force seems to be resolving that condition. There is a deep desire, need, which the force is seeking

to resolve, to make the two one.

K: Sir, if I may point out respectfully - I am not sure if I point out respectfully - may I point out that we are all so full of ideas, conclusions, what we want, we don't examine 'what is'. If I am married and I have a wife, or a girl friend, what is my relationship to her, what is it based on? Attraction, physical sensation, sex? And the movement of thought which predominates all this. No? I see. Let's look at it, sir.

You are married, one is married, or have a girl friend, what takes place instantly? Do look at it, please look at it. You are married, you have a girl friend, what takes place? Look at it. You have an image of her, haven't you? She has an image of you, hasn't she? No? Yes, sir? Start from that. You have an image about her, and she has an image about you. How does this image come into being?

Q: By a process of memory, which is thought.

K: So you are saying this image building is based on memory; you said something awful yesterday, rude to me, you insulted me, called me a fool, registered, memory and the building of images. Right?

Q: Can't the relationship be fresh every time you see the person?

K: But, sir, that is an idea, a conclusion. First begin with 'what is'.

Q: You are saying that all our relationships are based on memory, 'what should be', our needs. There seems to me there is no need other than that, if it's not in our hearts how does it get there?

K: Sir, in our heart, to have a relationship in our heart it means affection, care, all that is involved in that, have you got that?



Apparently you can't look frankly at this. One has an image about another, whether it is the wife, or the president of this country, or the pope, you have an image about each other. That's a fact. Based on previous memory, previous incidents, and stored up in the memory and the memory, which is image-making, memory is image, the word. Right? That's simple. So my relationship to my wife or girl friend is based on an image which has been gathering through incidents - sex, pleasure, this pleasure, the memory of sex, all that, then there is the dependence on her. Right? The attachment, the possessiveness, all that is built up through time as memory and image. This is fact. No? No?

Q: Yes.

K: Contradict, sir, discuss, break it. If I am wrong, I am wrong, let's find out.

Q: It's a fact.

K: Right. Then your relationship is between these two images. See the implications of it. Memory, relationship between two people, husband, wife, boy or girl, all that, is between these two images, which thought has built together through time. It may be one day, or one second, it is already there. When you say something nice to me, it is already in memory, or when you insult me, it is already there. When there is relationship between two images, is it relationship?

Q: No.

K: If it is not then what are we talking about?

Q: The minute that you say it, it can't be love, you've said it, then it is not love.

K: I haven't gone into that yet. I said relationship between two

images put together by thought in which we are caught. Right? Therefore the constant battle, the struggle between man and woman, husband and wife, whatever, the constant conflict, ending up in divorce and all the rest of it. Now let's move from there. I face the facts. I don't deceive myself, I don't say it's love, it's romance, it's a lovely feeling - wash it all out. The fact is, it's based on this image-making. Right?

Now my next question is, can this image-making stop? You understand my question?

Q: Can there be image-making and not be caught by it?

K: I don't understand the question. Can there be image-making and yet not be caught in it.

Q: Can the brain make actual images without being caught in them?

K: You haven't seen the question. You haven't understood the first part of the question: what is thinking; thinking we said is memory - experience, knowledge, memory, stored up in the brain, and its one movement, not separate movements, one movement which is the whole process of thinking. This thinking in relationship has built these images, me and you, we and they, communists, socialists, and all the rest of the world. So I am asking myself, I see when there are these two images, you have about her and she has about you, I see there is tremendous danger in this. You follow? Do you see the great danger in this in relationship, in all relationships, whether it is with the neighbour, or with your neighbour ten thousand miles away. Do you actually see what happens when there is these two images?

Q: We have to live in the now.

K: It is not a question of living in the now, sir, it is a fact. We go away from the fact. So you are asking yourself, as long as these two images exist there must be conflict. Right? And the next question is, I see the danger of conflict because when there is conflict there is no love, obviously - so we are asking, can this image-making stop.

Q: Who is going to answer the question?

K: Both of us together. I have put the question, which is the image-making and the images that we have between us, in relationship, and we say can that image-making stop. Not who is to stop it, please understand that. Not who is to stop it. If you say, 'I will stop it', the 'I' is the product of thought. Right? So thought has created the images, thought says, I'll break it because it will create another image. So what will bring about an end to the image-making?

Q: Yoga.

K: Yoga? Lord love a duck! Sir, the word 'yoga' - I won't go in it - sorry. That's a distraction. When we are talking about something very, very serious, to talk about yoga has no meaning. If you want to discuss yoga we will go into it, but when you are discussing relationship in which there is conflict - don't you know conflict, sir, between you and your wife. And can that division which thought has brought about, can that end?

Q: When thought ends.

K: No, sir. Can that end, the image-making?

Q: What about the use of memory?

Q: We tend to carry it to the present moment.

K: The present moment, that is to live in the present. Right, sir?

Now is it possible to live in the present? What does it mean?

Q: It means to be present.

K: No, what does it mean, sir, to live in the present, actually, not theoretically, actually, daily, when you are in your office, in your home, when you are sleeping with somebody, live in the present - what does it mean?

Q: Not having images.

K: That's a theory. You really don't know what it means to live in the present, which is to live without time. I won't go into all that. Again we are distracting. So I am asking...

Q: Is there anywhere but the present?

K: How can we live anywhere but in the present. The word 'present', the actual second, the present - you see, I can tell you but it has no meaning when we are discussing this. So can the image-maker, which is thought, and the building of images end?

Q: If we still the mind we can end it.

K: If we still the mind we can end it. Now, that is just a supposition - 'if', 'I wish it would rain' - it doesn't rain. Sir, please, for god's sake, stick to what we are talking about, not theories, not conditional responses, which is 'if', 'when', all that; the fact is this. If you will listen we will go together into this, but you are so full of ideas.

I see the tremendous danger, and I am using the word 'danger' in its full significance. Danger in relationship, having images about her and about him, because that brings about great conflict in life. Right? In that there is violence, conflict means violence, in that there is no care, you might say, 'Darling, how beautiful you are, here is a ring', but conflict goes on the next minute. So we have to

find out whether this image-making can end, not through effort, because if you make an effort it is part of, again, conflict, not through desire, not through a reward, say 'If I do this, I will get that'. So what am I to do? Put that question to yourself. What are you to do when you have got these two images, and you are living with another human being intimately or not intimately, you have got these images and therefore conflict, what are you to do?

Q: It started without images.

K: What has that got to do with it?

Q: Start every day anew.

K: That's just a theory again, start every day anew.

Q: Without the images.

K: Without the images.

Q: The experience of complete, total and absolute inner silence is the experience of no image.

K: Absolute, total silence.

Q: Inner silence.

K: Inner silence. Have you got it?

Q: Yes, I have.

K: Then the problem is over. You see, your people don't...

Q: Not twenty-four hours a day.

K: Not twenty-four hours but occasionally. The rest of the time battle. Sir, please, would you kindly listen. I really want to end this. This image-making, I see the tremendous danger in it. So I ask myself, can this end? Because the danger is more important than anything else; like a precipice, when you see the danger of it, you move away from it. When you see a rattler you move away from it.

Q: Krishnaji...

K: One moment. Just listen, sir. So one sees the danger of it. Which is, why does thought create these images? Don't please answer it immediately.

Q: Desire?

K: Go into it a little bit, sir, before you answer. Go into it a little bit. That is, I am asking you why thought, which is, my wife said something to me yesterday, nagged me, bullied me, was happy with me, gave me some comfort, etc., etc., and that has built an image. And that image, I live according to that image; and she does too. And I say to myself, why does thought do this? Don't answer it yet, please, give two minutes to go into it. You can only go into it if you have no ideas about it, if you don't say, this is so, that is so, and jump to words. So we have to find out why thought does this. Thought does it - I'll have to continue because you don't - thought does it because in the image it finds security. My wife, the image, and in that I am secure. Wait a minute, sir, just listen to it. My country. Right? Security. My group. Security. The group being the image which I have created about the group, the image which I have created about the nation, the image which I have created through religious indoctrination, the image - whether the Christ, the Hindu gods and all the mess of that business. And so thought creates these images because it finds security in it. Right? Whether that security is in neuroticism, neurotic beliefs, or some beautiful fanciful image, it is still the same. So thought finds security, wants security. Why?

Q: It seems to me thought wants to maintain itself.

K: Yes, go on, sir, a little further, don't stop there. Sir, don't. You have said something, investigate, move with it.

Q: It seems to me that thought is impermanent and therefore it seeks safety.

K: Are you sure of what you are saying? Don't theorize about it. Unless you are speaking from fact, everything else is meaningless.

Q: Security, safety and certainty.

K: Which is what? To be certain, secure, all that means it demands complete inviolable security. Just a minute. Why? Why does thought demand this? My wife. You follow? I possess her, she is mine, etc., etc. In that there is great certainty, great security. I have identified myself with her. She has fulfilled what I want. And she does the same with me, it's a mutual interacting exploitation. Sorry, to use an ugly word but it is a fact. So I say to myself, if thought seeks security, is there security in the image? You understand, sir? I sought security in my wife, the wife or the girl, and I have built an image about her, and in that image there is security for me. But it's an image. You understand? It's a word, it's a memory, it's such a fragile thing, but yet I hold on to it.

Q: Sir, I thought I was aware of the passage of time, and I'm afraid it's going to end, so I seek permanency in the images I create.

K: You see permanency in anything. Right? So I am asking, why does thought seek it. Look into it, sir. I seek - please just listen, sir - I seek security in the traditional symbol, in the cross, I seek security in that. That cross, the whole structure, the nature and all that lies behind it, rituals, dogma, all that, I find security in that, why? And I know logically, if I am aware at all, logically, it is a product of thought. Right? And yet thought clings to it, why?

Q: Conditioning.

K: Is that part of our conditioning? Part of our being conditioned from childhood to believe in that symbol - Rama, Krishna, Christ, you know. Why? If thought finds security in it, and thought looks into it, I say, my god, there is no security, it is just an idea. Right? Which thought has put together. So when thought clings to an image it is the very essence of neuroticism. Right? I know it is danger and yet I cling to it. Do you see the absurdity of this, sir?

Q: Yes, I do.

K: So do you actually, no wait a minute, do you actually see the absurdity of it?

Q: Yes, I do.

K: Then it's the end.

Q: Yes, yes.

K: Then you don't create images. Wait, wait. That is, the wife calls me an idiot, will I listen to her without forming an image? Or the old tradition, habit, conditioning, response says, yes, image-making. You follow? When she calls me an idiot, no image-making. Is that possible? Or when she flatters me, which is the same thing, the other side of the coin. If you will listen I'll show it to you. Shall we go into it?

Q: Yes.

K: That is, the wife calls me an idiot because I said, did, something which she didn't like and all the rest of it, she calls me an idiot. Thought is conditioned, so the immediate response is an image. Right? I am not an idiot. There is an image. Now can I listen to her - please find out, I am going to tell you something - can I listen to her without a response? You understand? Not



indifference. Can I listen to her when she says, 'Darling, you are so lovely' - which is another image. Right? Can I listen to her when she calls me an idiot, when she says, 'You are marvellous' - both. You understand? Listen to it without storing it, without registering it. Do you understand my question? Do you understand sir? It is very important, do get this a little bit. Which is - do you want to go into all this?

Q: Yes.

K: The mechanism of the brain is to register. Right? It is registering. And it so conditioned that it registers immediately - idiot. Or you say, what a marvellous person you are. It is registered. Now to stop registering - you understand my question? When he calls me an idiot, not to register it, or when you calls me marvellous, not to register. Which doesn't mean I become indifferent, hard, callous. So I can only do that - please listen - I can only not register, that is only possible when I give my complete attention to what she says. When she calls me - please listen - when she calls me an idiot or a marvellous person, when I pay complete attention there is no registering. Why? You understand my question? Do it, please, as you are sitting there do it now. That is, you have got an image about your wife or your girl friend, or your boy friend - gosh, this boy and girl, I'm getting bored with this! We go on until we die with this question, boy, girl, woman, man. It's so silly. I am pointing out the image-making is the process of thought. Thought has made this image, therefore there is conflict in that, I see the tremendous danger in conflict, whether between India and Pakistan, or whether Russia. You follow? Tremendous danger because they kill each other. So I ask,

can that image-making stop? It can. Why does thought bring about these images? It finds security in these images - security, safety. And yet thought knows how absurd it is. Therefore when thought clings to something which is irrational, it is neurotic.

So I am saying, asking, since the mind, the brain is so conditioned, it can't let go and say, finished. So I am saying when the wife says, or the man, husband says, or the boy says, or the girl says, 'You are an idiot', not to register. Just see it. Don't say it is possible, it is not possible, but find out. Because if you say if it is possible, then you have already gone off; or if you say it is not possible, you have blocked yourself. So is that possible, can that be done? We are going to investigate.

Why does the brain register the word idiot, and the word beautiful, marvellous, you are a lovely man - why? One is an insult, one is a flattery. Because the word 'idiot' has a great deal of significance. Right? The word itself is an insulting word. I have an image about myself, and that image rejects the idea that I am an idiot. You understand? I have not only an image of my wife, my husband, my girl, or whatever it is, also I have an image about myself. Right, sir? So when you call me an idiot the image gets hurt. Right? So is it possible to end all image-making about myself as well as the other? To end totally all images. Don't say, no, or, yes. So what is the momentum, the energy from which the image-making takes place? You understand what I am talking about? No, I am not making myself clear. I will.

Let's begin: as long as there is a centre, as the 'me', with my image, that is the centre, that image will always get hurt, or flattered. Right? So as long as there is a centre it is impossible not

to register. Do you get it? Haven't you got an image about yourself? If you are really honest and look at yourself, haven't you got an image about yourself? That you are this, that you are rather ugly, that you are not so clever, and I wish I were more beautiful, you know, not so bright, not so intelligent - you have got an image about yourself. So that image, which is the centre of your being, as long as that image is there it must register. Which means, registering means division, conflict, violence, and all the rest of it. When you see the whole structure of relationship, the whole of it, then the centre becomes unimportant. You are following all this? The centre has no value. Therefore there is no registration at all. The speaker is telling, for him, a fact, not just an idea. Because I have lived through this. K, this person, has lived through this - I have been insulted, hurt, brutalized, kicked about, called marvellous, you are the great teacher, everything. There is no registration because there is no centre. You understand, sir? Therefore no conflict. Have you got this?

So we began with asking, what is thought, and what is experiencing. Right? In the moment of experiencing anything, it doesn't matter, sex, looking at that lovely branch, or the evening sunset, the delight of an early morning, when there is an experiencing actually that is the second, in that there is no thought. Then thought comes along and says, 'How marvellous that was' and holds it. The moment it says, how marvellous, it has captured it, and therefore wants to repeat it. Right, sir? So to look at that sunset, or the morning light on a leaf, the experience of it and end it, not carry it over, all that demands tremendous attention. And attention is not possible when there is a centre which says, I must

attend, I must get - you follow. Right, sir?

What time is it, sir?

Q: Twenty past twelve.

K: We meet next Tuesday, for this dialogue we are going to talk over together about education.

Q: Sir, the lady would like me to ask if this image and hurt are the same thing.

K: The image and the hurt?

Q: Are they the same thing?

K: Of course. The moment you have an image you are going to be flattered or injured.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL 1977

We were saying how important it is in a world that is becoming so utterly chaotic, that there should be, and there must be, human transformation, a great, deep psychological revolution. A revolution is not the bloody kind, the physical kind, which man has experimented with centuries upon centuries, trying to change the environment through conflict, bloodshed, violence of every kind. And apparently he has not succeeded at all, though he has environmentally brought about certain destructive change, he has not radically, psychologically brought about deep transformation of man. And we are concerned in these Gatherings with that, whether man can radically transform himself, psychologically. Because if he does not bring about that transformation, that revolution, psychologically, inevitably we will have more and more conflict, more and more wars and conflict in all relationship, whether intimate or superficial.

And also we were saying - I hope you don't mind, those of you who have heard it before - that wherever you go in the world, whether in the East or in Europe or here, one finds man, which includes the woman, and I hope you don't mind if I don't say each time, woman - man or woman is about the same throughout the world, psychologically; they suffer, they are in great turmoil, uncertainty, anxious, great deal of sorrow and great many tears, loneliness, despair. And eventually facing death. And so, as one observes this fact, one sees that man, you or the woman, is the whole world, he is the world, and the world is him. If one realizes that, very deeply, not intellectually or merely verbally, then that

brings about an extraordinary quality of vitality, to face things, to face the world as it is.

And that is what we have been saying during the last two talks here. Now this morning, if we may, we'll go into the question of what is consciousness, the content of consciousness. And whether that consciousness can be radically transformed.

One often wonders whether human beings, you and I and others, are aware of themselves. Most people are aware rather superficially, their petty desires, superficial conflicts, their physical demands, sexual appetites and all the rest of it. They're superficially cognizant, know what they are going through. But there is also far deeper layers of one's being, which is consciousness, to be conscious of oneself. That is, to know or to be aware of the whole nature and the structure of consciousness, of what one is - that is consciousness. To be aware implies watchfulness, to observe, to observe what is going on within oneself, not biologically but psychologically - the thoughts, the motives, the conflicts, the desires, the opposing purposes, ideals and facts, saying one thing, doing another, thinking one thing, and contradicting in daily life.

The whole process of this is consciousness, which is fairly obvious. We are using the word 'consciousness' which means to be conscious of oneself, and all the turmoil that is going on within oneself. To observe it implies, or to be aware of it, if there is any choice in that observation that the factor of the choice distorts observation. I think that's fairly clear. That is, if one is to observe one's own deep layers of consciousness with all the struggles, the pains, the anxieties, the laughter, the tears and the ambition, and

the mischief that's going on within oneself, to observe it, to be aware of it, and if one chooses, then the observation becomes, is distorted. That's fairly simple. Right? Can we proceed from there?

So observation implies no choice. And when you observe this whole process of oneself, the whole content of oneself, the various factors, influences that bring about this consciousness, is that consciousness - please listen, give a little attention to this - is that consciousness different from the observer? You understand my question? One observes the mountain, the shadows, the movement of the clouds and so on, one observes. When you observe, there is a you, the observer and the thing observed. The observer, as we said, is the past, all the memories, experiences, knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory, which is the past. And when you observe through memory there is a division between the observer and the observed. Right? So to observe without the observer is a real problem, which we'll go into presently, if we've not done it already in the previous talks, because it's really quite important because it is the factor of conflict. Where there is division there must be conflict, as in nations, when you have various types of beliefs, in religious beliefs, there is always division, always conflict.

So to live in complete, deep peace, the observer is the observed, and therefore no conflict. So we are going to examine together, go into this question of consciousness, together. Please, if I may point out again, this is a very serious talk. One has to give considerable attention, in which is implied care, affection, and we're taking a journey together, I'm not taking a journey and you're following me, we are together exploring this. Therefore it is your responsibility, if you are at all serious, to go into this.

And, as we said the other day too, the speaker in exploring together with you, has no authority. Though he sits on a platform, which is for convenience only, don't make him into an authority - then you're not capable of exploring. Because your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind. I think that is the basic thing one has to understand: what you are, the world is. Your consciousness is in conflict, disarray, confused, disordered, and in your relationship, in all the things you do, there is disorder. And in the world there is disorder. So what you are, the world is.

So we are together going to explore this question of what is consciousness, and what are its contents. And are the contents different from consciousness. And is the content consciousness, and whether it is possible to go beyond this small, little, conditioned consciousness. That's what we're going to explore during the next three, four talks. So please be a little serious. I'm afraid most Americans - forgive me for saying so - are not very serious people. They'd rather be amused, entertained, acquire a lot of superficial knowledge from books, or go to classes, be told about psychology and other matters. And they think they are terribly learned, they know all the facts in the world. But they know very little about themselves, actually. They know about themselves according to Freud, Jung and all the rest of it, but when you put all those authorities out, and when you look at yourself, you hardly know yourself. So if you don't mind my pointing out, be a little serious, if you can, don't hold to your particular theory or to your particular conclusion, or add what we're saying to that which you already know. Or what we're saying adapt it to your particular guru or, you know, all that business.



So just, we are, as friends, look into this, we are not doing propaganda for you, or trying to convince you of anything. So, if you're a little serious and are willing to pay a little attention for some time, a duration, because you cannot give half a minute attention and then think about something else. This requires very considerable, deep enquiry which demands your care, your affection, your sense of responsibility.

So we said, we're going to observe, be aware of our consciousness. And we said also where there is a choice in observation, saying, 'I prefer this, I don't like this, or this is what I, this is right and that is wrong', so choice psychologically distorts clarity, observation. So please observe without choice.

In our consciousness there are certain factors, which are the desire for power, position. And there are many hurts that we have received from childhood, wounds, deep psychological hurts. And also in that consciousness there is the everlasting search for pleasure. Please, we are looking together, I am not saying it is, we are enquiring, learning together the whole content of our consciousness.

And there is the pursuit of pleasure, and there is this enormous sense of fear. Right? Then also there is suffering, not only personal suffering, but the suffering of mankind, man, and woman have been through a million thousand years with wars every other year, destruction, enormous sense of sorrow.

And in that consciousness also there is that thing which is called love, with all its jealousies, hurts, wounds, anger, violence, and so on. And also in that consciousness there are innumerable beliefs, dogmas, ideas, conclusions. And also there is death, the fear of the

unknown, fear of dying, coming to an end.

So this is the content of our consciousness, the knowledge that we have acquired from books, the knowledge that we have acquired from experience, stored up, in memory, in the brain as memory, which is the whole movement of thought. Right?

So the whole content of our consciousness are these things. So we're going to examine the major factors, not all the details, because that's endless. The major factors, like power, demand for power, which most of us want, a position. Power implies success, domination, power over others, or power over oneself, and so on. And also there is in that hurt, being hurt, from childhood we are hurt. And being hurt we have become violent. We'll go into that slowly, step by step. So we're going to examine, first the desire for power. Right? The desire to dominate, the desire to assert, aggressiveness, all that is a sense of power. The dictators throughout the world are, they are representatives of that power. And as long as they've not solved the problem of power, there's going to be conflict, not only in the world of dictatorship, totalitarianism, but also in the world of so-called democracy, individual voting and all that, there is also the desire for power, possession, domination. And this is an important factor to understand, and if it is at all possible to be free of it.

And is it possible to be free of it, this desire for power, which is to possess another, to dominate another, to carry out your particular ideals, and assert those ideals, you follow - all that, which is the expression of will. You understand this? Are you following all this? I hope you are, because it's your life, not my life. And if one observes, how you waste your life. You understand? So in talking

over together amicably, with friendship, with affection, with compassion, together, don't waste your life, and not to waste it implies the understanding of one's consciousness and going beyond it. So it is a very, very serious matter.

So in one's life, in one's daily life, is it possible to be free of the desire for power - power includes domination, possession, assertion, aggressiveness, all that. So to understand power, one must understand the whole movement of desire. Right? You're following all this, some of you at least? Because most of us want to fulfil our desires and when these desires are not fulfilled we feel frustrated. And from that frustration there comes all kinds of neurotic activity. So it's very important, it seems to me, to understand the nature and the structure of desire, which eventually is will, and will is the essence of power.

So you must go into this question of desire. We're not saying that you must not have desire, but to understand it, to go into it, see the results of desire, how desire arises, what is its nature, not as the monks throughout the world, religious monks have said, suppress desire. We are not saying that, on the contrary. When you suppress desire it must explode in other directions, but to understand, to go into it, to see the whole nature of it, then it becomes something else. So we're going to go together into the understanding of desire. You know what desire is, don't you, most of you, don't you? Desire for clothes, desire for cars, desire for man or woman, desire for position, knowledge, desire saying, 'I wish I was as clever as that man,' and so on.

So what is this desire, and how does it arise? Please, if I may ask you, suggest, don't repeat something that you don't know, that

you have not directly seen, because we are all secondhand human beings, we repeat slogans, what people have said, what you have learnt from books - you have never discovered anything for yourself, and that's what we're going to do, find out for yourself, and then it is irrevocable, it cannot be destroyed, it is inviolable, it can never be damaged, if it is something that you find for yourself.

So we're asking, what is desire, how does it come, because it is one of the major factors in our life - the want, the want of so many things, not because you're lonely you want something, or that you are in bad health, therefore you want something, to be in health. We are not talking, we are asking, what is desire itself? It is really very simple, if you look at it. If you observe it very closely. Desire arises, doesn't it, through perception, through contact, through sensation, and thought, and thought then creates the image. Seeing, contact, sensation, then desire, and the creation of the image out of that desire, and wanting that. Do you get this? No, see it in yourself, please, not because I point it out. You look at a car, you look at a woman, you look at a house, there the visual perception, sensation, then there's the contact and the desire, desire then creates the image of having that car or that house or that woman or that man. Right? Do you see this? Actually, not because I tell you.

And thought then pursues the fulfilment of that desire. And out of that comes conflict, not being able to fulfil and being able to fulfil. So desire with its will, is the search for power. That is, to dominate people, in the name of god, in the name of peace, in the name of ideal revolution, and so on. So is it possible to live - please listen to it - is it possible to live without will. That means, to live without direction, which doesn't mean living chaotically. We'll

leave it like that for the moment. We'll come back to it later.

And also one of the factors in our consciousness is the many hurts that one has received. The wounds. The wounds, the psychological wounds that one has received from childhood, in the schools, colleges, universities, and as we grow up, in business, in family, the hurts that one has accumulated. And the result of those hurts, what takes place when you're hurt? Either you resist, build a wall around yourself, and not to be hurt any more, and therefore withdraw from life - right? And the more you withdraw, the more neurotic you become. And isolate yourself, not to be hurt. And then one asks, is it possible not to be hurt at all in life. We are aware that we are hurt, that is, when in school an educator compares one boy with another boy, that boy is hurt. When the parents say you're not as clever as your brother, that's a hurt. And when somebody calls you an idiot, that's a hurt. And so on, there are a great many psychological deep wounds.

And when there are wounds of a such kind, the action from those wounds is to protect oneself, withdraw oneself, to resist. And out of that resistance there is violence. Now we are asking, is it possible not to be hurt at all, and to totally wipe out the past hurts. The past hurts to be wiped away and never again to be hurt. And it's very important to understand this because if we don't understand this, we've no proper relationship with another. Now we're going to go into this question, whether it's possible never to be hurt again, and to wipe out the hurts that one has received from childhood. Are you following this carefully? I hope you're interested because it is your life.

What is hurt? When you say, 'I am hurt,' what is it that is hurt?

Is it not, we're asking the question so that we two enquire into this - I am not, the speaker is not asserting, but we're enquiring - is it not that you have an image about yourself, and it is that image that is hurt. You have an image about being clever or not clever, being beautiful or not beautiful, you have an image or a picture or an idea about yourself. And it is that image, that picture, is hurt. It's fairly simple, isn't it? So we're asking, seeing the consequences of being hurt, which is violence, withdrawal, resistance, isolation and all the neurotic behaviour that comes from that isolation, seeing all that, it becomes very important to find out, and urgently, whether such hurts can be wiped away, altogether, and therefore never in life to be hurt. You understand what it means to have an innocent mind, a mind that is untouched, which has never been hurt. The word 'innocence' comes from the word, the root of it is, a mind that has never been hurt. Right? See the beauty of it first.

So the image which you call the 'I', I am hurt, as long as that image exists, there must be hurt. As long as I have an image about myself that I'm clever, that I'm this, that I'm that, or that I have a certain reputation, that I'm a great man, that I am this, a dozen images about oneself - as long as you have an image about yourself, you're going to be hurt. So is it possible not to have an image? Which doesn't mean that you become vacuous, live in a dreamy world, or become a vegetable. We are asking a question, as long as you're hurt, the consequences of being hurt are great, ugly. And when there is no hurt, your actions are extraordinarily clear. So is it possible not to have an image about yourself, both professionally, you understand, like a man who is capable, expert, specialist. And when you question them, they'll get hurt also, like

an ordinary man, he gets hurt when you say he's a fool, because he's got an image of himself, and so on.

So is it possible not to have an image. If you say, 'How am I to get rid of the image?', the 'how', which is the method, the system, when you say 'how' that is implied, then that system, that method brings about another image, and that image will also be hurt. But to see the fact, the actual, that as long as you have an image, you're going to be hurt terribly. And if you want to live a sane life, which means no hurt, and you see the importance of living a sane, clear, life without any hurt, naturally the image disappears. If you see the necessity, the importance and the urgency that as long as you have an image you're going to be hurt, and the consequences of hurt are enormous - if you see that, then you never create an image.

Is that clear? Are you doing it now? Or will you say, 'I'll think about it when I go home, when I've a little time'. You have the time, the leisure, the peace, now. If you don't do it now, because you've been forced to see it - forced in the sense, together we are investigating, therefore together we are seeing the fact. And because you see the fact of being hurt and the consequences, the image-making stops.

So one asks - please go into this carefully - the image is built by thought. Thought has put together the image that I should be something, that I am something. And what is thought, which we went into the other day. We'll go into it again. What is thought? What is thinking? Upon which all our social, moral, ethical, religious structure is based - thinking. All the gods and all the churches, all the symbols, the saviours, the, you know, Christ, Buddha, all that, the whole religious structure, the popes, the

priests and the bishops, the arch bishops, you know, it's all based, brought about by thought, thought of centuries.

So we have to enquire together what is thinking, because it's very important, because we're going to talk over together, fear, after we've gone into this question of what is thinking, we're going to go together into this whole nature of fear, which holds us so strongly.

Thought is the response of memory. Thought, memory is the accumulated facts, knowledge, experience. If you are an engineer, you have learnt a great deal about engineering, pressures, structure, mathematics, from childhood, and that is stored up in your brain as knowledge, and according to that knowledge you act skilfully or not skilfully. Right? Professionals, and the amateurs.

So thinking is the response of memory, memory being experience, not only your experience but man's total experience and the accumulated knowledge of centuries of which you are the representative as man or woman. So thinking is the response of memory. Memory is the past. You know, one must doubt a great deal. You understand? Have doubt. But if you begin with certainties, you end up in doubt. Right? Do you see this? But if you begin with doubt, doubting everything, not accepting, doubt, then you end up with certainties. But we unfortunately begin with certainties and end up with uncertainty and die.

So we are saying, thought is a response of memory, stored up in the brain cells, and we are not experts in the brain, but it is a fact, you can observe it in yourself, every day. So there is the image of yourself that gets hurt. And is it possible to be free of that image? That image has been created by thought, successive incidents,



accidents, assertions, all that has brought about the hurt to the image.

And thought in relationship, in human relationship, is a distorting factor. May we go into that? We're going to discuss together human relationship, the wife and the husband, the boy and the girl. We are saying that thought in relationship - right?-destroys relationship. We're going to go into that, because is thought love? Is thought compassion? And in relationship, between two human beings, intimate or otherwise, the movement is a separating factor. So we're going to talk over together the problem of relationship. And it is one of the most important things in life. If you're not related properly to nature, the trees, birds, to nature, then you are not properly related to man or woman. And life is relationship. And it becomes very, very important to find out what is right relationship.

We'll start with facts, and we're only dealing with facts, not with ideas for what relations should be, should not be, what it must be - those are all not facts. What actually is the relationship between you and your wife or your girl or your boy, actually. Is there any relationship at all? And what does the word 'relationship' mean? To be related, to be in contact, to be in touch, both physically as well as psychologically. Not to be separate. The word means that. I am related to you. That word implies tremendous significance. And we're going to look at it factually, what is actually in daily life taking place. Whether you're married or not married, every incident, every word, every assertion in that relationship, which is very delicate, an image is formed, isn't it? You have an image about your wife or your girl, and the girl has an image about you.

That's simple. As long as you have an image, there must be division. When you say, 'I know my wife,' or my girl friend, or the boy friend, when you say, 'I know' in that very assertion you find security. And that security is the factor that there is the image you have about her or him. And that image gives you a great sense of security. Doesn't it? Do you actually know your girl friend or wife or husband, actually? Of course not. You know all the reactions, all the superficial things, because you have an image about her, and she has an image about you. And these two images have a relationship which is words, memories, ideas. Because you have already settled in your own mind, you have a marvellous relationship.

Look, sirs, if you're a man, you go off to your office or the factory or some work, and there you're ambitious, greedy, envious, wanting success, position. And you come home and she also wants, goes out to work in America, she has her ambitions, desire for success, position. Where is your relationship? In bed? And is that all the relations you have? And what is your relationship to your children? None at all. See what we are producing in the world. For god's sake, it's your world. And thought is the factor in your relationship, not love. And thought is memory. You understand? Remembrance. So is it possible to live a life with another intimately or otherwise without any sense of image? That requires great attention, care. But you're not willing to give that care and attention, because you're concerned about yourself. And she is concerned about herself. The concerns are both the same, both are ambitious.

So one asks at the end of it, what is love? Is love desire? Is love

sex? Is love attachment? Is love being concerned about oneself eternally? Is love jealousy? Can there be love when there is fear? Can there be love when there is only the search for pleasure? You understand all this? So we're going to go into this question of what is pleasure. Let's first deal with what is fear.

You know as long as you have fear one lives in darkness. All our actions are distorted. Fear is like a terrible disease, and we put up with it, we live with it, we accept it, because we don't know what to do with it, how to be free of it. So we're going to enquire into the whole problem of fear. And first of all to go into it, we are not analyzing, because an analyzer is the analyzed. We are saying, the analyzer is the analyzed. The analyzer is not different from the thing analyzing, he is part of that analysis. Analysis implies division. Analysis implies time. You go to a psychologist, the money and the time and the trouble, all that business, he will analyze you. That means you are different from the analyzer. Right? And the analyzer is his own analysis. Because we are saying, analysis does not solve any problem. On the contrary, it perpetuates the problem, prolongs it, because you see, I analyze myself. If I don't go to a professional, I analyze myself. What is implied in that? I analyze myself: I am different from the thing which I am going to analyze. Right? But is that a fact? That which I analyze is me, who is analyzing.

So analysis implies time, division, it is like, analysis is analyzing itself all the time, it has no meaning. So we're not analyzing, but we're only observing. To look at that tree without analysis, you understand - just to look at the mountain or your friend, sitting beside you, or the girl. Just to look, not to analyze.

So we're going to do the same with regard to fear. We're not analyzing, we are merely observing fear, the nature of fear, the cause of fear, the structure of fear.

You know what you are, you know your fears, fear of loneliness, fear of old age, fear of not fulfilling, fear of losing, fear of being attached, and you might lose that which you are attached to, fear of not having success in life - dozens of fears. Will you examine, observe the many branches of fear, or fear itself. You understand? One may be afraid of loneliness, one may be afraid of one's wife or husband, girl or boy friend, one may be afraid of losing what you have, one may be afraid of a job, losing a job and not having a job and so on. And psychologically one may be afraid of this extraordinary sense of loneliness. One may be afraid of being attached and losing. Or one may be afraid of death, of a disease, of pain that you have had, and you don't want that pain tomorrow and therefore - there are many, many fears. Do we - please listen, please carefully listen - do you take one fear after the other or do you observe the central fact of fear? You understand my question? Do you look at the fragments of fear, fragments of fear or the whole, total fear? Which is it that you want to do? Will you take one fear at a time, fear of loneliness, fear of death, fear of not having a job, fear of, that your wife or girl friend may turn away from you, one by one. Or the root of fear - you understand my question? Which is it that you want to do? The whole fear or the varying expressions of fear?

Well, sirs? If you tackled the root of fear - right? - then the whole, the tree of fear disappears. You understand my question? If you tackle the root of it, the various fragments lose their meaning.

Understood? So we're going to do that - either you want to tackle, to grasp, to understand the fragmentary fears, or the very root of it. If you understand, go into the very root of it, the fragmentary fears disappear.

So we're going to go into this question of fear, radically, at the very root of it, whether it's possible to be free of the total fear, of all fear, both superficial fears and the deep-rooted fears, the unconscious unknown fears. We are now going to observe fear, fear at the very root, the root of it. And we are saying it is not analysis, because analysis will not eradicate fear. Analysis implies, as we pointed out, takes time, the analyzer thinking different from that which is analyzed, when they are both essentially the same.

So we're going to look into fear. What is the root of fear? The root of fear is time. Do look at it carefully, don't accept what I'm saying. The root of fear, we are saying, is time. Look, one has had pain last week, physical pain, and you don't want it to occur again, and you are afraid it might happen. Right? So the remembrance of pain which you had a week ago and not wanting it again. So there is time. You understand? Fear is essentially, basically, fundamentally, a question of time. Go into it, I'm going to go slowly into it.

What is time? Time is movement, from here to there, it's a movement by the clock as well as psychologically. Moving from 'what is' to 'what should be', that demands time. And you might not achieve what you want to be, and therefore there is fear. So time is the factor of fear. Look, I am afraid of death, suppose one is afraid of death. That is, in the future. If death happened instantly, there is no fear. So time is the factor of fear. And what is time, apart from

the chronological fact, by the watch, when you have to take a bus, car and all that, what is the factor of time? What is time? I will see you tomorrow. That is a fact of time. And I hope to change from what I am to what I should be. That requires time.

Time ceases when there is only 'what is'. When one is violent, time is necessary to become non-violent. But when there is only violence, and not its opposite, there is no time. So time is a movement. Movement implies not only time but thought. Going from here to there. All movement of thought is time. All movement of thought is measure and time. So time is the factor of fear. Time is brought about by thought, that I will die in two years time, therefore I'm frightened, and I think about it. So thought and time, which are both the same, is the basic factor of fear. And there is no fear when there is only the absolute fact, instantly. That is, can you observe the movement of time as thought which breeds fear? I am afraid of tomorrow, the fear comes into being when I think what might happen tomorrow. Or I've had pain yesterday and I don't want it to happen again, I don't want to have that pain again, and it might happen and there is fear. Right? So fear is the movement of time and thought.

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 10TH APRIL 1977

I would like this morning, if I may, to talk about pleasure. One of the structures of our consciousness is fear, pleasure and sorrow. And before we talk about it, go into it, I think we ought to understand something very clearly and simply, the art of listening, the art of seeing, and the art of learning. The word 'art' is generally applied to artists, those who paint, those who write poems, do sculpture and so on. But the meaning of that word 'art' means giving everything its right place, putting all our thoughts, feelings, anxieties and so on, in their right place. So the word 'art' means giving the proper place, proper proportion, putting everything in harmony - not just paint a picture or write a poem.

So if you will this morning apply the art, the art of listening. We rarely listen to anybody. We are so full of our own conclusions, our own experiences, our own problems, our own judgements, so we have no space in which to listen. We ought to have some space so that as two friends, you and I, the speaker, are talking over together their problems, amicably, under the shade of a tree, sitting down and looking at the mountains, but concerned with their problems, and so they are willing to listen to each other. And to listen is only possible when you put aside your particular opinion, your particular knowledge or problem, your conclusions, then you're free to listen, not interpreting, not judging, not evaluating, but actually the art of listening, to listen with great care, attention, with affection. And if we have such an art, if we have learnt such, rather, if you are capable of such listening, then communication becomes very, very simple. There'll be no misunderstanding.

Communication implies to think together, to share the things that we are talking about together, to partake in the problem, as two human beings, living in a monstrous, corrupt world where everything is so ugly, brutal, violent and meaningless. It is very important, it seems to me, if I may point out, that in the art of listening one learns immediately, one sees the fact instantly.

And if you, if one listens rightly, as we pointed out the meaning of that word right, correctly, accurately, not what you think is right, or wrong, but in the art of listening there is freedom and in that freedom every word, every nuance of word has significance and there is immediate comprehension, which is immediate insight, and therefore immediate freedom to observe.

Also there is the art of seeing, to see things as they are, not as you wish to see them. To see things without any illusion, without any preconceived judgement or opinion, to see actually 'what is', not your conclusions about 'what is'.

Then, the art of learning, not memorizing, which becomes very mechanical, because our minds, our brains have already become so extraordinarily mechanical. So the art of learning implies freedom to observe, to listen without prejudice, without argumentation, without any emotional, romantic responses. If we have these three arts, not merely as a verbal conclusion or an intellectual comprehension, but actually, in our daily life, to put everything in its right place, where they belong, so that one can live a really very quiet, harmonious life. But that is not possible if you haven't learned this art of giving things their proper place.

So we're going to talk over together this morning the problem of fear, not only the problem of fear, go into it much more, but also



the problem, the question why human beings, throughout the ages, pursue so intensely, pleasure. Not that it is wrong or right, but why?

Modern civilization, which is really based on consumerism, is the pursuit of pleasure, if you observe it. The books, your own feelings, is this constant, endless pursuit of pleasure, if you go into it, because pleasure and fear are the two sides of the same coin. And to understand one and disregard the other becomes rather meaningless. So we have to examine both, fear and pleasure, not as a separate thing, but flowing into each other, as the two sides of the same tree, the same coin.

We were saying yesterday that fear is time, not only the chronological time but also psychological time. Time, as we pointed out, is movement, from here to there, physically, to go from here to Santa Barbara or to Los Angeles you need time. That's a movement. And also there is psychological time, at least we think there is psychological time, that is, the changing of 'what is' into 'what should be', the pursuit of an ideal, away from 'what is'. The 'what is', is violence or grief or pain, and to overcome that or to understand it or to go beyond it, psychologically we say there is non-violence, and to achieve that you need time.

So there is both physiological time, the time by the clock, and also we think, unfortunately, that there is psychological time. That is, the pursuit of an ideal, which is time. For the speaker, all ideals are idiotic, because what is important is not ideals but to understand 'what is'. If one understands 'what is', then the ideals become unnecessary. But we think that to overcome 'what is', we need the ideals in order to lever, give pressure to wipe away 'what

is'. So that is time.

So thought, which is memory, stored up in the brain as experience and knowledge, so that movement of time is called evolution. Right? To evolve. So we think one can be free of fear through time. Now, we are, the speaker is questioning the whole process of evolution, psychological evolution. Which is, there is fear - all human beings have various types of fears, both biological as well as psychological. And the freedom from it, we have never demanded the freedom from it, we have never asked for the freedom from it, we put up with fear. And that's a part of our conditioning.

So we are going to question, and investigate together, this question of whether the whole structure of human thinking, which is time, which is measure, and as long as that process goes on, there must be fear. We are saying that fear can stop instantly, completely, and has no future, not that you will have other forms of psychological fears, but the ending totally of fear. And that's only possible when you understand the nature of time, the psychological time.

And, if we want to understand the nature of fear, and see the consequences of fear in action, one must use logic, reason, and approach it sanely. And to approach it sanely you must understand the whole movement of thinking. And we've said over and over again, what is the nature and structure of thought. And thought invents time, psychologically, because thought says, as I am myself uncertain, not secure, it invents security in an idea, in an ideal, in a picture, in a symbol, and clings to that symbol.

So to understand fear and go beyond it completely, not only

superficial fears, but the deep unconscious unknown fears, is only possible when you know or when you understand the process of thinking. And give thought its right place, which is the art of thinking. That is, as we said, thought is the outcome or the response of knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory. So thought has a right place, in building a house, or in the technological world, and so on. But thought psychologically breeds fear. So thought psychologically has no place if you would be free of fear. Are we meeting each other?

Now please listen to this, not how to be free of fear, which is meaningless, because the 'how' implies the invention of thought which creates, which brings about a system. When you say, 'How am I to do it?', you're asking for a system. That system is put together by thought. So thought again is caught in a system, hoping to be free of fear. So what we are saying is, please learn the art of listening, that is, you have fears of many kinds, or you have a fear, or you have fears which if you understand the root of it, all superficial, and the very root of fear goes. So please listen, as we said, with the art of listening, which is, the art of listening is, to put away your prejudices, your conclusions, your wanting to be even free of fear. The very wanting to be free of fear, the very desire to be free of fear is a hindrance to listening.

So please learn now the art of listening. And with that attention of listening, which is an art, when the speaker says, 'Thought is time, thought is measure, thought is a movement in time, which creates fear,' if you see that, if you actually listen to it, to that statement, and not make a conclusion of that statement, but actually listen with your heart, with your mind, with all your

capacity, attention and care, then you will see that fear has no place at all. The art of listening is the miracle.

So we'll come back to it a little later. So now we're going to talk about together what is pleasure, why man has pursued pleasure, because that's part of our consciousness, it's part of our daily life, it's part of our thinking, it's the motive that keeps us pursuing. Why has man made pleasure into such an extraordinary importance, into such fantastic proportions - the whole world of entertainment, why? There is not only the world of entertainment, from Hollywood and all the rest of the world, but also there is the religious entertainment. I'm not being sacrilegious or insulting, but the whole structure and the nature of religious mass and all the rest of it is a form of entertainment, you are entertained, you are emotionally sustained, excited.

So we have to go into this question, if you are willing, and you must be willing because it's part of your life. There is not only sexual pleasure but also there are various types of psychological pleasures, the pleasure of owning something, the pleasure of possession - please listen, see it in yourself, not just accept the words of the speaker, that has no meaning whatsoever. The pleasure of possession, the pleasure of being attached to something, the pleasure of belonging to something, a group, a community, a sect, a family.

Then there is the pleasure of power, power over others, power over oneself, the control, which is a form of asceticism. The word 'ascetic' comes from, which means basically 'ash', the word 'ascetic' means that which has been made into an ash, a withered human being - that's what is implied. So there is power, there is pleasure in

power, possession, attachment, there is pleasure in belonging to a particular community, the pleasure of following the herd, not swimming against the current, or swimming against the current, which becomes also a form of pleasure.

So there are these innumerable forms of pleasure. I hope one is aware of it. That is, if one may ask, are you, as a friend, talking over together, the friend asks, are you aware of the pursuit of pleasure which you follow, which you are pursuing. And we are discussing that pleasure, whether it is the pleasure of taste, food, sex, the biological pleasures, the sensuous pleasures, and the psychological pleasures. Why do you, as a human being, who represent the world, and as a human being you are the world, why do you pursue this pleasure? You understand my question? Why this constant demand? The pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of living up to an ideal, the pleasure of the search for so-called god. God is, after all, the invention of thought, isn't it? Are you willing to look into that? Because, while we are talking about that, it's important to understand what is reality, and what is truth. Because we have made god into an absolute truth, not only in this country but all over Europe, and over the whole Asiatic world - mention the word 'god' and you are a most respectful person.

So we are asking, what is reality? And what is illusion, and what is truth? Are you getting tired of all this? I hope you're not merely listening to a lot of words, then it becomes very tiresome, then it becomes rather boring. But if you're listening, which is the art, which is a great art, then you have to find out what is reality.

Would you say reality is everything that thought has created, everything, the beautiful building, the temple, the mosque, the

cathedral, and all the contents of the cathedral, the mosque, and the temple. That is reality. And thought has not created nature, that is reality, there it is. But thought has created many illusions, the illusion of nationality, which is accepted as a reality, illusion of war, which is accepted as necessary, a civilized existence. So thought whatever thought has created, both technologically as well as that which thought has created as illusions, is a reality. And thought has not created nature, but thought has built a chair out of the wood of nature.

So truth has nothing whatsoever to do with reality, which we'll talk about when we go into the whole question of what is meditation. Because what we're talking about now is part of meditation; the art of listening is a part of meditation, the art of seeing is part of meditation, and learning. So what we're doing now is the movement of meditation, which is to be free of fear, and the understanding of pleasure.

So we're saying, is pleasure love? Please find out for yourself, ask that question. Is pleasure love? Is desire love? Is possession love? Is the desire for power love? So we are asking, desire, pleasure, is it the nature of love? And if it is not, why have we made pleasure more dominant than love? And to understand love - please do go into this with the speaker, because this is very important in our life, because we have no love, we know what attachment is, we know what it is to possess or being possessed, and the pleasures of that. We all know what it means to have sex, and the pleasures of sex, the imaginations, the pictures, the thought involved in that act, all pleasure. All that we're asking, is that love?

And we use that word 'love' so easily. I love my country, I love

my books, I love what I'm eating, I love my wife, or my girl. So one has to go into this question very deeply to see and discover for oneself what love is. Without that you have wasted your life, you're just zombies, or just human beings uttering a lot of words, living a useless life, confused, miserable, suffering.

So we can only understand that which is love when there is the understanding, not verbal, or intellectual but the depth of the meaning of pleasure. There is pleasure, there is enjoyment and there is joy. You understand? Pleasure and the enjoyment of a morning, when the sun is out, early morning, the birds are singing and light on the mountains and the leaves and the colour - that's a great delight, great enjoyment. But when thought comes into it and says, 'What a lovely morning it is! I wish I could have such mornings every day.' Or the remembrance of such a morning and the demand, the pleasure of that morning, remembered, is pleasure, isn't it? Look, you have an experience, a pleasurable experience, an experience which is delightful, happy, joyous. And you don't end it there, thought comes in and says, 'Let's have it again, let's repeat it.' Which is the pursuit of pleasure, that which was delightful, enjoyable, has become instantly a pleasurable thing through the movement of thought. You get it? You understand this?

So there is pleasure, there is enjoyment, there is joy. Joy you can never invite, it comes, a happy and extraordinary harmonious marvellous state. And you don't end it there. Thought says, 'I must have it again.' The desire to have it again is the pursuit of pleasure, not the actual experience.

So there are these factors in pleasure, that which thought pursues, as pleasure, the enjoyment independent of pleasure, the

delight, the beauty of something. Talking of beauty, would it be right to talk about it a little bit here? What is beauty? You know when you see something extraordinarily beautiful, the mountain, the deep valleys, shadow, a sheet of water - when you see this marvellous, intense thing, at that moment, at that second, you are not, you with your problems, with your idiocies, with your absurdities, all that's gone - you're not there, because the magnitude and the dignity and the glory of a mountain is so enormous it drives you away. Which means, there is beauty only when you are not.

So we are saying, pleasure, enjoyment, and joy. And to put all this in their right place is the art of living. But our consciousness, which is our daily life, is so confused, so contradictory, and we are saying, unless you understand very deeply pleasure, enjoyment and joy, which comes, which grows into great ecstasy, unless there is order in your consciousness, you cannot possibly meditate. And that is what we are doing now, to live a way of life which is meditative, not meditate and lead a stupid, mischievous violent life.

So if pleasure, desire is not love, if jealousy is not love, if attachment is not love, if being possessed or to possess is not love, and as most human beings live with the pleasures of possession, then what is the relationship between pleasure and love? What is the relationship between attachment - you know what attachment is, how it comes into being? - and love? What is attachment - my country, my god, my belief, my wife, my husband, the dependence on another, whether it is a guru - and I hope none of you have gurus - then you're depending on somebody who thinks he knows. When somebody says, 'I know,' beware of that person.



So, to understand what is the relationship between pleasure and love, you must understand what is relationship between human beings. Right? What is the relationship between human beings, actually? Have they any relationship at all? Or it's only relationship of reactions, a sense of dependency, sexual and all the rest of it. When you say, 'I'm related to my wife or to my girl friend or boy friend,' what does it mean? Go into it, for god's sake, because it's your life. What does it actually mean? Are you really related? Or merely the idea, the thought of being related? You follow what I'm saying? If it is the thought of being related, that relationship is based on remembrance, remembrance of hurts, remembrance of sexual pleasures, remembrance of dependence, and so on. So your relationship is based on the remembrance of things past. And to that relationship we hold. So she has a remembrance of things past, and you have a remembrance of things past, so you never meet. Perhaps you meet in bed, but actually you never meet. Which is, as long as your relationship is based on remembrance of things of the past, then you are not related. You may call it love, it's a dead thing. And that's why there is such conflict between man and woman.

So listen to it, not what to do about it. If you listen, as we said, the art of listening, to be sensitive, to be alert, to be watchful, now. If you are doing that now, the art of listening, you will see you will put thought in its right place. Then you'll have an actual relationship with another, and therefore never conflict with another.

So we have come to a point in the understanding of our consciousness, which is our life, which is our daily, every day life.

In that consciousness there is the desire for power, the many hurts that one has received from childhood. Then there is fear, pleasure, and the thing that we call love, which is not love. And the innumerable beliefs that we have. I believe in god, I don't believe in god, I believe in socialism, I believe in capital - you follow - belief. And belief indicates a life which is based on make-belief, which is nothing to do with actuality.

So we are bringing order in consciousness, not by wanting order, not by making an effort to bring about order, but by listening, seeing, learning. To listen there must be no direction. You understand? To see there must be no distortion. And to learn, not to memorize, there must be freedom to observe, to learn and to watch.

So we will discuss when we meet next time, Saturday, what is love, and it's relationship to sorrow. And if there is time, we'll go into the question of what is death, because that's one of the factors of life, the dying. And unfortunately we never face it. To find out what it means to die while living, while you're full of life, not neurotic life, sane, healthy life, to find out the depth and the meaning of that extraordinary thing called death. And it is related to love. Love is not separate from life and death.

## **OJAI 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 12TH APRIL 1977**

K: We are going to talk over together, as usual together, about education, this morning. But before we do that I would like to make an introduction about the whole K Foundations and their schools.

The speaker, K, has been concerned with education since 1925 - a long time. And he was concerned with education and he was responsible for choosing the sites in India. There is one school in the north, near Benares, which is four or five hundred miles from New Delhi, and there are about two hundred acres there on the river Ganga, the Ganges; and also there is a school in Rishi Valley, in south India, about one hundred and seventy miles from Madras, which is south India; and there are also two other schools, one in Madras itself, and one in Bombay. The one in Bombay which has been going on for twenty-five years is entirely and wholly for the poor people, very, very poor people, they have got one hundred and sixty students; and there is another school being brought into being near Bangalore. So there are five schools in India.

And there is a school, as perhaps some of you know, at Brockwood in Hampshire, England. That has been going on for nearly eight years. We have said we will limit it to sixty students, and there are only sixty students there. I believe there are about fourteen, I am not quite sure, nationalities there, from all over the world.

And this school here, we have been discussing with the teachers, with the parents, and with the architects for the last two years. This school here is entirely different from other schools in

India and in England. Here the parents are involved in it, which is a new kind of experiment because if the children are going to be different the parents must also be different otherwise there is a contradiction between the children and the parents, and there will be conflict between them. So to avoid all that we thought it would be right that the parents as well as the teachers and the students work together as a family unit. So.

And with regard to the architecture here, we have been talking with some prominent architects for the last three years, or two years, I have forgotten now, and as Mr Mark Lee has pointed out, we are going to create it, not only a school but also a centre - which is going to happen in India, it is happening in England, and it must happen here, which is a centre where people can gather together for perhaps three weeks at a time to discuss, and be together, to be concerned with the problems and so on. That's the introduction.

So please the speaker is completely and totally involved in all the schools, in India, in England and here. These schools are not being created against his wishes, he is involved completely; and also with the centres. So having said that let us talk over together the question of education.

Q: If we as parents have not undergone a transformation then how can we bring about in our children such transformation?

K: I am going to go into that. Let me talk a few minutes first and then we will discuss the whole question.

I do not know why we educate our children. We have never asked, perhaps, what is the intention, what is the meaning of education. Is it to turn out so many engineers, technicians, academicians, professors, specialists, medically and otherwise?

And apparently that is what is happening, the cultivation of memory about facts, technologically educated, so that human beings throughout the world can earn a livelihood, settle down in a particular pattern of society, and totally completely disregard the whole psychological structure of man. That is what is actually happening in the world: cultivate one fragment of the mind so that going through school, college and university, if one wants to, and learn sufficient information, facts, and act from that memory skilfully or not. That is the pattern set for man in education. Right? Do we agree to this? Please, not agree, do we see this together?

And the psychological factors of human beings, because they are so utterly neglected, so disregarded, never even thought about and gone into, has produced a society that is utterly lopsided, utterly fragmented. So if that is the education most of us want, and that is what our children are educated to, then we must inevitably face the fact of conflicts, wars, terrorism, and all the ugliness that is going on in the world. Again that is a fact.

So when we talk about education, what do we mean by it? Is it the cultivation, not only of knowledge, but also be concerned with the whole total man. You understand? The whole of man - or the woman; forgive me if I talk about man, in that is included woman. And if the cultivation, or the concern of education is not only the technical development of man, with considerable information and knowledge, but also include in education the understanding of the whole psychological structure - the two should go together, and not one ahead, or the other - so that man is a total human being, not a fragmented, broken being.

And also apparently through education as it is now, as

knowledge is encouraged, is cultivated, many scientists, including some of the famous ones who have been talking on television in England and perhaps here also, that man can only ascend through knowledge. Do you understand? Ascend. Like Bronowsky and others are saying that man can climb, ascend, go forward only through the acquisition of knowledge. And these specialists, professors, experts, totally disregard the other field. And we all think in the Foundation that the two should go together, not one ahead of the other. So that education is concerned with the total cultivation, development, the whole of man. And to bring about that one needs not only teachers, or educators, who know a great deal about history and all the rest of it, but also are concerned with the other. Therefore one finds it terribly difficult to find such teachers. You understand? Who are really concerned with the total understanding of themselves and the children, the parents, as a unit, who are concerned with the whole of man. So that's one of our problems, to find proper teachers, who are really concerned with not only the deep inward cultivation, but also be excellent academically, the two marching together.

Then also one of the factors is, parents generally send their children to schools; day schools, state schools, free schools, private schools, residential schools and so on. They are not responsible for them. They feel as long as they are very young, up to perhaps five or six, they feel very responsible, after that let them go, throw them to the wolves. This has happened in India, and we have talked a great deal about it in India. And the parents for economic reasons, and also tremendous tradition of thousands of years want to say, 'You know better than we do about education, educate them,

because we are much too occupied with our own lives'. So that is one of our problems: the parents are not totally responsible - in the sense we are using the word 'responsibility', which means being responsible, feeling the depth of their relationship to their children so that they themselves are educating themselves as well as the children, so that there is no contradiction, when they go home they don't find the parents totally in a different area, dimension. That's one of our difficulties.

The other difficulty is financial. Nobody wants to do this kind of work. They would rather send their children to private, public schools, because it is much safer - at least they think so. They think they will have a good job and all the rest of it.

So these are the many complex problems in real education. In the so-called education it is comparatively easy. I do not know if you were listening last night on the television, the President of Yale University, and a Californian university. As you listened to them, they are not concerned at all with the psychological unfoldment or freedom of man. They are concerned with that and not with the other.

So then we ask, what then is education? You understand? How is this to be brought about? What is the function of a teacher, the educator? What is his relationship to the student? And what is his relationship to the parent? You are following all this, I hope? Are we meeting each other?

Let's begin with what is the relationship of the educator with the student? What is his relationship to the student? The speaker, K, because when he goes to India he spends practically a month in each place at these schools, talking with the students, with the

teachers, and all the whole school together, he knows a great deal, you know, we have been talking endlessly for last fifty-two years about education. So I am asking you, as parents, you, as educators, what is the relationship of an educator, the teacher, to the student. Is the relationship based on giving information from a status, as a teacher? You understand, status? He knows and the other fellow doesn't know, which is a fact, and so his relationship to the student is merely that of giving information, knowledge of a particular subject to the student. So he has really no relationship with the student. But when the educator comes, steps down from his platform, from his status, and begins to establish a relationship with the student, in the sense that the teacher is concerned not only with the technological knowledge, but with the whole psychological structure but also what kind of food he eats, what kind of clothes he wears, how he behaves, how he talks, how he eats, how he walks. Do you understand? All this is part of the relationship between the teacher and the student.

So there is no teacher separate from the taught. Am I making this clear? The teacher isn't merely the one who gives information, but the one who is so deeply concerned with the student, which means he is concerned with himself as well as with the student. That is, if I may explain a little more, if you will permit me. The student comes to the school conditioned. Right? Already conditioned, by the parents, by his friends, by the neighbour, and so on. He is conditioned. And the teacher is also conditioned. Right? Both the educator and the one to be educated are both conditioned. Right? So the responsibility of a good teacher is to explain to the student that we are both conditioned. Right? If he



can explain it in different ways, it is comparatively easy, and say, 'I am conditioned as an educator, and so are you'. In talking over together, in discussing, having a dialogue with each other, when we are out for a walk and so on, explore this conditioning. You understand? So that it is a constant relationship with each other. I wonder if I am making something clear? We are trying this, please, in Brockwood and in India where one of the new Principals with whom we have been talking a great deal, we are trying this. So that there is no division psychologically between the teacher and the student. Which means the teacher cares for the student - cares in the profound sense of the word, you know, affection, all that. Am I making this clear somewhat, what we are trying to do, what we want to do, what we will do. If not it is not worth trying. You understand? Because there are millions of other schools.

So that's one of our problems. Not 'our' problem, it is a human problem. The other problem is: will the parent who is heavily conditioned, with his beliefs, with his ambitions, lack of time to be with the children, care for the children, and all the rest of it, and the mother too has very little time for them because in modern society both the parents, the father and the mother go out to earn more money to have more cars and more something else. So they have very little relationship with their children. So will the parents also be concerned with the total development of their children and of themselves, with the help of the teachers altogether. Do you understand the question? Are you following? Are we communicating with each other, somewhat?

And the other problem is: to relate history - I am taking that as an example - as a factual movement, to relate it so that the child, or

the student understands the full meaning of history. You understand? If I am a teacher of history - god forbid, I am not a teacher of history - if I am a teacher of history, how am I to teach him the full meaning of history? You understand? The full significance of history, not the kings and the wars, and the dates of wars, you know what generally history is. But I want him to understand the story of man, which is history. Right? I wonder if we are meeting each other? The story of man, I want to tell him about that, not only the factual kings and queens, and the presidents and the wars and all the rest of it, but also I want him to see the extraordinary story of man who has grown, you follow, all that. How am I to teach him that? I don't know if you have ever thought about it. A few of us have already discussed this point here, the parents, and the educators. How is an educator to teach history, not of a particular country, of a particular group of people or a community, but the global history of man. Are we meeting each other?

If I was that teacher, educator, I would proceed this way: sorry! Because that student is the embodiment of total humanity. Right? Do you understand this? I wonder if you understand. We said in the talks here, the world is you, and you are the world. Right? That's an absolute truth to me. It may not be to you, but it is a complete, irrevocable, inviolable fact. And so is that student, he is the world and the world is him, because he is going to suffer, you know, go through all the mill and the travail of human beings, right throughout the world, so in him is the history of man. You understand what I am saying? Oh, come on! Do we understand this?

Q: Yes.

K: I am so glad some of you do. So I say now together we are going to learn the story of man, which is you. I would spend a great deal of time over that, how to read the history of man which is you, the book, the content of that book, which is you. So if he can read that book, that story of man, which is the student, which is the teacher, which is the parent, which is the man, human being, then also I would go into the question of wars, you know, the specialized communities - America, England, you know, the division, why the division takes place, all the rest of it, so that he learns the history of man through himself. You understand? Not through a book, not through some psychologist, professor and philosopher and all the rest of it. So he will be an authentic man. I wonder if you are getting this.

Q: Yes.

K: He will not be a secondhand man, or woman, as we are, but he will be the total human being. If I was a teacher in a school, that's how I would approach history. And if I was talking about mathematics, which is a little more complex a problem, I would be concerned with order. Right? Mathematics, part of it is very orderly. Right? Right, sir? Are there some mathematicians? It is very orderly. Higher mathematics, deeper, going into higher things, it may be rather confused, uncertain, unclear, but the general mathematics is order. So if I were a teacher of mathematics I would talk to him about order. You understand? Order in daily life, how he behaves, how he eats, how he talks, all these are very, very important. Consideration of others, politeness, which in America doesn't exist. Sorry, forgive me for saying this. There is no respect

for anything. So order, consideration, how one behaves, how one talks, how one walks, and out of that comes naturally respect for each other. So order in his room. You understand, sir? Order in his clothes and so on. So I would begin with that so that he understands order. Not imposed discipline. I wonder if you see. Are you understanding, sir? Because together, the student and I, are concerned with order. Which means punctuality, which meaning turning up at meals at the correct time and so on. And I would talk a great deal about that. And introduce algebra and all the rest of it. So that he, in himself, he is bringing order out of this chaos, without discipline, which means, compulsion, reward, punishment, marks, good boy, encourage him. All that is so irrelevant. They have had discipline in all the schools, beaten them and all the rest of it, it has not created any different human being.

So that is how I would, if I were a teacher, how I would teach the two subjects and other subjects I would go into. So that my relationship to the student is not that of an elder brother, or a teacher, or somebody outside, but together we are learning. I believe the word 'school' comes from the word 'leisure'. Leisure implies a mind which is not occupied. Not occupied with books, family, problems, just not occupied. It is only when the mind is not occupied then you can learn. But if it is already occupied, crammed full of complexities, it can't learn, in the deeper sense of the word. So in a school of this kind there would be leisure. Not to do what you like - have leisure to sit and look. I wonder if you understand all this. It doesn't matter, we will go into it.

So that's our problem. That's the problem of education, if one is deeply concerned with humanity, with each other, as an educator

and the person to be educated.

Now I have talked enough so perhaps you would like to. Yes sir?

Q: Your descriptions have been very clear, and I think well understood by me and they do raise the problems inherent today in education. However I wonder if you could answer me, how is it that when two entities comes together, the educator and the student, both who are conditioned, how can they generate education, create an education in that circumstance when both individuals are conditioned?

K: Wait a minute. You are the student, I am the educator. Have I to repeat that question? Have you heard that question?

Q: Repeat it, some people might not have heard it.

K: The questioner asks, how is it possible for the educator and the one to be educated, when both are conditioned, how to approach each other, how to free each other, how to bring about this freedom from which creation takes place. That's right, sir?

Q: That's right.

K: You have heard the question now? We are saying, you are the student, if I may, and I am the teacher. We both are conditioned. You in your way, and I am in my way, but deeply held in a trap. How do we free each other from this trap? If I remain as an educator, on the platform, the blackboard behind me, then I have authority. But if I step down from that metaphysical platform and I step down together, say I am conditioned, you are conditioned, right, let's go into it. What does it mean being conditioned? Being conditioned implies religiously, psychologically. Right? So as long as you belong to something,

attached to something, you are bound to be conditioned, to a belief, to a person, to some kind of physical necessity and so on, you are bound to be conditioned. So I talk it over with you. Not as a man who says, 'I am free, and I'll tell you', but together we are both conditioned. Right, sir?

Q: But can the blind lead the blind?

K: No, you have missed my point. In talking with you I am realizing I am conditioned.

Q: You are saying you are blind, yes.

K: No, I am not blocked. When I am talking over with you I am exposing myself to you.

Q: Yes.

K: And you are exposing yourself to me.

Q: We are both exploring our states.

K: Yes, we are both seeing our conditioning.

Q: I see how it is.

K: So in talking it over together we are freeing ourselves from it.

Q: I don't see that point, sir. How I, in admitting to you that I am conditioned, and you in admitting to me that you are conditioned...

K: No, I'll show you.

Q: We are still conditioned.

K: I'll show you, sir. I am conditioned, if I am, as a Hindu. Right? As an Indian. And you are conditioned as a Christian, if you are, it doesn't matter. And I would go into my conditioning, how tradition, superstition, the handing down, etc., etc., I would go into it very, very carefully. And I would help you to go into it very,

very carefully. So we see the fact. I see the fact that being conditioned as a Hindu, and you conditioned as a Christian, divide, divide people.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, follow it. It divides people. From that division arises conflict - wars, etc., etc., etc. Do you as a student, and I as an educator, see this fact so that I am no longer a Hindu?

Q: You are a conditioned human being.

K: No, I am no longer a Hindu.

Q: Well, what are you then?

K: I am a free man, a free human being.

Q: No, sir. If I may beg to differ.

K: Don't beg sir, just differ.

Q: In showing me that you are a Hindu and I am a conditioned Christian, both mutually deeply understanding the point that we are both human beings with a conditioning imposed upon each of us, and understanding this point sincerely and deeply. My point remains that in spite of that deep understanding...

K: And freedom.

Q:... and feeling - no, we are still conditioned, we still remain conditioned understanding conditioned human beings.

K: No, sir, you are missing the point, sir.

Q: I must be. It does not liberate us in my mind to understand that one is in goal. It does not release one from being in prison.

K: It does.

Q: No, sir.

K: I'll show it to you. I'll go into it. Let's go into it quietly. You are the student, I am the educator. Forgive me, I am not, but we are

putting it here. I would point out the meaning of division, what it does in the world, historically, physically, in relationship and so on, conflict. Right?

Q: If you wish.

K: Not, if I wish.

Q: Is conflict the relevant point that we are discussing. Because I thought conditioning was the relevant point.

K: No. If I am conditioned to the belief that all Christians are devils and only the certain type of Hindu, the Brahmins, are the holy people, what happens? We have no relationship.

Q: Yes. But if I was conditioned to understand that Hindus were beautiful people...

K: No, no. You may be conditioned as beautiful people but I am conditioned to treat you as the devil.

Q: In my mind we are still conditioned, sir. And it is to go beyond this conditioning that right education must begin.

K: I am showing you, sir.

Q: How to go beyond it.

K: To go beyond it. As long as I am conditioned, you are conditioned, there must be conflict. That's obvious, sir. The Arab and the Jew, the Catholic and the Protestant. And go to this village and you see how many churches there are, the Baptist, you follow.

Q: Conditioning can be negative, yes.

K: No, not 'can', does.

Q: All right.

K: So is it possible for you and me to uncondition ourselves?

Q: That's the question.

K: Uncondition myself implies not being a Hindu, not treating



you as the white devil, and you not calling me the beautiful Indian.  
Of course.

Q: All right.

K: So we both of us then are free of our conditioning, of our prejudices, our superstitions.

Q: I hesitate that discussing it as we are does free one from that conditioning.

K: It does if you are paying attention to it.

Q: Good, then we are, and we are becoming free. Do you really therefore believe...

K: Not 'believe'.

Q: Or know...

K: Not even 'know'. Facts.

Q:... that the way to uncondition is through discourse.

K: Not only discourse. But through relationship.

Q: Through relationship.

K: I a married. I watch my wife and she watches me and I realize through relationship how very different, contradictory we are.

Q: Is this a speedy process?

K: You can do it instantly, or take time. If you are tremendously attentive, it is finished.

Q: All right. I have another approach that I can describe.

Q: No.

K: Wait a minute sir, let him.

Q: And that would be that the only way to uncondition an individual, or a group of individuals, is to introduce an element that has no conditioned aspect, that is unconditioned, a pure state which

has no conditioning.

K: How do you know the pure state? That's a theory.

Q: No. If we assume that there is in creation a conditioned state, do we at least intellectually agree that there is somewhere an unconditioned state?

K: No. It is like saying - the Hindus have said this, and the Christians have said this for umpteen years and centuries - that there is god, who is the unconditioned.

Q: Yes. Oh, all right.

K: I don't accept all the gods and the unconditioned state. All that I can begin with is, I am conditioned.

Q: So there is no hope then?

K: You see, on the contrary. Your hope is based on a concept.

Q: No, sir. If we do not agree that there is a non-conditioned state...

K: Sir, the whole problem is that you are already conditioned that there is an unconditioned state. That's your conditioning.

Q: Whether I am or not is irrelevant.

K: No. The only relevant fact is human beings through centuries, through experience, etc., etc., are conditioned.

Q: I believe that there is an unconditioned state. That may be my conditioning.

K: It is.

Q: Fine.

K: Now break it, break it.

Q: All right. I want to ask a sincere question, and I don't mean to monopolize the floor, please.

Q: That's good.

Q: If there is, irrespective of my belief or not, if there is no unconditioned state then there can be no education.

K: Wait. It is for you and me to uncondition ourselves to find that state.

Q: Oh, we can uncondition ourselves, so there is an unconditioned state.

K: You see you are still sticking to your conditioning.

Q: How can you find what is not there?

Q: Don't try and find out from conditioning.

Q: You said...

K: Please, sir, do see it logically.

Q: I am trying, sir.

K: You suppose you believe there is that.

Q: Yes.

K: That is part of our conditioning.

Q: Yes, I understand that.

K: You accept that? So you are accepting something which is non-existent, or may be existent.

Q: Yes, I accept that.

K: So put that aside. It may be, or it may not be, so put it aside, break away from that conditioning and then start, say, look, we are conditioned, let us free ourselves first and see if there is there, or not. But don't presuppose. Surely that is simple.

Q: What will the end result be then if we do this?

K: First do it. Not seek the end result, or suppose. Let us first uncondition ourselves.

Q: Therefore there is an unconditioned state. I feel unconditioned now, therefore there is an unconditioned state. This

is what I must arrive at in order for education to begin, my education.

K: No, forgive me for saying so, you have not broken away from your conditioning.

Q: No. At least intellectually I have.

K: No, intellectually is just playing words, throwing words at each other. Intellectually we can say, it is beautiful beyond that mountain.

Q: May I ask then, has anybody achieved this unconditioned state, other than intellectually, in the audience?

Q: Well the fact that we are listening.

Q: You are not listening to the question.

K: Wait a minute, sir, wait a minute. Suppose the speaker says he has, what is your position?

Q: My position is I also want to achieve that.

K: Suppose the speaker says he has unconditioned himself, what value has it to you?

Q: That is an example.

K: Which means imitation. Which means you have an example which you are going to follow.

Q: No, sir, a goal.

K: Which means a direction.

Q: All right, a direction.

K: When there is direction there must be conditioning. No, don't laugh. Where there is direction there must be a conditioning. Direction implies motive. Where there is a motive you are already veering off, you are already...

Q: The only unconditioned state which I agree is directionless,

is omnipresent.

K: Ah, you see you are still caught in your old conditioning.

Q: Sir, why does motive imply conditioning?

K: No, I said motive implies direction. And where there is direction it is conditioned.

Q: Could we go back to that example of the mountain being over there.

K: Look, I sit here and imagine what the other side of side of the mountain is. Right? It's marvellous, it is beautiful, it must be, it is so hot here, over there it must be cooler, but I never get up from here, walk, climb and find out.

Q: Well, I have.

K: Which means you are free from the idea, the concept, the conclusion, the belief that there is an unconditioned state.

Q: You are only free of that concept when you realize it.

K: No, it is not a concept, it is a fact.

Q: You are only free of the knowledge of the fact when you arrive at that state you are unconditioned.

K: When you uncondition yourself you know the fact. It is not a belief, not an idea.

Q: The fact, the reality of it, that I know.

K: Then there is nothing more to be asked.

Q: No, there is, because I as a teacher and others as students, I must allow them to come to this unconditioned state also in order for their education to begin.

K: Which is, I would talk to them, as I said, about conditioning.

Q: Would you then hold it up to them as an ideal?

Q: No, sir, I would...

Q: That is the implication of what you are saying.

Q: Well I was try to arrive at it on a discourse level. It cannot be arrived at on that basis. It has to be experienced as an irrefutable reality.

Q: Why does it ever have to be even considered? The facts of conditioning demand action.

Q: Yes, correct.

Q: Why does the word 'unconditioned state' ever have to come into being?

Q: It doesn't, if the teacher has the skill to lead the conditioned student to the unconditioned state without...

K: You see!

Q: Don't the facts demand action, why does there need to be a leader when the facts demand the action?

Q: Sir, the river flows into the ocean, and in an ocean it realizes an unconditioned state, away from its boundary. A teacher in my mind, and I may be completely incorrect, at this moment is that he is the one with the knowledge. This is a fact, we have heard.

Q: No, no.

Q: He will bring the student to the awareness of this unconditioned state which is pure knowledge.

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: If I have missed the point, and I obviously have, it is because that I am here to learn.

Q: Get out.

K: What were you going to say, sir?

Q: Listen to the pitfalls in what you are saying, sir.

Q: Please explain them to me.

Q: I have the authority, I am the one who knows, you are below me, you are nothing. The pitfalls are terrible in this, sir. Q: No, sir. Please may I answer - this will be my last statement on the subject.

Q: Hooray!

Q: Once an unconditioned, or shall we say, once a teacher who is capable of bringing the awareness of the student to an unconditioned state - please be with me for a moment - once this teacher enables the student's awareness to come to an unconditioned level, then the truth itself is there for the student, he doesn't have to tell him anything more. Education has begun. The student knows the unconditioned state within himself, from that point on he can add the facts.

K: Sir, may I answer your question finally? How can the conditioned teacher say that there is an unconditioned state. Fact the facts, sir. How can the teacher, you a human being, caught in sorrow - you understand, sir?

Q: Sir, I heard your question very clearly. You asked me a question, how can the teacher, a conditioned teacher lead the student to an unconditioned state.

K: No, no.

Q: Pardon me. Please ask the question again.

K: How can the conditioned teacher talk about the unconditioned state?

Q: Because there are two forms of conditioning. There is a perpetual conditioned state and there is a temporary conditioned state. So a conditioned...

Q: Oh, no.

Q: Yes, please listen to me. It might be valuable also. In other

words a conditioned teacher may have periods of clarity in which he is unconditioned.

K: Be careful. Don't get caught in temporary, you will then be lost.

Q: No, sir, please I am not. I am just trying to make a point. The conditioning can be intermittent. Would you agree with that point? Conditioning can be intermittent.

K: Wait, sir. We are saying, conditioning is the fact. Right? Is the fact. You may be temporarily unconditioned.

Q: Good.

K: Wait, sir, listen to the very end of it, you won't agree! One is conditioned. One may be temporarily, for a brief second, unconditioned. Wait. That state of briefness, temporary, which means what? A state in which time exists, for a brief moment time is not. Wait, wait, sir. Look, sir, I am conditioned, and for a moment I feel free. What is implied in that moment when I say, I am free? Can you ever say, I am free? No, go into it, sir. Can one ever say, I am free? Or put it round the other way, can one ever say, I am happy? The moment you have said it, it is gone.

Q: Yes, you can only say, I have been happy.

K: Please, listen to what I am saying, sir. The moment I acknowledge I am free, I am not free.

Q: I agree.

K: So the temporary freedom is no freedom at all.

Q: For that moment it is.

K: It is no freedom. Freedom means being out of the prison.

Q: Yes, but it is the only way out, temporarily at first.

K: Sorry.



Q: It then becomes permanent.

Q: No, no, no.

K: There is no temporary happiness. There is no temporary enlightenment. There is no temporary glory, or whatever it is. Either it is complete, or not, it is never fragmentary.

Q: How does it go from the none to the real?

K: First face the fact. I don't know if there is real, all that I know is that we live in a monstrous world. Right? All that I know is that I am conditioned by this world, I am that world. That's all I know. And I start from that, I don't imagine that there is an unconditioned state, there is a bliss, nothing, I start from the actual daily fact.

Q: What do you mean by monstrous?

K: Oh, no. Monstrous - all the killing, the terror, the mugging, rape, you know what is happening in the world.

Q: Excuse me, if I could make one suggestion. The questions all seems to point to the place of knowledge in the transformation of man. Maybe another time for a discussion.

K: The lady asks, sir, are you making a point, which is, knowledge is important in freedom?

Q: My point is that freedom is knowledge.

K: Eh!

Q: Is knowledge, that it can be gained temporarily and then on the basis of a temporary intermittent experience it can become permanent, but one has to start somewhere.

K: What a dangerous argument you are going into, sir, really don't, because you will be caught out.

Q: All right, I won't go into it.

Q: The original question that somebody brought up is, what do

we do as parents with children, our children, how do we deal with them. As you were explaining the educator and the student.

K: How do you deal with the children who are not here.

Q: Our own children.

K: Your own children, all right, sir. How do we deal with our own children. How do you actually deal with them now?

Q: Without love.

K: So, first without love. Second you have no time for them. You go off to the office, she goes off to the office, or she pursues her ambitions, you pursue, you follow, so you have no time for them. Third, you are conditioned and they are conditioned. You conditioned them, and you are conditioned by society, by people round you, you are that. Right? So in fact there is no love, no care, no relationship, and they are your children.

Q: None, is there no relationship?

K: The questioner says, is there no relationship at all. That gentleman agrees sir, that gentleman who put that question says, you are right. We think we love them. If we love them do you think you would have wars? If you loved them do you think you would have all this terror going on in the world? If you really cared deeply for your children do you think you would have this kind of education? Your children are running away from you, they are escaping, they are forming their own little communes, you know what is happening in this country - divorce, each person occupied with his own sensations, problems. You know. So sir how will you deal with such people? So that is what we are saying, the father, the mother, are conditioned, for god's sake change, transform yourself. Then there is some hope for the world, but to merely live

in a kind of abstraction means absolutely nothing. That's what all the priests, all the do-gooders, the idealists, live in a world of non-reality. The reality is what is actually going on with our daily life.

Q: We have come here to learn something.

K: If I had a child I would say, I am going to - you follow, sir? Because we have no love for them. Have you ever watched a mother caring for her little baby? What she goes through, getting up early in the morning, all through the night, watching, watching, watching. At the age until five, after that throw them out. Throw them to the wolves, in fact. So can you, as a parent, father, mother, uncle, whatever it is, can you change, you bring about in you the transformation? Which is to love a child right through life. The child is far more important because he is the future generation. If you condition him to be like you, which is to be concerned about oneself, about yourself, about your worries, about your ambitions, your fulfilments, and all the rest of it, you don't care a hoot for the child.

Q: I am the mother of two children. I find my time really occupied with their demands. And I see my three and a half year old son coming from a very pure and innocent state going through some strong changes, being very fascinated by excitement, violence, and I find myself trying to point out to him how the excitement is just a thrill, and help him to understand the violence. I find myself stopping constantly and I realize I don't know what to do.

K: I understand.

Q: When I don't know what to do, then something happens, or I show him something but he only seems to forget it.

K: The lady says, I have got two children. They are nice, clean, healthy, lovely children. And they watch the TV, the people around and they are fascinated by violence. And I, I talk to them, but they are much more attracted to that than to what I am saying. Right?

Q: They don't want to see me.

K: I know, you are a nuisance when they want the other. So what is she to do? You understand the question? What will you do? You understand, this is an agonizing problem, you understand, this isn't just an intellectual thing. What am I to do? I have got two children and they are attracted to guns, soldiers, violence, and I see the absurdity, the cruelty of all that, and how am I to stop them? You understand my question? How will you stop it?

Q: Sir, I don't think you can stop it. I think that in my own case I have the same problem with my child, but I am going along and watching the programmes with him, I am not dividing myself from him.

K: You are not answering the question. I am a mother. I see my children caught in this trap, or being attracted to the trap. And I see the danger, I see the horror, I see the misery of it. What am I to do?

Q: I think the only thing the mother, or the father, can do is to change themselves fundamentally.

K: Yes, sir, but in the meantime what am I to do with my child?

Q: Warn them.

Q: I find myself through relationship with those around me, with my child, that living exposure comes out of my own violence, I see it. As I understand it, really understand it...

K: I understand all that.

Q: As I really understand it, it no longer exists, but there is still

enough violence.

K: Yes, madam, we have understood the question. The parents may be free from violence but my children are attracted to violence, what am I to do?

Q: Pay attention to them.

K: What do you do, sir, with your children who are attracted to violence, to all that, what will you do?

Q: It isn't the same.

K: See what happens, sir, look at it. Look at it. I can't keep them away from other children, can I. I can't take them away and go away, live in a forest with my children. That's impossible. I can't argue with them, I can't point out the dangers to them because they are much more attracted to the other. You understand? This is how all the youth movements, all the tyrannies with their youth movements are doing, making it so attractive that everyone wants to go and join it. Hitler did it, Stalin did it, the dictators are doing it. You follow? So what shall I do? Put yourself in that position, feel for it, for god's sake have passion about it.

Q: Try and educate them differently.

K: Keep them home and not meet other children, don't let them see TV, don't let them read violent books? And if you do, when they leave they are attracted to all that, the opposite.

Q: You have to be clear yourself which television is violent.

Q: The reason a child is attracted at say, age three, to television, or anything violent is because he already has an image that he cannot have the mother's attention, the father's attention.

K: That's what I am saying, I am coming to that, madam. Look at it, sir. He is attracted to it, attracted to all that, and he won't

listen to my talk, he kind of avoids me. Right? Don't you know all this, as parents? No?

Audience: Yes.

K: So what am I to do? What is wrong that they should be attracted to that? Answer my question: why should they be attracted to that and not to something much more beautiful, or whatever it is?

Q: Because we are attracted to it.

K: Yes, sir, I understand. Then the child in the meantime grows up.

Q: We can expose them to other things.

K: We have done all this, expose them to the most beautiful music, pictures, good talk, literature, but they prefer that.

Q: They are attracted to the violence because they feel a separation, a lack of relationship with the parents.

K: Sir, are you a parent?

Q: No.

K: Put yourself in the position of a parent.

Q: I am trying to.

K: Sir, feel the misery of a mother who feels this thing, don't intellectually answer this.

Q: Why are my children so young attracted to this?

K: I am going into it, sir. What am I to do? I don't feel violent, I have worked myself out of it, I don't feel I want to kill somebody, I don't want to throw bombs at somebody. I don't want to create a physical revolution because I don't believe in physical revolutions but my two children are attracted to all that. What am I to do? What is wrong with society that allows this to happen? You don't

face all this.

Q: Perhaps...

K: Let me go on, sir. You don't face this, which means what? You don't want to transform yourself or society, you don't feel passionate about anything. No? Sir, passion is something that comes out of great suffering. Right? But you avoid suffering, you escape from suffering. If you have no passion you can't create, you can't build anything.

So if I have two children and I have a passion, not just intellectual concepts of what I should do, should not do, a passion to see that they understand this thing. So I would spend my time with them, point out, I would do it because I have love for them, I have affection for them, I care profoundly for them. I am passionate about all this.

Q: I think a lot of compassion is dissipated in the search for a method.

K: Quite right, sir. Method...

Q: That man has never experienced that, it is agony observing the child, which is the fuel.

K: So, sir, if I was a mother and had two children, and I don't want them to be thrown to the wolves, that is, society, everything, I am concerned about them and myself, in my relationship, find out, I'd spend - you follow, sir - it's my passion. I'll find a way to do it.

Q: Maybe when you say 'passion' you mean something different from what we understand by that.

Q: May be if we had the enthusiasm to live.

K: Oh no, it's nothing to do with enthusiasm. Enthusiasm fades and disappears; you are enthusiastic about TV, or TM, which is

transcendental meditation, enthusiastic about a new guru.

Q: I remember as a boy, I can't speak from the parent's point of view, but as a boy I must have been saying something very cruel to my parents, and they just broke down, both of them at once. It shocked me very much.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: I always remembers that.

K: Did you hear what he said?

Q: It really made me see the violence that I was doing, and it was just because they broke down, they cried and I had never seen them cry, may be two times in my life.

K: There you are. That's enough.



## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 14TH APRIL 1977

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk over together this morning?

Questioner: Sir, what opens the door to perception and understanding, or does it open by itself?

K: Does one open the door to perception and understanding, or does it open by itself.

Q: Could we consider if there really is such a thing as a teacher, or rather simply an environment in which the student learns?

K: Is there such a thing as a teacher for students, or will it not be an environment that will help them to learn.

Q: Last Tuesday you said the facing of sorrow and suffering or pain, passion comes. I was wondering, would you discuss that and the connection or lack of connection of that idea, or fact, and boredom, negativity, contempt, anxiety, criticism and low energy.

K: Sir, there are too many questions in one question.

Q: Could you also talk about the hyperactivity of the mind? Whether negative or positive thinking starts it. Can self enquiry be cultivated in spite of pleasure of the self, or whether that matters.

Q: Sir, why does one keep slipping back into despair?

K: First his question was, what is passion, and does it come out of grief and pain. And the rest of the other question, sir, I couldn't make out. So if you don't mind one question will be enough. And also the other question is, this gentleman asks, why does one so often slip into despair.

Q: What is intelligence? What enables intelligence to awaken in the educator and in the student, particularly if intelligence is not a result?

K: What is intelligence, and if intelligence is not a result then how can that intelligence be transmitted or conveyed to the student.

Q: Or even how can it awaken in the educator himself?

K: Or how can that intelligence awaken in the educator himself.

Q: Can we discuss further the relation between desire and love?

K: What is the difference between desire and love.

Q: The relationship.

Q: Can we discuss discipline?

K: Discipline. Could you discuss discipline.

Q: Our relation to the suffering of others, and people and animals, and any living things.

K: Yes, what is the relationship between suffering of human beings and animals and so on. I think that's enough, don't you?

What is intelligence, can it be awakened in us and so help the student to understand it. And is intelligence something to be striven after, or does it come naturally. That's one of your questions. And what is passion, does it flower from suffering and pain. Why does one so often slip into despair. What is the relationship between human beings who suffer and animals who are tortured and suffer. Now out of all these questions which do you think we ought to discuss, take it up?

Q: Passion.

Q: Suffering.

Q: Intelligence.

K: Can we begin by talking over together, having a dialogue between ourselves, between friends, what is intelligence, and how does it come into being, can it be cultivated, and can that intelligence be awakened in the student. Perhaps if we could go

into that question fully the other questions might be included in it.

What is the intellect? What is intellect? The capacity to reason, to perceive, to understand, to grasp the significance of a word or a statement. That is generally understood to mean the intellect. The capacity of the brain to reason objectively, sanely, if it is possible, and not be caught in opinions and judgements. That is the general meaning of intellect. And what is the function, or relationship of the intellect, which all of us have, that capacity to reason, healthily or not healthily, sanely or insanely, what is the relationship of the intellect to thought? Please, you don't mind my going step by step? May we go on that way? What is the relationship of the capacity to reason sanely or insanely, its relationship to thought? Is intellect - all the meaning which we have given - different from thought? You understand?

Is not thought the whole movement of memory, experience, knowledge - the whole movement of that is thought. Can thought reason correctly, rationally, and therefore the intellect is part of that thought? Are we meeting each other?

Audience: Yes.

K: Yes? May we go on? Please, it's no good going on by myself, unless both of us discuss it, understand what we are talking about. We are trying to establish if there is any difference at all between thought and the intellect. The intellect is the product of thought, and if it is the product of thought then thought, can it reason correctly, accurately, sanely? That we must first establish, then we can proceed from there in the understanding of what is intelligence.

As thought is conditioned, as thought is fragmentarily, as

thought is the movement of time, and the movement of measure, can that thought which is the past, which is the product or the response of the past, can it ever meeting the movement of the present, can that ever be rational, sane, healthy? You are following this, sir? Because we have given such importance to thought. Right? We have given such extraordinary value to all the construction of thought. All the movement of thought, which has made the gods, the rituals, the saviours, built churches, temples, mosques, the whole movement of thought is based upon knowledge which is past. Right, can we go on from there? It's a dialogue, please. We are not asserting anything. We are together investigating, informing each other, the nature of thinking. So we say thought - what, sir?

Q: Would you characterize much of what you do as thought?

K: Would you characterize what the speaker is doing as a movement of thought. My word! May we come to that a little later - I am not going to avoid it, I am not cunningly moving away from it, I will answer it, but first understand this thing. Because if I tell you how the speaker functions without understanding all this, then you will say, 'What are you talking about, you are mad'. So I think it is important to understand before I can answer that question, what is thinking, and what are the things that thought has created, and thought being very limited, the scientists are now accepting, I was told by Dr Bohm and others, that even the scientists are accepting the very limitations of thought. So we are saying, thought is a fragment. Right? Whatever it creates, whatever it thinks is still in the field of fragmentation. Right? So thought can never perceive the whole because thought is directional, thought

moves with a motive, thought functions with remembrances. So it will invariably, under all circumstances, whether technological, scientific, human, religious, or superstitious, illusory, it is fragmentary. Do we see this fact? Not, I tell you the fact and you see it - do you see this as a fact for yourself?

Q: Where does sanity and insanity fit into what you are saying?

Q: We began by saying intellect is reason, logic, sanity, what is the relationship of intellect to thought. Then we say thought is fragmentation. Then the gentleman asks, how does sanity fit into that picture.

K: It doesn't. One can reason using thought as an instrument of expression, one can reason, and think that reasoning is very sane, but if that intellect is neurotic, whatever it does is still neurotic. So it can never be sane. Right? I don't know if you agree to this, if you see that. Sanity implies - let's go back. The word 'whole' implies health, sanity of the mind, and the perceiving of that which is holy, sacred. That word covers all that: health, sanity and holiness, h-o-l-y. So can thought perceive the whole, can the intellect perceive the whole? You understand my question? Because it is fragmentary it can never perceive the whole.

Q: Would this imply that logic and reason are mechanical?

K: Yep! I mean, yes. I am becoming an American! You have understood what he asked, which is, is thought mechanical. Now you, please, how would you answer that question? I said, yes - or yep! Now how would you answer that question?

Q: What are the other functions of the mind besides thought, or thinking?

K: Wait, sir. How would you answer that question, is the mind,

the brain, thought mechanical?

Q: Mechanical means repetition.

K: Mechanical means - it has several meanings: repetition, there must be a motive which keeps it going, an energy which keeps it going. So is the intellect, thought, mechanical? I do not know if you have not noticed for yourself that we live in habits, we are creatures of habits - sexual, nutritional, committed to a belief, an idea, or an ideal, a conclusion, and living in that field all the time is mechanical - repeating, believing, caught in tradition, ancient or modern. So the whole process of our existence is mechanical, as it is. Right, sir?

Q: Obviously thought is mechanical, but I am not so sure about the intellect.

K: The gentleman says, if I understood it rightly, he says is intellect also mechanical.

Q: Thought in the past would be recording things over and over.

K: Is not the intellect also fragmentary?

Q: It's true intelligence, is it?

K: We are coming to that, slowly we are coming to it, go step by step so that we both understand that, we are speaking accurately.

Q: Intelligence is perception and adds rational data without the use of thought. Is that possible?

K: I don't quite understand.

Q: He is confusing intelligence and intellect, not seeing the distinction between them.

K: He says, if I understand rightly, that intellect is intelligence.

Q: Or asking.

K: He's asking. Please, I said thought is fragmentary. Right? Intellect must be fragmentary. Intellect which is reason, understanding, capacity to grasp things, but that intellect cannot perceive the whole because it is still fragmentary because thought is functioning. When thought is functioning, whether it operates through the intellect, or uses the intellect as a means of understanding, thought being fragmentary, whatever it does or produces, using the intellect, the intellect is still fragmentary.

Q: What would it mean then to speak of right reason?

K: I am coming to that, sir. Just a minute.

Q: What is the difference between intellect and thought?

K: Between the intellect and thought. What is the difference between the intellect and thought. You see, I am answering all the questions, why don't you answer it?

Q: The intellect is the response of thought, as we know it.

K: The intellect, the lady says, is the response of thought.

Q: In the service of thought.

K: In the service of thought. The intellect, the lady says, is at the service of thought.

Q: It produces all the knowledge we have acquired through the thought process.

K: I am afraid we can't hear. Please, if we once understood this together it becomes very simple. We said thought is under all circumstances fragmentary because thought is limited, because thought which is the response of memory is limited. You might acquire tremendous knowledge about everything, about the world, everything in existence, and that learning results in knowledge, and that knowledge is never complete, is never whole, therefore from

that knowledge, the response is thought, that thought is limited, fragmentary. That is the first principle. If that is clear, then thought operates through the intellect.

Q: Through the intellect?

Q: Yes.

K: What?

Q: I don't understand what you mean by 'through' the intellect.

K: Thought is part of the intellect.

Q: It's like the structural capacity to think.

K: Yes, madam. Look, I've just looked at a first-class dictionary, and it says, the intellect is the capacity to reason, the capacity to think clearly, to understand, to grasp. So thought is in operation. When you reason thought is in operation.

Q: So then instead of saying intellect is the tool of thought, we would say thought is the tool of the intellect.

K: Thought - you see, we shouldn't really separate the two, that's what I am trying to get at.

Q: Would you say that the intellect is like a movie screen and thought projects data onto it, and they work together?

K: Use your own intellect. Use your own intellect, which is part of the mind. We are speaking in English. You and the speaker understand English, so the understanding, the verbal understanding is part of the intellect, which is thought. You translate what you hear in English and that becomes the understanding, verbal understanding of what is being said. So thought is intellect. So intellect can never be, or perceive the whole. Intellect thinks it can. Thought thinks it can see the whole. Just a minute, madam. Right? But we are saying that thought being fragmentary can never see the



whole. Right, sir?

Q: It's not quite clear.

K: You are not quite clear.

Q: Is intellect anything other than the manipulation of concepts, words and images?

K: That's right. That's right.

Q: Is that all it is?

K: That's all it is. Concepts - manipulation of concepts, beliefs, ideals, reactions, imagination, all that is the function of the intellect.

Q: What about logic?

K: Logic is part of it.

Q: Logic is the manipulation.

K: Of course. Logic is the manipulation of thought. If this is clear, not because I say so, because I am not your authority, I have no authority.

Q: You said that thought was part of the intellect at one point.

K: I said that thought is that part of the intellect.

Q: But then you said that thought is intellect.

K: Yes, thought is intellect.

Q: If thought is part of intellect then it would seem...

K: All right, we'll change it. I withdraw 'part', and say it is - thought is the essence of the intellect.

Q: There is no difference, they are one and the same?

K: You observe it in yourself, sir. I say to you, 'It's a beautiful day'. You listen to the words, the words convey a certain response in your memory, which becomes a thought, and you say, 'Yes, it's a lovely day'. Which means thought is operating, conveying and all

the rest of it. So thought is the movement of the intellect. Thought being limited under all circumstances, whether it is technological, aspirational, imagining there is god, or imagining there is Jesus, this, that and the other, it is essentially limited.

Q: What about the relationship between thought and mind?

K: The mind, to me, I may be wrong, please question it, go into it, the mind is the intellect, the thought, the feeling, the nervous responses, the reactions, the whole structure of human thought, the whole content, which is consciousness is the mind, in which suffering, pain, anxiety, fear, the pursuit of pleasure, fear of death, the whole of that is consciousness which is the mind.

Q: What's the function then of meditation in relationship to consciousness?

K: Meditation, what is the function of meditation in relation to consciousness. What is the function of meditation in relationship to consciousness. Sir, meditation is the process of emptying the content of consciousness. Emptying the content of consciousness, which is the content makes consciousness. If there is an emptiness, emptying of all the content, the consciousness as we know it does not exist. It's a totally different dimension. We won't discuss that because that's a tremendously complex question - we will go into it perhaps on Saturday or Sunday.

Q: Isn't the content of consciousness thought?

K: Yes, sir. The content of consciousness are all the things that thought has put in it. Please forgive me, we won't go into that because we can do it on a different occasion.

Q: Doesn't the mind stop when it realizes...

K: We haven't come to that yet, sir.

Q: Could we ask it this way: if consciousness is only the manipulation of concepts, images, symbols, memories, experiences, does it ever see anything for itself?

K: No.

Q: OK.

K: So let's see. We start now, if you all see this as an actuality, not because I tell you, that thought is fundamentally limited, and whatever it does within the area of consciousness is still limited. It can imagine consciousness is as wide as heaven, but it is still the product of thought. It can imagine the most lovely things, it is still the product of thought. It can say, there is god, it is still the product of thought. It can say anything, illusory, factual, it is still within the field of consciousness. Right?

Q: What is thought limited to?

K: No, thought is limited in itself, it is not limited to something. Goodness! Sir, you haven't seen the first thing: that thought is the response of memory, stored up in the brain as memory, which is the result of experience and accumulation of knowledge, so it is limited. Please stop there. Let's get on with it.

So what then is intelligence? You understand? If thought is fragmentary, and so the intellect also is fragmentary, and is intelligence part of this fragmentation? If it is not, then fragmentation has no relationship to the whole. That is, sir, when I say I am a Hindu, the assertion of that is based on memory, conditioning, superstition and so on, so as long as there is conditioning which is the product of thought, whatever it does is still limited, fragmentary, illusory. So the question is then, what is intelligence, if all this is not intelligence, what is intelligence? You

understand my question? Are we meeting each other somewhere?

Q: Yes.

K: Not in the Oak Grove!

Q: Yes.

Q: Would intelligence be the recognition of the limitation of thought?

K: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Q: Does...

K: You haven't listened to him, we are so occupied with our own conclusions. He says, is it not intelligence that realizes the limitations of thought. And we said, yes. So we are going to go into the question of what is intelligence, apart from the dictionary meaning. Because the dictionary meaning says, intelligence is the capacity to read between the lines. You understand? Legere, I won't go into it. To read between the lines, which means you must observe what occurs between two spaces of thought. I am translating it, it doesn't say that in the dictionary. It comes from the word 'legere' to read - to read, psychologically read, and read objectively 'what is', all that is implied in intelligence, that word, according to the dictionary. We are not using that word, intelligence, in that sense, because all that is implied in thought. You understand? To read very carefully between two lines, is to penetrate that which is not said through thought, that which is not printed on the page, you have to exercise thought to penetrate what is between the lines. I wonder if you get this.

So we are saying, what is intelligence.

Q: Is it the complete integration of intellect and thought?

K: No, find out. Go into it, sir. If thought is limited, whatever it

does bring about conditioning. When I say, I must be brotherly, it is part of that conditioning. So whatever it does is limited and therefore conditioned. Now is intelligence the product of thought?

Q: No.

K: The product of reason?

Q: Intelligence is cessation of thought.

K: Is that a fact to you, or just an idea? You see, that's why I don't want to... Can thought bring about intelligence?

Q: No.

K: Or is intelligence totally independent of thought? And if it is independent, totally, can intelligence then use thought? Not the other way round.

Q: Intelligence is...

K: Please, just listen, forgive me, I am not being impatient, but please just listen. Which is, we said, thought is limited, fragmentary, it is the movement of time, which we will go into a little later, the question of time. And if that is so, then we are asking, does thought bring about intelligence? If it does, that intelligence is still fragmentary. Right? Therefore it cannot be intelligence. Wait, wait. So what is intelligence? If we say thought cannot bring about intelligence then intelligence is totally independent of thought. So have you listened to this grasped, or had an insight into these two facts? Insight, that is see the truth of this, that thought is limited, and thought cannot under any circumstances bring about intelligence, cultivate intelligence, under no circumstances, therefore thought is unrelated to intelligence. Intelligence we say is the capacity to see the whole - the whole of the movement of thought. The capacity to see that. The capacity to

see thought is limited, to have an insight, that insight is intelligence. I wonder. Right, sir. Now wait a minute, wait. Therefore intelligence can analyze; thought because it is fragmentary, whatever it analyses will still be fragmentary. Whereas intelligence analyzing will be analyzing always with the background of the whole. I wonder if you see all this? Right?

Q: What is the whole?

K: What is the whole. What makes you ask, if I may madam, what makes you ask that question?

Q: How can you operate from the background of the whole, how can you operate from the background of anything?

K: We said thought is necessary in certain areas, the area of technology, the area of communication, verbal communication, the area where memory must function: technological, verbal, how to ride a bicycle, drive a car and so on and so on and so on, there memory must function, otherwise you wouldn't know - that would be rather insane. Now we are saying that very thought which is based on knowledge, which is necessary, that thought says, 'I can understand the whole structure of man'. So whatever it investigates will be fragmentary. Right? I wonder if you see this?

Q: Isn't it that the best it can do is to come up with a formulation or a conclusion about the whole structure of man, or the whole?

K: But it is not the whole.

Q: It is not the whole.

K: So the description is not the described, the word is not the thing. Right?

Q: But that's not it.

K: That's all it can do. Thought can describe what the mountain

is, but the description is not the actual.

Q: In other words...

K: Not 'in other words', just see the fact. Right? Can we move from there?

Q: Yes.

K: By Jove it takes a long time, doesn't it?! So what is intelligence? Intelligence is the capacity to see the truth that thought is limited. And how does that capacity come into being. You understand, that was your question. It can only come into being when thought - wait, I've got it! It can only come into being when there is the art of placing - when there is the placing of thought in its right place. Have you got something? That is, I need thought to speak - not I, I am going into that presently, that question, how do you - to communicate to you verbally I need to use thought. Right? Because words have been stored up in the brain and all the rest of it. But thought thinks, I can also perceive the whole, pretends, imagines, conceives, but that is not the whole. So we are saying the perception of the whole is intelligence. And how does that perception arise which is intelligence? Right, is this clear?

Q: I don't agree that we can think our way to the whole.

Q: He didn't say that.

K: I have been saying, sir - I never said you can think your way to the whole - I said on the contrary, thought will not lead to the perception of the whole. That's simple.

Q: But intelligence will.

Q: When thought is in order then it stops and intelligence can operate.

K: No, madam, just go slowly. Golly, you don't even listen to anything. Look, I see the world fragmented. Right? The world around me - me, you, we, they, the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Christians, fragmented, broken up. All that is the operation of thought, obviously. When I say I am a Hindu, it is the operation of thought. And so whenever thought operates it can only bring about fragmentation. That's an absolute fact - I won't go back on that, repeat, repeat. So thought can never make its way through to intelligence. So how does this intelligence come into being?

Q: The recognition of a thought as a thought, and only a fragment, is the beginning of intelligence.

K: I said so, we said so just now. He asked that question, that gentleman asked that question, and we said, yep!

Now let's go on, sir. Thought cannot bring about order in itself.

Q: It thinks it can.

K: See the difference. Thought thinks it can bring about order in itself. But thought being limited, whatever its order, is limited. I am using logic, simple. So the capacity to put thought in its right place is intelligence. That is, I do require knowledge, experience which will give me knowledge, therefore memory and thought, all that. That's clear. So to put that in the right place is intelligence. So that intelligence comes into being only when thought realizes whatever it does is limited, when it realizes its own limitation.

Q: Thought realizes.

K: Thought, oh, yes. Can thought realize its own limitation - you are asking?

Q: Yes.

K: What do you say? No, what do you say? Just think about



this.

Q: It is still a thought, sir, no. If thought realizes its limitations it is still part of thought.

K: Of course.

Q: And so we suffer.

K: No, don't bring in suffering, please. My golly! So we are saying, thought cannot make its way or cultivate intelligence. Intelligence comes into being when thought sees - I must be careful here.

So, may I go into something else for the moment, totally related to what I am saying? To observe the mountain, how do you observe the mountain? There they are in a mist. Watch it, sir, watch it, look at it. Look at it first. How do you observe that mountain, that thing called mountain.

Q: I look.

K: How do you look at it, apart from your eyes, apart from visual perception, the nerves, the retina and so on, the nerves and so on, conveying to the brain, the shape of the mountain, all that. How do you look at it?

Q: We look at the mountain with the image, which is the word 'mountain'.

K: Yes, the word creates the picture, and the picture indicates that it is the mountain.

Q: That's not true.

K: That's not true, he says. You discuss with him, sir. Go on discuss it. Sir, don't say it is true, or not true, have a dialogue with him, friendly dialogue.

Q: When you see that it's a mountain first, but if you see the

mountain first with no word involved, you just see it in the now, that it's a piece of land, you don't need to think about it being a piece of land you just see a mountain. There's no image involved in the past. It's in the present and it's just there.

Q: What is it?

Q: Well if you ask, what it is, then you have to give a name to it. Just look at it and not ask what it is, just look at it in the now, you are not thinking about what it is, or what it is going to become, you are just thinking of what you are looking at, you just standing and looking, you are just looking. There's no thought involved.

Q: What is the relationship between pain and intelligence?

K: Sir, we haven't even come to that.

Q: Sir, you can look at the mountain without the image.

K: You can look at the mountain, the gentleman says, without the image. Of course, sir, you can, just to observe without a picture.

Q: But I question that.

K: Sir, that's what you two have decided. That means what? To observe without the word. Right? Without the picture that you have conceived as a mountain. Right? Without the response which mountains awaken in you, just to observe. Just to observe. In that observation there is you and the thing you observe, so there is a distance between you and the thing you observe. Right? And the distance is time, to go there and so on. That distance brings a division. Right? Now can you look - please listen - can you look at your boy friend, or husband, or wife, can you observe without the name, without the picture, without the image, without all the movements that have taken place between you and her, or her and

you, which is division. Right? Come on, please. Can you observe without the distance, that distance, time, interval. That's easy to look at the mountain! But can you look at your wife, or boy, or whatever it is, without the word, without the image which is the result of all your conflict, the struggle, the pain, the insults, the nagging, the pleasure, the fear, the domination, the attachment, all that brings about a division. Right? The division takes place when there is the observer. Right? Who is the past. So can you observe without all that, your wife, your girl friend? Go on, sir, look at it.

Q: If you do that then there is no observation.

K: On the contrary. If you do that, the gentleman says, there is no observation. All this is preventing you from observing the actual. Right? Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Watch it, sir. Don't question me, watch it in yourself. My ambition to become the most important executive in my business, or whatever it is, is separating me from her. Right? Because I am concerned with myself. And she is concerned with herself - her fulfilment, her blah, blah, blah. So is there an observation - please listen to this, because I am going to relate it presently to intelligence - is there an observation without the word, the image, the picture and so on?

Q: Yes, there is.

K: Don't say, yes, or no, sir, look, find out. What happens then if there is no division between you and her, which is the division of thought, memory, remembrances, conclusions, when there is none of that between you, what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are observing her, or him, for the first time. No? So in the same way observe the movement of thought, be aware of the movement of thought so that this awareness puts thought in its right place. You understand? And this awareness is choiceless, because if there is choice there is immediately thought, and this awareness, penetrate it more and more in that awareness, it becomes attention. Right? I wonder if you are following all this.

Q: Yes.

K: Of course you are not. So attention means what? Attention can only take place when there is no centre as memory, conclusion, which are all the movements of thought. So attention implies no centre as the 'me' at all. The 'me' is put together by thought. So when there is no 'me' attention is intelligence. Fight me!

Q: Sir,...

K: No, first, have you understood, please. I must ask that question first before you attack me. Just a minute, sir, just a minute. Before you jump on me, have you understood what I have said? Be clear, otherwise what you say will have no relation to what I am saying. Right? I said - I'll repeat it carefully - I said you observe your wife or your husband; when you observe the observer is made up of the past. The past is your thoughts, your memories, your remembrances about her, all that. Now can you look at her without all these images, pictures, and all the rest of it? And that is only possible when there is great awareness of the movement of thought. Right? Can you observe your wife, or your whatever it is, without the movement of thought? The movement of thought occurs only when there is choice. I say, 'Yes, she has been good to me', and hold on to that, or hold on to, 'Oh, she has been etc., etc.'.

So where there is choice there is no awareness because it is still the operation of thought. So to observe without the observer is to be totally aware of her, or her, me, you. So then in that awareness if there is no choice there is supreme attention. Attention can only take place when there is no movement of thought as the 'me', with all my pictures and all the rest of it. And that is intelligence.

Now, have you understood my statement? You may not agree, you may say, that's all blah, anything you like, but first understand what I have to say.

Q: How does that awareness arise?

K: I'll show you how. I have carefully pointed out: look at the mountain. Can you look at the mountain without the picture, without the word, without the symbol, without all the reactions arising out of seeing it - beautiful, ugly, I don't like that, I like - you follow? So can you observe that, which is fairly easy, but can you observe your wife and your girl friend, or your boy friend without the image, the name, all the accumulated pleasures and so on and so on?

Q: I can do that for a short space.

K: You do that for a short space, you can do that temporarily, for a short space, then it comes back. So what happens? Go on, just watch it carefully, watch it, sir, in yourself. Temporarily you may have this, awareness, and then the other things overflows. That temporary thing becomes a memory, doesn't it - I have had it for a second. And that remembrance makes thought demand more, wants more of that temporary remembrance, or that remembrance which was temporary. You understand, sir? I'll show it to you.

Why am I working for you all?

Q: We are working together.

K: Oh, you are not.

Q: So what quality in us does it take to use this awareness?

K: I am showing it to you, madam. It's not what quality. Can you observe the mountain without the word, just to observe. That's fairly easy, isn't it. You can. If you are interested in finding out what observation is you can do that. But now apply that to your wife, or to your husband or to your wife. Can you look at her, or him, without the name, without the remembrance, you follow, all that, can you?

Q: Is understanding a part of intelligence or a part of thought?

K: Understanding can only take place when your thought is not in operation. When you are silently listening for the first time.

Q: If I went to the mountain and I see an image...

K: Sir, did you hear what the speaker just now said to that question? If my mind is chattering while you are talking, telling me something, I can't understand it. Right? Because I am thinking of something else. But if I stop thinking of something else, and listen to what you have said, I understand you.

Q: How can I stop thinking?

K: No, I said very carefully, sir, - I'll stop thinking - that's all wrong. I said please you don't follow it step by step that's why. I said, sir, do quietly listen. Forgive me if I insist on asking this. I said first look at the mountain. Can you look at the mountain without the word? And perhaps some of you who have gone into the question of observation, to see, may understand this. And I said the next thing is, can you observe your intimate friend, your wife or your husband, or boy or girl, to observe - please listen - to

observe her is only possible, or him, when the memories, conclusions, all the images which thought has built about her are in abeyance. Then you can see her as she is, as it is. Right? I have said this, very clear and very simple. That can only come when you are aware of the movement of thought. That is all I have said. Yes, sir?

Q: You are saying that intelligence operates in me only when I look at somebody else's wife.

K: I said your wife, your girl friend, not somebody else's wife, or somebody else's man. This is too absurd. Either you are serious, sir, either you are serious or you are making this into a picnic.

Q: I am trying to understand.

K: Please, sir, if you want to have an amusement I'll walk out, I'm not interested.

Q: There are some serious people here.

Q: I assure you that there are some serious people here. Now you say that by observing or being aware of thought then you can look.

K: No, sir, listen to what I have said. I have said, if you are aware of the movement of thought, be aware of the movement of thought, how it functions, how it operates. You follow?

Q: That is not stopping thought?

K: No, I said observe it, sir, which doesn't mean stopping it.

Q: I think that has to be cleared up because when you look at the mountain...

K: Sir, please, you haven't even...

Q: I understand what you say, but when you look at the mountain a thought comes in and it's a mountain...

K: Then you are not watching the mountain.

Q: What do I think, do I have to stop thinking it's a mountain, and look at the mountain?

Q: By saying that you get away from looking at the mountain.

K: Sir, leave the mountain now. I am glad there are no coals or oil up there. Leave the mountain. Can you look at your wife, or your girl friend, or at yourself, which is much better - can you watch yourself, what you think, what you feel, what you want, what your pleasures are, sex, can you look at yourself without any previous conclusions, without saying, this is good, this is bad, I am beautiful, I am ugly, I am not so intelligent as you are, this, that - just watch, look at yourself as though you are observing yourself in a mirror. The mirror doesn't distort, unless the mirror is crooked. The mirror doesn't distort. In the same way look at yourself. Can you do that? Which means can you be aware of the movement of your thoughts? Without any distortion? The moment distortion takes place thought is in operation.

So we proceeded from there to be aware. And if you are aware, if there is any choice, that choice distorts observation. If you say, well, 'My nose must be straight', you are not looking at the mirror. So where there is choice awareness is a distorting factor. When there is no choice, that means in that awareness you are aware of the movement of thought, movement, not stopping it, and that awareness brings about the right place to thought, the right place to thought. And that awareness if there is a penetration more deeply is attention. In that attention there is no centre from which you are attending. If there is a centre that is the movement of thought. You can see if you give - please just listen - if you give all your



attention to something there is no centre. Right?

Q: What actualizes the attention, that supreme attention in which there is no centre, even if you are not aware of it.

K: No, you haven't followed the whole step. You haven't followed the whole picture, the whole thing that we have been saying. There is no incentive, there is no motive.

Q: I realize that. I am just asking what actualizes that first? Are you saying there is supreme attention in the now.

K: Sir, would you listen to a statement without making an idea of it, without distorting it, without making a conclusion of it? I will make a statement. I say, the ending of sorrow is the beginning of intelligence. Listen to it, just listen to it, without drawing a conclusion, making an abstraction of it.

Q: What is the name of that thing that is looking without commenting on it.

Q: What is it that sees thought and sees thought's limitation? Is it thought itself?

K: If it is part of thought then it is still limited. You haven't got the roots of the matter.

Q: Sir, the interval, the space between me and what I have observed, what happens when I believe that I perceive that, or I have perceived that as a fact, and then my thought begins to take over once more? At that point. I believe that thought has been silent completely, and it is no longer, thought is in operation, that's my impasse.

Q: Why doesn't the silence continue - I think that's what he is asking.

K: Sir, are you asking, is intelligence continuous? Right? So

that one moment you are intelligent and the rest of the day you are unintelligent. So you say, can this intelligence be sustained, last several days. Is that what you are asking? The moment you have asked that question, the question is not an intelligent question, because you are introducing thought which says, 'I must have it for a whole day'.

Q: Yes.

K: Ah, you don't see the beauty of all this.

Q: Sir, what does it mean for awareness to penetrate thought?

K: No, I didn't say that. I said, sir, please would you listen, I must stop because you can't sustain this for an hour and a half, your brains won't stand this. I said can you be aware, as you are aware of the tree, as you are aware of the colour of the dress you are wearing, the person who is sitting next to you and the sky, the trees, can you be aware, watch, the movement of thought? Then you say, who is watching. If thought is watching itself, it stops movement. You understand this? If I watch myself being angry, I stop being angry. Right? If I watch myself being happy, happiness stops.

So can you be aware of your movement of thought? This awareness is not identified with thought, just to watch it, sir, like watching this microphone, watch it. But if I say, 'It's a microphone, it's that colour, this, who is sitting behind it' I am not watching. So I say can you watch yourself as though you were looking at a mirror that doesn't distort? And I said, when there is this alert watchfulness which is awareness in which there is no choice, that moves into attention, in which there is no centre from which you attend. So when there is complete attention, with your heart, with

your mind, with everything you have, to attend, then that intelligence begins to operate. Right.

## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH APRIL 1977

I would like, if I may, this morning talk about meditation. It is really one of the most important things in life. Not how to meditate, not the system of meditation, nor the practice of meditation, but rather what is meditation. And if one can find out very deeply what is the significance, what is the necessity, what is the importance of it for oneself, then one puts aside all systems, methods, gurus, and all the peculiar things that are involved in the Eastern type of meditation.

It's very important, I think, to uncover for oneself what one is, what actually one is. Not the theories, not the assertions and the experiences of psychologists, philosophers and the gurus and all the rest of them, but rather investigate into the whole structure of oneself - what actually one is, what is the nature and the movement of oneself. And in that transformation of oneself, radically, psychologically, one affects the whole consciousness of man.

All human beings throughout the world suffer, go through great agonies, despairs, fear; and there is the absolute fear of death. This is the common lot of every human being, whether they live in Asia or in the Western world, whether they are under tyranny, or in the so-called democratic societies. This is the common lot.

And we don't seem to be able to understand how extraordinarily important it is to see what one is, actually as though you are looking at it yourself in a mirror, psychologically, and bring about a transformation in the very structure of oneself. Because that transformation affects man. After all, each one of us is the history of mankind. That's a fact. History in the sense, the story of

suffering, agony, violence, brutality, cruelty, ambition and all the things man has put together with his thought. And so when one fundamentally, deeply brings about a transformation, a mutation, then that mutation affects the whole consciousness of man. Like those rather brutal, violent people who are tyrants, who have been tyrants, who have killed thousands and millions of people, for some ideologies - Communist and other ideologies - have affected the consciousness of man. This is also an absolute fact and a reality.

So it becomes very important, if one is at all serious, if one is concerned with the world as it is, with all its appalling misery, confusion, uncertainty, and with all the divisions of religions, nationalities, with their wars, with the accumulation of their armaments, spending enormous sums to prepare for war, to kill people, in the name of nationality and so on and so on, so it becomes vital, absolutely important that there must be freedom, freedom from this whole content of our consciousness. The content of our consciousness are all the things put together there by thought. Thought, as we said, is the response of memory stored up in the brain cells. That memory is knowledge, experience, and the response and the movement of memory is thought. So thought is limited. And whatever it does, both in the technological world as well as in the psychological field, must be limited, because thought in itself is a fragment, a movement of fragmentation. And even the scientists, and when we use the word 'scientists' those people have gone into all this business, even they agree, and so perhaps you'll also, because the scientists say so, you'll also easily accept.

But we're not talking of acceptance, we are seeing the fact for

ourselves, not according to anybody, including the speaker, because there is no, as we said, no authority in the matter of the psyche, in the matter of spiritual business. And when there is authority, that destroys all endeavour to find truth, which is the ultimate enlightenment.

And freedom from this, from our angers, brutalities, from our vanities, arrogance, from all the things that we are caught up in, freedom from that is meditation. And all these talks here have been to lay the foundation for this meditation. The foundation, if laid by thought, is still limited. Please, some of you may have come here for the first time, and so it is necessary to explain that we are exploring, investigating into the whole structure of our consciousness, of what you actually are, not what you want to be, or what you should be, or your ideologies, which are all the projections of thought, and therefore limited - but actually, in your daily life, to see what you are. And the very perception of it is the beginning of the transformation. Change and transformation are two different things. Change is a modified continuity. I am this and I want to be that. That is projected by thought, because it does not understand 'what is'. So it hopes by having an ideal the 'what should be', away from 'what is', it hopes to use the ideal as a means of changing 'what is'. Which is, the humanity throughout the world is violent. That's a fact. That is the actual reality. And thought has said, 'I don't know how to deal with this violence, but if I have an ideal called non-violence, then perhaps I will move from this to that.' That is, a modified continuity of violence. Therefore it is not non-violence. Whereas we are talking about the transformation of violence, not into something else, but complete, the ending of

violence, which is the transformation, which is mutation.

So if one understands that very, very clearly, not that we change from this to that, but the ending of violence, the ending of anger, the ending of sorrow, the ending of this continual struggle to be or to become psychologically something, to end it.

And we also went into the question of the observer and the observed - the observer who separates himself from the observed. I must be this, I am this, I must become that. So the observer is making an effort to become that. Is the observer different from that which he is observing, psychologically? Or the observer is the observed. Please, this must be clearly understood when we are going into the question of what is meditation, because meditation implies the ending of all strife, of all conflict, inwardly, and therefore outwardly. Actually there is no inward or outward, it is like the sea, there is the ebb and flow.

So in the same way, it is very important that we understand this question. Is the observer, psychologically, we're talking, different from the observed? I observe the tree or the mountain, and I am not the tree - I hope not. But when I observe my anger, my greed, am I different from my greed? You understand the question? Am I different from the fact of anger? When there is anger, there is no me or anger, there is just that state of anger. Right? Can we proceed from there? I hope you are following all this, if not, I'm afraid you'll be wasting your morning instead of playing golf or going for a walk. If you don't understand this, perhaps you would leave and go for a walk.

But as a human being, living in this world, with all the terrible things that are going on, it behoves for every human being in the

world to be concerned with this problem, to bring about a different way of living, not the terrible, meaningless existence that we do lead.

So we are asking, is the observer different from that which he observes, psychologically, that is, inwardly, under the skin as it were. That is, I am angry, I am greedy, I am violent. Is that 'I' different from the thing observed, which is anger, jealousy, greed? You're following this? Am I different? Obviously I'm not. Right? When I'm angry there is no, 'I am angry', there is only anger. So anger is me. So the observer is the observed. So you eliminate the division, altogether. You're following this point? Wherever there is division there must be conflict - between the nations, between communities, between the episcopalians and god knows what else. So wherever there is division there must be struggle, there must be conflict - between a man and a woman, when they are pursuing their different ways, their personal, etc., division. Where there is division, man and woman must be in conflict.

So we are saying to eliminate this conflict, psychologically, it's very important to understand whether the observer is different from the observed. If he is not, then the observer is the observed, and therefore conflict ends. I'll explain, go into this a little more. I hope you are working with the speaker, that you're not merely listening to a series of words, ideas, conclusions, but rather using the speaker, the words, as a mirror in which you are seeing actually yourself. So that you are aware of yourself, because we're talking about a human being, which is you. That human being is the story of the totality of mankind. And when you investigate that, when you look at it, you see the conflict has always existed between man



and woman, in himself.

So part of this meditation is to eliminate totally all conflict, inwardly, and therefore outwardly. And to eliminate this conflict one has to understand this basic principle, which is, the observer is not different from the observed psychologically. Are we meeting each other? Yes? Do you see the fact, not the acceptance of what I'm saying.

Look, when there is anger, there is no 'I', but a second later the thought creates the 'I' and says, 'I have been angry,' and there is the idea that I should not be angry. So there is 'me' who have been angry, and I should not be angry, so the division brings conflict. I hope you understand this because we are going into something which demands that you pay complete attention to this, which is, the essence of meditation. And to eliminate totally, completely every form of conflict, otherwise there is no peace in the world. You may have peace in heaven, but actually to live in this world with complete, inward peace, therefore every action is born out of that peace.

So it's very important to understand that the observer is the observed. When that takes place - please listen - that is, one is jealous, of which you all know, one is jealous, is jealousy different from the observer? You understand my question? Or the observer is the observed, therefore he is jealous, there is not 'I am jealous,' but there is only jealousy. right?

Then what takes place? You understand? Before there was division between me and jealousy, and then I tried to conquer it, I tried to suppress it, rationalize it, put away from it. But now when I see the 'me' is jealous, then what takes place? Before I tried to

conquer it, suppress it, understand it, rationalize it, or say, 'Yes, why shouldn't I be jealous?' And therefore in all that process, there is conflict. Whereas, we are saying, when there is no division between the observer and the observed, and therefore only the thing that is, which is jealousy, then what takes place? Does jealousy go on? Or is there a total ending of jealousy? You understand my problem, my question? I wonder.

When jealousy occurs, when there is no observer, you let it blossom and then end. You understand the problem, question? Like a flower that blooms, withers and dies away. But as long as you're fighting it, as long as you're resisting it, or rationalizing it, you're giving life to it. So we are saying that the observer is the observed. And when there is this jealousy, let it, when the observer is the observed, then jealousy blossoms, grows, and naturally dies. And therefore there is no conflict in it. I wonder if you see this.

So what then is action? We live by action, all our life is action - action according to a motive, action according to an ideal, according to a pattern, or action habitual, traditional, without any investigation. So we're going to ask ourselves, what is action? Because a mind that is in meditation, must find this out. What is action?

One of the major problems in our life is conflict, in ourselves. And from that conflict all kinds of neurotic activities go on. And to end conflict, and therefore end neurotic action becomes very important, to have a sane mind, a mind that's healthy, a mind that's not neurotic, caught in beliefs and fears and so on. So we're investigating conflict and the ending of conflict. And also we're asking now, what is action, because we live by action. When you

go to the factory, when you go to your office, when you talk, when you walk, everything is action, life is action. So when you're asked, what is action, and how do you act, according to what principle, according to what quality or state of mind from which you act. Please investigate it together. You generally act from memory, the memory which has set a pattern, which has become habit, routine, which is based on remembrance and that remembrance having, being pleasant, act according to that which is pleasant. Or act on reward or punishment. Or you act according to an idea, an ideal, having an ideal you say, 'I will carry that ideal out in daily life.' Or you have a certain ambition. And try to fulfil that ambition. So there are these various types of action.

So each of these actions are incomplete, fragmented. Each action is not whole, holistic. You understand this? If I go to the office every morning for the next fifty years, I'm a business man - thank god I'm not - but I'm a business man, or a lawyer, doctor, some kind of professional careerist. Therefore my actions are divided. Right? Do you see this? Divided, fragmented. I'm a business man and I come home and I love my children, but when I'm a business man, there, I don't love anybody, I want profit etc., etc. So my actions are divided, fragmentary. So when there is a fragmentary action, it must inevitably bring conflict, psychologically. So we're asking, is there an action - please listen to this - is there an action which has no conflict? You understand my question? So we're going to find out, together, we're going to investigate into this question whether there is an action in which there are no regrets, no failures, no sense of frustration, and therefore an action which is whole, harmonious, complete, holistic.

But first we must see very clearly that our actions are fragmentary in our life. I may be a scholar, a painter, but my life, though I'm an excellent sculptor, my life is shoddy, I'm ambitious, greedy, wanting money, position, recognition, fame. So there is contradiction. And hence, where there is contradiction there must be conflict. And that's the way you live. I may be a priest but I am burning inside to be, to become a bishop. It's this pattern goes right through the world. And where there is division in action there must inevitably be conflict - that's law.

So we're trying to find out if there is an action which is whole and never contradictory, therefore an action that does not bring about tension, division and all the rest. So we must find out what is action, not action in a particular field contrary to another part of the field. Therefore one has to see what one is actually doing, how one is actually living, living a contradictory life, contradictory action, and therefore conflict. You must see that, you must become aware of it. Are you aware of this fact, that you, as a human being, live actively, and each action contradicts other actions. Are you aware of this fact? If you are completely aware, then what takes place? You understand my question?

Suppose I live a contradictory action, live in contradictory actions, and you tell me, 'Be aware of it.' What do you mean by being aware of it, I ask. Awareness is not possible when you choose, when you say, 'I like that particular action, I would like to keep that, and please help me to avoid all other actions.' You follow? Which are contradictory to what I like. You follow what I'm saying? Therefore that is not awareness, that is choosing a particular action which is most satisfactory, most comforting, most

gratifying, rewarding and all the rest of it, and I say, 'Please let me hold to that and help me not to have contradictory actions with regard to that.' That is not awareness. You understand? Where there is choice in awareness, there is no complete, total, holistic awareness.

So I'm asking you, are you aware of this fact, that your whole life is lived in contradiction with contradictory actions, without any choice, just to be aware what actually is? Then if you are actually aware of it, there is no problem, is there? I wonder if you see this. We'll go into it a little later.

So, I'm coming back to it. We are saying that there is an action which is continuous, without any break. Do you see this? Our actions are broken, and therefore contradictory, change, but we are saying, there is an action which is continuous and therefore holistic, whole. The word 'whole' means to have good health, physically. It means also to have a mind that is sane. Sanity implies not being committed to any particular form of belief, dogma, church, nothing - sane, which is capable of reason, logic, and therefore able to think clearly, directly, objectively. That is sanity. But a neurotic mind cannot think logically, sanely. Therefore an holistic mind, whole, the word 'whole' means having good health, a sane mind. And also the word 'whole' means holy, sacred. All that is implied when we use the word 'holy', 'whole'.

So we are saying there is an action which has no break in it, and therefore a movement that is holistic, whole, and that movement we're going to find, not I'm projecting the idea and then finding it. You're following this? But in the process of meditation, we're going to find that action. You've got what I'm saying?

So we're coming to the point, what is meditation? Not how to meditate, not how to sit in a particular posture, breathe in a certain way and all that - to me all that is nonsense. Because you can only meditate in the depth of meditation and understand it fully, when there is no search or desire for power, when there is no storing up of hurts, when there is no fear, when you have understood the meaning of pleasure, in which there is joy and enjoyment. We went into that, I won't go into it now. And when there is the ending of sorrow, this must be, and love and all that. Therefore this is the basis of foundation, otherwise you're caught in an illusion. So we're asking what is meditation? And why should we meditate?

First of all, the Asiatics, including India, have brought to this country their idea of what meditation is. Their system of meditation, their concept of meditation, the conclusion of their meditation, which is traditional. You have in this country, and also brought from India, the thing called 'transcendental' meditation. The word 'transcendental' is misused. They give you a mantra. You know what that Sanskrit word 'mantra' means, it is entirely different from what you have been told, the root meaning of that word. It means, 'man' means, reflect - please listen, for god's sake listen - reflect on not becoming or being. Reflect on it. Look at it, observe it, see what is implied in it. Therefore reflect on not becoming, or not being. 'Tra' means to put away or destroy all self-centred activity. You understand? So mantra means reflect on not becoming, and dispel all movement born from the centre as the 'me'. That is the meaning of that word. And you have made it into something extraordinarily meaningless, which is, you repeat a word or a series of words, given by another, for 150 dollars or 20

dollars or some absurd money and then you repeat it three times a day for 20 minutes or 5 minutes, and have a good siesta. You know what a siesta is, don't you? And you think you are meditating.

So we're asking, what is meditation. That certainly is not meditation, because I can have a 20 minutes siesta, wake up, go to my office and - follow? - carry on the most mischievous life. Or in my family.

So we are trying to find out, what is meditation? Not according to any guru, not according to any system, because freedom from all authority is one of the factors of meditation, therefore there is no teacher of meditation.

And to find out what is meditation, what is the first thing that is necessary to find out? All previous knowledge of what meditation is, blocks the exploration of what is meditation. You've understood? If I have heard somebody tell me what is meditation, and I accept that or deny it, but it has left a mark on me, and with that memory I investigate it, then it's blocked. So we are investigating into what is meditation without any previous knowledge. So there must be freedom from the past, which is time.

So we have to investigate what is time. Time by the watch and time psychologically. That is, I will be something or I will become something. That requires time, doesn't it? Physically to go from here to there requires time, that's obvious. But we're asking, is there psychological time at all. That is, is there the movement of becoming, or being, or moving from this to that. Which is psychological time. We are questioning that psychological time. We are accustomed or educated to this idea that you must change from what you are into something what should be. That is the

traditional acceptance of this. We are saying, that movement is time. And that movement has no meaning because you're not changing 'what is', you're changing 'what is' modified. Change implies modification. Transformation implies the ending of 'what is'. The ending of anger, not how to become not angry. I hope you've understood this.

So in the investigation into what is meditation, freedom is absolutely necessary, freedom from authority, psychologically - of course I have to accept the authority of the policeman or the doctor etc., that's irrelevant. From all authority, there is no teacher, that's going to teach you what meditation is. When there is that freedom you can proceed.

What is necessary in the investigation of what is meditation, first? Is it concentration, or is it attention, or is it awareness? There are three things, concentration, awareness and attention. You're in daily life, sir, look at daily life. When you concentrate, what takes place, actually? Your whole energy is focused on a particular point, or on a particular page. Right? When you concentrate. Which is to put aside all interfering thoughts. So what happens then? That is, you're resisting, in concentration. But we are saying something totally different, which is, be aware of your thought, aware, don't choose in that awareness which thought you would like, just be aware of it.

And from that awareness comes attention. Attention implies that there is no centre from which you are attending. This is really important to understand, because this is the essence of meditation. In concentration there is a centre - right? - from which you are concentrating, on a picture or on an idea or on some image, etc.



From a centre you are exercising energy in concentration. That means, resisting, building a wall, so that no other thought comes in. Therefore there is conflict. There's conflict. When you resist anything there must be conflict. When you say, 'I must think about that and I must not think about other things', your mind, your brain, your thought is wandering all over the place. Right? So you try to pull it back, and therefore there is conflict, constant conflict. To totally eliminate that, become aware of your thought. Say, for instance, I want to think about - what? - think about my suffering, I want to think about it. In thinking about it, I'm distracted by the noise that is going on out there. Or by a thought that comes in that I must see somebody tomorrow, so there is always a distraction going on. Now, become totally aware of this movement of distraction. I'm thinking about suffering, and then I think about cleaning my shoes. Then leave suffering, and look at your thought which wants to clean your shoes. So there is no conflict.

So pursue each thought and therefore there is no contradiction, no resistance about any thought. You've understood this? So then from that arises awareness, to be aware, you are aware then of all the movement of your thought. You've got it? Then out of that awareness comes attention. Now when you are attending to something, really, deeply, there is no centre, is there? Have you watched? Now wait a minute. If you are listening very attentively to what is being said, now, actually now, when you are attending with all your nerves, ears, giving all your energy to attending, is there a 'me'? Is there? Obviously not. You understand? So in attention there is no centre from which there is, you're attending, whereas in concentration there is a centre. You get it? Well, it's up

to you.

Then in that attention, if you have gone that far, which is that you have laid the foundation, that you are free from all the business of thought, all the travails of thought, fear, agony, despair, that's the foundation. That is, the content of your consciousness, which is put there by thought, now is being emptied. You understand? It's being freed.

So meditation is the emptying of the content of consciousness, which is consciousness. You're getting this? That is the meaning of, and the depth of meditation, the emptying of all the content, which means - please listen - thought coming to an end - thought is necessary when I function technologically, in the office and so on, but every other form of registration comes to an end. You understand what I'm saying? No, please listen - I'll tell you something. You know, our brain is registering almost everything, the noise, the words which I'm using, like a tape, it is registering. Now is it possible not to register but only register what is absolutely necessary? Why should I register your insult? Why? Why should I register your flattery? It's unnecessary. Why should I register the hurts? Unnecessary. You understand? Therefore register only that which is necessary to operate in daily life as a technician, a writer and so on. But psychologically, don't register anything else. Are you capturing this? So the registration is the movement of thought, which is anger, jealousy, hatred, all that.

So the brain, so consciousness then has lost its content, therefore it is totally a different state of mind, which is - I do not know how far you can go into this. I will go on. Follow it if you can, if you cannot, it doesn't matter, because this is the way of

living, not the way that we carry on day after day with all kinds of confusion, uncertainty. We are pointing out a totally different way of living, which is the emptying consciousness of its content, which is fear.

Now we've come to a point when we say, meditation is the attention in which there is no registration psychologically, no registration except the fact of language, going to the office, working in a factory and so on. Nothing else. Then out of that comes complete silence, because thought has come to an end. It functions only where it is absolutely necessary. So time has come to an end. You understand? Time means, movement, therefore when time stops, then there is a totally different kind of movement, in silence. And religion then becomes a totally different thing. Religion then has a totally different meaning.

Now, let's look at that. Religion as it is now - please, if I use strong words, look at it, don't say you're prejudiced or you're conditioned or anything, just look at it. Religion now is a matter of thought. Right? Thought has made the various Hindu religions, the Christian religions, with all their contents, their superstitions, with their symbols, with their, you know, figures, everything is put together by thought. And therefore each religion is fragmented. You are a Christian, somebody else is a Muslim, somebody else is a Hindu and so on. And in those divisions there are subdivisions, multiple divisions, all the result of thought. This is what you call religion, going to the Mass, rituals, the incense, the symbols, all that is called religion, the beliefs, the hopes, the fears, and the desire to be secure in another world or find security in a belief and so on. All that is called religion. Right? We are saying that is not

religion, that is merely the movement of thought in fear, in hope, in trying to find security. Thought being a material process, material process - when we use the word 'material' it means memory, experience, knowledge, is stored up in the brain, in the very cells, therefore it is matter. So thought is a material process. And anything that thought has created, put together, is fragmentary, and therefore not religious.

So we're finding out, then what is religion? If all this is not religious? Which no bishop, no devout Christian, no devout, superstitious Hindu or superstitious - will accept this, but it doesn't matter, these are facts. Then what is religion? If it is none of these things, then what is it? It is the investigation with all your attention, which means with all your energy, the summation of all your energy to find out that which is sacred, to come upon that which is holy, which thought has not put together. And that can only take place when there is freedom from noise, that is the noise of thought. That means, the ending of thought and time, psychologically, inwardly. But not the ending of knowledge in the world where you have to function with knowledge. So this, that which is holy, that which is sacred, which is truth, can only be when there is complete silence, when the brain itself has understood the necessity or put thought in its right place. Then out of that immense silence, then there is that which is sacred.

Silence demands space, space in the whole structure of consciousness. There is no space in the structure of our consciousness as it is, because it's crowded with fears. You follow? Crowded, chattering, chattering. And therefore there is no space. When there is silence, there is immense, timeless space. Then only

there is a possibility of coming upon that which is the eternal, the sacred.

# SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 27TH JULY 1977.

K: We are going to have a dialogue about any subject. Dialogue implies conversation between two people, people who are concerned about serious things. It is not an intellectual game, or idealistic exchange, or exchange of mere ideas, but rather it is a conversation, I hope friendly, between us. So what shall we start with?

Q: I am a student confronted with theories, speculations and my mind is occupied with this during eight or ten hours a day. I have a great passion to live a simple life, a life with beauty, among all these complex circumstances. Is that possible?

K: The questioner says - I don't know if I need to repeat it - the questioner says that he is a student dealing with theories, ideas, speculations, and he wants to lead a very simple life, a life of beauty, quietness and fairly simple. How is this to be managed? Any other questions?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you saying, sir, many philosophies and teachers say that suffering is necessary? Is that it? That is one question.

Q: Is it possible to look at the psychological and physiological state as one movement?

K: Is it possible to observe the physiological as well as the psychological states as one movement. Obviously.

Q: Sir, you said the other day that we should keep our discontent alive. Later on you also said that we should be able to live without conflict. I can't quite understand this.

K: I didn't hear the first part of the question.

Q: One day you said we should keep our discontent alive, and the other day you said no conflict.

K: To keep discontent alive without conflict. Is this possible? Or one day you said be discontented and also, in the next talk, live without effort. How do you bring this about, together?

Q: Why is it so difficult to be totally aware?

Q: How can a human being unattached totally, function in this world?

K: Is that enough?

Q: What do you mean by responsibility?

K: I think that is enough. May we start with these few questions together and go on with them, should we?

One wants to live a simple life, uncomplicated, and yet at the same time a beautiful life, but being a student, who is concerned with ideas, speculations, theories and so on, how is this possible? That is one question. The other is, what is responsibility, what do you mean by that word responsibility? And another is, one day in one of your talks you said one must keep this discontent alive, and in another talk, there must be no effort, is this possible? And how is one - not how - is it possible to be totally and completely aware? Right? Can we start with that.

I think if we could talk over together as a dialogue, what does it mean to be totally aware, and I think we can then ask the question of responsibility, being a student how to live a life of simplicity in a world of theories, ideas and so on, and the other question which is, conflict and discontent. Can we start? Would you object to that, sir? Would any of the questioners object if we start with what does

it mean to be completely and totally aware? Can we start with that then I think the other questions will be answered through that.

According to the dictionary meaning - I prefer to look at the dictionary and see what it means, not translate what I think is awareness, or what you think, but according to the dictionary awareness implies sensitivity: to be sensitive to the environment, to all the things, most of the things that are happening in the world outside, and also to be sensitive, to be aware of what is happening, going on within oneself, within the skin, as it were. To be aware not only to nature, to other human beings, to all the beauty of the world, and the political chaos, the contradictions, the hypocrisy, all that outwardly, and also to be aware inwardly, one's own problems, conflicts, desires, misery, confusion and so on. So it is a movement of sensitivity to the outer as well as to the inner. That is, I think, the real meaning of being aware. We all agree to that, do we? Please I am not laying down the law, I am just exchanging with you what does it mean to be aware, that is generally understood.

Q: Is it awareness, or aware of the outer and the inner?

K: I am going into that.

Q: There are a lot of people here speaking a lot of words of what it is about, awareness. But has it changed their lives? What do you say? Has there been a radical transformation in their lives? That is one thing I would like to ask: how many people have actually been changed throughout the years by what you have said?

K: How many people have been changed by your talks. Right? How many people have been radically changed by your fifty years and more of talking all over the world? Right, sir?

Q: Ask the people who have been here.



K: Let us first listen to what he has to say. He says you have talked for about fifty or more years, and has there been any human being, one or two that are radically changed.

Q: Like yourself. It seems to me that people will only hear your words but not implement them.

K: I don't know quite follow, sir, what you are saying.

Q: What I am saying is, they try and live according to your words instead of following themselves.

K: No, I don't quite understand what he is saying. Would you talk a little more quietly. I will answer it sir, I will repeat your question.

Q: What I am asking is this: people come here, there are a lot of people coming here for many years, and it seems that they have not in their daily life effected the radical change that you are talking about.

K: That is what I am going into.

Q: Now, I ask myself why.

K: Don't. If you answer the question yourself you are...

Q: I can't answer the question because I have not arrived at where you are at. The words seem to be particular and peculiar to you. But they have no meaning or relevance to my life simply because one has got to follow oneself. And it seems quite futile asking questions about what awareness is when you don't know the meaning of awareness.

K: We are trying to explain, sir, the meaning of that word first, awareness. And with regard to the other question: you have talked for over fifty years, have there been any one person who is radically transformed by your words? Right? If I may point out, it

is not my responsibility to see if anybody is changed, or not. It is up to them. It would be an impudent action on my part if I said, "Have you changed?" It is up to each one who listens, or who cares to listen, or who is serious. It is up to them, and not up to me.

That's all.

Q: I agree.

K: It is up to you, sir, as well as up to every other person. May we go on?

That is, we were asking...

Q: Thank you very much.

K: Not at all, sir. We were asking, what is it to be aware. We said according to the dictionary, it has several meanings but I am taking the principal meaning of that word, which is, to be conscious, to be in touch, not verbally, but inwardly, to be in touch, to be conscious, to be sensitive to the outer and to the inner. When one is sensitive there is no division as the outer and the inner. And we are saying, is it possible - that is the question - which is, is it possible to be aware totally, completely. It implies, does it not - this is a dialogue, I am not giving a speech, so please share in the question and answers - we are saying, the questioner is saying, is it possible to be completely aware? Now is there a difference - I am asking you - between the outer, that is the political, social, economic, and all the things that are happening in the world, the violence, the brutality, the appalling political chicanery, deception, all that is going out there, is it not also going on inwardly? Is society created by us, or society just exists by itself? You understand my question. So if we are related, or sensitive to what is happening in the world, with all the violence and so on, who is

responsible for it? And to be aware of that responsibility, which means to be sensitive, to be conscious, of one's own violence, double talk, say one thing and think something else, wanting complete security, nationalities, and so on and so on, can one be totally aware of this movement? That's the question; please answer it, discuss it, talk it over.

Can a human being, again who is the representative of the whole of humanity, which we discussed very clearly, which is obvious, which is factual, can a human being be aware of that noise of the train, the wind among the leaves, the beauty of the mountains, the environment and also be aware what is going on inwardly?

Is it possible to be aware - no, I must go a little more deeply. One is aware of this tent. Right? Conscious, the shape of it, the structure of it, the length of it, the proportions of it. Right? And also one is conscious, one is aware, sensitive to the people sitting around you - the colour of their dress, how they look, the colour of their shirts, and what the ladies wear, and so on, to be aware of it, conscious of it, sensitive to it. Right? But in that awareness comes the question, "I like that blue shirt, and I don't like that red shirt", "I like that person, I don't like that person" - for various reasons. Now can you observe - we are asking - can one observe the person sitting next to you, the dress they wear, the colour, without choosing, without saying, "I like, I don't like", just to observe? Is that possible, can you do it? That's fairly simple, isn't it? No? Can't you do that?

Q: When you point it out, yes it is possible.

K: I am coming to that, sir, you want to go ahead too quickly.

You might observe the shirt the speaker is wearing, and say, "Sorry, that's too much colour. I don't like it. It is sewn badly" - which is perfectly right, it is made in India! Please wait a minute, things are made very well in India, perfectly, but this happened to be a bad tailor. And you can look at it without any condemnation or approval, can't you? Right? That's fairly simple, isn't it?

Q: Why do you say it is simple, it is not simple for us. To look without judging, it is not possible. (continues in Italian)

K: Ah, no, the gentleman is saying it is very difficult for us to be aware without judgement, without judging. And I say, is he speaking for himself, or generally, for all the people in the tent. He says, at last, I am speaking for myself. Now is that so? Can you not observe - please try it, this is a discussion, a dialogue, a conversation - can you observe without judgement, without approval, just to look? Is that not possible? No?

Q: No.

K: It is not possible? Why? Is it because one is so heavily conditioned to like and to dislike? I am just asking, I am not saying you are. I don't like the Russians, or I love the Russians, I don't like this, and I don't like that, but to observe. Because we will go into it a little deeper afterwards. Can you observe a tree, a mountain, a river, without - just to look at it, not say, "I like," "I don't like", "This is beautiful" - just to look at something. Is that not possible? Because if you cannot do that outwardly it becomes much more difficult when you go inwardly. Right? It is fairly easy to observe a car and say, "That's not a nice colour", or just to look at it. And if one cannot do that then how can you observe yourself without any condemnatory process, just to observe what is actually happening?

That is, to be aware without any choice. I believe, I was told the other day, when we use that word 'choiceless awareness' that is the essence of religion. It may be, it may not be. I am just passing it on to you.

So we are asking: if one is not sensitive, you can't be sensitive if you say, "I don't like that", or "I do like that", "This gives me more delight in looking and that disgusts me". Because if one is not capable to observe without any movement of thought, which is like and dislike, condemning, accepting, how can one observe the extraordinary complexity of one's own existence inwardly? You understand my question?

Q: Can we ask the question the other way: is there anyone here in this tent who can so observe without judgement?

K: The gentleman says, is there anyone here in this tent who can so observe, without judgement. That will answer that gentleman's question about whether anybody had changed or not. It's up to you.

Q: It can be done for a moment.

K: The gentleman says it can be done for a moment. Just for a second or two you can observe, just observe. But a few seconds later the whole machinery of thought begins. Right?

Q: I can do it with will.

K: Gosh, you people! He can do it with will, he can control and observe. I say that is not possible. When you control your like and dislike and observe, you are not observing totally. You are not giving your whole energy to observe. I can't understand the difficulty in this at all.

Q: It is so difficult to see what is in front of you.

K: Sir, can't you look at this poor man sitting on the platform,

just look at him.

Q: But after a while...

K: No, sir, we are not going inwards into that. I said, can't you look at the speaker with his pink, or whatever it is, look at him, just look without all the machinery of thought of saying, "I like", "I don't like", "He is good", "He is clever" - he is this, just to observe.

Q: There is a fear, sir, if I may speak for myself, that once one observes without judging standards of morality will disappear.

K: We will come to that, sir, we haven't gone into the very, very complex problem of observing, being aware, inwardly. We are just observing this. Can you listen to that noise of that train without saying, "For god's sake, I want to listen to you", and therefore resist the train, noise of the train?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, the gentleman asked - we haven't even approach his question, we are just exploring the question - the gentleman there asked, what does it mean, is it possible to be totally aware? He says, I want to be, I see the importance of it, but I can't do it, what does it mean? He is asking that question. And we are exploring the word, not the significance of the whole thing, just the word. I said the word means to be conscious, to know, to be sensitive. And one cannot be sensitive, judge if there is condemnation, judgement, just to observe.

There is an Italian gentleman, I have known him for over sixty years - seventy? And I look at him, I talk to him and I have known him all these years, I never once ask him, have you changed. It is up to him. If he does not change then it is his misery. It is not my misery.

Q: You have talked for fifty years in order to produce what result? And you have not produced it.

K: I don't want to produce...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Would you kindly listen to me. I will answer your question, sir.

Q: You can only answer it in words, not change people.

K: You have gone back to the question.

Q: Excuse me, Krishnamurti, I am no follower of yours but I think I would like to point out to those gentleman over there. First to enlighten you, that is something you have to do for yourself. His aim in life is to keep and maintain the light of his own being.

K: Sir, I can answer the question for myself, you don't have to! Would you please listen. Please I am talking very seriously, why I am talking, why I have not deviated for the last sixty years from what I have been saying, I will tell you why if it interests you.

First of all the speaker doesn't expect anything from anybody. Right? Because he said, look, he said very carefully from the beginning, no authority, he said that sixty years ago. I am eighty two now. Sixty years ago he said that, no authority, therefore don't follow anybody, including me. You have to be a light to yourself, not light your candle or your fire at the fire or candle of another, including myself. So you by listening, if you care to listen, are responsible for yourself, not for me. And I also said, the speaker does not expect anything from anybody, all of you. If you want to drink at the fountain, drink it. And if you don't, don't. It is very simple. If I expected anything from you I would be disappointed, I would be hurt. I would feel, my god, I have done nothing in my

life. But I don't feel that. I am very serious, I don't feel that way. I am talking and the urge to talk is born out of compassion, without any cause. I carefully explained, compassion has no cause. So that is why I am talking. And also you might ask a flower on the road side, why do you have such beauty, why do you have such perfume. And if the flower was able to talk it would say, "Look, I am like that, what are you going to do about it?".

So let's continue with what we were talking about.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, we are talking about awareness. Please ask that question...

Q: Awareness is to be aware without thought. (Inaudible)

K: I don't understand your question, madam. I can't hear it. If somebody has understood will you tell me.

Q: We are conditioned to like and dislike things. How can we stop this?

K: Yes, we are conditioned to like and dislike, can we talk it over how to stop this. And also I forgot when those questions arose why you have schools. There too we are not expecting anything except to help them to understand life. If they don't it's up to them. Let's proceed.

We are having a friendly conversation, a friendly conversation between two people, you and I, or many of us together, which is about is it possible to be totally aware. We are going to go into that question. It is a very complex question, and if we can go together into it you will see what is implied in it. But you are refusing. I am saying, to be aware implies to be sensitive, to be conscious of the outer as well as the inner. If one is not sensitive to the outer, it



becomes much more difficult to be sensitive to the things that are happening inside the skin, as it were. So I began by saying, can you observe something without judgement. That's all. Just to look. Not say, "I like" - I know you are conditioned, I know it is very difficult, you make it terribly difficult by making it an intellectual thing. But to look at something, just look without all the operation of thought entering into it. If you cannot then it is impossible to look with clarity, without any judgement about what is happening inside you, which is very, very complex.

So I just began by pointing out, to look at the outer without any judgement. If that is not possible, find out why it is not possible, not how to be free of the conditioning, but why is it not possible. Find out. It is not possible because your whole education from childhood has been to say, develop this conditioning of like and dislike. Right? I like Italians, I hate the Russians. Right? That's how we operate. Or I hate the person who is speaking here. So it doesn't matter.

So I am just asking you to kindly observe what is happening outside - violence, divisions of religions, political divisions, building up instruments of war. Right? This is happening outside. Concentration camps - people who disagree politically are sent to mental hospitals, torture. All this is going on outside. Can you look at it first without identifying yourself with any of them. Right? If you cannot do it, find out why. Is it because you are an Englishman who is so stuck in his conditioning, or an Indian who is so traditionally bound? Nationality in India didn't exist at all for centuries, millenia, it is only the British, and other foreigners, brought it in, and they began the national wars, conflicts and all the

rest of the nonsense.

So if you are aware of that let's move inwardly. Right? Now can you look at yourself without any judgement? I want to live a very simple life. That is one of the questions. But I am surrounded by ideas, theories, speculations, and that gives me a degree. You follow? Therefore how am I to live simply? So this is one of the problems. Look into it. We are asking, can you look at yourself, not according to me, or according to Jung, Freud, or professional psychologists, just to look at yourself? As you look at yourself immediately you say, "I am bad", or "I am evil", or "I am jealous". You follow? The whole machinery of the past, the traditions, thought begins. But before the thought begins just have a space, a little space so that you can look without that machinery quickly coming into action. You understand? It seems so simple.

Q: Shall we give importance to some things and not to others?

K: Sir, we haven't come to that yet. You see we have already started what is important, what is not important. I am just looking at myself, I haven't come to anything.

Look, I'll begin: I want to look at myself, I want to see what I am, not who I am. What is all this going on in me? I just want to look first. I see I can only look without distortion if there is no judgement. Right? I see that. But I have been conditioned, heavily conditioned so long - society, education, etc., family, tradition says, you must judge. I know that. I have been conditioned. I say I'll hold that in a minute, I'll hold that back, but I just want to look. Right? Are you doing this as we are talking together? Or have you just gone off. Are we doing this together?

Q: Yes.

K: Right. That is, I want to look at myself. I want to see exactly the shape of my face in the mirror. Right? I look at myself in the mirror, the outer, and my face is my face. I can't say, well I wish I had a straighter nose, or black whatever it is. I just look first. All right. Then I say to myself, I wish it were not like that. Right? Why do I say it? Because I think your nose is better than mine. Right? So comparison is born. You understand? You are following this? Now can I look without comparison? You understand? My interest is to look, is to observe, and therefore as my interest is tremendously strong to look, comparison fades away. You understand? Because my whole urgency, urge is to observe. Therefore comparison doesn't exist at that moment, it may come later, I will deal with it later. But at the moment my interest is so great that I want to look. My interest pushes aside all comparison. Right?

Now, have you got that interest? I am not saying you must have it. Have you got it? If not, why not? You understand my question? If you haven't got that tremendous interest to know what is happening in the world, and what is happening inside you, and you have created the outer - the society, the whole structure is created by human beings, and as you are a human being who is the representative of all humanity, you are responsible for this terrible state. So I just want to observe.

Q: Even if you say I observe my face...

K: X's face. Sir, all right, I want to look at you. I know you are American, by your speech, or an Italian. And I don't like Americans, suppose - please don't go off - so I say, oh, he is an American and turn my head away. Right? But my interest is to

look, whether you call yourself an American, your language is American, whether you are vulgar, stupid, that's not my - I want to look, I want to see what you are.

Q: You take a photograph of it.

K: Yes, take a snapshot and you look at it. Can you do the same about yourself. That is what I am coming to. You refuse to move. I want to go into this. This is tremendously important. I want, as a human being, I want to look at myself before I say who am I, what am I, condemn, judge, evaluate, this is good. I just want to look.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, you are all making it so complex. It will become tremendously complex a little later, don't begin with complexity. My body, my mind, my - you follow? Just look at yourself.

Q: What do you mean by, 'the house is burning'?

K: You have understood his question. I'll repeat his question. He says, what do you mean 'the house is burning'? Don't you know the house is burning? Your house, the world is your house, the earth is your house. The earth is being destroyed, the rivers are being polluted, the air is becoming impossible to breathe with so many cars, and all the rest of it. Some fishes are being destroyed completely, the whales are disappearing, there are wars - preparing, whether it is in Egypt or Israel, it doesn't matter, it is part of your house. Are you aware of this, that it is your house? Not Israel and Egypt. Right? Are you aware of it, sensitive to it? Or you say, "Poor chaps, it is their affair"? If you are not aware of it, why are you not aware of it? The house is burning, you understand? You don't seem to realize what the world is going through.

And the second question is: must there be complete

transformation - listen to the question - must there be complete transformation, psychologically, all that we have talked about, before you put out the fire? You understand the question? I see the fire in the world, and the fire inside myself - the misery, the confusion, the idiocy, the pettiness, my arrogance, and all the rest of it. Until - the questioner says - until I radically transform myself it is not possible to put the fire out.

Q: You must become...

K: Sir, listen to the question first, find out what is implied in it: I cannot do anything until I become perfect. Right? And the house is burning in the meantime. And the house is me. I am being burnt, so I wait until I become perfect. Right? This is the question that is asked not only by that gentleman but by everybody. Which is, can I teach, can I start a school, can I do anything until I have completely transformed? You see the absurdity of the question, need I explain it? I am not being rude to you, sir. But need that question be answered? Do you mean to say you wait until you become transformed; or you see the importance of putting an end to the fire, and that very essential urge to put out the fire is transforming you. You understand? Right.

Now please let's stick to one thing. What time is it?

Q: A quarter to twelve, sir.

K: Thank you. Let's go into this a little bit, may I? I want to look at myself. I know I am so conditioned that I cannot look at myself properly. Right? So I put that question 'wanting to look at myself' completely, I leave that. I then go and tackle or investigate, why am I conditioned, why do I accept it? Not just say, well I am conditioned. I know. Why do I accept it? Do you accept it because

it is the easiest way of living?

Q: Yes.

K: So, wait a minute, sir, I want to observe and I see I cannot observe because I am conditioned, and I have never questioned because I am afraid I might not be comfortable. So I see I want to be comfortable, is that it, that's why I can't look. So why do I want comfort? Where am I to find it? I want it. But where am I to find it? So I find it in my companion - I think I find it - in my wife, with my girl, with a belief. So don't disturb all that, because with my wife so far I have found comfort with her, safe. But one day something is going to crack, so I am frightened. You follow how far I have moved away. I want to observe and I find I am really afraid to observe. Right? Right? Are you following this? So I am going to find out why am I afraid. What am I afraid about? Losing my comfort, losing my security, losing my conditioning? It is this conditioning that is creating the misery in the world. Right? So the house is burning, I want to put out that fire, but I don't want to because I am frightened. Right?

Are you doing this? So in other words, sir, you want to remain mediocre which means - I am not condemning you, I am just pointing out - mediocrity means climbing half way up the hill; excellence means going right to the top of it.

So most of us would rather remain in our stagnant pools of little conditioning, and knowing that very conditioning is destroying the world. Right?

So look how far I have gone into it. I want to look and I find I am conditioned, I question why I am conditioned because in questioning why I am conditioned I find I want comfort, I want the

easiest way. The easiest way is to accept.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Though there is contradiction I accept it. There is contradiction. So I would rather let things alone. Right? Is that what you are all doing? Please investigate, I am not saying you are doing it.

Q: Sir, when we are talking about this, including myself, what part is looking, one part is looking at the other part. We verbalize it and think we understand it. I can understand your message, that there is a different way of seeing yourself. Like you said, seeing in the mirror, you see your face.

K: How do you look at your own consciousness, is that it?

Q: I think in the same way that you look at your face.

K: Yes, sir. How do you look at your own consciousness, the questioner asks, as you look at your own face. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are a rummy crowd!

Q: What exactly am I thinking about at this moment. It is always something in the past.

K: Look: at the end of an hour and ten minutes - three trains have passed - at the end of an hour and ten minutes, or more, that question has not been answered. The gentleman says, please tell me, I am really anxious to find out, how to be totally aware. That has not been answered. And he will go away and say, my god, when will that question be answered. Because you really don't want to find out, do you, what it means to be totally aware?

Sir, to be totally aware implies a choiceless observation of the content of your consciousness. The content is the society, the wars,

the misery, the confusion, the repetitive pleasurable actions and so on, the content is that, can you observe it? Can you observe that you are afraid - not how to change it, not how to run away from it, or transform it, just to observe that fear? And to know, to be aware that you are pursuing pleasure - pleasure of possessing money, pleasure sexually, pleasure of a position, different forms of pleasure - are you aware of it? Now wait a minute, 'are you aware' means are you aware fragment by fragment? You understand? Are you aware of the many parts of the content of consciousness? Or are you aware instantly of the whole? The whole is more than the parts. But if you say I am going to look at each part, there will never be perception of the whole which is much more. So which is it that you are doing actually - examining the parts, fear, jealousy, anxiety, sorrow, the house is burning, I am left, centre, or extreme right, or extreme left politically, are you aware of the fragments; or are you aware of the totality of consciousness?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know, but find out if I am observing the parts and why are you observing the parts? Because you are conditioned. I look at my life as a Frenchman, as a Dutchman, or whatever it is. That is my tradition, I have been brought up in Holland and I have said, I am a Dutchman, and that is my conditioning, therefore I will always look fragmentarily. Just be aware of that, not how to go beyond it. The moment you become aware of it you are already out of it.

So consciousness with its fragments - each one of us is aware of the fragments. You understand, sir? The wheel is greater than the spokes. Right, you understand that? The whole is greater than the parts. That's all. But if I am conditioned, holding on to my parts, I



will never see the whole. If I say, I have been born in India, I am a Brahmin, I am the tradition, etc., etc., which is the part, and I hold on, so I will fight for the part. Which is simple, that is what you are doing - America, Russia, you follow? Whereas if you see the whole of it then the parts disappear. Right, sirs? Do it, please do it.

Q: How do you get to the total?

K: I am showing it to you.

Q: No, you are not. You are destroying it. You are talking about it.

K: No. All right, sir. I have got your question, wait sir. I will show it to you. If you will kindly listen, sir, I am pointing out something. First I say, please listen, first I say the word is not the thing.

Q: That's right.

K: Right? So what I have described is not the actual, the truth. Right? So can you when you are listening not be caught in words but see the thing that is being described? But that becomes difficult because we have lived in a world of words. So I have been saying from the beginning of every talk, the word is not the thing. The word 'mountain' is not the mountain. I may describe the mountain most eloquently, beautifully, or paint it, but the paint, the picture, the words, the description is not the thing. Therefore consciousness is the word, the content is the word and awareness is the word, so go beyond the word, which is see your own consciousness, its content, etc. So if you are merely caught by the description then you will fight with me for ever.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam. Look, we human beings are used to being told

what to do. We want to be awakened to all this. Right? We want to see all of this and go beyond it. And who is going to do it for you? If I see - please listen sirs - if I see that I have to be a light to myself - right - and that I cannot light this light from another, or through another, then I have to look at myself. Look. Look at the content of myself. But I cannot look at the whole as a whole because I am trained to look partially. So my concern then is, why do I look partially. I look partially because of my education, my tradition, my environment, the society, my wife, my father, they have all been looking at themselves partially. So I refuse to look, I refuse to look how they have told me to look. I say, I don't know, they may be totally wrong, probably they are, so I want to look, for the first time to look. Sir, when you look there is no difference between the observer and the observed, there is only the state of looking.

Q: Do I look partially because of my attachment, my positioning, or because of all the things that I have done wrong in my life, and I know it? Say I have been buying something for five francs and I am selling it for twenty five francs to somebody who needs it. I do see moral things. At this point I can't make any kind of excuse for myself - my ego can make an excuse for anything, but I do not want to see the real me which is ugly, hideous.

K: Quite right, sir. When you say, hideous, ugly, you are already condemning it. For god's sake, do look how we are caught in words. Sir, when you love somebody - I mean love, ordinarily, not something extraordinary - for the moment you forget everything, don't you. You may want to hold her hand or sleep with her, or have her as your companion. In that there is no problem.

We have made this all so terribly intellectual, verbal.

We'll continue, if we may tomorrow morning.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 28TH JULY 1977.

K: If you don't mind we will continue with what we were talking about yesterday. Which is, is it possible to be totally awake, aware? And if you will allow me I will talk about it for a little while and then you can have a dialogue about it. And we are only going to discuss, talk over together, what does it mean to be aware totally. And if you don't mind I won't answer any other question except that because I think if we could go into this very deeply we will find out how to look at ourselves. And from that observation one begins to see what is the meaning of knowing oneself. Because without knowing yourself you have no basis for action. Without knowing yourself one wanders around with all kinds of absurd ideas, commits oneself to all kinds of activities, caught in various traps. So I think it is very important if we could go into this question of what does it mean to be totally, completely aware. And I think most of our questions will be answered in the discovery for ourselves of what it means to be aware. May I go into that that way? Would you allow me?

First of all, one can see the importance of being a light to oneself. It doesn't mean to cling to some idea that one has discovered, or experienced a light in oneself. But that comes about by understanding fully, deeply what awareness means. I am going to talk it over with you first, and then please question, let's talk it over, have a dialogue together.

I don't think awareness can be practised. If you practise it then it becomes mechanical. Right? That's simple enough. It is like a man

who plays the piano, if he practises all day long he might practise the wrong notes. So awareness implies no practice at all. It is free observation without any distortion, without any bias, without any prejudice, without any conclusion - free observation and exposition. Not only observation of the world around one, but also from the outer observation move inward because unless one understands the outer very carefully merely starting with the inner awareness may be distorting, may be illusory, may be non-factual. Whereas observing the outer, your reactions to the outer, whether you are a Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, British, American, whatever it is, so if you are conditioned as most of us are, and if you look at the outer with that conditioned mind then you can't observe freely.

So awareness implies that one is conditioned, and from that conditioning we have created the world, the moral, ethical, cultural, political, religious world, as well as the psychological world. Right? We are conditioned by our culture, by the society in which we live, which we have created, and we are conditioned by the religions, by the priests, by the family, the tradition, the tradition of war, and the tradition of god, as the tradition of rituals. We are conditioned by the name, by the connotation attached to that name. All this is a form of conditioning.

Now just a minute. So the human being conditioned at the beginning, and then he conditions himself through greed, and then he creates a society which helps him to be greedy. Right? This is simply logical. So it is an interaction between the outer and the inner. It is not that the outer is different from the inner, but it's interaction, constant ebb and flow. It's clear, isn't it? So we are

asking: is it possible to be aware of one's conditioning totally, both the conditioning of the conscious mind as well as the deep rooted conditioning of which one may not be aware at all? And we are going to deal with both. Please I am talking now and you are going to discuss it with me afterwards. I will stop at a certain time.

So is it possible for a human being, without a motive - if a human being has a motive to examine and be free of that conditioning, that very motive is born out of his past conditioning. I wonder if you see that. We will discuss it. If I have a motive to be free of my conditioning because I have pain, or pleasure, of fear, or this or that, the motive is born out of my conditioning. And so the motive dictates how I observe my conditioning. Right? See the importance of this. So I must observe my conditioning, whatever it is, good, bad, indifferent, mediocre, and excellent, whatever it is, I must examine it, look at it without any motive. Because I see the logic of it, the reason of it - where I have a motive, that motive is the outcome of my conditioning, that motive dictates further conditioning, modifying it, or changing it a little bit here and there, but that motive being born out of my conditioning operates on further conditioning. That's clear.

So is it possible for me to observe without any motive? See what we are doing, going step by step into it. Is it possible for me, for one to observe without any motive? If one sees the logic of it, the truth of it, that is, a motive born out of my conditioning still maintains the conditioning. Do you, and I, see the truth of it? When I do, the motive disappears. I don't have to struggle against it. Right? If I have a motive to be free of my conditioning, that motive is dictated by the desire to be free of my trap in order to be

something else. To be something else is born out of my conditioning, to be something else is the reaction to my conditioning, dictated, directed by the motive. That's clear. May I go on? Please we are going to discuss this, have a dialogue.

So one asks, is it possible to be free of motive, all motives, not just one motive? And that is only possible if I see the movement of a motive. Right? How the motive is born, what its actions are, what its responses are, how that very motive curtails, limits further examination, therefore seeing the truth of that the motive, all motives disappear. I wonder if you see that. We are going to discuss this a bit, have a dialogue soon.

Now the very fact, having no motive, gives freedom of observation. Right? Right? Now one observes, that is, having no motive I am becoming aware of my consciousness. Right? Of one's consciousness. So in becoming aware without motive, and therefore no choice in the observation of my conditioning, because the motive dictates the choice - I wonder if you see all this? We will discuss it. So there is no choice in observation. Observation then is freedom to look. The motive is the factor of the past, the motive is the past. The motive is the observer. Without the motive there is no observer. Are we getting something of this? You are following? So the mind is free to observe without any choice, without any motive, because I see choice is the outcome of my conditioning, motive is the outcome of another form of conditioning, so seeing the truth of that there is freedom to observe without the observer. We will go into it later.

So there is an observation only - no correction, no direction, no suppression, there is just observation. I observe - there is an

observation - not "I observe" - there is an observation of authority. One of our conditionings. Authority implies fear, conformity, imitation, obedience, following somebody - much more is involved in that authority. Authority of one's own experience, authority of one's own knowledge, or the authority that has been imposed through society and so on and so on.

So in the observation of authority, that is the art of observation - please follow this - the art of observation is to see that authority has a certain place - doctors, medicine, technology, but authority has no place in the field which we call the psyche. Right? Art means, as we said at the beginning, to put everything in its right place. Right? See the beauty of it, sir: to put everything where it belongs, not through choice but through observation. Have you got it? Right?

(noise of train) They have better rail beds and therefore they are going faster, more noise!

So authority has its right place, I have observed it - there is an observation of it. And there is fear. I am just taking a few of the contents of our consciousness of which we are becoming aware. Fear has its right place - which is the fear to protect the instrument, the organism, and it has no other place. Pleasure, and how thought pursues pleasure - we went into all that. And what is love, what is sorrow - we went into all that. So is there a possibility of being aware of the whole of it at a single observation and not pursue, take fragment by fragment, because they are all interrelated, they are not separate, they are not fragments which exist by themselves. They are all interrelated, acting upon each other. So in this observation is it possible to observe totally the whole movement?



You understand? It is possible only when we understand the meaning and the significance of thought - thought, experience, knowledge stored up in the brain as memory, and the action of that memory, thought. Again the art of putting, giving thought its right place and no other.

Now we are asking: is it possible to be aware of this total movement as a single unit? Or must you go through fragmentary observation of the fragments? That's one point. Second point is: can the conscious mind investigate the unconscious, the deeper layers of consciousness? You understand my question? That's part of observation, that's part of being totally, completely aware. As most of us are educated to live on the superficial conscious level we find it awfully difficult, or impossible, to open up - not to a psychologist, or a psychotherapist, to ourselves, to open up everything, because again if we have understood fear then it is possible. You understand? If you have gone into the question of pleasure, love, suffering, death, then the whole cave, the whole hidden thing is exposed. You don't have to go after them but they come out. Have you understood any of this?

Right? So having no motive, there being no direction, and so no choice, there is a total awareness. You get it? Complete awareness. Why the Russians are behaving that way, or the British, the Americans, the Hindus, why religions are this way. Because we have observed the outer very carefully, how you are trapped by the gurus because you want to find out something - you are eager, when one is very young, and fresh and innocent and wanting to enthusiastically find out, there comes along some man who says, "I'll tell you all about it", and you are caught. To be aware of all

that. Which means to be aware of your desire, desire being will and so on, desire with its illusions, which is to follow somebody who is going to give you the light. To practise something hoping thereby that you will have this extraordinary delight, or ecstasy, joy.

Ecstasy, as we said, is a state of mind which is beyond the self.

So both consciously as well as deep down there is a total awareness, and from that total awareness in which there is no choice there is complete action, to act without a motive which is out of compassion. You get it? Which is out of clarity. And that compassion, clarity gives the skill to operate, to function, to act. This is total awareness. Have you got it?

Now let's discuss it.

Q: Are you actually doing that all the time?

K: Sir, do it. I am not asking you to do anything.

Q: I am asking you.

K: I am not answering you. If you have listened very carefully you will have answered it yourself.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, just listen. Can you be free of motive? Begin with that, knowing a motive is born out of your conditioning. That conditioning dictates what kind of motive you have. That conditioning has come into being right from the time you were born, from the past, millenia after millenia. It isn't just a newly conditioned mind, it is the result of millenia existence of man. Man has operated always with a motive - of god, country, and you know all the rest of it, I don't have to go into it.

So please first let us talk about this, this one thing. Is it possible for you to be free of a motive. If you have a motive, is that love?

I'll put it round the other way then perhaps we will get together a little more clearly. When I love you, if I have a motive because I want companionship, sex, or I am lonely, or you are nice, attractive, sensuously I would appreciate it, if I have any form of motive can there be love? Find out.

So we are asking: after explaining the whole movement of motive, logically, sanely, have you a motive in observation? That's all. Let's stick to that one thing. If one has a son or a daughter and you love them, but you say, "Yes, he must be an engineer, and she must marry the rich man", etc., etc., but is that love? Right? So ask yourself if in your observation of the world outside you and the world inside you, which we will come to presently, are you free of a motive when you observe the world - the communist, their tyranny, what is happening in Russia, and there is the affluent society of America, and the amazing poverty of the Asiatic countries, including Africa, when you look at it, have you a motive? - wanting to help them, wanting to feed them. Go on, sirs, examine it. Or have you a motive when you are a wife and a husband, a girl and a boy? If you have then you can't observe. That is a simple fact.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, forget the culture. You see we are going off. Have you a motive in your observation?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, please begin with this, you will go into it a little later. Have you a motive when you follow your guru - if you have a guru? I hope you haven't, but if you have a guru, a long beard, brown, or a white man with a white beard - it is the same thing -

have you when you follow somebody, a guru, have you a motive?

Q: If I observe only because I want to understand...

K: That's a motive.

Q: So how do you observe?

K: No, no. If you see the truth that motive of any kind - righteous, or pleasurable, any motive, is born out of your own conditioning, and you want to be aware totally of your conditioning, then motive prevents you from observation. That's all. That's a simple fact.

Q: I know that all my actions have a motive. That's clear. But I am afraid that without motive, without desire, I will fall into indifference.

K: He says, if I have no motive I might fall into indifference. Is that so? Or are you imagining that you might fall into indifference? Because you have not seen the truth that motive distorts observation, but you have already concluded that if there is no motive the whole thing will collapse. But therefore we have to talk over together the question of whether it is possible to be free of a motive. Right? Not project what will happen without a motive. That's a clever trick to prevent oneself from having a motive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We have said that, sir. Art is putting things in their right place. Not painting pictures, appreciating Picasso or Rembrandt, or somebody else, putting everything in its right place. Then the motive to eat the right food, right diet, and yoga and all the rest of it has its right place. It would be insanity to say...

So proceed, after talking over together, I am going to stick to this one point until we completely understand it - not understand,

act. Which is, are you free from motive? Or you first see that if there is no motive, my god, what shall I do? Which is, thought - see what has happened - thought projecting what might be, then that very thought is frightened of what might be, and therefore do nothing, carry on. So is there a possibility of observing without a motive?

Q: Sir, I have a very strong urge to become more aware so I tried to be aware. And is this different from motive?

K: No sir, it is not. I want to be aware. Right? I want to be aware. Why? Explore. Look into it. Why do I want to be aware? You mean to say when the house is burning you are not aware? Right? The house is burning, isn't it? Unless you are totally blind, totally indifferent, completely consumed with your own activities, obviously you are not aware of what is happening, which is the essence of neuroticism. No? So as the house is burning, your house, you mean to say you are not aware of it - you are not aware of what is happening in Russia, in Italy, the chaos, Eurocommunism, dictatorships, instruments of war, the tradition of war. Historically, there have been wars for five thousand years, practically everyday somewhere on the earth.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I said communism, American, everywhere the earth is being destroyed.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No. Listen. Forgive me, I said the whole world, including Eurocommunism, communism, Marxism, Lenin, Mao, everywhere, America. Sir, don't pick up one word and throw a brick at it. The whole world is destroying itself. Human beings are destroying

themselves. It is an absolute fact.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, let's forget communism, Eurocommunism, socialism.

Q: But education has the motive of learning. So if I want learn what am I to do?

K: Sir, look. Of course. I want to learn mathematics, or engineering; there is a motive because that way I will be able to earn a livelihood. Right? Right? We said put it in its right place.

Q: I understand what you want to say.

K: Not what I want to say.

Q: It is a fact.

K: So if it is a fact to you, sir, are you free of motive to observe?

Q: If I see the necessity.

K: No, not if you see the necessity. I want to observe whether I love my wife, or my girl friend - love. If I have a motive, is that love?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am afraid then we haven't understood at all what we have been saying. I want to observe my relationship - keep to that one little thing - I want to observe my relationship with my wife, or my girl friend, or my children. I want to be aware of that relationship. If I have a motive because my wife gives me sex, pleasure, comfort, cooks my meals, washes my etc., etc., and I say, "I love you, darling, because you do all those things" - is that love? That's all. Let's stick simply to that. And is it possible to have a relationship with a woman, or a man without a motive?

Q: Sir, if you say to a person, "I love you" that is already a

motive because it excludes other people so it is not love.

K: No, no. Please you are going off. Sir, most of us...

Q: What is the reason that you choose that person? That is a motive. Because you like another person more than someone else.

K: Don't you?

Q: Sir how many people are couples here?

K: Oh, for god's sake sir, please.

Q: And why? Because they have a motive.

K: So sir, because of that motive is there love? That's all I am saying.

Q: No, when you say, "I love you", you exclude other people from your relationship. So you isolate yourselves.

K: I am asking, sir, you may love that one. Don't exclaim, "I can't love all the others".

Q: Why not?

K: I don't know.

Q: Because you have a motive when you say, "I love you". It is exclusive to that person.

K: In that exclusiveness is there a motive? So if there is a motive in that exclusive love of another, is that love? Therefore that's all. Now can you love that man, or that woman, without a motive? What is the difficulty?

Q: Can we use a different word from love?

K: He wants to introduce another word instead of love. Call it mud! You see how we refuse to stay with one thing and go through with it.

Q: What we are talking about is looking at our life.

K: I am sorry, you are not looking at your life or my life.

Q: I am going to say something else. Now, you are the one putting the questions. On the other hand it is very clear that all of us are here because we have a motive. We want to understand you.

K: Right sir. First of all you are not understanding me at all - not you only, please sir, please listen.

Q: All these abstractions...

K: Sir, would you mind, you have said enough. Please you have said enough, sir. I am going to answer, if you will permit me. Which is, you are not trying to understand what the speaker is saying. What the speaker is saying is, look at yourself. That's all. To look at yourself you must be aware, not aware of what K is teaching you, or telling you, but to be aware of what you are doing, why you are here. What is the motive behind your coming here. Are you aware of it, do you know your motive? To understand K, the speaker, or in talking over together you are understanding yourself. That's all. I have made this very, very clear from the very beginning when I began talking. But if you say, I am here to understand you, I say, there is nothing to understand, you are understanding empty words. That's very clear so don't let's go back to that.

What is the motive that you are here? One. What is the motive in your listening? What is the motive when you want to find out, to look at yourself? What is the motive behind the desire that says, look at yourself? Please may I beg of you to keep to this one point.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The gentleman says, I come here because I feel a sense of liberation, freedom. Sir, please, I am not asking your personal motive for coming here. This is not a group therapy. I hope it is



not. No group therapy. I am asking you to investigate for yourself what is the motive, if you see the truth of this simple fact that when you have a motive, that motive is born of your conditioning, and you strengthen that conditioning. That's all. And therefore you cannot be aware of your conditioning.

Q: I see the motive but nothing happens.

K: He sees the motive but nothing happens.

Q: I come here each year with an urge to find a new motive, a refined motive - different forms of the same thing, modified, or continued.

K: What shall we do? I won't move from this. You can move, go away, get up and go, perfectly right. You are free to do what you like outside the tent, not inside the tent. Because inside the tent we are responsible.

So I am holding to this one fact: do you, as a human being, who is the representative of all humanity, I repeat that over and over again - the repetition becomes a lie if you repeat it without understanding it. Right? The speaker sees the fact, therefore his repetition is not propaganda, is not a lie, he is just showing you what it is. But if you take the words and repeat it, it will be a lie, it will be hypocrisy, it won't be honest. But if you see it for yourself that you are as a human being the total essence of all humanity - there is great beauty in that. And if the question arose, what do you mean by being totally aware, please explain it. I have explained it before the discussion began, what the speaker means by the perception of the whole, holistic. The word 'holistic' means something much more than the parts. And the something much more is not possible when you are holding on to the parts. Which is

the part is my motive is different from your motive. But if both of us are free of motives we can both work, journey together.

So Mr Ortalani, etc., and all the others, after listening to this carefully, logically, sanely, are you free of motive? Don't answer me, find out. That is if you want to answer that question, is it possible to be totally aware, it is only possible when there is an observation.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, we are talking about a motive, not about love. Does one see that where there is a motive there is a distorting factor? That's all. Stick to something factual, not move into some other factor.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, my friend, if you are here to resolve your problems with the speaker's help, you are not going to be helped. A simple fact. If you have a sexual, mental, fear, sorrow, any problem, they are not going to be solved with my help. And by talking over together, talking it over together, investigating together, exploring, then you yourself will help yourself - you are the humanity. That's all. Sir, if this doesn't please you for god's sake don't come. Go to some guru, church, do whatever you want, but if you here, if you are serious, let both of us meet on the same level. Right? On the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity. Right? Which is love. Otherwise we won't meet.

Q: How does one see the house is burning?

K: How does one see the house is burning? The newspapers tell you every morning, the radio tells you every evening, the televisions show you exactly what is happening. The news is

printed all over the pages, and if you don't see the house is burning then something is amiss.

Q: Yes, but what I am saying is...

K: We haven't understood each other, sir. Let us drop the 'house is burning', and look at something else. Which is, are you here with a motive?

Q: Of course.

K: Yes. What is that motive? Don't tell me! What is the motive? Find out. If the motive is to follow the teachings of K then you are totally taking the wrong direction. But if you come here with a motive to understand and talk over together, to solve the problems not according to me, but observing yourself totally, then that motive will disappear and you will understand yourself.

Q: Once one sees the house is on fire...

K: I said leave the house on fire! I said what is the motive that you are here? Don't tell me but find out, etc. Sir please sit down. I have repeated this a hundred times. Either it is the difficulty of language - motive means move, a momentum, a drive, a desire, all that is implied in the word 'motive', move. What makes you move? Fear? Sorrow? Your ignorance of yourself? Then if that motive, which is the drive, momentum, and you are here, then let's talk it over together, not that you are copying K, or following his teachings, or this or that, because I am not your guru. Don't be a follower of anybody. But in talking over together you see yourself, see yourself totally. That is to be totally aware of yourself. Then when you are totally aware of yourself there is no problem.

Q: I cannot live without a motive but I would like to.

K: You cannot live without a motive but you wish to live

without a motive. See the contradiction. I want to live without a motive but I have a motive, therefore there is conflict. Right? And if you like that conflict carry on. And if you see the futility of that conflict you examine both, why you have a motive, how the motives are born, the desire, the urge, the compulsion, the drive, the momentum that makes you do something. And the other which is merely a verbal communication, which has no reality. What has reality is your motive. And when you see that motive is born out of your conditioning, and therefore strengthens your conditioning, if you like it carry on.

What time is it? Isn't that enough for this morning?

Q: No.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is a motive complete? Motive is very complex. No, don't analyse it, for god's sake don't analyse it, just look at it. Look sir, please just listen to me. Why do I talk? Why do I go through this? For over fifty years I have done it, why? What is my motive? I am going to answer it. Listen to it. What is my motive? If I have a motive, you understand, which would be to help you, to see that you are free of sorrow, to see that you love, and then I would fight with you, force you, compel you, I would do all kinds of tricks with you, offer you heaven. Right? And I won't do that for the very simple reason that together we are going to look. We have created the world together, man and woman, baby, that also, but the world, society, morality, political structure, the economic structure, that we have created together. So please together. That means you have to look at yourself because yourself is the whole universe, yourself is the whole of humanity, therefore if you follow somebody else

you are not a human being looking at yourself who is the whole of humanity. Because that man whom you follow is only taking a part, a segment, a tiny little observation. We are looking at the total observation. Right? That's enough for today.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 29TH JULY 1977.

K: I am sorry you have such a nasty morning.

We are going to have a dialogue, that is, an enquiry together as two friends who know each other fairly well, talking over their problems, and therefore without any aggression, without any assertion, but as a friendly enquiry into our problems. So what shall we talk over together, have a dialogue about this morning?

Q: What is the relationship between self knowledge and education, not only of children but of grown-ups as well?

K: Would you like to discuss that? Education not only of children, students, but also educating ourselves. What is the relationship between education and self knowledge? Do you want to discuss that, talk it over together?

Q: Sir, what is the relationship between discontent and meditation?

Q: What is the relationship between meditation and death?

K: The Brockwood people have got together on this, I see!

Q: Can you speak about the heart entering into the mind?

K: Is there any difference between heart and mind? That is, affection, care, consideration, non-aggression, and so on and so on, which are supposed to be the qualities of the heart, can that enter into the mind. But both the mind and the heart when they are really harmonious are one.

So shall we talk about, have a dialogue, about the relationship of self knowledge and education, not only of the student but also of the grown-ups; and what is the relationship between death and

meditation; and discontent and meditation? Shall we start with those three, or have you another question? All right.

What is the relationship between self knowledge and education? One asks, if one is talking over together, two friends, what do we mean by education, and what do we mean by self knowledge? We must be clear before we find a relationship between the two, we must be clear what we mean by education, what we mean by self knowledge. So what do we mean by education? Most of us know how to read and write. Most of us have some kind of degrees, college, school, university, where you acquire a great deal of information about many subjects, or branch off into a particular subject and specialize in that subject, developing a skill so as to function in the world - if you want to function in the world. That is what we call education. That is the accepted norm, the meaning of education. But we question it. Right? We are questioning if that is all of education. Or is education not only the cultivation of various subjects and so on and so on, gathering knowledge, but also be concerned with the totality of man? Which apparently no school, no college, no university, is concerned - at least, as far as I know.

So what do we mean by education? If you are merely satisfied with the acquisition of knowledge, the cultivation of memory, and then use that memory skilfully in a particular branch of any livelihood, and so on, and so on, engineer, scientist, philosopher - the word 'philosopher' means the love of truth, the love of life, not speculating, theoretical, verbal, intellectual expressions. So proper education would apparently mean not only the cultivation of knowledge but also the cultivation of the whole of man. Right? Now is that possible in a school, in a college, in a university - the

cultivation of the total human existence, human being? I believe we neglect all that field, all that side, and cultivate extraordinary capacities, technological and so on. We know this.

Now the questioner asks, what is the relationship between self knowledge and education. So we have more or less verbally expressed what we mean by education.

And what do we mean by self knowledge? This 'know thyself' has been a catch word, or a slogan, for millenia; the Greeks said it, the ancient Indians said it. And what do we mean by that word 'know yourself'? Can you ever know yourself? Please, we are questioning, I am not laying down any law. Please, we will discuss this. Can we know ourselves ever? Can I say to myself, "I know myself"? Is that ever possible? And when you say, "I know myself", in it is involved a certain conceit, a certain sense of arrogance of achievement - right - that one has really deeply investigated into oneself and has come to a conclusion. And that conclusion gives you the assurance that you know yourself. Right? This is what we call knowing yourself. Now I want to question that.

So we are questioning both the self knowledge and education, and their relationship with each other in a school, college, university, and daily life. Is that all right? I am talking, why don't you? Please, have a dialogue, let's have a dialogue about it. One sends one's children to a school - the State demands it and so on and so on. So you send them. And they are taught there something totally different from their daily life, from childhood. As they grow up the contradiction grows more and more and more. This is inevitable, you must have seen it in your own life. That the



acquisition of knowledge has become tremendously important because it gives one a social security - social security being you can earn a livelihood, in that there is a security, a job, and all the rest of it. So the cultivation of knowledge, which is memory, gathering information and storing it up in the brain as memory, and using that memory skilfully, which will earn us a livelihood, and neglecting the whole area of human existence.

When you send the children to school, they are being trained to conform. Right? Would you question this statement? They are trained to conform, conform to the left ideology, central ideology or extreme right ideology, religious, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu. So they are being very carefully conditioned - right - both at home and at school. And as they grow up they live within that conditioned area. Right? Am I saying something extravagant? I hope you are going to discuss. They live in that conditioned area, they accept all the traditions of that society - wars, you know the whole business.

Now he says to me, the questioner says, what is the relationship between self knowledge and education. There is none as we understand education means now. It is only when you don't quite fit into the society you are called neurotic, you have problems. And then you go to the analysts, or the psychotherapists, and they try to somehow help you to conform. So what is relationship between the two? When do we begin to enquire, if we do at all, into the whole structure and the nature of the self? Do we ever do that?

Q: Is it possible if I don't know myself?

K: But do we ever say, I don't know myself? Do we ever question, ask, what is it all about - my action, my living, the wars,

the conflicts, the misery, the relationship between man and woman, the everlasting struggle? We never ask what is this human being who is caught in this? We only ask that question to understand oneself when we are in a tremendous crisis. Right? Please, I am not...

Q: I think that education is developing skill, and know thyself is relative.

K: I understand, madam, but we are talking first of what is actually happening in the world. Your theories or my theories, but what is going on with your children and other children. In that, in schools, there is neither compassion, nor clarity, nor the communication of that clarity and compassion through skill. That doesn't exist. It only exists as a theory because you have heard me talk about it. Or you might have read about it somewhere. But actually - deal with facts - not what you or I think education should be. If we know what the facts are then we can move from there. But if we start with theories we are lost - we have your theory, and somebody else's theory, and we never get together. If we take what actually is happening in all the schools throughout the world - the speaker has been to many, many schools in the west, and here, and all the rest of it, there are five schools in India with which we are concerned, and Brockwood and so on, Canada and Ojai, California. So please let us deal with facts.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, there are exceptional schools. There are one or two rare schools, perhaps in Germany, perhaps in England, one or two, who are concerned with the total education of man. Right? Don't let us say, your school is better than mine.

To educate, we said, as it actually takes place, is to cultivate memory. That memory is used skilfully as knowledge in earning a livelihood. So society demands that every human being has some kind of skill to earn a livelihood, or help the student to conform to a particular ideology, and so on and so on.

So we are asking: what is the relationship between the two - self knowledge and education? We know what education more or less is, except there are exceptional schools. I don't know any but there are, let's hope for humanity's sake there are exceptional schools. When do we ask this question, that is, I want to know myself? When do we ever ask, if we are at all thoughtful, do we ever ask it? Do we say, I must know myself, otherwise there is no education. When do we ask it?

Q: When we suffer.

K: When do you ask? When you suffer. Then what takes place when you suffer? Do you say, "Why am I suffering? What is the root of suffering"? Or do you say - please I am just asking, I am not laying down - or do you say, "I want to escape from it, I want comfort, I am lonely, desperately lonely, I have lost everything, I have lost the person I thought I loved, I am left completely lonely in this world"? Right? Then there is suffering, and that suffering makes you seek comfort, rely on somebody, come to a conclusion, and so on and so on, turn to god, or whatever you prefer. So you really never ask yourself actually, if you are truthful to yourself, never ask oneself, "What am I, what is this?" Right?

Now we are saying, let us examine both and see their relationship, if there is such a thing as separate education and self knowledge as something separate. I don't know if you see. Are the

two things separate? You understand? We have divided it as education and self knowledge. Then we try to find a relationship between the two. But I question very seriously whether the two are separate.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You yourself, our friend says, you yourself have separated, the physical, the psychological and so on. So this leads somewhere else, that is, is the psychological enquiry, does it affect psychosomatically? You know what that is? If there is psychologically perfect health, psychologically, perfect health in the sense no conflict, sanity, no me and you, psychologically there is no division, that does surely affect the physical: one is much more healthy, vigorous and all the rest of it.

So we are now asking, please, what is the relationship between the two, and is there a division at all between the self enquiring into what is the 'me' and education? Are you meeting this question, sir? Right?

How am I, as a teacher, not sitting on the platform, I don't mean that, in a school, how am I to convey to the students both the acquisition of physiological facts - knowledge, mathematics, history, geography and all the rest of it - and also in the very teaching of those subjects cultivate the enquiry to look at himself as the representative of all that. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

If I am a teacher of history, how am I to help the student not only to know the meaning of history, which is the story of man, and also help him to understand himself, who is the man? Are you catching what I am saying? Right? Does this interest you? Or you

say, for god's sake let's talk not about education because I have no children - just a minute sir - and drop that and let's talk about our personal problems? Which is it? Are you interested in this? Be sure because this is not entertainment.

So how am I, a teacher in a school, to help him to understand himself through the subject which I am teaching, which is history? Right? We have talked a great deal about this in various schools so I am rather good at it! Sorry, I didn't mean that!

History is the story of man. Right? The wars, the kings, the tyrannies, the so-called cultural evolution of man from the Stone Age and all the rest of it. How am I to teach him history so that through history he is understanding himself, which is the total development of man? Right? Now how am I to do it? If you are the teacher put yourself in the position of a teacher, and how are you to teach history that way? Mathematics, or physics, anything? That's the only way to cultivate self knowledge and at the same time acquire knowledge of various subjects, so that they are not separate, they are always moving together, flowing together.

Q: Sir, I don't know myself, can I be a teacher?

K: Can I be a teacher of this kind if I don't know myself first? Right? So you are saying, let the house burn while I am... That is, I must understand myself first before I do anything. You see the falseness of it?

Q: No, I...

K: No, please sir, look at it, sir. Must I wait until I have complete knowledge of myself before I teach in a school?

Q: Not in a general school but in a school of this kind.

K: In a school of this kind - all right, I'll accept that for the

moment. Which means what? I can't teach until I know myself wholly. If that is so then the children, the students, are being thrown to the wolves. Not knowing the importance of self knowledge, or what is the right kind of education, we are saying a teacher who is interested in both, in the very teaching of it he is learning himself. In teaching history and his relationship to the student, the student and myself, in the very act of teaching I am discovery how I am acting, what I am thinking, what my motive is, so there is constant enquiry, not only into the history and teaching but also as I am teaching I am discovering myself. That's what we are trying to do in the various schools. I won't mention schools. Don't get interested, I am not doing propaganda. That is, when the teacher is really interested in self knowledge and education, and tries to find out how to teach through history - I am taking one particular subject - through history to find out what he is and learn at the same time the whole story of man. This can be done surely if the teacher is really interested in this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know that is why we want to have special teachers' educational centre - I am not going into all that. We are going to do it.

Q: What I mean is I am a teacher myself. I would like to discuss what will you do at this centre?

K: Madam, how can one answer such a question? I have a son - I haven't, but suppose I have a son. I can't afford to send him to the right kind of school because I haven't the money, my husband and I have separated. This is a common occurrence in modern society, the breaking up of the family, and I am left with two or three

children. Right? What am I to do? Go on, sirs, it's your job, enquire. I have to earn money to support them, work like a slave for these four children, or two children, or one child, and educate them in the right sense, because one has thought about it. As there are no such schools, except very, very few, what are you going to do? You follow, sir? Go into it. You should think before you have children, before you get married, of the whole thing, not afterwards. Right? We are always thinking what shall we do when it is a fait accompli, not before. You say, I am going to get married, if I want to marry, or have children, what is going to happen? That is the self knowing - you understand? But not say, well, I have got four children, for god's sake what am I going to do. There is the State that will help you and so on. Or there are special schools where you can have scholarships and all that. So don't let's enter into that.

So what is a teacher to do? A teacher of the right kind, not who just says, I am bored with all the other work, at least I can become a teacher. And therefore - you follow. Generally the teachers are those who can't get into business, who can't earn a lot of money, who this and that and that, so they eventually become teachers. I don't mean that there are not exceptions. There are exceptions, thank god. Right?

So what shall we do now? How shall I teach history, mathematics, if I am a teacher, so as to convey both the acquisition of knowledge and also at the same time to know oneself? I think if the teacher is really interested it is a creative thing, you discover; you don't say you are going to teach in this way or that way, then the teacher gets bored. But if he is creative, interested, it flows out

of him. Right?

Q: The best teacher is one who knows himself and what he teaches.

K: Yes, that is what we are saying. Are we saying something different from you?

Q: No.

K: All right. The other question is - have we discussed sufficiently that point - the other question is: what is the relationship between discontent and meditation? We will come to you afterwards. What is the relationship between discontent and meditation? What do you think? As we said, discontent most of us have. Either it becomes an all consuming flame, or it is soon satisfied, smothered by getting married, by having a job, by having children, or by joining some society, community, or becoming some ideologist. You follow? That flame which should be burning is gradually smothered. That is a fact. One is totally discontented with society, with the establishment, with short hair, grows long hair, you know the whole thing that goes on. So can discontent never be smothered? Never. Though you may have children, wife, never that flame wither away, die, become ashes. Go on sirs, investigate into yourselves as we are talking. Right, dialogue. I don't seem to have any dialogue. That's one problem: whether it is possible to keep the discontent at its highest excellence. Excellence means to reach the top of the mountain. Mediocrity means to go half way. Right? We are explaining what the dictionary says.

And meditation. What is meditation? Not all the childish stuff, not all the immature gurus with their immature disciples, but what is real meditation? We said that, we said real meditation is to



empty the content of one's consciousness. That is, no jealousy, no anger, the whole content without effort. We went into that.

So can these two move together, or must they be separate, or the very discontent, keeping that flame alive is a form of meditation? You get it?

Q: Sir, it seems very often that discontent means rebel against somebody or some group.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: How can we feel discontent without making a cause?

K: If discontent has a cause - you are following - then the effect of it is to be satisfied by joining this or that, or by doing this or that - if there is a cause. Now is there a discontent without cause? I wonder if you see this. Suppose one is discontented, not with society, with my wife, or with my group, or with my friends, but discontent. Don't you know that? No? Not with something, or I want something and I can't get it therefore I am discontent. I want to be a great man, I can't because I haven't the capacity and I am terribly discontent, frustrated. So I channel, there is a channelling that particular discontent along certain lines so that it is gradually diminished and dies. So we are asking: is there a discontent without cause?

Q: It has to have some relation with actuality.

K: The actuality is, sir, the actuality is I am discontent with my society, I am discontent with the pattern which society has given me, I am discontent with the education I am getting, I am discontent because I don't want to have a job, go to university and get a job, but I want to do something entirely different - wander the world with a little money, or help along. So that way you will

observe, if you have gone into it sufficiently deeply, that gradually this discontent withers away. Right? Haven't you noticed this? Some people are ardent leftists, extreme leftists, the moment they get married and a job the thing quiets down. We happen to know many of such people, of course there are exceptions - don't jump on the exceptions.

So we are asking: discontent is to keep that thing alive, flaming. Which is to be discontent with tradition, with the tradition of wars, the tradition of belonging to a group, the tribal instinct of the tradition of saying, my group and your group, we and they. Now in enquiring into all that which is the outcome of discontent is a form of meditation, isn't it? Which is, in enquiring why I accept, one accepts, religious authority, or even political authority, or ideological authority, in enquiring into that one discovers one accepts it because one is frightened to stand by oneself - the fear of loneliness. So that fear of loneliness is smothered by saying, I must be with you, I must escape. So the understanding of that fear is part of meditation. Right? So the highest form of discontent is freedom. Right? The excellence of discontent brings freedom. Do it, sirs, not verbally accept it. See the depth of such a thing.

So discontent and meditation go together. Right? If you are content with the system, a guru, or what ancient people have described, then you accept it and practise it, you are smothering discontent. But if you say, look, what do you mean by it, why should I accept any system of meditation? Who are you to tell me how I am to meditate? There are lots of teachers who are giving lessons how to meditate, which is the acceptance of authority. When you question it, the flame is keeping alive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Ah, no discontent brings freedom.

Q: Because discontent is merely suffering.

K: Discontent, he says, is merely suffering. Because you suffer because you can't get something out of discontent. I am married to a woman I don't like, I am discontent.

So now let's go on to something else: he said, what is the relationship between death and meditation. Right? Are you interested in all this? Not interested, is it part of your life? You see let us approach death with total discontent. Right? Will you? That is, not accept any form of comfort, any form of explanation, approach it with any idea, or be afraid to understand what death is. So is there a tremendous discontent to find out? Which means there is no fear. Right? There is no seeking of comfort, no me, what is going to happen to me? So can we approach it that way?

One may be married, have children. The man goes out and may have an accident, killed, and the wife is left alone with children. She feels terribly lonely. Right? Don't you know all this? Lonely, desperate. And she is not really concerned about death, the whole meaning of death, but she is concerned about herself and what is going to happen to the children, who is going to support them. I have lost somebody whom I loved, and so on and so on. One never says, all right, I want to find out what death is. You understand what I am talking about? Can we go into this that way? Which is, approach it with total discontent, not knowing where it will lead me. Right? Can you do that? There is no hope. You know, I don't know if you know what it means to have no hope - not to be depressed, not to say, my god, I am lost. But hope is born out of

despair. Right? When there is no despair there is no hope. Right? I wonder. Why is there a despair? Because one is left alone. This sense of great loneliness. One may have a lot of money, children will be properly educated, you may have a house, or whatever it is, there is this intense feeling of desperate loneliness. Don't you know it all? Don't you know it? You may have friends, you may live with lots of people in a group, and there is occasional intimation of this extraordinary sense of isolation, loneliness, without any relationship with anybody. Haven't you had all this? You see then, specially when you are young, one doesn't know what to do. Right? One has no sense of direction, no somebody whom you can trust. Nothing, you are just left absolutely alone. Has it ever happened to any of you?

Then there is the fear of that loneliness. And fear being much stronger than loneliness, you escape from it. Right? You know all this. You escape from it, you run away from it, you smother it, you do everything not to be frightened, or you say, I must face this loneliness. And when you force yourself to face this loneliness there is nothing, it doesn't respond, there is no answer because you are building a wall of resistance against it. I wonder if you know all this. No? We are talking about something very common to every human being.

And the question then is to understand what loneliness means. To go into loneliness, what does it mean, how does it come about? Right? Don't we every day of our life, in our activity - of course there are always exceptions, so don't let's talk about the exceptions - isn't there in our daily life, our activities are always isolating ourselves? No? You understand? One goes to the office, or the

factory, or some kind of work, there you are climbing the ladder of success, you want to become something, higher, and higher, which is a form of isolation, isn't it? No? When a local priest wants to become the archbishop it is the same pattern, or a communist, or a commune leader wants it.

So through these activities one is gradually enclosing oneself, building a wall round oneself. We are doing it. Do face this. Every day we are doing it. And one day suddenly this loneliness becomes real. One has carefully brought it about - my wife, my god, my country, my ideals - isolation. And my success, my ambitions, I must do something better than you. All this is a form of bringing about isolation, which is the ultimate expression of loneliness. Right? This sense of having no relationship with anybody, or with anything, even nature doesn't tell you, you have nothing.

So can one look at that loneliness, not escape from it, not try to cover it up, nor try to fill it with companionship, with knowledge, with a dozen things, but just to observe that loneliness? Observe - we went into that - without direction, without motive, without wanting to change it, just to observe completely that sense of intense loneliness. Right? Then are you doing it as we are talking?

Q: Krishnaji, I don't think we do it as you talk. We listen to you and then think of putting it into practice.

K: Oh no, no, we have been through all that. Don't put anything into practice, least of all what we are talking about. You can put into practice what other people say, but here, at least while you are in the tent don't put anything that the speaker is saying into practice, then you are dead.

So we are saying, can you live with that loneliness, observe it

without wanting to go beyond it, suppress it, run away from it, without giving it any direction, which means - listen to it carefully - thought has created that loneliness by your activities, and thought then says, "I must escape from it". So can you look at it without any movement of thought? Without any movement of thought. Then you will see for yourself it doesn't exist at all. You have gone beyond it - not you, it doesn't exist. Then a totally different kind of thing comes about, which is you are alone. Alone is different from loneliness. Alone means, the word itself means 'all one'. It doesn't mean all of you I am.

Now he says, death and meditation, can you approach death without any single movement of thought? That is what it means. When one actually, physically, biologically dies that is what is going to happen. Right? Are we clear? You may be lonely, greedy, envious, all the rest of it, belonging to right, left, centre, extreme right, extreme left, all that, but when death comes it says, "Don't argue with me, old boy, you are finished"!

So can we come to it having finished all this? You understand? That means, having no fear, having no attachment. That's is what death is going to tell you at the end, it says, you can't have your house, you can't carry your money with you, your bank accounts are closed, you are leaving your wife, your favourite chair, everything you are leaving behind. Right? So can you do it now - leave your favourite chair? Now to do that, leave no attachment of any kind, to a belief, to a dogma, to a conclusion, and leave your fears, your pleasures, your attachments now, then what is the relationship of that to meditation? Right? To leave, say for instance, to put away attachment without conflict - if you have a

conflict then you cultivate detachment, which is the opposite. I wonder if you understand this? Detachment then leads to indifference, callousness. Right? You are following this? So being attached, not to become detached, callous, indifference, brutality, violence, all the rest of it, but without effort to cut lose everything. You understand? That is, to loosen the threads of attachment without effort, that is part of meditation. Right? Because the investigation of attachment shows that you are dependent on somebody, or on something. When you are dependent on something you become that. Right? When one is attached to one's favourite chair you are that favourite chair. Right? So to enquire into it, without compulsion, without motive, is a form of meditation. Right?

So the understanding of death comes through meditation. Which is, death means ending of your pleasure, complete ending of your pleasure - sexual, religious, etc., etc. And death doesn't argue with you, doesn't say, "Old boy, I'll give you another day" - or a week. He says, "Look, it is there, at your door". So the investigation into attachment, fear and so on, is the movement of meditation, which is the enquiry into the whole structure of thought. Right? They are all linked together. You understand? So when you are enquiring into attachment, you are attached because you are lonely, you are attached because you haven't solved this enormous feeling of guilt, loneliness, separation, wanting to be something, and being incapable of fulfilling what you want, therefore feeling frustration, bitterness, anger, hate, all that. To enquire into it without any motive, if you have a motive enquire why you have a motive. That motive is the response of your conditioning. Enquiry, you know, if

you observe it will tell you everything. But we are so eager to read the book, the book of ourselves, we are so eager, we want to know everything very quickly. But if you just observe, the book will tell you instantly everything. And I mean it. It will tell you everything about yourself. It will tell you, if you observe without direction, without motive, without fear and all the rest of it, the whole story of yourself instantly, not chapter by chapter, page by page, it shows everything wholly. Do it!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you saying, sir, if I understand it rightly, I can't hear it properly, are you saying: what is the relationship between discontent, and affection, and love? Is that it, sir?

Q: I don't understand what you mean by discontent without a cause.

K: The questioner says, I don't understand what is discontent without a goal.

Q: A cause.

K: Without a cause. The cause is a goal! You see the truth of it? That was quick! The gentleman doesn't understand what is discontent without cause. Sir, what do we mean by a cause? You put a pin into my knee there is pain, that is the cause. Pin, pain, connects through nerves to the brain and the response is pain. There is the cause and the effect. Just follow this two minutes. There is the cause and the effect. They are never separate. We have separated them. Right? Do you see that? Cause, effect, the effect becomes the cause for the next effect. I wonder if you see that? Right? So it is a chain, it is one continuous chain - not cause something, and effect something else. Follow it closely, a little bit.



I am coming to something, I just saw something. Cause and effect, the effect becomes the cause, and so it is a continuous chain in which action is always limited. So the cause becomes the means, or is the means different from the cause? Sir, this requires a little bit - think it over with me, will you follow it?

One has observed cause, effect. One smokes endlessly, the effect is cancer in your lungs. So the cause creates the effect, the effect becomes the cause for the next effect. So it is a constant chain. So action is always within this field of enclosure. Right? So the means of action is never free from the cause. Are you getting something? Oh, yes, I see it. Right? One wants to create a beautiful society, a lovely society, therefore the cause is that, and to create that I must destroy lots of people because they are in the way. So the means doesn't matter, the end matters. The end matters, therefore the means doesn't matter. So the cause without means, the effect is to destroy you. Whereas there is only means, no cause and effect. I wonder if you see that? No, no. Don't agree with me. I am not quite sure. There is only means, no cause and no effect. Wait. I'll find out. Means - the doing. Right? The doing. The very doing is the means. I have got it now, I can go.

When there is cause the means is not important, the effect is important. So you are only concerned always with the cause and the effect, and never realizing the effect becomes the cause. So we are never concerned with the means, never. And the means is the doing - not to achieve an end, but the doing.

Q: The doing...

K: One moment.

Q: The doing is the actual.

K: That means the doing is the means. The doing is without a cause and effect, therefore the means is all important. Yes, sir, I have got it. I'll battle with you.

So the gentleman asks: I don't understand what you mean by discontent without cause. If there is a cause for discontent, then discontent is the effect, but it is not discontent at all. I wonder if you see that. If I have a cause to be angry, because you hit me or you said something to me, the cause, and the effect is always a result - I hit you back, or I call you by a name, or I wait until I am stronger than you then... all the rest of it. So in that process there is no means. The means is the very fact of discontent, not the cause and the effect. I wonder if I am making myself clear? Have I explained this question, sir, to you, who asked this question?

Q: No.

K: I have gone too far. I am saying when there is a cause for discontent it is not discontent. That's very simple.

Q: Would you say that cause and effect are on the level of the ideal and the means are on the level of time?

K: Sir, look, what is action? Just look at it, please look at it for a minute. I must stop, what time is it?

Q: Ten to twelve.

K: I must stop talking. What was I going to say?

Q: Action.

K: Action. If you are acting because you have a cause, that is, you have an idea, or a principle, or a conclusion from which you are acting, that acting is not action. Action, the meaning of the word action means doing, now. Not doing according to a principle. I wonder if you see. It is very simple. We have translated action as

doing something according to a cause, a principle, an idea, a conclusion, or an ideal, a belief. Either action based on the past or on the future, therefore it is not action; action means doing, the active present. Verbally, in the verbs, not having done, or will do, but doing. Therefore the doing is the means. Got it? I must stop.

Sirs, look, this is meant to be a dialogue and I am talking all the time.

Q: What do you mean by dialogue?

K: I explained, madam, perhaps you were not here at the beginning. A dialogue means a conversation between two friends, between two people who are interested in the same subjects seriously, want to find an answer, not quarrel over words, ideas, but two really good friends who say, let's talk about this.

Q: It doesn't seem possible. I think the microphone is in the way.

K: If the microphone were not here I don't think you would hear.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 30TH JULY 1977.

K: What shall we talk over this morning?

Q: We had a very deep investigation into death and meditation yesterday. The other day we went into awareness. If we could go on, that is, is there an awareness of truth, whether that exists beyond the word? And if it does can this awareness happen?

Q: Could we talk about 'abreaction' and the effect on personal growth, on experiences such as 'the process' you experienced in 1922, the development for person growth.

K: I am not quite clear about that question.

Q: 'Abreaction' - the aspect of the process of what you experienced on August 20 1922, and the effect of such experiences on the personal development.

K: Sorry. What language do you speak, sir?

Q: Italian.

K: Speak in Italian.

Q: (In Italian)

Q: Sir, is thought employed to realize this radical transformation? And can we know anything which is not in the field of thought, including this awareness? If we employ thought through investigation and through enquiry then is that thought, is that process going to promote this change, this dimension which we speak of in which there is no movement of thought?

Q: Why has thought become such a beastly little heaven?

Q: That is not what I am asking.

Q: No, it is what I am asking.

K: Would you make your question short?

Q: OK. Is thought used, is thought employed to realize, to bring about, to comprehend this radical transformation?

K: I am afraid I haven't understood. Would you speak louder.

Q: I don't know how to make it clearer. I am asking if it is thought that does the investigation, that does the enquiry?

K: I see. Is it thought that enquires, is it thought that observes, is it thought that explores.

Q: Yes. And does that process of that bring about this transformation?

K: Ah. Does that process bring about change, transformation.

Q: Change, right. Thank you.

Q: Sir, I am sorry to repeat the question again. The other day you were kind enough to explain to me but I have confused it. How can thought see its movement?

K: How can thought see its own movement. Right, sir.

Q: Please, sir, in the western tradition there has been a question that all philosophers and thinkers have written about and thought deeply about, and that is: what is man's place in nature. Now with regard to what you have talked about, in the total awareness where there is love, silence and total space, what is nature and what is man's place in nature? Thank you.

K: What is nature... would you repeat it slowly, sir, don't make it too long.

Q: OK. In that total awareness that you have spoken about where there is love, etc., in regard to that, what is nature, what is our perception of nature, what does nature become, and what is our place in that?

K: In this total awareness, in which there is love and so on, what is the relationship between that awareness and nature.

Q: I had to stop at something yesterday, and I would just like to know if you think this is OK.

K: Make it short, please.

Q: I am lonely because I live with motivation. When I drop motivation I have love. But you can't have love when you still have motivation. I won't be lonely any more when I drop motivation.

K: Sorry I haven't got it.

Q: Shall I do it again slowly?

K: Please, make it short.

Q: I am lonely because I live with motivation. When I drop motivation I have love because you can't have love when there is still motivation. So I can't be lonely when I drop motivation. Do you understand?

K: When I drop motivation there is love and... what?

Q: Well I just discovered for myself if I drop all motivation I am left with love. So if I have only love I can't be lonely. And loneliness is having motivation.

K: I think we will go into that. Right? There have been so many questions. The first one was: in this awareness what is truth; why does thought have such an extraordinary deep rooted importance in our life; and the gentleman asked also - I have forgotten. Sir, may we take one question out of all this, and go into that one question which perhaps will answer all the other questions. Can we do that madam, can we do that sir?

Q: I don't think we can do it, sir. I can't see that you can do it. They are all different questions.

K: I think if we can take one question you will see it. I think the gentleman who asked the first question, which was: what is the relationship of awareness and truth? I think if we could take that one question, though there are contradictory questions, personal and that which we talked about the other day, so I think if we take this one question we will see if we can get all the others in, however contradictory they are. May we try it? May we, sir?

He asked a question, which was: what is the relationship between truth and awareness? Would you like to put that question in a different way? What is the relationship of actual facts and truth? Right, would that be right? I am asking you, sir.

Q: Yes.

K: What is the relationship of violence, which is an actual fact, to truth? What is the actual relationship to a recognized, well known factor in oneself as envy, greed, fear, to truth? What is truth? We will come to that. I daren't touch it for the moment. But we can go into this question by being aware what is reality? Fact, facts, 'what is', reality, truth.

What would we call facts? What would you say, or describe, or talk about, 'what is', actually 'what is', not theoretical, not abstracted, not an abstraction, or a supposition. When we say 'fact', 'what is', what do we mean by those two words? Right? Facts. The fact is that there is war. Right? The fact is that human beings are violent. The fact is there are national divisions, political divisions, religious divisions, ideological divisions. Right? You and me division, the woman and the man division. And the fact is where there is division there is conflict - the Jew, the Arab and so on and so on, the Muslim and the Hindu, and so on. So where there is

division there is conflict. That is a fact. That is a law. Right?

Now what is reality then? Is fact different from reality? And is reality different from truth? You understand? Please this needs a little bit of enquiry into this. The questioner asked also: in observation is there transformation morally - if I understood that question rightly. Now we are going to observe together this problem, this question. The fact, what actually is going on, reality, and truth. We said facts, or what actually is - short, tall, broad, brown, white hair, pink and so on, black. Those are facts. The conclusions from those facts - like and dislike - though they are reality as illusions. Right? Reality - no, I must go slowly.

So fact, 'what is', reality and truth. What is the relationship between these three? Is this clear? Let's move. Don't be impatient, please.

Q: Sir, is the fact a fact without words?

K: Is a fact without words. I make a gesture, that is without words, but it is a fact. I look at you, friendly, or with antagonism. That's a fact, there is no word. That's one point.

What is reality? Let's come to the next. What is reality, the real, the actual? Would you say everything that thought has created is reality? Thought has created this tent. Right? It is a reality. Thought has created this microphone. It is a reality. Right? Thought has created the various illusions, which is a reality. Because it is created, one lives with it. You are following? Whatever thought creates is a reality - the building, technological things that thought has produced technologically, computers, televisions and so on. Everything that thought has created is a reality, including the illusions that thought has created. Nationality



is an illusion. Right? And god is an illusion, thought has created it. Right? But thought has not created nature - the tree, the things that are outside. Right? But the chair, made out of the wood of a tree is a reality. Please, right? Thought has not created nature, but thought making a chair out of a tree is a reality. So thought has not created nature. One of the questions was: what is the relationship of man and nature. Right?

So there are these things: facts, which thought has created also, I am and I am not, I must be, I will be, I have been; or I will evolve slowly, or that there is no evolution at all psychologically, and so on. The building, the instruments of war, the churches, and the things that are in the churches, all the rituals, all the adorations of images made by the mind or by the hand, are still the product of thought. Right? And the illusions surrounding these churches, the gods within, the saviours within, are all created by thought which are illusions. Right, is this clear? Are we all together in this? It is not very difficult.

So what is the relationship then of reality to truth? Right? Or is there no relationship at all? Does this interest you, all this?

Q: I'd like to know what sort of work one should be doing.

K: Sir, if we understand what kind of life we are, what we are, from self knowledge action takes place. Sir, we have divided action as though it was something totally different from ourselves. Right? We are investigating into really what is total action, which we are coming to - what is total action in our daily life? Right? Look, what shall I do? Let me put it this way, what shall I do confronted with all this confusion, misery, suffering, uncertainty, what shall I do? The country is demanding one thing, society wanting me to do

something else, the priest asks me something else. You follow? Amidst is all this immense confusion, which is the right action? That is the question he is asking. What is the right action? Is there right action if I am caught in an illusion? I am in some kind of illusion, such as, I love my god. That is an illusion, because god - if you don't mind, I hope you will not think me blasphemous, or absurd - god is created by thought. No?

Q: Thought is created by what?

K: I am afraid. I am afraid of the future, there is nobody upon whom I can depend, there is somebody who must be protect me, the father figure. And I want to feel consoled by the image which I have created and I say, that's god. Thought has created it. Sorry. I hope you don't mind. Which doesn't mean I am an atheist, on the contrary. That is not god, something else is god.

So I am caught in this illusion that somebody is going to look after me, some superior entity, an outside agency, a god, a guru, or whatever it is, the State. Now in that illusion, which is an illusion, what is right action? Right action can only take place when I have no illusion. Right? When I have no illusion that I am much more superior than anybody else. So action can only take place when the mind is totally free from all illusion. That's obvious. If I am neurotic I can't act rightly. That's obvious. If I am confused I can't act rightly. If I am caught in a particular form of prejudice with its conclusions I can't act rightly. So there must be freedom from all this to act rightly, in daily life, whether it is politics, religion, my wife, children, everything. As long as there is an illusion of any kind action, total action is not possible. That's actually what we are examining: facts, thought creating the microphone which is a

reality, it is not an illusion, the building, the tent is not an illusion, the chair is not an illusion, and nature - the tree, the mountains, the sky, the moon, the everlasting stars and the beauty of stars, that is not created by thought. But thought has created illusion which are realities. You follow?

So by investigating very carefully, as we are doing now, what is illusion, and what is reality? If thought has created the tent, and thought also creates various forms of illusion, so both are realities. But there must be recognition, or perception, or awareness, or observation that the church, the building is not an illusion, but what is contained within the church, or in the mosque, or in the temple, is illusion created by man. This is all very simple. Once you see this it becomes extraordinarily clear. Right? Are we meeting each other? Are we?

So to find out what truth is, to let it happen, like spring, like a flower, like the water flowing, let it happen, that can only come about when the mind has put everything in order. Right?

Q: How do you define the word truth?

K: I don't define truth.

Q: But...

K: Sir, sir, you haven't even listened to what I am saying.

Q: I have.

K: I am sorry, you are not, when you are asking a question what is truth, describe truth, I haven't come to it yet. You are asking something which I haven't even enquired into yet. We are enquiring into facts, into reality - reality, as we said, everything that thought has created including the illusions. But thought has not created the mountain, the rivers, the trees, nature. So what is the

relationship of man to nature? Which was one of the questions. If man lives within the illusion which he has created he has no relationship. Right? But man without illusion, and seeing what thought has created, and thought has not created nature, and therefore puts thought in its right place, then he has a relationship to nature. I wonder if you get this?

Q: To give up illusions is a very painful process.

K: We are not giving up anything. There is no sacrifice, there is no "I must give up this in order to get that", but to observe this. To observe - please, sir, this is very important, if you would just follow this - to observe what thought has created, and what thought has not created, to observe the illusion - to observe, not say, it is right, or wrong, I must give it up, to see that thought has created illusion as well as the building. The building is necessary, illusions are not necessary: to see that, to observe it, there is no fear, it is a fact. So when you observe the fact there is no fear. I wonder if you see it?

Q: What I don't see is...

K: Have you understood what I said just now?

Q: What I don't see is if thought is creating the illusions...

K: No, no. So we have to discover, we have to find out what it is to observe. Right? We are now going to enquire together into what does it mean to observe. I can observe you with thought. Right? Thought can observe you, say, yes, he is an Irish man, he is a German, long hair, short hair, like and dislike. Right? And being conditioned I don't like Irishmen, or I love Irishmen and not the Englishman. You follow? Now is that observation? Is it one form of observation? Right? A very limited form of observation. But if I

want to observe there must be no movement of thought. Right? I wonder if you see that. I want to observe you, just look at you. But if I am prejudiced I can't look, my prejudice is looking. Right? So is there an observation of my prejudice - not that I observe my prejudice, because prejudice is the 'I'. I wonder if you see that. So is there an awareness of prejudice, saying, yes, I am prejudiced? That is an awareness of your prejudice.

So there is an observation without thought, without the movement of thought with its prejudices, with its like and dislike. In this context there is another problem, which is, in observation there is a certain sensitivity. Right? If you observe very closely without any prejudice the sensory activity becomes much more acute and therefore there is more sensitivity. Now the question is there, if I may go into it a little bit: when you are sensitive do you have more pain, more suffering? Go on sir, answer it. I am asking you a question, which is, when there is sensitivity, not that you become sensitive - see the difference, please. I said through observation, without prejudice and so on, there is the sharpening of all the senses, therefore there is greater sensitivity to smell, to taste, to see the trees, the mountains, the rivers, the faces. And being sensitive acutely - when there is sensitivity is the suffering much greater? Or when I am sensitive then everything affects me, either greater pleasure or greater suffering. I wonder if you see the difference? Right?

So we are saying, observe the reality. Reality is everything that thought has created, including the various neurotic activities, neurotic behaviour, neurotic assumptions, and illusions. Right? Those are all creations of thought - to observe it, not thought

observes it. I wonder if you see. Are you meeting me, are we getting somewhere, am I meeting you?

Q: No.

K: Sir, can you look at this tent without thought - thought being naming it as tent, seeing the structure, how the arch, the cross bars, without using the words, without thought saying, it is a tent, just to observe? Isn't that possible?

Q: Is that a kind of hypnotism?

K: Oh, for god's sake.

Q: I can't see this.

K: Just to observe, sir, it is not hypnotism. You know what that word means? I don't know if we are talking English, or not.

Q: There is observing, or no observing at all. If you observe the tent you are here, if you are not here you are not observing the tent.

K: Of course not. When you are observing a word called tent you are not actually observing the tent. You are only observing the word. I wonder if you get it.

Q: If I look, I...

K: Sir, look at yourself.

Q: It is much more complicated to look at yourself than just observing the tent.

K: We have said that before.

Q: The actions are on different levels but are going on all the time.

K: We said it is easy to observe a tent, but it is much more complex to observe another human being. We have been into that very, very carefully in the talks and the discussions, I won't go into that again.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, this becomes so impossible. Each man interprets it in his own way. Just find out for yourself whether you can observe another human being, your wife, your husband, or your girl, or that man who is speaking, can you observe that person without any image? Right? That's all. Look, sir, if you are married, or if you have a girl friend, or a boy friend, you have created an image about him or her, haven't you? That is a fact, isn't it. Fact. The fact which is the product of thought, the image. Right? Oh, lordy, come on!

Look, I am married, or a girl I have, and through various activities, interrelationship, she has created an image about me, and I have created an image about her. This is an absolute fact. So our relationships are between these two images. These images, or pictures, or ideas, or our conclusions, are the product of thought. Right? So can there be a relationship without images? Right? I am asking.

Q: Sir, can we be sensitive to needs without being prejudiced?

K: You haven't understood what I have said.

Q: That is exactly what you are asking me.

K: No, I am not.

Q: You are talking about observing without prejudice.

K: No, sir, would you listen first.

So I am asking if we have an image about another, that image is created by thought, that image is a reality created by thought, and relationship then is between two thoughts, two images, two pictures, two ideas, two conclusions. So we are asking is that relationship at all? Or relationship exists only when there is no image. Right? Is that possible? My wife calls me a fool. And that is

immediately registered in the brain, the picture is formed, and there is antagonism, or anger, or irritation. She may be telling the truth, or she may not be telling the truth. So that there is an image formed. Now is it possible to let the machinery of making the images end?

Q: The answer is yes. And because when you observe without thought and without image, then you have the truth. This is what is truth, to observe without image and without thought.

K: Now is that a reality, a fact, or a supposition? Any supposition of what it is, is an illusion.

Q: If we look without the thought process there is no perception whatsoever.

K: Try it, sir. I say there is. What shall we do? I happen to be sitting on the platform, and you are sitting down there. Therefore people will listen to me, people won't listen to you! But we are saying, have you tried to look at something without thought? Find out, sir, go into it.

So what we are saying now is, thought, which is again let's repeat, thought which is experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory, and the response of memory is thought, which is a material process. A material process. So whatever thought has created is reality, the image between man and woman, the image I have about the tent, the word that creates the meaning, and is there a meaning without the word. Go into it all. And as nature is not created by thought, then what is the relationship of man who is full of thought, full of his images, his conclusions, his fears, what is the relationship between reality and that which is not created by thought? None at all, obviously. Right? I may talk about nature, I



may talk about there is beauty of the mountains and the rivers and all the rest of it, but if one is enclosed within oneself, with one's problems, with one's ideas, with one's conclusions, illusions, and all that, there is no relationship at all.

Q: Sir, thought is the product of...

K: Are you asking, sir, how does thought arise? Are you asking, how does thought arise?

Q: Yes.

K: I will show it to you. If I may, if you will listen kindly, I will show it to you. I say to you, or to somebody, you are a fool. Now what is your reaction? You have an image about yourself that you are not a fool and you get annoyed. Right? Right? So experience of various kinds is registered in the brain, which is knowledge, and that knowledge with its memory is thought. The origin of thought is from the very beginning of time. Right? Every incident, every experience, every pain, physical, biological as well as psychological is registered in the brain, and that becomes a memory, and from that memory you act. So thought began with the origin of man. When is the origin of man? The scientists say twenty five million years and so on and on. If you want to investigate into that, go into it.

Q: Man is part of nature.

K: Are you? Biologically you may be, but are you part of nature? Go on sir, answer it for yourself, this doesn't require a great deal. Nature is all that, the rivers, the trees, the mountains, the birds, the endless seas, and so on. Are you all that? Or are you a Catholic, Protestant, Communist, Socialist?

So, sirs, you are not going forward with this. Now let us ask -

we know what thought is, we know what thought has done, the most extraordinary things - technologically, surgically, medically, extraordinary things. And thought has also created lots of illusions, which we all know, which we don't have to go into. All that is reality. Right? Is that clear? Then what is the relationship of reality to truth? When you ask that question it means, it signifies that there is a truth. Right? Please listen carefully. We know now and have very clearly established between ourselves what is reality - sorrow, pain, insight, neurotic behaviour, all that is created by thought. So whatever thought creates is reality. Why doesn't man stay there? You understand my question? He is always probing. Right? He says, I acknowledge this, it is fairly clear, but there must be something more. Right? Are you following this, sir? So thought begins to investigate. Right? Is this clear, or not? Thought then, whatever it creates, is a reality. You understand this? One sees very clearly what is reality. Thought says, yes, I am very clear about that. But thought also says, that is not enough, there must be something much more. So either it projects a god, an eternity, a timeless state, but it is still the product of thought. Right? So it is still reality. I wonder if you see this. Do we see this a little bit, may we go on?

It is only when thought realizes its own limitations, then it won't investigate into that, if there is or if there is not. This is logic, isn't it, really clear? No? We said whatever thought creates is reality. When thought investigates into what it wants, hoping for something greater, it is still reality. So it is always moving in its own limitation, in its own area - it may extend it, it may contract it, it may say, well I am the universe, I am the cosmos, I am god, but

it is still thought. Right? So thought cannot investigate into that, if there is that. Right?

Q: That is the only instrument we have.

K: Our Italian friend says, it is the only instrument we have. But if that instrument says, I cannot penetrate into something I don't know, it stops. Wait a minute, sir, see the fact of this. It can create, say, I know there is something, but it is still within the area of thought. I wonder if you see this simple thing. No? So thought, however sharp, however intelligent, however erudite, learned, experienced, it is still thought, a reality, as the building, as the microphone, and so on. So thought being the past, the outcome of the past, is limited by time. Right?

Q: You have said that the probing is necessary for thought to see itself.

K: I did not say that, sir. Look.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I said, sir - you see, I don't want to go back to this, we have already explained it ten times. So if you don't mind, sir, I won't go back into it.

See what thought does. Thought recognizes itself as a movement in time. Right? That is, thought being the outcome of the past knowledge, knowledge is always the past, so it is time-bound, so it is limited, so it is fragmentary. Now having been time-bound it says, there must be something timeless, because it wants that state because it says, this is too limited. Right? Right? So thought, which is the movement of time, tries to investigate into something which is timeless. Therefore that is impossible.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You will find out.

Q: So I cannot say the river is here.

K: What good does that make to you? I say yes, there is. You say, what nonsense, it might be an illusion.

Q: Can I put it in a different way: what is the capacity of thought to deal with meditation?

K: Sir, thought has no place in meditation.

Q: The capacity of thought in meditation.

K: Sir, look sir, as a human being living in this world there must be some kind of action, action, to act. I must do, action is life. And I want to find one human being who is fairly intelligent, fairly observing, knows what is happening in the world and so on and so on, and also what is happening in himself, says, what is the right action, what am I to do with all the surrounding misery? Right? That is what we are investigating - what am I to do. Not all your theories, speculations. To find out what is the total action, so that I have no regrets, no pain, no saying, my god, I wish I hadn't done that. To find that out we say, look, you must put everything in its right place. Right? Say, put thought in its right place, let thought put itself in the right place. Which is, thought has its right place, which is not only the world of technology, but also in the world of language, etc., etc., and thought being the outcome of the past, knowledge, is time-bound, therefore very limited. Right? And that is the only instrument we know. Is there another instrument which is not of this quality? But before we put that question you must find out exactly the limitation of thought, discover it, be aware of it, not just put, is there something else. Are you aware totally of the limitation of thought?

Q: Partially.

K: Is it partial being pregnant?

So, sir, what we are trying to find out is, what is man to do surrounded by this extraordinary confusion, uncertainty, poverty in every direction, what is one to do? You don't ask that question, you don't burn with that question. So we are trying to find out what do totally. So all action has been based on thought, either the thought which has said, I have done this, which has brought me pain, I will not do that, but if I do the other thing it will bring me pleasure, I will do that. That has been our action. Our action is based on reward and punishment, obviously. And that is the world we have lived in. And that world has no answer, it can keep on going round and round in that world saying, there is an answer, there is an answer, but it will always remain there. That is obvious.

So when there is an understanding of thought, and therefore putting thought in its right place, then what is the instrument, if there an instrument, which is not of thought? Right? But you must put it in the right place, not just say, let me investigate the other. That is what you are trying to do. You say, "I want to find the other before I give this up. I will give this up if that is much more profitable, if that is much more pleasurable". I say, "Sorry, thought whatever it does is limited". So what is there which is not of thought? If somebody has gone into it sufficiently deeply, you will see, then you will ask the question: is love thought? Go on, sir. Can thought cultivate love? And when it cultivates love, is it love? A man who is full of vanity cultivates humility, and he says, "I am very humble" - that humility is still vanity. Right?

So is love the product of thought? Answer it, sirs. If it is not,

there is the action. Right? So as love is not manufactured by thought, then what is love? Is there such a thing at all?

Q: It is energy.

K: Oh, madam, listen.

Q: But I thought you said it was a dialogue.

K: But it is not just answering like that, love is energy. That doesn't mean anything.

Q: It means something to me.

K: All right. Is love thought? Go on, sirs. You say, it is not. Right? Then that may be the new instrument.

Q: Love is the product of reward and punishment.

K: Oh, no, sir, I am afraid you don't understand English either, perhaps I may not understand English. Which is, I said our life is based on reward and punishment. Right? And that is the movement of thought. If I do this I will get that, which will be better. If I don't do this I may be punished - punished in the sense I will be unhappy, I will be in conflict, etc., etc. So we have gone beyond that, please.

So is love the new instrument?

Q: No.

K: No.

Q: There is no instrument needed any more.

K: You are using the word 'instrument' like a screwdriver! We are not talking of that. That is why I didn't want to use instrument - that gentleman used that word instrument, I was just following it. It is not an instrument. Oh lord. We said everything that thought creates is reality. Is love a reality - in the sense we have used that word 'reality'? If it is not it is something entirely different, outside

of thought. Right? Have you got it? Or just verbally say, "Yes, quite right, let's go on with it"?

So we said, love is not within the realm of thought. It is not sensation, which is the realm of thought. It is not in the realm of thought as pleasure. It is not in the realm of thought as desire. Right? Therefore love is not a remembrance. Right? Now has the brain, your brain, seen the fact of this, the reality of it? So as long as there is desire, pleasure, pursuit of pleasure, there is no love because all these are the product of thought. When there is love, what is the action - because we are concerned with that? Then what is the relationship between that which we call truth - which may not be - what is the relationship between something which is temporary - thought is temporary - right, I wonder if you see that - therefore it is time-binding. Now is there something which is not time-binding, which is not temporary, which is not based on reward and so on and so on? We say there is, which is love. Then what is the action in our daily life when there is love? Would you ask that question? You understand, sir, what I am asking?

Q: You said as long as there is the product of thought there is no love. Therefore as long as there is building, technology, there is no love.

K: Oh no, sir, you are going off. It is such a waste. I'll go on, sir.

What is the action of a man who has understood reality, not mentally, intellectually, but deeply, you follow. He has put reality in its right place. And perhaps he has that perfume of love. What is his action? Would you put such a question? Please say, no or yes. Let's find out. That's a wrong question, isn't it? If there is that thing called love then it acts - please follow this very carefully. In

investigating the whole structure and the nature of all reality, and giving it its right place, the mind has become extraordinarily intelligent - not the intelligence of cunning, conspiratorial cunning. You follow? It has become extraordinarily sensitive, alive and therefore intelligent. Therefore that intelligence is not of thought.

Q: Would you allow a very small experiment?

K: Just a minute. Sorry, I am in the middle of a sentence.

Q: I know.

K: Sorry, I am not going to listen. Sorry I am in the middle of a sentence madam. Then please politely.

Q: Would you please listen to me? Please.

K: What were you going to say madam?

Q: I ask you very kindly. Well you have tried to make people see the concept of sensitivity as being either true or not. And more or less denied the role of the word or the image in making this clear. I would like to try to illustrate what you said.

K: I am asking a question about what you are saying, madam. Are you French or English?

Q: I was born in Holland a long time ago.

K: Which language do you speak easily?

Q: You speak English easily. Can you understand my English? Would you like to try?

K: Are you expressing easily in English?

Q: Yes.

K: Then please be brief.

Q: Yes. Sensitivity, the concept without the image, and without the use of words, I feel only through the concept you cannot ask people to see. The word sensitivity would perhaps mean something



if I gave you a picture. There is a kind of sensitivity, it is rather like a dustbin, with the lid open and the bottom open. That's one. There is another kind that has the lid open and no bottom. I mean it keeps all that comes in and it relates it to the self, and it hangs on to that. Do you see? And there is no bottom. Then this goes right through.

K: Right, madam. All right, madam.

Q: Do you see what I am saying?

K: Kindly sit down.

Q: I was only trying to make things clear, and the words and images shouldn't be discarded as useless, you cannot only see things with your head.

K: Please sit down, you have stated what you wanted to say.

So if one has, if I may point out most respectfully, if one has gone into this, as we have gone, very closely, very hesitantly, into what is reality, and in seeing what is reality there is a sharpening of not only the intellect, not only your sensitivity, out of that comes a quality of intelligence which is not of thought. Right? If you have done it. Then that intelligence is love. Then action is dictated by that intelligence, wherever we are. It may say you become a gardener, or this or that, that intelligence is love and therefore that intelligence acts.

Then you can go on much further, if you want to, into it. Is intelligence, this intelligence, not the intelligences of cunning verbal disputation, dialectical opinions, and so on, but a mind that put everything in its right place - the building, the illusion, the fear, you follow, everything, therefore through observation there is intelligence. We are saying that is the new moment of action.

Now what is the relationship - I had better not enter into that.

You will all - that will be theory, won't it. I would like to ask what is the relationship of intelligence to compassion, to clarity and skill? You understand? We said skill by itself has no meaning. It has a meaning that makes you more and more selfish, more and more egotistical, and limited. It becomes egotistic, limited because there is no clarity, and clarity comes with compassion. Right?

So in our daily life, our everyday life, not for a life of a few weeks at Saanen, but when you go back home, everyday of your life, can this operate, move? That is, compassion, clarity and skill. Because you must have skill in life, skill may be with one's hand, skill may be an intellectual skill, skill may be communication, verbal communication, but when that is without the other two it becomes what we have made the world into, cunning, deceptive, hypocrisy, using skill to achieve a status, and the moment you have status you become very proud, privileged, you know, all the rest of it. So where there is compassion, clarity and skill there is no vanity, no hypocrisy, no contradiction.

You see I would like to go into something much deeper, which is, what is the relationship when there is this total action, to meditation, meditation which is the complete emptying of all the content of one's consciousness, which we have talked about, and what is the relationship of that to total silence, emptiness? You understand, sir? One is afraid to use the word emptiness because we think emptiness, my god, that is nothing. After all I have worked and lived and I end up in emptiness? You follow? But when you have put everything in its right place, which is the art of living - the art of living is to give everything its proper place. That is the art of living, which is the greatest skill, and out of that

orderly life one has this intelligence, which is love. And with love goes compassion, and clarity and skill. Now what is the relationship of intelligence to that which is the outcome, natural outcome, without effort, of total emptying of the mind of its content, which is meditation. You understand, we talked about it sufficiently.

What is the relationship of intelligence to silence? You understand? When there is the right kind of meditation, silence must be the central issue, the central core of meditation is the total emptying of all the fears and so on, so that consciousness as we know it doesn't exist. And what is the relationship of this intelligence to this total silence of emptiness? You understand it? No. One can go into it if you have gone that far. You understand? Not verbally but actually in daily life, then it is fun to explore. What time is it?

Q: Twelve o'clock.

## **SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 31ST JULY 1977.**

K: I am so sorry it is such bad weather. This is the last dialogue, or discussion, or whatever one likes to call it. I wonder how much one has got out of all these talks and discussions. Whether one has deeply understood and changed, transformed oneself, or do we still remain half way up the hill. Because I think we ought to ask this question of ourselves. We said the other day, the word mediocrity means going up the hill only half way; and excellence means going all the way up. And I wonder whether we are moving, or staying only half way, frightened, anxious, uncertain, not knowing what to do, and remain there.

So I think it would be rather interesting and worthwhile if you could go into this question for yourselves. But before I go into all this, there are really things to talk over together.

Q: Could we talk about the importance of relationship and self knowing?

Q: When thought stops, what exactly is aware, and what is the relationship of this awareness to the sacred?

Q: May I say something?

K: Please be very short, not ten minutes, a minute.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I have to translate what you say in English because many of them don't understand French. I think the gentleman is asking, if I can understand him properly, and if I am mistaken I am sorry, he is asking, why do you speak, you are a god to these people and so on and so on. Right? That's the real meaning of what he is trying to

say. Why isn't there after so many years of talking, one person who can sit beside me. You come over and sit beside me, all of you! If there is one who really understood what the speaker has said then why doesn't he sit here and help me to convey? Then I invite all of you to come and sit here.

Q: Can love go beyond death?

Q: I have this process in myself and I wish to open myself. How can I do that without inventing a god?

K: What was your question, sir, the first question?

Q: The importance of relationship and self knowledge.

K: Shall we start with that?

Q: When I try to investigate these questions often there is a feeling of isolation.

K: I think by taking that question of what he said: relationship to self knowledge. Right? I think we will stay with that because otherwise we will get lost, and also I think we will finish with what we were talking about yesterday.

Let's be very clear about one or two things - not your god!

Q: Thank god!

K: Thank god! And I am not your leader or your guru, please for god's sake do listen to whatever we are saying. We are not trying to impress you, influence you, to tell you what to do, nothing of the kind. But I think it is very important for human beings to communicate with each other. To communicate implies we must both be interested in the same thing, at the same level, with the same intensity, otherwise you can't communicate. If you are not interested in this question of self, and the relationship of that self with another, which is a very important sociologically as

well as psychologically, I don't think any talking about it becomes clear. Unless one wants to go into these things very carefully I think we had better stop talking to each other.

First of all yesterday we were talking about something very important, it seems to me at least. We were saying, what is love in relationship with each other. That was the thing we were talking about yesterday - the love that exists between man and woman, the love of a mother with her baby, the love of one's country and so on and so on. We were going to go into that question which said, can there be love if there is no total comprehension or self knowledge? Right? We were exploring that question. And that question also can be answered this morning when he put that question: what is the relationship between human beings who have self knowledge, or who are understanding themselves? That's the first question raised.

Are you all quiet now, after the morning's disturbance? I would like if I may to go into this question with a dialogue, that is, communication between us, both verbally and non verbally. Because most of us, as far as one sees throughout the world, have no real understanding, or the depth of this extraordinary word called love. And it is worthwhile, I think, to go into it very quietly, not offering opinions - your opinion against my opinion, or your ideas of what love is - exploring. Do you understand, which is quite different from offering opinions.

So can we go into that question, which is related to self knowledge. We said self knowledge, knowing oneself, must begin knowing the world outside, knowing what is happening in the world - politically, religiously, economically, socially, racially, the

class differences, the totalitarian states, leftist, right and centre, all that one must observe. It is not possible to observe if one is prejudiced. That is very simple and very clear. If I stick to my nationality, to my belief, to my race, I cannot possibly investigate, explore, observe the world. Through the observation of what is taking place outside of each human being - without observing what is going on around us, socially, morally, religiously and so on, merely to investigate oneself leads to insanity, because there is the object very clearly to be observed, what is going on. From there you begin. Move from the outer to the inner, not the inner and then the outer. You can deceive yourself enormously if you begin with yourself. Whereas if one begins from the outer, then goes deeply within oneself, then you will see there is no difference between the outer and the inner. It may be like the sea, the ebb and flow, going out and coming in all the time.

Now to observe oneself, we said, one must be free to look. Freedom implies freedom from prejudice, belief, dogma, conclusion, so that you can observe yourself, otherwise you will see what you want to see, or deny what you see. Right? So to observe there must be freedom. That's simple. Now can we do this as we are talking? Can we, wanting to understand the extraordinary complex structure and the nature of the self, the 'me', observe that structure and that nature of this self without any conclusions? If you say, that is very difficult, one cannot do that, then you have blocked yourself. Right? That's simple Whereas if one is really involved in it because what one is the society, the religions, all that is the result. If you are envious, greedy, seeking power, position, you create a society which will bring about what you are - greed,

power, position and all the rest of it.

Is it possible to observe oneself without any distortion? We say - please follow it step by step - we say it is possible only when there is no direction, when there is no motive. Because the motive dictates the direction, and distorts the observation. Right? That's clear. Then you will say, how can I observe myself without a motive because I am full of motives - motives being reward and punishment essentially. Isn't it? So can one look at oneself freely without this tremendous tradition of man seeking reward and avoiding punishment, but just to be free to look? Right? Let's do this as we are talking.

And in observing one of the most fundamental questions is: what is relationship between human beings - relationship, man, woman, husband, wife, mother and baby, and so on? Because if our relationship is not correct - I am using the word 'correct' in the English sense - actual, truthful, right - then we create a society, either a society which is so disintegrating, which is so appalling, or a world of totalitarianism, we create it, and accept it. We will go into that, leave it for the moment.

So it is very important to understand relationship. Right? Relationship implies, the meaning of the word is to be related, actually to be related, to be in contact, to have empathy, sympathy, a sense of sensitivity that understands each other completely, not partially. So as most human beings have not that relationship at all, their relationship is based on conflict, how does this conflict arise? You are following? Please this is important if you will go together into this because our life is involved, don't let's waste our life, we have got only this life - good enough, what the future life may be,



it doesn't matter, if we don't change what we are now we will continue in a different form - I won't go into that.

So it is very important to understand this question of relationship because that is part of self knowledge, part of knowing oneself. Through relationship, which is the outside, you can then move from the understanding of relationship move inwardly. So it is important to understand relationship. Which is, are we related at all to anything - nature, to each other, private intimate relationship, sexual, the mother and the baby, and so on, relationship? Now what is this relationship based on? Please follow it for yourself. You have your husband, your girl friend, or boy friend, a mother with a baby, all that is part of our life, so please follow, if you will, be serious enough for once in your life.

What is this relationship based on? Is it two entities, two human beings deeply concerned with themselves, deeply occupied with their own ambitions, with their own worries, with their own anxieties, uncertainties, confusion, these two people meet - boy and a girl, and so on and so on. And then there is all the problem of sex, and in this relationship because each is separate inwardly - right - there is conflict. Obviously. Right? Can we go on with it?

So conflict becomes inevitable when each one of us is occupied so entirely with himself. Right? Which we are. And we need to be, in exploring this, tremendously honest otherwise the game is not worth playing. Now the problem is can this relationship exist without effort, without this constant strife between human beings, and what then is that relationship in which there is no conflict at all? You are following? So why does this conflict exist at all, first? It seems that this conflict exists because each one is centred within

himself: from himself he goes out - right - from himself he acts, from himself he says, "I love you", but the centre is the 'me', the self. Right? This is clear, isn't it? We are describing what is very obvious.

Now the question is: can that centre be understood and dissolved? Otherwise life which is relationship must inevitably be a series of incidents and conflicts. That's clear. So we are asking: can this centre be understood, watched, see the nature of it, the structure of it, and end it - not verbally but actually end it? Right? That is our question. Therefore one must observe freely the nature and the structure of the self. Right? May I go on?

So various questions are put: what am I, who am I, accept what the psychologists say, and the latest psychologist with his peculiar ideas, and new ways of thinking, you say, "By Jove, I will accept that". We are saying don't accept anything because then you are merely copying what the psychologist says you are. Right? So there is no authority in the observation of oneself - Freud, Jung and the whole bally lot of them. Wipe it out, and begin. Because then what you discover is original, not secondhand. Right?

So it is only possible to observe oneself in relationship - how one reacts to another, how one looks at another, what are the verbal and non-verbal communications with each other. So it is only in relationship that one sees what one is, actually, not theoretically, not subjectively, but seeing in relationship your responses. Now the responses are the expression of what you have remembered. Are you following? You have remembered certain incidents, certain expressions, verbal, gestures, it is stored up, you have registered them, the brain has registered them. And what you have

registered becomes a memory and with that memory you observe. That's fairly clear, right? You observe your relationship with another with a past memory, therefore you are not observing. Right? So is it possible not to register at all? Please this is really a very, very complex question. Unless you give your mind, your intelligence, your capacity to think clearly you won't capture this. And you must be serious because this is one of the most fundamental questions: whether the brain, which is registering all the time, which is consciously or unconsciously absorbing, which is registering, and this registration is like a tape which is being played over and over and over again. Right? So we are asking: is it possible for that tape, that machinery, which is registered, to stop? You understand? Are we meeting each other? Somebody tell me, please. Are we together?

Q: Yes.

K: Please, I am not your god. You are not my followers, I am not your guru; we are together taking the journey into something tremendously important in life. If you are not doing it don't listen, think of something else. But if you do pay attention, give your whole attention to it.

So the brain, its function is to register. It registers because in that registration there is security. Right? It feels safe because it says, "I know, I remember", and in that remembrance, in the conclusions which I have, I am secure. Right? So the brain demands security, like a baby, it must have security right from the beginning, otherwise it becomes neurotic, all kinds of things happen to the baby. Now the brain is seeking security because having security implies it can function effectively. If it is uncertain,

unclear, then its efficiency is lost. This is clear, isn't it? I am not saying anything very strange, so please. I am going to say something very strange a little later on so go into it!

So the brain demands security. Then only it can function effectively, sanely, rationally. If there is any kind of uncertainty then its actions become neurotic. Right, that's clear. So it must register. So when in relationship there is constant registration and remembrance, then relationship becomes a conflict because you are remembering your incidents, accidents, what has been accumulated, and the other is also doing the same, so the centre is being strengthened. The 'me' is strengthened in me and in you. So the question is: is it possible only to register what is essentially important? What is important - not essentially, remove that word - what is absolutely important. Because if, as the brain demands security, it will find security in what is absolutely necessary. Right? It must have security in food, clothes and shelter, absolutely. In technological knowledge and so on and so on. But what is the need of registering any other factor? You understand what I am saying? Please go into it with me, if you don't mind. Don't offer opinions and judgements, we are investigating it. The brain is accustomed through millenia to register - my tribe, I live with my tribe I am safe, outside my tribe I am unsafe, outside my class, outside my group, outside my belief, I am uncertain, there is fear. So the brain through millenia has developed this quality of registering because in that there is safety. Right? Now we are saying, is there safety in the registrations that are going on psychologically? You understand what I am saying?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: One moment. I am going to go into it. Sir, I said for ten minutes listen to me to the very end and then you can jump on me as much as you like, but please listen to what I have to say first. Because you are disturbing, I am going on with something, let me finish to the end of it. I am not being impatient or trying to prevent you from talking, you will have your opportunity afterwards.

We are asking: is there security in registering all the psychological hurts, all the psychological fears in relationship, the attachments - you follow? So take one thing: in relationship psychologically we are hurt - right - hurt, wounded from childhood. And the results of that hurt are violence, wanting to hurt others, or withdrawing not to be hurt anymore, and therefore isolating oneself, and being isolated act neurotically, and so on and so on and so on. So I am looking at that one thing for the moment, which is that we hurt each other in our relationship. The more intimate it is the more we get hurt. And is it possible not to be hurt at all? Which is, not to register the things said by another which may wound? You are following this? Do it in yourself as we are talking. In our intimate relationship with each other we say things casually, we say things rather brutally, you know, friction. And in that friction there is a great deal of hurt. Now we are asking, is it possible in that relationship with each other not to register and therefore not to be hurt? You have understood? All right?

We are saying it is possible. And I will go into it. Don't say it is impossible and then block yourself. Right? We are going into it. Don't say it is not possible, or it is possible. We are moving together, like a river going round, going, moving, flowing and any difficulties that come we will go round it, but keep going.

So we say it is possible not to register in relationship because love is not remembrance. Right? Love is not something that you say, "Darling, you were so good to me the day before yesterday." So love is not a thing of the past, a thing cultivated by thought, it is not a thing that can possibly happen when there is conflict in relationship. So we are trying to find out what is love in relationship in which there is no conflict. We are saying that it is possible only when you begin to understand yourself in relationship. In relationship there is hurt, many, many hurts. And those hurts can never heal completely because they are all the time happening. So is it possible in relationship not to get hurt? Please, this is a tremendous question, you understand? We are saying it is possible. And it is possible only when there is the realization, when there is the realization, the observation that any form of registration in relationship psychologically is hurting, and it is essential to register at a certain level, not at the psychological level. When you see that, when you observe it, when you know it, then you don't register. Say for example, in our relationship I call you a fool, or, you were terrible this morning, I want to read the newspaper and you come and take it away. I get irritated.

So at that moment, which is at the moment when you are being called a fool, or whatever you are, at that moment to be attentive. You understand? Attention implies, as we said the other day, there are three types, which is concentration, awareness and attention. Concentration implies focussing with your whole energy on a certain point, therefore excluding and there is constant resistance to other forms of thoughts coming in. We said choiceless awareness is to observe without any choice - we went into that. Now attention

is when you attend completely, as I hope you are doing now, completely attentive, there is no centre. Right? Have you noticed it? So when another calls you an idiot in relationship, when you are so attentive it doesn't register. Don't ask, how am I to be so attentive. That is a silly question. There is no practice, there is no method, there is no system. But when you see the real importance, the truth of this fact, that any form of psychological registration will inevitably end in conflict and hurt and all the rest of it, when you see the truth of it clearly you don't register. Therefore at the moment when a person calls you an idiot when you are attentive there is no registration. Are you doing it? Will you do it, not in the future, actually sitting next to your boy friend, or husband, wife, or whatever it is, see the whole machinery of it, not just a single part but the whole structure of this.

We said, registration is the means of acquiring security. Right? It has sought security in the images that it has built in relationship, in the image. Right? That image ceases to exist when there is complete attention.

Now, wait a minute: the gentleman asked, what is it that divides that which is to be registered and that which is not to be registered. Right? Now when you see the nature and the structure of relationship, what happens, actually observe it with your heart, with your mind, with your blood, what happens out of that observation? There is not only attention there is intelligence, isn't there? No? Because you have seen something which is true. That is when you are not attentive hurts begin, when you are attentive there is no image forming. If you see the truth of that, the perception of that is intelligence. You have an insight into it. You

have insight into the nature of registration of the brain, and that insight you can only have when you are free to observe. That is, insight can only take place when there is emptiness, not your prejudices, your hopes, your fears. Right? That intelligence says, this is where registration is necessary. Right? Therefore there is security for the brain in intelligence. You understand?

Q: Yes.

K: Not verbally, but in your blood. It is like seeing something tremendously dangerous it is finished, you don't approach it. In the same way when you see the extraordinary fact that hurts, all these conflicts between human beings - I have said it all.

Q: What about will in relationship?

K: I must do this and you want to do something else. Right? I want to become the chief executive of some business, and you want to do something else. Desire, which is the essence of will, pushes me in one direction and pushes you in another direction. Right? That is one of the factors in relationship. No? That's very simple.

Q: It is not simple at all.

K: Sir, it is very simple when you have got this intelligence. It is extraordinarily simple to understand the activity of will, which is the activity of desire. Please have an insight into it, you understand, not a verbal argument, saying, this is tremendously difficult, or not difficult. Have an insight into the whole movement of will, which is desire. I desire - I don't know - to play golf, to be a first-class golfer. My wife wants to be a social leader. And there is conflict between us. Right? I want that, and she wants that. Now how will you avoid the conflict? To avoid the conflict, to wipe away all



conflict you must understand desire, why there are separate desires. I wonder if you have got this? You are following this? Why you have a particular desire, and another a totally different desire. Desire being for an object, for a position, for an idea, for something. Right? You have a desire for that, and she has a desire quite the opposite. If the two desires go together, both of us wish for the same thing we think there is perfect harmony. But when there is contradiction between the two then there is trouble. And the gentleman says, it is one of the principal causes of conflict.

Now is desire different? The object of desire may be varied. I may want a car, you may want a baby. And so there is conflict. But we are saying, is desire in itself different? You have understood? The objects of desire may vary. We will leave that. But is desire in itself different? Or is it essentially desire? If we understand what is the nature and the structure of desire, the essence of it, then what will happen? Now we will go into it.

I want to move to something else. Have patience. Is desire love? We said not. Right? We were very clear on that matter when we talked about love. And the nature and the structure of desire, we went into it very carefully some time ago, during this gathering here. Which is, perception, seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought taking it over, making it into desire and creating the image which will be fulfilled through the will of desire. It is simple. I am not going to go into that. No, because there is something we must talk about.

So if we understand desire, really, basically, have an insight into desire, you will have your object and I will have mine, there will be no conflict. It is only when we don't understand desire

fundamentally then there is conflict. Leave that alone.

Now I want to go on. That is, we said registration in which thought has found security, the brain, now finds that psychologically there is no security at all, therefore there is no registration. But the discovery of that is intelligence. And in that intelligence there is complete security. Right? Complete security. Have you got that intelligence after listening to all these talks, and words and words and words? Have you captured that, has that intelligence been awakened?

And that intelligence can only be awakened when there is an observation which is to observe freely, without any distortion, without any motive in relationship, to observe. Out of that comes intelligence. So intelligence gives complete security, therefore it registers what is necessary and what is not necessary. So we are saying then, is love a remembrance? Right? Is love something to be thought about? Or can love be cultivated by thought? We said no. That is fairly simple, everyone agrees to that. Then what place has love in relationship? Right? If love is not desire, if love is not the pursuit of pleasure, then what is love in relationship? Go on work it out, sir. Would you ask that question when there is that sense of love? The problem is this: you have that love, which is not desire, which is not pleasure, etc., etc., which is the essence of intelligence. I wonder if you see it. Suppose you have that extraordinary essence which is of intelligence, which is love, and I haven't got it. In our relationship - I am fortunately, or unfortunately, I am married to you - and you have got it and I haven't got it, then what is our relationship? You understand this? You understand my question?

Q: I would like to ask a question, please.

K: It is raining very heavily.

Q: In discussing I really appreciate your talks and discussions, and everyone can see if there is some truth in what you have said or not. I would like to ask if you can imagine that I am there if you are not there.

K: No, sir, this is all theoretical.

Q: Do you not understand this?

K: Yes, yes. This has been an old question, I know it. But we are not discussing that at the moment. If you don't mind. What we are talking about is, when there is that quality of love which is not desire, which is not merely pressure, then what is the action of that love in relationship? Which is, we said, in relationship each one is concerned with himself.

Q: Compassion.

K: No, wait sir. Don't jump to any conclusions. Don't use words yet. We said in relationship you discover what you are. Right? Your reactions, your pride, your envy, your this, and that. And through relationship you begin to dissolve all that. Right? Then you are beginning to understand yourself as deeply as possible, because in relationship it shows it. And you begin to realize that where there is attention there is no registration. We went through that. Then the problem arises, what is love in this relationship? Right? If there is no desire, if there is no pursuit of pleasure in this relationship, what is then relationship? You understand? Go on, sirs, think it out. I am not going to think it all out for you and then you accept it or reject it. Go into it. I love you.

Q: Attention.

K: Not attention, madam, we have gone into that. I love you - watch yourself do, you love somebody don't you? You love somebody and that love is not controlled by desire, that love is not the pursuit of pleasure - we went into all this before. Then what is the relationship between two human beings, man, woman, when there is this love?

Q: There is no centre, therefore they are one whole.

K: That is a conclusion, that's a theory. The lady says there is no centre therefore we are one. Is that it? You see none of you - forgive me for saying this - none of you do it, go into it.

Q: How do you know?

K: How do I know? If you did it you wouldn't be here. God, it's raining hard, isn't it. I hope you have got warm clothes.

We are asking: what is the place of this quality of love in relationship? Do you understand? We said there is the operation of intelligence, the awakening of intelligence, which is the essence of love. Right? And this intelligence is also compassion. This intelligence is also clarity, which we talked about. And also this intelligence acts skilfully. Right? Skillfully - got the meaning of it now? You are understanding it?

Q: Like a river.

K: Go into it for yourself and you will see the extraordinary thing that will happen in your life if you do it. Not verbally, not theoretically, not come to some conclusion, but actually have an insight into all this. And you can only have insight when there is freedom, psychological freedom, freedom from choice, freedom from direction so that you can look.

So we talked about compassion, clarity, and skill. We said, in

that quality of love there is intelligence. Right? Intelligence is compassion, isn't it? Because you can't have compassion without clarity. So in one's relationship with another, when there is compassion - love, compassion, intelligence, clarity - you will act in excellent skill in relationship. Right? I wonder if you see this? Do you see it, or is it all Greek still?

As we said, we have great skill, we have acquired enormous skill in every direction - in the air, in the sea, on the earth, skill in being cunning in our relationships. Right? Deceptive, hypocritical, act in a skilful manner to avoid getting hurt, getting my own way and hoping you will follow me and therefore not create any conflict. We have learnt all this. But that skill is not out of clarity. That skill only emphasizes the more 'me'. We went into that.

So see what takes place. Just briefly I will go into it, what takes place logically. We said you can know yourself without distortion by observing what is outside, what is happening in the world. And from the world move inwards, and then whatever you see will be correct because you have learnt to observe correctly, truthfully, accurately, what is going on around you. So in observing yourself one of the major of factors in relationship is conflict - hurt, expression of will, desire. Right? Getting hurt, conflict and each one desiring his own particular way. All that emphasizes separation, division. So wherever there is division created by will, created by idea, created by desire, objects of different desires, pursuit of particular ideologies, divides people, and therefore there is tremendous conflict. My wife may be Catholic, and I may not be Catholic, and there is conflict. I want her to become non-Catholic and she wants to make me Catholic, so there is battle.

So we said, the brain registers because in registration there is security. And the security it has created is in the image that we have made about each other. And because there is the image of each other which is different there is conflict. So we are having an insight into oneself - right - through relationship. That insight can only take place when there is freedom and emptiness to look. You can't look if your mind, if your brain is full of prejudices, this and that. So there must be emptiness to look. That is, the observer ceases to be. We have gone into all that.

So we said registration, non-registration psychologically is possible only when there is that intelligence. That intelligence comes about when there is an insight. So that intelligence registers what is necessary and what is not necessary.

Then we went into the question of what is love. Is love desire, etc., etc? If it is not then love is intelligence in relationship. Right? And that intelligence is part of compassion. And that compassion can only be when there is clarity. Clarity which comes through freedom, and freedom of observation and insight. And compassion, clarity, will function with great skill in relationship. Right?

Now have you, at the end of all these talks and dialogues - if we have had dialogues, we haven't had dialogues at all, I have talked or the speaker has talked all the time, we must do it differently next year if we are here - we will be here! Now at the end of all this where are we? Have we together taken the journey, together all the way, flowing together, passing, like a river passing obstacles, it goes round it, have we moved that way? Or are we still part of the bank and looking at the river? You understand what I am saying? Are we sitting comfortably on the bank with our ideas, with our

hope, with our security, you know all the rest of it, and watching the river go by? Which is it that we are doing? To be part of the river, to flow with the river you must leave the bank, naturally. I wonder - please don't answer - I wonder how many are flowing with all this. Then, sirs, look. Then it becomes very important that there isn't only one speaker like me. You understand? It becomes very important that you come and sit here instead of me. That you become the one that is enlightened, who has clarity, compassion, skill. Because the world is getting madder and madder, insane and some of you must go psychologically through tremendous revolution to come here and sit here and talk, go outside. Will you do all this? Or we are too old?

Q: You said at the end...

K: What is the time? I must stop. I can't talk any more. So I hope - not hope - that you have walked along together, and that together we have walked very far. Not stopped half way and say, well it is too difficult, I don't understand, I must understand him not myself. You know all that game we play with each other, and play with lots of ideas and cunning logic and all that, dropping all that, have we gone very far together?

## **BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 21ST JANUARY 1978**

If I may, I would like to remind you that this is not an entertainment. This is not a gathering of people who want to be amused or intellectually enlightened. We are concerned, if I may point out, with the total regeneration of man. Because as one observes throughout the world man is destroying himself, by his education, by destroying the environment, pollution and all the terrible things that are going on in the name of technology and war. The division of people into races, cultures and the division of religions, all this indicates, doesn't it, that there must be a new kind of mind to deal with all our problems, a new quality of apprehension, to perceive a different kind of action which will always be right, correct, true, under all circumstances.

And it seems to me that we should be concerned, if we are at all serious, whether it is possible for man, that's you, to be reborn anew, not in some future date or future time, but during one's short period of life; whether it is possible for you to bring about in yourself a moral revolution. The essence of moral revolution is religion, not all the phony stuff that is going on in the name of religion, not all the rubbish, superstitious nonsense. But, rather, we must be concerned whether it is possible for a human being, which is you, to bring about a total regeneration of the mind. We mean by that word 'mind', not only the movement of consciousness, the quality of the brain which is so damaged under pressure and also we mean by the mind, the quality of action. That is, not only action in our daily life, which we shall discuss presently, but also action



with regard to our social environmental existence, action with regard to our state of consciousness - I am using that word not as a noun, but as a movement. And to bring about a total psychological revolution is our concern, not only this evening, but throughout our existence.

Before we go into that, we must understand each other. We are using ordinary non-technical language, language that is spoken ordinarily. So to understand each other, we must use words. Words have great significance in our life. Most of us are slaves to words. We live in a network of words, and we think by understanding the word we have understood the whole significance of existence. So we must be very clear, right from the beginning, that however important the word is in communication, the word is never the thing. The description is not the described. But most of us, unfortunately, are apt to fall into the trap of description and think we have understood, think we have captured the full significance of existence. So we must be very wary, advisedly careful in the usage of words and the limitation of words, and we must use words as a means of communication. We can communicate with each other only when we have the same direction, when we capture the meaning of what the speaker is saying, which is to communicate with each other, which means sharing together, investigating together, exploring together this question whether human beings, you, whether you live in Russia or America or in Europe or in India or in Asia, whether that human being is capable of bringing about not only a moral revolution, but a regeneration of the totality of one's existence. That's what we are concerned about and that's what we are going to talk about.

So, we must first, it seems to me, establish proper communication, that is, to listen to what is being said and not translate what is said into your own particular pattern of thought, into your own particular images or knowledge or conclusion. You are apparently here to understand what the speaker has to say. That is obvious, otherwise you wouldn't be here. To understand what he has to say, he must use words, but words are very deceptive. You will translate the word which he uses to cover your own particular mode of thinking, your own particular way of life, which excludes naturally whether you are listening or not. That's simple, isn't it? If you go on thinking your own way, you are caught in your own particular pattern and translate what is being said into your pattern, then you, obviously, are not understanding the speaker. It seems to me that is very, very simple. That is, to listen to what the speaker has to say without interpreting it, without translating it according to your own particular way of life or conclusion.

So first, if I may point out, there is an art of listening. Have you ever thought about it? I wonder if you ever listen to your wife or your husband or your girl friend. Do you? Do you listen? Or you have already come to a conclusion that you know her or him and whatever he says passes by very lightly, doesn't actually penetrate your mind. So what we are trying to do, here, this evening, is to learn the art of listening. To listen to those crows, though they are a nuisance, to listen to what the speaker is saying, to listen to your own thoughts, to your own reactions, to listen to your responses to what is being said. So all this requires, doesn't it, a careful, attentive, precise mind; not just casually listen while you are talking to somebody else. Because it is very important, it seems to

me, from the very beginning of these talks that we should understand each other, that we should share the problems together. We have got many human problems and it is possible, if we give our care, our attention to solve them completely, totally and utterly.

So please learn, understand the art of listening. It means to listen with affection, with care, with a sense of urgency. And if you are at all serious, and I hope you are, not serious in your particular mode of life, but that quality of seriousness that comes about when you are comprehending or aware or understanding the global problem of man. When I use the word 'global problem', aren't you, as a human being, whether man or woman, a representative of all mankind? Please understand this question, this is a very serious question. Aren't you as a human being representative of all humanity? Because, your problems are the problems of every other man - economic, social, moral, private, personal; and whether American, Russian, or Chinese, or this country, your problems are shared, are common to every man, because you suffer, are anxious, uncertain, insecure, confused, caught up in a world of utter insanity, madness. This is the problem of every human being in the world. There is fear of death. They want to find out what is meditation, how to go beyond and be utterly free of all fear, to find out the full significance of existence. And to find out also a way of living that is true, not hypocritical. This is the common problem of every human being in the world. And so you represent the common factor, and therefore you are the rest of humanity. Your consciousness is the consciousness of the world, not your private consciousness.

I hope we understand each other about this question. That is

why when one says, as we say, that you are the world and the world is you, it is literally so. And whether you as a human being representing the common factor of humanity, whether it is possible for each one to bring about a regeneration of his mind. That is the question, that is the problem we are facing, not as individuals, but as a human being; not as a group, but as one entity who represents the whole global man, with all his problems. So if you as a human being can bring about a radical, moral revolution, that revolution affects the whole of mankind. I wonder if you understand this. You know, one or two people in the world affect the consciousness of mankind. The great butchers of the world, the great conquerors affect your consciousness, as the consciousness of this country is affected by their superstitious beliefs, as in Europe, two thousand years of a certain incident and glorified into a religious symbol does affect the whole consciousness of Europeans and Americans. And in the same way if you are a communist and if you accept that pattern, and that way of thinking, that whole consciousness is affected. I wonder if you follow all this.

So please understand the utter simple responsibility of a human being, you, living in this mad world. When you change radically it affects the conscious of the world. So that's what we are concerned with. The word 'regeneration' means to be reborn, not in some future life, which may or may not be true, but in this life, in this whole period of existence, whether it is possible for you as a human being who represents all mankind, whether it is possible for you to be reborn. Do you understand my question? That is the question, the challenge that the speaker is putting before you. How you respond to it is very important. Morally, every country in the

world is immoral. Our society is immoral, our religions are immoral, and we live in that society. We respond to that society. We are part of that society. We are that society. We are not different from that society. Please see this, not intellectually, not verbally, but actually, that you are the result of your environment, of your culture, if there is such culture; the result of your religions, of your gurus, of your books, of your education. You are that. And in that we pretend that there is something extraordinarily spiritual, and we are trying to discover that spiritual entity, which is sheer nonsense.

So, we are asking you as a human being, whether you can bring about a regeneration in your life, your life being your daily relationship with another human being. That's our life. You may technologically be a marvellous engineer or a scientist and so on. That is merely a calculated, specialized entity to earn a good livelihood. But we are not talking about that. As a human being, we are referring, not as a specialist. I have always thought, a doctor who is always investigating, who is a specialist in nose, ear and throat and as the specialist, his heaven will be nose, throat and ears. Won't it? I wonder whether you understand all this. So those who are specialized have their little heaven of their specialization. Obviously if you spend all your life, being a doctor or a surgeon, good or bad, if there is such a thing as heaven, you will be, there, a surgeon. Obviously. So it matters very much whether you can bring about a change, in yourself, radically, morally. And we are going to investigate that together.

When we use the word 'investigate', it implies that your mind must be capable to explore, to look, but if you come with a

prejudice, with a conclusion, with a direction, you will not be able to observe. Right? So investigation implies that you must be free to look, free to look at your life, free to look at your reactions to life, free to look at your reactions or responses to your wife or to your husband, because there is the life. We are going to investigate into that. And to investigate, you must be free to look. So first find out for yourself whether you are free to look; look at your life, your daily, ugly, conflicting life; to look at it, to investigate it, to explore it. If you have a conclusion, then your investigation will be directed by what you have concluded. I wonder if you see all this. If you have a prejudice, that prejudice is going to dictate your investigation. If you have a belief, that belief is going to direct your investigation. So the mind - please do it as we are talking - your mind must be free to explore, and is your mind free? Obviously not. Because if it was free you would already be investigating. So, if I may point out, it is very important in our investigation whether it is possible for a human being, you, to bring about a radical, not only transformation in consciousness, but also a moral, regenerating action.

Then the next question is, in this investigation, the investigator is not different from the investigation. This is going to be rather difficult. When you examine as a scientist, a good scientist, through a microscope into something, if he comes with a hypothesis, that hypothesis is going to direct what he observes. Right? So he must observe what is actually going on, not what he thinks is going on, not what he would like to see going on. So investigation implies that your mind, your eye, your whole being which is being investigated, be free to be observed. Right? Is this

clear? Are you doing it? Or you have the habit of listening to somebody, words, words, and you are caught in that habit of just attending to some speaker. You understand what I am saying? So we are going to investigate together whether it is possible for a human being like you to bring about a regenerating factor, regenerating energy, regenerating action in our daily life. That is our question.

First of all, what is our life, our daily life? What is our daily life? Your daily life? Your daily life is, isn't it, one series of conflicts, one series of struggles, conflict between the opposites; wanting to be something and denying that. And a series of conscious as well as unconscious fears, a pursuit of pleasure, and a relationship, actually, not theoretically, actually a relationship with another, with your wife, with your husband or whatever it is, in which there is no love at all. And our life is made up of this continuous burden of sorrows and also fear of death. That is our life, the daily conflict of our life. And added to that we try to find out how to live a life which is peaceful and so we escape through meditation, denying this life, try to find through meditation a way of living which won't be in conflict. Look at your life, not at the description which the speaker is making, at your daily life. We are going to first find out whether it is possible to live in our daily life without conflict. Please give your attention to this. Nobody talks to you like this, give your attention, your heart, to find out whether you can live a life, your daily life, to live without conflict in relationship, because our life is relationship. Right? Our life is in contact with each other, and in that relationship there is conflict. So is it possible to live a life, live in a relationship with each other in

which there is no conflict whatsoever? Right? Let us investigate that and find out if it is possible or not possible. We are not saying 'yes' or 'no'. We are going to investigate and therefore find out for yourself, because the speaker has no authority whatsoever. He is not your guru. I wouldn't accept you as followers. This is very important to understand. You are all trained to follow, to obey, and the speaker says, together, you and I, as two human beings, are going to investigate whether it is possible to live a life in which there is no conflict. You understand this? See the greatness or the beauty of that question, not intellectually put, but the actual reality of that question.

Why do we live in conflict? What is the root of conflict? You understand? The root of it? There are many expressions of conflict. Right? Many expressions - the neurotic expression, the common expression of conflict and the ultimate conflict to achieve peace or some enlightenment. All that is based on conflict. Right? So I am asking why do you have conflict? When I ask you that question, please look at yourself, your own thinking, your own way of life and find out, if that question, why you live in conflict, is put, how you respond to it, how you receive the question. You understand? Is it an actual question which disturbs you as pain disturbs you, or is it a theoretical question put to you and you are trying to answer a theoretical answer? Or do you realize for yourself that you live in conflict, and ask yourself whether it is possible to live without conflict. Don't say 'yes' or 'no', but let's investigate it. Right? As we said, to investigate there must be freedom, you can't be tethered to a belief, to an idea, to a tradition. You must be free to look. What is the cause of conflict? Are you waiting for me to answer it? You



are. Therefore it means that you are not investigating. That means we are not sharing the problem.

We live in duality. Don't we? I want this and I don't want that. I like to be this but I am not like that. I like to be happy and I am not happy. I am angry and I would like not to be angry, and so on and so on. Why is there - please listen - why is there an opposite at all? You understand my question? I am asking you, if I may, most respectfully, why is there an opposite? Why have we accepted an opposite? There is an opposite as light and darkness, man and woman. I am asking this question psychologically: why is there in you a dual process of thinking? You understand? Or - please listen - there is only the fact, what is actually happening and nothing else. You understand my question? Look: one is greedy or one is violent. Why have we invented the non-violence? Why have we invented the idea of not being greedy? Why? When we are actually greedy, actually violent, why have we the opposite of it? This country has lived with non-violence, which is sheer nonsense, of course, because you are all violent. So please follow this. It is not rubbish that we are talking about. It is a very serious factor, because this may totally eliminate altogether conflict, if you know, understand what is being said. When we use the word 'fact', we mean by that word that which is, 'what is'. The what is not is non-fact. Non-violence is a non-fact. But the fact is violence. I am asking why has humanity, you, invented the opposite? Do you understand my question? Either you have invented it because you don't know how to deal with 'what is', with violence, and therefore it is an escape from 'what is'. Or you think you need an ideal which is the opposite to eradicate 'what is'. Or use the ideal as a means of

getting rid of 'what is'. The 'what is' is a fact, is actual, but the ideal is non-factual. It's an escape from the fact. So can you drop your ideal? Can you drop the opposite and deal only with 'what is'? You understand my question? I can't see your faces, but you can see mine. It is unfortunate, it should be other way round.

So we are saying, observe and investigate 'what is', not how to go beyond 'what is', not how to transform 'what is'. If you do, then the duality comes into being, therefore conflict. I wonder if you understand. That is, suppose I am jealous. I have never been jealous in my life, but suppose I am. See what is involved in observing 'what is'. Suppose I am jealous, and my education, my culture, my religious upbringing has said, 'don't be jealous, it is wrong to be jealous, because jealousy implies hate, anger, all the implications of jealousy, bitterness and so on, so don't be jealous'. So I have been educated in not being jealous. But the fact is I am jealous. So immediately I have a conflict. You understand?

Immediately the conflict begins. I am jealous and I must not be jealous. But the fact is I am jealous. So I am only concerned with jealousy, not 'I should not be jealous'. So I have no conflict of duality. I have only the understanding and the observation of what it means to be jealous. Are you following all this?

So I am going to investigate into 'what is', which is jealousy, which is a common factor of all humanity, a feeling which I have named as jealousy arises, because - I won't give you the reasons, it's obvious. Don't you know jealousy? So I don't have to give the reasons. Now, a feeling arises and there is immediate naming of it, immediate recognition of it, through verbal association. When the feeling arises, instantly there is naming of it as jealousy. The

meaning of it is to strengthen it. When you recognize it, which means you have had that feeling before, and you have named it, and that memory reacts to the present feeling. So you are looking - please listen to this - you are looking, or observing this new expression of that thing called jealousy with old memories.

Therefore the old memories are contradicting or trying to bring the present feeling into its own record. So to observe that feeling without naming, will you do it? Next time when you are jealous, probably you are jealous even now, can you observe that feeling arising and not name it at all? Then what takes place? Then, as I said, that very observation without naming brings about a transformation in the fact.

You know I have gone into this question considerably, previously many years ago, and we were talking to some scientists the other day, the speaker asked one of them what actually takes place when a scientist observes a phenomenon through a microscope, a phenomenon that he is investigating. Right? And when he observes it without any prejudice, without previous knowledge, without a direction, then that which he has observed is undergoing a radical change. You understand this? The scientists, some of them, have assured the speaker that it is so. So we are saying, if you can observe the reacting feeling which you have named jealousy, without naming it, just to observe it, then that very observation brings about a radical transformation in that which is being observed. Have you got it? Or must I explain it again?

Look sir: the word 'violence' is associated with so many things and when we use that word, we are already educated to condemn it because violence is something unholy. So to observe our feeling of

violence without the word, and in that observation you will find that feeling is undergoing a radical transformation. You can only test this, not accept it. You can test it for yourself, in your daily life, if you know how to do it. And therefore we are sharing this thing together, that it is possible to live completely without conflict of duality, because there is no duality. It is the invention of thought. What is fact is real. Everything else is non-real. So can you, in your daily life in your relationship, live without the opposite and only live with 'what is'? And you can test this. You know what I mean by 'test this'? Actually finding out for yourself by watching yourself and seeing whether what is being said is true or false, because it is your life. It is not my life. You have to test it.

And also in that conflict there is the problem of desire. So we are going to investigate together, because there is no authority here, and I really mean it, I am not an authority. The authority of a surgeon is totally different from the authority of a guru. You know sir, when you are seeking truth, really seeking truth, you are never alone. Do you understand that?

Now we are trying together to find out for ourselves how to live a life in which there is not a shadow of conflict. We have gone into this question of duality. Right? I hope you understand it with your heart, with your depth, not intellectually, but with tremendous attention, because your life is in conflict. The other problem is, conflict arises when there is the dual opposing desires. So we are going to investigate together what is desire. We are together investigating into this tremendous problem of desire. Because that is one of the root causes of conflict. All religions have said 'get rid of desire', because a man who comes to serve god must be free of

desire. And we are educated unfortunately to suppress it, to run away from it, to find a substitution, or desire for the noblest thing - god or whatever it is. And modern society, modern world says 'express yourself fully, indulge in your desires. It is nonsense of all religious idiots, throw them all away.' Our society has become permissive, to do whatever you like.

So we must together investigate into this question of desire. I do not know if you have ever asked yourself why desire plays such an important part in our daily life - desire to be perfect, desire to achieve a status, a position, a power, desire to have money and all the rest of it, the whole gamut of desire. Please listen. Do the objects of desire vary or desire itself varies? Do you understand the question? When you are a young chap you desire a car, or later on a woman or later on a man or later on a house and so on. Do the objects of desire vary, or intrinsically desire has in itself a variety, a change - no, not change - a different object inherent? We are going to find out. First, let's find out the root and the meaning of desire, how desire arises, not how to suppress it, not how to run away from it, but to see for ourselves the whole movement of desire, the origin of desire, the beginning of desire.

Are you prepared? Are you also working, as the speaker is working, not physically, psychologically, intellectually, verbally trying to communicate something and are you also working together or are you just listening, half asleep? Because it is really a very important problem in our daily life, whether it is sexual desire or desire for power, desire for sidhis, desire for enlightenment, desire to have a bigger house or for a more beautiful wife and so on. What is desire? If one can understand it very deeply you will

find that the object becomes totally irrelevant. So we are going together to understand the movement of desire, movement, not a desire for something, the movement. Now just a minute. When we use the word 'movement', it means moving from here to there, which is time. Movement implies time, not only chronological time, but psychological time. That is, I desire to have a big house. I don't, but suppose I desire to have a big house. It's a movement which will take time. To have that house, I must work, I must gather money, and all the rest of it and get that house. That is a movement in time. When we use the words 'movement of desire', in that is implied time also. I wonder if you see it. Do you see the implications? You don't. We will come to it. I just thought of it, it is a marvellous idea. Desire means movement. Movement means time. We are not only investigating time, but also desire. Are you getting tired at the end of the day? If you are tired I'm awfully sorry, but we will go on. Because desire for enlightenment is the same as desire for a house. There is no difference for a sannyasi who desires heaven and a man who desires a house. They are still movement. He must do certain things, control, celibacy, and all that business, arrive at that state when he says, 'I've got enlightenment', which is absurd. When you say 'I am enlightened', you are not enlightened.

So in investigating desire, we are investigating time. It is really extraordinary. You don't see the beauty of it. What is desire? Desire is never static. It is always moving, living, and most of us think that it is static and therefore can control it, therefore can suppress it, can escape from it, but it is a living thing. So we are trying to capture a living thing, not a static, dead thing. So your

mind must be equally alive to understand it. That means your mind also must be alive to investigate into what is desire, how does it arise? The speaker is putting this question for you to find out for yourself, not wait for the speaker to tell you. Unfortunately I will tell you! But find out for yourself as we go along. Then it becomes exciting, fun, alive. But if you merely listen to what he is saying, memorize it and then apply it, then it is a dead thing. So together we are doing it. What is desire? One sees a beautiful watch in the window, or a beautiful car, a beautiful dress, whatever it is. There is first the seeing, then there is contact, then there is sensation, then thought comes in and says 'how nice if I had it'. So perception, contact, sensation, then thought, image, thought creating the image of you driving in the car, and having the pleasure of driving the car, and then desire. You understand? Watch it in yourself, not what the speaker is saying. So there is first perception, the seeing, contact, the sensation, thought creating the image and desire. This is the movement of desire, which is the movement of time. When I see the car and thought says 'how nice it will be to drive a car', the power, and then desire; to get the car needs time, and all the rest of it.

So our question is, why does thought create the image and out of that image desire is born? You understand my question? Is it possible for thought not to create the image? You understand my question? Seeing, contact, sensation, then thought creating the image and the pursuit of that image, desire. We are asking whether thought can be in abeyance and not create the image. Look at it: I see a beautiful watch in the window. I see it, I contact it, sensation and then thought comes in and says 'how nice it will be for me to

have it'. Now before thought comes in, just to observe, contact and sensation and stop there. This requires great attention of your reactions. Then desire becomes a minor part. Then you begin to understand the movement of desire. But when the image becomes strong, then the pursuit of desire is intense. Have you understood a little bit of this? - not understood, are you doing it? That is, memory which is stored in the brain - I am not a brain specialist but you can observe it in yourself - memory is stored in the brain like a recorder - seeing, contact, sensation and for the brain to stop the movement of recording. You understand this? I wonder if you understand this? No, sir, you don't. Please, keep quiet. You know, the function of the brain is to record, record every kind of experience, every kind of incident; it is its business to record like a tape recorder, everything that is being said is recorded. So the brain is the recording instrument. And the question is - this may be a little bit difficult - the question is, not to record what is not necessary. Find out. To record only what is absolutely necessary, not to record your jealousies, which is not necessary; not to record your hurts which is not necessary, not to record your ambitions.

Then the brain is only recording that which is essential - the language, how to drive a car, how to do business and not do tricks in business, and all the rest of it. Just to record what is necessary. Then you will find that the relationship between desire and the non-recording process is that the desire is not recorded. I wonder if you understand this? No, please don't agree. You have not done it. You can only agree when you have tested it, gone into it. Find out for yourself, do it, test it. But to say, 'Yes, I agree', your head is loose, that is all. So this is a tremendous problem for humanity to find



out. As we have discussed, we are going to find out a way of living in which there is no conflict whatsoever. And the speaker is showing that it can be done, completely, which means you must understand, discover through your own investigation the conflict in which we live, between man and woman, sexually or otherwise, the conflict of ambition, the conflict of competition, all that. And, we said, it is possible only when you actually live with 'what is', not with the ideas, with suppositions, with fixations. And also, in trying to understand the whole movement of conflict, if you understand, find out the movement of desire. Desire comes into being only when thought creates the image and that image is recorded. I have found something very new. It doesn't matter, you won't understand this.

So we have to stop. You are the representative of all humanity and that is the fact, you represent me, the American, the Russian, because they are all in conflict, misery, confusion, that is the common factor between all human beings, though you may be a doctor, a rich man, may have many possessions and all that, but you still go through the misery of sorrow, pain suffering, fear, so you are that, you are the rest of the world, you are the world. If you understand and transform yourself, you are bringing great blessing on the world, So, we are saying there is an actual way of living - when I use the word 'actual' it means what is taking place, actually what is happening - if you understand that, life opens, has a totally different meaning.

## **BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 22ND JANUARY 1978**

If we may we will continue with what we were talking about together yesterday evening. We were saying, weren't we, that one of the factors of conflict between man and man is desire, and also we are educated, conditioned to live and accept this conflict between the opposites. We talked about that yesterday evening. And also we talked about the responsibility of every human being, the responsibility that must be accepted by everyone if one is at all aware or sensitive, or informed of what is happening in the world. As we were saying yesterday, we are living in a society that is totally and utterly immoral, and there must be, if humanity is to survive at all, a moral revolution, not a revolution according to a pattern, according to some ideal, because morality is not a blue print. It is a living thing. It is not laid down by any particular religion, or sanctioned by any particular group, but rather, it must be understood as a living thing to be lived in our daily life. We never seem to accept that fact. We are always running away from our daily responsibility, the responsibility between human beings, between man and woman, wife and husband and so on. We seem to either deliberately, avoid it and so become rather hypocritical in our life, that is, saying one thing, and doing something totally opposite to what you have said. So we gradually become a rather hypocritical group of people. And also we were saying yesterday that a regeneration of the mind is necessary. Though technologically man has advanced extraordinarily, perhaps to destroy himself and destroy the earth and the air, and everything

else; and that regeneration can only be possible when we are aware, know, appreciate the state or the condition in which we live.

It seems to me if I may point out, that most of us either in business or in some kind of profession or just ordinary people like you and me, seem to forget that we are concerned with a life that is becoming more and more intricate, complex, and so unclear, uncertain. It is only clarity that brings about innocence, and we will talk about that clarity, perhaps, if time allows later on.

Regeneration is possible when we have abandoned or put aside totally our usual religious, moral, evasive attitudes. We talked about it yesterday, also. We said, perhaps some of you may remember, that we human beings who have lived perhaps two or three million years or more, morally, psychologically were just about the same as we were two thousand or five thousand or ten thousand years ago. We have the same problems - sorrow, pain, grief, the utter lack of love, fear and so on. We don't seem to have come to grips with them and gone beyond them. We are still living in all this common factor of all humanity. As we said yesterday again that you are the essence of all humanity because you suffer, go through all kinds of miseries, unhappiness, disappointment, despair and pursuit of pleasure and so on. So you are the common factor of all humanity and, perhaps, if you change radically you do affect the consciousness of mankind. That's also a truth, a fact.

So we are talking about not only moral regeneration, but a total regeneration of the mind - mind being not only the quality of intelligence, the capacity to understand, perceive and also the capacity of the brain that is not wounded, that is not damaged, that is not living under constant pressure, and a sense of deep abiding

love for nature, for trees, birds, rocks, the stray dogs and a love of each other. When we talk about mind we include all that, not merely an intellectual capacity.

And we were saying yesterday with regard to desire, the capacity of the brain to make images, that is, we said the movement of desire is perception, the seeing, the contact, the sensation and thought bringing about an image and from that flows, moves desire. That is an obvious fact. And desire is one of the factors of conflict in our daily life, as comparison which is the conflict of duality. We went into that very carefully yesterday and we won't go into it again today.

But I think we should consider seriously the capacity of thought to make images, pictures, symbols, words and we live in that world of words, symbols, images, pictures - and as we said, we are going to examine that fact. Please bear in mind again, if I may repeat, that we are partaking in our exploration, I am not speaking to you as a lecturer giving certain ideas, but on the contrary we are sharing together our problems; sharing, partaking, inviting each other to look at our major problems in life, and when we do look, as we said, it is possible without any effort whatsoever to bring about a transformation. That is the point, that, one has to learn the art of observation. Art means the capacity to put everything in its right place. That is the real meaning of that word art, to put everything in its right place, so that the mind is liberated, is free from constant disorder.

So we are going to talk over together, together, I mean together, partaking in understanding what we mean by observing, whether we observe at all the trees, the birds, or your wife, your children,

observe. And what does observation mean? Because we are going to go into something when we find out what it means to observe and actually learn the art of observation. We are going to go into the question of why the brain, thought brings about images and with those images we live, from which arises fear. We are going to go into that together. So first what do we mean by observing, the art of observing, the art of seeing. We talked yesterday about the art of listening, whether we listen at all to anybody or we are always occupied with our own thoughts, with our own problems or, if we do hear another, it is always translated according to the pattern, pictures, images that we have about that person. So there is never actual listening to another. So we are now talking over together this question what it means to observe. Of course if we know how to observe, perhaps we may dissolve all our problems. To observe, to see. Perception is not only visual, optical, but also a great deal of psychological interference with what we observe.

We observe through many conclusions. Right? Please go into it as we are talking, observe, see how you look at it. You have some conclusions and you look with those conclusions, or you have some experience and from those experiences you have cultivated a memory and that memory looks. Which is, the past looks, because memory is always the past, as knowledge is always the past. And with the eyes and memories, and remembrance of the past you look. That is a fact. So you are never actually looking. Right? You are always looking with a distortion, with a conclusion, with an opinion and so you never see actually 'what is'. Your desire, your conflict interferes with observation. So we are asking, is it possible to observe without the interference of the past? The past is the

observer. Right? All right, I see I am not making myself clear. Let us bring it down to much more reality which is, when you look at your wife or your girl friend, or your husband or your guru, if you have one, and I hope you haven't got any, when you look at them you have already formed a picture, an image, and that image looks, that picture looks, that conclusion looks. So there is never a direct observation of anything, of your relationship with another. Right? So the past is the observer - the past being the experiences, the accumulated memories which have become knowledge stored in the brain cells and that knowledge, that experience, that memory looks, and so, there is always an observation which is distorted. So we are asking, can you look, observe nature, the birds, the rocks, the stray dog and your wife, your husband without the picture you have created about that person. Can you do that? Then only it is possible to observe actually your relationship.

Can you observe the speaker, this speaker, without the image, the picture you have built around him? And if you cannot, your communication with the speaker and his communication with you is distorted. You don't actually listen so completely. You can only listen completely to something new, but if you come with your old habits, with your old memories, you know all the rest of it, you can't possibly listen totally. In the same way if you come with a picture of the speaker, his reputation, and all the blah that is around him, you can't possibly have a direct communication with each other, because I have no picture about you because I don't know you. Even if I knew you, I wouldn't build a picture about you because we must go into the word, 'know' and 'knowledge'. Sorry to complicate all this. Can you ever say you know a person? Can

you ever say you know your wife, or your husband, or your guru or your whatever it is, your boss? You will have knowledge about him, superficial knowledge, what he looks like, and so on and so on, but one can never actually say, I know. Because the person is a living thing. And when you say; I know, you are then caught in the image that you have created about that person. I hope you see all this. So then you look at the person with a totally different mentality, that you are actually looking at a person or nature, the beauty of the sky as though for the first time. We never ask, why do we as human beings live in the past, and all our activity stems from the past, why? You understand my question? We are the past. Just a minute, don't agree or disagree, let us examine. We are exploring, you are exploring as much as the speaker is actually exploring now. So it is not a matter of agreement or disagreement. You are looking.

Why do we live in images, images being symbols and words? Why the past which is made up of our memories, of our experiences, knowledge, why is that so dominant in our life, the past? Is it because, please find out for yourself, though I may talk about it, find out for yourself if it is the truth, if it is the fact - is it because the past is more secure, more certain and the future is totally uncertain? So the past knowledge, and all knowledge is the past, however great that knowledge be, we live in the past and the past is more secure, more certain, we are aware of that, we are in contact with it and that gives us a great sense of security. Right? Is that so? Right? And so the past meets the present, the present incidents, accidents, experiences, modifies itself and goes on. Right? The past meeting the present, modifies itself and goes on to

the future, that is our life, that is the flow of our life, of our everyday life. Right? Now we are asking why does the brain which is the mind and so on, why does the brain live in the past? I am going to go into something. I hope you won't mind, perhaps a little complex, but if you don't understand, say so, and we will go into it and explain much more. Our brains are damaged. Our brains are deformed. I will explain why, first listen. Our brains are not functioning at their highest level. Where there is pressure, the brain must be marred, must be distorted. Right? When there is any kind of pressure, there must be distortion. Right? That is so. If I am pushing you always in one direction, your whole conditioning is deformed, and all conditioning is a form of damage. So when the brain is constantly under pressure, as yours is, then it is deformed. Right? Think about it, go into it. You are under pressure, aren't you? Economic pressure, social pressure, pressure of propaganda, the pressure of religions, the pressure of gurus, the pressure of ideals, the pressure of your wife, husband, you are constantly under pressure. No? And so where there is pressure, the brain must be deformed. Are we aware of this? Are we aware that we live under pressure, which is in this country, over population, poverty, constant, ruthless competition, division, all those act as a pressure - economic, social, tradition. So our brains are damaged, deformed.

Now is it possible not to be deformed? That is one of the questions we have to ask and find out if it is possible or not. I hope you are following all this. First may I ask are we investigating together or are you merely listening to the speaker? Are you actually investigating your own self, the way you think, the way you feel, the way you act. Are you not under pressure? Right? You



are under pressure and when there is pressure on the brain it must yield and if there is enough vitality in the brain it can reject, it cannot be moulded by pressure. Right? I wonder if you understand all this. It is very important to find out for yourselves whether you live under a pressure - the pressure of jealousy, the pressure of greed, the pressure of comparing, the pressure of imitation, the pressure of obedience - watch yourself please - the pressure of competition. So life as we live it is under great pressure, strain, which must naturally affect the brain, and so our conduct, our behaviour, our way of thinking is distorted. Right? Now we are asking is it possible not to live under pressure so that the brain is clear, and therefore totally undamaged, undeformed. I don't know if you have gone into the question of clarity, having a clear mind, not a confused mind. Lawyers have a good mind, a clear mind, that is a speciality, but in their relationship with each other, with their wives, with their children, they are confused. So we are saying a total clarity of the mind is the essence of innocence. Perhaps we will talk about it later.

So we are asking is it possible to live a life in which there is no pressure whatsoever, so that the brain is not deformed, so that one acts freely, innocently, totally because most of us are neurotic. It is obvious when you sit here, some of you should come up here and sit with me, and you observe how neurotic we are in our action, in our behaviour, in our peculiar expression of seeking religion, whatever god and all that you seek there is this deformation of the mind, of the brain from which there can never be right action. So we are going to find out what it means to have right action under all circumstances, wherever we are, whether we are a business

man, a sannyasi - you wouldn't be a sannyasi if you knew what right action was. Right? That is very simple. A right action in your relation with your wife, with your children, with your husband, with your neighbour. And to find that out very deeply, actually, one has to find out if one is living under pressure and to be free of any pressure. Out of that comes right action.

We said yesterday, desire with all its conflicts is one of the factors of pressure. We explained what desire is. I am not going to go into that. We also explained the conflict between the opposites, which is also a pressure. There is only 'what is', there is no opposite. Right? This is difficult to perceive, this is difficult to go into, because we have always lived with the opposites. We have never said to ourselves: let me look at what actually is. The word 'actual' means that which is happening now, to see actually what is happening, not have the educated, cultivated ideal, which is the opposite. So you discard the opposite entirely, not that there is not the woman and man, sunlight and darkness, but the psychological structure in which we live which admits duality. But when you observe, look, there is only 'what is', the actual thing that is happening. So desire, conflict in ourselves of these opposites and fear. Fear is one of the great pressures on our mind, on our brain. Right? Are you following all this? What am I to do? Is this all totally new to you? Is this all something that you haven't gone into yourself and found? Or are you just waiting to be told. Sir, when you are waiting to be told, out of your confusion, out of your uncertainty, you create authority. You understand? You are responsible for creating authority and then having created the authority you just obey like so many sheep. There is no actual

discovery for yourself. You are all secondhand human beings. And what we are saying is, please in the name of heaven share this, partake in this, examine, explore together in this. It is as much your responsible as the speaker to find out and not just sit there and accept or not accept.

So we are saying fear, as desire, conflict is one of the factors that deforms the brain. So we are going to examine why we live in fear and whether it is possible to be totally, completely, utterly free of fear; not only biological fear, the fear of getting hurt and so on but the psychological fears which mankind has accumulated through centuries, through millennia, whether it is at all possible to be completely rid of it. And we say it is possible, and we are not talking secondhand. It is possible. So we are exploring together fear, which means, what are you afraid of, what is actually your fear? Is it that you are lonely, and therefore afraid, or you are so withdrawn from humanity through your own isolating process that you have lost contact with another, that you have lost contact with nature. You are so withdrawn because you have been so hurt. Please examine all this, explore it, not analyzing. My lord! As we said analysis is paralysis. You laugh, it is a good phrase. But you are educated to analyze. All the psychiatric societies, groups, psychoanalysts are all processes of analysis. But you never ask who is the analyzer. You take it for granted. Is not the analyzer the analyzed? Examine it, go into it, find out. The analyzer is the analyzed. If he is to analyze, if the analyzer is to analyze, he must know what he is analyzing. So you are part of the analysis, like the thinker is the thought, without thought there is no thinker, like the experiencer is the experience and so on. There is no time perhaps

to go into this question of analysis. We have discussed this point with a great many psychotherapists, they go up to a certain point and they abandon it, because for various reasons, economic, social reasons, their wives and their responsibilities and so on. They go so far to a certain point and no further and probably you do the same.

But we are asking that by observing fear without analysis, it will tell you the whole structure and nature of fear, not that you tell fear what it is, but if you can observe fear, without analysis, it reveals its content. Right? Do you know fear? Or are you aware of fear after it has happened, or project what might happen. You are following? No? I am asking you, if I may, what is fear? You are afraid of darkness, perhaps, you are afraid of loneliness, you are afraid of not being happy, you are afraid of so many things, aren't you? If you are a sannyasi you are afraid of not achieving enlightenment in this life. If you are a husband you are afraid your wife might look at somebody else and so on and so on. Right?

There are so many fears. There is bodily fear: having had pain you are afraid of the pain or the disease recurring. So there are all these kinds of fears - fear in dreams - I mustn't go into that because there is a tremendous lot to be said about sleep and dreams. Sorry, I mustn't go into it because this is slightly distracting. So are we concerned with the many expressions of fear or are we concerned with fear itself? Not the object of fear but the root of fear, you understand? Which is it that you are investigating with me? Is it the many expressions of fear - fear about something, fear about my boss, fear about my losing the house, fear of death, fear of not being happy, fear about my not becoming a success and so on, fear about, which has many expressions; or are you concerned with the

root of fear? You understand my question? Which is it that you want to investigate with me, the expressions, the objects of fear - fear of losing your wife, fear of death, fear about this, fear about that - or the fact of fear itself?

Be quite clear what we are investigating. If you are investigating your own particular fear because you are lonely, because your husband has run away, this and that, then you are looking at a particular form of fear. Right? Whereas we are asking if one can understand the very nature and structure of fear, the expression, fear about something comes to an end. Right? So be clear. We are investigating not the expressions or about fear but fear itself. Are we together in this? Because please, it is very important to understand fear. We have lived with fear for millennia, and out of fear we have created the gods and all the circus that goes on in the name of religion. We invent so many things, so many images out of fear which are not real, which are not actual. So it is very important to understand and be free of fear. And that is why we are investigating together into this question. It is not for amusement. It is not for intellectual entertainment. Because in investigating this thing together you may walk out of this place completely free of fear. That is what the speaker wants you to do: to walk out as a free man with light and laughter, joy inside, with a song. I am sorry!

So we are investigating into fear. To go into the root of fear we must understand why the brain, thought lives in images. Please follow this a little bit. Why you live and create images, pictures, about the future, about your wife, your husband, about the speaker and so on? Why you create pictures. Because if you don't create

pictures and images, is there fear? Go into this very carefully. So we must first go into the question why thought breeds these complicated, complex pictures, images in which we live. Right? So we must ask what is thought. You understand? Please, are we going together? No? We are investigating into fear and to go into that very deeply you must enquire into why thought creates the picture of the future or of the past which breeds fear, and what is thought? Unless you understand this you will not come face to face with fear. You will avoid it. You will run away from it. Because fear is a living thing. You can't control it, you can't put a lid on. Right?

We are investigating now, not fear, but thought which creates the images about which it is frightened. Right? Am I the only one working or are you also working together with me? It's up to you. What is thought, what is the origin, the beginning of thought? Right? You must answer that question, not just say, well I will look in some book and try to find out. There is no book that will tell you what is the origin. We are going to find out what is the beginning of thought. Right? Animals, the higher form of apes have a form of thinking, some form of calculated intelligence. So we are asking what is the beginning, the origin of thought? The first man, you understand, the first ape man, how did he begin to think? Because in us there is the origin of thinking. Are you following all this? Or is this becoming too complex? Right? The origin of thinking is the registration, the imprint on the brain of an incident, like the tape recorder recording on the ribbon what is being said. So similarly the brain records everything that is happening in us and around us. This is a fact. And the recording is necessary for its survival, for its

security. Otherwise you wouldn't know how to talk and so on. I won't go into all that rather unnecessary detail. So the recording, which is the function of the brain to survive, and to survive it must think ahead or think about the past which will help for it to act skilfully in the present. Right?

So the origin of thinking begins with the recording of an experience, of an idea and so on, recording. And therefore, having recorded the past pain, physical past pain, then thought says, I must not have that pain again tomorrow, and so it is frightened of tomorrow. It has created a picture of tomorrow having a pain, and so it is frightened of that. Are you getting this? See the connection between creating an image and fear and how the brain registers, holding to some biological, physical pain, then thought says, I hope I will not have that again. Right? So image-making, thought, making pictures is the beginning of fear. Right? I wish you would see this. You understand sir? Suppose I have a very good job in a good business and there are cleverer people below me who are going to push me out. So I have an image of what might happen tomorrow, the clever boys coming and pushing me out. So I imagine, there is an image, thought is making an image of what might happen to me and so I am frightened. You follow this? So thought with its pictures and images causes fear. This is one factor.

Thought which is the movement of time is another factor of fear. That is, what might happen in the future. Right? I am living, I am quite safe, no disease, but I might die tomorrow. So the tomorrow is the movement of thought, as time. Right sir? I am going to watch you. I hope it will help me. Time being, not only by the watch, by the sun, but also time as inward time, psychological

time. That is, I am not what I should be but I will be tomorrow. The tomorrow then becomes tremendously important. Right? So I am frightened that anything might happen between now and tomorrow. I wonder if you see all this. So thought is a movement in time, and movement means time. To go from here to your house means time. To become, psychological something, implies time. So as long as there is time, there is fear. And thought is the movement of time. Right? Not how to stop thought. You understand this? Right sir? Not stopping thought. If you stop thought, who is the entity that is stopping thought? It is still thought. Is that clear, right? Right sir? So you have to understand the nature and the structure of thought in order to be totally and completely free of fear. It is thought that is making fear. It is thought that says, what might happen, or what has happened in the past and I am afraid of that. Right? So that is why it is important to investigate the whole movement and nature of thought. Thought, as we said, has its origin in registration. Now please listen. Is it possible to register only what is absolutely necessary and nothing else? You have understood my point? That is, I insult you, or rather the other way round, better, you insult me, and I register it. And that registration which is memory is going to react next time I meet you, which is totally unnecessary. Why should I register insult or flattery? When you do so register your reactions, your responses are distorted. Right? So I am asking you, is it possible not to register psychologically, inwardly, but only register how to speak a language, how to drive a car, how to do your business, and all the rest of it. Only register that and nothing else. Then there is no fear at all. I wonder if you see this. No, sir, don't agree. It requires deep



penetration, an insight, an inward look to find out whether your brain can be free to register only that which is obviously necessary, and not build the psychological structure of the 'me', which is in essence the root of fear.

You may intellectually, or verbally understand this, but that isn't good enough. But you have to go into it very deeply to understand this, which is, thought, the origin of thought, which is the registration, like a tape registering your voice, so the brain is registering. It has been trained, it has been educated through school, college, university, and to suddenly come upon this non-registration, except where it is necessary, is a tremendous task, which means you have to watch without analysis, without direction, watch whether the brain is not receiving insults, flattery, hurts. You follow? To be so tremendously alert. Then you will see for yourself, you can test it under all circumstances that the psychological fears come totally to an end.

So you have investigated this with me this evening, has that fear ended in you? Not in me, don't bother about me, because it is so - I won't tell you, it doesn't matter, that is totally irrelevant. Have you together investigated, explored, therefore partaken in this exploration, this fact of fear? If you have not then you have not listened. If you have listened with your heart, with your mind, with all your blood, listened, then that very listening is a miracle and will wipe away fear, because you have understood the whole structure and the nature of fear.

So it is very important to understand and to live - I am using the word 'understand' not verbally, but we are using the word 'understand' which implies action, which implies perception and

action. Not perception, then act much later. I wonder if you understand this? Action means the doing now. That is what it means, the active present of the verb to act, which means you are acting now, not, I will act, or I have acted. So are you listening, perceiving in this exploration the whole movement of fear, the whole movement, both the biological, the physical fears, as well as the psychological fears, the nature of fear, how thought through the image, picture, which is time, creates this feeling of fear, uncertainty. Right? Have you explored and found the truth of it, have you an insight into it, have you touched the very root of fear, and therefore it is like cutting down a tree, it's finished. Are you in that state? Or when you leave here you are going to be afraid of your wife, your husband, your - all the rest of it? Then you have wasted your time. Don't waste your life, for heaven's sake, don't waste your life. This is the only life we have. What you do now matters enormously.

Therefore, if you act through fear you are lost. Fear and love cannot exist together. In this country there is no love. They have devotion, reverence but no love. Devotion to your guru, to your gods, to your ideals, is self-worship. Right? You understand? It's self-worship because you have created your guru, your ideals, your gods, you have created them, thought has created them, which is, your grandfather has, and you accept it because it satisfies you, so it gives you comfort. So what you are devoted to is you are devoted to yourself. Right? Swallow that pill and live with it! So we are asking, as love cannot exist with fear, and we live in fear, the other thing is not. And when you have the other thing you have all life, and then do what you will it will be right action. But fear can never

bring about right action, as desire can never bring about right action, or conflict. So when you understand fear, the root of fear, go down to the very depths of fear, then the pressure on the brain doesn't exist, therefore the brain again becomes fresh, innocent, not something jaded, moulded, shaped, made ugly as it is now.

So please if you have not understood this now, go home and spend an hour with yourself, quietly to find out. You may cry, you may sigh, you may shed tears, but find out how to live without a shadow of fear, then you will know what love is.

## **BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 28TH JANUARY 1978**

If I may, I would like to talk about several things this evening. First of all, we should establish between us the right kind of communication, not only the verbal communication, because words and language drive us and we very rarely use words with their full significance. So, if I may point out, one has to be very watchful of words. One is caught in words and words become very significant. But language is meant to be used to communicate. So language shouldn't drive us, but we should use language to understand each other. So, if I may point out, when we are communicating, as we are this evening, we should be very watchful that the words don't trap us and the words do not limit our perception, our insight.

I would like to, first of all, if I may, point out again that we are exploring together into some of the problems which the speaker is going to raise this evening. To explore into a problem very deeply, one must be free from one's motives, from one's prejudices, one's fixations and conclusions. To investigate, the mind must be extraordinarily free to look, and we are going to try and look and explore together - I mean together, not that the speaker talks and you just listen, but rather sharing, partaking, participating, in what we are going to talk about together.

First of all, I wonder why you come. That is rather interesting if you go into it and find out for yourself, why you are all sitting there, listening to the speaker. He has something very definite to say and he would like that you understand what he says

completely, totally, utterly. Then he would like that you should participate in what he is talking about. And when you are participating, sharing, you must be equally responsible. Also, if I may again point out, you must be eager, intense, to find out. I think love is that state of mind which wants to communicate at the same level, with the same intensity, with the same clarity, and if we have not this quality of affection and eagerness to participate in what we are talking about, to get totally involved, then they remain merely words, they remain merely an intellectual concept, ideas. But if we can listen, not merely to the words but to something that is beyond the words; nothing mysterious, but not to be caught in verbal, linguistic drives. Right? Is that clear? I don't know if you are, but we will proceed.

First of all, we live in great disorder, both outwardly and inwardly. And disorder is a wastage of energy. Where there is complete order within oneself, there is the essence of all energy. So, we will talk a little while about the disorder in which we live.

What is the root of disorder? What makes our lives so disorderly, so confused, so uncertain? And being uncertain, confused, we try to find something that will give us security, certainty. And in the search for that certainty and security we get caught in all kinds of mischievous activities. So, I would like to, if I may, go into this question: why human beings, you and others, live in such confusion. I don't know if you are aware or conscious that you do live in confusion. Why? And we seem to get used to this confusion, to this disorder. Why? Is it that to break away from disorder is more frightening, more uncertain, than to live in disorder? Because we are used to disorder; the dirt, the squalor, the

poverty, the misery, outwardly the appalling political conditions that are going on, and also inwardly, this great uncertainty, confusion and choosing. I think one of the destructive activities is choice. We think we are free when we can choose, whether it be in philosophy, or the ideals, or the statement, because you are free, politically, religiously and all the rest of it, we think we are free to choose. It is only the mind that is confused, uncertain, disorderly, that chooses, not a mind that is clear, not a mind that sees everything in order. It has no choice. It does what is actually right under all circumstances. So, one asks, and I hope you are asking yourself, why we live in such great disorder. You know what we mean by disorder; contradiction, imitation, conformity, obeying, repeating over and over again the same thing, all that is going on, within and without. Why do human beings support, entertain, continue to live in disorder?

One knows, if one has gone into this question, that when there is order there is great energy. The greater the order, the greater the energy. If you have your room in order, put away things in their right place, then there is no confusion. You go directly and you don't waste your energy in searching where things are. And when one lives in disorder, as most people do, there is constant seepage of energy. And we are going to find out, participate, why one lives in disorder, if one is at all aware. Why? I think one of the reasons is that we accept conflict as inevitable. A mind that is in conflict is obviously in disorder. Are we meeting each other, or am I making statements and you just agree or disagree? Are we sharing this thing together, participating, or are you just casually listening? Because, I think it is very important to find out for oneself, whether

it is possible to live completely, totally in order, so that there is complete order. A machine that is not functioning properly is wasting energy. So, one asks oneself - and please ask yourselves, if I may suggest - what is the root cause of disorder.

Pleasure is the root. Pleasure. I will go slowly. There is pleasure, enjoyment and joy, and beyond joy there is ecstasy. And what is pleasure? Why do human beings, right throughout the world, pursue pleasure - pleasure sexually, pleasure in having a position, status, pleasure in seeking enlightenment, following a guru, following a system and all that, pleasure of belonging to something, to a group, to a community, the pleasure of pursuing an ideal, the pleasure of practising certain systems of meditation? What is this pleasure? And why do human beings pursue it? There is total disorder - lovely country this is. When you walk down any street the debris in the road never removed year after year, and we put up with it. That's up to you.

So, we are asking: what is the nature and the structure of pleasure? When we use the word structure, I don't mean merely the form, the scaffolding, but the whole movement of pleasure, because if we don't understand that very deeply, we may get caught in what we superficially call love. So, it seems to me very important to understand and go into it very deeply - why human beings are caught in the pursuit of pleasure. Pleasure is always - I was going to use the word individual, but there is no such person as an individual, I am going to explain what we mean by the word 'individual', so don't get alarmed - pleasure is always secretive, isolating. I mean by isolating, you may join others in the pursuit of a certain form of pleasure, but in that joining a group, you are

always isolated, if you have not noticed it in yourself. And pleasure, as being an isolated and secretive process, may be, and probably is, one of the major factors of disorder. And what do we mean by that word - the pleasure of having great wealth, the pleasure of controlling oneself absolutely, the pleasure of austerity? The word 'austerity' means ash. It comes from the word 'ash'. Most people who practise austerity, become very dry. They have the practice; but inwardly, they have no life, no living quality. So, why do human beings pursue pleasure, and what is the nature of pleasure? You know, the objects of pleasure may vary. One may seek sexual pleasure or the pleasure of climbing a mountain or the pleasure of running a race, and so on. The objects vary but the essence of pleasure is always the same. Right? The root of it, though the branches of pleasure may multiply, vary, but the root of pleasure is always constant.

So, we are asking, what is the nature of pleasure? At the moment of pleasure, at the second of pleasure, is there a recognition that says, 'I am having a great pleasure'. You follow what I am saying? At the moment of anger, there is no you to be conscious of being angry. It is only after it is over that you say, 'I have been angry'. In the same way, at the second of pleasure there is no you who says, 'I have had pleasure'. It is only after it that you say, 'Yes, what a pleasurable meal I had. What a pleasurable evening!' Or when you have achieved a status, a position, and that gives you a certain form of pleasure, then that is recognizable. But generally, pleasure is a second, or a little later.

So one discovers that pleasure is the movement of time. After all, when you have had pleasure - sexually, or the pleasure of



seeing a most marvellous mountain with the blue sky, the lines, the valleys, the snow, the marvel of light - the seeing gives you great delight. What actually takes place there? Please observe it in yourself. You see something extraordinarily beautiful. Have you ever seen something extraordinarily beautiful? I doubt it. A flowing river, a sheet of water, the beauty of a night full of stars, the bird quietly singing away, and when you see such extraordinary majesty of a mountain, what takes place? Have you considered it? You see this extraordinary thing called mountain. The majesty of it for a moment drives all your worries, all your problems, pushes everything aside because of its greatness, its magnificence. Like a child with a toy - the toy absorbs the attention or the pleasure of the child. Similarly, the great beauty of a mountain, the evening light on a water, drives away the 'me', the self. Then, a second later, thought says, how marvellous it was, that feeling. Are you noticing all this? Don't you know all these? What a lovely sunset it was. So, thought, which is the movement of time, thought captures that incident and demands more of it. The demand for the more is the pursuit of pleasure. Are we understanding each other? The remembrance of a thing past, and that remembrance re-awakening the memory, that memory says: I must have more of that marvellous state. One has had a marvellous experience or experience of great delight in the past, it is recorded, and thought then says: I must continue with that delight, though it is over, there must be more of it. The demand for the more is the pursuit of pleasure. Right? That is a fact.

So, pleasure is the movement of a remembrance and the pursuit of that remembrance. Right, sir? Now, can you observe? Please test

it, test the statement that the speaker is making, don't accept a thing he says, but test it, test it in your daily life. You see something beautiful, a beautiful woman or a beautiful man or the beautiful sunset with all the light and the glory and the extraordinary radiance of it. To see it and not record it. You understand my question? The moment you record it, you are already caught in the pursuit of pleasure.

So, enjoyment is not pleasure. You enjoy at the moment it is happening. Then, thought takes it over and says: 'What a lovely thing that was: I must have more of it.' So, to enjoy and not pursue it - you understand what I am talking about? Will you do it, are you doing it as you go along? No, you are not. And joy is something entirely different. You can invite pleasure, you can pursue pleasure, you can cultivate pleasure. But joy you cannot capture. It comes uninvited like ecstasy; not the ecstasy of a vision or an experience, but an ecstasy in which there is no recording whatsoever. We won't go into that for the moment. So, there is this pleasure which brings about disorder. There is enjoyment. You can enjoy a beautiful sunset, but the moment that enjoyment is captured by thought, thought then wants more of it, then it becomes pleasure. And joy is something that cannot be invited. And when there is that quality of joy, to observe it, to not record it, requires an extraordinary sense of alertness, watchfulness because the whole machinery of the brain is to record, remember, to store up knowledge.

So, we are asking: is pleasure, desire, love? Please answer that question for yourself. You have many desires, many pleasures, above all sexual pleasure which you call love, and we are

questioning: is that love? Or love has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure and desire?

Love of a guru is fear. Right? The love, the respect that you have for your bosses, for your politicians, for your gurus, for your so-called higher authorities, that respect which is never shown to those below you, politically, religiously, morally, ethically, in business, is really a cowardice. Are you accepting all this? The word 'respect' means to look back. Do you understand the meaning of that word? It is very significant. When you say, 'I respect somebody,' especially those above you - financially, so-called religiously - there is nobody spiritually above you, I don't think you understand all this - when you show respect, you are looking back and looking back in order to find out that which is most profitable. Right? So, we're asking: is pleasure love, is desire love? Does an ambitious man, who is climbing the ladder of success, know love? Does the man or the woman who has a family, husband, wife know what it means to love? Or is there a relationship with another, which is not based on memory, image, psychological, sexual pursuit, a relationship in which the 'me' and the 'you' don't exist? You understand all this? And we are asking: is there love in this country? Don't say: is there love in another country? That is a political reply. But actually, when you consider and go into it very deeply, it is one of the greatest tragedies of this country, that there is not love at all. There is respect, there is devotion, there is bootlicking, psycophantism, everything but the other.

To bring about a regeneration of one's mind, one's whole being, love is the flame that burns away all the meanness, the brutality, the cruelty, the ugliness. And so we are going to find out through

negation what it is, what is the positive, through negation discover that which is the positive. When there is jealousy, there is no love. Right? When there is ambition, there is no love. When you are competing, there is no love. When there is fear, there is no love. So, can you be totally free of fear, negate fear, not deny fear, understand the nature of fear and go into it, live with it, totally wipe it away? In the same way, to be completely free of ambition. You say in this world, if you are not ambitious you will be destroyed. Be destroyed. You understand? Because without love, you are dead, without love, you cannot bring about a new civilization, new culture, nothing.

How can a man who is thinking about himself, about his problems, his worries, who is busy building himself up - how can he love? So, can you live a life without ambition, without fear, having a right relationship with another, not based on memories, pictures, images? Do go into it, because without deeply understanding the nature and the beauty of this thing called love, which is so loaded with all kinds of ugly memories and associations, because if we don't clearly understand what love is, you will not be able to understand what sorrow is. And therefore, without understanding what love is - not intellectually or verbally but living it - you will never understand the depth and the greatness of death, which we are going to explore together what is sorrow. You understand what we are saying?

We are saying pleasure is one of the factors, perhaps the major factor, of disorder in our lives and therefore it is a wastage of energy. Where there is disorder, there is wastage of energy. And also we said in enquiring what is pleasure, perhaps in the

understanding, in going to the depth of it, order will come, and therefore you will have greater energy to put aside your ambitions, your greeds, your fears, so that you know what love is - and therefore bring about right relationship with man and woman. From that arises the question, naturally and inevitably, what is sorrow? Why do human beings throughout the world put up with sorrow? Why in the Christian world is sorrow worshipped, worshipped in the one man who bears the sorrows of mankind. That is all very romantic and all the rest of it, but actually, we are all, most human beings, everyone is in sorrow of some kind or another. Here in India, they explain it very carefully - past lives and karma and all the rest of it. But that has not solved the problem. You live in sorrow, and the question is: can sorrow end, is there an ending of sorrow? Not get used to it, not accept it, not carry the burden of sorrow in your heart, but find out for yourself whether there is the ending of it.

When someone dies whom you say you love, you are in sorrow, you shed tears. There is the sorrow of poverty, ignorance. There is the sorrow of not being loved. This is your lot. Please listen to all this, not by the ear, but with your heart listen. There is the sorrow of disease, there is the sorrow that man feels in complete isolation. There is the sorrow of poverty, when you see all these poor, ignorant, dirty, hopeless people. There is sorrow when you see all the animals of the world being killed, destroyed, butchered in laboratories, and so on. There is sorrow when you see a young seal being killed by a man with a bludgeon, all the millions of whales being killed. And the wars - thousands of people killed, children maimed, you know all that. There is sorrow. Can all this, can this

sorrow in human beings, end?

So, there is a peculiar thing: in ending there is a new beginning. If you end something, there is something new taking place. But, if there is a continuity, there is nothing new. But we cling to continuity, because in continuity we think there is safety. Right? Say for instance, you are attached to somebody, or to your ideal, to a belief, to whatever it is, or to your guru. I hope none of you have gurus. I will repeat it till I die. It is the most ugly thing to follow somebody, especially in matters of the spirit.

Can sorrow end? Your sorrow. Which means, if you end sorrow, out of that ending comes passion, not lust. Most human beings know what lust is. But lust is not passion. Passion comes into being when there is the ending of sorrow. And sorrow exists only when there is this enormous fear of death. That is the ultimate fear. Isn't it? Sir, look at it; for god's sake, be honest. So, without passion there is no regeneration of the mind, and that passion can only come into being when there is the ending of sorrow. So, you must enquire, find out for yourself, spend time, energy, to find out whether it is possible - this thing that man has carried throughout the millenniums - to end that thing.

Now what is sorrow? Is it a word? The word - please listen - the word, as we said at the beginning of the talk, drives most of us. The language drives us. We don't drive the language, the language drives us. So the word 'sorrow', the description of sorrow, is not sorrow. Right? I can describe in various ways what sorrow is; but the description is never the fact, never the described. So, we must be very clear, not to be caught in the description, in the symbol, in the word. Right? So we are dealing only with the fact, not with the

word, not with the symbol. So, what is the fact of sorrow, the actuality of sorrow? That is - please listen - the word 'actual' means that which is happening now. Right? Sorrow as an actuality, does it exist? My son dies, I will never see him again. I thought I loved him. And that love may be inherited from the monkeys that love their little babies. Please face all these facts; because our brains are very old - it is derived through thousands of years, millennia, millions of years. So it is very, very old. And when a mother loves a child, it may be derived from that ancient instinctual reaction. And is sorrow a word? Does the word create sorrow - please listen - does the word create sorrow or sorrow exist by itself, irrespective of the word, irrespective of the incident, irrespective of my son dying? Do you understand my question? Or is sorrow always associated with an incident? My son dies, my wife dies.

We are asking: is there sorrow by itself, per se? Or is it always in relation to something? if it is in relation to something, it is not sorrow. No sir, don't nod your head so easily. I don't quite know if I understand it myself. I have just made a statement which I am going to penetrate and enquire because I don't prepare talks. What did I say? I said: is there sorrow without the word? If there is no word, and if there is no relationship which brings sorrow, then has sorrow a cause? Is sorrow an effect? Please go into it with me. If there is a cause, then the effect is sorrow. Then the effect becomes the cause. It is like a chain, isn't it? When there is a cause, the cause produces an effect. That effect becomes the cause for the next effect. So, it is a chain. Now, is sorrow a movement of bondage? Are you following what I am saying? Yes, sir? Or is sorrow something that has existed and will exist for the rest of our

lives and for generations upon generations? And it will exist if there is a cause. Do you understand? Leave it there for the moment, because we want to go into the question of death.

We never ask, what is death? Not the unknown, after death, but what is the meaning, the state of a mind, the whole thing, when there is no breath? Are you understanding all this? I don't think you are, but I will go on. Sirs and ladies, death must be a most extraordinary thing - if one is not frightened - because it is something of such colossal importance in our lives, much more than sex, much more than pleasure, much more than all the circus of religions. Death has an extraordinary importance and significance in our life, the dying. And nobody, no religion, or the institutions called religions have answered this question. They have explained it. They say there is another life, you continue with it, you continue what you are, modify and go on. Or, as with the ancient Egyptians, death is part of our life, take what you live with, when you die you carry on with what you have, and all the rest of it. But nobody, it seems to me, perhaps somebody has - I am not asking this in vanity - nobody has asked how to live a life with death. You understand my question? Death is something further away from living, death is something at the end of living. The living is the disease, the pain, the anxiety, the hopeless misery, confusion, despair, hope, anxiety, the sense of utter loneliness, conflict in all our relationship, the utter lack of love, and fight, struggle. That is our life. And we never ask, 'Can I live with death always as my shadow?' That is, death says to each one, everything that you have got - your attachments, your beliefs, your hopes, your fears, your despair - when death comes, all that ends. Actually



your brain cells, not having enough oxygen, come to an end within three to five minutes. That is complete death. And to live with death means to end your attachment now. Can you do it? Your attachment to your wife, to your husband, your attachment to your beliefs, your experiences, to your gurus, your visions, to everything that you are attached to. Can you? Not with effort, not with the hope that by getting rid of attachment, you will get something else. That is a merchant's mentality, in which you are very carefully trained: if I give up this, will I have that?

So, can one live with death? That means, ending everyday all that you have acquired. You know what it means then? Then there is the ending of sorrow. Therefore, out of that ending comes tremendous energy of passion; and that passion is love, compassion. Therefore, love, passion and death are very closely related together. But all that you are concerned with is: my son dies, I shed tears, and I hope to meet him in the next life. Or you say: is there a next life? Out of that you have nothing. You understand? You have just ashes - which is just words, beliefs and comfort. You know when you end something - like attachment, I'll take that as an example, or violence, your personal vanity, arrogance - end it, you will see out of that comes a totally different beginning.

So what is important is not what death is, but what is your life, your life now. Because your life now is a tragedy, tragedy of despair, therefore the tragedy of hope, because you are in despair there is the desire, the longing for something hopeful. But if you end despair, there is something entirely different. Hope is the silliest form. But the ending, the ending of your attachment to your

husband - the husband may not like it, because he feels secure when you are attached to him, and you like being attached to him or to her because you feel you are secure. So, out of that comes jealousy and anxiety, hatred and all the rest of the nonsense. So, what is important - please listen, not hearing with your ears but listen inside - what matters is your daily life, which is conflict. End conflict, see what happens. End your ambition. If you say that they will crush me, be crushed, die to it.

Because, sirs, if you have no love in your heart, if you have no love for the skies, for the rocks, for the trees, for the birds, for the stray cat - love of beauty - beauty does not exist in this country because you have no love in your heart. So, the ending is the dying and the beginning. If you are only interested in understanding what death is, or crying over your son or your uncle or somebody else dying, then you are not concerned with life, with living. So, can you end your conflicts, your worries, your hatreds, your anxieties? Abandon them? That is death. Then, life and death are not separate. They move together.

## **BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 29TH JANUARY 1978**

We have been talking over together the many problems of our daily living, such as relationship, fear, pleasure and the sorrow that man carries throughout his life. And we also talked over together the question of what is love. I think we ought to also talk over together what is meditation, what is the meaning of it, whether it is necessary, and what is the intention of a person who wants to find out what is meditation. But before we go into that, if I may, I would like to point out certain obvious facts which may escape your perception. Most of us are heavily conditioned, most of us follow the easy path of tradition without much thought, the repetitive beliefs, the repetitive conclusions and what the ancient people have said and so on. We are bound a great deal to tradition. And we think that along the traditional way there is some kind of future, hope for man. Tradition implies - the very meaning of that word - to hand down, to pass on, to give from generation to generation a certain set of ideas, systems, beliefs and worship. And also that word has a very definite meaning, which is betrayal; to betray; to betray the present. And, for most of us it is very difficult to break down the walls that generations of the past have built around each human being. Unless we do break down all our beliefs, all our ideas and conclusions, we cannot possibly start with a clean slate, and one must start with a clean slate to find out for oneself what is truth. And, the entity that breaks down tradition is part of the tradition, is not separate from the tradition.

So, the problem arises how is one, knowing that one is heavily,

deeply conditioned as a Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist, Christian and so on, whether it is at all possible to uncondition oneself, to break down this conditioning and not enter into another conditioning. To find that out, to break down, one must go into the question whether the entity who wishes to break down the tradition is different from the tradition itself? You understand my question? Please, let us go into this as two friends talking over together. That is, is the observer of the tradition different from the tradition itself? That is the question, first. That is, the entity that wishes to break down the enormous conditioning, the weight of it, is that entity different from the quality of the conditioning itself? Or the entity that wishes to break down the conditioning is part of the conditioning, therefore there is no division between the entity that wishes to break down the conditioning and the conditioning? They are one, not separate. You understand my statement? We think and our conditioning says that the 'I', the person who makes the effect, who breaks down the conditioning, is something totally different from the conditioning. But, when you observe closely, you will see that the entity, the being that endeavours to break down the conditioning is part of that conditioning itself. So, you have a great problem. I hope we are participating in what we are talking about.

You know, one of the most interesting and amusing things is to find out what is the process of our thinking, how we approach a problem. The approach is far more important than the problem itself - how you come to the problem. And the approach to the problem either breaks down the problem or increases the problem. So we must be very clear when we talk about the observer is not different from the observed, which is a fact if you go into it very

carefully, how you receive, how you approach, how you participate in that question. That is, a person who is angry, is he different from the person who says 'I must not be angry'? Or the observer is the observed and therefore when the observer is the observed you eliminate altogether conflict? Please understand this very carefully. I'll explain it in ten different ways because we are going to go into something that is very, very complex that must be approached with clarity, and there is no clarity, if there is conflict. So, from the very beginning we are saying that it is important to find out for yourself whether the observer who watches his conditioning is different from that which is conditioned. All right.

Suppose I was born in India - I was born in India - brought up as a Hindu with all the superstitions, pujas, beliefs, illusions, god is in me, god is outside me, god is all in me, you know, that tremendous weight of tradition. Now, is that tradition different from me who is observing that tradition? Do you understand my question? If it is different from me, then there is a division between me and the conditioning. Then I can operate on that conditioning, break it down because I want to go beyond my conditioning. But am I, who is endeavouring to go beyond the conditioning, different from the conditioning itself? If I can solve that problem, then I remove altogether - there is a removal altogether of conflict. You understand? I hope so. Because, when we talk about meditation - as we are going to - any form of effort on the part of the meditator denies meditation, because the meditator is more important than meditation. And to find out, to understand what the meditator is about, is far more necessary, far more important than to say 'Please teach me how to meditate'.

So, we are saying: is the conditioned different from the man or the person who says: 'I want to break down my conditioning.' If he wants to break down his conditioning, then there is conflict. Because the person or the idea that he must break down, thinks he is different. So we are saying both are conditioned. Both. Now, that is the problem first. How do you approach that problem? Is the problem different from you? Or you are the problem? Now, if you are the problem, that is your whole outlook on life, your whole activity, your whole existence is basically, fundamentally conditioned, if you go into it very deeply. And there is no spot, there is no somewhere in that conditioning, some light, some divinity, some energy outside us, that is going to break down the conditioning. The whole human mind is conditioned through education and this modern education is destroying our minds, our brains, through tradition, through beliefs, through the assertion that 'I am different from that which I observe.' That is part of the tradition. So, the entirety of your existence is conditioned.

Now, how do you, if you are at all aware of this problem and if you are somewhat alert to this problem, how do you approach it? You understand my question? What is your reaction, response to this fact? Do you see the fact, or do you make the fact into an idea, and creating the idea, then follow the idea, not the fact? I wonder if you see this. Now what is it your are doing? How do you approach this question, which is basic, which you understand? Because if you are really going into the question of what is meditation, which is very complex, and one has to go to the very root of it, and you cannot possibly understand what it means to meditate if there is any kind of effort. What we are saying goes against all tradition.

So, how do you approach this question? Is it a fact to you, like that tree is a fact, like the person sitting next to you is a fact? But the person sitting next to you, you may like or dislike, or you may have an image about that person, a picture about that person, so, there is a division between you and the person sitting next to you. And in that relationship there is a conflict. Obviously. Isn't there? Let me put it differently, because this is really a very basic question which you must absolutely understand. Am I becoming too serious?

Isn't there conflict between you and your wife or your girl friend, between you and your guru and all the rest of it? Isn't there conflict? Isn't there conflict in yourself? Now, is that conflict different from the observer who says 'I am in conflict'? Or the observer is the very root of conflict? Please don't agree unless you see the fact. This is a microphone. Right? We all name it as a microphone. If we named it as a giraffe, we would all say that it is a giraffe. But we have all agreed that it is a microphone. That is a fact, put together by thought. Right? So, anything put together by thought is a reality. I want to expand this question slowly. Are you following all this?

Nature, that tree is not put together by thought. So, what you make of that tree is put together by thought. A chair made out of wood is put together by thought, but nature is not created by thought. Right? That is clear. No? And anything that thought has created is reality. And thought creates also illusion, and therefore that is also a reality. And thought says: 'I am different from the thing I act upon', because thought has created the observer who is the essence of the past, the observer then says 'I am different from

that which I observe'. So he translates what he sees in terms of the past, but the past as the observer is the observed because he translates what he sees in terms of the past. Have you got this? Or are you all asleep? Please, if I may beg of you, we are sharing this thing together. You understand? We are participating in this. If you don't, you don't. Leave it alone. But see the fact. So, the fact is your entire structure, both physiologically as well as psychologically is conditioned. That is a fact. Now, to break down the psychological conditioning, we invent, thought invents the observer who is going to break it down. Thought itself is conditioned. Therefore, whatever it does is conditioned. So we have lived and accepted as tradition duality, the 'me', and the not 'me', we and they. Thought itself is fragmented, because it is the result of memory, experience, knowledge, and knowledge is always limited, and knowledge is always in the past, is the past. Therefore, anything born out of that knowledge, experience, memory is limited, fragmentary. But thought says 'I can investigate the immeasurable, the divine, etc., etc.' But thought itself is fragmentary, it cannot investigate that which is immeasurable, nameless. You get this?

So, we are going to go into this question of whether there is a stop to thought, whether there is an ending to thought, which means, you have to come to the question freely to enquire, not with all your superstitions, your saying 'God has made me, he is in me and he will tell me what to do', and all that stuff. That is just belief, there is no purpose or meaning. So we have to approach this question with a free mind, free mind being without your prejudices, your conclusions, your ideas. That's fairly simple. If you are serious, you can put aside your conclusions, your opinions, your



judgments so that your mind is capable of investigating.

So, first we are going to investigate together the question of time. Because it is very important to understand time. There is time by the watch, there is time according to the sun rising, the sun setting, the moon rising, the moon setting, yesterday, today and tomorrow. Time implies movement. To get from here to my house takes time. I have to cover so many miles. That's the movement of time. So, all movement implies time. A tree from the acorn to become an oak takes time. And is there - please listen - is there psychological time at all? You understand? Me breaking down my conditioning which will take time; me that will become better, that will take time; me that is in despair because I have no money, nobody to love, nobody to care for, I am ignorant and I will take time to throw away my ignorance. You understand? I am in despair and there is hope in me, that will take time. All movement is time. Is there such movement, psychologically, inwardly? You understand my question? I wonder because it is part of your tradition to accept time as a means of enlightenment. You must practise, you must prepare, you must struggle, you must follow a guru, follow what he says in order eventually to attain whatever you are going to attain. That involves time. We are questioning, I am questioning, if there is such psychological time at all? Or thought has invented it because thought does not know how to solve problems which it has created.

Are you understanding all this? Look into yourself and see you are greedy or ambitious or jealous. You say that will take time to get rid of it. I am jealous and if I am jealous, I want to be free of it because it brings a lot of antagonism, fear, hate, all the rest of it. It

is burdensome, an ugly thing, and I want to get rid of it. So - please follow this carefully - is that jealousy different from me or jealousy is me? And therefore when I realize that jealousy is me I have eliminated time altogether? Then I have a totally different problem. You understand? Come on sirs, help me. I am doing all the work. You understand my question? If I am different from my jealousy, then I can operate upon it, suppress it, rationalize it, say 'why shouldn't I be', and so on and so on. In that process, there is a conflict. Conflict is part of the movement of time. But when there is the realization of the fact that jealousy is me, that is the fact, in that there is no time. So, what then takes place? When the observer is different from the observed, then the observer can act upon it. When the observer is the observed, then what takes place? You understand my question?

We are saying: what takes place when the observer is the observed which is anger? You can test this out for yourself. Don't accept a thing the speaker is saying, because if you accept, repeat, then you are second-hand human beings, which you are. So, please have the courtesy, the dignity, the intensity not to accept anything psychologically. So, we are investigating together this question, when the observer is the observed, the anger is not different from me; I am anger. Before, I thought I was different from anger, and therefore I could act upon it. But I see the fact, the truth, that I am anger. Then, what takes place? Before, the observer wasted his energy by separating himself from that which is observed and trying to operate. Therefore, there was conflict, struggle, pain, time. All that is involved which is, in that process he was wasting all energy, a great deal of energy. When he does not do that, he has

got immense energy. You understand? This is a simple fact. So, there is tremendous energy. With that energy, the problem comes to an end. It is only when you are not energy, that you become jealousy. I wonder if you understand all this. I am not going to repeat it, I can't repeat. I'll tell you differently, if you wish.

As we said yesterday, there is wastage of energy when there is disorder. There is wastage of energy when there is conflict. There is conflict between the observer and the observed when the observer thinks he is different from that which he is observing. But when there is the realization - not you realize - when there is the realization of the fact that the observer is the observed, you have all that energy. And when there is great energy there is not the fragmentation of an energy called jealousy. Got it? That can only be done when you put it to the test, not agree. Next time or now, when you are jealous, go into it, look at it. That is, how do you approach jealousy? As we said, are you approaching jealousy or greed or violence and so on, from the point of view of an observer who is different from that which he is observing? If you are different, then you are wasting energy in your conflict with that which you are observing; whereas if the observer is the observed, therefore, you have got that tremendous energy which is not being wasted. Therefore, where there is energy which means total attention - ah, I've got something else - when there is that total energy, which means complete attention, there is no jealousy. Only when you are not attentive you are jealous. Only when you are not attentive, you waste your energy. Get it?

So, we are saying psychologically there is no tomorrow. This requires great meditation to understand this. There is no tomorrow,

which means tomorrow, psychologically, implies a movement towards that thing which thought has created and is pursuing. One of our conditionings is that if I practise a system, I will achieve nirvana or heaven or whatever it is. There are two things implied in this: practice: what does practice mean? Doing something over and over and over and over again. That is what you mean by practice, sadhana and all the rest of the Sanskrit words. Do you know what happens to a mind that is practising, practising, practising? It is a dead mind. You might have a bright mind but keep on practising, your mind becomes mechanical and destructive. Sorry. So, you practise, practise a system. The word system comes from the root 'stare', 'to stand' not move. A system means it is not a movement, it is not a dynamic thing, it is not a living thing. So, when you practise a system, you are dead. Right?

So, listen, go into it very carefully, you will see the entity that practises has invented the practice to safeguard himself, to find in the practice security. And through that security, he hopes to achieve something or other, which is so absurd. Right? That's one thing. In meditation, you have to find out, participate or enquire into the whole movement of time, that is, the whole concept of psychological evolution. We are saying psychologically there is no evolution. There is only 'what is'. I have said enough but there is a lot more to be said about it.

And also you have to enquire into the question of space. Most of our minds are occupied. Right? Occupied with something or other. If you are a very religious man, you are occupied doing mantras, pujas and beliefs. Occupied. Like a housewife is occupied with her meals, with her cleanliness, with her utensils. Have you

found something? The man who is occupied with god is the same as the woman occupied with her meals. One is not higher, nobler than the other. Both are occupations. The man who is in business is the same as the man who is occupied, a sannyasi, with repeating his mantras and thinking, thinking, thinking. Sorry!

So, when the mind is occupied, there is no space. Everything lives in space. Nothing can exist without space. If you have ever watched of an evening how the birds are sitting on a telephone wire, have you watched that? They have an equal space because if they are too close, they cannot fly. So, as long as the mind is occupied with something or other, there is no space, and the mind must have space to understand, to look, to observe. Now, how do you approach this question? Please listen. You know your mind is occupied with something or other, psychological sexual pictures, psychological demands and all the rest of it. Your mind is occupied - I don't want to go into details - with something or other. How do you approach this question: whether your mind can stop, end occupation? How do you approach this question? Are you approaching it as an observer who is different from the occupation or the very observer is the movement of occupation? Because, if you are occupied, there is no space, and you must have space. Without space you cannot possibly live. They have tried putting lots of rats together in a very, very, very small space. They have found the rats kill their own babies, because they need space, otherwise, they destroy each other. That is what happens in big cities. I won't go into it. So, how do you approach this question? Your mind is occupied, your thoughts are occupied, your feelings occupied, and you realize that you must have some space to

breathe, to look, to observe, to have some freshness. Now, how do you approach it? Is your intention to break it down, the occupation, or the very observer is occupation? You understand my question? No, I am not going to go into details all over again. I have got lots more.

So, meditation implies order. When there is order there is no dissipation of energy. Only when there is disorder there is dissipation of energy. Order in your relationships, in your daily relationship with your wife, with your husband, and that order can only exist when there is love, not images of each other. I have gone into this very carefully in previous talks. So, there must be order in your relationships, in your daily life, because that gives you the energy to understand what is beyond order. If you have not order, don't meditate. That will lead you to illusions, to superstitions, to all kinds of fanciful images. Therefore, it is very, very important to establish order in your daily life, which is going to be your immense problem, because you and your wife or your friend or your boss are demanding something of you. Your wife wants something from you, and you don't want it, you want to possess her, own her, and she is going to break it down. There is jealousy, antagonism. All that creates disorder in your daily life. For god's sake, see this. And your going to temples, to ashrams, has no meaning whatsoever if you have no order. Because we don't have order, we try to escape, go to temples, do pujas, and all the nonsense that goes on. So, that is the first thing to realize if you want to go into the depth of meditation, because you need great energy, not the energy of this idea of kundalini. I won't go into that and those people who talk about kundalini know nothing about it,

because the speaker knows a great deal about it. Full stop. I am not going to discuss that with any of you.

You need tremendous energy, not mechanical energy. There is a division - let's understand this: mechanical energy and non-mechanistic energy. Mechanical energy has always a cause. It needs a cause to make it move, like petrol. An internal combustion machine needs petrol. Therefore, it depends on something; that is mechanistic. Our minds have become mechanistic - go to the office everyday at nine o'clock, come back, sex, whatever you do, that becomes a routine. So, our life, by education, by circumstances, by over-population, by so-called culture has become mechanistic. That is a fact. Face it. When you practise, practise, follow a system, that is mechanistic. Now the energy that is not mechanistic is when you put everything in its right place. When you put your handkerchief in the right drawer or your socks in the right place, or your kurta, or whatever you put on, in the right place, then you are free, you have time, you have energy, you do not go round searching. That is as simple as that. Understood sir? Look, you have to start from great simplicity, then the flower blooms. But you start with great certainties, great beliefs and you end up with uncertainty. So, a person who is serious, earnest, and those who are earnest and serious are the only people who are living. The others live a mechanical life, therefore, they are almost dead.

So, if you want to go very deeply into meditation, there must be complete order, not sporadic order, order one day, disorder the next day, but order right through life. That is, I have to repeat this, I hope you don't mind. The art of listening, the art of observation, the art of learning - art means, according to the dictionary, the root

of it, to put everything in its proper place. Right? Sex in its proper place, business in its proper place, money in its proper place. Then, you will ask 'what is the proper place, tell me what is the proper place'. You become then mechanical. But you have to find out, to put your relationship in its right place, which is not to be jealous, not to possess, not to dominate - love. You don't know anything about it. So, you have to find out how to listen, not with the hearing of the ear, but listening with your heart, with your mind, with your whole being. If you so listen with complete attention, there is nothing more. But we do not listen. And the art of seeing. The observer is the observed. That is the art of seeing. Then, there is the art of learning. Learning which is the accumulation of knowledge becomes mechanical. But there is a learning, which is to have an insight instantly into things and act immediately, in which there is no time interval. I won't go into it. I have explained all this.

So, art means to put your life, your whole existence, your daily activity in its proper order, not according to any blueprint, not according to your guru, not according to your books, not according to some ashram, but to learn the art of putting everything in its right place. Will you do it? When you go home, when you see your wife or your husband or your girl friend, see what your relationship is, actually, not invent it, whether you dominate, whether you possess, examine it, look at it, then give it order.

Then there must be this thing called love, not lust. Sex has its place, but you cannot through sex or through that excitement achieve some extraordinary state, which is all sheer nonsense. When you have put order, which means no disorder in your life,



there is energy. Then that energy can begin to enquire into what is time. I have gone into it. Then we can enquire into what is space, which is to put occupation in its right place. You understand? I wonder if you do. You must be occupied. You understand? A businessman must be occupied with what he is going to do, but to give occupation, whether it is the housewife or husband or businessman or the so-called sannyasi, to put this tremendous occupation in its right place, then you are free of occupation. Then you have space in your mind.

Now, from that space, thought finds its right place. Because, now thought is all over the place. It is part of your tradition that says, thought must be controlled when you meditate. You have never asked who is the controller. If you have asked, who is the controller, you will say it is my divine something or other. That divinity, if it exists, is the invention of thought. Obviously. Because you cannot hold the sea in your hand, you cannot hold the air in your fist. You think you have got divinity inside you. That is your tradition, that is your upbringing, but you have never asked because you dare not ask. If you ask, you will get frightened, because you think that divinity is going to operate, somehow guide you, protect you, help you to earn more money, less money. You follow? So, thought being fragmentary, thought must find its proper place. Which is, to think when necessary, not to think when it is not necessary, not to control thought. Again, the problem arises, is the controller different from that which he is controlling? Wait! I have been brought up - suppose - I have been brought up in the tradition that I am different from thought. So, I try to control thought in my meditation, or in my school or in my college,

everywhere we are taught there is 'me' that is controlling thought, and thought has created the 'me'. Right? Do you see that? Thought has said, it has not said so verbally, but in its realizing that thought is in constant movement, changing, undergoing, modifying itself all the time, thought has said there must be something permanent, and the permanent is the thing that thought has put, which is the 'me', which is the divinity, which is something super-super-superconsciousness, it is still thought. I wonder if you see this?

So, thought, when it realizes its limitation, has its right place, which is - please go into this with me, it may be a little complex but this requires that you understand this - thought is a movement born of memory, experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain. The very cells of the brain hold memory. So, thought is a material process. So there is nothing divine about thought, but thought can invent divinity, and thought can then worship that divinity. All the temples, all the churches, all the mosques are created by thought, and having created them, thought says 'I am going to worship it', which is self-worship. Right So when thought has its right place only - please go into it, share it, partake of it, be with it - that is, as long as long as the brain is registering like a tape, then thought operates everywhere. But when thought realizes, please understand this, when thought itself realizes that the registration is the beginning of thought and when there is no registration thought has its right place.

That is, sirs, you are always talking about silence, peace of mind. What you want is peace of mind from worries. When you have a piece, it is a very small thing: a piece of wood, a piece of stone. So, we are enquiring into something very complex, which is

to have silence, complete, total, utter silence of the brain, and therefore of the mind. And that silence can only be born, not cultivated, not practised, there is no system, but when thought sees itself as the movement born out of registration and therefore limited. Then the question arises: is there a possibility of not registering at all, but only registering what is absolutely necessary? That is, it is absolutely necessary when you drive a car, to think, or it may be instinctual, but you have thought of it, to learn a language, to play the piano, to do your business, to do whatever you do, thought is necessary. But why is there, what is the necessity of registering your hurt? What is the necessity of registering your flattery? What is the necessity of possessing somebody psychologically? So, you begin to understand that it is possible, and to test it, not accept it, not repeat it, that it is possible not to register at all but only register what is absolutely necessary. Then, out of that comes silence, which is born out of space. A little mind, having no space, can practise meditation, practise silence; then that silence is between two noises, between two thoughts, between two things. But the silence we are talking about is born of order in daily life and the understanding of the movement of time, time as movement, time as thought. Then space; then out of that space comes a silence which can never be put into words.

Now, if you have come as far as that, actually, not in theory, not in practice, not as a hope, but in your daily life have come to that point, there is absolute silence, because you have put occupation in its right place, therefore there is space and so on. And if you come as far as that, movement as time comes to an end. So, there is an ending to time; there is an ending to thought because you have put

everything in its right place, therefore, there is complete order in you. And when there is complete order, then you are part of the universe, not some sublimated universe, but the universe of order, because the sun rises, the sun sets. The universe is run on order, stars, heavens, beauty of the world is based on order. And out of that silence, out of the order comes compassion, because it has no cause. Compassion has no cause, no motive. It does not begin with something and end with something. There is compassion. And with it comes clarity, because you have put everything in order. And clarity implies innocence. Mind, because it has everything in order, and because there is that extraordinary perfume of compassion, there is clarity. And with that clarity comes skill. We have skills; the businessman has skill, the doctor has skill, the carpenter has skill, the cook has his skill, the lawyer has his skill, but those skills encourage the self. If you are a very good engineer, it enhances your importance, your ego. Now, is there a skill which does not cultivate the 'me'? I suppose you are not interested in all this.

So, meditation is the flowering which has no motive, which does not seek anything, because it is without time, without the self, the 'me; there is no belief, nothing. Meditation is to come upon this quality of nothingness, absolute nothing. Nothing is not negation, is not a negative thing. Nothing means not-a-thing, not a thing put there by thought. So, the mind, the brain, is no longer a plaything of thought. So there is a totally different dimension. Don't please translate it according to your books, according to your gurus, according to your tradition. If you do, you are lost. You have to test it in your daily life. If you have no compassion, if you have no love in your heart, to love a tree, to love a woman, to love a man, to

love a child, to love your children; if you love your children, you will have a different world, you will have a different education. They would not become all engineers, all lawyers. You follow? You would create a different world, different culture but you have no culture. Culture means that grows, multiplies, flowers and bears fruit.

So, meditation is the exploration of the self, and in the exploration of the self, the 'me', not the super-consciousness - all those are such idiotic, nonsensical, meaningless - the ending of the self, the ending of your selfishness disguised in so many ways. The ending of that is the beginning of meditation.

Now, please, I want to sit quietly for two minutes or a minute. Don't mob me. Afterwards you can mob me, but let me sit quietly for a minute. You don't mind?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 22ND JUNE 1978 1ST CONVERSATION WITH PROF. BOHM, MR. NARAYAN AND TWO BUDDHIST SCHOLARS**

Narayan: I will just say one or two things by way of introduction. Dr Schloegel is a well known scholar in Zen Buddhism. She lived in Japan for twelve years and she teaches Zen Buddhism in London. She was also the librarian of the Buddhist Society until very recently, and many people know her because many people have been her students. We have been wanting to arrange this dialogue with Krishnaji since last year, but it has not been possible. Dr Rahula is from Ceylon, Sri Lanka, and he is a very great Buddhist scholar both in the and the Theravada and the Mahayana. He lectures in Ceylon, Oxford, he goes to the USA, Japan and he is quite well known, and has written quite a few books. And I am very glad it is possible that we have this dialogue today with Krishnaji.

K: Probably you all know Dr Bohm and myself so we don't need introducing.

Rahula: Yes, sir, we know you so well and I have been following your teaching - if you will allow me to use that word, I know that you don't like that word - from my young days and I have read most of your books with great interest, deep interest, and I have wanted to have this discussion with you for a long time, and I am very happy, very pleased that we have got this opportunity today, thanks to Mr Narayan for arranging all this.

I must say that as I have followed your teachings, your books, for many years, I must say that for a person who knows Buddha's

teaching sufficiently well, your teaching is quite familiar, and for a person like that it is not a new thing, it is quite familiar. And what the Buddha taught 2,500 years ago you teach today in a new idiom, a new style, and you put his teaching into a new garb. And that is what I feel always when I read your books. And I have written very often, I haven't got the books here, but most of your books are with me, and when I read your books very often I write in the margin, comparing such and such a teaching with the Buddha, sometimes I even quote the verse, or the chapter and verse, or the text - not only Buddha's teaching, the original ancient teaching, but even later Buddhist philosopher's ideas - I will discuss with you later - even those things you say practically exactly the same. I was surprised how you got these things so well and so beautifully.

And to begin with I want to mention very briefly a few points which are common between Buddha's teaching and your teaching. And, for instance, Buddha did not accept god who created the world and who rules this world and rewards and punishes people for their actions. You also don't accept that idea, I believe. Then Buddha did not accept the old Vedic, Brahmanic idea of eternal, permanent everlasting, unchanging, soul, Atman - Buddha denied it. And you also, I think, don't accept that thought, that type of thought.

Then Buddha begins his teaching on the ground that human life is in predicament, suffering, in conflict, sorrow. And I see in your books you always emphasize that. And then Buddha says that the cause of this conflict, suffering, is due to the selfishness which is created by the wrong idea of idea - myself, my atman. I think you say the same.

And then Buddha says that when one is free from that desire, attachment, self, he is free from suffering, he is free from conflict. And in fact you said somewhere, I remember, freedom means freedom from all attachment - you said that somewhere. And that is exactly what the Buddha taught, that all attachment, there is no discrimination, there is no good attachment and bad attachment - of course there is in our ordinary practical life, but ultimately there is no such division.

Then seeing truth, realization of truth, that is to see things as they are; when you see that, you see the reality, you see the truth and you are free from that conflict. I think this is what very often you say - in a discussion, I think, between you and Dr Bohm, I think, 'Truth and Actuality', in that discussion you have discussed this question. When I read that recently I thought this is quite well known in Buddhist thought as sanghasatya and paramarthasatya, sanghasatya is the conventional truth, and paramarthasatya is the absolute or ultimate truth. And so you can't see the ultimate truth, or the absolute truth without seeing the relative truth. That is the Buddhist attitude. I think you say the same thing.

Then one of your things more on the popular level, but it is very important, you always say that you must not depend on authority - anybody's authority, anybody's teaching. You must realize it yourself, you must see it for yourself. This is a teaching very well known in Buddhism and Buddha said, don't accept anything just because it is given by religion or scriptures, or by the teachers, or by a guru, only if you see for yourself that it is right, then accept it; if you see it is wrong or bad then reject it.

And I remember a very interesting discussion you had with



Swami Venkatesananda. And his point was very much that the whole idea of gurus, the importance of gurus, but you always said what can he do, it is your business to do it, a guru can't save you. This is exactly the Buddhist attitude that you should not accept authority, and after reading I listened to that also. A friend of mine lent me that tape, later on I read the whole thing in your book 'The Awakening of Intelligence', after reading at the end I wrote as from the text - Buddha has said these things too, all this discussion is summarized by the Buddha in two lines in the Dhammapada: you should make the effort, the Buddhas only teach. This is in the Dhammapada which you read long, long ago when you were young. I found it in Mary Lutyens' book, you quoted it, not this line but another.

Then another very important thing many people don't understand when you say - I must say this openly, let them know it, if they don't understand it, your emphasis on awareness, mindfulness. This is a thing in Buddha's teaching which is very, very important, extremely important, to be mindful. I myself was surprised when I read in the Maha-parinibbana-Sutra, that is a discourse about the last month of his life, at every point wherever he stopped and talked to his disciples he said always, be aware, cultivate awareness, mindfulness. It is called the presence of mindfulness. This also is one of your very strong points in your teaching, which I appreciate very much and follow.

Then another interesting thing, your emphasis always on impermanence. This is one of the fundamental things in Buddha's teaching, everything is impermanent, there is nothing permanent. And in one place you say exactly - I think it is in the book

'Freedom from the Known' - to discern nothing is permanent is of tremendous importance for only then is the mind free. That is exactly in the four noble truths of the Buddha.

Then another interesting small point I want to mention: how your teaching and the Buddha's teaching go together. I think in one place, in 'Freedom from the Known', you say, control and outward discipline are not the way, nor has an undisciplined life any value. When I read this I wrote on the margin, Buddha told a Brahmin, a Brahmin asked the Buddha, how did you attain to these heights of spiritual heights, by what precepts, by what discipline, by what knowledge did you attain? Buddha said, not by knowledge, not by discipline, not by precepts, nor without them. That is the important thing - not with these things, but not without them also. Exactly what you say: you condemn this slavery to discipline but without discipline life has no value. That is exactly in Zen, which is Buddhism, after all. There is nothing called Zen Buddhism, Zen is Buddhism. In Zen discipline is attachment, and slavery to that is very much condemned, but there is no Buddhist sect in the world where discipline is so much emphasized. I think Dr. Schlogel will talk about this later.

Therefore all these things - we have many other things to talk about but to begin with I want to say that these things, these fundamental things are quite in agreement, and there is no conflict between you and the Buddha. Of course you are not a Buddhist, as you say.

K: No, sir.

R: No. And I myself don't know what I am. It does not matter. But in your teaching and the Buddha's teaching there is hardly any

difference, only you say the same thing in a fascinating way for the man today, for tomorrow's man. And now I would like to know what you think about all this.

K: May I say, sir, with due respect, why do you compare?

R: This is because when I read your books as a Buddhist scholar, as one who has studied Buddhist texts I always see it is the same thing.

K: Yes, sir, but if I may ask, what is the necessity of comparing?

R: There is no necessity at all.

K: If you were not a scholar of Buddhism, and all the Sutras, and the sayings of the Buddha, if you were not just scholarly and not gone very deeply into Buddhism, how would it strike you reading this, without the background of all that?

R: That I can't tell you because I was never without that background. One is conditioned, it is a conditioning. We are all conditioned. Therefore I cannot answer that question because I don't know what would be the position.

K: So if I may point out, I hope you don't mind.

R: No, not at all.

K: Does knowledge condition human beings - knowledge of scriptures, knowledge of what the saints have said and so on and so on, the whole gamut of so-called sacred books, does that help man at all?

R: Scriptures and all our knowledge conditions man, there is no doubt about it. It conditions. But I should say that knowledge is not absolutely unnecessary. It is just like this: Buddha has pointed out this very clearly, if you want to cross the river and there is no

bridge, you make a boat for yourself and you cross with the help of the boat. Going to the other shore, if you think, oh, this boat has been very useful to me, very helpful, I can't leave it here, I will carry it and you put it on your shoulder, was that man acting rightly? No. Then what you should do is to say, of course this boat was very helpful to me but I have crossed the river, now it is not any more use to me, and I'll leave it here for somebody else to use. That is the attitude for knowledge and learning. Buddha says, even the teachings, not only that, even the virtues, so-called virtues, moral virtues are also like the boat and they have a relative value and conditioned value.

K: I would like to question that. I am not doubting what you are saying, sir. But I would like to question whether knowledge in its actual sense, has the liberating quality of the mind.

R: I don't think knowledge can liberate.

K: Has the quality, sir. Knowledge can't, but the quality that you derive from knowledge, the strength, the sense of capacity, the sense of value, the feeling that you know, the weight of knowledge - doesn't that strengthen you, the self?

R: Certainly.

K: Does knowledge actually condition man - let's put it that way?

R: Knowledge.

K: The word knowledge, both of us surely mean, and all of us, means accumulation of information, accumulation of experience, accumulation of various facts and theories and principles, the past and the present, all that bundle we call knowledge. Does then the past help, because knowledge is the past?

R: All that past, all that knowledge disappears the moment you see the truth.

K: No, can a mind that is burdened with knowledge see truth?

R: Of course if the mind is burdened and crowded and covered with knowledge...

K: It is, generally. It is. Most minds are filled and crippled with knowledge. I am using the word 'crippled' in the sense of weighed down. Can such a mind perceive what is truth? Or must it be free from knowledge?

R: To see the truth the mind must be free from all knowledge.

K: Yes, so why should one accumulate knowledge and then abandon it, and then seek truth? You follow what I am saying?

R: Yes, yes. I think that in our life, even when we take our ordinary life, most of the things which will happen are useful at the beginning, and for instance, in our studies as children at school we can't write without rules, but today I can't write on ruled paper. But at that stage...

K: Wait a minute, sir. I agree. When you are at school, college and university, we need lines - lines to write on and all the rest of it - but does not the beginning matter enormously, which might condition the future, as he grows up? You understand what I am saying? I don't know if I am making myself clear. Does freedom lie at the end or the beginning?

R: Freedom has no beginning, no end.

K: Would you say that freedom is limited by knowledge?

R: Freedom is not limited by knowledge, perhaps knowledge that is wrongly applied, though acquired, may obstruct freedom.

K: No, there is no wrong or right accumulation of knowledge -

knowledge. I may do certain ugly things and repent, or carry on with those ugly things, which is again part of my knowledge. So I am asking if knowledge leads to freedom? As you say, discipline is necessary at the beginning. And as you grow older, mature, acquire capacities and so on and so on, that discipline, has it not conditioned the mind so that it can never abandon discipline in the usual sense of that word.

R: Yes, I can quite understand. You agree that discipline at the beginning, at a certain level is necessary.

K: I question that, sir. When I say I question it, I don't mean I doubt it, or it is not necessary, but I question it in order to enquire.

R: I should say at a certain level it is necessary, and if you cannot abandon it ever - I am talking from the Buddhist point of view. And there are two words in Buddhism with regard to the way: all those people who are on the way, who have not yet arrived, that means all those disciplines, precepts, and all those things that are good and bad, right and wrong. And an arhat who has realized the truth has no discipline because he is beyond that.

K: Yes, I understand this.

R: But that is a fact in life.

K: I question that, sir.

R: I have no doubt about it in my mind.

K: Then we have stopped enquiring.

R: No, it is not so.

K: I mean we are talking about knowledge: knowledge being useful or necessary, as a boat to cross the river. I want to enquire into that fact, or into that simile whether it is the truth - whether it has the quality of truth - let's put it that way. For the moment I am

putting it that way.

R: You mean simile, or that teaching?

K: The whole of that. Which means, sir - just a minute - which means accepting evolution.

R: Yes. Accepting.

K: Evolution, gradually, step by step, advancing, and ultimately reaching. Right? First I discipline, control, effort, and as I get more capacity, more energy, more strength I abandon that and move on.

R: There is no plan like that, there is no plan.

K: No, I am not saying there is a plan. I am asking, or enquiring, whether there is such a movement, such progress at all.

R: What do you think?

K: What do I think? No.

Schloegel: I am very much with you, I can't believe it.

R: Yes, there is no progress.

K: No, we must go into it very carefully, sir, because the whole tradition, both Buddhist, Hindu and Christian, all the religious and non-religious attitudes are caught up in time, in evolution - I will be better, I will be good, I will eventually blossom in goodness. Right? I am saying in that there is a root of untruth in it, there is untruth in it. Sorry to put it that way.

S: May I please come in. I entirely agree with that for the very good reason that ever since human beings have existed as far as we know, we have always known in our different context that we should be good. If it would be possible to progress by something like this we would not be the human beings that we are nowadays. We would all have progressed sufficiently.

K: Have we progressed at all?

S: Precisely, we have not progressed - if at all very little.

K: We may have progressed technologically, scientifically, hygienically and all the rest of it but psychologically, inwardly, we have not - we are what we were ten thousand years ago, or more.

S: And so the fact that we know we should do good and have evolved so many systems of how to do it has not managed to help us to become precisely that. And as I see it there is a specific obstacle in all of us, and it is this obstacle that needs - because we do quite honestly from our very heart, most of us want to be good but most of us do not bring it off - but it is this working through that seems to me at stake.

K: We have accepted evolution. Biologically there is evolution. We have transferred that biological fact into psychological existence, thinking psychologically we will evolve.

R: I don't think that is the attitude. No.

K: But that is what it means when you say 'gradually'.

R: No, I don't say gradually. I don't say that. That realization of truth, attainment of truth, or seeing the truth, is without a plan, is without a scheme.

K: Is out of time.

R: Out of time. Exactly.

K: Which means then, my mind, which has evolved through centuries, for millenia, which is conditioned by time, which is evolution, which is the acquiring of knowledge, more, more, more, will reveal the extraordinary truth.

R: It is not that knowledge that will reveal truth.

K: Therefore why should I accumulate knowledge?

R: How can you avoid it?



K: Psychologically avoid it, not technologically.

R: Even psychologically, how can you do that?

K: Ah, that's a different matter.

R: Yes, how can you do that because you are conditioned.

K: Wait a minute, sir. Let's go into it a little more.

Biologically, physically, from childhood up to a certain age, maturity, adolescence and so on, that's a fact. A little oak tree grows into a gigantic oak tree, that's a fact. And is it a fact, or we have created, assumed it is so, psychologically we must grow? Which is, psychologically, eventually I will achieve truth, or truth will take place if I prepare the ground.

R: No, no. That is a wrong conclusion you have come to, that is a wrong point of view. The realization of truth is a revolution, not evolution.

K: Therefore, can the mind be free psychologically of this idea of progress?

R: It can be.

K: No, not 'can be'. It must be otherwise you can't.

R: That is what I told you that revolution is not evolution, a gradual process.

K: So psychologically can there be a revolution?

R: Yes. Certainly.

K: Which means what? No time.

R: There is no time in it.

K: But all the religions, all the scriptures, whether it is Islam, or whatever it is, have maintained you must go through certain systems.

R: But not Buddhism.

K: Wait a minute. I wouldn't even say Buddhism, I don't know have read, except when I was a boy, but that has gone out of my mind. When you say, eventually you must discipline first and then let go of that discipline.

R: No, I don't say that. I don't perceive it like that, and nor did Buddha.

K: Sorry. Then please, I may be mistaken. How do you consider...

R: I asked you, how do you proceed.

K: Proceed with what?

R: That realization of truth, how do you do that?

K: Ah, that's a different matter.

R: How do you proceed?

K: That's quite a different matter.

R: I mean what I say is that we are conditioned. Nobody can tell us that, however much they try. And the revolution is to see that you are conditioned. The moment you see that it has no time, it is an entire revolution and that is the truth.

K: Suppose one is conditioned in the pattern of evolution - I have been, I am, I shall be. That's evolution. No?

R: Yes.

K: You understand? I was ugly yesterday, but today I am learning about that ugliness and freeing myself and tomorrow I will be free of it. Right? That is our whole attitude, psychological structure of our being. This is an everyday fact.

R: Do we see that?

K: We see that, right.

R: No. You see understanding is one thing, intellectually,

verbally.

K: No, I am not talking either intellectually or verbally, that is a fact. I will try to be good.

R: There is no question of trying to be good.

K: No, but sir, not according to the Buddha, not according to scriptures, but average human beings of everyday life, he says, "I am not as good as I should be, but I eventually - give me a couple of weeks, or a couple of years - and I will be awfully good".

R: Certainly that is the attitude of the people.

K: Practically everybody.

R: Practically everybody.

K: Now wait a minute. That is our conditioning - the Christian, the Buddhist, the whole world is conditioned by this idea, which may have come from the biological progress moved into the psychological field.

R: Yes, that's fine.

K: Now how is a man, or a woman, a human being, to break this pattern without time? You understand my question?

R: Yes. It is only by seeing.

K: No, I can't see if I am caught in this blasted ugliness of progress. And you say it is only by seeing, and I say I can't see.

R: Then you can't.

K: No, but I want to enquire into it, sir. That is, why have we given progress in quotes, such importance, psychologically?

S: I am not a scholar but I come from the practical side. May I come in for a moment please? I am a practitioner but I have done my practice in a Buddhist field, and for me personally as a Westerner, as a one-time scientist, I have found the most

satisfactory answer in the Buddhist teaching that I blind myself, I am my own obstacle, as long as I, with all my bundle of conditioning, am here, I cannot see and act. It seems to be a possibility.

K: That doesn't help me. You are saying that I have learnt that.

S: I have learnt it but I have learnt it in the same way as one learns to play a piano, rather than in the way of studying a subject. That is the point that I would like to contribute.

K: Again you are going back to playing the piano, which means practice - not practice, good pianists don't practice.

S: I must have practiced in order to become good.

K: So what are we talking about at the end of this?

N: There seems to be one difficulty in this. Knowledge has a certain fascination, a certain power, one accumulates knowledge, whether it is Buddhist, or scientific, and it gives you a peculiar sense of freedom, though it is not freedom in the realm of conventional freedom. And after years of study one finds it very difficult to get out of this because for years, twenty and twenty five years you arrive at this, and you value it, and it hasn't got the quality of what you might call truth. And the difficulty with all practice seems to be that when you practice you achieve something; and achievement is of the conventional reality type, it has got a certain power, a certain fascination, a certain capacity, maybe a certain clarity.

R: By that you get attached to it.

N: Yes. And to break away from it is much more difficult than for a beginner, a beginner who has not got these things may see something more directly than a man who has so much of acquired

wisdom. Maybe. Is it so?

R: That depends on the individual. You can't generalize.

K: Sir, if I may point out, one can generalize as a principle.

R: As a principle, in which way?

K: I mean - let's come back to it. We are all caught in this idea of progress. Right?

R: We have just come to an agreement on that point, that humanity accepts the fact that progress is a gradual evolution, so as you said, biologically they accept it, and prove it, so they apply the same theory to psychological things. We agree it is the human position.

K: Is that the truth? I may have accepted biological progress, biological evolution, which I have gradually transferred to psychological existence. Now is that the truth.

R: Now I see you are questioning. I don't think it is the truth.

K: Therefore I abandon the whole idea of discipline.

R: Then you see that.

K: No, no.

R: I should have said there is no question of abandoning it. If you abandon it consciously...

K: No, sir, just a minute. I see what human beings have done, which is move from the biological to the psychological, and there they have invented this idea that eventually you will come to the godhead, or evolution, or enlightenment, reach Brahman, or whatever it is, nirvana or paradise, or hell. If when a human being sees the falseness of it, actually not theoretically, then it is finished.

R: Absolutely, that is what I tell you all this time.

K: Why should I then acquire knowledge of scriptures, of this

or that, psychologically?

R: There is no reason.

K: Then why do I read the Buddha?

R: That is what I told you, we are all conditioned.

Bohm: Could I ask a question: do you accept that you are conditioned?

K: Dr.Bohm asks do we all accept that we are conditioned.

R: I don't know whether you accept or not, I accept it.

K: No.

R: And there is nobody in time. To be in time is to be conditioned.

K: No, Dr.Bohm is asking, the implication of his question is - need I translate what you are saying? Go on sir. It's your show now.

B: Well I am really saying that I think that Krishnaji has said, at least in some of our discussions, that he was not deeply conditioned in the beginning and that therefore he had a certain insight that would not be common. Is that fair?

K: Please don't refer to me. I may be a biological freak, so leave me out of it. What we are trying to discuss sir, is this: that psychologically can we admit the truth that there is no movement forward - the truth of it, not the idea of it. You understand?

R: I understand.

K: The truth of it, not I accept the idea of it, the idea is not the truth. So do we as human beings see the truth or the falseness of what we have done?

R: You mean human beings generally?

K: The whole world.

R: No, they don't see it.

K: Therefore when you are telling them, get more knowledge, read this, read that, scriptures, what the Buddha said, what Christ said, if he existed at all, and so on and so on - they are full of this accumulative instinct which will help them to jump, or propel themselves into heaven.

B: When we say we are all conditioned, how do we know that we are all conditioned? That is really what I wanted to say.

K: Yes, his point is, sir, are all human beings conditioned?

R: That is a very complicated question. As far as our society is concerned, all are conditioned. There can't be anybody who is unconditioned because he is within type. But what we are talking about is the realization which has no time, which is unconditioned. But you can't say it is a human being as you take humanity.

B: But I really wanted to emphasize that if we say we are all conditioned there could be two ways. You see, one way could be to accumulate knowledge about our conditioning, to say we observe the common human experience, we can look at people and see they are generally conditioned. Right? The other way would be to say, do we directly see in a more direct way that we are all conditioned. That's really what I was trying to drive at.

R: Of course, I can see there are people who see that.

K: But does that help sir, in this matter? I mean there may be, or there may not be.

B: You see the only point I was trying to make is that if we say we are all conditioned then I think there is nothing else to do but some kind of disciplined or gradual approach. That is you begin with your conditioning.

K: Not necessarily. I don't see that.

B: Well let's try to pursue it. That's the way I take the implication of his question that if we begin all conditioned...

K: ...which we are.

B: ...then what can we do for the next step?

R: There is nothing called 'the next step'.

B: How can we be free of the conditioning as we do whatever we do?

R: The freedom from conditioning is to see.

B: Well, the same question, how do we see?

R: Of course many people have tried various ways.

K: No, no, there are not various ways. The moment you say a way, you have already conditioned him.

R: That is what I say. All that is finished. That is what I say. And you are also conditioning by your talks, your lectures are also conditioning. Trying to uncondition the mind is also conditioning it.

K: No, no, I question that statement, whether what we are talking about conditions the mind - the mind being the brain, the thoughts, the feelings, the whole human psychological existence - whether what K is talking about conditions the mind. I doubt it, I question it.

R: I think...

K: If I may suggest, we are going off from the central issue.

R: The question is how to see it - is that it?

K: No, sir, no. Not 'how', there is no how. First let us see this simple fact, sir: do I, as a human being, and therefore representative of all humanity - I am a human being, right, and



therefore I represent all humanity. Right?

S: In an individual way.

K: No, as a human being, I represent you, the whole world, because I suffer, I go through agony, etc., etc., so does every human being. So do I, as a human being, see the falseness of it, the step human beings have taken, moving from the biological to the psychological, with the same mentality? There progress, from the little to the big and so on and so on, from the wheel to the jet. As a human being, do I see the mischief that human beings have created, moving from there to this? You understand?

R: Yes.

K: Do I see it, as I see the table? Or is it I say, "Yes, I accept the theory of it, the idea of it," and then we are lost. Therefore the idea, the theory is the knowledge.

S: If I see it as this table then it is not a theory any more.

K: It is a fact. But the moment you move away from the fact then it becomes idea, knowledge, and the pursuit of it.

S: And it has further and further pictures.

K: Further away from the fact. I don't know if I am making myself clear.

R: Yes. I guess that is so.

K: What is so? Human beings moving away?

R: Human beings are cornered in that.

K: No, no. Sir, it is a fact, isn't it, that there is biological progress, a little tree to a gigantic tree, from a baby and all the rest of it, boyhood, adolescence. Now we have moved with that mentality, with that idea, with that fact into the psychological field and create there the fact that we progress, which is a false

movement? I wonder if I am making myself clear.

B: Are you saying that is part of the conditioning?

K: No, leave the conditioning for the moment. I don't want to enter into that. Sir, would you say, why have we taken over from the biological growth into the psychological growth, why? Which is a fact, why have we done this?

S: I want to become something.

K: Which is you want satisfaction, safety, certainty, a sense of achievement.

S: And it is in the wanting.

K: So why doesn't a human being see what he has actually done, not theoretically?

S: An ordinary human being.

K: You, I, X, Y.

S: I do not like to see it. I fear it.

K: Therefore you are living in an illusion.

S: Naturally.

K: Why?

S: I want to be something which I fear at the same time not to see. This is where the divide is.

K: You have a false fear, there is no fear. No, madam. when you see what you have done there is no fear.

S: But the fact is, that I usually do not see it.

K: Why don't you see it?

S: I suspect because of fear. I don't know why.

K: You are entering into quite a different field, fear. But I would just like to know as an enquiry, why human beings have done this, played this game for millenia. You understand sir? Why

this living in this false structure, and then people come along and say, be unselfish, be this and all the rest of it - why?

S: All we human beings have a very strong irrational side in us.

K: I question all this. Because we are living not with facts but with ideas and knowledge.

R: Certainly, certainly.

K: Not with facts, the fact is biologically there is, psychologically there isn't. And so we give importance to knowledge, ideas, theories, philosophy, and all the rest of it.

R: You don't agree at all, you don't see at all that a certain development, an evolution, even psychologically?

K: No.

R: A man who has been very undesirable, criminal, telling lies, stealing and all these things - you explain to him certain very fundamental, very elementary things, and he changes into - in our conventional sense - a better man, now he does not steal, now he does not tell lies, he does not like to kill others.

K: He is a terrorist.

R: The man who is changed like that.

K: Are you saying sir, a man who is evil, 'evil' in quotes, the terrorists that are going around the world, what is their future? Are you asking that?

R: Don't you agree a criminal in the accepted sense, you meet a criminal like that, you explain to him the wrong way that he lives, and he realizes what you have said, either because of the ideas he has realized, or because of your personal influence, or whatever it be, he transforms himself, he changes himself.

K: I am not sure, sir. I am not sure. A criminal, in the orthodox

sense of that word, whether you can talk to him at all.

R: That, I don't know.

K: You can pacify him, you know, give him a reward and this and that, but an actual criminally minded man, will he ever listen to any sanity. The terrorist - you know, sir, the terrorists - will he listen to you, to your sanity? Of course not.

R: That you can't say, I don't know. I am not at all positive about it.

K: That is what happening, sir.

R: But until I have more proof I can't say that.

K: I have no proof either, but you can see what is happening.

R: What is happening is that there are terrorists, and we don't know whether any terrorists have transformed and converted into good men. We have no proof.

K: You see that is my whole thing. The bad man evolved into the good man.

R: That in the popular sense and the conventional sense, certainly there is, I can't deny that.

K: I don't quite follow.

R: A bad man...

K: Quotes, 'bad' man.

R: Yes, that's right. A bad man, or a criminal, changing his way of life, and becoming a good man - good also in quotes.

K: Yes, we know that, we have dozens of examples.

R: Don't we accept that at all?

K: But, no, no, wait a minute, sir. Bad man who tells lies, who does cruel things, and so on, probably one day he realizes it is an ugly business, and says, "I'll change and become good", but that is

not goodness. Goodness is not born out of badness.

R: Certainly not.

K: Therefore the bad man, in quotes, can never become the good man, non quotes.

R: No I would quote surely, goodness.

K: Ah, goodness is not the opposite of the bad.

R: At that level it is.

K: At any level.

R: I don't agree.

N: We might put it this way. In the conventional level the bad man becomes the good man. I think we carry that phrase, that attitude to the progress psychologically. That's one thing we do, the human mind does.

R: That is what we were talking about. That is, transfer this idea to the psychological realm.

N: The other thing is, we seem to feel that psychological progress is the only way the bad man becomes the good man at the relative level.

K: I don't want even to... you see you are making it again a relative thing. Sir, may I put it this way: is there an opposite?

N: At the relative level.

K: No, at any level - psychological, of course, you are wearing yellow and I am wearing brown, the opposite night and day, man and woman and so on and so on. But is there an opposite of fear? Is there an opposite of goodness? Is love the opposite of hate?

R: If you ask me...

K: Opposite, which means duality.

R: I would say, we are talking in dualistic terms.

K: All language is dualistic.

R: You can't talk, I can't talk without dualistic approach.

K: Yes, comparing. But I am not talking of that.

R: And at the moment you speak about the absolute, the ultimate... When we talk good and bad we are talking in the dualistic level.

K: No, that's why I want to move away.

R: You can't talk about the absolute in terms of good or bad, there is nothing called absolute good, or bad.

K: No, no. Is courage the opposite of fear? That is, if fear is non-existent is it courage? Or it is something totally different?

S: It is something totally different.

K: Therefore it is the opposite. Goodness is never the opposite of bad. So what are we talking about when we say, "I will move, change, from my conditioning, which is bad, to freedom from my conditioning, which is good"? Therefore freedom is the opposite of my conditioning. Therefore it is not freedom at all. That freedom is born out of my conditioning because I am caught in this prison and I want to be free. It is a reaction to the prison, which is not freedom.

R: I don't quite follow.

K: Sir, could we consider for a minute: is love the opposite of hate?

R: The only thing you can say is, where there is love there is no hate.

K: Ah, no, no. I am asking quite a different question. I am asking, is hate the opposite of affection, love? If it is then in that affection, in that love, there is hate, because it is born out of hate,

out of the opposite. All opposites are born out of their own opposites. No?

R: I don't know. That is what you say.

K: But it is a fact, sir. Look, I am afraid, and I cultivate courage, you know, to put away fear. I take a drink, or you know, all the rest of it, to get rid of fear. And at the end of it I say I am very courageous. All the war heros and all the rest of them are given medals for this because they are frightened. And they say, "We must go and kill", or do something, and they are very courageous, heros.

R: That is not courage.

K: I am saying anything born out of its opposite contains its own opposite.

R: How?

K: Sir, if someone hates you and then says I must love, that love is born out of hate, because he knows what hate is and he says, "I must not be that, but I must be that". So that is the opposite of this. Therefore that opposite contains this.

R: I don't know whether it is the opposite.

K: That is how we live, sir. This is what we do. I am sexual, I must not be sexual. I take a vow of celibacy - not I - people take a vow of celibacy which is the opposite. So they are always caught in this corridor of opposites. And I question the whole corridor. I don't think it exists. We have invented it, but actually it doesn't exist. I mean, please this is explanation, don't accept anything sir.

S: Personally from the way in which I, where I stand at this moment, see it, and I claim no possibilities either for the truth of it, or something, it is a working hypothesis. I see this channel as a

humanizing factor, this channel of opposites, we are caught in it.

K: Oh no, that is not a humanizing factor. That is like saying, 'I have been a tribal entity, now I have become a nation, and then ultimately international' - it is still tribalism going on.

S: No. That I quite agree. I see it in the sense of a really barbaric stage, I could have laughed when you had broken your leg, nowadays I could not laugh any more.

B: I think both of you are saying that we do in some sense make progress, in the sense that we are not as barbaric as we were before. Right?

S: That is what I mean by the humanizing factor.

K: I question whether it is humanizing.

R: I don't like to work in extremes.

K: This is not extremes, this is just facts. Facts are not extremes.

B: Are you saying that this is not a genuine progress. You see in the past people were far more barbaric generally than they are today, and therefore would you say that that really doesn't mean very much?

K: I don't quite follow.

B: Well, some people would point to their past and say there was a great deal of barbarism then.

K: We are still barbarous.

B: Yes, we are, but some people say we are not as barbaric as...

K: Not 'as'.

B: Let's see if we can get it straight. Now would you say that that is not important, that is not significant?

K: No. When I say I am better than I was - it has no meaning.

B: You say that has no meaning to say that.



K: Absolutely.

B: I think we should clarify that.

R: In the relative, dualistic sense I don't accept that. I can't see that. But in the absolute, ultimate sense there is nothing like that.

K: No, not ultimately - I won't even accept that word 'ultimately'. I see how the opposite is born in everyday life, not ultimately. I am greedy, that's a fact. I try to become non-greedy, which is non-fact, but if I remain with the fact, I am greedy, then I can do something about it actually, now. Therefore there is no opposite. Sir, you know violence and non-violence. Non-violence is the opposite of violence, as an ideal. So non-violence is non-fact. Violence is the only fact. Right? So I can then deal with facts, not with non-facts.

R: So what is your point?

K: My point is, there is no duality even in daily life. It is the invention of all these philosophers, intellectuals, who say there is the opposite, work for that. The Utopians, the idealists, the fact is I am violent, that's all, let me deal with that. And to deal with it don't invent non-violence.

S: The question now is: how am I going to deal with it, having accepted the fact that I am violent...

K: Not accepted, it's a fact.

S:... having seen it.

K: Then we can proceed, I'll show you.

S: And the question is how to proceed.

K: We'll proceed with that. Therefore I must see what I have done. I avoid the fact and run away to non-fact. That is what is happening in the world. So don't run but remain with the fact. Can

you do it?

S: It is part of our training. That is precisely the point.

K: I am sorry, I won't accept the word 'training'.

S: Well it is precisely this 'can you do it' and one does it though one very often does not like doing it.

K: No. Of course you can do it. It is like seeing something dangerous and you say, "It's dangerous I won't go near it". Running away from the fact is dangerous. Finished. You don't run away. That doesn't mean you train, you practise not to run, you don't run. I think the gurus have invented this running, the philosophers. Sorry.

R: There is no running away. That is entirely different. It is a wrong way of putting it.

K: No, sir.

R: You can't run away.

K: No, I am saying, look.

R: If you see there is no running in it.

K: I am saying, don't run. Then you see. Don't run, then you see. But we say, "I can't see because I am caught in that".

R: I quite see that, what you say I see very well.

K: So there is no duality.

R: Where?

K: Now in daily life, not ultimately.

R: What is duality?

K: Which is the opposite. Violence and non-violence. The whole of, you know, India has been practising non-violence, which is nonsense. There is only violence, let me deal with that. Let human beings deal with violence, not with the ideal of non-

violence.

R: Yes, that is of course quite a different question.

K: No.

R: We agree, if you see the fact, this is a fact, we must handle this.

K: Therefore there is no progress.

R: That is a word that you can use any way.

K: No, not any way.

R: It is simply a word.

K: No, sir, no sir. When we have an ideal, to achieve that ideal I need time. Right? Therefore I will evolve to that.

R: So?

K: So no ideals. Only facts.

R: What is the difference, what is the argument? We agree there are only facts.

K: Which means, sir, to look at facts time is not necessary.

R: Absolutely not.

K: Therefore if time is not necessary I can see it now.

R: Yes, agreed.

K: You can see it now. Why don't you?

R: Why don't you - that is another question.

K: No, no.

R: Yes.

K: No, not another question.

B: If you take it seriously that time is not necessary then right now one could perhaps clear up the whole thing.

R: Yes, that does not mean all human beings can do it, there are people who can do it.

K: No. If I can see it, you can see it.

R: I don't think so. I don't agree with you.

K: It is not a question of agreement, I am not trying to argue about these matters, so there is no agreement or disagreement. But when we have ideals away from facts time is necessary to get there, progress is necessary. I must have knowledge to progress. All that comes in. Right? So can you abandon ideals?

R: It is possible.

K: Ah, no, the moment you use the word 'possible' time is there.

R: I mean seeing the facts...

K: Do it now, do it sir, not - forgive me, I am not being authoritarian - when you say it is possible you have already moved away.

R: I mean to say, that I must say that everybody can't do it.

K: How do you know?

R: That is a fact.

K: No, I won't accept that.

S: I can perhaps come in with a bit of a concrete example. I think that we can possibly come together on that. If I stand on a high - a concrete fact - on a high springboard over a swimming pool and I cannot swim, and I am told just jump in and relax completely, the water will carry you. This is perfectly true I can swim. There is nothing that prevents me except I am frightened of doing it. That is I think the point in question. And therefore this is I think the question. Of course we can do it, there is no difficulty but there is this basic fear which does not stand to reason that makes us shy away.

K: Please forgive me, I am not talking of that, we are not saying

that. If one realizes that one is greedy, why do we invent non-greed?

S: I wouldn't know because it seems to me so obvious that if I am greedy then I am greedy.

K: Now why do we have the opposite - why? All religions say we mustn't be greedy, all philosophers, if they are worth their salt, say don't be greedy, or something else. Or if you are greedy you will not reach heaven. So they have always cultivated through tradition, through saints, the whole gamut of it, cultivated this idea of the opposite. Right? So I don't accept that. I say that is an escape from this.

S: Which it is. It is a half way stage at best.

K: It is an escape from this. Right? And it won't solve this problem.

S: It hasn't.

K: It hasn't. So to deal with the problem, remove it. I can't have one foot there and one foot here. I must have both my feet here.

S: And if both my feet are here?

K: Wait, no. A simile, a simile. So I have no opposite, which implies time, progress, practice, trying, becoming, the whole gamut of it.

S: So I see I am greedy, or I am violent.

K: Now we have to go into something entirely different. How is one, a human being - not 'how' - can a human being be free of greed now? That's the question. Not eventually. You see I am not interested in being greedy next life, who cares, or the day after tomorrow, I am not interested in it, I want to be free of sorrow, pain, now. So I have no ideals at all. Right sir? Then I have only

this fact, I am greedy. Now do we go into that? What is greed? The very word is condemnatory. Right, sir? The word has been in my mind for centuries, and that word 'greed' immediately condemns the fact. By saying "I am greedy" I have already condemned it. Right? Now can I look at that fact without the word with all its intimations, all its content, with its tradition? Look at it. You cannot understand the depth and the feeling of greed or be free of it if you are caught in words. So as my whole being is concerned with greed it says, "All right I won't be caught in it, I won't use the word greed". Right? Now is that feeling devoid of the word, divorced from the word 'greed'?

S: No, it isn't.

R: It has no word.

S: Please go on.

K: So as my mind is full of words and caught in words, can it look at something, greed, without the word?

R: That is really seeing the fact.

K: Then only I see the fact. Then only I see the fact.

R: Yes, without the word.

K: Therefore it has no value. Finished. This is where the difficulty lies, sir. I want to be free of greed because it is in my blood, my tradition, my upbringing, my education, everything says be free of that ugly thing. So I am all the time making an effort to be free of that. Right? I am not educated, thank god, on those lines. So I say, all right, I have only fact, the fact is I am greedy. Right? I want to understand the nature and the structure of that word, of that feeling. What is it? What is the nature of that feeling? Is it a remembrance? You understand, sir? If it is a remembrance I am

looking at it, the present greed, with past remembrances. The past remembrances have said condemn it. Can I look at it without past remembrances?

S: Exactly.

K: I am going to show you. Right sir?

R: If you can see without - I'll listen, yes.

K: I'll go into it a little more because the past remembrance condemns this and therefore strengthens this. Right? If it is something new, I won't condemn it. But because it is new but made old by remembrances, by memories, by experience, I condemn it. So can I look at it without the word, without the association of words? That doesn't need discipline, that doesn't need practice, that doesn't need some guide, just to say, can I look at it without the word. Can I look at that tree, woman, man, sky, heaven, without the word and find out? But someone comes along and tells me, "I'll show you how to do it", then I am lost. And 'how to do it' is the whole sacred books. Sorry. All the gurus, all the bishops, the popes, the whole of it.

So do we stop now?

N: Yes, sir, I think we stop now.

K: By Jove, we have been talking an hour and a half.

R: It depends on you. I am very much interested, I am not tired at all.

K: We had better keep it for tomorrow morning and afternoon. Don't let's overeat.

R: There are several other things that I would like to ask you tomorrow morning and afternoon.

N: Tomorrow we meet at 11.30.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 23RD JUNE 1978 2ND CONVERSATION WITH PROF. BOHM, MR. NARAYAN AND TWO BUDDHIST SCHOLARS**

K: Yes, you wanted to start.

Rahula: This morning and afternoon I want to ask you one or two things to clarify. And for a long time these questions were on my mind, and very often I thought of you, to meet you and to discuss these things, not in a place like this but privately between you and me, but it was not possible and now ultimately I am grateful to Mr. Narayan for arranging this. We continued yesterday about something, I think you were getting at the last thing about greed and as a bad thing, the idea is given by words, but if you see it without the word it may not be the same thing. And of course that is quite so, because the thing itself has no word when you see the thing. In Buddhist terminology there are three levels of knowledge: one is that we get wisdom, self-knowledge through learning, the books, the teacher; then there is further development, the wisdom that you get by thinking, meditating according to that, your knowledge, still within words, it is still within language; but the highest wisdom goes beyond words, it has no word, it has no name, it has no terminology. That means that you see the thing without a word. I think that is what you meant when you said, when you see the thing, all our reflections, accumulated meanings disappear. That is how I understood it. I don't know whether that is what you meant.

K: Perhaps we will go into it, sir, but you also said you would like to ask some other questions.



R: That's right. That is very interesting. I am very grateful to you.

K: Not at all, sir.

R: These are things which have been on my mind for a long time. Sir, you know the words arhat, in Buddhist terminology. Arhat is the one who realized the truth, who is liberated, who is free, and that is a very well known term. And the question was put to the Buddha, very often, by his disciples, and by various people, what happens to an arhat after his death? And then that man asked, "Does he exist after his death?" The Buddha said, "No." "Then he does not exist." The Buddha said, "No." "Then he exists and does not exist." Buddha said, "No." "Then he does not exist, nor not exist. These are the four corners." He said, "No. None of those terms exist or does not exist, is or is not, can be applied to that state." All those terms, relative, dualistic terms, are used only within our knowledge, within our experience, within empirical world. But this is beyond that, therefore you can't apply any of those words. This answer is everywhere, in many places he was asked these questions, and what do you say to this? He said you can't exist, or not exist.

K: Could we talk over together, sir, what is living and what is dying, and what is the state of the mind that is dead, or in the process of dying? Could my putting it that way be a help to answering the question?

R: I don't know.

K: You see, after all arhat is known also I believe in Indian thought, Hindu thought, because, not that I have read any books but I have discussed. Human beings right throughout the world, as

far as one can make out, are always enquiring or believing into what is death, is there life after death, is there a continuity, and if there is no continuity what is the point of living at all? Life is such a dreadful affair anyhow with a lot of trouble, anxieties, fears, and so on, if there is no reward for living properly, correctly, what is the point of being good, kind, noble, etc? Could we approach your question from that point of view? Or do you want to ask what is the state of a mind that has no self whatsoever?

R: That's right, that is an arhat.

K: That is what I want to get at.

R: That's right.

K: Yes. Could we go into that, that way?

R: I think that is a good approach, because that is an arhat who has no self whatsoever.

K: Is that possible? We are enquiring.

R: Yes.

K: I am not saying it is, or it is not, we are enquiring, I am not saying it is, or it is not, we are enquiring, proceeding through exploration and finding out, not believing or not believing.

So what is the self? The name, the form - just a minute, sir, let me enquire, we are enquiring. The form, the body, the organism, the name, the name identifies itself with the body, certain characteristics identifying itself with the 'me' - I am strong, I am weak, I have got a good character, I am not bad. So the characteristic is identified by thought as the 'me'. The tendency is identified by thought as the 'me'. The experiences, the accumulated knowledge is identified by thought as the 'me', and the 'me' is that which I possess - my property, my house, my furniture, my wife,

my books. All that, the violence, the pleasure, the fear, the agonies, all that with the name, with the form, constitutes the self. So what is the root of the self? Is the root of the self the acquired experiences - I am enquiring, sir - the acquired experiences - we are enquiring into the very root of it, not the mere expressions of it. Right sir? I want to laugh a bit!

R: Yes, that is very important.

K: So the whole process of identification - my house, my name, my possessions, what I will be, the success, the power, the position, the prestige, the identification process is the essence of the self. If there is no identification is there the self? You understand sir?

R: Yes, I follow.

K: So can this identification come to an end? Which is, the identification is the movement of thought. If thought didn't say, that is my furniture, identifying itself with that, because it gives it pleasure, position, security, all that, so the root of the self is the movement of thought.

R: Yes.

K: So death is the ending of that movement. Or is death a continuity of that movement into the next life? You understand?

R: Quite.

K: Arhat, or the liberated man, why should he wait until the end, till he reaches that which is called death? So, when we realize the very root of the self is the movement of thought in time, in distance, from here to there, and all the conflicts, miseries, confusions, created by thought - right sir - is the self. So when thought comes to an end that is a form of death while living.

R: Yes.

K: Now, can thought come to an end? To bring that about, or wanting thought to end, we meditate, we practice, we are aware, we go through all the tortures of so-called meditation. Right sir? Would you agree to that.

R: Popular religion.

K: No, no. You see - please sir, if I may point out, the ordinary man is not interested in all this. Right? He wants his beer, whatever he wants, he is not interested in all this, because, perhaps wrong education, social conditions, economic position, environmental influences, and maybe the religions have helped to keep the man down there, popular, the elite are somewhere else - the pope, the cardinals - you follow? So I wouldn't, if I may point out sir, I wouldn't say popular. It is the human tendency, that is all we are talking about. Every human being has identified himself and so conditioned himself with something or other, with god, with nirvana, with moksha, with heaven, with paradise and so on. Now while living can that death, which is the end of thought, take place? Not at the end of one's life which then is a graveyard renunciation. It has no meaning.

R: I agree when you said it is not necessary to wait until the end of your life, at the death, and Buddha pointed out the same thing. When this question was put to him, the question was asked also what will happen to the Buddha after his death. He asked the disciple, "What is Buddha? Is it this body?" - like you said, the name, the form, all this. Exactly what you said, in Buddhist terminology is called the kamarupa.

K: In Sanskrit too.

R: And the disciple said, no. Then you can't pin-point the Buddha even now, living, then how can you say after death?

K: Sir, if I may ask, I hope you don't think me impudent - why do we bring in the Buddha? We are talking as human beings.

R: Just because I raised the question from the Buddha's point of view.

K: Ah, no, as a human being I want to know what happens after death. Or what is the significance of death. Or can one live in daily life not as a monk, as a saint, all that stuff, daily life, without the self?

R: Of course my question was not that. The person who has realized the truth, who has become liberated, free, to him, what happens. That is the question.

K: I would never ask that question, because he might say this happens, or he might say that happens, or nothing happens. Then it becomes a theory to me, which is an idea.

R: I wanted from you a little more than that.

K: Ah, you want from me.

R: Not a theory.

K: If you want it from this person who is talking you have to enquire as he is enquiring. And therefore he asks, is it possible to live in daily life, not at the end of one's existence, in daily life without this identification process which brings about the structure and the nature of the self, which is the result of thought? Can the movement of thought end while I am living? That is the question, rather than what happens when I die. The 'me' is merely a movement of thought. Thought itself is very limited. Right? It is a piece in a vast movement, it is a small piece, broken up. So as long

as thought, limited, a broken up thing, a fragment, whatever it creates will still be limited, broken up, fragmentary. Right? So can a human being, you or I or any of us, can we live without the movement of thought, which is the essence of the self? Suppose I say, yes, it can be done - what value has it to you?

Schoegel: Once that identification is really broken - once that identification of thought and 'me' is really broken...

K: Ah, no, not broken, end.

S: That is what I mean, ended.

K: When you break something it can continue. It is an ending.

S: It can never come back in the same way again, it is an irrevocable ending.

K: All I am saying is, suppose the speaker, this person says, yes, it is possible, I know it is possible, then what? What value has it to you?

S: That is what personally I hope we can discuss.

K: I am coming to that. What value is that to you? Either you accept it; or you say, don't be silly, and walk away, as it is not possible, and you leave it. But if you want to enquire and say, look, is it possible, let's find out - not as an idea but as an actuality in daily life. Right? Somebody join us!

Narayan: Dr.Rahula, we have been talking in this context of the value of Buddhist meditation, preparation, practice, mindfulness. What is the value of all those things that are mentioned in the Buddhist literature, which is practised as a very important thing in relation to the ending of thought?

R: Ending of thought, or self?

N: Mindfulness, let us say.

R: Mindfulness, or rather presence of awareness - a sense of mindfulness. Yes, satybhata has many aspects, not only one but the most important thing is the mindfulness, awareness in everything. Even now what we do here is a meditation, it is not sitting with legs crossed like a statue under a tree, or in a cave, that is no meditation, that is only an exercise externally. Many people take it as the meditation. What we do here nobody would think we were meditating. But to me this is the deepest sort of meditation, also given in the satybhata, this is called dharmapassana, to see, or to follow, or to observe, or to be aware of various subjects, topics, things, doctrines, things like that, various things, that is the intellectual side of it. Then there is also meditation being mindful of everything you do, whatever you do, eating, drinking, or going about, talking, everything is mindfulness. And all that leads to what he says.

N: It leads to.

R: It leads to what he says.

N: That is the thing I really want to get at.

R: To end the thought process of self.

N: Yes.

K: Sir, I hope you don't think me impudent or irreverent to what the Buddha said. I personally haven't read all these things. I don't want to read a thing about all this. They may be correct, or not correct, they may be under illusion or not under illusion, they may have been put together by disciples, and what the disciples do with their gurus is appalling - twist everything. So I say, look, I don't want to start with somebody telling me what to do, or what to think. I have no authority. So I say, look, as a human being,

suffering, going through agonies, sex and mischief, and terror, and all the rest of it, in enquiring into all that I come to the point, which is thought. That's all. I don't have to know all the literature in the world, which will only condition further thinking. So forgive me for putting it that way: I brush all that aside. We have done this - Christians, I have met Christians, Benedictine monks, Jesuits, great scholars, always quoting, quoting, quoting, believing this is so, this is not so. You understand sir? I hope you don't think I am irreverent

R: Not at all. I fully agree with you and that is my attitude as well. I am talking to examine it.

K: You see I only start with what is a fact, for me. What is a fact, not according to some philosophers and religious teachers and priests, a fact - I suffer, I have fear, I have sexual demands. How am I to deal with all these tremendously complex things which make my life and I am so utterly miserable, unhappy. From there I start, not from what somebody said, that means nothing. You follow, sir? I am not belittling, forgive me, the Buddha, I wouldn't.

R: That, I know, I know you have the highest respect for the Buddha. But we have the same attitude and I want to examine it with you. That is why I put the question.

K: No, sir, not quite, sir, forgive me for saying so, not quite. I start with something which is common to all of us. Right? Not according to the Buddha, not according to some Christian god or Hindu or some group, to me all that is totally irrelevant, they have no place because I suffer, I want to find out to end it, or must I carry on for the rest of my life - this agony, this brutality, this sexual perversion, or sexual desires, you know, all the rest of it.



Right sir? So I see the root of all this confusion, uncertainty, insecurity, travail, effort, the root of this is the self, the 'me'. Right sir? Now is it possible to be free of the 'me' which produces all this chaos, both outwardly, politically, religiously, economically and all the rest of it, and also inwardly, this constant struggle, constant battle, constant effort? So I am asking, can thought end? So thought has no future - that which ends then has a totally different beginning, not the beginning of the 'me', ending and picking up again later. Right sir?

In what manner can thought end? That's the problem. The Buddha must have talked about it. Right sir? I don't think Christianity, as far as I know, has touched this point. They said, give yourself to God, Christ, abandon yourself to him. But the self goes on. They haven't gone into this at all, only the Hindus and the Buddhists have done so, and perhaps some others. So can this thought end? Then the priest comes along and says, yes it can end, only identify yourself with Christ, with the Buddha - you follow? Identify, forget yourself.

R: That is the Christian attitude.

K: Christian, also part of the Hindu.

R: But not Buddhism. I must defend it.

K: I know.

N: I believe a great deal of Buddhist thought has degenerated into this.

R: Yes, yes, of course, degenerated, that is certain schools of thought, but I mean to say according to the Buddha's teaching.

K: You see.

S: Shall we say it is human nature to lean on something, and

this is what automatically happens and this is what we are trying to get away from.

K: So here I am, an ordinary human being, fairly educated, not according to schools, colleges, fairly educated, has observed what the world is going through and he says, "I am the world, I am not different from the world, because I suffer, I have created this monstrous world, my parents, my grandparents, everybody's parents, created this". Right sir? So how is it possible for thought to end? Some people say, yes, which is to meditate, control, suppress.

S: No, no.

K: Wait. I said some people madam.

S: I beg your pardon.

K: Some people have said, suppress it, identify the self with the highest, which is still the movement of thought. Some people have said, burn out all the senses. Right sir? They have done it, fast, do everything for this thing. So somebody comes along like me and says, effort is the very essence of the self. Right? Do we understand that? Or has it become an idea, and we carry that idea out? You understand what I am talking about? I don't know if I am making myself clear.

N: If you say effort is the very essence of the self, is there again a preparation, an initial training to come to that situation? Or does one come to it effortlessly?

S: If I have understood you and please correct me if not, you mean that the very effort that I make to come to it, that in itself is already contributing to my delusion?

K: To the maker of the effort, who has already identified with

something greater, and is making an effort to reach it. It is still the movement of thought.

S: And it is still a bargaining - if I do this, or if this happens, then I will get that.

K: So how do you, if I may ask, listen - listen? How do you listen?

S: Listen?

K: A person like me says, effort of any kind only strengthens the self. Now how do you receive that statement?

S: I am entirely in agreement.

K: No, not agreement, or disagreement. How do you listen to it?

S: Let it impinge.

K: No, no.

Bohm: Do we listen in the same way we have made identifications, that is in general we listen through the past, through our previous ideas, through what we know?

S: That must be.

B: Is that right?

S: If one can open out and just listen.

K: Ah, no. When you eat, you are eating because you are hungry. The stomach receives the food, there is no idea of receiving the food. So can you listen - listen - without the idea of receiving, or accepting, or denying, or arguing, just listen to a statement? It may be false, it may be true, but just listen to it. Can you do it?

S: I would say yes.

K: Then if you so listen, what takes place?

S: Nothing.

K: No, madam, don't say immediately, nothing. What takes place? I listen to a statement that thought is the root of the self. After carefully explaining the mood of thought which identifies itself with the form, with the name, with this and that and the other thing. So after explaining very carefully, it is said that thought is the very root of the self. Now how do we receive, listen to the truth of that fact, that thought is the root of the self? Is it an idea, a conclusion, or is it an absolute, irrevocable fact?

R: If you ask me, it is a fact. You see I listen to it, receive it. I see it.

K: Are you listening as a Buddhist - forgive me for putting it that way?

R: I don't know.

K: No, you must know.

R: I am not identifying anything at all. I am not listening to you as a Buddhist or a non-Buddhist.

K: I am asking you, sir, are you listening as a Buddhist - just a minute - are you listening as a person who has read a great deal about the Buddha, and what the Buddha has said and so comparing - just a minute - and so you have gone away from listening. Right? So are you listening - I am not being personal, sir, forgive me - are you listening?

R: Oh, you can be quite free with me - I won't misunderstand you and you won't misunderstand me.

K: No, no. I don't mind you misunderstanding me at all. I can correct it. Are you listening to the idea, to the words, and the implications of those words, or are you listening without any sense of verbal comprehension, which you have gone through quickly,

and you say, yes, I see the absolute truth of that?

R: That is what I said.

K: Do you?

R: Yes.

K: No, Sir. Then it is finished. It is like seeing something tremendously dangerous, it is over, you don't touch it. I wonder if you see it.

S: Why not touch it?

B: It seems to me there is a tendency to listen through the word, as you say, and that word identifies, and that identification still goes on while one thinks one is listening. This is the problem. It is very subtle.

R: In other words, it is listening you use the word in seeing, in that sense.

K: No. Sir, I listen. When you say something to me, what the Buddha has said, I listen. I say, he is just quoting from what Buddha has said, but he is not saying something I want to know. He is telling me about the Buddha, but I want to know what you think, not what Buddha thought, because then we are establishing a relationship between you and me, and not between you, Buddha and me? I wonder if you see that.

R: That also means you were listening...

K: I was listening to what you were saying about Buddha. Just listening. I don't know. You are quoting, probably what you are quoting was perfectly so, you are quoting probably correctly and so on, but you are not revealing yourself to me and I am revealing myself to you. Therefore we have a relationship through the Buddha, not direct relationship. I love my dog and you like that

dog too, but you like that dog and our relationship is based on that dog. I don't know if I am making myself clear. I am not comparing Buddha to the dog!

S: May I try to say what you are trying - not trying - what you are looking for is our personal experiential response.

K: No, your personal experience is also the experience of everybody else, it is not personal.

S: Though it is individually rendered.

K: If you and I suffer it is suffering, not my suffering and your suffering. But when there is identification with suffering there is my suffering. And I say, I must be free of it. But as human beings in the world we suffer. We are going off somewhere else.

B: It seems to me this question of identification is the main one, it is very subtle, in spite of all that you have said, identification still goes on.

K: Of course.

B: It seems to be built into us.

S: And this raises a question whether that identification can be ended - if I understood rightly.

B: Identification prevented listening freely, openly, because one listens through the identification.

K: What does identification mean? Why do human beings identify themselves with something - my car, my house, my wife, my children, my country, my god, my - you follow? Why?

S: To be something, perhaps.

K: Let's enquire why. Not only identify with outward things, but also inwardly identify with my experience, identify with experience and say, this is my experience. Why do human beings

go through this all the time?

B: At one stage you said we identify with our sensations, for example, our senses, and this seems very powerful. What would it be not to identify with our sensations?

K: Yes. So when one listens, am I listening to identify myself with that fact about which he is talking, or there is no identification at all and therefore I am capable of listening with a totally different ear? Am I hearing with the ears of my hearing, or am I hearing with total attention? You understand sir? Am I listening with total attention? Or, my mind is wandering off and says, "Oh my goodness, this is rather boring, and what is she talking about?" - or he - and so I am off. But can I attend so completely that there is only the act of listening and nothing else, no identification, no saying, yes, that is a good idea, bad idea, that's true, that's false, which are all processes of identification, but without any of those movements can I listen? When I do so listen, then what? The truth that thought is the essence of the self, and the self creates all this misery, is finished. I don't have to meditate, I don't have to practise, it is over when I see the danger of these things. So can we listen so completely that there is the absence of the self? And one says, can I see, observe something without the self - which is my country, I love that sky, it is a beautiful sky - and all the rest of that. So please.

So the ending of thought, which is the ending, or cutting at the very, very root of the self - a bad simile, but take that - when there is such active, attentive, non-identifying attention, then does the self exist? I need a suit, why should there be identification in getting a suit? I get it, there is getting it. So the active listening

implies listening to the senses. Right sir? To my taste, the whole sensory movement. I mean you can't stop the senses, then you would be paralysed. But the moment I say, "That's a marvellous taste, I must have more of that", begins the whole identification.

B: It seems to me that that is the general condition of mankind, to be identifying with the senses. Now how are we going to change that?

K: That is the whole problem sir. Mankind had been educated, conditioned for millenia to identify with everything - my guru, my house, my god, my country, my king, my queen, and all the horror that goes on.

B: You see with each one of those there is a sensation.

K: It is a sensation, which you call experience.

R: So we should come to our point.

K: Yes, which is?

R: The one that we began.

K: When the self ends - it can end, obviously, it is only the most ignorant and most highly burdened, and people with knowledge, and identifying themselves with knowledge and all that, when there is the ending of the self, what takes place? Not at the end of my life, not when the brain becomes deteriorated, when the brain is very, very active, quiet, alive, what then takes place, when the self is not? Now, how can you find out, sir? Say, X has ended the self completely, not picks it up in the future, another day, but ends it completely, he says, yes, there is a totally different activity which is not the self. What good is that to me, or to any of us? He says, yes, it can end, it is a different world altogether, different dimension, not a sensory dimension, not an intellectual projected



dimension, something totally different. I say he must be either a cuckoo, a charlatan, or a hypocrite, but I want to find out, not because he says so, but I want to find out. Can I, as a human being, living in this tremendously ugly, brutal, violent world, economically, socially, morally and all the rest of it, live without the self? I want to find out. And I want to find out not as an idea, I want to do it, it's my passion. Then I begin to enquire, why is there identification with the form, with the name - it is not very important whether you are K or W or Y. So you examine this very, very carefully not to identify yourself with anything, with sensation, with ideas, with a country, with an experience. You understand sir? Can you do it? Not vaguely and occasionally but something you have got to do with passion, with intensity, to find out.

That means I must put everything in its right place. Right? Because I have to live, to have food, I don't have to identify myself with that or that food, I eat the correct food, and it's finished, therefore it has its right place. But there are all the bodily demands, sex, put it in its right place. Who will tell me to put it in the right place? You understand sir? My guru, the pope, any scripture? If they do I identify myself with them because they are giving me help to put things in the right place, which is sheer nonsense. Right sir? The pope can't tell me, sex has its right place, and he says, don't divorce, marry, your marriage is with god - all that. And I am stuck. Why should I obey the pope, or the guru, or scriptures, or the politicians? So I have to find out what is the right place for sex, or money. Right sir? What is the right place? How shall I find out what is the right place for sex, which is one of the most powerful,

urgent physical demands, which the religious people say, cut, destroy it. Right sir? Suppress it, take a vow against it and all the rest of it. I say, sorry, that doesn't mean a thing to me. So I want to find out what is its right place. How shall I find out? I have got the key to it. Right? Which is, non-identification with sensation, that is the key of it. Right sir? So non-identification with sensation, which is translated in modern experience - I must experience sex. Right? So that is, identification with sensation makes the self. So is it possible not to identify with sensations? - yes sensations, I am hungry, but sex is a little more powerful. So I have got the key to it, the truth of it. Right sirs? So I feel secure, all right. Non-identification, that is the truth of it. If I really see the truth of it then sex, money, everything has its right place.

R: In other words, you can see, you must see, or you see without the self.

K: Ah, no, no.

R: Identification is self.

K: No, there is the truth that identification with sensation, with this, or that, builds the structure of the self. Right? Is that an absolute, irrevocable, passionate, lasting truth? Or is it just an idea which I have accepted, yes, it's true, and I can change that idea tomorrow? But this thing is irrevocable. One must have money - money gives me freedom, money gives you freedom to do what you like, freedom, sex, if you want it, money gives you a sense of travelling, power, position - you know, all the rest of it. So non-identification with money. You follow?

B: And that means the end of desire for anything.

K: No, desire has very little meaning. But it doesn't mean I am a

dead vegetable.

B: Are you saying identification gives desire excessive meaning?

K: Of course.

So having put everything in its right place - I don't put it, it happens because I have seen the truth of this thing so everything falls in its right place.

R: Right.

K: No, I can't say yes, right or wrong.

R: No, no, I see what you say.

K: Then what place has thought? You understand, sir? What place has thought? Has it any place at all? Obviously when I am talking I am using words, the words are associated with memory and so on and so on, so there is thinking there - not with me, there is very little thinking as I am talking, don't let's go into that. So thought has a place. Right sir? When I have to catch a train, when I have to go to the dentist, when I go to do something, thought has its place. And it has no place psychologically when there is the identifying process taking place. Right? I wonder if you see.

N: Are you implying that because there is no thought the identifying process has lost its strength?

K: No, it hasn't lost its strength.

N: Or it doesn't happen at all.

K: We said just now, that having the key, or living with the fact, living with the truth that identification brings about the structure and the nature of the self, which creates all the innumerable problems, seeing the truth, living that truth - living, it's in my brain, in my throat, in my gullet, it's part of my blood - seeing the truth of

that, that truth is there. And so thought has its right place. I have put money, sex - not I.

S: It falls into its place.

K: I want to go further into this.

N: If the insight, the passion, the truth, is powerful enough...

K: No, you see you are using the word 'powerful'.

N: Yes, I am using it.

K: No, it is not powerful.

N: It has its own strength.

K: No, you can't use those words.

N: Now if it has no strength thought asserts itself.

K: No, no, it is not strength.

B: You are saying it is identification that makes thought do all the wrong things.

K: That's right. Identification has made thought do the wrong things.

B: It would be all right otherwise.

K: Otherwise thought has its place.

B: But when you say no identification, you mean the self is empty, that it has no content, doesn't it?

K: There are only sensations.

B: Sensations but they are not identified.

K: Not identified.

N: Through thought.

K: Not identified.

B: They are just going on, do you mean?

K: Yes, sensations are going on.

B: Outside or inside.

K: Inside.

N: And you are also implying there is no slipping back.

K: Of course not. When you see something most dangerous, you don't slip back or go forward, it is dangerous. Sir then is that death? That is the question we began with.

R: Yes, yes.

K: Is that death? Death as we know it, that is the brain cells, etc., etc., die. Right? The body deteriorates, there is no oxygen and all the rest of it. So it dies. Sensations die with it. Right? Now where am I?

B: Sensations, you say, die with the body. There is no sensation.

K: No sensation. Right? Now is there a living with the sensation fully awakened - they are awakened, they are alive, but the non-identifying with sensation deprives, wipes away the self. We said that. Now what is death? Is it possible to live a daily life with death, which is the ending of the self?

R: Yes.

K: I am not questioning. Go on, somebody talk for a little while.

R: I follow it.

N: Would you say there is a great deal of talk about insight - insight meditation, vipassana - is insight a thing we can use and doesn't slip back? Is insight that quality?

R: Exactly what he is saying now is the insight meditation. What he is telling now is the insight meditation.

N: No, I am asking, does insight endure without reference to time?

K: Don't use the words 'endure', 'last'.

N: All insight is a momentary process.

K: The moment you have an insight it is finished.

N: Finished, yes.

R: Once you see it, finished.

K: I have an insight into the whole nature of the self. I have an insight.

R: Exactly that is what he says.

N: It is complete.

R: In itself it is complete and there is no coming back.

N: Otherwise it is not insight.

R: You have seen it, and you know it and there is no slipping back, no coming back.

S: Who has seen it? With those words we always into trouble.

R: No, this is only the language. There is no see-er apart from seeing.

N: There is no see-er apart from seeing.

B: Would you say the insight transforms the person?

K: That is what we were discussing the other day - the insight transforms not only the state of the mind but the brain cells themselves undergo a change.

R: Absolutely.

B: Therefore the brain cells being in a different state behave differently, it is not necessary to repeat the insight.

R: The whole system changes with that.

K: Be careful, sir, don't - either it is so, or it is not so. So I am left with this now: I am left with the question of what is death. Is the ending of the self death? Death in the ordinary accepted sense of the word. It is not, obviously, because the blood is circulating, the brain is working, the heart is pumping, and all the rest of it.

B: It is still alive.

K: It is alive but the self is non-existent because there is no identification of any kind. This is a tremendous thing. Non-identification with anything, with experience, with belief, with a country, with ideas, with ideals, wife, husband, love, no identification at all. Is that death? People who call that death say, my god, if I don't identify myself with my something or other, why I am nothing. So they are afraid of being nothing. Then identify. But nothingness, which is not a thing, you understand sir, not a thing, therefore it is quite a different state of mind. Now that is death. While there is living, sensations, the heart beating, the blood circulating, breathing, the brain active, undamaged - our brains are damaged.

B: Can this damage be healed? Is it possible to heal the damage?

K: Insight, that is what I want to get at. Our brains are damaged. For thousands of years we have been hurt psychologically, inwardly, and that hurt is part of our brain cells, remembered hurts, the propaganda for two thousand years that I am a Christian, that I believe in Jesus Christ, which is a hurt; or I am a Buddhist - you follow sir - that is a hurt. So our brains are damaged. To heal that damage is to listen very carefully, to listen, and in the listening to have an insight into what is being said, and therefore there is immediately a change in the brain cells. Therefore there is no identification, complete and total. And then is that love? You see I question this, sir. There is a great talk about compassion, isn't there, in the Buddhist literature. Be compassionate, don't kill, don't hurt. What place has love in compassion? To love a man or a

woman, or a dog, or a piece of stone, a stray cat, to love something, the clouds, the trees, what place - or the nature, anything, love, the house put together by architects, a beautiful thing, the bricks, to love it, which is non-identifying with the bricks, with the house. The dying while living is that love in which there is no attachment.

R: That is so.

K: So then what place has love - loving a woman, a man, you understand, not identifying, please identifying with the sensations of sex with a woman, or with a man, and yet to love that person. When there is that love, that love is not the woman whom I love, it is global love. I wonder if you see.

R: Yes.

K: Don't agree, sir.

R: No, not agree, I see it.

K: What place has that quality with compassion? Or is compassion the same as love?

R: No.

N: Why do you say no?

R: Compassion is only for the suffering people. Love, there is no discrimination, whereas compassion is directed towards those who are suffering.

N: You make that distinction between compassion and love.

R: Yes.

N: Is it in the Buddhist language?

R: Karuna is compassion and love is maitri, it is more than compassion.

K: Sir, does one love without identification, which implies no self, no attachment?



R: That is the true love.

K: No, I am asking you, you as a human being, not as a Buddhist, as a human being without identification with your senses and so on and so on, do you love a woman or a man, or a child, or the sky or a stone, or a stray dog without identifying? They all suffer - the woman suffers, the man suffers, the dog has a terrible life, a stray dog, chased and kicked. And when there is no identification do you love that dog, or do you have compassion for that dog? Is compassion an idea - I must have compassion for the suffering, for the poor, for the demented?

B: I still think the question is, is there love for somebody who is not suffering? Suppose there is somebody who is not suffering.

K: Suppose somebody is frightfully happy, because he writes good books, or thrillers and gets a lot of money, says, jolly good luck.

B: I didn't mean that exactly. You could say that he was suffering underneath.

K: That's what I am questioning.

B: But would there be love if there were no suffering? You know if mankind were to be free of it.

K: Would there be love without suffering. Or, are you saying, a human being must go through suffering to have love?

B: Well not necessarily.

K: You see when you put it that way, that is what it implies, doesn't it.

B: Well you could say one point that there could be love whether there is suffering or not. And the other is compassion, the way the Buddhists use it, is that is only for suffering

K: I question that.

N: I didn't quite feel that karuna, compassion, was only for those who were suffering. I think it has a wider quality than that.

R: No, there are four qualities called Brahma Viharas, these supreme qualities - maitri, karuna, mudita, upekkha. Maitri embraces suffering and not suffering; karuna embraces only suffering, mudita is directed towards the happy people, happiness, in the world there is no such sympathetic joy; upekkha is equanimity. These four qualities are called the Brahma Viharas, the supreme, divine qualities. And that classification when you use the word love it is much bigger.

K: No, I haven't come to compassion yet, sir. I just want to know as a human being, do I love somebody - the dog, the chimney, the clouds, that beautiful sky, without identifying? Not as a theory but fact. I don't want to delude myself in theories, or in ideas, I want to know if I love that man or woman or that child, or that dog, without saying, "It is my dog" - my wife, my house, my brick - actually not abstraction.

S: If I can be quite sure the 'I' is gone, as long as I feel 'I' is acting as self, I cannot do it.

K: No, madam. We said the truth is the identification breeds the self which causes all the trouble, miseries.

S: And if that is seen.

K: I said that, it is an absolute, irrevocable reality, it is in my blood, I can't get rid of my blood, it is there.

S: Then I cannot help but love.

K: No, no. You are all too quick.

S: I beg your pardon.

K: Not, "I cannot help loving" - do you?

R: If you see it.

K: No, no. Do you see the truth, the truth of that, that identification is the root of the self, with thought and all the rest of it? That is an absolute fact, like a cobra, like a dangerous animal, like a precipice, like taking deadly poison. So there is no identification, absolutely, when you see the danger. Then what is my relationship to the world, to nature, to my woman, man, child? When there is no identification is there indifference, callousness, brutality - say, "I don't identify" and put your nose in the air?

R: That would be very selfish.

K: No, not selfish. Is this what is going to happen?

R: No.

K: No, sir, you can't just say, no. Why not? It will happen if it is intellectual.

S: It is not truth.

K: I have an ideal.

R: That is what I said, you have not seen then.

K: No. I am asking, sir, is this non-identification an ideal, a belief, an idea which I am going to live with and therefore my relationship to the dog, to the wife, to the husband, to the girl, or whatever it is becomes very superficial, casual. It is only when the truth that identification is absolutely cut out of one's life, there is no callousness then - because that is real.

We haven't solved the question of death yet. It is five minutes past one and we have to stop for lunch.

R: And in the afternoon I have some more questions, a list of things.

K: Let's go through them.

R: And these have been working in my mind for a long time.

K: Let's do it.

R: I want to discuss them with you and there is one session only we have this afternoon.

K: Do you want some more sessions?

R: Not possible today because we are going to have lunch.

K: This afternoon we are going to meet, but after today?

N: Dr. Rahula said he would like to stay back on Saturday, if it is possible. But Dr. Schloegel is going back this evening.

K: So we can meet today, this afternoon sir and we will see.

R: We will see how it works. If it is not possible today we will meet some other time. But you are going away.

K: Yes, I am going away on Tuesday. We will see.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 23RD JUNE 1978 3RD CONVERSATION WITH PROF. BOHM, MR. NARAYAN AND TWO BUDDHIST SCHOLARS**

Narayan: I am suggesting that Dr. Rahula puts all the questions that he has noted down so that in the course of the discussion we can cover most of the ground. And I have also got one or two things to say. I would like also to put it so that the discussion can centre round the questions.

Rahula: Why not put your question first?

N: My question is, in the Buddhist philosophy as coming from Nairanjana, probably the greatest thinker, second century: he talked a great deal about shunyata, void and it has a very close association with insight. And I believe the whole of later Buddhist thought owes its strength to this Nairanjana idea of shunyata as being something which is pure, pristinal. And there is no insight without shunyata. I will put it that way. And then he also said without understanding the outer there is no possibility of going to the inner. Then he also made a statement which seems to be fallacious: samsara is nirvana, and nirvana is samsara.

K: Sir, you are using Sanskrit words, perhaps some of us may understand each other but you must explain it.

N: Samsara is worldly life with all its travail, suffering and dukkha, sorrow, with all its sorrow. Nirvana is a state of freedom, bliss, liberation. He said samsara is nirvana, and nirvana is samsara. And this is explained by the Buddhist scholars through (?), the whole thing is interrelated, conditioned co-ordination. So this has a very powerful influence over the Buddhist thought today,

as I understand it. And I would like this to be examined in the context of what we have been talking about.

K: I haven't understood the statement.

N: The first thing is the importance of shunyata.

K: What do you mean by that word shunyata?

R: From the Buddhist point of view I will explain. Shunyata literally means voidness, void, emptiness.

K: Nothingness. I know the meaning.

R: That is the literal meaning. But the significance is that it is attributed by western Buddhist scholars mostly to Nairanjana. That is incorrect. It is the Buddha who said this first and Nairanjana as a great thinker, philosopher, developed it into a system. Whereas Buddha said it in a very simple way. And Ananda who was Buddha's nearest associate, companion, disciple, asked one day, "Sir, it is said the world is sunyata, empty, what does it mean, to what extent is it sunyata?" He said, "Ananda, it is without self" - he used the word, atman - "without self and anything pertaining to self, therefore it is sunyata". It is very clearly explained. In many other places he told a man, "See the world as shunyata and you are liberated". And these are the original statements. Nairanjana took these ideas and developed them by his dependent origination, I would rather call it conditioned genesis, and on that philosophy, that is everything is interdependent, relative, nothing is absolute, everything is cause and effect, and cause cannot be separated from effect and effect is a continuity. That is time also. And on this philosophy Nairanjana developed very highly as a system this teaching of shunyata as void, empty. And that is exactly what Krishnaji says also. There is no self, and you see it and every

problem is solved. There is no complication, there is no problem.

That is how I see it in relation to his explanation.

Then the second thing you said - what was the second question?

N: The relationship between the outer and the inner.

R: That is exactly what Krishnaji and Dr.Bohm discussed as 'Actuality and Truth' and it is published in that new book, that is sunyatasatva and paramatasatva, these are also accepted Buddhist philosophical propositions. Sunyatasatva is conventional, that is what we do, talk and eat and all these things, duality within relativity. You can't say this is false, this table. But in another sense this is not so. But sunyatasatva is that conventional truth.

Paramatsatva, the ultimate, absolute truth. These two also cannot be separated.

N: That's right.

R: Now Nairanjana clearly says in one place, one who cannot see and does not see the conventional truth is incapable of arriving at the ultimate truth.

The third question you raised was, I think, nirvana and samsara. That is also, Nairanjana says - really I remember the words even by heart - he says that nirvana has no difference whatsoever from samsara and samsara has no difference whatsoever from nirvana. To clarify the word 'samsara', the strict definition is the continuity of our existence. And I remember once I put this question to Krishnaji in Paris, personally, there was nobody except him and myself.

K: Two wise people!

R: I don't know. But I put it to Krishnaji there is a great Nairanjana statement like this, it is very interesting to say it today,

I asked him what he thought. Then to my surprise he said, "Who is Nairanjana?" I said, "That is your compatriot", and then I explained to him who Nairanjana was historically as a thinker and a philosopher. I said in Buddhist history he is perhaps the boldest thinker. Then he asked me, what were his attainments. I said we can't say, that we don't know, only we know his writings, through writings about him, but about his attainments, spiritual realization we can't say anything. Krishnaji paused for a minute and asked me, "What did Buddha say about all this?" I said, nothing. You said, that is correct, that is right. Because I was always doubtful and I did not accept Nairanjana's statement so clearly, definitely saying nirvana and sunyama were the same.

K: I am not quite sure that we understood, all of us.

R: Yes, will you explain this point sir?

K: May I ask this, to explain a little more? What does samskara mean actually?

R: Samskara is another thing. Samsara literally means wandering, going off.

K: And Samskara means?

R: Samskara means construction, that is all our thinking.

K: The past.

R: It belongs to the past.

K: That's right.

R: It belongs to the past.

K: Yes, I understood that.

R: All our sanskarsas are memory, knowledge, learning and all that.

K: Like an old man going back and living in the past. That's it.



R: But samsara is continuity. Nirvana means...

K: Whatever it is.

R: Whatever it is, it is never defined in positive terms by the Buddha. Always whenever he was asked he said, no, that is not nirvana.

K: So you have asked your questions?

Now, sir, you had better ask your questions too in relation to what he has said.

R: The question is not from him, from you. My question I am asking from you.

K: What?

R: There are many questions but as we have not much time...

K: We have got plenty of time, sir.

R: One question is - both I will say at once so you can take them - one question is that in western philosophy, western thought, free will has played a very important part.

K: Free will.

R: Free-will - absolutely freely. Yes, free will. According to the same philosophy that Mr.Narayan said, conditional relations, that is cause and effect - according to that philosophy, Buddhism, such a thing is impossible because all our thinking, all our construction, all our work, all our knowledge is conditioned. Therefore if there is a free will it is free only in a relative sense and it is not absolute freedom. That is the Buddhist position. That is one question I put.

K: Let's talk it over, sir. What is will? What is will? How do you explain what will is?

R: Will is that you decide, you want.

K: No, what is the origin, the beginning of will? I will do this, I

won't do that. Now what is the meaning of will?

R: The meaning of will is to want to do.

K: No. All right, let me go on then. Is it not desire?

R: It is a desire.

K: Desire accentuated, heightened, strengthened, which we call will.

Bohm: It seems to me that we make it determined. We determine the object of desire. We say, "I am determined".

K: In that there is determination.

B: It gets fixed there.

K: I desire that, and to achieve that I make an effort. That effort, the motive of that effort is desire. So will is desire. Right?

R: It is a form of desire.

K: Now, can desire ever be free?

R: Absolutely. That is what I wanted to hear from you because you don't like to say that but I want to say it.

K: Desire can never be free. It can change the objects of desire: I can desire one year to go to buy this, the next year that, change, but desire is constant, the objects vary. And the strengthening of desire, I will do that, the will is in operation. Will is desire. Now can desire ever be free?

R: No.

K: But we say free will exists because I can choose between this and that, between this job and that job, I can go - except out of the totalitarian states - I can go from England to France freely. So the idea of free will is cultivated with a sense that human beings are free to choose. What does that mean, to choose? I can choose between blue jeans and something else, between this car and that

car, between that house and so on, but why should I choose at all? Apart from material things, apart from certain books and so on, why is there choice? I am a Catholic, I give up Catholicism and become a Zen Buddhist. And if I am a Zen, I become something else, and I choose. Why? Why is there choice at all, which gives one the impression that I am free to choose? Right sir? So I am asking why is there the necessity of choice at all? If I am a Catholic, and absorb the whole significance of Catholicism, with its abstractions, with its rituals, dogmas, you know the whole circus in it, and I abandon that, why should I join something else? Because when I have investigated this I have investigated all the religions. So choice must exist only when the mind is confused. No? When it is clear there is no choice. Is that right?

R: I think you have answered the question, to me you have answered the question.

K: I haven't fully answered it.

B: I think that the western philosophers might not agree with you, I am not sure.

K: They won't agree, of course.

B: They say that choice is not desire, that will is not desire, but will is something else. I think that is my impression.

K: Yes, will is something else.

B: Will is a free act.

K: The will is something inherited, or it is part of the genetic process, to will, to be.

B: But I think for example, I can't say I know much about it, but Catholic philosophers may say that when Adam sinned, he willed wrongly, let's say, he made a wrong choice and he set us off on this

way.

K: You see that is a very convenient way of explaining away everything. First invent Adam and Eve, the serpent and the apple, and god, and then put everything as the primal crime.

R: Yes, a lot of creation in that, mental creation.

B: I think if one observes one can see that will is the result of desire. But I think people have the impression that will is something entirely different.

K: Yes, will is part of something sacred.

B: That's what many people think.

K: Something derived from a divine being.

R: According to the western philosophy.

K: More or less. I don't know very much about western philosophy but from people with whom I have talked, and they may not be sufficiently informed, but they have given me the impression that will is something not quite human, not quite desire, not quite something that you cultivate. It is born out of the original sin, original god, and so on and so on.

But if one puts all that aside, which is theoretical, problematical and rather superstitious, if you put all that aside, then what is will and what is choice, and what is action without choice and will? You follow? That is the problem. Is there any action which is not compounded with will? I don't know what the Buddha said.

N: Would you say that insight has nothing to do with will?

K: Oh, nothing whatever to do with will, or desire, or memory.

N: So insight is something which is free from will, and also analysis.

R: Yes. Insight is seeing. And in that seeing there is no choice,

there is no discrimination, there is no judgement, there are no moral or immoral values. You see.

N: So insight is not visible to will, nor is it visible to analysis.

R: No.

K: You see this is becoming theoretical. You are making it so theoretical.

N: Because through analysis...

K: Excuse me, sir. You are making it theoretical, you have defined it, it is not this, it is not that, and you think you have insight.

N: I don't agree.

K: Then why do you discuss it?

N: No, because we have been discussing insight so far, or we have been seeing.

K: Now, Narayan, if I may point out, we are talking over together action in which there is no choice, in which there is no effort as will. Is there such action? I don't know, sir, please.

R: There is such an action.

K: You know it? Or is it a theory? Forgive me, I must be clear. I want to move away, if you will forgive me, and I am not being impudent, one should move away from theories, from ideas, from conclusions. But find out for oneself the truth of that matter: which is, is there an action in which there is no effort of will at all, and therefore no choice? So what is correct action in which there is no will, no choice, no desire - because will is part of desire and so on? To find that out one must be very clear, mustn't one, of the nature of desire. And desire is part of sensation, and desire being part of sensation, and thought identifies itself with that sensation, and

through identification the 'I' is built up, the ego, and the ego then says, "I must", or "I will not".

So we are trying to find out if there is an action not based on the principle of ideals, on desire, on will, not spontaneous - that word is rather a dangerous word because nobody is spontaneous, one thinks one can be spontaneous but there is no such thing because one must be totally free to be spontaneous. Do you follow? So is there such action? Because most of our action has a motive. Right? And motive means movement - I want to build a house, I want that woman, or that man, I am hurt psychologically or biologically and my motive is to hurt back - so there is always some kind of motive in action, which we do in daily life. So then action is conditioned by the motive. The motive is part of the identification process. So if I understand - not 'understand' - if there is a perception of the truth that identification builds the whole nature, the structure of the self, then is there an action which doesn't spring from thought? I don't know, am I right sir?

B: Could we ask why - before we go into that - why there is identification, why is it that this is so prevalent?

K: Why does thought identify.

B: With sensation and other things.

K: Why is there identification with something?

B: Specially sensation.

K: Yes. Go on sirs. Answer it sirs. You are all experts.

N: Is it the very nature of thought to identify, or are there forms of thought which don't identify with sensation?

K: Narayan, why do you - if I may again most politely and respectfully, etc., etc., why do you put that question? Is it a

theoretical question or an actual question? Why do you, Narayan, identify?

N: Let me put it this way...

K: No, I won't put it differently.

N: Why I can identify with these sensations, I have nothing else to identify with.

K: So why do you give importance to sensation? Do you say, I am a sentient being and nothing else?

N: No, no.

K: Ah, that's it.

N: If I have to identify with anything it can only be with sensation.

B: Is there a duality in identification? Could we make it clear.

K: In identification, as you point out sir, there is duality, the identifier and the identified.

B: Is it possible that you are trying to overcome the duality by identifying, by saying, "I am not different", when you are, or when you feel you aren't.

K: You see I don't want to enter into the field of ideologies, theories. To me, I have no interest in it. But I really, in investigating I want to find out, perhaps I have found out but talking over together, is there an action in which the self is not? In daily life, not in nirvana, when I have reached freedom and all the rest of it, I want to do it in this life, as I live. Which means I have to find out - the mind has to find out an action which has no cause, which means no motive, an action which is not the result or an effect of a series of causes and effects. If that exists action is always bound, chained. Am I making myself clear? So is there

such an action?

B: Well, it seems to me we can't find it as long as we are identifying.

K: That's right. That's why I said as long as identification exists I can't find the answer.

B: But why does thought identify?

K: Why does thought identify with sensations?

B: Is that irresistible or is that just something you can put aside?

K: I don't know if that is irresistible, or if it is part of sensation.

B: How is that?

K: Let's investigate.

B: You think that sensation is behind that?

K: Perhaps, when I say perhaps, that word is used for the purpose of investigation, not "I don't know", but let's investigate. But it may be. So why have sensations become so important in life - sexual sensations, the sensation of power, whether occult power or political power, economic power, or power of a woman over man, or man over woman, power of environment, the influence of the environment, the pressures - why has thought yielded to this pressure? Right, sir?

B: Does sensation necessarily produce a pressure?

K: It does when it is identified.

B: Yes, but then it is the two together.

K: I know, but let's examine. What do we mean by sensation?

B: Well it is clear that we may have a remembered sensation of pleasure.

K: Senses, the operation of the senses - touching, tasting, seeing, smelling, hearing.



B: The experience that happens then; and also the memory of it.

K: No, the memory is only when there is an identification with it.

B: I agree, yes.

K: When there is no identification the senses are senses. But why does thought identify itself with senses?

B: Yes, that is not yet clear.

K: We are going to make it clear.

B: Are you saying that when the sensation is remembered then we have identification?

K: Yes.

B: Can we make that more clear?

K: Let's make it a little more clear. Let's work at it. There is perceiving a pleasurable lake, seeing a beautiful lake, what takes place in that seeing? There is not only optical seeing by the eye, but also the senses are awakened, the smell of the water, the trees on the lake...

B: Could we stop a moment? When you say seeing, of course you see through the visual sense.

K: I am using purely visual sense.

B: Therefore you already have the visual sense awakened merely to see. Is that what you mean?

K: Yes. Just seeing.

B: Visually.

K: Visually, optically, I am just seeing, then what takes place?

B: And the other senses start to operate.

K: And the other senses start operating. Why doesn't it stop there?

B: What is the next step?

K: The next step is thought comes in - how beautiful that is, I wish I could remain here.

B: So thought identifies it.

K: Yes.

B: It says, "It is this".

K: Because in that there is pleasure.

B: In what?

K: Seeing and the delight of seeing, then thought coming into operation and saying, "I must have more, I must build a house here, it is mine".

B: But why does thought do that?

K: Why does thought interfere with senses - is that it? Now wait a minute, sir. The moment the senses take pleasure, say, "How delightful", and stop there, thought doesn't enter. Right? Now why does thought enter? If it is painful thought avoids it, it doesn't identify itself with that.

B: It identifies against it, it says, "I don't want it".

K: No, leave it alone, go away from it, either deny it or move away from it. But if it is pleasurable, when the senses begin to enjoy, say, "How nice", then thought begins to identify itself with it.

B: But why, I mean?

K: Why, because of pleasure.

B: But why doesn't it give it up when it sees how futile this is?

K: Oh, that's much later.

B: That's a long way on.

K: When it becomes painful, when it is aware identification

breeds both pleasure and fear, then it begins to question.

B: Well, are you saying that thought has made a simple mistake in the beginning, a kind of innocent mistake?

K: That's right. Thought has made a mistake in identifying with something that brings to it pleasure, or there is pleasure in something.

B: And thought tries to take over.

K: To take over.

B: To make it permanent, perhaps.

K: Permanent, that's right, which means memory. A remembrance of the lake with the daffodils and the trees and the water and sunlight, and all the rest of it.

B: I understand thought has make a mistake and later it discovers that mistake, but it seems to be too late because it doesn't know how to stop.

K: It is now conditioned.

B: So can we make it clear why it cannot give it up, you see.

K: Why it cannot give it up. That's our whole problem.

B: Can we try to make it more clear.

K: Why doesn't thought give up something which it knows, or is aware is painful?

B: Yes.

K: It is destructive. Why? Go on, why, sir? Sir, let's take a simple example: psychologically one is hurt.

B: Well that is later.

K: I am taking that as an example, doesn't matter later. One is hurt, why can't one immediately give up that hurt, because knowing that hurt is going to create a great deal of damage? That

is, when I am hurt I build a wall round myself not to be hurt more, there is fear, and isolation, neurotic actions, all that follows.

Thought has created the image about myself, and that image gets hurt. Why doesn't thought say, "Yes, by Jove, I have seen this", drop it immediately? It is the same question. Because when it drops the image there is nothing left.

B: Then you have another ingredient because thought wants to hold on to the memory of the image.

K: Hold on to the memories which have created the image.

B: And which may create it again, and thought feels they are very precious.

K: Yes, they are very precious, nostalgic and all the rest of it.

B: So somehow it gives very high value to all that. How did it come to do that?

K: Why has it made the image so valuable. Why has the image become so important which thought has created?

B: If I may say that in the beginning it was a simple mistake, and thought made an image of pleasure and it seemed to become very important, precious, and was unable to give it up.

K: Yes, why doesn't it? Sir, if I give up pleasure, if thought gives up pleasure, what is there left?

B: It can't seem to return to the state in the beginning when there was nothing.

K: Ah, that is the pristine state.

B: It is unable to return to that state.

K: It can't because thought - you know, all the rest of it.

B: Well, I think what happens is that when thought thinks of giving up pleasure which has become very precious, then the mere

thought of that is painful.

K: Yes, giving up is painful.

B: And therefore thought runs away from that.

K: Yes, so it clings to pleasure.

B: It does not wish to face the pain.

K: Until there is a better reward for pleasure, which will be a better pleasure.

B: That's no change.

K: Of course.

B: But thought seems to have fallen into a trap which it has made because it has innocently remembered pleasure, and then gradually made it important and then it has become too painful to give it up. Because any change from the immediate removal of pleasure is very painful.

K: Because it has nothing else then afterwards, then it is frightened.

B: But you see in the beginning it was not frightened to have nothing else.

K: Yes.

B: Now it is.

K: Yes, In the beginning, that means the beginning being the beginning of man.

B: Yes.

K: In the beginning of man - can we question even that?

B: Perhaps not.

K: Beginning of the ape.

B: If you go far enough back. You want to say it has been going a long time, but thought has built this trap which has gradually got

worse.

K: Sir, could we say as the brain is very old - all our brains are very old - merely tracing it back further and further and further, you can never find out. But I can say my brain is now as it is, which is very old, conditioned, in terms of pleasure and pain.

B: They say the old brain is also the emotional product of the brain.

K: Of course, emotional and all the rest of it, sensory. So where are we now?

B: Well, we say this brain has conditioned itself by continual memory of the image of pleasure, the unpleasantness of giving it up and the fear.

K: So it clings to something which it knows.

B: Which it knows and which is very precious to it.

K: But it doesn't know that it is going to breed fear.

B: Even when it knows it still clings.

K: But it would much rather run away from fear hoping the pleasure will continue.

B: Eventually it starts to become irrational because it creates pressures which make the brain irrational and unable to get this straight.

K: Yes. Where are we now at the end of this? We started off, sir, didn't we, Dr.Bohm, with, is there an action in which there is no motive, no cause, the self doesn't enter into it at all? Of course there is. There is when the self is not, which means no identifying process takes place. There is the perceiving of a beautiful lake with all the colour and the glory and the beauty of it, that's enough. Not the cultivating of memory, which is developed through the

identification process. Right?

B: This raises the question, how are we going to stop this identification?

K: I don't think there is a 'how'. You see that means meditation, control, practice, practice, practice. And that way makes the mind mechanical, dull - forgive me - and literally incapable of receiving anything new.

Schloegel: If it imitates, if it just imitates it, this is precisely what happens. If these practices are done with imitation, imitation...

R: That means if that practice becomes an imitation then the mind is mechanical.

K: What do you mean 'imitation'?

S: If you tell me - if I make it very simple - just three times a day put your hand on the floor, something will happen; and I do it, I do not think about it, I do not enquire about it, I do not say, "Now, what happens, why should I", if I do not question it, if I just mechanically do it nothing will happen, I will get only more and more fuzzy. But if I enquire into it why, what for, what is my reaction...

K: My question is, I have listened to somebody who says, put your hand there, and then I begin to enquire, but I don't accept anybody telling me that I must put my hand there, then I don't have to enquire. Do you remember that famous story of a guru, he had a favourite cat, and he had many disciples. Every morning before they all started meditation, he caught hold of the cat, put it on his lap, and meditated. And when he died the disciples had to search around for a cat.

R: I heard it quite differently. The cat was tied up so he could not come and listen.

K: Same thing. You see our minds are mechanical anyhow, have been made mechanical. Can't we investigate why we have become mechanical, rather than practice that which is non-mechanical, which may be mechanical.

S: We can, since there have been people who have become whole before us...

K: I don't know.

S: Or it seems so.

K: I don't know anybody.

S: It seems likely.

K: You see you accept it.

S: Looking at it as a possible proposition.

K: I don't know. I start with myself. I don't look to somebody who is enlightened. I don't know. They may deceive themselves.

S: This is why I am trying to find...

K: So one must start with oneself. Oneself is already secondhand, living in the shadow of others, so why look to others. So here I am. From there I begin. It is so simple, whereas the other leads to so many complications.

S: I do not necessarily see it as a complication. If I have an idea that there is something that is more than my illusion, my suffering, my general state of dissatisfaction in which I am and which I have to face, if I do not think that there is any possibility then I might not even try. If I see that there might be a possibility, I do not need to take it for truth, but it gives me the sense that it is worthwhile trying to work with myself as my own subject of experiment, to



work it out.

K: Why do you want a motive?

S: I think it is almost impossible not to start with that motive because that starts from self.

K: No, madam, we are talking about the same thing, aren't we? I just want to know myself, not because I suffer, I go through, you know, I just want to know what I am, not according to anybody but just know about myself. So I begin to enquire, I begin to look in the mirror, which is myself. The mirror says, your reactions are these, and as long as you have these reactions you are going to pay heavily, you are going to suffer. So that is all. So now how am I, an ordinary human being, knowing all my reactions, ugly, pleasant, hateful, all the reactions one has, to bring about an observation in which there is no motive to restrain, or to expand, reactions? I wonder if I am making myself clear.

S: Yes.

K: How am I to observe myself without a cause? The cause generally is punishment and reward. Which is obviously too absurd, like a dog being trained. So can I look at myself without any motive? Go on sirs.

S: At this stage of enquiry, where I am beginning to try to do it, to start with I cannot do it, I am too conditioned.

K: No, I wouldn't admit that. You are always asking for help.

S: No, but I can in the same way that I can do a physical training, I can be able slowly, but not immediately, to look at the proximity of those things that I do normally not like to see in myself.

K: I understand that madam. I have no muscles to do certain

exercises, in a week's time I have those muscles by doing exercises. That same mentality is carried over - I don't know myself but I will gradually learn about myself.

S: It is not that I need to gradually learn - we have to be very careful here - it is not that I need to gradually learn about myself, it is only that I have to develop the courage, the strength to bear myself.

K: It is the same thing, it is the same thing. I haven't the strength, physical strength to do certain exercises: the same mental operation goes psychologically, I am weak but I must be strong.

S: It is not that I must get strong. I think this is where one gets oneself into a critical state, it is not for the motive, it is the very real suffering and looking, and suffering and looking, and there is a changing factor in it which in the end makes it possible.

K: Which is again gradual, evolution. I say that is totally - if I may point out, I am not correcting you - that will lead nowhere, that is an illusion.

S: It need not lead to anywhere, but if it is continued in that spirit, with that attitude, not I get something out of it, then there is a sudden change which is possible and it does occur. And I would like to make another point on that: whether we have done it starting with that motive and began slowly the other way, or whether we have done it unknown to ourselves so that it can suddenly happen on the basis of the life that we have lived, does really not make any difference.

K: Madam, either you have insight immediately, or you don't have it.

S: yes, that is true but...

K: Ah, there is no preparation, that means time, which means cultivating, identification, the 'me'.

S: No.

K: Of course. The moment you allow time it is the cultivation of the self.

S: Not necessarily.

K: Why do you say, not necessarily?

S: If I do it for something that I want to gain out of it then it is certainly a cultivation of the self.

K: Madam, when you say, as we said just now, insight is devoid of time and memory. Insight is timeless, it must happen. You can't gradually come to it, it is not a thing cultivated by thought. So to have an insight into oneself instantly, not by degrees. Is that possible?

S: Yes.

K: No, don't say, yes, we are enquiring.

S: Then I would say with my own conviction and experience, yes.

K: Say yes to what?

S: It is possible.

K: That means if you have an insight, that insight wipes away the self, not momentarily. So would you say action then is without motive? Do you know such action - not occasionally, but living an everyday life? I don't want to be occasionally fed but I want to be fed every day. I don't want to be occasionally happy - you know all the rest of it. As insight is devoid of time and divorced from memory, thought, therefore is there an action born of insight? You understand?

R: If you have insight - I don't say 'had' because that means memory again.

K: Have insight.

R: If you have insight, there is no exception, all your actions are without motive.

K: Again forgive me - are we talking theoretically or actually?

R: Actually.

K: That means action is correct, accurate, right through life.

R: Yes. You may make mistakes, sir, technically.

K: No, I am not talking of technically.

R: There is no self, there is no motive if you have that insight. Every action...

K: Have you got that insight? Not you, sir, has one insight, that insight into the whole nature of the self, not arguments, not inductions, not deductions, not conclusions, but have an insight into the nature of the self. And therefore the self, if there is an insight through the self then action will inevitably follow from that insight.

S: May I make one point clear that I feel strongly about - it is not that I have the insight, that is not possible. There is that insight. It is not as if I had it.

K: I have no insight, I have only blood. If I say, "I have an insight into that", I am a little bit mentally deranged. So what are we talking about? You asked a question, sir.

R: Of course we have gone very far away from our initial question.

K: I know.

R: Now let us go back to that question that was answered.

K: Let's go back to it.

R: No, that question you have answered. Then there is another question also dealing with intelligence. You see there is - perhaps you are aware of this theory, many people - that we think in a language. Many people say that. In which language do you think. I don't know. There is no language in thinking. Thought has no language, and the thought is immediately interpreted into the nearest language.

K: Sir, could you convey your thought to me without the word?

R: That is the thing. When you convey thought it is indefinite.

K: No, sir. Can you convey your thought to me without the word?

R: That depends on the level.

K: Which means what?

R: I don't know whether you accept it, or whether you have that experience, without talking, without words, there is communication.

K: That is, sir, there can only be communication, communion, when you and I are on the same level, and with the same intensity, at the same time. Right? Which is what? When you and I are on the same level, with the same intensity, at the same time, what is that thing? Then words are not necessary.

R: No.

K: What is that thing?

R: You can say if you like that it is thought.

K: No, no. Sir, when both of us are like that, what is the quality of that state? Not the absence of thought, but the quality, the perfume, the thing of it. Wouldn't you call that love?

R: Yes.

K: Don't.

R: But you asked me, or just you are going to answer it. I get confused when you put it to me and think you want me to answer it.

K: Sir, when two people have this extraordinary quality of this state, words are not necessary. There is that quality of love which exists, words become unnecessary. There is instant communication. Now for most of us language drives us. Right? Right sir? Language drives us, pushes us, shapes us. Our minds are conditioned by language, which is language, words, drive us, force us. I am an Englishman - the language, and the content of that language. Right? And if we use words without the language directing us, words then have an entirely different meaning.

N: The language doesn't drive you, but you drive the language.

K: That's right.

B: I think that ordinarily we are identified with our language and therefore it is driving us, but if we are free of identification...

K: That's right, sir, It is extraordinary how language has made us. I am a communist.

B: That's an identification.

K: That's it.

B: But do you think that language is the major source of identification?

K: One of them.

B: One of the big ones.

K: Yes.

R: I don't know whether it would be useful, I would like to

remind here of a very important Mahayana Buddhist philosophical attitude. That is, it is said that the world is caught up in language. And it is said the ordinary man is stuck in words just like an elephant in the mud, and so one must go beyond words to see them. Because as long as you are, as you say, driven by language...

K: Are you?

R: Are you asking personally?

K: Yes, are you? Am I? Dr.Bohm, is he driven by language?

R: That I can't see. You answer it.

K: I can answer for myself, but I am asking you.

R: Yes, you answer for yourself.

K: Absolutely.

R: That's enough.

N: But I think the more skilful, or scholarly one becomes in language, I suppose there is a great possibility of being caught in language.

R: Yes.

N: Whereas the rustic might just use it for simple communication.

K: Sir, that was your question, whether thought has words, whether thought is part of words. Does the word create the thought, or thought create the word?

B: You once asked the question, is there a thought without the word?

K: That is very interesting, sir, shall we go into it a little bit? Do you want to go into it, sir?

R: Is there a thought without the word.

B: That is the question.

R: I think thought has no word. Thought has no word. Thought is an image.

K: No, we are using the word in the sense of the symbol, the image, the picture, the word.

B: You see the word can easily be turned into an image, for example, by an artist, a description can be turned by an artist into an image, or vice versa, the image could be described and turned into words. So they have an equivalent content.

K: Sir, what is the origin of thought? If you had to find out, not what the Buddha said, if you, as a human being, had to find out something you must find out, otherwise your head will be chopped off, it is something tremendously important that you must find out, what will you do, what is the origin of thought. God made the word and the word was incarnate, at the beginning of Genesis. Please sir, answer that question.

R: Is there an origin?

K: Must be.

R: Why?

K: Otherwise - in you sir, what is the origin?

R: No origin.

K: Of course, sir, there must be a beginning of thought.

R: That is again a fallacy, a wrong way of looking at it.

K: No, no.

R: By asking everything must have a beginning.

K: No, I am not asking that everything has a beginning. I am just asking in order to find out, what is the beginning of thought. How did thought begin? With the dog - you follow sir - with the animals, everything that is living, they all think in various ways, or



feel, and so on - there must be a beginning of that. What is that in human beings.

S: If we had no desire at all we would have no thought.

K: No, it is not a question of that.

B: Are you discussing thought without identification?

K: No, sir. How did thought begin in myself? Was it handed down by my father, by my parents, by education, by environment, by the past? I want to know. What made me think? Go on sir. What made you think?

R: The question is this, you are putting some cause behind it, but I would say, nothing made me think, it is in the nature of yourself, thinking.

K: No.

R: There is no other cause.

K: Oh yes there is. I'll show you.

R: What is that?

K: No, I am not the final authority, sir. I'd like to talk it over. If I had no memory, would there be thinking?

R: I ask you again, what is the origin of memory?

K: That's fairly simple to answer. I remember seeing you in Paris - which I don't, but suppose I remember seeing you in Paris - that is recorded, isn't it? Right, sir?

R: That is generally accepted that it is recorded in the brain.

K: No, it is an ordinary fact.

R: No, that I do not accept. It is an old 19th century, 18th century, theory that everything is recorded in the brain somewhere.

K: No, sir. Look, I met you this week, you come back a year later - I hope you will - and then I say, yes, sir, I recognize you.

How does that recognition take place?

R: This is a question that I want to ask you. I didn't ask it but this is the question that I very much wanted to ask you.

K: I meet you now, and in a year's time you come back, I hope you will for a discussion. Then I say, yes, sir, Mr. Rahula, we met last year. How does that take place? Very simple. Memory, the brain has recorded that memory of meeting you, learning your name. So that is memory, and when I meet you next time I recognize you. Right?

R: How does it happen?

K: It is very simple. You have been introduced to me, we have sat down here for two afternoons and a morning, and that is remembered, when you come back next year I say, yes. If I didn't remember I wouldn't recognize you. Right? So recording goes on - it is the 19th, or 1st century, or the 20th century, recording must go on. The elaborate educating process of learning a technique, how to drive a car, or go to the moon, whatever it is, it is careful accumulation of memory, which then acts. There is nothing wrong in that, is there?

R: How does it happen?

K: Sir, I don't know how to drive a car, so I go to the man who teaches me how to drive a car. I take twenty four lessons, at the end of it I am inspected and the man says, pretty good. I have learnt it by driving with him, he is telling me, be careful, turn to the left, he is guiding me all the time. So at the end of twenty four lessons I am a good driver. I hope. And that's all. There is nothing right or wrong about it. In the same way I meet you today, next year I will remember, which is, there is remembrance, which is the recording

process. No? It is so simple.

R: It is not so clear to me. Let us admit it is recorded, how does that record come up when we meet next year?

K: When I see you. That memory comes up and says, oh, he is Mr. Rahula. And the recording is the image, pleasurable or not pleasurable.

R: I hope it will be pleasurable!

K: And that is recorded, and when I meet you next time, I meet you. But if it is not pleasurable I say, oh, what a bore. And I turn away and talk about something else. So this whole process is recorded - how I learnt to drive a car, how I learnt to speak English, French, German, whatever it is, there must be recording. No?

R: Certainly it is so.

K: But you said 19th century...

R: What I want to say is, it is not in the brain. That is the thing. It is in the nature of what we call generally the mental faculty. Just as I hear noise etc., the mind faculty, the mental faculty, also is a faculty. That is one possibility.

K: It is the faculty of the brain to record.

R: It is not the physical brain. That is my point.

K: Ah, you have gone off into something else.

R: Yes, that is what I say.

N: You are saying that the mental faculty is spread all over the body, not necessarily in the head?

R: Our mental faculty is one of the sense organs - there are five physical sense organs. You see the eye has the power to see and examine, the ear can't do it, it can hear all right. There is the mental

factor just like eye, ear, nose, tongue - all the physical faculties - there is the mental faculty, which eye, ear, nose, tongue and body deals with the external world, material world. But the world is finished by that, the bigger part of the world is not touched by that.

K: What is the bigger part of the world?

R: That is what we were talking about, these sensations and all these things are not touched by the body, or anything like that. Then the mind faculty the mental faculty is the thing that has many, many aspects, many potentialities; one is the memory. And what I want to clarify from you is how does it happen, and of course you begin with the idea of the brain...

K: No.

R: ...the recording in the brain, and with which I disagree.

K: Sir, let's cut out the brain, for the moment. I meet you today and I see you a week later. There is the process of recognition. All right. That's one part of the faculty. The other part of the faculty is to think logically, or not logically. So there are several aspects, faculties which are made up in the mind. You cannot have mind without the brain.

R: Yes. Not only the brain, but without the body, without the stomach, without the heart. Without the physical existence you can't have the mind.

K: That's all. Therefore the mind is part of the senses, the mind is part of the thought, emotions, certain faculties and so on and so on. Is that outside, or the whole structure of the organism, the whole brain, body, eyes, ears, all that is part of this mind which is the process of thinking. No?

B: Are you saying mind is thought, or is it more than thought as

well?

K: I don't know but I don't want to say that. I only want to say the mind as long as it is functioning within the field of thought is limited.

B: You mean consciousness, the mind is that.

K: Yes, consciousness is limited.

B: We say it is limited by these faculties, wherever they are.

K: Yes, that's right, whatever they are.

B: But as far as recognition goes, people are even making machines that can imitate the process of recognition.

K: Of course.

B: You know you can recognize simple things already by means of a computer.

S: And yet, if I have met you just for a moment, and there was not a sufficient impact of you of that meeting image, I will next week pass you by and not recognize you.

B: That's the point, it has to be recorded with some energy, you see.

S: That is what I mean, there must be sufficient energy.

K: All recording must have energy.

B: If you don't turn on the microphone nothing is recorded.

R: And many things that we see and hear we don't remember, only things that leave a certain impression.

B: You see I think it is fairly clear how the record could give rise to a recognition from the next experience. The next time you see the person the record is compared with.

R: It comes back.

B: It comes back, yes.

R: It is exactly like the computer.

K: So our brains are computers.

R: I should say, no, not the brain.

K: What is the brain?

R: The brain may be the basis - why do you only say brain, why not the whole body, whole heart, without heart can you think?

K: No. Therefore sir, we said that. The brain, the mind, the mind contains the brain, the feelings, the heart, the whole structure.

B: All the nerve centres.

K: We are using the mind as consciousness, which is I cannot have consciousness if the heart doesn't function.

R: That is why I used the word mental faculty instead of the mind, or consciousness, the word faculty embracing, involving all that department.

K: What do you mean by the word faculty? What does the word mean, sir?

B: To have some capacity and ability - capacity to do something.

R: The ability to do, like when you say a visual faculty.

K: No, sir, ability to do depends on knowledge. If I didn't know how to play the piano, that is learnt it...

R: No, excuse me, sir, you are going away from the point. I said the mind faculty - mind has the power, the capacity, the potentiality, to do all that. And those are different aspects of the thing.

K: Oh, I see.

B: The faculty is inborn.

R: Inborn, innate, in itself has the power. And you can't ask why

and from where.

K: No, I won't ask that. I won't accept the mind has the inborn faculty.

B: To think.

K: Inborn which means it is not genetic, it is not heredity.

B: No, inborn means genetic.

R: No, no, that is not right. Say the mind just like our eyes has the power to see.

K: So the mind has the power...

R: ...to do all those tricks, all those things that we are taught - the memory, reaction and sensation, and all that.

K: The mind is the active energy to do all this.

B: Well also the physical structure is all over the body. I think that it is a good analogy to say that the eye has certain possibilities and in this whole body already the infant has the ability to think already built into him because of the heredity.

K: How has this 'built in' come into being?

B: By growing in the same way that the eye grew. You see the eye has a tremendous...

K: Which means evolution.

B: Evolution, yes.

K: Wait, wait, go slowly. Which means right from the beginning it has evolved until we are now monkeys, greater monkeys. Sorry!

R: I question that. You took for granted Darwin's theory.

K: I don't take Darwin, I see this happening in the world.

R: When you say we are evolved from the monkey.

K: We have evolved from imperfect man; or not evolved from

perfect man. We are going down the hill instead of up the hill, or we are going uphill, therefore we are imperfect man.

B: I wonder if we want to discuss all these things, they are really details that are not certain.

R: That is why I object to that statement about the monkey evolving. We don't know.

K: I don't know sir, I don't know how we have evolved but I do know the very simple thing which is, without recording there is no thought.

R: That means that thought is memory.

K: Of course. Thought is memory, which is experience, which is knowledge, stored up - it doesn't matter where, in my big toe, stored up - and when it is challenged it operates.

B: Well we have also said thought is the ability to reason logically and along with the memory, all that together.

K: Logically, or illogically, and so on.

B: All that is what you have called faculties.

R: Yes, I used that word because it uses a bigger field.

B: But you are saying it still depends on memory.

K: Of course, a sense of recording is memory.

B: Without memory none of the other faculties could operate.

K: Of course. I see that thing, it has been called a tree, I call it a tree. That's all. It is recorded all the time. Without that recording there is no beginning of thought, there is no thought. Sir, if you were born in the Catholic world, and conditioned by the Catholic world, you would be thinking along the Catholic world, Christ, you know the whole business of it. So you are conditioned by propaganda, by books, by priests, by all the circus that goes on, as



you are conditioned in India, or Ceylon and so on. So what is the origin, the beginning of this conditioning? Why does man condition himself? For security, to avoid danger? Obviously. I believe in Christ, because I have been brought up in the Christian world, that's my conditioning, and this life is a miserable life, unhappy life, but I believe in Christ which gives me a certain sense of comfort, strength, to face this appalling thing, the world, so it gives me great comfort. That's all. It gives me security in an insecure world, psychologically the Father is looking after me. And the Hindus, the Buddhists, the Muslims, they are all in the same category.

So the instinctual response of a human being is to feel secure, like a child, sir, obviously. No?

R: How does it come about, that sense of security, the feeling of security, what is the origin of that?

K: The mother and the child, the baby, they must have a little security, the baby must have security, physical security, it must have food at the right times, at the right hour, and all the rest of it.

B: Does the baby have a feeling of security at the same time?

K: Probably, I don't know, not being a baby, but I am sure it feels safe.

B: It feels safe.

K: Safe, looked after, quiet, the moment it cries the mother is there, to change the diapers, to feed it and all the rest of it. What's wrong with that? From that physical security we turn to psychological security, which Christ gives me. It may be nonsense, unreasonable and all kinds of things, but I like that, at least I have comfort in some illusion. But I don't call it illusion. If you call it

illusion I will kick you. So we go on that way. You have your security in something, I have my security and another has his security in Islam, and so on. So each one of us clings to our own particular form of security, whether it is reasonable, sane, rational, that doesn't matter.

B: It seems to me that it is similar to the pleasure question, that is you register the feeling of pleasure and then try to build it up.

K: I can't say, well I'll let go of Christ, I say, my god, I can't.

B: It is the same with pleasure, you can't give up pleasure.

K: Of course, of course, the same problem.

S: I think it is harder with pleasure because people nowadays do seem as if they give up or change their religions without too much difficulty, but we are much against giving up our pleasure when it really comes to it.

K: Ah, well that's a different matter altogether. Physical pleasure...

S: Or pleasures of the mind.

K: Of course.

R: But where are we going?

K: Where are we going - I haven't finished yet. We haven't discussed the central issue, what is action without this enormous complex of motives, reactions, regrets, pain, sorrow. Can a human live in action without all this dreadful confusion? That's all. And you say, yes, you can live. And you tell me, if you are a Christian, believe in god, believe in Christ, he will save you from all this. And I am so unhappy I say, for god's sake, and I cling to it. And if you are X you say, I believe in all the things the Buddha said, that to me is good enough. I will take comfort in that. So my actions are

based on reward and punishment. Right? Right, sir? If I do this I will reach Nirvana, if I don't I'll go to hell, which is the Christian idea and all the rest of it. One has thrown all that overboard, being fairly intelligent and educated one says, that is all nonsense. I want to find out if there is an action without any shadow of effort and regret. You understand sir? It is important to find out, not theoretically or casually, it is a burning question for me, a passionate thing I must find out because I don't want to enter into the cage, the rat race. So what shall we do? What is right action under all circumstances, which doesn't depend on circumstances - my wife says, do this, I love you but you must do this, or something else. I put away all those influences or pressures, but I want to find out if there is an action which is complete in itself.

So I must understand is there an action which is total, which is complete, total, whole, not partial. Which means can I observe myself wholly, not in fragments? Or through the fragment instantly see the whole? So is there an action which is whole? I say, yes, there is, definitely. Don't you ask me, what is that?

R: I wanted to ask but I was waiting for the reply.

K: Ask it!

R: I want to ask, what is that?

K: First of all, can you see with your eyes the tree as a whole? Can you see your wife, or your husband, or girl friend, or boy friend, as a whole entity? Do you understand my question? Can you see anything totally, or are you always seeing partially?

R: When you use the word 'totally' what is the meaning?

K: Whole. Don't go to something else. Can I see you as a whole being? You understand? Can I see humanity as myself, which is

the whole? That's good enough. Can I see humanity as myself? Because humanity is like me, suffering, miserable, confused, agony, terrified, insecure, sorrow-ridden, like another. Right? So in seeing man, humanity, I see myself.

R: Or rather the other way: by seeing yourself you see humanity.

K: Which is me. It doesn't matter whether you say, I see myself as humanity, then humanity is me. I am not separate from humanity, I don't say, I am an elite, I am this; I am like the rest of the gang. So I see the world as myself, which is the whole. That's simple sir - not simple, it is - would that be right sir?

B: I was wondering if, as you said, we could consider the tree for a moment.

K: The tree is too petty.

B: It is not clear when you say you see the tree as a whole...

K: The whole thing, to see something wholly, sir.

B: Just see it all, right.

S: I think we are in a slight language difficulty because we have no other possibilities. This, "I see as a whole", really it means that the self, or the fallacy of the self, has clearly been seen into and has broken down, because otherwise however much I see the tree as a whole it is still my thought.

K: That is the ultimate thing. But can you see your husband, your wife, or your girl friend, as a whole being? Totally, you know. You can, can't you? How does that happen when you can see somebody wholly?

S: Tremendous - but not mine - warmth.

K: No,no.

S: Warmth comes in.

K: If you love that tree you will see it wholly.

S: But we have also to be careful what we mean by love.

K: Keep it very simple, don't intellectualize it for the moment - we'll do it later. If I love somebody, love not possessive, acquisitive, all the rest of that nonsense, if I love the whole thing is there, the totality of that man or woman is there. So can I see myself wholly - myself being humanity? I am not different from humanity. I am not an individual. That's all phoney. I am the rest of the world, I am the world. Can I see that as a whole? I am not a communist sir, because the communists say that too, but I am not that - stupid communists.

R: Why do you want to deny communism?

K: No, no.

R: What is wrong if you are a communist?

K: No, you have misunderstood. Communists are full of theories and putting those theories into practice and shaping man according to a theory. I am not talking about that, leave that for the moment.

To look at myself, I can only see myself as a whole when I am actually the rest of mankind.

B: You mean in essence, you mean that essentially I am the same as the whole.

K: Essentially, basically.

B: The basic qualities.

K: I may have a long nose, or short nose, and crooked eyes, or blue eyes, I am not talking about that.

S: A basic human being.

K: As a human being. Then there is no individual effort, nor collective effort. Right? When one sees oneself as a whole the parts disappear. But we think by collecting the parts we make the whole. So when I see myself as a whole then the parts disappear, therefore the self is not. Sir, when I see that thing, that tree, completely, I can only see it completely if I don't condemn, if I don't say, "It's my tree, it's my garden." Right? You understand what I am saying?

R: Yes, yes.

K: So when I love that tree I see it as a whole.

B: Would you say then that it is similar to all trees? Like saying, if I see myself as a whole I am the same as all mankind.

K: So all trees I love.

B: Is that the same?

K: Of course.

B: It doesn't depend on that single tree. It is not just this tree that you love.

K: It isn't that elm that I love.

B: That is right here in this place.

K: The trees I love, whether they are in your garden, or my garden, or somewhere else.

B: Wherever it is.

K: On the field.

B: So it doesn't matter, the particulars.

K: That's it.

S: And it doesn't matter which side it is because they are the same. I love the tree and see it whole because I love it, that doesn't matter, the one and the other is the same.

K: I raised the question of seeing wholly because what is action

which is not fragmented, not broken up as a business man, as the artist, as a lecturer, as a professor, as a priest, an action which is total. Don't say, if the self is not then you will have it. But I have a self, one is caught in the self; or rather the self is there.

B: But you are saying, see the self whole and then it will change.

K: What?

B: You are suggesting, see the self whole and it will not be there.

K: Yes, sir.

B: Therefore would you also say that you have to love the self?

K: That is a dangerous statement. I was going to make it and I stopped myself in time because that is what advertising people say, love the world as yourself, love your hair, use this shampoo.

B: Could you say instead you are mankind, you love mankind?

K: Ah, now, be careful.

B: Because the analogy seems to be limited.

K: Analogies are limited.

S: So are the words in themselves.

K: Any more questions, sir? We will stop unless you have any more questions.

R: There is no end to these questions, therefore let us finish today like that. But you have answered all my questions, and thank you very much for all your very enlightening explanations. And also I must thank Mr. Narayan for arranging this.

K: And all these people.

R: Of course they are all one.

K: No, no.

R: When I thank you or Narayan, or somebody else.

K: No, we have to thank all the people here, you don't thank me and therefore thank everybody else.

S: We all thank each other.



# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 26TH AUGUST 1978**

I see all my old friends are here!

If I may ask most politely and respectfully, please don't make this into a festive occasion. It is not a Pop festival, but rather we are a serious group, not inclined to frivolity, but a rather earnest, serious group of people who will want, or desire, to enquire into the whole complex problem of living. And if one may point out again, there is no speaker here, though he is sitting on the platform, but actually the speaker doesn't exist because then you will be merely listening to the speaker and not actually investigating for yourself. So please, if I may again suggest most earnestly that there is no speaker but we are together investigating, exploring, enquiring into something, which is life with all its complex and varied problems. So we are sharing this thing together. The speaker is not here. And I want to make that quite clear. But rather together we are taking a journey into ourselves and demanding the excellence of ourselves.

We are never challenged psychologically; we may be challenged outwardly, we may demand outwardly better material, better workmanship, better schools, better politics: the challenge is for the better outwardly, always. But apparently very few of us enquire and challenge ourselves with the highest form of both intellectual, ethical, moral action, psychologically. And if we may, we are going to go into this question together, that we are challenging ourselves deeply, demanding the highest form of intellectual and - I would not like to use the word 'emotional'

because that tends to become sentimental, but rather the highest form of affection, the highest form of love. And why is it that human beings who have lived for millenia upon millenia are living the way we are doing now - confused, unhappy, miserable, uncertain, and outwardly in the world, as one observes, things are getting worse and worse and worse. The more you produce, the more we are using the things of the earth, we are destroying the earth. And inwardly, spiritually, if I may use that word, we have lost all sense of religious excellence. I am using the word 'religious' in the sense of not belief, not dogma, not rituals, not the varied form of hierarchical, theological assertions, but the religious person is one who has no self at all. That seems to me the highest form of religious action, where the 'me', the ego, the self, doesn't exist at all. And that is the highest form of intelligence and excellence ethically and in action.

So we are going, if I may, into these problems. So you are not listening to a speaker but rather listening to yourself and challenging yourself, not accepting anything but the highest form of clarity, the highest form of behaviour, and so excellence in action. That is what we are going to go together into. So please you are listening to yourself, you are listening not according to your particular like and dislike, including those, but actually listening to what is going on and demanding why we live as we do now in this appalling, frightening, destructive way that we are living. Right?

I think that is the most serious question we have to ask of ourselves. When outwardly everything is disintegrating, there is no question about it - terrorism, which is the ultimate form of war, there are the terrorists, divided nations, all that is going on in the

world, four hundred billion dollars a year spent on armaments - the world all over. So we are all crazy people. And to allow all this each one of us must find out for oneself what is the right action with regard to all these external events, what is one to do, which must be correct, accurate, true. And that can only be found out for ourselves if we are challenging our actions, our way of life, which is jobs, occupation, relationship with each other, and the utter lack of clarity in thought, the sloppiness of our thinking. And to live a totally different kind of life, not merely based on pleasure, on fear and so on. So we are going together to find, if we can, all the answers to these questions for ourselves. If that is clear between you and the speaker, and the speaker is not here, if it is very clear with what we are concerned with then we have established a certain kind of relationship with each other. If we are all concerned with the same thing, not with our particular opinions and judgements, with our intellectual theories, but rather be concerned together seriously, at least for today and for the few days when you are here, concerned to find out a way of life that may bring a different world into being - right?

So that is our question. If we are going to enquire together obviously the first step is to put aside all our personal prejudices, our personal desires, our petty problems of the moment, and so have the capacity to enquire freely and deeply. Capacity doesn't come through constant practice, psychologically we are talking about. It comes when there is direct interest and the challenge to which you must respond with all your highest capacity, then you have the capacity to enquire freely. Otherwise you will be merely playing with words. The words are important because they convey

a certain meaning, but if words drive us, if words force us into certain conclusions, certain actions, then language, words control us, shape us, force us. That again is very clear, isn't it? Either language uses us, or we use language. But most of us are driven by language, use the word 'Communist' and you have all kinds of fearful ideas, not that the Communists are not fearful. And if you say "I am British", immediately certain reactions arise. So words, language drive us, shape us, shape our thinking, our behaviour, our action. In realizing that, the slavery to language, but if we know how to use language, the exact meaning of words, the content and the significance of the depth of the word, then we are using language unemotionally, unsentimentally, not identified with a particular word, then we can communicate with each other directly and very simply. If I stick to the word 'Hindu' or an 'Indian', and that word shapes my thinking, my prejudices, all that nonsense, then the word 'Indian' or 'Hindu' forces me to act in a certain way. But whereas if I am free of that word 'Hindu' with all its national, limited, superstitious significance, then I am free to understand the human being who is behind the word. Right? Are we meeting each other?

So here we are using language and the language is not using us - we are using the language unemotionally, language which is pliable, correct according to the dictionary, so we can both of us communicate with each other very simply and directly when we use the word unemotionally, the word which hasn't got tremendous psychological content behind it. Can we do this? For most of us it is extraordinarily difficult because we have identified ourselves with the word and the word is us - I am a British, I am Hindu. Can

we strip ourselves of this network of language which is driving us, shaping us, and unemotionally use words that are simple, direct and therefore a word that doesn't bring about psychological reaction? Right? Can we do this first of all? If we can, then we can enquire together because we are free of the word which drives us, but we are using the word directly. I hope this is clear. Am I making the thing clear? At least I hope so.

Then knowing the meaning of words unemotionally, without any reaction to the word, then we can enquire into this whole problem of our way of living, why we live this way, why every day of our life is conflict, violent, selfish, narrow, limited, anxious, fearful, uncertain, a muddle in which we live. So we are challenging ourselves to find out why we live this way. Why we are mechanical in our relationship, in our ways of thinking, why we tolerate any form of violence, both in ourselves and externally, why though man has lived for thousands and thousands and thousands of years he lives in sorrow, without any love, frightened, miserable, utterly unintelligent.

So we are going to begin to enquire together, using words unemotionally without any reaction, to find out why we have become so intellectually, ethically mechanical. Right? We are just stating facts, not conclusions. It is not a conclusion to say we are mechanical, we are, we are caught in a routine whether in the office, or when you come home from your labours, exactly the same repetitive process goes on, sexually, ethically, in our daily action. Some of us realize it and try to escape from them by becoming revolutionaries, physical revolutionaries, or ideological revolutionaries. Physical revolution doesn't bring about anything,

that is obvious, in spite of the terrorists. psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were, why have you become mechanical? I mean by that word 'mechanical', action based on pleasure, action based on fear, action based on authority, action according to a certain pattern of thinking, action along evasion, avoiding, running away and never facing the fact as we are. These are not conclusions, these are obvious daily facts. And again please, you are listening to yourself, although the speaker may put it into words, though the speaker is not here, you are listening to yourself and finding out, challenging yourselves why we live this mechanical existence. You may leave one set of ideologies, Christian or Communist and join another set of ideologies, you may give up being a Catholic and become a Protestant or a Hindu, or if you are rather advanced you will go off and do Zen Buddhism, or if you are still more advanced you go off into Krishnamurti stuff! (Laughter).

You understand how we are never demanding for ourselves what is the right thing to do, always depending on somebody, guru, this person or that person. So what is the right action in a world that is crumbling, that is becoming daily more frightening, where there are so many divisions of beliefs, dogmas, nationalities and so on and so on, religions and every form of division. What is the right action for each one of us in our daily life with our occupations and so on, what is the right action, what is the correct way of living? If you challenge yourselves, and I hope you are doing it now, what are you to do?

So we have to enquire: What is action? Right? What do we mean by that word 'action', whether you are married, whether you

are not married, whether you are in the office, whether you are fairly well off and independent and so on and so on, what is the correct thing to do in my life, facing all this, not according to any pattern, obviously, that is not correct action? Not based on certain ideologies, that also is not correct action because those ideologies are projected by thought, clever, cunning thought. And action based according to certain authority, whether religious, political or your own particular authority based on your own experience and knowledge, that is neither correct action. Please understand all this because if you base your action on your own experience then your experience is very limited, and you are constantly demanding greater and greater experiences, which is greater and greater sensation, not experience. The word 'experience' means to go through, finish with something. And action based on a past conclusion, however right, however worthy, that is still from the past and therefore still limited in terms of time. Or if your action is based on a future conclusion, on a future ideology or a future ideal, that again is not correct action because you have projected the ideal, what you should be, what your country should be, or what your group should be, and act according to what should be, therefore you are not acting at all. Action implies doing something now, independent of the past and the future.

This is really quite fascinating and tremendously interesting, if I may use these words, which are not the correct words but it doesn't matter for the moment, to find out for oneself: is there an action totally devoid of time? You understand? Time being the past with all my memories, knowledge, experience, stored up in the brain as memory and acting according to that memory, which is the past

acting in the present, or the past, which has had so many experiences, so many failures, so many anxieties, fears, sorrows, projects something in the future as ideological, what should be, how happy it would be and act according to that, which again is non action - right? At least let's meet together intellectually, then if you understand that intellectually then you can go still deeper into it, at least we can understand each other at that level, which is very limited.

Then: is there an action in daily life, in our daily relationship with each other, intimate or not intimate, sexual or not sexual, is there an action which will be holistic, whole, which is not dependent on time, on environment, on circumstances? So we are challenging: is there such an action? Or we only know action based on the past, or on the future? We don't know any other action and we accept such action, it is much more convenient, more comfortable, easy to accept such action. So we are challenging each other to find out if it is possible to live a life of correct action, which is not dependent on environment, on circumstances, on the past, or on the future. You understand? This is the most difficult thing to find out. When you want to find out such an action, if there is such an action, thought immediately begins to operate, thought says "Is there such a thing?" "I must enquire." So thought is the past - isn't it? Thought is the outcome of memory, thought is the result of your experience, accumulated knowledge and from that arises memory and then from the reaction of that memory is thinking. That is simple, very simple if you go into it. It is not complicated. So when there is such a challenge as saying: is there action which is not dependent on the past or the future, on



environment, circumstances, then thought begins to operate - right? That is what you are doing. Then thought says, "I must find out such action." Since thought cannot find such action, you say that it is impossible. You are following all this? We are all together in this, or am I talking to myself? I can do that in my room.

So action based on thought is limited because thought in itself is a broken up thing, a fragment, limited because it is based on knowledge and knowledge however much you may accumulate, however much you may accumulate facts, expanding knowledge over and over, expanding constantly, it is still limited. That is obvious again. Perhaps not to the people who advocate the ascent of man through knowledge, because that is their particular form of conclusion. But when one sees actually, in daily life, how knowledge is so extraordinarily limited, you may have technological knowledge and you must have, and to that knowledge more can be added, it can be constantly expanded, but is there the accumulation of psychological knowledge from which action takes place? All right?

One has accumulated knowledge, psychologically. I have been hurt many years ago as a boy, or a girl, I have been hurt. And that hurt has become my knowledge, it is there inside my skin. And I act according to that knowledge, which is I resist, I isolate myself in order not to be hurt more. And so there is constant division between me and another to prevent being further hurt. This is a common fact again. So I act according to that knowledge. I may see the irrationality of it. I may go to psychologists. I may do all kinds of things about it but the wound is still there and that wound is responding all the time. So I am acting according to a past

incident, whether that past incident is pleasurable or painful is irrelevant but it is the past event, which is my knowledge. I have had a lovely afternoon - that becomes my knowledge. I am going to have a marvellous day tomorrow - and again, you follow, this whole process is based on the accumulated process of experience, desire and pleasure.

So is there an action which is totally independent of all this? You understand my question? To enquire into that, the operation of thought must be understood because you can't stop thinking. If you force, as many people do through meditation, which is not meditation, try to control thought, shape thought, then they have divided themselves into the thinker who is superior and thought inferior, and so the superior tries to control the inferior - you know all this. So is there an action which is totally divorced from all this? We are challenging you - I am challenging you and you are challenging me, together we are in a state of being challenged.

Perhaps if you have challenged sufficiently deeply and earnestly and with all your being then you will find an answer, which is, I will tell you but we are discussing this together, we are sharing this together therefore I am not telling you and you are not accepting it, then it becomes futile, then we might just as well go to some guru. But whereas if you can discover this for yourself then you are free - you understand? You have understood action in all its full meaning and its depth and the beauty of action. We say - the speaker says there is such an action devoid completely from the past or the future, from environment, from circumstances. It is to have an insight into the total movement of thought as it expresses itself in the environment, circumstances, past and future, which is

to have insight into action. That is, insight is not the response of memory - right? Hasn't it ever happened to you, suddenly you say "I have understood it"? - without words, without gestures, without circumstances, without the past, you suddenly feel that you have got it. And that is irrevocable, it is ultimate truth, you can't say, "Well I have got it but the next day I have lost it".

So we are going to find out together the meaning of this word 'insight'. To have an insight into something is not personal, it is not based on some ideological conclusions, memories, remembrances. One must be free of that to have an instant insight into something. One must be free of knowledge to have immediate perception. This is not something extravagant, exotic, or rather emotional but actual: where if you have ever had this kind of immediate understanding and therefore immediate action, that immediate understanding demands immediate action irrelevant of time. Hasn't it happened? It happens obviously but then thought says, "I have that insight, I have had that strange deep perception and therefore from that immediate action, but I wish it could continue all the time". You understand? I want that insight, that immediate perception, immediate understanding, to continue. When you say it must continue you have already begun the whole movement of thought. I wonder if you see this? Insight, the quick perception of something is instantaneous and finished there. You can't carry it over. Whereas thought demands that it should be carried over, and therefore prevents the next insight. I wonder if you get all this?

Have we understood something of this because it is very important, because from this we can go into something further where quick insight is demanded so that you never have to

struggle, never have to have conflict. Because when you are acting upon insight it is an irrevocable truth. It is not intuition. We are using the word carefully. People have intuitions, which is, they desire, project and you know all that ugly stuff. Insight, quick perception and action is not personal therefore it is whole, it is holistic. And our actions are never whole. We do something, regret, "I wish I hadn't done that", or we have done something which gives us pleasure and we want more of that action. So whereas insight is something which is quite simple, but to have such an insight into things one must have a quick mind, not a dull mind, not a mind that is frightened, or a mind where thought says "If I do that what will happen? I might regret it, or there might be failure, it might bring about hurt to others and to myself" - and so action is never total, complete, whole. Whereas action which is born out of insight, immediate perception has no regrets because it is actual, it is the only action.

Now bearing that in mind, perhaps even intellectually, do you have a quick perception of what is the whole nature and structure of authority? Authority of books, authority of professors, authority of scientists, authority of the religious priests, and so on and so on. Or your own experience, which has become your authority. To have an immediate insight into this then you are free totally of all authority. Then you don't have to fight and struggle to say "I accept this authority, I don't accept that. The authority of my guru is marvellous but I reject the authority of the priest". They are exactly the same thing.

So in discussing, in being challenged and challenging each other, are you free of authority? There is the authority of the

policeman, the authority of the law, the authority of the surgeon - that perhaps has its right place - but is there psychological authority of a belief, of a dogma, of a conclusion, of an ideology, the Communist, Socialist or whatever authority, religious, inwardly? If you have then you will never find out what is right action - obviously. Right?

So enquiring step by step into this are you actually, if I may most respectfully ask, free of authority, including the authority of this person sitting on the platform at this moment? If you are not, find out why you accept authority inwardly. Objectively you need authority - right? You can't drive on the right hand side in England, you would have accidents. If you reject authority of some State laws you will be punished and so on and so on - there authority has its right place. But inwardly, deeply, not to have any form of authority.

Then we can proceed to enquire into why human beings live constantly in a state of fear - right? Shall we go into it? Why you as a human being, who is the representative of all humanity - right? - I wonder if you realize that. That you as a human being represent the entire human mind because you suffer, you are uncertain, you are caught in certain beliefs, or you are conditioned, you are British, you are French, you are German, or this or that, and you believe in this Jesus or Christ or somebody else doesn't believe in that, and you are a Hindu, a Muslim, you follow? So are you aware that in your relationship, in your daily activity, there is a sense of great fear - right? Is one aware of it? If one is - now look: if you have fear the natural - I won't call it natural - the irrational response is to cultivate courage, whatever that may mean. Or to run away from it.

Or rationalize it - why shouldn't I be afraid, it is natural and so on and so on. Or you identify your fear and yourself, yourself and fear are one, there is not you separate from fear, so that fear which is you identifies itself with something greater and says in that surrender to the greater I have lost fear. We have played all these kind of games for centuries. And we still have fear, at the end of a million years every human being right through the world has some kind of fear. Now to have a quick insight into this and therefore to be totally free from it. Is that possible? Because fear is the most dreadful thing, you know all the rest of it, the result of fear - neuroticism of every kind, escape into various forms of entertainment, religious and otherwise, rationalizing fears and accepting fears as part of our daily existence.

Now we are asking: is it possible to have an insight into the whole nature and structure of fear and be free of it? Don't you want to know if you can be free of fear? Or do you accept, as we accept so many things, it as part of life? If you don't accept it as part of life then what is the nature of fear? What is the root of fear? What is the substance, the structure, the whole movement of fear? Not only fear of one's wife or husband, girl - you know, fear in its entirety, not one particular form of fear. Don't you want to find out? In the sense, don't you want to give your mind, your heart, your being, your whole energy to find out whether it is possible totally to eradicate fear? Fear has many forms, one of the major factors of fear is attachment - attachment to a person, attachment to an ideal, to a belief, attachment to a piece of furniture - you know what attachment is. And where there is attachment there is inevitably the fear of losing. And is it possible to exist without

isolating, without attachment? You understand my question? Is it possible for a human being who has lived ten thousand years and more, lived always in fear as part of his life from the caveman until now, is it possible to uncondition himself from fear? As we said, one of the factors of fear is attachment, to find out if one is attached, not avoid it, but find out to see if one is attached to something, to your guru, to your knowledge, to your furniture, to your friend, to your wife, girl, boy or whatever it is, attached to your country. Where there is attachment there is jealousy, there is possessiveness, there is a sense of identifying oneself with something else. And when there is that attachment and identification there is always uncertainty. These are facts, aren't they? No?

So can you be free of attachment? - not tomorrow or when you are on the deathbed, then of course it is very simple to be detached!. (Laughter) You can't argue with death. But now living your daily life, to be free of every form of attachment without becoming isolated, which again breeds fear. I may detach myself from this and from everything else and suddenly feel I am lonely, a sense of emptiness, and being frightened of that emptiness begin again being attached, not to a person, but to some marvellous ideal. All that in every form of attachment brings fear. A man or a woman who really enquires and demands, challenges himself whether you can ever be free of fear, then we have a quick insight into the whole nature of attachment. Have you, as we are talking, exploring with each other, have you got this feeling, this insight, this immediate perception of the whole nature of attachment and its structure with all the complications involved in it, see it instantly?

And when you see it in all its totality it is finished. It doesn't mean you become callous. It doesn't mean you become isolated. On the contrary: you are a free human being who is no longer held down by fear. Right? That is only one expression of fear. Perhaps the deepest expression of fear, of losing what you have. Actually you have nothing but that is irrelevant.

So what is the root of all this fear? You see most of us are inclined to trim the branches of fear - right? I am afraid of this thing therefore let me get rid of it, or let me go to somebody who will help me to be free of fear, of that particular expression of fear - the psychologist, the priest, the analyst, the latest gurus and all that business. But we are not concerned with the trimming of the tree of fear but rather to uncover the root of fear so that when you see the root of it and have a depth of understanding of the root then if you have certain understanding it is an insight then fear disappears completely, you are no longer afraid psychologically. Physically it is a different matter. Physically one must be careful, one must be rational, sane, unless you are extraordinarily neurotic then that is a different matter. But physically one must be watchful of danger, as you would be watchful of a precipice, as you would be watchful of a dangerous animal and perhaps human beings are becoming more and more dangerous than any animal. So one has to be watchful of human beings, the terrorists, the politicians - are there any politicians here? (Laughter) And very watchful of gurus and so on and so on.

So one understands the watchfulness, the danger physically. But what is the root of psychological fear? Please challenge, ask yourself. Don't accept my challenge. Ask yourself what is the root



of all this? Don't say "I don't know" and just leave it like that. Or draw some conclusion. If you do, it will prevent you from finding out the root of it. If you say, "I really don't know what the root of fear is", then you start with humility. Then you say, "I really don't know but I am going to find out". But if you start with arrogance and saying "I can solve it. I know, I have all the facts about fear", then you are starting with a conclusion, with a sense of hope, which doesn't mean you must be in despair to ask it, but if you are really deeply concerned with the nature and the structure of fear at its very depth, what is the root of fear? Those of you who have read or heard the speaker before, don't say "Yes, I know it". That is a cheap trick. Because you have heard somebody tell you that, and that may be the truth but it is not yours, it is not the truth, it is somebody else's. There is no your truth or my truth, but if you accept a statement made by somebody like this person and say "Yes, I have heard that before but it hasn't got rid of my fear", then language is driving you - you understand? Language is driving you. Language is using you. But if you are free of what you have heard before, but actually demand now as you are sitting there, to find out what is the essence, the root, the basis of all fear, then as you don't know you come to it afresh, you come to it with a certain sense of curiosity to find out. But if you come to it already with some conclusion there is no possibility of your understanding the root of it.

So let's find out together, afresh, what is the root of this whole nature and the structure of fear. When you want to find out, if you have a motive, that is, "I must be free of fear" - which is a motive, then that motive gives a direction to your enquiry. So the motive

which gives a direction prevents you from enquiring. This is simple isn't it? If I have a motive in order to enquire into fear because I want to get rid of fear, I have already given a direction to it - right? Because my desire is to get rid of it, not to understand the nature and the structure and the depth of fear. We won't get rid of the word 'fear'. So the word 'fear' is driving us. You understand? Whereas if you look at it, if you are free of the word and say, "What is this fear which I have lived with for so long?" What is it? Is it time? - time being yesterday, today and tomorrow, the sun setting, the sun rising. Which is, is fear the result of time? Something happened which you are fearful of a year ago or yesterday and that fear of that incident remains, and that memory of that thing is called fear. You are following all this? The memory of that incident which took place a year ago or yesterday has left a certain remembrance and that remembrance says there is fear - right? So recollection of a word called fear will say, that is fear. Whereas we are trying to find out, being free of the word, what is the essence of it. Are you following all this? Is this getting too tiresome all this?

What is the root of it? I say to myself because I am a very serious person, and I have got plenty of energy, I must find it out, I don't want to live with fear. It is too absurd, too illogical, irrational. What is the essence of it? Is it time? It is partly that, time. And also is thought creating fear? You understand?

So time, thought - I have understood more or less the nature of time, time externally, time inwardly, psychologically: I will be, I am not, I will be, or I should be, whereas I am not. The 'should be' is the movement of time - right? I don't know if you are following

all this?

It is a nice morning and I hope you are enjoying this too. I hope you are having a pleasant happy time in this enquiry, as you would have a pleasant time sitting on the lawn and looking at the trees and the clouds and the warm sunshine.

So what is thought then? I have understood the nature of time. Now I want to understand if thought is responsible for fear. I don't know but I am going to find out. If thought is responsible I must understand the whole nature of thought. What is thinking? Thinking is the response of memory - right? Obviously. If you have no memory at all you wouldn't think. But thinking has become very important for us. We apply thinking to everything we do. Is love a remembrance, a thought? I am not talking of sexual love, sensation, the sensuous love, I won't even call that love, it is sensation. Is love sensation? Is love a remembrance? And is thought love? You understand? I am asking all this. And what is the nature of thought? Very simply it is based on the accumulation of knowledge gathered through experience of millenia, living, which is stored up in the brain - I am not a brain specialist, you can watch for yourself - in the brain and the memory responds to a challenge.

Now I am challenging myself: what is thinking? And so it says, 'Memory, of course'. So is memory responsible for fear? I have been hurt physically last year, I remember that and I am afraid it might come back again, the disease, or the pain, or whatever it is. That is, thought based on an experience of last year's or yesterday's pain, remembering it and being frightened of it. That mustn't happen again. All our action, all our existence, is based on thought.

I don't know if you have ever realized this extraordinary fact: everything that we do is based on thought. There is no spontaneity, that is quite a different existence, to be spontaneous. To have that spontaneity one must understand the nature of thought which has conditioned our brain, our whole mental outlook, our activity. When there is an understanding, immediate insight into this then there is spontaneity, there is freedom. But that is quite a different matter.

So we are asking: time, I see is partly responsible. Thought is also responsible. Is time thought? Or thought is time? You understand? They are not time and thought separate. There is only thought which creates psychological time - right? And therefore having gone into the depths of it, understood it, not intellectually, verbally but actually see for oneself the nature of thinking, then one realizes thought is basically responsible for fear. Then one says, "How then can I stop thinking?" - which is the most absurd question. You see that is part of the trick of what the gurus have brought. Which is: meditate, try to control thought, stop thought. Have you ever tried to stop thinking? If you have you will find out that the person who says "I must stop thinking" - the entity that says that is also part of thought. He is playing a trick upon itself.

So if you see time is thought, time is movement, movement from yesterday, today, tomorrow. And also thought is movement, movement based on a past memory, past experiences, past knowledge - knowledge is always the past. So thought is basically responsible for fear. You understand? Now is the word 'fear', fear? You understand? Is the word 'fear', actual fear? Or the word is not that thing. Are you all getting too tired? You understand my

question? Is the word different from the thing? Or is the word creating that thing, fear? Then the word is driving you and the word is creating the fear. Or is there fear independent of the word? Which is, the word is not the thing? Right? You understand? So have you separated the word from the thing? The tent, the marquee, the word is not that - right? So when you look at it, can you separate the word from the thing? You understand my question? So have you separated the word from the reaction, which you call fear? Which means, are you aware that you are caught in the network of words? And therefore the words are driving you. So can you look at the thing without the word? Which means look at that thing without naming it, which becomes the word. I wonder if you understand all this? Look, this requires great alertness, great awareness, of observation. It isn't just saying, "Yes, I can separate the word, this and that" - play around. But actually see that you are caught and that your observation is through a word, and therefore the word becomes all important. In realizing that you say, "All right, I will separate the word, put it away, let me look at the thing itself" - not with the word interfering with it, the word with its connotations, its content. "Let me look at that thing". Do you understand? I am expending a lot of energy, I hope you are too.

So, can you look at fear, the word, the actual sensation without the word? Or the word is creating the sensation? The name, fear, is creating that. You understand? You can look at the marquee, the word and the fact, the tent, differently, you can separate it and say, "Yes, I can look at it without the word. I can see the lines, I can see the posts, without the word". But to do that psychologically one has to be extraordinarily alert. To be so deeply aware of the

meaning, the word and the thing. Now if you are, then the thing you are looking at without the word, is it fear? You understand what I am trying to say? The reaction which you have named as fear, if you don't name it, is there fear? You have come to that after investigating, understanding time and thought. Thought is time because both are movement. Time is movement. Thought is movement. So they are not two separate things. Thought creates psychological time.

So thought has created the word. The original man or the ape or the primate says "I am afraid" - fear has gone right down to us - you follow? And now we are asking: separate the two, the word and the sensation, the reaction and look at it, observe the reaction without the word. Now when you observe the reaction, is the observer different from the reaction? You understand? Or they are both the same, the observer is the observed, the reaction is the observer? Right?

I see you don't see, some of you. You have been angry, is that anger different from you? You are only aware of that anger - at the moment of anger you are not, but a second or a minute after you say, "I have been angry". You have separated yourself from that thing called anger and so there is a division. Similarly, is the reaction which you call fear different from you? Obviously it is not. So you and that reaction are the same. When you realize that, you don't fight it, you are that. Right? I wonder if you see it. Then a totally different action takes place, which is, before you have used positive action with regard to fear, say, "I must not be afraid, I will deny it, I'll control it, I must do this and that about it, go to a psychologist" - you know, all the rest of it. Now when you realize,

when there is the fact - not realize - when there is the fact that you are the reaction, there is no you separate from that reaction. Then you can't do anything, can you? I wonder if you realize you can't do anything. Therefore a negation, a negative, a non-positive observation is the ending of fear - right?

What time is it?

Audience: One o'clock.

Forgive me for talking an hour and a half, I didn't realize it. I hope you aren't bored, you aren't stiff sitting in the same position.

Audience: Don't be afraid. We enjoyed it.

K: Good. We will meet tomorrow again.

Audience: Thank you. (Clapping)

K: Please don't clap. It isn't worth it.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 27TH AUGUST 1978**

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday morning? Before we go into that may I point out that one should have quite a bit of scepticism, doubt, not accepting what the speaker is saying but questioning, investigating, enquiring into what he is saying or what we are thinking ourselves, if there is any truth, if there is any falsehood or if what is being said is factual, which is, applicable to daily life. So if one merely accepts words, as most of us do, we are collectors of words and phrases, and thereby we miss a great deal. So what we are talking about is that self knowledge, that is knowing oneself, is the greatest importance, not according to some psychologist, analyst or according to the speaker but knowing oneself actually as one is. Not denying or accepting what is but observing, looking into oneself very, very deeply. And whether what you find in yourself, not according to somebody else, but actually for yourself what you see and what you perceive in your actions, in your reactions and so on, to be aware of that, to know oneself. Knowing oneself implies, doesn't it, not having known and recognizing 'what is'. That is, to discover oneself anew each time, not according to a remembrance of something that you have seen before in yourself and recognize it, and keep on recognizing all the time. I hope I am making this clear.

That is, I want to know myself because if I don't know myself there is no possibility of right action, right behaviour, or I have no foundation for any clarity. One can deceive so immensely, live in a kind of illusory world, a make-belief world, but to know oneself so



completely frees the mind from all its entanglements, from all its worries, its everlasting chattering and so on.

In that enquiry we were saying yesterday, we are driven by language. Language uses us rather than we use language. We went into that fairly thoroughly yesterday. And also we said that the speaker not being here, you yourself are speaking to yourself and listening to yourself to find out what exactly is going on within yourself, within the skin, within the psychological area of yourself. We know very well what is happening around us, at least if you are fairly well informed, but very few of us know exactly where we are, what our reactions are and if it is possible to go beyond them.

And also we were saying yesterday that the basic root of fear in which most of us live, is time. Chronological time as yesterday, today and tomorrow, and also the whole movement of thought. Those are the two factors which bring about fear. And the other factor in that is remembrance. The remembrance of a past fear and holding on to that remembrance and projecting a future fear. We were talking about that yesterday.

So if we may we would like to go into further factors of ourselves. Most of us, psychologically, live in disorder. I do not know if you are not aware of it. We are driven by, not only language, but also by a great many pressures from outside, economic, social, political, national, the religious beliefs and so on. But psychologically the greatest pressure is desire with most of us. As we said yesterday, please we are communicating with each other. You are not merely listening to the person who is talking, who is not at all important. What is said is important, not the person. It is like if you have a telephone you don't give great

importance to the telephone, you keep it clean but what is said through the telephone is all important. Similarly the person who is speaking here is not at all important. I would like to point this out over and over again: the person is not important at all. But what is said is important. So your admiration for a person, or your dislike of the person, or this, that, all that nonsense is of very little importance. You don't, if you have a good telephone you don't smash it, you keep it clean, you respect it. But the telephone itself is of no value at all, but what is said through the telephone becomes significant. Similarly here the person is not important. Have you understood that clearly and definitely?

We are saying we live in disorder, psychologically, we may have an orderly room, do proper exercises, do so-called yoga - I won't go into that word, what it means, how it began and all the rest of it, it is not the moment. But we keep order outwardly, apparently, but there is disorder, astonishing disorder in the world. Perhaps that disorder is brought about by each one's psychological disorder. Disorder means contradiction in oneself, thinking one thing, doing another, saying one thing and do the opposite to what you have said, or being uncertain, not clear, contradictory, and so on. All that indicates disorder. And also where there is contradiction there must be effort, where there is division there must be conflict and so on. All that is a state of disorder in which we live, that is an obvious fact.

And to bring about order psychologically what is one to do? I hope you are challenging yourself and not accepting my challenge. Knowing consciously where one is in disorder psychologically, what is one to do? How is one to bring about order? Because

without order psychologically as well as outwardly one must live in chaos - as the world is becoming more and more chaotic, destructive, violent, which shows a great deal of disorder in the world. And perhaps that disorder is projected by each one of us because we live in disorder.

So we are asking: how is one to have complete, total order in oneself, is that possible? Where there is order there is tremendous energy. Where there is disorder there is the dissipating of energy, wastage of energy. So we are going to enquire together - I am not enquiring to myself but together we are enquiring, exploring into this question: what is order and can there be order without understanding disorder? So we are enquiring together to find out this actual state, the fact that we live in disorder - is that a fact, not a verbal description of the disorder? The word is not the thing. The description of the disorder is not actual disorder. The description of a mountain however beautifully it is painted, the beauty of the valley, the light, the snow, the lines against the sky, the whole sense of dignity, beauty of that mountain can be described most beautifully but the description is not the actual fact. For most of us description is sufficient. So we are caught in the description, not with the actual fact. So then we are asking: what is disorder? - is that an idea of what you think should be order and in comparison with what you think should be order there is disorder, which again is total disorder. I hope you are following all this. So we are going to find out what is disorder, and having an insight, a quick perception of the whole structure of disorder, then out of that comes order. That order is not according to a pattern, according to a blueprint, according to some saying, or some philosopher, or

some religious quack. And most religious priests and hierarchy and all the rest of it are super quacks, even the new pope.

So are we aware first that we live in disorder? Not the definition of that word but the actual fact of contradiction, of division, me and mine and you and yours, we and they and all that division that goes on within ourselves, the constant conflict. All that indicates disorder. And how do you observe that disorder? Say for example, as we took yesterday, attachment in any form is a factor of disorder, and also a factor, as we pointed out yesterday, as we discovered yesterday, a part of fear. So attachment to a person, to an idea, to a conclusion, to a past memory, to a piece of furniture and so on and so on, does breed disorder. Do we see that fact?

And the freedom from attachment, without becoming isolated, callous, indifferent, does that bring about certain order? Because what we are talking about is, that when we have put everything in order then there is a great deal of energy, tremendous energy. And one needs that energy to go most profoundly into oneself. So we are asking, discovering for ourselves, first the disorder in which we live and the nature of that disorder which is part of attachment, fear, and pleasure and so on, and without directing it in any particular direction, hoping that will bring order, but just to be aware of this disorder without any movement away from it. Are we meeting each other? Is the speaker making the thing clear? That is, may I go into it? All right.

Suppose I live in disorder, inwardly, I may have marvellous order outwardly but inwardly perhaps I am in great disorder. And I ask myself, what am I to do? Is that disorder different from me? Or I am that disorder? You understand this question? Please, this is

really important to understand because if the disorder is different from me then I can do something about it, then I can change the pattern, move from one corner to another corner, or bring psychological order by suppressing, by control, by this and by that. I can do something about it. But if the disorder is not different from me, which is a fact that the disorder is me, the disorder is me, then the problem arises what happens then? You are following all this? You are not listening to me, you are listening to yourself. Then perhaps you will bring about a change. But if you merely listen to the speaker, you can listen to him for the rest of your life, and I hope you won't, and if you merely listen to him you won't change. But if you yourself see that you live in disorder and that disorder is not different from you, fundamentally, basically you are that disorder, then what takes place? Before you could do something about it because you had separated yourself from it and you operated on it, and therefore in that there was constant conflict, betrayal, one day you could do it, the next day you couldn't do it and so on and so on, fluctuating from day to day. Whereas the fact is you are that disorder. That is a fact, not a conclusion which the speaker has come to and is trying to impose it on you, it is not. We are not doing propaganda of any kind, trying to convince you of anything. But when the disorder is me I can't do anything about it, which means I can't operate on it as I used to before. So I remain in this total disorder. Are you doing this as we are talking? Or is it just a verbal accumulation? I am not different from that disorder. That disorder exists because I have divided myself from what I have called disorder. That is one of the major factors of disorder. I have discovered that. Wherever there is a separation between me

and psychologically what I observe, that division is one of the major factors of disorder. That is, when I call myself a Hindu, or myself a Muslim, a Christian, Catholic or a British or a French, or German, or whatever it is, the division is a factor of disorder - the Jew and the Arab, you have got an obvious example, everyday that is happening. So psychologically when there is division between disorder and myself, I am encouraging and cultivating disorder. Whereas the fact is the disorder is myself and therefore the realization, the truth of that brings order. Are you following this? You are all very silent. It's up to you.

Q: I am waiting for it to happen.

K: The gentleman says he is waiting for it to happen. I'm afraid you will have to wait a long time! (Laughter) It is a fact, it can't happen to you. You, yourself, see what is going on, therefore the actual fact, the truth of the matter frees the mind from disorder. The cause of this disorder is the separation as me and different from disorder - you understand?

So similarly can we bring order in our life? That is, to learn the art of putting everything in its right place. That is order. But you cannot put things in their right place unless the man who puts the thing in the right place is also very orderly - you understand? Naturally. So we are trying to find out what is order, and what is disorder. Disorder can be dissolved only when the division between me and the other ceases to be, psychologically. And one has to learn the art of putting things in their proper place. Money, which most of us, if we have lots of it, cling to, if you have little of it you want more of it, and so on and so on. Money has become tremendously important in the world. And also sex has become

tremendously important - I am not going to talk about it, it is important. You know how important it is in your life. And when you give something such great importance that very fact that you are giving a particular thing great importance is disorder - right? If I give tremendous importance to exercise, so-called yoga, then I am putting that totally out of proportion. So putting everything in its proper place implies giving everything its right value - right? Can we do that? Do we want to do that? Or is it all much too difficult? Or you say, "Please, we have lived for so many years in this mess, let me go on. Don't interfere with this mess". And so you accept the mess and you are accustomed to it, you become comfortable with this mess, and you don't want to alter it. But a man who is seriously concerned not only with the world outside of us but also inwardly, to give money, sex, everything its proper place is to learn the beauty of freedom. Without that there is no freedom.

So then the next problem is: we live under great pressure, more and more. Pressure - institutional pressures, political pressures, economic pressures, social pressures, and so on and so on and so on. And we said perhaps the greatest pressure in most of us is the desire that we want to act, the pressure of tremendous desire - right? Are we following all this? May I go on?

I hope you are watching all this in yourself. Because you can listen to these words for the next ten years, fifteen, twenty years but at the end of that you say, "I am where I was". Because you don't apply, you don't say, "I am going to find out". You merely live at the level of words.

The next thing is: why is there such a tremendous pressure of

desire in most of us? The pressure of sex, the pressure of desire for sex, desire for experience, desire to be popular, famous, desire to - you know, all the rest of it, what the activities of desire are. Desire for enlightenment, which is the most stupid desire! For enlightenment doesn't come through desire. You may go to all the highest peaks in the Himalayas but you will never find illumination there. It is where you are, not in India, or in Japan, or in some other place - or even Rome. (Laughter) Sorry to talk about Rome because I have heard this morning about the Pope being elected!

So if one is aware of oneself, one sees how desire is so extraordinarily strong - desire for power, to dominate people, you know all this, I don't have to go into details. You know it all very, very well. And we live under this pressure. And so not only physiologically one becomes ill, the strain of it, but also psychologically it is a great travail, it is a great problem. I desire, say for example, to be the most marvellous person, and it is a constant strain to become somebody, to be somebody, to achieve a result. So one can see desire, without being understood, the whole nature and the structure of desire, is one of the factors of disorder - right? Please do we see that? Please don't accept what I am saying, that is totally unimportant. Is that in yourself a fact which you have discovered for yourself, seeing desire in all its multiple forms and multiple expressions does breed confusion, does breed disorder - right? And most people have said control desire, suppress desire, or fulfil desire, go the extreme of desire - they have done all these tricks. Talk to any monk and they will tell you that you must suppress any desire, carnal desire, or any form of desire in order to serve god - whoever god is. And so there is always this



suppression, control, constant conflict - you desire something, you suppress it, you rationalize it, you control it, you run away from it and so on. So what we are trying to do, what we are saying is: let's find out the nature of desire, how it arises, and whether we can give desire its proper place, and not in any way suppress it, control it, destroy it - right? We are going to go into that.

So one must find out the whole nature and the structure of desire. Find out for oneself, not be told what is the nature and the structure of desire. Then if you accept it you will come back next year and for the next thirty years and say, "Well, that is exactly where I am, I began and you have left me where I was after thirty years". Because one has lived on words, not actually gone into it for yourself. Why has desire become so extraordinarily important? It is encouraged through education, in every form, society, all things around us encourage this process of desire. I want to find out why desire has become important in oneself and what is desire? So I must first understand the nature of sensation - right? Sensory perception, senses. I must understand the way of the senses. May we go on?

The senses being touch, smell, taste and so on. And we never function with all the senses in operation. I wonder if you understand this? No? Taste becomes so extraordinarily important, if you are a gourmet, if you like good food, wine and all the rest of it, taste becomes extraordinarily important. Or if you are sensitive, music. Music becomes important, hearing a lovely sound and the space between sounds, and the quality of sound. Or something. So our senses are broken up, fragmented, we never see anything with all our senses completely. Right? Are we understanding each

other? Can you look at something, the movement of the sea, the way of the clouds, the wind among the trees, to look at it all with all your senses fully flowering and looking. Can you do that? Then when you do that you will see as a test - you are not accepting what I am saying - test it for yourself - then you will see there is no centre from which you are observing. There is no division caused by the centre who says, "I am different from that". When you observe things totally, a woman or a man or a child, or your girl friend, husband, wife, with all the senses awakened then there is no one particular sense demanding an action. You are following all this? Are you doing it as we are talking about it? So senses have their right place, but they become destructive, divisive and conflicting when one particular sense is developed and the others are dormant or semi-dormant. Whereas when you observe something entirely with all your senses then there is no division in yourself.

So desire is part of these sensations, is the beginning of sensation - right? That is a fact, isn't it? See a beautiful woman or a man or a child, or a car, or a mountain, or a lovely proportioned house, or a garden, and perception, sensation and the desire arises - right? And the desire, that sensation, perception, sensation creates the image and then desire begins to operate. That is the whole movement of desire. This is a simple, obvious daily fact which you can observe if you are paying attention.

So where does the conflict, the trouble, the confusion begin, in the movement of desire? Right? You are following? Say, for example, I see a beautiful tree, or a lovely garden. I have got a piece of land and I'd like to have such a beautiful garden myself.

That is, there is perception, sensation, the image-making which is thought - right? - and then thought pursues that which it has observed, which it has pleased. So wherever there is the movement of thought with regard to sensation then desire brings conflict. Are you understanding this? Is this clear? No, I see it is not. I will have to repeat it differently.

There is perception of a beautiful house, well proportioned and all the rest of it. Then there is sensation. That is normal, that is essential, otherwise I am blind, my senses are not acute, aware. But the trouble begins the moment thought creates the image of owning a house like that and working for it, identifying oneself with that house and so on. So where thought begins to interfere with the perception then there is division, then desire begins. You follow this? Is this clear? No, not what I am saying, for yourself. Are you also working as hard as we are working? It is hot in here. Are you working as hard? I hope so. It doesn't matter. It is up to you.

So the question is: it is natural to have the perception, sensation, that is natural, but can that moment stop and not thought come, and create an image and pursue that image which becomes desire? You understand my question? That is, perception, sensation is normal, healthy, but when thought comes in, creates the image then the image is pursued as desire, then the trouble begins. Haven't you noticed it in yourself? You can see a beautiful car and there is sensation and the image of you driving in it, driving it, the power you have and all that. But whereas seeing the car, sensation and stop there, Can you do it? You try it and see what is involved in it. In that there is no control. You see the whole implication of desire, how it arises, how thought then creates the image and pursues it.

Whereas perception, sensation and looking at the car - or the mountain, the girl, or the boy, or whatever it is. Then there is no conflict, there is no suppression of desire, then you have the enormous energy that has been used up by the movement of thought as desire. Is this clear?

So the next point is - we are investigating into ourselves - why do we live so greatly on remembrances? You understand my question? Why do human beings live in the past, which is to remember? Right? You all look so puzzled. You had a pleasant day and you remember it, and it is stored up as a memory, and you delight in that memory, you live in that memory; or you live in a sexual memory, or the memory of some achievement that has been possible for you. So remembrance has become extraordinarily important for all of us - as experience, as knowledge. I am asking - we are asking, why? Do you understand? Not that we must not remember, of course you must remember how to drive a car, where your home is and so on and so on, the technological knowledge one has acquired, but psychologically why has remembrance such importance in our life? Right? You are asking this question yourself. So what is remembrance? What is the factor of remembrance? There was an incident that was pleasurable or painful, an event that brought a smile or a tear, and that is registered in the brain - right? Naturally, this is simple. And that registration becomes the memory, that registration is the remembrance of that delightful event, or that painful event. Now the question is: why should we register psychologically anything? You understand my question? I have put a question: why should the brain register an event which was painful or pleasurable? It

may register things that are dangerous - right? Like a precipice, like a dangerous animal, or dangerous snake, or a dangerous person, a crook and so on, it may register. Those are all obvious daily facts. But why should the brain register the hurt, the flattery, the insult, the feeling that you are this and all the rest of it, why should there be registration psychologically at all? You have got the question, haven't you? Are we meeting each other?

Now we are asking: it is one of the factors of the brain to register, of necessity. I must register technological knowledge if I am working with machines and so on and so on. And also if I write or if I am a surgeon, a doctor and so on, it must be registered. But we are asking: why should one psychologically register anything at all? At least see the question first. Is it necessary? Does it bring a clarity? Does it bring greater energy, freedom and so on? Or psychological registration is one of the factors that destroys a real joy. I'll go into it presently.

We said the brain in its activity must register certain things, it is necessary. But we are asking: psychologically, inwardly why should the brain register? Is it a habit that we have fallen into, that when you insult me I register it immediately? When you flatter me, I register it immediately? Why? When you flatter me you are my friend, when you insult me you are not my friend and so on and so on. Now we are asking: can this registration stop psychologically? See what it means? Then that means regeneration of the brain. So the brain becomes extraordinarily alive, young and fresh because it is not registering that which is not necessary. I wonder if you follow all this? Now, is that possible? Intellectually one can see the beauty of it, verbally, say, "By Jove, it must be most extraordinary

intellectually to have no psychological registration". It doesn't mean one is a vegetable, or empty, or all that, but there is a freedom, an extraordinary sense of elation, an extraordinary sense of youthfulness, the brain doesn't get old, worn out. So one must find out if it is possible. Because as we grow older the brain gets more and more mechanical, more and more fixed in a groove, in a track, and becomes hard, brittle, not pliable, quick. Now is this possible, not to register psychologically at all? You have got the question? Is the question clear? Yes?

Now, let's proceed to find out. Find out, it doesn't mean that I am going to tell you and then you discover it and say, "Yes, it is so". Then you will come back thirty years later and say. "I am still where I started."

We said the brain needs security, safety to function efficiently. It must register certain facts, how to drive a car, write letters and so on and so on, technology and so on. Then the brain has realized that putting order, giving order to register only things that are necessary, which is to bring order - right? Then we can proceed to find out why the brain or the psyche, psychologically registers. Does it bring safety, avoid danger? Does it prevent further hurts, further destruction, further obstructions? Or we have cultivated unconsciously the habit of registering. We have registered there, so why not here? From there we have moved to here, psychologically, outwardly it is necessary but psychologically, from there we have moved to here. And is that necessary at all? A very simple example: from childhood we are hurt psychologically, by parents, by other children, by the school, college, university, if you are lucky and so on and so on - we are hurt, we are wounded

psychologically. And that wound is registered. And having been hurt then it registers isolation, fear and all the rest of it. Now is it necessary when you incite me to register at all? You understand my question? Is it possible to prevent registration? You understand my question? I hope so. It is possible only when you are insulting me, or flattering me, for all my senses to be awakened and listening. You understand this? Then there is no reception at all? Is this all Greek? (Laughter) I see the importance to have fresh, young, bright clear brain. That is utterly important. Is it possible to maintain that clarity, that precision, decision with that beauty of all that is implied until I die? It is not possible when there is registration of things that are not absolutely necessary. Right? So one has to find out why any form of psychological registration becomes memory, remembrance, and is it possible not to do it? One discovers if you go into it deeply it is possible. It is possible only when you are really attentive at the moment of insight, at the moment of flattery. Right? Have you tried this?

The other day a man said to me, "You are a damn fool, you are stuck in a rut" - it was rather impolite but there it is. (Laughter) So I went to my room and I said, "Is that a fact?" I want to find out, one may be stuck in a rut and one may be a damn fool. One investigates it and by watching very carefully you don't register, you listen to the word, you listen to the fact whether you are or not, whether you are stuck in a rut. Are you stuck in a rut? You understand? Are you? No, find out, don't answer me please. Somebody calls you what somebody called me, I hope more politely, and you want to find out if it is so. You neither deny nor accept but you must watch it, find out. If you are stuck in a rut, it is

fairly obvious, you soon find out you are in a rut.

So registration does not take place when you are alert, awake, totally aware with all your senses open, there is nothing to be registered psychologically. Will you do it? No, you won't because pleasure has become immensely important for us - right? If you observe yourself very carefully you will see what a great part, perhaps the greatest part, pleasure plays in our life. The pleasure to find god, or illumination, the pleasure to be free, the pleasure to have money, possessions, lovely wife or husband and all that business, pleasure of sex, pleasure of power, the politicians with their pleasure of immense power. And so the registration of pleasure in most of our lives is tremendous - right? And the pursuit of pleasure has become a dominant factor: that is the remembrance of a past pleasure and the pursuit of that past pleasure as remembrance and desire behind it and searching out, asking, demanding, wanting. Our whole religious organizations are based on that. It is a vast entertainment, it gives great pleasure, which is great sensation, that you are in the presence of holy things and so on.

So we said, the registration of pleasure, of an event that gave you great delight, is registered and the pursuit of it in our life.

Now the question is: what is pleasure? When you are enjoying something at the moment you don't say, "How pleasurable it is, how lovely" - you are in it. Only a second later thought comes along and says, "What a lovely time that was, how beautiful it was, what a great sensation it gave me, what a lovely experience", so there is registration taking place, then thought is in operation. You are following all this?



We are talking about all this because it is part of knowing oneself, not from books, not from words, not from description, but actually knowing oneself. Knowing doesn't mean accumulating memory about oneself and from that accumulation observe. If you observe through accumulation you are only accumulating what you have already known. But whereas if you are observing afresh each time then it is like a vast river with a volume of water flowing, moving.

So what is pleasure? Is it time, is it thought as fear? We said the root of fear is time. The root of fear is thought. Thought which is remembered, remembrance remembers certain events that caused fear, registered, the remembrance of it and the next time this whole remembrance is projected. You are watching? So is pleasure time and the movement of thought? Or they are both the same, thought and time are essentially the same? So thought is the movement of pleasure, which doesn't mean that you can't look at a beautiful tree and enjoy it, a beautiful person, a painting or a lovely valley with all the purple shadows in it. Look at it but the moment it becomes registered and remembered it is no longer delight, it becomes a pleasure, which is the remembrance of things that have happened before. Now if you see the whole nature of this, completely, then pleasure has its place, delight and therefore psychologically, inwardly there is no registration of that event. The mind then, the brain then becomes extraordinarily alive, young, fresh without any neurotic reactions.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **29TH AUGUST 1978**

This is supposed to be a discussion, or a dialogue. A dialogue being a conversation between two people and as it is impossible to have a conversation with two people including so many, perhaps we could take a problem which may affect all of us and discuss it as though it were between two people. Or we could turn this into a question and answer meeting. So which would you like?

Discussion generally ends up in an argument, which would be rather futile, offering one opinion against another, one judgement against another and so on. But whereas a dialogue, a conversation between two people who are friends, who are concerned about a problem which is mutual and perhaps they can talk over their problems deeply, quietly, seriously and with a sense of humour. Or we could turn this into a question and answer meeting; there too again what kind of question one asks, who is asking, what is the purpose of asking and who is going to answer the question, and so on. All that is involved in all this. So which would you like, or think it proper, to either question, dialogue or discussion?

Questioner: Dialogue.

K: If it is to be a dialogue what shall we talk about, remembering a dialogue is between two people, a conversation amicable, easy, quiet and penetrating? So what shall we talk over together?

Q: I would like to ask a question, not necessarily a dialogue. You were saying yesterday that the chaos and the violence in the world is a result of our everyday life. But I don't think it is as easy

as all that. If you take the spectrum, at one end of the spectrum you put Hitler and at the other end of the spectrum you put a person like Schweizer, then you have two people who are doing something quite different: one person is trying to help humanity and the other person is trying to destroy humanity. Now if you leave that aside for a moment: take any one person in this tent, give them the right environment, the right job, they are free of conflict, they are not hooked on religion or dope and they get cancer. Now the conventional religious view would say that it is an act of god, which is obviously crackers. But you could say that this person has a disposition towards a disease. Now it does appear to me that in the world today there are people who are definitely for the forces of good and those for the forces of destruction.

K: The gentleman asks why do you say the world is in chaos because we are in chaos, each one of us, uncertain, argumentative, greedy, selfish, violent, which perhaps may project in the world, bearing in mind that we are the world: we are not different from the world. And there are good people, the questioner says, and there are some bad people, bad guys and good guys, and would it be erroneous on your part to say that because we live in our own particular individual lives, rather violent, ugly and so on, that maybe quite inaccurate.

What other questions would you like to discuss, talk over?

Q: I would like to ask a question, if I may. I was churning over in my mind what you said yesterday about registering memories. And what concerned me was if you were to ask me a question, if I was to totally experience what you were saying to me that at the end of the question, if I had totally experienced it, that I wouldn't

know that you had asked me a question in order to be able to answer it. And what I would like to ask you is: is it possible that we have two parts to our communication, which are the two hemispheres of the brain, one which only receives and which totally registers all the time, and the other part which transmits, which in fact we need not register because if we experience that we need not register it. It is possible - my mind has got a blank now. (Laughter) When we receive we are not able to blot out that memory, that it is there totally and that in fact it is our choice whether we use one side of the brain or the other and to what we use each side of the brain.

K: The questioner says there are two spheres in our brain, one that is receiving, registering, memorizing, and the other part, perhaps the other part which is more free, which is not conditioned and therefore there is this duality going on in us. And memory, remembrance of a particular of this sphere is necessary. That is his question.

Any other questions?

Q: Yes, would you please talk about the problem that arises when the intensity of one's feelings and emotions block one's awareness.

K: When one's emotions and sentiments and reactions, which are intense and strong, block a perception, what is one to do?

Q: I understand that meditation is a way of life all day, so you think there is no need to sit down in lotus position at certain times. That is one thing. And the other thing is when we return from here and we are all alone in a crowd where do we find the strength to keep on?

K: Yes. Is it necessary to sit in a certain posture, lotus posture introduced from India and the East, is it necessary to sit that way to meditate? And is it necessary to set aside a certain part of the day to have daydreams! (Laughter) I know, I am only joking. And how is one to have, when one leaves here to have the strength to face all one's solitude, loneliness, all the travail of life. That is the question.

Q: Do you see any relation between the awareness and faith?

K: What is the relationship between awareness and faith? Yes sir?

Q: I would very much like to ask a question connected with the first question. This is that one can see fairly clearly that one's own psychological pain, the pain of the world as a whole is caused by us, a projection. But it seems that there is pain in the universe as a whole which is not caused by human beings. The sort of thing I refer to is the genetic imperfection of children being born with frightful diseases which one cannot put to human beings. In other words a slightly imperfect universe causes this pain. This is quite a problem.

K: If I understood the question rightly, may I put it in my own words to see that we understand each other? That there is not only individual suffering, each person suffers in a different way, but also there seems to be a universal suffering, a global suffering - children are born deformed, mentally retarded and so on and so on.

Now just a minute please - which of these questions do you want to discuss? Which is, first the question the gentleman asked: you may be in error when you say that because we live in chaos and uncertainty and violence and so we create a world that is chaotic, violent and so on. That may be a wrong question. Are you

exact in saying that? I have reduced it to a small thing sir. And the other question is: do we have to sit in meditation in a particular posture, lotus as it is called in India and it is brought over into this country. And the other is, your question, emotions and sentiments, which are intense come in the way of observation, clarity and awareness. And the other question is: what is the relationship between awareness and faith? And that question that gentleman put, which is: there is not only human, particular human suffering but there is global, universal suffering. Now which of these questions...?

Q: What about loneliness?

K: Nobody asked about loneliness, I introduced it.

Q: The question about registration, the two sides of the brain.

K: Oh, yes, I beg your pardon - quite right.

Q: There is one more question.

K: Wait a minute sir. That gentleman asked that perhaps two spheres in the brain, one that registers, remembers, accumulates knowledge, experience, cultivates memory and so on, the other part may be unconditioned. What is the relationship between the two? That is right sir? Now no more questions.

Q: One more question. What is the source of urgency, energy to go into all these questions?

K: What is the source, the drive, the push, the pressure, why should one be interested in all these things?

Q: What is the beginning of memory and is there a point in time when the mind sees the age of a problem?

K: What is the beginning of memory and what is?

Q: Is there a point in time when the mind sees the age of a

problem, like fear being older than jealousy?

K: I don't quite understand.

Q: I can see fear is older than jealousy. There are times when I can see the age of a problem. It is a rather serious question about reincarnation.

K: Ah, you want to discuss reincarnation. Now which of these questions would you like to talk over together?

Q: Global suffering.

K: You decide. (Laughter)

Q: Emotions.

Q: The use of energy.

Q: Reincarnation.

Q: Krishnaji, could you deal with them all in some way by answering one question?

K: The questioner asks: could you include all these questions in one question, in one statement. Perhaps we could.

Q: You said we could forget the past and...

K: I never said we could forget the past sir.

Q: Forget the past, you said it the day before yesterday.

K: No, I did not.

Q: When you have got suffering you have forgotten it, in your finger - and the past is difficult to forget. I want to know how we can forget the past.

K: Forgive me for contradicting you sir, but I did not say forget the past. You can't forget the past. We will go into all this by taking one question, which perhaps will include all others. now which shall it be? Just think it out sir. Look we have had several problems put to us and the gentleman suggests that we should perhaps by

investigating one question, one statement, you could perhaps include all the others. I think that it could be done. But which shall we take which will include all the others?

Q: Emotions.

K: Just take a second sir. Take just a second. Let's find out.

Which question would include all the others?

Q: Where do all these questions come from?

K: What is the source of all these questions?

Q: The source is the energy which asks the question.

K: Is that what you are interested in, the source of the energy that asks all these questions?

Q: No.

Q: Could you answer the question: what is insight, by what process does it come about?

K: Look there are so many.

Q: The registration in the mind.

Q: You decide, or we are never going to start.

K: You are quite right. (Laughter) Could we take up the relationship between awareness, faith and emotions, meditation and what is the need of a brain that it should register at all, not the two but the necessity of registering at all. Could we by taking one question, I think we could do it, I suggest this, I am not saying it must be that way, I suggest that we discuss what is the relationship, which would include all these. What is the relationship between awareness, faith, meditation, the registration, the global suffering of man, in which is included the suffering of each one of us - right?

Q: And the registration.

K: And registration - I said that.



Now, shall we begin by talking about registration and relate that to awareness and to the intensity of our emotions and so on? Right? So we will begin if we may, if - please correct me, I am not the Delphic Oracle - if you think we should discuss something else we are willing but let us begin by asking: what is the need of a human mind, brain to register anything at all? First of all, are we aware, know, cognizant of this registering process going on? You understand? I am just beginning with that. Do you, as a human being, know, or aware that you are registering? You understand my question? Or you have accepted the statement and then you proceed to question the statement? Are you aware that you are registering certain things? An unhappy incident of yesterday is registered. Are you aware of this registering process going on? Or you are merely accepting a statement by somebody else? You see the difference? If I accept a statement that you have made and question about that statement, which is one thing, whereas if I am aware that I am registering, then my question has a different quality to it - right? So which is it we are doing now? Are we aware that we are registering? Are you aware now, sitting there that you are registering what is being said, which means that you are actually listening to what is being said. Right? Are you? Or are you still concerned about why the need for registration? You see the difference?

Can we proceed this way, slowly?

Q: Sir, one is aware that one holds on to what is being said.

K: Yes, that is it. One is aware that one holds to what is being said? Now why does one hold on to what is being said? When the speaker says there is no speaker, you are listening to yourself, you

are investigating yourself, why do you hold on to a statement made by this person? - which means you are not actually listening to yourself.

Q: Sir, because you want to act on it.

K: No, no. You see the difference sir? If you are told you are hungry, that is one thing; but if you are really hungry that is another. Obviously, right? So which is it? Are you really hungry? Or you are told you are hungry? Which means, are you aware that you are registering, holding on to a statement, to a phrase, to a conclusion, to an idea and so on, which is registration going on? Right sir? Now why do you want to register what is being said? Because the speaker must have either a reputation, or you think he knows something more than you do, or you are expecting him to solve your problems, so you are depending on another. The other says, "Please, don't depend on anybody, including the speaker." You follow?

So, let us be clear in this matter. Are you aware of the whole momentum, the movement of registration, when you can see a tape recorder registering - right? Are you similarly aware that you are recording? Or you have been told that you are recording. See the difference. If you are told that you are recording that is one thing, it has no value, it is just like a tape, you can wipe it out and a new tape can be put in; whereas if you discover for yourself that you are registering and ask the question: "Why am I registering, what is the necessity of any kind of registration?" Then we can proceed, then we can communicate with each other. But if you are saying that you said that yesterday about registration, I am awfully interested in this idea, let's talk about it. Then it remains merely at the verbal

level, it has no meaning. At least for me, it has no meaning whatsoever. Whereas if you say, "I want to find this out, why I register" - can we go along that way?

Why do you register, if you are aware of it? Obviously you register when something is dangerous - right? A precipice, a snake, a dangerous animal, or a dangerous man, or a motor coming hurtling towards you, it is danger. You immediately register it, in order to protect. And also you register when there is pleasure. So this process is going on all the time. The registration of everything that is dangerous - right? And everything that gives one a great pleasure. One can say the registration began with the first man - the cave man, however they lived. You can see there they had to register danger otherwise they would be destroyed. So let's find out what is dangerous for us to register, and then we can go on to the other. What are the most dangerous things in life that should be registered? Not depending on individual opinions. I wonder if I am making myself clear? Because to me one thing may be most dangerous, and to you, you say that is too silly. So it must be a common factor for a human being, whose necessity is to register danger and therefore avoid - right? Danger means avoiding, not going near it, not touching it, not be involved in it - right sir? So what is most dangerous for you, us human beings?

Q: What disturbs the mind.

K: No, no. What is most dangerous? Not what disturbs your mind You are going off into some - please begin at the lowest level.

Q: That is what disturbs me, that is most dangerous for me.

K: You see what I was trying to void. What is most dangerous

for me - I said maybe not so dangerous for another. So don't look, if I may suggest, don't take yourself and say this is my particular danger. See the danger of what is dangerous for man.

Q: Survival.

K: Yes, which is non-survival? Not to survive. Sorry I am putting it wrongly. The demand is to survive. Anything that destroys that survival is dangerous - right? For all human beings, not for me or for you, for all of us.

Q: Why?

K: Why? Why should we survive?

Q: May I restate the question? What is more important than survival?

K: Wait sir, we will come to that slowly. Come to it sir. Survival, and the lady said why should we survive. It is a serious question. Why should we survive? What is the need for survival and this urgency, the demand to exist, to survive, to live? Come on sirs, answer it.

Q: Instinct.

K: Instinct. That is not it. The birds have the instinct to survive, the animals, the reptiles, the most elemental - you know everything demands survival.

Q: Pleasure in life.

Q: Fear of death.

K: Fear?

Q: Because we think it is important.

K: I don't see why you even asked that question: what is the necessity of survival. Here you are! If you hadn't demanded to survive you wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be here, none of us

would be here. The parents would produce us, they wouldn't exist either. So the world wouldn't exist. So anything that is dangerous to survival we must register - right? Physically a car coming towards us we jump out of the way - right? So there must be some kind of registration to protect the organism - right? To have a roof, to have clothes, to have food, that's apparently natural in every living thing. And so we avoid anything that is dangerous - right?

Let's go into it a little more. Is belief dangerous to physical survival?

Q: Yes.

K: So you have no belief?

Q: A particular belief.

K: I understand sir, I understand. I believe in something, or in some idea, in some goal, and so on, a belief, so I am asking each one of us, I am asking: is belief a danger to physical survival?

Q: No.

Q: It may be.

Q: In Northern Ireland.

K: In Northern Ireland.

Q: Don't let's go into politics right now please.

K: I know.

Q: A misguided conscience can be...

K: No, no please. I am taking belief, don't begin too many things at once. Take one factor, go after it step by step into it. Is belief a danger to survival? I believe in Catholicism and you are a Protestant, I am a Catholic, we believe in different things. Look what is happening in Northern Ireland, what is happening in the Middle East and so on and so on. For physical survival, apparently

belief is a most dangerous thing.

Q: Sir, could I ask you do we not need belief in technical matters?

K: In technical matters, why do you even there have belief? You work, you learn and you go on.

No, just please go into it for yourself, don't question me, find out if you have belief, any form of belief and doesn't that belief divide people? Belief can be a conclusion, a concept, an opinion, strongly held opinion.

Q: Prejudice.

K: All that, included. We can put a lot of these words together but let's find out if each one of us has a certain belief, that I am a Christian, that I am an Englishman, a Frenchman, or - you know, all the rest of it. Isn't that a tremendous danger for physical survival?

Q: Yes.

K: You say yes, sir but are you free of it?

Q: No sir. (Laughter)

Q: Belief in the good in every one of these beliefs.

K: So I know. We teach in the school every one of these things. So history may be rewritten differently.

Q: Surely belief...

K: You are not really interested to find out for yourself. For God's sake, do listen.

Are you really serious to find out the necessity of registration and the inadequacy psychologically of any form of registration? We are discussing that. If you say belief is a danger then why do you hold on to it, saying I am a Hindu, you are a Muslim or a Jew,

or a Communist - why do you hold on to these words?

Q: Perhaps because one doesn't see it completely.

K: So, the gentleman suggests you don't see this completely. The danger, you don't see completely the danger of any form of belief, which is obviously non-fact. Why do you hold on to that?

Q: All belief is a support structure.

K: Yes, belief is a support. If it is a dangerous support why don't you drop it.

Q: I have dropped some.

K: Ah! (Laughter)

Q: But not all of them, when I see all of them only then will I drop them.

K: It is like all of us sir, we want to keep some which are pleasurable, pleasant, comfortable and the others we discard.

Q: I suggest, if I may, that it is not the sensations, the physical sensations of a dangerous experience that we register but that it is the reasoning that we attribute to it at the time that we register in our minds.

K: That is right sir. Let's go step by step into it sir.

We have talked about physical survival and anything that is dangerous to that must be totally avoided if you want to survive. And belief, any division between people is most destructive - right? If you are a Christian, I am a Buddhist, and I fight for my Buddhism and you fight for something else, there is no physical security. Every war has shown this - right? Every war is the result of our particular conditioning, of our particular beliefs, etc. etc. So will you drop all those beliefs because that is the most dangerous thing for survival?

Q: Are you saying that anybody who believes in anything, from the people you mentioned yesterday, the politicians, priests, gurus, is not being honest with themselves, and that only Krishnamurti can put forth the truth? That only the truth is available from you and we must not believe anything from any other person?

K: I couldn't hear the whole of it sir, somebody who has understood it please repeat it.

Q: It is not the belief that is the threat to survival, it is the belief in the belief that is the trap to survival, it is an attitude of mind. The feelings that the belief is something true for all time.

K: Sir, drugs are dangerous for survival, drink is dangerous, smoking and all that business - do we drop all those things because they are dangerous?

Q: When we see a cigarette...

K: Sir, that is just it. So really we are discussing intellectually, verbally this idea of survival. We really don't care if we survive or not. We just exist.

So let's proceed from there. Psychologically why do you register?

Q: Fear.

K: No, just look sir. Look. I can answer these questions very quickly, but do please enquire. It is a conversation between us two - us two is all of us, you and I, a conversation, in which we are saying: why do I, or you, register psychologically anything?

Q: We can't help it. It just happens.

K: It may be our conditioning. It may be our education. It may be our social condition and economic and so on and so on. So we are conditioned to accept this psychological registration. Now we



are saying, all right, that is a fact. Now why?

Q: Does one actually register in fact?

K: Yes, one actually registers, that is a fact. But I am asking why? Do find out. Ask yourself sir, not me ask you, ask yourself: I register my hurts, my pleasures, what you said to me, what you didn't, do, this, that, ten different things. Why do I register psychologically?

Q: Biological registration has gone into psychological registration.

K: There is biological registration which we said is necessary and psychological registration. We said why do we register psychologically at all?

Q: For security. To feel secure.

K: Is that so? Or you are isolating yourself which gives you the illusion that you are secure?

Q: Because we have no choice.

Q: Because we think we can solve things by thought.

K: You say we have no choice - why?

Q: Human nature.

K: No. The gentleman said we have no choice. What do you mean by the word 'choice'? Is danger a choice? And why do you choose?

Q: Conditioning.

K: No, no, don't just throw out.

Q: Can we say biologically, let's say I like smoking or whatever - right? This is dangerous but it is pleasurable so thought has a choice.

K: Yes. Sir we are trying to find out the meaning of that word

'choice', the depth of that word. I choose between two pieces of material for trousers or a coat. Wait, wait. Choose. And I choose to go to that place and not to that place. I choose this guru and not that guru. I choose to believe in this and not in that. I am questioning, asking you, if you will kindly listen to find out, why do you choose, what is the source of your choice?

Q: Inattention.

Q: It is a question of pleasure again.

K: No, no. When do you choose? Don't you choose when you are uncertain? A man who is very clear, very clear, there is no choice. It is so.

Q: When you don't know.

K: Sir, that means what? That is right, when you don't know. Do you think you will find...

Q: One thing you choose on a certainty, and the other on a non-certainty.

K: Yes, that is the same thing. When one is very clear you don't choose, when you know exactly what route to take to a certain place there is no choice. It is only when you are uncertain you begin to choose, or ask, question, find out. So I am asking psychologically choice exists only when you are confused, uncertain - no? When you are very clear there is no need for choice. So a mind that is confused chooses. You are all silent at that statement.

Q: Could we talk about why the mind chooses?

K: Wait sir. I want to see - please look at it sir. We are discussing, trying to talk over together why the brain registers. The brain biologically we said, organically must register.

Psychologically, inside, we are asking, why do we register at all? Somebody said because we have no choice in the matter. And the word 'choice' implies choosing between this and that. Now when you see danger you don't choose - right? You see danger and move. You don't say, "Well, shall I go to the right or to the left, is it right, wrong" - (Laughter)

So similarly I am asking: psychologically what is the need for registration? Does it help us to protect ourselves?

Q: Yes. When you set out in life we are concerned with the survival of the body but soon the mind takes over.

K: That is what we are saying. Physical survival has skipped into psychological survival - right? I say, why?

Q: It exercises a sense of identity.

K: Identity with whom?

Q: Because we don't really know what is right?

K: So you want to find out what is right? How do you find out what is right when your mind is uncertain, and confused? No you are going off, you don't stick to one thing at a time. Please forgive me. Psychologically why do I register?

Q: Because we want to register.

Q: Because I am not whole.

K: No, sir. Look into yourself, you will find out.

Q: In order to build up experience.

K: In order to build up experience, which is knowledge, which then becomes memory. And without memory, without knowledge you are nobody. So we say "By Jove, I must have some knowledge about..." - right? - otherwise I am nobody. Is that what you are saying? You are not thinking about all this.

Q: One wants to protect oneself.

K: One wants to protect oneself. Biologically, organically, you have. We have learnt how to do that very well. In spite of wars, in spite of terrorists, except the victims. Now we are saying psychologically do you protect yourself? What is it you are protecting?

Q: I think it is...

K: Please answer me. What is it you are protecting?

Q: All this memory.

Q: Your idea of yourself.

Q: Our minds become so cluttered up with what is in our minds that it becomes greater than our experience of our bodies. So our minds become up there and we are more aware of our minds than our bodies. And we think that it is our minds that we should protect.

K: So you give more attention to your body and less attention to your brain.

Q: No, the other way round.

K: Yes, get more and more muddled. (Laughter) You see sir, we psychologically register in order to be something - right? Psychologically - right? I register where I was born, that is simple. The brain registers because it has been trained to accept certain strata of society, and that gives the person psychologically a position, a sense of power, a sense of superiority. So this registration psychologically gradually builds up the ego, the 'me' - right? Don't accept what I am saying, please look at yourself. If you didn't register psychologically would have an ego?

Q: No.

K: Obviously not. Psychologically you are aggressive, abrasive, violent, it gives you a certain sense of - you know, authority, a certain sense of assurance. So this gradual process of registration psychologically builds the sense of the 'me'. That is a fact, no? Me, my opinion, my judgement, my wife, my husband, my girl, your girl, boy, my house, my quality, my experience, my hurts, my fears, my - I am all that, psychologically. Right? It is a fact. You don't have to agree with the speaker, it is so.

Then I say to myself, why do I build this ego, why is there this constant building of the me?

Q: To protect it.

K: What are you protecting?

Q: I am just trying to hold on to it, more and more.

K: Yes, sir. After building it up you hold on to it, cling to it, you say, "I daren't break it down."

Q: It is like a sand castle.

K: Sand. Don't go off into similes. Stick to one thing. So I say, what is the need for it, because that brings enormous trouble, enormous pain? I am hurt, I am frightened, I am anxious, I am jealous, I am greedy, I must not, I must be - you know - this battle is going on constantly, emotionally getting stronger and stronger, more intense. And what am I building? What is the reality of this structure? You understand? The reality, in the sense this is real, the microphone in front of me is real. Actually I can touch it. Can I touch the psychological structure of the 'me'? I can't. So it is merely a building up of words. This is rather difficult to accept. One builds in relationship the hurts, the flattery, the comfort and so gradually out of that I depend on you. And you hurt me by doing something

so I cling to you not to be hurt. And so on and so on. Now, why do we do this?

Q: We are protecting the part of us that does not know.

K: No. We don't know what will happen if there is no building up the 'me'. Right? I will find out. I will find out if I say, "All right, I will find out, there must be a process where the building up is not" - right? Then I will find out what happens. But to speculate what might happen before is such a waste of time and energy.

Q: That's what makes the fear do it.

K: So: first you build it up, society helps, religions help, everything helps to sustain the structure, and then you are afraid to lose it - right? And then you proceed to meditate how to get rid of this self - no? So before we say how to get rid of the self, let us find out why you build it.

Q: The need for power.

K: Yes, all right, it leads to power, put it any way you like. But the fact is this constant assertion, this constant building up of the 'me', psychologically, is it not a great danger? A great danger in your relationship with your wife, with your girl, with society, with anything. Is it not a great danger - because the danger is that you are in constant struggle, constant battle.

Q: It is difficult for you to adapt.

K: No sir, find out why you are - are you aware that you are building the 'me' up? And from that structure you have strong emotions, you want to express, you want to assert.

Q: Is it the need for pleasure?

K: Yes, all right, for pleasure and also it's fear, and also it is greed, and also it is constantly in pain, being hurt - you know. So

don't take one thing and say it is that, it is the whole thing.

Q: Is not the 'me' a myth - is there not a myth that we believe in that if we don't survive psychologically we shan't survive.

K: It may be a myth sir but can't you throw away that myth?

Q: Have we been conditioned to this myth?

K: Yes, if you are conditioned to this myth, can't you uncondition yourself, can't the mind say, "It is nonsense"? See we don't want to do that and we talk round it all the time. If I am aggressive it gives me pleasure, it gives the structure of aggressiveness, it makes me violent, rude, vulgar and I like it. All right, keep it! Don't talk about meditation, etc. etc. etc. If that is a fact find out why you register these things, why you hold on, and whether it cannot be totally dissipated. If you say it cannot, that is the end of it. All right you cannot. If somebody says, "Find out if it can or not" - then you say you are an illusion, you are an ass, you don't know anything about it.

So whereas I am suggesting psychologically there is no need for registration, if you see the danger, real danger, as you see a precipice, real danger of this psychological build up of the 'me', then you find out how to be free of it. Not you, you are part of that. There will be no toleration of the 'me', with all the opinions, judgements, evaluations, aggressiveness, fear, pleasure, you know, the whole bundle of it.

Q: What about the registrations that have already taken place from childhood before you are able to reason in this way?

K: What about the registration that has taken place from childhood. If you see registration is a danger, then the childhood registration till now disappears.

Q: We don't see it though.

K: That is all I am saying sir. We won't see the danger of it, we like it. We like our fear, we like - you accept it, aggressiveness, we like to live in constant battle with ourselves, that gives us a sense of well being, that at least you are alive. And so on and so on.

Q: It is comfortable.

K: All right, sir, it is comfortable.

Q: What can we do with the vacuum that is left?

K: You see - what will you do if you are in a vacuum. That is, you don't know what will take place if there is no registration. Find out. Not say you will live in a vacuum. I say to you that you won't. What is the matter? On the contrary, a man who is in constant battle is not living.

Q: How do we find out?

K: How do I find out what?

Q: How can you find out what else there is? What is the alternative to having this ego thing. How can we find out what the alternative is? How do we go about it?

K: I don't understand.

Q: Have a faith.

Q: How did you do it? How did you get rid of your ego?

K: How do you know I have got rid of it? (Laughter)

No sir, don't bother about me. (Laughter) I have been a long time at it, from the age of fifteen. For me, when I was born, probably it was not there. But that is totally utterly irrelevant to you. What is relevant is you, why you hold on to this thing, this miserable unfortunate suffering 'me'. And to escape from that you go off to India, put on robes and put on beads - you know.



(Laughter) All that nonsense goes on.

Q: Because we live in the past or the future, not in the present.

K: Please don't bother about me. Just find out why you build, see the consequences of building this structure, the consequences of this structure, and if you like it, if it pleases you, if it gives you comfort, know in that comfort there is tremendous danger, that you suffer, that you go through all kinds of neuroticisms, you know what is happening. If you say that gives me comfort, stay with it.

Q: In other words we are too lazy to change.

K: Yes. Now how is that? I perceive, or I am aware that I am building this structure, thought is building this structure all the time, sleeping, waking, dreaming, day dreaming, walking, all the time, concerned about itself. Now what is the way, what is the process to end this thing? You don't ask that.

Q: If I may - if I ask myself why I collect these identifying things about me, who do I ask in order to get past the me?

K: No I am asking you.

Q: I understand. I don't mean ask a person. How does an I do this?

K: I'll show you sir in a minute, look.

Q: O.K.

K: Is it a fact to you, that you are building psychologically this illusory structure, which has become such an extraordinary reality to one? Are you aware of the structure first?

Q: I think so, yes.

K: If one is aware of it, what do you mean by being aware of it? We have come back to the original question: what is the relationship between awareness and faith? There is no relationship

whatsoever between awareness and faith. Faith is not a fact. It is a belief.

Q: Define faith. What does faith mean to you?

K: Nothing. Please don't bother about - so are you aware of the structure? Please let's be for five minutes serious. Are you aware of the structure in yourself? If you are, what do you mean by being aware? In that awareness is there a duality, that is, I am aware of that? You understand my question sir? I am aware of that light, that light is different from me. Now am I in that same position when I say I am aware of the structure, the structure being different from me? Or the structure is me?

Q: It is a very comfortable feeling.

K: No, no. It isn't a question of comfort or discomfort. Please move away from those things, forgive me, you are just going back to that. Which is, am I aware as though the structure were something separate from me, away over there, or near, and I who am aware is different from that? Or I am that? You understand? Obviously. Right? I am that. That is, the observer is the observed - right?

Q: I question if that is true or not.

K: No, no. There is no question, don't hesitate so, see it is so simple. I have built up this structure, the structure has been built. And part of the structure is, I am different from the structure. I am the soul, I am the great man, I am the, etc. etc. Or I am full of knowledge and the structure is not knowledge. You follow? So I am asking: do you see the structure as something separate from yourself?

Q: No.

K: If you really say no, that means, what does it mean?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. Oh, for half an hour, do please put your minds to this I beg of you. Are you different from your aggression? Obviously you are not. You are aggression, it is part of you.

Q: We alone can change it.

K: No. Who is we?

Q: I mean we ourselves. We can change.

Q: If I was just my aggression I wouldn't know about my aggression.

K: Oh yes you would.

Q: How?

K: Your friends would tell you, "Don't be so aggressive." (Laughter) If he is a friend.

Q: You ask us to look for ourselves, well that surely implies...

K: No, madam, I am asking this, please listen to it, if I may suggest. I am asking you how do you observe this structure? You can observe the building, see it away from you. But this structure you can't separate it, say "It is not me", it is you. Your fears, your quarrels, your ambitions, your aggressiveness, your anxieties, all that structure is you. There is no argument about it.

Q: But you are not a united thing. You are all sorts of things and they are all in conflict with each other.

K: That is what I am saying.

Q: How do you take aside one part of you and observe other parts?

K: No. The observer is part of the observed.

Q: Yes but you couldn't observe yourself in totality if you

were...

K: Oh, yes. I can observe, I can say I am fear. The next day I say I am pleasure. The third day I say I am so jealous. But is part of the whole thing. Now that is what I am saying. Please, if I may suggest, please give your attention to this, which is: as long as the 'me' separates himself from the structure, the 'me' that separates itself from the structure, as long as there is this division there will be conflict, there will be fights, there will be nagging, there will be anxiety, and all the rest of it. But the fact is: the structure is you.

Q: Sir, the conflict seems to be inward, in the individual and it somehow seems to be a conflict between what you were talking about the senses not being fully alert, and also the mind, the intellectual mind wanting to take individual problems and fears or tendencies.

K: Sir, all that is included in that. Your individual tendencies, idiosyncrasies, your particular talent, or lack of talent, your capacity - include everything that thought has put together as me. That is the structure thought has created. Then thought says, "I am different from the structure."

Q: I don't think everybody thinks that they are different from the structure.

K: I don't know.

Q: I don't.

K: Do you. I am not talking to you personally madam, but I am just asking: does each one of us realize that we are the structure and that structure is not separate from us? If you realize that, if that is an actual fact then a totally different action takes place.

Q: Are you saying that the part of us that is made up of our

belief is our outer shell and that in order to grow and evolve we have to break through something?

K: No, no, no. I am not saying anything of the kind. I am just saying sir - don't translate what I am saying into your own - you know when I speak in India, which I do unfortunately, or fortunately, they translate what I say into their own particular language and most of the languages in India are derived from Sanskrit, and the words they use are loaded with tradition, all kinds of meanings. I say, please don't translate what I am saying, just listen to what I am saying, which is very difficult because they immediately translate. They think by translating that they have understood. They have understood the traditional meaning, say for instance of awareness. They have got a special Sanskrit word for it, in that word there is all kinds of connotations in that word. So please, I am just saying, as long as there is a difference between the structure and the observer there must be suppression, there must be conflict, there must be escape, there must be going off to India, to find how to do this and how to do that, meditate, surely, not cooking and so on and so on and so on. Whereas when there is the actual proof, the fact that the observer is the observed, the structure is me, me is not different from the structure, then there is a totally different action. That is what I want to get at.

Q: Sir, if you realize that and there is a sort of silence, how do we keep that and not go back?

K: When you see a danger, a precipice, or a dangerous animal, you don't go back to it, it is finished.

Q: It seems to me that this process of separation is a fundamental process of all the conditioning that goes on, and

everything that I seem to do to try and go against this conditioning, always seems to be just another part of this conditioning.

K: Yes sir.

Q: How on earth do I get around that?

K: I am showing it to you, you don't listen. Not that you must listen sir, but I am pointing out something. When you say "I am that conditioning, conditioning is not different from me" - when that becomes an absolute, irrevocable truth, a fact then there is totally different action out of that fact.

Q: Then what happens?

K: Ah! Then what happens - that is exactly what it is. First you don't come to it but you say then tell me what happens. (Laughter) You don't want to climb the mountain, which is arduous, which demands that you carry little, dangerous, I have played with all this, I have done this, some part of it. It is dangerous to climb mountains. So you go lightly, not with heavy rucksacks and all the rest of it.

So this demands that you work, that you look. But unfortunately all kinds of interruptions take place. Some of you this morning I saw doing exercises - good or bad, that is up to you - but here you don't even give ten minutes to find out. Find out what actually takes place when the observer of the structure is the observer himself - the structure is the observer. Then you will find there is no conflict at all - right? When you are that what can you do? You follow sir? So there is no conflict and therefore there is energy. I won't go more into it because that is too - where there is energy, complete energy there is emptiness.

That is enough for today, isn't it? Perhaps we can continue with

this on Thursday. Would you agree to that please?

Q: Yes.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **31ST AUGUST 1978**

K: What shall we talk about this morning, talk over together?

Q: Could we please request you to say something about the energy of consciousness?

K: Would you talk over together the energy that you talk about.

Q: I feel after Tuesday's discussion that there is some confusion over the word 'observation', in as much as what we generally call observation is in fact commentaries after the fact and not observation at all.

K: What do you mean by observation? We generally observe after the event and not observe as it is taking place - is that what you mean sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Any other? Madam?

Q: Could you speak about learning, and what is learning, what is relationship? And can one learn about oneself through relationship?

K: Can one learn about oneself through self observation?

Q: And relationship with others.

K: Can one learn through relationship with others about oneself. That is the question?

Q: Yes.

Q: Please talk on emptiness.

K: Just a minute.

Q: You have said that silence is the one fact. I wonder if you could enlarge on that.



K: Silence is a fact and could we go into it, enlarge it, and see the depth of it, the meaning of it.

Q: Could you go into emptiness please?

K: Could we go over together, talk about that which you have said about emptiness.

Q: The question of registration, whether one should register or not.

K: Oh. The question of registration, whether one should register or not. I wonder if you were here the other day sir, I think we discussed it two days ago, or the day before and I hope you will not mind if we don't go into it because we went into it pretty thoroughly.

Q; I wonder, could we talk about the energy of violence.

K: Talk about energy of violence.

Q: (In French) ...disorder.

K: Disorder. Can one be aware of oneself and at the same time observe one's disorder?

Q: Can one be one with fear and so on and at the same time observe it.

K: That's it sir.

Q: You said that we shouldn't make an effort but that we should work on ourselves. I don't understand not to discipline and not to make the effort and still be working on ourselves. Can you make that more clear?

K: Can you talk over together about effort and discipline and without effort can one observe oneself.

Now just a minute please: we have had so many questions. I don't know of whom you are asking these questions, because we

are asking these questions of ourselves and trying to find a solution, an answer. So these are the questions: energy, can one learn about oneself through relationship and also what do you mean by that word 'learn', can one learn about oneself through relationship and what do you mean by learning. The other is to talk about emptiness, silence. I think that is about all. And that lady points out can one observe oneself in action, and that lady put a question, which is, effort and discipline seem to go together, and you apparently point out a different way of observing, acting. So which of these questions shall we take?

Q: The last question: you also point out that you must do it. It seems like a contradiction.

K: You also say you must do it, that is, test it out. Test it out, test out what is being said in one's own life and not depend on somebody else. Now which of these questions shall we talk about?

Q: Learning and relationship. (Laughter)

K: Learning and can one learn about oneself through relationship. Now which of these questions would you like to talk over together?

Q: Energy.

Q: Silence.

Q: Silence and energy.

K: Silence, emptiness, relationship - all right, I think we can bring it all together in talking over this question of what is learning, and can one learn about oneself in any kind of relationship, and perhaps if we could go into that rather deeply we might be able to answer these several questions about energy, silence, discipline and effort, and can one observe without any

effort and discipline, and is it possible to be aware at the same time when one is acting, conscious? Right? And silence and so on. Can we bring all this into this one question which has been put: what is learning and can one learn through relationship? Can we go into that and bring all the other factors into it? May we?

Audience: Yes.

K: All right. What do we mean by learning? I think this is a fairly important question, if we could go into it rather slowly and carefully. We learn from books, we learn from parents, colleges, universities and so on, and also we learn through experience. We learn through various forms of events, which all become knowledge - right? That is fairly clear: that we gather information, experience, and various forms of events and incidents that happen in our life, and from all these we accumulate knowledge, and from that knowledge we act - right? That is one way of learning.

Is there another way of learning at all? That is, we know the ordinary way of learning. Is there another way of learning? Because the ordinary way of learning, the implication of learning in the ordinary way, is to accumulate knowledge and act according to that knowledge, therefore that learning helps us to become more and more mechanical. I don't know if you follow all this? May I go on with it? This is not a talk by me. We are sharing this thing together. I can go into it but you will also have to join in, in the investigation of what we mean by learning. So it is your responsibility too, not just mine talking about it.

The ordinary everyday form of learning is to accumulate through experience, events and accidents and so on, a great deal of knowledge, and that knowledge is always the past. There is no

future knowledge - right? And if we act according to that knowledge it must be action based on the past, based on knowledge and that knowledge can be expanded infinitely, or to a certain extent, but it will always be limited, it will always become a routine, mechanical. So we are asking if there is another way of learning. Learning through accumulation of knowledge and acting according to the accumulation of knowledge, acting and acquiring knowledge from that action: or having acquired knowledge through various forms act, from that. You follow? Do you understand? Am I making myself clear?

Q: Yes.

K: That is, I accumulate knowledge about science, about technology, doctors and so on, accumulate it. And then from that accumulation I act. Or act and through that action learn. And having learnt a great deal through action that also becomes knowledge. So both are the same essentially: acquire knowledge and then act, act and from that action accumulate, which becomes knowledge, so essentially both are the same. Both tend to become mechanical. If this is clear then the question is: is there a way of learning which is non-mechanistic? I don't know if you are interested in all this. To find that out we must be very clear that the mechanistic activity of accumulated knowledge and the whole movement of that, one must be very, very clear in oneself. Can we proceed? Please as we are talking over together, find out how you learn, whether this learning is becoming more and more mechanistic. You hear me, the speaker, read about it, listen to tapes, learn, accumulate knowledge and then say, "Well, I am going to practise that." Therefore that practise becomes

mechanistic.

Now we are asking: is there a different movement which is not mechanistic? - which is also learning but it is not accumulated knowledge and acting from that - right? Is this clear?

Audience: Yes.

Q: Sir, part of that mechanistic process might be an attempt to destroy the knowledge that you have accumulated.

K: Yes, which is still mechanistic. You try to get rid of that past knowledge which you accumulated, you say that is not the way to learn so you learn in a different form but yet accumulate.

Q: Yes.

K: This accumulation process goes on all the time. So we are asking, please: is there a different way of learning which is accumulated, which is not mechanistic, which is not all the time functioning on the past movement. Right? We are going to find that out. Do please enquire, question, challenge and all the rest of it for yourself and find out.

We said very clearly, action and then knowledge, knowledge and action are both essentially the same. Now we are asking: is there a different learning? Don't jump to conclusions, don't say spontaneity, don't say it is intuition. Don't let's be caught in words. Is there a way of learning which is not mechanistic?

Q: Does silence come into this?

K: You see, you are jumping. It is as though you don't know.

Q: Through suffering in relationship.

K: Wait madame we are coming to that. We are starting with, is there a question mark, therefore you don't know. So don't say it is silence, this or that. You really don't know. Sir that is the way to

find out, with a clean slate you don't know, so you are going to find out. Are you quite sure you don't know? Or you pretend you don't know? (Laughter) For oneself, no please I am talking of oneself seriously. Do I pretend that I don't know, or I actually don't know a way of learning, perhaps learning then has a different meaning, a way of learning which is not mechanistic, I don't know. I have to be terribly honest to myself then I can find out. But if I say, "Yes, I don't know, but I have a few ideas about it, behind me", then you are not enquiring at all.

So can we start honestly by saying I really don't know? Which is rather difficult because when you don't know you are looking, you are trying to find out if you know. You understand my question? When you say I don't know, but there is always the desire to find out, or expect to be told, or project some hidden hope and that becomes an idea and say, "Yes, I begin to capture it." So if you can be free of all that and say, "I actually do not know", then you are curious, you are really curious, like a young boy or a girl learning for the first time. You have got it? No, no, see what has happened. Do watch yourself sir, don't look at me or anyone, watch yourself, which is, when you say "I really don't know", what has taken place? Your mind is not actively thinking out how to find out - right? Are we meeting each other in this point? Say for instance, I really don't know, which means I have no hope of finding it, I have no conclusion, I have no motive. This is very important, when I say I don't know, in that is implied having no motive whatsoever. Because motive then gives a direction and then I have lost it. So I must be very, very clear and terribly honest in myself to say, I really don't know. Wait sir, listen to it carefully. I really don't

know, then what has taken place in my mind? Find out, don't answer quickly.

Hasn't it broken away from the old tradition? You understand? The old mechanistic tradition. When I say, I really don't know I have moved out of that field altogether - right?

Q: Although I don't think that one's thinking in terms of not knowing a new way of learning. All that one knows is that the conflict which mechanistic knowledge causes, just that - one doesn't know any more. And one can see that one doesn't know how to get over this conflict.

K: We are not talking of conflict yet sir. We will come to that in a minute. We are talking about: is there a different process of learning? If you don't know it - I don't know it - and I actually say "I don't know it" - what has happened?

Q: My mind then says if I don't know it I am empty.

K: Oh, for god's sake! How silly people are.

Q: Why is it stupid?

K: I didn't say stupid, I said silly. (Laughter) Because we are not paying attention, it is empty - is it empty? Or is it so tremendously free of that, mechanistic, it is totally awake? Because it is intensely curious to find out. You see the difference? The mind that says, "I don't know" - wait, let me take an example. Do you know what God is? Of course you have beliefs, you have dogmas, all kinds of conditioning, but actually you don't know that. You can invent about it, you can think about it, you can argue about it, or be against it, but the actual fact you don't know. So you start with not knowing in order to find out.

Q: May I ask you sir, do you always start with not knowing

when you come to speak, do you always start with saying, "I don't know, let's find out now"?

K: Yes, that is what I am saying.

Q: Is that what you do when you come into this tent, is it what you do? Are you completely free of what you know before?

K: Please I don't prepare talks, I don't do anything, I just come and I spill out. (Laughter) I have prepared talks, written them all out carefully and so on and so on, and one day somebody says throw away all your notes and talk. So I did and began that way.

Q: There isn't a lot of difference really. I mean having it written down on paper and having it written down inside.

K: No. I don't, I am doing it now. Please - you follow? When you say actually you don't know, you stop the mechanistic process of learning, haven't you? So your mind is not empty, it is free from that in which it has been functioning, and therefore it is now in a state of acute attention, learning, acute state, free from that. Then what takes place?

Q: Hunger.

Q: The mind gets bored.

K: Do try it, please try it as we are talking here, do it in the sense attempt to find out.

Q: Enquiry.

K: Yes. What does enquiry mean? Enquiry implies that you must be free from your prejudice, from your habits, conclusions, from any form of opinion so that your mind is free to move. In the same way if you understand this whole nature of this mechanistic acquisition of knowledge then if you put it in its right place you are free from it. And you are then capable of complete attention, aren't



you? When there is complete attention is there a learning? Please this requires a little bit of going into.

I may be rather stupid this morning so please forgive me if I keep on persisting in this thing but perhaps we will come back to it a little later.

The next question in that is involved: can I observe myself through relationship? Can I know myself fundamentally, basically, all the reactions, all the nuances, the subtleties of myself in relationship - right? That is the question, that was raised. So we have to enquire what do we mean by 'relationship' - the word itself. To be related, to be in contact, to be not physically intimate but, not only that, but to have a relationship at the same level, at the same moment, with the same intensity, then there is a relationship - right? There is a relationship between a man and woman, or a friend and another, or a boy and girl, when they meet not merely physically only but much more, which is when they meet at the same level, at the same moment, with the same intensity there is actual relationship, when they are meeting at the same level - right? That can be called a real, true relationship.

Now, one's relationship with another is based on memory - right? Would you accept it? On the various images, pictures, conclusions I have drawn about you and you have drawn about me. The various images that I have about you - wife, husband, girl or boy or friend and so on. So there is always image-making - right? This is simple, this is normal, this is actually what goes on. When one is married or lives with a girl or a boy every incident, every word, every action creates an image - no? Are we clear on this point? Don't agree with me please, I am not trying to persuade you

to anything, but actually you can see if for yourself. A word is registered, if it is pleasant you purr, it is nice, if it is unpleasant you immediately shrink from it, and that creates an image. The pleasure creates an image, the shrinking, the withdrawal creates an image. So our actual relationship with each other is based on various subtle forms of pictures, images and conclusions. That's right?

Now I am asking: when that takes place what happens? The man creates the image about her, and she creates an image about him. Whether in the office, whether in the field, or anywhere this relationship is essentially based on this formation of images - right? This is a fact, isn't it? Can we go on from there.

Then what takes place? You have an image about her and she has an image about you. It doesn't matter where it is, in the office, in the factory, in the field, in every way, labour, there is this image-making all the time. So when there is an image like that, she has and you have, then in that there is division, and then the whole conflict begins. Right? Where there is division between two images there must be conflict - right?

Q: Why have images become so important?

K: We will go into it madame First go into it step by step, not say 'Why' - have you got this image about your brother, your sister, your husband, your wife, your father, whatever it is? Then see when there is this image there is certainly a division, the Jew and the Arab, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, the Communist - it is the same phenomena - right? When that takes place there must be fundamentally conflict. The husband or the boy or the girl may go off to work and there he has created images about himself, his position, his worth, his competition and all the rest of it, he comes

and says, "Darling how are you?", and again he has got his image and she has hers. So there is conflict. So it is a basic law that where there is division between people there must be conflict. Full stop. Right? The man may say to the woman, or the woman may say to the man "I love you" but that may merely be sensory love, sexual love but basically they are not related at all. They may wear rings and hug each other and sleep in the same bed and live in the same house, but basically he is pursuing his ambitions, his greed and all the rest of it, and she also. Right? So basically they never meet at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity. Cannot. Right? Do we see this? - not accept the words that are spoken by the speaker, that is worthless. Actually this is so in daily life. And then we can say to each other, "I love you. You are so beautiful" - you are this and you are that, put more colour on your hair - you know, play with all that kind of stuff.

Now why do we create these images? Why do you create an image about your girl or your wife, or your husband, or your boy, why?

Q: I think it is survival.

K: Survival?

Q: I think it is through fear. Basically because you didn't look at something you feared.

K: He says that it is survival.

Q: To guard one's ego. One doesn't want to be intruded on. One doesn't want someone close, one's frightened to lose one's ego.

K: Oh! Is that so?

Q: I don't know.

K: What sir?

Q: Because we don't see the whole of the fact.

K: How can I see the whole, if that is what you are saying, the whole beauty of relationship, the whole nature of love and all that, when we are so concerned about our beastly little selves all the time?

Q: Is it because we are registering all the time?

K: No, madame we have been through all that, I want to forget the registration. Look at it anew. Why do I, or why does one create an image about another? Why do you create an image about the speaker?

Q: It is lack of attention.

K: Just go into it sir. Why do you create an image about your girl, or your husband, boy and all that, why?

Q: To be dependent.

K: Do look at it before you answer. See what you do first. If I may gently suggest, see the fact of it first, not say well this is it, this is that. Just see if it is so.

Q: We want to be recognized in some way or another.

Q: Is it because I'd like to know what is going to happen tomorrow.

K: Do look at it sir. You are married, you have got a girl, or a boy. This image-making goes on. And I am asking why. Take time. Please. You don't know, I don't know, let's find out.

Q: It is very pleasant to have an image. It is possession.

K: Is it? Is it very pleasant to have an image?

Q: It is very gratifying.

K: Is it very pleasant to have an image? Please sir - an image?

Q: Image is a dirty word.

K: All right. I won't use the word image - use some other word.

Q: Phantasy.

Q: Familiarity - we take things for granted, we are at all times preoccupied rather than attentive.

K: I want to find out why I create the image about my wife - if I have one. Is it habit? Is it convenient? Is it immemorial conditioning? Is it a tradition that I do this, brought over from the genes and so on and so on, that instinctively I make an image about you?

Q: Does it matter why?

K: Find out. So I am saying is it this tremendous habit in which we live?

Q: No. It is influence.

K: Include that. Influence. And because one is so accustomed to being influenced, which is environment and all the rest of it. So I say, is it habit, is it a tradition that has been handed down, unconsciously, from race to race, from generation to generation? Is it a thing which I have accepted as my arm, as I accept a leg, it is part of me?

Q: Sir, does that really answer the question why. That is just saying that we do have an image, but why do we have an image?

K: I am going into that sir.

Q: I think it is a continuation of the conditioning that we ourselves have received.

K: It is part of our conditioning, inherited from father to son and so on and so on, generation after generation. So just let's find out. So put all this together, habit, immemorial tradition, desire for a sense of nearness and yet withdrawal - all that. Is that why you do

it? Do look at it, take a second, please take a second. Or is it that we want to be certain of the girl or the boy, the husband, certain? Certain to possess her, it is mine and not yours. All that is involved in it. Desire for certainty - it is my wife, my girl, my boy, my husband, I am sure. That is, it gives me certainty in my relationship with another. I know my wife, which is the most absurd statement. It gives me a feeling that I possess something and I am sure of that possession. So habit, tradition, a thousand million years of tradition carried from generation to generation to generation. Then the desire to possess, to be dominated, love to be possessed and love to be dominated - a neurotic state, and the desire to be certain, it is my house, my table, my pen, my wife - right? What do you say to all this?

Q: We should be free of all that.

K: We should be, or we are?

Q: We should be.

K: Oh! I should be on the top of the Himalayas, but I am not!

(Laughter). How can we talk over together if we are not both moving in the same direction? Please. The 'should be' is non-existent; 'what is' is the only fact.

Q: Can one not accept this state by understanding it?

K: No, madame we are doing it. We are doing it step by step, going into this. I am certain about my name, I am certain about my form, my physical form, I am certain I am qualified mechanically or a scientist, or professor - I am certain. My profession, my career as a military, or navy, or a doctor, it is my career, I am certain. So I want to be certain in my relationship - no? And when that certainty is shaken then begins the trouble, it ends up in divorce, or a

separation, or whatever you like to call it.

So these are the factors that we create these images in order to be sure, certain, in order to possess and in that possession feel the power, the pleasure, the strength of that possession. And there is in this inherited a thousand million years or a million years of man's desire to hold somebody and not let go, and so on and so on. These are the factors in daily life - no?

Q: So that implies something is just fixed, doesn't it?

K: Yes sir.

Q: We also make use...

K: That is right. I want to be certain. I want to be sure when I come back from the office she is there. And when she comes back from the office she wants to be quite sure I will turn up too!

(Laughter) This is the game we have been playing infinitely, in a variety of ways.

Q: Why do we need the certainty?

K: We are going to go into that. Go slowly sir.

Q: I am afraid I lose control.

K: You are afraid to lose control over her? I hope your wife is there! (Laughter).

Look sir, we are talking about something so tremendously serious. Whether it is possible, knowing these are facts, not imagination, not ideas, not some conclusions which you have got because I have talked about it but these are daily facts. Now the question is: in that there is no possibility of relationship. You may sleep together, you may hold hands together, do all kinds of things together, but actually there is no relationship. That is a fact. And you don't want to acknowledge it. Because the moment you

acknowledge it then begins doubt, frightened, nervous and all that begins. Now please just listen.

Now, can I learn about myself in my relationship with another? That is the question we began with, that is the question that was put. In that relationship I can observe my reactions - right? I like and I don't like. She said a nasty word, or it was so pleasant and so on - my reactions I can watch. Those reactions are myself, aren't they? They are not separate from me, both sensory as well as nervous, psychological responses - right? I am learning about myself tremendously as I go along, I have seen infinitely what I am doing, what I have done, what I am doing, what I will do tomorrow if I continue this mechanistic way of behaviour - right? And death comes and you say, "Darling, I am leaving you." She feels terribly lonely, miserable, unhappy, tears, finds out suddenly she is left alone, or he is left alone. And then he can't face it and goes off to some entertainment, or goes off with another woman, or whatever it is, or becomes tremendously religious. (Laughter)

What a game we are playing with each other - right sir? So I see this is a fact. I have learnt a tremendous lot about myself in my relationship with another. Then the factor arises: can this image-making stop? You understand my question? Can this momentum of the past, all that of that tremendous momentum, with tremendous volume behind it, like a river with a great volume of water rushing, can all this image-making tradition, desire for all that end, without a single conflict? You understand my question? Are you interested in this? What will you pay for it? (Laughter) That is all you can do. By paying something you think you will get it.

Now how can this mechanism of image-making, not just image-



making but the desire for certainty, the tradition, the whole structure of that, can that end? Right? Are you asking that question? Or am I asking, I am putting my question onto you? If you put that question to yourself, do you say, "I don't know therefore I will find out"? Or you are already struggling to find out? How can this image-making come to an end? Which means the ending of registration, not to register a word that he or she says, the slur, the insult, the nagging, all that, not to register at all. Is that possible? Do you understand my question? Please don't go off to sleep. I am asking this question, you have to answer it.

Q: No, it is not possible. I don't find it possible.

K: The lady says it is not possible, therefore she has shut the door.

Q: No, I haven't shut the door, but I find it impossible.

K: The moment you say it is impossible, it is not possible, or it is possible you have shut the door. It is like a man saying "I can't do it" - finished. I am sure each of us can do it. I am certain, clear, if you put your heart and your mind into this question.

When the wife or the girl, or the man or the husband, says to you, "You are rather stupid this morning" - must you register that - react to the word, to his feeling and watch your own reactions to the word and his feeling. You follow? Can you watch all this instantly? Or he says, "You look very nice this morning" and you follow? Go into it sir. Not to register at all. Now is this possible? Please we are talking about learning about oneself in relationship. And we see why we create this image and so on, and therefore there is no actual relationship at all. There may be physical relationship, psychologically, obviously you are totally divided.

How can you be related and love another if you are ambitious? You can't. Or competitive, or this or that. So you have learnt a tremendous lot in enquiring into this relationship. You have come to the point now when we say: is this possible, to hear the word, not shut off, hear the word, see the meaning of the word, the significance of the word, the expression on the face of the man or the woman who says it, and your own reaction to all that, can you be aware of all that?

Q: Sir, it seems that we are continually getting into this difficulty at this point of saying I don't know. Could we look at that and maybe it is the mechanism that builds the images that doesn't want to say "I don't know". It doesn't like the idea of saying it.

K: Don't keep on repeating, "I don't know", then you are stuck. But we started out by saying we create these images; why we create these images is fairly clear. And we said the next question is: can this image-making stop? Then I can say, "I don't know". Right? Because then your mind is tremendously alert.

Q: One has to be concerned to end the images.

K: Yes. You are concerned to find out whether the image-making can stop. And you say it is not possible, or it is possible, then you are stuck. But when you say "I don't know, but I am moving", when I say "I don't know", I am not static. I am moving, I am tremendously active and full of energy to find out. I am not transmitting my energy to you, you are doing it yourself, please. That is a danger.

So is this possible? Which means to listen and not to register.

Q: Sometimes you are paralysed.

K: No, there is no paralysis madame. You can't paralyse when

your relationship with another is so tremendously important. All life is relationship. Not just you and me, it - not only you and me, it is a global problem. So we have to meet it globally, not just "I love my wife" - you follow? You and me, that is too little affair. When you understand the global issue then you will understand the little issue. But if you start with the little issue you won't understand the global - global in the sense of the enormity of it. It concerns every human being wherever he may be. So I say - now can I listen to the word, see the expression, the gesture, the contempt, the arrogance and so on, on the face of the other and listen to it without any reaction? So now we will have to find out what you mean by listening. Are we interested in this? Can we go on? No please I can go on. I have spent my life from the age of fifteen at this - right? So please spend also an hour with this.

Can I listen? Therefore what does it mean to listen? Do you ever listen? Are you listening now? Please, you understand? Are you listening to what I am saying? No, I am not sure. Or you are listening to a conclusion which you have made about yourself? Or in listening you have already drawn a conclusion? Or you have abstracted from listening an idea? And pursuing that idea? Therefore you are not actually listening. So are we listening now? That means you are listening without a single movement of thought because you are so tremendously concerned about this. If you are not then you won't listen. If you are deeply, profoundly concerned about this then you will instinctively naturally listen. And so are you listening from your experience, are you listening to the word and not to the content of the word, or are you listening and making an abstraction of what you are hearing into an idea and say, "Yes, I

have got it"? Which means then that you are listening without any movement, any movement of thought, any movement of intention. Just listening. If that is so - carefully please hear what I have to say - if you can so listen when the boy or the girl, or the wife, can you listen to that in the same way? You understand my question? You are finished. It is so terribly simple if you capture the simplicity of it. But intellectually we make a such a mess of everything.

So if there is the act of listening, then there is no registration. The other day after one of the talks, a man came up to me and said "What a marvellous talk that was. It was excellent. I feel as if I have got it all." I listened to it very carefully. I have been told this for fifty years and if I keep on registering how marvellous it is I would be a cuckoo! (Laughter). So can you please find out, listen to somebody saying nasty things, or pleasurable things, so completely that there is no registration? Which means can you be so attentive at the moment the word is said that there is no centre which records? You understand my question? Have you ever been attentive? Attentive in the sense of giving all your attention, all your energy, your heart, your mind, everything to that. When you do that there is no 'me' from which you are attentive, there is only attention - right? In that attention there is no recording. It is only when there is inattention there is a centre which records. Got it?

Q: Sir, there is no distraction.

K: No. There is no such thing as distraction. Please understand this. There is no such thing as distraction. You want to pay attention to that and you are distracted as one generally is. Which means what? You are not paying attention, therefore there is no distraction. So realize that you are not attentive and therefore

distraction. The moment you are aware that you are inattentive, you are already attentive. Capture this sir. There is no effort necessary in this. So it is possible not to register at all when the wife says something pleasant or unpleasant, or a friend or a boy or a girl or a boy at the office, labour. Can you live that way? Not for one day or a few minutes - can you live the entirety of your life that way?

Q: Regardless of your age.

K: Regardless of my age, or your age? (Laughter). I don't understand this.

Q: Excuse me sir. When I am attentive in this way of which you speak, is the attention limited to the thing to which I am attentive?

K: No.

Q: Or identified with.

K: No. Attention is attention, not limited to this or to that. I am attentive. There is attention. Not tension. (Laughter) When you are attentive there is no tension. Now wait a minute, just look at it: the question was about learning and can one learn about oneself through relationship. We went into the whole thing step by step, logically, reasonably, sanely. Now, just a minute, listen to this. We went into it very, very carefully, in detail. Now can you observe this whole thing as a whole, not broken up into little pieces. You understand my question? Can you have perception of the entirety of the structure? We have dealt bit by bit, fragment by fragment, or piece by piece. That means nothing personally to me, but if you capture the whole thing then from that you can work details. But you cannot through details work to the whole.

Now can you after an hour and twenty minutes, and ten

minutes, or a quarter, can you observe this whole phenomena of registration, learning, relationship as a whole? I mean by whole having a deep insight into the whole thing instantly. You see we are not used to that. We are always from one thing to another, from one fragment to another fragment, from one broken piece to another and so gradually build up the whole. We think we have built up the whole. But the whole is not this. The whole is the perception of the whole structure and beyond, then you can be terribly logical.

Q: And beyond the structure you said.

K: Oh, of course. The structure is very, very fragile.

Q: Does the attention include the structure and going beyond the structure?

K: Yes sir, when we are attentive the structure is non-existent. You understand? You are missing all this. When you are totally attentive there is no structure - right? That attention is meeting the person at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity - the other may not, that is indifferent, that is irrelevant. Your mind is meeting that totally. Then begins the objection on the other person, saying "You are indifferent to me," you are this, you are that, begins. You are not the cause - you understand? I wonder if you see all this?

Q: What is being attentive?

K: I have explained madame. You are not attentive to something, about something, or for something, you are just attentive.

Q: Who, what is it that is being attentive?

K: There is no you to be attentive, I have explained that. There

is only attention.

Q: And there isn't another I there?

K: No, please. See you are going off to something. So are we at the end of an hour and a quarter - are we free of the images? If you are not you haven't been listening, and nobody can force you to listen. It is up to you. If you want the present kind of relationship with each other and so with humanity, globally that way, it is up to you, but if you want to find out a way of living totally differently, it is also up to you but you have to listen to everything in yourself, in others - you follow? I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it?

Q: I don't see how the structure disappears, I am sorry, I don't understand it? How does the structure disappear when I am attentive to it?

K: Sir, I will tell you. The structure exists with all that we mean by structure, which is the desire for certainty, habit, centuries of tradition and so on, all that is the structure, the picture, the image, which we have made about another, when we are totally attentive there is no structure and therefore you are beyond everything, the image-making. You just try one thing. Just for fun. Next time your wife, your husband, your girl or boy says something pleasant or unpleasant, watch it, just for that second watch it, be attentive for that single moment and then you will see whether you are registering or not. You see that is what I mean, find out, try it, otherwise you will never find out.

Q: It seems to me there is contradiction, how can you watch it and be one with it at the same time? For god's sake explain that.

K: I don't quite follow sir.

Q: How can we be fear and watch it at the same time?

K: No, we are going off into something sir. I am saying, that you have listened for an hour - right sir? - an hour and a quarter. You have realized, understood the mechanistic way of learning and a different way - right? And also whether one can learn about oneself through relationship. We went into that more or less. Now I am asking: can you be aware of this whole structure first? Right? Be aware of it as you are aware of the colour of the dress of the person sitting next to you. Then be aware that you are separate from that, which is absurd, therefore in that awareness you realize there is no division there begins to be a sense of great attention. In that attention, which is not yours or another, it is just attention, in that attention, the whole structure is non-existent and I say from that when your wife, or a girl, or a boy says something to you be attentive at that moment and see what happens.



## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 2ND SEPTEMBER 1978**

We have been talking about various things that concern our daily life. We are not indulging in any form of theories, beliefs, or ideological, speculative entertainment. We are actually deeply concerned - I hope - with our daily life and to find out if it is at all possible to bring about a radical change in the ways of our life. Because our life is not what it should be. We are confused, miserable, sorrow-ridden, struggling, struggling from day after day until we die. And that seems to be our lot. This endless conflict, not only in our personal relationships but also with the world, which is deteriorating from day to day, becoming more and more dangerous, more and more unpredictable, uncertain, where the politicians and the nations are seeking power.

And we should also talk over together this morning, I think, about freedom: whether man - or woman, when I use the word 'man' I include the woman, I hope you don't mind, Women's Lib - it seems to me, as one observes in the world, in our daily life, freedom is becoming less and less. The more and more restrictive we are becoming, our actions are limited, our outlooks are very narrow, or bitter, cynical, or very, very hopeful, and we never seem to be free from our own daily conflict and misery, completely free from all the travail of life. And I think we should talk over together this question of freedom. Of course in the totalitarian states there is no freedom. Here in the western world and the eastern world, partly, there is somewhat more freedom - freedom to change your job, freedom to travel, to say what you like, to think what you like,

express what you like, write what you like. But even this freedom that one has is becoming more and more mechanical, it is no longer freedom.

So I think we should, if you are at all serious, go into this question rather deeply. That is, if you are willing. The Churches, the religions have tried to dominate our thinking: the Catholic church in the past tortured people for their belief, burnt them, excommunicated them, and even now excommunication is a form of threat for those who are Catholics. Which is exactly the same thing that is happening in the Totalitarian State - control of your mind, your thoughts, your behaviour, your actions. They are more concerned with the control of the mind, control of thought, and anyone who descends from that, disagrees, is banished away, or tortured, or sent to mental hospitals and so on. Exactly the same thing as the past Catholic world has done and now they are doing it in the so-called political economic states. So freedom is something that we have to find out what it means and whether it is possible for us to be free, not only inwardly, deeply, whether it is at all possible inwardly, psychologically, inside the skin as it were, but also to express ourselves correctly, truly, accurately. Then perhaps we will understand what freedom is.

Is freedom the opposite of slavery? Is freedom the opposite of prison, of bondage, of repression? Is freedom to do what you like? Please, as we said the other day, we have been talking over together, the speaker is only expressing, I hope, verbally what we are all questioning, therefore you are not listening to the speaker but listening to the questions which you are putting for yourself, therefore the speaker is not here. Is freedom the opposite of non-

freedom? And so is there an opposite at all? You understand? That is, if we move away from the bad to the good and think that is freedom, the good being the freedom - if we accept the good, which we can go into presently, what is the good, and the bad - is the good, the goodness the opposite of that which is not good, which is evil, which is bad? If there are opposites then there is a conflict. If I am not good, I will try to be good. I will make every effort to be good, if I am somewhat conscious, somewhat sane, not too neurotic. So we are asking: is freedom the opposite of anything? Or if freedom has an opposite then is it freedom? Please enquire together in this matter. That is, any opposite, the good and the bad, the very opposite of the bad has in it the opposite of the bad which is the good, the good has in it the roots of the bad. Go into it please. Consider it together.

If I am jealous, envious, the opposite of jealousy is a state of mind which is not jealous - a state of feeling. But if it is the opposite of jealousy that opposite has in it its own opposite. Do we see this? Because we want to go this morning into the question of what is love? Whether such a thing exists at all. Or is it merely sensation which we call love? So to understand the full significance and the nature and the beauty of that word which we use as love, we must understand, I think, what is the conflict between the opposites. Whether this conflict is illusory, in that illusion we are caught, which has become a habit? Or there is only 'what is' and therefore there is no opposite to it. I hope this is not becoming too intellectual, is it? Or too verbal? Or too nonsensical?

Because as long as we live in opposites, jealousy and non-jealousy, the good and the bad, the ignorant and the enlightened,

there must be this constant conflict in duality. Of course there is duality, man, woman, light and shade, light and darkness, morning and evening and so on, but psychologically, inwardly we are asking whether there is an opposite at all? Is goodness the outcome of that which is bad? If it is the outcome of that which is bad, evil - I don't like to use the word 'evil' because that is so appallingly misused, as is every other word in the English language - if goodness is the opposite of the bad then that very goodness is the outcome of the bad, therefore it is not goodness. Right? Do we see it ourselves, not as an idea, as a conclusion, as something somebody has suggested to you, but actually do we see anything born out of an opposite must contain its own opposite? So if that is so, then there is only 'what is', which has no opposite. Right? Is somebody meeting me? We are meeting each other?

So as long as we have an opposite there cannot be freedom. Goodness is totally unrelated to that which is evil, which is bad - in quotes 'bad'. As long as we are violent, to have the opposite which is non-violent, creates a conflict, and the non-violence is born out of violence. The idea of non-violence is the outcome of being aggressive, abrasive, anger and so on. So there is only violence, not its opposite, then we can deal with violence. As long as we have an opposite, then we are trying to achieve the opposite. I wonder if you see?

So is freedom the opposite of non-freedom? Or freedom has nothing whatsoever to do with its opposite? Please we have to understand this very carefully because we are going to go into something, which is: is love the opposite of hate? The opposite of jealousy? The opposite of sensation? So as long as we are living in

this habit of opposites, which we are - I must, I must not, I am, I shall be, I have been and in the future something will take place - all this is the activity, the movement of the opposites. May we go on?

So we are asking: is freedom totally unrelated to that which we call non-freedom? If it is then how is that freedom to be lived, understood and acted, from which action takes place? We have always acted from the opposites - right? I am in prison and I must be free of it. I must get out. I am in bondage to a habit, psychologically as well as physiologically, and I must be free of it to become something else. Right? So we are caught in the habit of this everlasting corridor of opposites and so there is never an ending to conflict, to struggle, to be this and not that. I think this is fairly clear. Can we go on from there? You are not listening to me: you are discovering this for yourself. If you are, it has significance, meaning and can be lived daily, but if you are merely accepting the idea of it from another, from the speaker, then you are merely living in the world of ideas, and therefore the opposites remain. The word 'idea' - the root meaning of it, from Greek and so on, is to observe. See what we have made of that word! Just to observe, and not conclude, or make an abstraction from what you have observed into an idea. So we are caught in ideas and we never observe. If we do observe we make an abstraction of it into an idea.

So we are saying: freedom is unconnected with bondage, whether it is the bondage of habit, physical or psychological, the bondage of attachment and so on. So there is only freedom, not its opposite. If we understand the truth of it then we will deal only with 'what is', and not with 'what should be', which is its opposite. I

have got it. Are we meeting each other somewhere? Right? May we go on?

So it is very clear that there is only the fact, the 'what is' and there is no opposite to 'what is'. If you understand that basically, the truth of it, you are dealing with facts, unemotionally, unsentimentally, then you can do something. The fact itself may do something. But as long as we move away from the fact, the fact and the opposite will continue. So we are asking now if that is clear, not because somebody said so but because you have discovered this for yourself fundamentally, it is yours, not mine, then we can proceed to enquire into this whole question which is very complex: what is love? If we are sentimental, romantic and imaginative and Raphaelites and Victorians, then we will never even put that question. But if we put aside all sentiment, all emotional response to that word, or having a conclusion about that word, then we can proceed sanely, healthily rationally into this question of what is love. Do you understand? So first of all are we approaching the question without a motive, without sentiment, without prejudice? Because the approach matters enormously, rather than the object itself - right? Do we meet this? Am I putting you all to sleep?

So do we know how we approach this question? Are we aware of our approach to it? We say, "Yes, I know what love is," and therefore you have stopped enquiring. So as we said, the approach to the problem is more important than the problem itself. Don't make it into a slogan! Or a cliché, then you have lost it. So are we clear how we approach this question? If the approach is correct, accurate, in the sense there is no personal conclusion, or opinion,

or experience, then you are approaching it afresh, then you are approaching it with a sense of deep enquiry.

So we are saying: what is love? Theologians have written volumes about it. The priests throughout the world have given a significance to it. Every man and woman throughout the world gives a specific meaning to it. If they are sensual, they give that meaning and so on and so on. So being aware how we approach it, openly, freely, without any motive, then the door is open to perceive what it is - right? We close the door to perception if we come to it with an opinion, with some conclusion, with our own personal little experience. We have closed the door and there is nothing you can do, you can't investigate, but if you come to it openly, freely, eagerly to find out then the door opens and you can look through - right? Please, are we doing this? Because I think this may solve all our human problems. The approach and what is love. In the mechanistic world it doesn't exist. To the totalitarian people, that word is probably an abomination - they only know the love of the country, the love of the State. Or if you are a Christian you have the love of god or the love of Jesus, or the love of somebody. In India it is the love of their particular guru, of their particular deity, and so on. So we are asking, putting all that aside, not ignorantly but seeing what they have done, what religions have done with that word and perhaps with the feeling behind that word, being aware of all that, we must go into this - right?

It means we must not only look what others have done to the word, how they have imposed certain conclusions upon our minds throughout the ages, and also what our own inclinations are, being aware of all that, let's approach it tentatively. What is love? Is it

pleasure? Go on sirs, enquire, dig into yourself and find out. Is it pleasure? For most of us it is, sexual pleasure which is called love, sensory pleasure. And that sensory pleasure, sexual pleasure has been called love. And that apparently dominates the world. It dominates the world because probably in our own lives it dominates us. So we have identified love with that thing called pleasure, and is love pleasure? Which doesn't mean that love is not pleasure. Enquire into it, it may be something entirely different. First we must enquire into it - right? Is love desire? Is love remembrance? Please. Which means, is love the remembered experience as pleasure, and the demand of thought as desire, with its image and the pursuit of that image is called love. Is that love? Well sirs?

And is being attached to a person, or to a country, to an idea, is that love? Attachment, dependence? Please look into yourself, not listen to me, I am not worth listening to. What is significant, what is worthwhile is that you listen to yourself when these questions are being put, you have to answer it for yourself because it is your daily life. And if attachment is love, what are the implications involved in it? You understand my question? If we say love is pleasure then we must see the whole consequences and the implications of that statement. Then we depend entirely on sensory, sexual excitement, which is called love. And with it goes all the suffering, the anxiety, the desire to possess, and from that possessive desire attachment. And where you are attached there is fear, fear of loss. And from that arises jealousy, anxiety, anger, gradual hatred - right?

And also we must see what are the consequences if it is not



pleasure. Then what is love, which is not jealousy, attachment, remembrance, pursuit of pleasure through imagination and desire and so on? Is love then the opposite of all this? You follow? I am lost!

We said is love the opposite of pleasure, of attachment, of jealousy? If love is that then that love contains jealousy, attachment and all the rest of it. Therefore love, seeing all the implications of attachment, pursuit of desire, the continuous reel of remembrances, I loved, I am not loved, I remember that particular sexual pleasure or that particular incident which gave me delight - so the pursuit of that and the opposite of what is called love, is then love the opposite of hate? Do you understand? Or love has no opposite? Are you following all this?

So we are finding out - please go with it you will see something extraordinary come out of this. I don't know what is coming out of it myself but I can feel something extraordinary coming out of it. If you will all listen to yourselves actually. And the religions have made love of god, love of Jesus, love of Krishna, love of Buddha - you follow? Totally unrelated from daily life. And we are concerned with the understanding and finding the truth of our daily life, the totality of it, not just sex or power or position, or jealousy, or some idiotic complex one has, but the whole structure and the nature of the extraordinary life in which we live.

So as we said, the opposite is not love. If we understand that, that through negation of what it is not, which means not negating or denying in the sense of pushing it away, resisting it, controlling it but understanding the whole nature and the structure and the implications of desire, of pleasure, of remembrance, out of that

comes the sense of intelligence which is the very essence of love - right? Are we meeting each other sir?

He said it is impossible. I am young and full of beans and I am full of sex, and I want to indulge in it. You may call it whatever you like but I like that. Until I catch some disease or some man or woman runs away with another then begins the whole circus - jealousy, anxiety, fear, hatred and so on. So what is one to do when one is young, full of life, all the glands highly active, what is one to do? Don't look at me! (Laughter) Look at yourselves. Which means - please listen - which means you cannot possibly depend on another to find out the answer. You have to be a light to yourself. You have to be a light to yourself in understanding, desire, remembrance, the whole attachment, to all that - understand it, live it, find out. Find out how thought pursues pleasure endlessly. If you understand the depth, and the fullness and the clarity of all that, then you will not be in a state of perpetual control, then guilt and regret - you follow? All that one goes through when one is young, if one is sensitive. If you are merely out for pleasure, well that is a different matter.

So love is not the opposite of hate, of desire, of pleasure. So love is something entirely different from all that, because love has no opposite. If you really understand this, go into it, not catch my enthusiasm, my vitality, my interest, my intensity, then you will find out what is much more inclusive than that, is compassion. The word is passion for everything - for the rock, for the stray animals, for the birds, for the trees, for nature, for human beings. How that compassion expresses itself - when there is that compassion, actually not theoretically and all that nonsense - when there is

actually that state of compassion, all action from that is action of intelligence. Because you cannot have love if you haven't understood the whole movement of thought. One cannot grasp the full beauty and the significance and the depth of that word without understanding the whole business of attachment, not intellectually but actually, whether you are free from attachment - from the man and the woman, from the house, from the particular carpet or particular something or other that you own - right?

So out of that investigation and awareness and all the significance of that, from that there comes intelligence, not born of books and cunning thought and discussions, and clever expressions and all that; but the understanding of what love is not, and putting all that aside. Not say, "Well I will find out gradually when I am dead and buried, or just before" - but now today, to find out while you are sitting there listening to yourself, to be free completely from all attachment - from your wife, from your husband, from your girl - attachment - do you understand? Can you? Not resist it, not throw it away, I am going to fight it, I am going to exercise my will to resist it and so on and so on. Will is part of desire.

So can you put aside attachment, dependence, and not become cynical, bitter, withdraw and resist. Because you have understood it, what attachment implies and in the very understanding of it, it drops away, and it drops away because you are intelligent, there is intelligence. That intelligence is not yours or mine, it is intelligence.

So then the action of compassion can only come through intelligence. It is like those people who love animals, protect animals, and wear their fur - right? You have seen all this, haven't

you?

If we have understood this to its very depth then we can proceed to enquire into this problem of fear with regard to death - right? Do you want to go into it? No, no please, don't casually say, "Yes, let's do it for fun". Because most of us who are young or old, whether we are diseased, or lame, or blind or deaf or ignorant, poor, we are frightened of death. It is part of our tradition, it is part of our culture, part of our daily life to avoid this thing called death. We have read all about it. We have seen people die, you have shed tears over them, and felt this enormous sense of isolation, loneliness, and the fear of all that. And from that there is this great sorrow, grief, not only the human sorrow of two human beings but also there is this great sorrow, global sorrow, sorrow in the world. I don't know if you are aware of all this. We have had recently two wars - hasn't that created immense sorrow for mankind? No? Think how many women, children, people, have cried and shed tears - not your tears or mine but human tears of humanity. So there is a global sorrow, the sorrow of the world and a particular human being with his sorrow.

Are you getting mesmerized by me? I question this all the time because you are so very silent and I hope that silence indicates the non-movement of physical movement and the non-movement of thought, does it indicate that you are really deeply concerned, deeply enquiring, putting your whole heart and mind and everything that you have into this understanding of 'what is'?

So before we go into the question of death, we must also understand the nature of sorrow: why we shed tears, why we rationalize sorrow, why we hold on to it. In the Christian world

sorrow is put on the cross, finished with it. You have idealized it or put away that sorrow onto one person and that person is going to redeem you from sorrow. You know all this, don't you? So one never goes into this whole question of sorrow. In the Asiatic world sorrow is explained through various theories, very intelligent, very clever - there is great possibility in their theories but yet in the Asian world, including India, there is still sorrow. So we are asking whether man can ever be free from it? Because we are asking this question to find out its right place - the right place of sex, money, physical security, technological knowledge and so on. All these have their right place. When once you have put these in their place, freedom comes.

So sorrow: the word sorrow, in that is involved passion. Passion, not lust, but that quality of mind when sorrow is completely, totally understood and gone into, seeing the whole significance of it, then out of that comes passion. Not to paint pictures - I don't mean all that kind of stuff - but passion, that quality of energy which is not dependent on anything, environment, good food and so on, it is that tremendous quality of energy, which may be termed as passion. It comes out of the understanding of this burden which man has carried for millenia. Why do we suffer, psychologically? You may have physical pain, injury, disease, crippled and is it possible - please listen quietly - is it possible to put pain, physical pain in its right place and not let it interfere with the psychological state of the mind - you understand what I am saying?

One has often physical pain in different forms. Or one may have serious sickness, or crippled, and that sickness, that disease, and so

on, not to allow all that to interfere with the freedom, with the freshness of the mind. That requires tremendous awareness, watchfulness to see that physical pain is not to be registered - you understand? - psychologically. Are we meeting each other? You have been to a dentist, haven't you, so have I, all of us have been, and there is considerable pain sitting there by the hour, and not to register that pain at all. Then if you register it, then you are frightened to go there again, fear comes in. Whereas if you don't register it, the pain, - you follow? - quite a different quality of mind, brain comes into action. So we went into the question of registration very clearly, carefully, so I won't go into it now.

So similarly we live in sorrow and perhaps that is getting more and more expansive, through divorce, people are divorced and their children go through a terrible time, the children suffer, become neurotic. All that goes on in the children; they are fed up with their present wife and for various sexual and other reasons and they chase another woman, or man - you follow all this, this is happening. And there is tremendous suffering in the world, the people who are in prison, the poverty that exists in India and Asia, incredible poverty. And the sorrow of a world of those who live in Totalitarian States. We were talking the other day to a person, just in Switzerland we met them, and we had asked them a question, saying how do you tolerate all this? He said, "We get used to it". You see what the implications are? We get used to oppression, suppression, fear, watching always what we are saying, we get used to it. As we have got used to our own particular little environment - you understand what I am saying?

So is it possible to be totally free from sorrow? If the mind, if

the brain is capable of not indulging in its own misery, in its own loneliness, in its anxieties, travail and struggle and fear and all that, therefore there is no centre from which you act. The centre being the 'me' with all the things that are included in that, as long as that exists there must be sorrow. So the ending of sorrow is the ending of 'me', the ego. Which doesn't mean the ending of 'me' implies callousness, indifference: on the contrary.

So we know what sorrow is and never to run away from it, just to live with it, capture it, understand it, go into it at the moment, not a few days later after you have been through all kinds of struggle, just to never move from that fact. Then there is no conflict about it. And out of that comes a totally different kind of energy, which is passion.

So now we can go into the question of what is death. All this is necessary to find out what is meditation, you understand? To be free of hurts, wounds, psychologically, to be free of fear, to understand the whole movement of pleasure, the nature and the structure of thought, and the thought that has created the division, the 'me' and the thing which he has observed is not 'me' - all the divisions. To understand all this and lay the foundation, then one can really meditate, otherwise you live in illusions, some kind of fanciful day dreaming. Or you go to Japan, or Burma, I don't know if you can go to Burma nowadays, Japan and learn Zen meditation. It is all such nonsense. Because unless you put your house in order, the house that is burning, that is being destroyed, unless you put your house, that is yourself, in order, to sit under a tree in a cross-legged Lotus position, or whatever position you take, is utterly meaningless. You can delude yourself, you can have illusions

galore. So that is why it is important and to understand and be free of anxiety, fear, attachment, and whether it is possible to find out the ending of sorrow.

Then we can go into the question of death. I wonder why we are all so frightened of it. Have you ever asked: what does it mean to end anything? What does it mean to end attachment? To end it. Say at this moment, sitting there, observing yourself very carefully and realizing that you are attached to a person, or to something or other, ideas, your experience and so on. To end that attachment now without argument, without etc. etc. Just end it. Then what takes place? Do you understand my question? I am attached to this house, behind me - I hope not! And realizing that I am attached, not theoretically or in abstraction, but actually, the feeling, possessing that, being something there, all that nonsense. To observe that, be aware of that attachment and end it instantly. The ending is tremendously important. The ending of a habit, smoking or whatever habit one has, to end it. So one must understand what it means to end something without effort, without will, without asking, "If I end this will I get that?" - then you are in the market. In the market place you say, "I will give you this, give me that" - which most of us consciously or unconsciously do. That is not ending. To end and find out what happens.

So in the same way, death. Please hold on to it for a minute, don't say, "Is there life after death? Do you believe in reincarnation?" - as I said, I don't believe in anything. Full stop. Including reincarnation. But I want to find out, one must find out what it means to die. It must be an extraordinary state. That is freedom from the known - you understand? I know my life, your



life. You know your life, if you have gone into it, observed it, carefully watched all the reactions and your behaviour, your lack of sensitivity, or being sensitive escape into insensitivity and so on and so on. You know your life very well, if you have watched it. And all that is going to end - right? Your attachment is going to end when you die. You can't carry it with you but you like to have it until the last moment. Right? So can you end your habit, one habit without arguing, rationalizing, fighting it, you know, it is finished, over? Then what happens? You will find out only if you don't exercise will - right? "I will give up" - whatever your particular habit is. Then you are struggling with it, you are battling with it, you are running away from it, suppressing it and all the rest of it, it goes on. But if you say, "Yes, I'll end it, it doesn't matter, I'll end it" - see what happens.

In the same way death implies the ending. The ending of everything that one has collected during this life, the furniture, the name, the form, your experiences, your opinions, your judgements, your jealousies, your gods, your worship, your prayers, your rituals, everything comes to an end. The brain, which has carried immemorial memories and tradition and thoughts, that brain lacking oxygen peters out. That is the 'me' which has collected so much, the 'me' is the collection of all this - right? That is obvious. The 'me' is my fear, the 'me' is my attachment, my anger, my jealousy, my fears, pleasure, my attachment, my bitterness, my aggression - that is the 'me'. And that 'me' is going to come to an end. That 'me' is projected by thought which is the outcome of knowledge, the knowledge of my fifty, sixty, or thirty or twenty or eighty or a hundred years, that is the factor, the knowledge, the

known. The ending of the known, which is the freedom from the known, is death, isn't it? No?

And so one must find out whether the mind can be free from the known. Not at the end of thirty years later but now. The end of the known, which is 'me', the world I live it, all that. The 'me' is memories, please listen to all this, the 'me' is memories, experiences, the knowledge which I have acquired through forty, sixty, thirty, twenty, or a hundred years, the 'me' that has struggled, the 'me' that is attached to this house, to this woman, to this land, to this child, to this furniture, to this carpet, the 'me' that is the experience that I have gathered through a number of years, the knowledge, the pain, and the anxieties, the fears, the jealousies, the hurts, the beliefs as being a Christian, love of Jesus, love of Christ, all that is 'me'. And that 'me' is just a lot of words - no? A lot of memories.

So can I be free from the known, end the known now, not when death comes and says, "Get out old boy, it is your time". Now. But we cling to the known because we don't know anything else. We cling to our sorrows, we cling to our life, the life which is pain, anxiety - you know all that, you know all this, that is our daily, miserable life. And if the mind doesn't cling to it at all there is an ending to all that. But unfortunately we never end. We always say, "Yes, all right, I'll end it but what is going to happen?" So we want comfort in the ending - do you understand sirs? So somebody comes along and says, "Old boy, believe in this, that will give you tremendous comfort." All the priests throughout the world come and pat your shoulder and hold your hand when you are crying, they give you comfort, the love of Jesus, he will save you, do this

and do that. Do you understand? We are saying the ending in which there is no time, the ending of time, which is death - you understand?

So what takes place when there is the ending of 'me', the known, and when there is freedom from the known? Is that ever possible? It is only possible when the mind has understood and put everything in its right place so there is no conflict. When there is freedom from this known, what is there? Do you understand my question? Do you ask that question? I'll end my attachment to this house, to that woman, or to that boy or to that girl, I'll end it, then what? Don't you ask that? If you do ask it, 'then what', you have approached the whole problem inadequately. You will never ask that question, 'then what'. The very question, 'then what', implies that you have really not actually dropped, ended something. It is the lazy mind that says, 'then what'. Climb the mountain and you will find out what is on the other side. But most of us sit in our easy chairs, and listen to the description and are satisfied with the description. Finished. Right.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK**

## **SEPTEMBER 3RD 1978**

There are a lot of people and I hope some of you understand what is being said. You know we have been talking over together for the last week our human problems; not only talking over together as two friends but what each one of us has discovered for himself in our conversation, and in our exploration and investigation. It must become quite obvious for most of us, if we are at all serious and not treat these Gatherings as a kind of festival, a little more serious than the Pop Festival, or other kinds of festivals.

This morning it will be good to talk over together, as we have talked over fear, pleasure, sorrow, pain and death, I think we ought to talk over this morning the very complex and subtle problem of what is meditation. It is quite a serious issue and perhaps some of you will kindly pay sufficient attention to what is being said, if you care to.

This word is now becoming so common, even the governments are beginning to use it, even the people who want money are trying to meditate more to get more money. They are trying to meditate in order to become quiet so that they can do better business. And the doctors are practising meditation because it will help them to operate properly, and so on and so on and on. And there are different kinds of meditation - Zen, Tibetan and the ones you invent for yourself, and with all this in mind, the Indian type of meditation, the Tibetan, the Zen, the Encounter Group meditation and the aspiration to have a still, quiet, silent mind, bearing all this in mind, let us try to find out, if we can this morning, why one

should meditate and what is the significance of meditation.

This word has recently been popularized from India. And people go to India and to Japan and to other places in order to learn meditation, in order to practise meditation, in order to achieve some kind of result through meditation - enlightenment, better understanding of themselves, have peace of mind, whatever that may mean, and generally they have a little peace, not a peaceful mind. And the gurus have invented their type of meditation and so on and on and on - right? I am sure you are aware of all this.

And of course there is the passing fad which is called transcendental meditation. It is really a form of siesta in the morning, siesta after lunch, siesta after dinner or before dinner, so that your mind kind of becomes quiet and you can do more mischief afterwards. (Laughter).

So consider all this, the various types and practices and systems, and question them. It is good to have doubt, it is good to be sceptical up to a certain point. It is like a dog on the leash, you must let the dog go occasionally, run freely: so doubt, scepticism must be kept on a leash all the time but often it must be allowed to run free. And most of us accept the authority of those who say, "We know how to meditate, we will tell you all about it".

So please we are together examining the whole problem, or the whole question of what is meditation, not how to meditate, for then if you ask how am I to meditate, then you will find a system to meditate; the 'how' implies a method. But whereas if you are enquiring into this question of what is meditation, and why should one meditate, then you will never ask how to meditate. The very questioning, the very asking is the beginning of enquiry which is

the beginning of meditation.

As we said, this is a very complex problem and we have to go very slowly and hesitantly but subtly into this question. As we said during the last week, we are investigating, we are enquiring into it so that you are not listening to the speaker, you are asking the question of yourself and finding the right answer without accepting any kind of authority, specially the authority of the speaker sitting on this unfortunate platform. It doesn't give him any authority because he sits on a platform and talks. There is no authority in so-called spiritual matters, if I can use that word 'spiritual', in the matter of the spirit, in the matter of enquiring into something that demands very, very careful examination. So we are doing this together, not meditating together but enquiring what is meditation and from that discover for oneself as we go along the whole movement of meditation. Is this all right?

First I think one must be careful in observing that meditation is not something that you do. Meditation is a movement into the whole question of our living. That is the first thing: how we live, how we behave, whether we have fears, anxieties, sorrows, or if we are pursuing everlastingly pleasure, whether we have built images about ourselves and about others. That is part of our life and in the understanding of that life and of those various issues involved in life and being free from those, actually being free, then we can proceed to enquire into what is meditation. That is why we have, for the last ten days or the last week, we have said we must put order in our house - our house is ourselves - complete order. Then when that order is established not according to a pattern, but when there is understanding, complete understanding of what is disorder,

what is confusion, why we are in contradiction in ourselves, why there is this constant struggle between the opposites and so on, which we have been talking about for the last ten days or last week. Having put that in order, our life in order, and the very placing things in their proper place is the beginning of meditation. Right? If we have not done that, actually, not theoretically, but in daily life, every moment of our life, then if you have not done that then meditation becomes another form of illusion, another form of prayer, another form of wanting something - money, position, refrigerator and so on.

So we are asking now: what is the movement of meditation? First of all we must understand the importance of the senses. Most of us react, or act according to the urges, demands and the insistence of our senses. And those senses never act as a whole but only as a part - right? Please understand this. If you don't mind enquiring into this a little more for yourself, talking over together, but all our senses never function, move, operate as a whole, holistically. If you observe yourself and watch your senses you will see that one or the other of the senses becomes dominant. One or the other of the senses takes a greater part in observation in our daily living, so there is always imbalance in our senses - right? May we go on from there?

Now is it possible - this is part of meditation, what we are doing now - is it possible for the senses to operate as a whole; to look at the movement of the sea, the bright waters, the eternally restless waters, to watch those waters completely, with all your senses? Or a tree, or a person, or a bird in flight, a sheet of water, the setting sun, or the rising moon, to observe it, look at it with all your senses

fully awakened. If you do, then you discover for yourself, I am not telling you, I am not your authority, I am not your guru, you are not my followers - followers are the most destructive people and the gurus too - if you observe this, if you observe this operation of the whole senses acting you will find there is no centre from which the senses are moving. Are you trying this as we are talking over together? To look at your girl, or your husband, or your wife or the tree, or the house, with all the highly active sensitive senses. Then in that there is no limitation. You try it. You do it and you will find out for yourself. That is the first thing one has to understand: the place of the senses. Because most of us operate on partial or particular senses. We never move or live with all our senses fully awakened, flowering. Because as most of us live, operate and think partially, so one of our enquiries into this is for the senses to function fully and realize the importance and the illusion that senses create - are you following all this? And to give the senses their right place, which means not suppressing them, not controlling them, not running away from them but to give the proper place to the senses. This is important because in meditation, if you want to go into it very deeply, unless one is aware of the senses, they create different forms of neurosis, different forms of illusions, they dominate in our emotions and so on and so on. So that is the first thing to realize: if when the senses are fully awakened, flowering then the body becomes extraordinarily quiet. Have you noticed all this? Or am I talking to myself? Because most of us force our bodies to sit still, not fidget, not to move about and so on - you know. Whereas if all the senses are functioning healthily and normally, vitally then the body relaxes and becomes



very, very quiet, if you do it. Do it as we are talking.

Then the question arises: what is time? what is the place of time in meditation? And what is the place of control in meditation? You understand? May I go on? I hope we are meeting each other, are we? First let's state whether it is possible to live a life, daily life, not occasionally but live a life without any form of control - which doesn't mean permissive activity or doing what one likes, rejecting tradition - you know all the modern young people are doing. That is no regret, no restraint, no control, do what you want - which the old people do anyhow only you think it is their prerogative, something they have invented.

Now we are asking a question, please consider it seriously: whether it is possible to live a life without any form of control, because when there is control there is the action of will - right? Are you following? So what is will? I will do this. I must not do that. Or, I should in the future do that, and so on. The operation of will. So we have to enquire what is will. Is not will desire? Is not will the essence of desire? Right? Please look at it. Don't reject it or accept it, enquire into it. Because we are now asking whether it is possible to live a life in which there is not a shadow of control, in which there is not a shadow of the operation of will. And will is the very movement of desire. We went into the whole question of what is desire. I won't go into it now because I have a lot to cover this morning. Desire is contact, perception, seeing, contact, sensation, from that arises desire and thought with its image - all that is desire, which we went into but I won't go into now.

And we are asking: is it possible to live without the action of will? Most of us live a life of restraint, control, suppression, and so

on, escape. And we have to ask: who is the controller? When you say, "I must control myself, my anger, my jealousy, my laziness, my indolence" and so on, who is the controller? Is the controller different from that which he controls? Or are they both the same? The controller is the controlled. Is it all right? Do we understand? After all you have listened to me for a week, ten days, by now our language, our use of words must be quite common and understood. So as long as there is a controller he is exercising his capacity to control. And we are saying the controller is the essence of desire. And he is trying to control his activities, his thoughts, his wishes and so on and so on. So realizing all that, can one live life which is not promiscuous, which is not doing what you like but a life without any form of control, either sexual and not indulgence, the will to control what you should, should not, and all the whole problem of control. Very few people have gone into this question. And the whole eastern form of meditation is partly control. And personally I object to the whole, their system of any form of control, because the mind then is never free, always subjugating itself to a pattern, whether that pattern is established by another or by oneself.

So the senses, the control: then we must ask: what is time? Not the scientific fiction, science fiction of time. What is, in our daily life, what is time? What part does it play in our life? How important is it in our daily activities? You understand my question? Of course there is time by the watch. There is time according to the sun, the setting and the rising of the sun. There is time as yesterday, today and tomorrow. There is time as something that happened in the past, remembered and shaping the present and the

future - right? So there is physical chronological time and we have also psychological time - I will be, I must, I am violent, I will be non-violent. All that implies a movement of time - right?

Movement means time. Please understand this really very carefully because we are going to enquire into meditation, which is whether the mind can be absolutely quiet in which time as movement doesn't exist at all. You are following all this? Are you interested in all this? Even as intellectual curiosity? Because this is very important to understand, whether time, not chronological time but psychological time, can that come to an end? Or must there be always until I die this movement of, I will be, I must not be, I should be, I shall not be - you follow? - the whole psychological activity in which time is involved. That is, can time come to an end? Please see why it is important. Because our brains are conditioned to time, our brains are the result of a million years and more - it doesn't matter - immemorial, centuries upon centuries the brain is conditioned, it has evolved, grown, flowered, it is a very, very ancient brain, and as it has evolved through time - evolution implies time - as it evolved its functions in time - you understand? I wonder if you understand all this? The moment you say, "I will" it is in time. When you say, "I must do that" it is also in time. Everything that we do involves time and our brains are conditioned to not only chronological time, sun, rising sun, setting, but also to the psychological time. So the brain has evolved through millenia and the very idea, the very question whether it can end time - you follow? - it is a paralysing process. I wonder if you understand this? It is a shock to it. Does somebody understand this?

Because we are going to ask presently whether the brain itself

can be absolutely quiet. You understand? Not your body, not your breathing, not your eyes and thought, the brain itself, which is constantly chattering, constantly thinking about this, that, the other. Whether those very brain cells can be absolutely quiet. So therefore we must understand the nature of time. That is, psychologically, inwardly we are caught in a network of time. I am going to die, I am afraid. I shall be. I have been. And I remember the happy things or the painful things. And the brain is functioning, living in time - right? You can see this yourself. These are obvious facts.

So part of meditation is to find out for oneself whether time can stop. You can't do this saying, "Time must stop" - it has no meaning. But to understand the whole structure and the nature and the depth of this question - right? That means: is it possible for the brain to realize that it has no future? Do you understand what I am saying? We live either in despair, or in hope. Right? Don't you? Hope is part of time. I am miserable, unhappy, uncertain, I hope to be happy - do you understand? Part of time is this destructive nature of hope, or the invention of the priests throughout the world - faith. You suffer but have faith in god and everything is all right. Do you follow all this? Again that is, faith in something involves time. Can you stand - stand in the sense, can you tolerate that there is no tomorrow psychologically? Can you? That is part of meditation, to find out that psychologically there is no tomorrow.

We were once talking with somebody quite intelligent, quite learned, about this question. And it was a real shock to him when we said: hope, faith, movement of the future as tomorrow is non-existent. He was appalled at the idea and said: "I shan't meet you

tomorrow, whom, I love" - do you understand what I am saying? I may meet you, I probably will but the hope, the pleasure, the looking forward to something, all that is involved in time. Which doesn't mean that you discard hope, which means that you understand the movement of time. If you discard hope then you become bitter, then you say, "Why should I live, what is the purpose of life?" and all that nonsense begins - depression, agony to live without anything in the future - do you understand all this?

So one has to go into this question not verbally, not theoretically but actually to find out psychologically in yourself if you have the slightest sense of tomorrow.

The next question in meditation is: whether thought as time can stop? Thought, as we have talked a great deal about it, is important, important in its right place. But it has no importance whatsoever psychologically. I wonder if you see this? I see I must go briefly into it.

Thought is the reaction of memory, it is born from memory. Memory is experience. Experience as knowledge stored up in the brain cells themselves. You can watch your own brain, you don't have to become a specialist - I am not, I just observe myself very carefully. The brain cells hold this memory. It is a material process. There is nothing sacred, nothing holy about it. And everything that we have done, going to the moon, planting a silly flag up there, going down to the depths of the sea and living there, thought has created all this immense complicated technology and its machinery. Thought has been responsible for all this. Thought has also been responsible for all wars - right? It is obvious, you don't have to question it even because your thoughts have divided

Britain, France, Russia - you follow? And thought has created the psychological structure as the 'me' - right? That 'me' is not holy, something divine. It is just thought putting together the anxieties, the fears, the pleasures, the sorrow, the pain, the attachments, the fear of death, it has put all this together which is the 'me'. It is this 'me' with its consciousness - right? I wonder? May we proceed? You are following all this? This is 'me', this consciousness. This consciousness is what it contains. Consciousness, your consciousness is what you are - it is your anxieties, your fears, your struggle, your moods, your psychological despairs, pleasures and so on. The content of your consciousness is its content - right? Again there is nothing to argue about it, it is very simple. And that is the result of time. Right? I have been hurt yesterday, psychologically, you said something brutal to me, it has wounded me, and it is part of my consciousness. I have had pleasure and so on. So consciousness is involved in time. When we say can time end, it implies the total emptying of this consciousness with its content. It implies that. Whether you can do it or not that is a different matter. But it implies that.

When you are enquiring into time, whether the immovable layers of this consciousness, sensation, desire and all that, layer after layer, the whole structure of it, whether that consciousness which is a result of time, yesterday I was hurt and so on and so on, whether that consciousness can empty itself completely, therefore time psychologically ends? I am putting first this question for you to look at. Then we can ask: is it possible? Do you understand my question? You are aware of your consciousness, aren't you, you know what you are, if you have gone into it sufficiently, at least for

the last week you might have done it somewhat. But if you have gone into it you will see that all this travail, all this struggle, all the misery, uncertainty is part of you, part of this consciousness, your ambitions, your greed, your aggressiveness, your anger, your bitterness - all that is part of this consciousness, which is the accumulation from a thousand yesterdays to today. And we are asking whether that consciousness which is the result of time, psychological as well as physiological, can empty itself so that time has come to an end? You have understood the question first? Please somebody say 'yes' or 'no' - please. Don't go to sleep.

We are going to find out if it is possible. If you say it isn't possible then you have closed the door, then you might just as well walk out, don't sit here and waste your time if you say it is not possible. And if you say it is possible you have also closed the door. But whereas if you say let's find out, then you are open to it, you are eager to find out - right? Please this is not an intellectual game. This is not an entertainment of a Sunday morning. This is not a sermon either. I must tell you a lovely story about it. There was a preacher with his disciples and every morning he used to give a sermon for ten minutes, quarter of an hour. And all the captive audience listened to it. (Laughter). And one day he gets on the rostrum and begins - just about to begin and a bird comes along, sits on the window sill and begins to sing. And the preacher doesn't say a word. At the end of ten minutes or five minutes, the bird after singing flies away. The preacher then says, "The sermon is over for this morning" - (Laughter). I wish I could say that too! (Laughter).

So the question now is, if you are serious enough to go into it:

whether it is possible to empty totally the whole content of ourselves, the content of our consciousness, this consciousness which has been built through time? Is it not possible - please listen to it - is it not possible to end one of the contents of your consciousness, your hurts, your psychological wound? Surely you know what that means. Most of us psychologically have been hurt from childhood, parents, cruel - our whole existence we are hurt. That is part of your consciousness. Can you end that hurt completely, totally wipe it out without leaving a mark? You can, can't you? If you pay attention to the wound, know what has caused it and the wound is the image you have about yourself that has been wounded, and end that image that is wounded - you can do that if you have gone into it very, very deeply. Or if you are attached to somebody, if you are attached to your wife or your husband, it doesn't matter what it is, attached to a belief, to a country, to a sect, to a group of people and so on, to Jesus and so on, can you not completely logically, sanely, rationally end it? Because you see attachment implies jealousy, anxiety, fear, pain, and having pain you become more and more and more attached - seeing the nature of attachment, the perception of attachment is the flowering of intelligence. That intelligence says, how stupid to be attached - it is finished. You understand this?

So go into it. Or you have a particular psychological habit, thinking always in a certain direction. That is part of your consciousness. Can thought move away from the groove, from the rut? Of course it can. So it is possible - please listen - it is possible to empty totally, completely the content. Now if you do it one by one, that is, attachment, your hurts, your anxiety and so on, it will



take infinite time. See what is involved if you do it one by one, it will take time. So we are caught in time again. I wonder if you see this? Whereas is it possible to empty it without involving time instantly, as a whole, not parts? I'll show it to you, don't shake your head, or agree or disagree. Do you understand my question? When you do it part by part you are still involved in time. If you really see the truth of it then you won't do it partially - right? Naturally.

Then you move to a different question which is: can it be done in its entirety? That is, is there an observation of this consciousness which is not mine really, it is not my particular consciousness, it is the universal consciousness. My consciousness is like your consciousness, or somebody else's consciousness, because we suffer, we go through agonies, etc. etc. There may be a few who have said "Out" - they have flowered out and gone beyond, that is irrelevant.

So we are asking: is it possible to observe the thing in its entirety, wholly, and in the very observation of that totality the ending of it? You understand my question? So is it possible to observe your hurt, or your anxiety, or your guilt or whatever it is, totally? You understand my question? Suppose I have guilt. I feel guilty - which I don't, but suppose I do. Can I look at that guilt, how it arose, what was the reason for it and how I am dreading further and so on - the entire structure of guilt, can I observe it wholly? Of course you can - no? You can observe it only wholly when you are aware of the nature of being hurt. You can be aware of it and the guilt and so on, all the various things that we have collected, you can be aware of it if there is no direction or motive involved in that awareness. Have you understood this? I'll explain,

I'll go into it.

Suppose I am attached to something or somebody: can I not observe what are the consequences of attachment, what is involved in attachment, how that attachment arose, can't I observe the whole nature of it instantly? I am attached because I am lonely, I want comfort, I want to depend on somebody because I can't stand by myself, I need companionship, I need somebody to tell me you are doing very well, old boy. I need somebody to hold my hand, I am depressed and anxious. So I depend on somebody and out of that dependence arises attachment and from that attachment arises fear, jealousy, anxiety - right? Can't I observe the whole nature of it instantly? Of course you can if you are aware, if you are deeply interested to find out.

So we are saying that instead of doing it piecemeal by piecemeal, it is possible to see the whole nature and the structure and the movement of consciousness with all its content. The content makes up the consciousness, and to see it entirely is possible. And when you see the entirety of it, it disintegrates.

The question then is - we are asking this question: as the content is part of our daily life of our consciousness, and that consciousness is the accumulation through time, whether that time can stop, which means is there an ending of all the struggles, you know, all the rest of it instantly? We say it is possible. I have shown it to you. It has been shown through examples. That is, to have a complete insight into the whole nature of consciousness - right? Insight means, implies without any motive, without any remembrance, just to have instant perception of the nature of consciousness and that very insight dissolves the problem. Have

you understood this somewhat?

Then we can go to the next thing, which is: we are occupied with measure - right? I am tall, I am short. I must be different from what I am. Measure - you understand? Which is comparison, following an example. Our whole technological development is based on measure. If you had no measurement there could be no technological advance. That is, knowledge is movement in measure. I know, I shall know. It is all measurement. And that measurement has moved into the psychological field. Follow all this sir. Are you following? Watch yourself, how it works, you can see it very simply.

And so we are always comparing psychologically. Now can you end comparison, which is also the ending of time - right? Measure means measuring myself with somebody and wanting to be like that, or not like that. The positive and the negative process is a part, through comparison, of measurement. I wonder if you see? Are you getting tired? Go into it for yourself and you will see it.

So is it possible to live a daily life without any kind of comparison? You do compare two materials, one corduroy colour against another corduroy colour, but psychologically, inwardly to be free of comparison completely, which means to be free of measurement. Measurement is the movement of thought. So can thought come to an end? Do you follow all this? You see most of us try to stop thinking, try to, which is impossible. You may for a second say "I have stopped thinking" but it is forced, it is compelled, it is a form of saying "I have measured a second when I was not thinking". So we are asking something, which all the original real people who went into this question, who said, "Can

thought come to an end?" That is, thought born from the known - you understand? - knowledge is the known, which is the past, can that thought come to an end? Can there be freedom from the known? Do you understand my question? Because we are always functioning from the known and therefore we have become extraordinarily capable and imitative, comparing, and this constant endeavour to be something - right? So can thought come to an end? Thought itself, when it is aware of itself, knows its limitation and therefore it has its place. I wonder? Are you doing all this while we are talking?

So we have talked about measurement, control, the importance of the senses and their right place - all this is part of meditation.

And we are asking next: when one has come to a certain point, the senses can develop extra sensory perception, because they become extraordinarily sensitive, telepathy, reads other people's thoughts, control various forms of clairvoyance and so on and so on. They are still within the field of the senses - right? So they have not this colossal importance that man is giving to them. Right? I wonder if you see this. The speaker has been through all this. Forgive me for entering personally, I have been through all this and one sees the danger of it, caught in all that sensory excitement, all that. It is stupid. So though these things there are definitely, but they are irrelevant.

We are asking now another question which is: man is always seeking power - right? The politicians, the priests, the everyday man and woman wants to dominate, wants to control, wants to possess. Power has become extraordinarily important. The two super powers. That means power in the hands of the few, to dictate

what others should think - the Christian Church has done this excellently at one time. The heretics, the torture, the Inquisition and all that. Control man through propaganda, through books, through words, through images, controlling him through his fear and reward and punishment. Any form of dissent is either tortured, expelled, concentration camps, or burnt. Right? This is the history of man's stupidity, whether he calls it patriotic, religious. Now we are asking: is it possible to live without any sense of power? You understand what I am saying? Are you following all this, interested in all this? Which means, can you live in total anonymity and total humility? You may have a name, you may write a book, or talk, and be somewhat famous, notorious, whatever word you like to use, but nothing behind it. So we are not seeking power through clairvoyance, through telepathy, all this can be used by governments to control the captain in the submarine - they are all experimenting with this. For god's sake be aware of all this. And can one live without any sense of power? You know there is great beauty in that, to be totally anonymous. And the whole world is seeking identity, power, position.

Now the next question is: can the brain - please listen to this - can the brain, which is millions and millions of years old, so heavily conditioned, so full of all that man has collected through centuries, and therefore it is acting mechanically all the time, can that brain be free from the known, and can that brain never, never get old - old in the sense physically? Do you understand what I am talking about? Don't you ask these questions? Do you? Perhaps you do when you get old, when you are somewhat incapacitated, when you have lost your capacity to think, you are losing your memory

and then you say, "My god, I wish I could go back and be young again, to have a fresh mind, a young mind, a decisive mind" - don't you ask this sometimes? Whether this brain can lose its burden and be free and never deteriorate? Don't say "Yes" or "No", find out. Which means - please listen if you are interested in this - which means never psychologically register anything - right? Do you understand? Never to register the flattery, the insult, the various forms of impositions, pressures, never. To keep the tape completely fresh. Then it is young. Innocence means a brain that has never been wounded - right? That is innocence, that knows no misery, conflict, sorrow, pain, all that, which is all registered in the brain and therefore it is always limited, old as it grows physically older. Whereas if there is no recording whatsoever, psychologically, then the brain becomes extraordinarily quiet, extraordinarily fresh. This is not a hope, this is not a reward, either you do it and discover it, or you just accept words and say, "How marvellous that must be" - "I wish I could experience that" - and you are off the mark. Whereas if you do it you will find out.

So the brain then becomes, because of this insight, which we have talked about, because of that insight the brain cells undergo a change. It is no longer holding to memories. It is no longer the house of vast collected antiquity - right? So that is that.

Then also we must ask the question: is there anything sacred in life? Is there anything that is holy, untouched by thought? Do you understand my question? Please understand the question itself. That which is holy, sacred, we have put them in the churches as symbols - the Virgin Mary, the Christ on the cross - and go to India, there they have their particular images, go to Buddhist

countries they have their own images, and that has become sacred, the name, the sculpture, the image, the symbol. In certain places, churches, temples and so on, in the mosques - naturally there are no images in the mosques but lovely writing, which has become an image also.

Now we are asking a question: is there anything sacred in life? Sacred being that which is deathless, timeless, from eternity to eternity, that which has no beginning and no end - do you understand? We are asking this. You can only find that out - no, you can't find it out, nobody can find it out - it may come when you have discarded all the things that thought has made sacred - the pictures, the museums, the music, the churches and their beliefs, their rituals, their dogmas, all that is understood and discarded completely. There is no priest, no guru, no follower. Then in that tremendous quality of silence you may find out - in that silence there may come something that is not touched by thought, because that silence is not created by thought.

So one has to question, go into the whole nature of silence. There is silence between two noises, there is silence between two thoughts, there is silence between two notes in music, there is silence after noise, there is silence when thought says, "I must be silent" and creates that artificial silence and thinking that is real silence. There is silence when you sit quietly and force your mind to be silent. All those are artificial silences, they are not real, deep, uncultivated, unpremeditated silence. We said silence can only come psychologically when there is no registration whatsoever. Then the mind, the brain itself is utterly without movement. Then in that great depth of silence, not induced, not cultivated, not

practised but in that silence there may come that extraordinary sense of something immeasurable, nameless. This whole movement from the beginning to the end of these talks is part of meditation. Finished.



# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST SEMINAR MEETING 12TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: I believe we are going to talk over together the question of what is the meaning of being a light to yourself - what is the meaning of being a light to yourself. If you don't like that subject we can change it to something else that you want. And I think it would be good if I may suggest that we all talk, not one or two of us talk, but each one of us share in the discussion or in the talk. Is that all right? All of us take part in it.

So do you want to discuss that, or any other subject, that is, be a light to yourself. I believe I have said that before so it was suggested that we talk about that. If that is not what you want we can talk about something else.

Questioner: What does it mean to be a light to oneself?

K: That's what we are going to discuss, we are going to go into it, if that is what you want to talk over. May I set the ball rolling and then we can... please this is not a talk, or a sermon, by me, but rather we are all going to partake or share in our discussions, so each one of us, if I may most respectfully suggest that we all talk, each one of us expressing what we want to say, contradicting each other, doubting each other, questioning each other to find out the truth of whatever we are saying, not only the speaker but all of us. So may I start the ball rolling?

I think most of us are slaves, either to religious concepts, beliefs and symbols, or to some kind of experience, or slaves to institutions, and concepts. And being prisoners to all that how can one be a light to oneself? You understand? I am just starting it. If

one is committed to a certain pattern of life, a certain way of living, if one is a businessman or a scientist, or a philosopher, one is caught in that, one becomes completely absorbed in it and the rest of life flows by. We are concerned in our discussion with the whole of life, not just one part, one segment, or one particular tendency, or one's profession. So does one realize, including myself, that one is caught in a routine, which naturally prevents freedom. We can discuss what freedom is, we can go into all that. It prevents freedom and so one can never be clear in oneself. One can never understand the depth of oneself, or when one is dependent on something one cannot be a light to oneself. That is the general outline, we can go very much into detail, and we should, if you want.

So that is what we are proposing to discuss whether the human mind, our mind, your mind and my mind, can be completely free from all institutions, from all the impositions, the pressures of religions, their symbols, their ideologies, their theories, and their dogmas, all of that is superstition, can one be free of that completely? That's one point.

Then can one be completely free from the imposition of language? Language drives us, shapes our thinking, forces us to a certain course of action. So is one aware of that, and be free of being a slave to language? We can go into all this.

The next question: can one be free of ideologies and so on, because all these make our minds narrow, limited, prisoners to society, to social environment, economics and so on and so on. If that is so, how can one be a light to oneself? Do we discuss this, or do you want to talk about something else?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I think we all heard that, I don't have to repeat it. Right. How do we start discussing this thing, exploring it in ourselves, not exploring some other person. How can I explore myself, understand the depth of myself, without understanding how one's mind has become slavish, dependent and so on?

Q: Does the way we are educated, does it make our minds slavish?

K: Does education, the way we are educated, does it make our minds slavish, conforming, accepting the pattern, or establishing a new establishment and becoming a slave to that, and so on.

Q: Well a certain part of education is conditioning itself.

K: Go into it sir. I don't know how to discuss this matter or go into it, find out, sir, first, if that is what you want to discuss. I am not imposing what we should discuss but that was just suggested. But if there is something better than that please put it forward and we can go into it.

Q: Can we ask the question, what is the instrument of enquiry because there seems a contradiction between not knowing and enquiring. Enquiring always seems to be some sort of direction, a means to something. What is this contradiction?

K: What is the instrument of discussion which is capable of discussion. Is that it?

Q: He is asking what is the instrument of enquiry.

K: Yes, what is the state of the mind, or thought, or what you like, that can freely enquire. Right? What is your state, sir? Don't ask me. Find out, what is your state of mind that is capable of enquiry?

Q: When you talk about the state of mind...

K: Stick to one thing, sir, don't - we have understood the meaning of that word. What is your state of mind that says, I must enquire, that wishes to enquire?

Q: Krishnaji, could be go into exactly what you mean by being a light to yourself. Does it mean simply being free of words, and being free of institutions?

K: No, it means...

Q: Or is there more?

K: Doesn't it mean that we depend on the light of others. Right? The Christian world has been conditioned, for example, that Jesus and so on, that person will be your salvation, so you are relying on that person, idealized, made divine by the priests and so on and so on, to depend for one's salvation - I am using the old fashioned word which we will explore - to depend on an external agency for our freedom from sorrow, pain, anxiety, and so on and so on. The church, the Catholic church has done that, the Hindus have their own pattern of thinking, so have the Tibetans, so have the Buddhists and so on. Along the same pattern, only a different set of words, different set of phrases, different symbols and so on, but always depending on external agency, thinking that external agency is different from us. We have created the external agency, the outside agency. So we have divided ourselves from that and say, that will save me from my anxiety, fear, sorrow and all the rest of it. We have created that. Right? And having separated ourselves from that then we say, how am I going to be saved - in quotes. So can one be free completely from external agency for all that - for happiness, for enlightenment, whatever words we like to use.

Q: Sir, but surely nowadays many people will say that they don't believe in god, so they reject that, so they have no obvious external agency.

K: Then if you reject the outside agency, in what manner, how will you free yourself, in what manner will you be free from all your entanglements, from all your sorrows, pain and so on, if you don't depend on anybody, including K, including the speaker?

Q: Sir, I think many people have independence of their god.

K: No, either that freedom is intellectual, theoretically accepted, or actually one has put that aside completely.

Q: Would being a light to oneself give you freedom?

K: I haven't understood. Please answer her, don't wait on me, discuss it.

Q: I don't think he means freedom as opposed to anything else - opposed to political freedom, or non-freedom, just freedom per se.

Q: Surely we are talking about freedom which is deeper than political freedom.

K: No. First of all is it possible to act rightly, accurately, truly without any guidance from outside? You follow my question? To think very clearly inwardly and outwardly, and act outwardly, without any imposition, without any pressure.

Q: What usually happens when somebody hears that is that if you realize you don't want to be a slave to a guidance from outside, you think OK I will have my inner guidance.

K: First of all if you hear that and reject that, and then depend on your inner guidance, what does that mean?

Q: Well you feel like you want to gather more experience and formalise your concepts about life.

K: Which comes to the same thing.

Q: Yes.

K: Eventually - when you reject the outer as your guide you must also reject the inner as your guide.

Q: Yes, so can we go into that?

K: It becomes very complex, that's why I want to explore it, if you will.

Q: Also, sir, it is also complex in the sense that most people, many people today would say that they have no guide. Or they would not think in those terms of having an outer guide or an inner guide. They simply go on living.

K: Therefore if you reject the outer god and the inner god, and then what?

Q: Obviously they live a very confused life.

K: Yes, so, live confused, unhappy and all the rest of it. Is that we are doing, what you are doing? Surely this is...

Q: We have your words.

K: Ah! Throw those out. You don't have my words, throw them out.

Q: I was going to say that.

Q: We have your words.

K: No, sir, then you become prisoner of those words.

Q: If I stand up and I say, well I am going to throw away everything, all my dependencies, all my external relations, my crutches, everything I have used to get to where I am and go by myself into the world...

K: You can't.

Q:... what am I left with?

K: Nothing! Intellectually you have nothing left. If you intellectually reject, verbally say, well I have got rid of the church, I have got rid of god, I have got rid of Jesus, I have got rid of Krishna, I have got rid of the Buddha, I have got rid of this and that, including Jehovah, then have you done it intelligently or merely verbally.

Q: How can I do it intelligently?

K: That is what we are trying to find out. When I see something dangerous, stupid, can't I see the danger and the stupidity of it and discard it - which is the awakening of intelligence.

Q: If I see something that is hurting me...

K: Not you, not only you, humanity.

Q: Well, yes, humanity itself.

K: Which is part of you. Humanity is...

Q: Which is part of me.

K: Therefore?

Q: Then I have to throw it away.

K: No. Not 'have to'. Do you...

Q: If I don't I am crazy.

K: Probably we are.

Q: We are.

Q: It is not an intellectual process. If it is an intellectual process, it's not discarding, it just stays in the mind. When you see the truth of something you don't say whether you have finished with it or not, you either have in fact, or you haven't, it doesn't become an intellectual question.

K: Yes, sir, that's just it. Is this what you want to talk about? Please. Or do you want to talk about something else? Do you want

to talk about your personal problems?

Q: That is a personal problem.

K: Wait, sir. You have said it. Do you want to talk over your personal problems, or personal problems but make it impersonal, put it that way.

Q: The great thing is, sir, that it is a personal problem but it is everybody's problem.

K: May I suggest something? Can we ask the right question? What do you mean by 'right', and what do you mean by 'question'? The right question will inevitably bring about the right answer. But if we ask a wrong question, that wrong question evaporates into nothingness. So can we ask the right question which will awaken our own intelligence, our own native perception? I don't know how to put all this into words.

All right, let's begin with something. Are we sceptical?

Q: Generally only when things are bad.

K: Or have we a quality of doubt which is not cynical, which is not born out of bitterness, or negligence, but a capacity to question. Not fanciful questions, not romantic questions, but questions about the way we live, the way we think, our actions, question the whole of our existence, as we live. Have you got the capacity to do that? Can we begin with that at least? The way we live, our actions which have become mechanical, our feelings, our reactions, our fears, our pleasures, the whole of our existence, can we question the way we live. Can we begin with that? What would you like to begin with, for god's sake?

Q: One thing struck me, you mentioned that we are a slave of institutions, and all these questions, there should be one about the



nature of us which makes us become a slave.

K: Tunki, we are old friends. Do you realize the way you live - I am not being personal - do you question the way of your living, of your life, what you are doing, why you think this, why you feel that, why you have certain reactions, sexual and otherwise, do you question the whole thing, do you? Or do you just trot along in your old pattern which you have established for yourself, or a pattern which your father, your grandfather, your environment, has said, do this, and you follow that?

Q: I think that basically we follow most of the time because we have fear of making mistakes.

K: Before you awaken to fear do you question the way of your life? Do I question my way of life? I talk everywhere, do I question it, or do I say, it is part of my routine, I have done it for fifty, sixty years, and I'll carry on. Or do I say, my god, what am I doing? What am I doing?

Q: Sir, I think people generally don't question.

K: At all. Partly, when it suits them.

Q: I think their minds are mainly concerned with physical survival.

K: Yes, so can we here, the first day, learn the art of questioning.

Q: Wouldn't it be better to say, or question what is stopping you from getting out of that rut.

K: No, no. I want to learn the art of questioning myself. There is art in it, isn't there. I must do it the right way, or the wrong way. There must be a way of questioning that awakens the whole nature and structure of myself. The way I look at it, the way I understand

it, the way I see the whole operation in movement, I must question it.

Q: Why must there be a way?

K: Why must I question.

Q: No, why must there be a way? Why must there be an art of questioning? You said there must be an way of questioning, why must there?

K: Of course, if I put a wrong question to myself I won't find out - I'll have a wrong response. No?

Q: You mean I'll only respond to pain.

K: No, sir, not only to pain. Isn't there an art in the way you walk? Isn't there an art in the way you talk, you know? So mustn't one learn the art of questioning, or not questioning, but the art of observing - if you like to put it that way.

Q: Is there an art of seeing that you ask bad questions?

K: Oh, yes it can become a lovely art too.

Q: You are saying that there is an art to questioning, to ask the right question.

K: Sir, does it appeal to you to find out? To find out together the right way of questioning so that out of that questioning intelligence can arise? Intelligence. Can we do that? I don't know how to push this heavy weight.

Q: What is the question without motivation?

K: I can't hear.

Q: Without motivation.

K: Well, let's find out. If I have a motivation in questioning I have already directed my questioning. Right? I've already set a line according to which I will question. Therefore I shall never put the

right question if I have a motive. So I have to go into it and say, have I a motive in questioning. Or in observing, or in listening to myself, listening to what is going on around me and the world and everything.

Q: Isn't wanting to find out a motive?

K: No, no, that's not a motive. I see in my enquiring, in observing, if I have a motive I have set a direction. Right? So I can never be free to discover the right observation if I have set a course. So if I see that then I am already intelligent, am I not. Somewhat intelligence. So it's dropped. Isn't this clear?

Q: You can ask a question. Experiment. You can say, I am going to ask a question to myself which has a motive in it and see what happens when I have a motive.

K: That's right.

Q: Then find out what it is to ask a question without a motive.

K: That's right, do it. Let's do it now. Have I a motive in my questioning, in my observation? I see in my observation what the religions - I am taking that as an example, I'll expand it much more - I see what religions have done, they have enslaved man. Right? Do I see it because I am antagonistic against Jesus, or the Pope, or some reason for which I say, that's nonsense? Or is it so, independent of me, independent of my prejudices? Or go to India, they have all these enormous superstitions, like the Catholics, like everybody else. And have I thrown those away because I have accepted other forms of superstitions, which are more pleasing, and therefore I have got rid of the Hindu superstitions. But my question is, have I got rid of all superstition? Have I seen the nature of superstition, how superstition arises, fear, reward, punishment, hell

and heaven - hell and heaven has been going on for millennia. Right? All this we all know, historically. So am I free of one superstition, one set of superstitions, and fall into another? Or have I superstitions in myself? You follow?

Q: To look at one superstition, or one motivation, is quite easy, but if we are trying to look at the nature of superstition itself or the nature of motivation itself that is quite different.

K: Which is the nature of superstition: I am frightened, I want to be comforted, I want some external agency to help me.

Q: But what is that process by which - or how is it that a person can go from looking at a single example of something like superstition to seeing all superstition?

K: Do you see what is superstition? Let's understand what do we mean by that word superstition?

Q: Belief.

K: Which means what, belief in something which you hope to be true.

Q: Hope or suspect or fear.

K: Yes, hope, that will give you comfort, that will protect you, that will help you to get over certain fears and so on. Right? Which is, thought invented some kind of figure, some kind of agency outside yourself which will help you. And all the complications of it. And when you see how absurd, how nonsensical it is, which is superstition, that nonsense you see in every form of religion.

Q: But, sir, isn't there a possibility of a deception in that. For instance the mind may take it as a fact that a certain scientific something is true, and you base your action according to that because you are healthier; but how does the mind perceive a fact in

the external world and see the difference between that and a superstition which you have also been told by someone that it is a fact - I don't know what - that you don't do something on the 13th of the month, or whatever the superstition is, how does the mind make a perception between them.

K: Yes, I understand that question. Please answer her, I don't have to answer her.

Q: It is a very basic, I think, human difficulty in this notion of saying religion, there is a sense of divination, people have said that certain things were real. Now the mind either says, oh yes, it must be so and accepts it, or says, no. But how do we draw the line between perception of the fact and perception of something that has great authority in other people's lives.

K: Answer her, please.

Q: I think if you have a scientific education then your judgement will be based on that fact is non-verifiable, but you cannot verify the existence of god therefore there is no reason to believe in god, that would be the scientific answer to that problem. There would be no reason to believe in god if you had received a modern education because it is a non-scientific fact - not a fact - it is a non-scientific premise, supposition.

K: Science also can be mistaken.

Q: Of course. But in answer to that particular problem, many people today would say that god does not exist, or they would say it is stupid to have superstitious.

K: Galileo, you know, Galileo says the earth goes round the sun, and the church said that is a heresy, we will burn you. He said, all right, all right, the earth doesn't go round the sun, but I believe

it, I know it. And before that they believed the earth stood still and the sun went round it.

Q: But that doesn't change anything because Galileo was right.

K: No, but you follow. Mrs Zimbalist is asking how do you differentiate between fact and superstition.

Q: Well...

K: Wait. Find out, I want to be clear for myself, I am trying to think it out for myself what she said. The fact and the idea. Right? Let's put it that way. The fact and the idea about the fact. Go slowly. Don't jump on me. Don't jump on me yet, go slowly. The idea about the fact, and the fact itself without the idea. Is there such a state?

Q: Well the fact is seen...

K: Don't answer, find out. Say for instance, I am frightened, fear - is that an idea, or is it a fact? If it is an idea it is a superstition.

Q: Then there is no...

K: You are not examining sir, find out.

Q: Sir, something goes on, and we call it fear. Perhaps the calling it fear is the idea.

K: That's what we are saying.

Q: But something is actually going on, which is a fact. But somehow we take from facts - we give more credence to the name that we give the fact than what is actually going on. Even with what Mrs Zimbalist said I think in science we take many things as facts which may be just working hypothesis.

K: Quite, quite, that's it. Can I differentiate the word from the fact? Knowing the door is not the word. If I cling to the word and worship the word I am living in superstition, I have moved away

from the fact.

Q: But most of us have to live our daily lives surrounded by facts unverifiable by us.

K: Yes.

Q: So there is a margin in there of everyday life.

K: That certainly. But I am talking about the facts about oneself, not whether the moon is made of cheese or rocks and all the rest of it, but I am concerned whether I am living in a world of make-believe, superstition, in a world that has been imposed on me, which I have invented, and then in turn have been a slave to that, I want to find out that. That is, I want to enquire into facts as they are.

Q: Well, I can see that some facts, I can see that I do live in a world like that, but I only see the particular. You see, I see particular fears, or particular superstitions, but I don't see all of fear, or all of superstition. And that is a jump to go from the particular to the general.

K: Now wait a minute, Scott, do you question why you don't see the whole nature and structure of fear? Or do you say, I don't see, I only see part of it, not the whole of it? Do you question why you don't see it?

Q: Yes.

K: When you ask me why don't I see it, you are depending on me.

Q: I have questioned why I don't see it.

K: You might have questioned casually, you might have questioned wrongly, or you might say, it is terribly important that I find this out.

Q: Isn't it connected with authority actually, psychologically?

K: Yes, yes.

Q: The superstition and so-called scientific fact are based on authority, some verifiable and some not.

K: Sir, I can't verify what the moon is made of. Right? The scientists and the astronauts and all the rest of it have told me what it is. All right, yes it is made of rocks, or dead earth, or whatever it is. All right, why should I believe or not believe, I don't know. Maybe. Like those people who believe intensely in flying saucers - they come to me and say, do you believe in it, I say, I don't know. But to me we are moving away from the most relevant facts, which is the world I live in, the actions I do, the way I think, feel, all that I am concerned with, which doesn't mean I am selfish, that I disregard the world. I am concerned because I am the world. The world is not different from me, I am the world.

Q: There seems to be hierarchical ideas, that some things are more important. The idea that the moon is made of rocks may be more voracious than the idea that there are flying saucers, or it may not be. And aren't religions like that, essentially they have said something quite high about human existence, and we hear them, and we don't know whether it is true or not but it is important that somebody has said that.

K: Yes, I understand. But is it that one is more and more dependent, looking outwardly - you follow, sir - the baby is born out of a tube, the moon, astronauts and all that is going on around us is so tremendously interesting, and may be tremendously dangerous, and we are fascinated by all that and so we forget about ourselves, our world, our life. And I say, for god's sake that exists,



let's come back here. From here we can go out there and perhaps do something about it.

Q: But it seems important for me to know that things are made of patterns, and made of tiny particles of energy so that one knows with one's mind that creation exists out of energy. That seems to change things, one isn't taken in by the senses.

Q: Sir, are you saying that we concern ourselves with these questions outwardly just in order to escape looking at ourselves?

K: Maybe, maybe.

Q: I know I find it very hard to hold to what is actually going on.

K: I mean you pick up a newspaper every morning, if you read it, and you read what is happening everywhere, the floods in India, the butchery in the Korean war, this, that, you know, and you say, my god, I've spent the whole morning, and you go off to your job, again something else, and come back, and again the evening news, and keep living eternally, until you die, out there. Is that what we are doing?

Q: If you read the paper in the morning, you can be aware that you are responding to what you are reading.

K: Quite right, sir, quite right. I understand. Mrs Zimbalist's question was, how do I differentiate the fact, the actuality and superstition, something non-fact. If I live in make-believe, non-fact, it is inevitably superstition - that somebody is going to save me, which the whole of Christendom is based on. Then I live in appalling superstition, because I have created that Jesus. I don't know if you follow all this.

Q: Krishnaji, is it how you differentiate between the fact and

superstition, isn't it in the way you approach it? If you say there is a fact and you accept it because some authority says so.

K: Of course, of course. All right. Let's find out. How do you approach any problem, human problem, I think it applies to the scientific too, how do you approach any problem?

Q: We can only look without motive.

K: No, how do you approach it, sir? One can - how do you actually approach a problem? If you are a scientist, how do you approach it? Your problem in science, in physics, in that and so on, how do you approach it, what is the quality of your mind that approaches a problem, whether it be scientific, business, a problem of relationship and so on, how do you come to it?

Q: By questioning.

K: No. Find out, sir, find out how you approach it.

Q: Well I begin to ask questions about it, that's what I do.

K: Is that the way to approach it?

Q: If you are bringing whatever competence you have in that field to it, otherwise you can't even enter the field.

K: Maria, I am asking a question, you are not... I am sorry I am not making myself clear then. Suppose I have a problem, one has a problem of relationship. One quarrels with one's wife, or with one's husband, or girl, a problem in relationship, how do you approach that problem?

Q: Look at it. You stay with it.

K: No, no. How do you come to it, sir? If you say, stay with it - that's one approach.

Q: But I want to explain what I mean. You asked how I come to a problem. Do you want me to sit here and look at in myself. I am

aware of how I come to a problem. Do you want me to speak out and say how I come to a problem?

K: Go ahead, go ahead.

Q: If I come to a problem with relationship I am aware of the response, the response that comes about after that relationship or that contact has taken place. It comes into my mind, I see that there has been a problem.

K: That's right.

Q: So I stay with it.

K: Stay with it, I understand. Now how does another approach it?

Q: I approach it with a feeling that there is something that I can do.

K: Yes. So you see, one says I approach it with a mind that says I won't escape from it, I will look at it, I will stay with it; the other says I can do something about it. And so how does each one of us approach any of these problems? Isn't it important to find out our approach.

Q: I think first of all we have to be clear of the problem.

K: I am not talking of the problem.

Q: No, no, I mean approaching, when there is a problem you...

K: Look, Tunki, old boy, I am asking you, how do you approach a problem - approach, not the problem. How do you come to it?

Q: I think if we set our self aside, if the ego says, the problem is separate from me, and we make a separation between that problem and our self, it is an ego that is approaching.

K: Yes, all right. So you are saying I approach the problem, I

approach realizing the problem is not different from me. That's your approach, approach, not the problem. Am I making this clear, or am I dumb?

Q: Krishnaji, I think this is a false distinction to make between the approach to the problem and the problem.

K: No. All right. State your case, sir. Go on.

Q: Well I think it might be a wrong question initially to say how would you approach the problem, because as far as I am concerned personally my initial awareness is how I become aware of the problem. How do I know it is a problem. I use some kind of benchmark, something is not right, I say, feel in myself, something is incomplete.

K: Sir, there is this whole world around us, right, of which I am a part. Right? I have created this monstrous society of which I am part. Right? Right, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Now I know it exists there because I am part of it, it is there. I am not talking about the problem at all. I say, how do I look at it, how do I approach it, how do I - what is my mind, or the state of my mind when I look at it, knowing the problem is not different from me, and all the rest of it. Is this difficult?

Q: An open mind without prejudice.

K: Now what do you mean by an open mind?

Q: A mind which is not burdened by any thoughts.

K: So you mean a mind that is not burdened by opinions, by one's own accumulated knowledge, one is not approached by fear. So are you - not being personal, sir - are you free from fear, personal prejudice and opinions and conclusions so that you are

approaching it, approaching whatever the problem is, that thing, freely?

Q: How can you approach any problem, free of the problem, without any knowledge at all?

K: What?

Q: Without knowledge. How can one approach something without any knowledge?

K: No, no. Do I approach the fear that I have with previous knowledge of fears? I am asking a question, please answer me. Is this so? Do I approach the present fear with the memories, remembrances of other forms of fear which I have had in the past, which have become memories, with that memory approach the present fear? Just answer me that question. Do we do this, which is natural.

Q: We do.

K: Now wait a minute. If we do, then are we approaching it rightly? That's all I am asking. What one does may be right, but I am questioning whether it is right.

Q: It seems it is clearly not right, but is it possible to approach without the past?

K: You are asking a question: is it possible to approach the problem of fear as though for the first time, without the remembrance of other fears which you have had. Whom are you asking? General assembly? Ask them.

Q: All of us together.

Q: I think when we have a problem there is no space, our mind is stuck to the problem. When there is space there is some seeing.

K: I have asked a question, madam, which is, we generally

approach a particular fear with the remembrance of other fears. That's all. If we could stay with that for a minute and examine whether that resolves the problem of fear. Or is it possible to approach without the past remembrances of fear and can that be done? If it cannot be done, it is nonsense.

Q: The fact that we have fear is already an operation of the past.

K: Yes, so are you...

Q: How can it be that you observe it without the remembrance?

K: Ask her. She has listened to me for a number of years, ask her to answer you. I can take a rest! Good. I'll help you. You teach English, so teach him.

Q: All right, I'll...

K: Teach her, tell her, sir. You've escaped, I am coming back to you.

Q: Approaching the problem of fear and you are asking yourself what is fear, how do I recognize fear, what do I call fear. You look at what you call fear, and you feel what the fear is, what you name as fear, and if you stay with it with real interest to learn about it, you could find, or should find, or may find that the thought or the idea will separate from the feeling and then you are with the feeling and you stay with that. And then you come to the point of saying, who is observing this feeling, what is this that is looking at this feeling. Then there is something, the dissipation of fear.

K: Tunki, you answer it, I am keeping out of this.

Q: While your idea is there, thought is there, there is a separation - fear is in that separation.

K: Please.

Q: If you have got a feeling of fear and you look at that feeling,

you stay with the feeling so that there is nothing but the feeling, what else is there but the feeling.

Q: What is looking at the feeling? What is aware of the feeling?

Q: Nothing. There is the sensation of feeling.

Q: There's something looking at it. You have got to find out what is looking at the feeling, that's the separation, that's where the feeling comes in.

K: Quite right, sir.

Q: Wanting to do something about it

Q: There's something looking at the feeling, there's something observing the feeling, and when that is seen - well, you just ask the question then, what is looking at the feeling, and then there is a different state altogether. Then is there a separation? And you find the separation is the looking at the feeling, being separate from it. This is where it is a bit hard to explain, you have to do it. You have to actually see that the thought and the feeling are separate. Then you live with the feeling, looking at the feeling as it is, not running away from it, you are looking at the feeling, then what is looking at the feeling.

Q: I don't understand what you mean by thought and feeling are separate.

Q: I am not going to be able to explain that. Krishnaji is much better.

K: That's a dirty trick!

Q: You just have to do it.

Q: I don't really understand what you mean. When the mind hasn't moved off from it, which is what usually happens, it doesn't stay with it and it moves on to something else outside. But when I

have been able to do it I see that they are not separate because if I think something the feeling is there too, it comes immediately. I don't see them as two separate things but rather thought/feeling is happening at once.

Q: You can experience the feeling without a thought. You can experience the feeling on its own without a thought, then you are just stuck with what is looking at the feeling.

K: Sir, if I may ask, are you helping me - helping in quotes, after all no authority - are you trying to help me to look at fear properly? Is that what you are trying to do?

Q: Yes.

K: Now, you have told me something that there is no separation and so on, is that an idea to me or an actuality which I realize?

Q: Are you asking me that question?

K: I am asking generally. I have heard you say this, I realize what you are saying, perhaps there is truth in this. And do I listen to find out the idea of it, or do I listen to find out if it is actually me. You follow what I am saying? Have I listened to you, made an abstraction of what you have said, which becomes an idea? Or what you are saying is immediately applicable in myself? Is that applicability taking place in me? Now which is that we are doing now? All of us. Are we making an abstraction of it, an idea of it; or, yes, it is so, so, by Jove, I realize what I have done - I have separated myself from fear, I am acting upon it, which is I see the falseness of it, and that fear is me. Is that a fact to me, or is it an idea to me? You follow, sir? If it is an idea then I am lost. Then I enter into all kinds of theories, superstitions, you know, I play with the words. But if it is so then, that I am not separate from fear,



what takes place in me? So are we dealing with ideas, conclusions and theories, or, as Mrs Zimbalist wanted to know, with facts and not with theories?

Now I want to find out how I approach this, you follow? Whether I am living, actually realizing or theory. Now these are the two facts, they are both facts. Right? Conclusions, theories, beliefs, and facts. Now how do I see this thing in myself, how do I approach it? Sorry if I labour that point. How do I approach it, this question, am I making theories of it, verbalizing it, intellectually saying, yes, a marvellous idea, and trotting off in that direction, or do I say, now let me look? Right? Let me look, which is I am approaching it. You follow sir? I have discarded that, I see the stupidity of what I have done, making a theory of it. Now if I don't make a theory of it then I am with the fact. Which is, I have separated myself from that. Is that so? Or am I still playing with words?

Now leave fear for the moment. Let's take something else. That may help to kind of widen this thing. Do I realize that I am the total of humanity, the totality of humanity? Not the theory of it, you follow, sir, not the verbal idea that I am the world, but the actual feeling, the real state that I am, as a human being, I represent the whole of mankind - which we can go into. Because mankind suffers, mankind goes through all kinds of illusions, pressures, agonies, and all the rest of it, and so do I, so does every human being. So the world is me. Is that a theory, a lovely idea, an emotional, romantic, you follow, all that nonsense, or is it an actual fact in my life?

Q: Well I can understand that intellectually, but...

K: Wait. The moment you say, I can understand intellectually, what do you mean by that? You mean you understand verbally. You understand the English language which you and I speak, perhaps I speak badly, but we understand the language and you say, intellectually I grasp it.

Q: It is the whole idea, it is so. The whole idea is true but I don't feel it.

K: But is it so?

Q: Yes. Intellectually it is true, but I don't feel that way.

K: The moment you say 'intellectually' you are merely accepting the words. And 'intellectually I understand' becomes rather, you know, arrogant, rather silly.

Q: How do we recognize whether we understand or not?

K: No. I am asking about this one thing: do you see actually the reality of it or the idea of it?

Q: How can we see whether we perceive an idea of it, or we perceive the actuality itself?

K: All right. How do you listen to this statement? How do you listen to it actually? Tell me, how do you listen to it. Or anybody listens to it. There is a statement made.

Q: Well, sometimes it is are you the world, or what have you, and I say...

K: Not 'what have I'.

Q: Or whatever the statement.

K: No, sir, I'll make it clear. Every human being, it doesn't matter where they are, psychologically, inwardly, they go through exactly - more or less - the same thing as you do. They suffer, they are uncertain, they run away from family, they dislike their mother,

they love their father, there is separation, there is pain - everybody goes through this. That's the common factor of mankind. Right?

You may say, that is not so, all right let's talk about it.

Q: No, I haven't said that.

K: Wait. This person has stated that, a statement has been made, whether it is true or false we will discuss. How do you listen to it? That is, how do you approach it, how do you look at it? Does my brother suffer like me, actual brother? Does my father go through the same agony that I am going through? Does that man in India go through the same thing that I am? Perhaps a little variation, but basically, fundamentally the common factor of mankind, whether he lives in Jerusalem, or in Mecca, or in Moscow, or in Washington, here, there, anywhere, it is the common thing. No?

Q: Can I realize that everyone is going through exactly the same thing as I am?

K: Aren't they?

Q: Can I realize whether they are or not?

K: Find out, sir.

Q: Not by thinking about it, but by feeling it.

K: No, but seeing the fact.

Q: Feeling it the whole time.

K: Seeing in the sense, this is so. Whether you live in France or somewhere else, you are a human being, with all the things that are going on inside you. And the man living in Spain has the same agony going on inside him. And we say this is the common factor of mankind. Therefore mankind is me.

Q: The division and isolation continues.

K: It won't continue the moment it is a reality. How can you

say, I am isolated? I am the world, all this thing that I have created. So that's why I have been asking how do you listen to this statement? What does it mean to your mind, to your heart, to your feelings, what does it mean when you make a statement of that kind? Do I intellectually argue about it, rationalize it, tear it pieces, is this so, is it not so, it is partly, it is not partly, and so on and so on? Or do I immediately test the depth of it?

Q: I doubt if you will ever get an answer to that question. If I ask why the sun is out there, nobody is going to answer.

K: First of all, do you doubt that statement, do you say, what nonsense you are talking about? I am different from my brother, I am different from that Arab, filthy, ugly, uneducated, I am educated, I have been to Oxford, I have been to Harvard, I have been to this or that, I have got a good business, and there is that filthy little man in India who is nothing at all, I am certainly different from him.

Q: Am I?

K: I am questioning, sir. Are we judging these differences by education, by clothes, by dirt, by having a bigger house, lesser house, outwardly? Or are we saying, look, I know I am different, that man is not educated, I am educated, but he has the same poverty in himself? You follow, sir? The same sense of isolation, frustration, all that, as me. Apparently you don't see this. If you do then a totally different thing takes place. If you don't, I say, what am I to do, rationalize it, explain it ten different ways. I am willing.

Q: I can see when I look at other people's behaviour and talk to them and so on, how we have the same problems, the same emotions.

K: Exactly.

Q: And yet it doesn't make me feel responsible.

K: So does it mean your isolation, your egotism, your sense of importance is so colossal, consciously or unconsciously, that you say, that is not me?

Q: Or do we really see it in ourselves? I think perhaps it is easier to see it in somebody else, but do I - most of the time I am not even aware of the complex problems, I mean I cover them up so easily.

K: Sir, is it also that we like to identify with something greater? A professor, a marvellous engineer, or the admiral, you know something tremendous, we think powerful, and poor little chap down there in the street, throw him out.

Q: Well, that doesn't come into for me.

K: No, I am just saying, I am asking, is this what you do. Identify with something ennobling, powerful, prestigious, or the little man.

Q: But he is doing that and so am I.

K: So that goes on. So you are like that poor little man, empty inside, insufficient and all the rest of it, and so is the admiral, probably. I don't know how to convey this. Why don't you see this? Not see it verbally, intellectually, ideas and so on, but why don't you actually see it? What's wrong? Either it is wrong, what I am saying is totally wrong. You have every right to say, what nonsense you are talking about. And if you say it is not nonsense then why don't you see the thing actually, as a fact?

Q: It is a fact, Krishnaji, but it doesn't seem to do away with the fact that our whole existence is based on separatism.

K: Yes, sir, that is egotism, your arrogance, your sense of 'look, I am powerful', I assert myself, so you more and more emphasize yourself, give importance to yourself and so you refuse to see what is taking place. So what will make you, or help you to see the truth of it? Knock on the head? Drug? Pain, suffering? Man has been through all that, and yet we keep this thing going.

Q: It is all probably the self.

K: No, if it is so, does the self exist in the sense that we have given it importance. You follow my question? When I realize actually, not theoretically, not as a belief, actually I realize that I am mankind, haven't I really lost an extraordinary sense of my own importance?

Q: Is it our sense of self importance that keeps us from seeing this, Krishnaji?

K: Perhaps.

Q: What makes somebody miserable is the same for every man.

K: My misery may come about because I have lost my money, or another is miserable because his wife has run away, another's misery may be because his son is not fulfilling what his father wants, and so on and so on. It is misery. Isn't it? Not the expressions of misery, it's misery.

Q: Yes, but in the depth - these are the first reasons of the misery - but in the depth isn't there something that is common to all these miseries?

K: Which is, my misery is equal to your misery. Now why don't I recognize that I am the rest of mankind, the rest of the stupid, you know, this miserable thing that I am, like the rest?

So let's now, we are going to meet every morning at eleven

thirty, now we are dispersing, you follow, sir, we are not putting our minds together over a particular thing and resolving it. Not carry on next year and meet again, repeat, repeat, repeat. But can we take something together that is common to all of us and dissolve it, be free of it, your know either one way or the other. You follow? Can we do that?

Q: I don't know.

K: No, I am asking, sir. I would like to discuss something, one particular thing, and you may like to discuss something else, and another something else. So can't we find out together, altogether, what it is we would like to talk over together, not verbally, but seriously so that it really affects my daily life.

Q: Why do we need to be different from our neighbour and what can we do to stop it?

K: Is that what you want to discuss, sir? Is that the subject you really want to take up and go into seriously, at the end of the discussion be free of the separation? Of course you are taller than I am, have long hair, shorter hair, you live in a beautiful place, I don't and so on and so on. Apart from all that. Of course that may be affected if we realize that inwardly you and I are the same. Is that what you want to discuss?

Q: Why I am so important to myself.

K: Why are you so important to yourself. Is that what you want to talk about? I give up.

Q: I would like to question the idea of dependence, because it all comes down to dependence, that makes a separation. If we can overcome dependence...

K: Do I really want to talk over together with you, and in the

talking over with you at the end of the discussion I am free of that totally and completely - of something. You follow what I mean? Am I serious enough, earnest, intensive enough to say, 'Look, I am going to go through this thing right to the very end and be finished with it.'? Do you want to do that? Great silence!

Q: We are bound to.

K: Do it. Do it sir. Let's do it. Say for instance, I would like personally to discuss with you meditation. Just a minute, don't jump on me. Meditation. I don't think you can. Because I have to go into it very deeply, but I don't think you can. You haven't gone into it. I would like to discuss with a person who says, I have gone that far, now let's go much further. In the same way I would like to discuss with someone who says, what does it mean to have a mind that is completely empty. Empty in the sense, it has no problems, no impressions, not any kind of imprint on it. And what is the quality of such a mind, with that extraordinary energy which is implied in emptiness. You can't. You follow what I am saying? I would like to discuss, for example, with you, what relationship really means, to be related to somebody, whether it is possible to be related without a single image about the other. You follow, sir? Will you do that? Will you say, look, let's take relationship and go through it to the very end so that there isn't a particle of contradiction between her, me and she and you? Can we discuss that? We are here for that purpose, for god`s sake.

Q: Krishnaji, this is a problem, listening to you now, you are asking the people in this room. I am very interested in solving the problem of me and the world. It's the same problem as fear and all these things because separation from the world seems to me to be



the problem. Once you are the world, then you have solved that division.

K: Yes, now shall we discuss that?

Q: Go into that and finish it.

K: Sir, I am asking you. I will take anything you want - your sex, whatever it is, go to the very end of it and see where we are at the end. You see you hesitate, you go silent.

Q: Krishnaji, before going into that question, which is certainly very fundamental, can we discuss how we are going to go into it.

K: How. That's it. What is the quality of your mind - sir, we will go into it, but choose, all of us, take one subject which is common to us and work it out in detail and go to the very end of it, and at the end of it say, right, I'm out - and not always talk about it.

Q: Why this sense of isolation when we know that everybody is in the same boat?

K: Is that what you want to discuss? Will you put your guts, energy - sorry to use the word 'guts', but it is a good word - will you put your guts, your energy, your vitality into solving something? Or you just float around? I thought we were all gathered here for that purpose, that a few of us take one thing, or the other, a human problem - not the moon, or how to fly a kite, or anything - but a human problem and work it out so completely. If you don't want to, what is the purpose of our meeting?

Q: It seems that we can only discuss the problem that is really real for all of us.

K: What is that? Come on! What would you, Harsh?

Q: Can we talk about relationship?

K: Now, can we go into that and work it out, in detail, break it

up, and see it, and find out how to live rightly with another, can we do that? Would that interest you?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes.

Q; Yes.

K: Can we do that tomorrow morning? You stick to it, and you mean it?

Q: Yes.

K: Right.

Q: But, Krishnaji, the question that was raised earlier seems to be very important, that we look at how we approach the question.

K: We are going to do both, sir. We are going to do all of that, sir. We are going to discuss tomorrow morning, this one thing, relationship, with all the things implied in it, everything implied in it, and in discussing see if we cannot break down this barrier between woman and man, not sexual, I don't mean that, this psychological division that man has created between themselves. Shall we do this? Right. Lunch time.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND SEMINAR MEETING 13TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: Shall we go on to talk over together the thing that we wished to talk about this morning, relationship? I think the word means - please correct me - from the Latin, to refer to, to look back. I think that most of our relationships are that. And we are going to talk over together the whole significance of relationship as it is, and in the understanding of what it is actually go beyond all the implications of that narrow limited relationship into something wider and deeper. That's what we are going to discuss, talk over together.

So what do we mean by relationship? Please, this is not a talk by me or a solo, but join all of us together in this because we are all involved in some kind of relationship or another - with a wife, with a husband, with a girl, or a boy, with parents, with our relationship to society, to nature, to the whole world, our relationship to all the things that are happening in the world, the terrible things, the violence, and also the extraordinary technological advancements and science and engineering and so on. So not only the limited relationship between two people but also relationship with the whole world - have we any? And so on. Shall we start it? Will you start it?

Questioner: Sir, when you said that the dictionary means to refer back to.

K: Referee, from the Latin, to look back to, to refer to.

Q: Are you of the opinion that people generally, this is how they relate to other people? I don't quite understand what you meant by

that. Do you feel that people generally...

K: Let's begin, sir. Forget what I have said. What does relationship mean to you, to each one of us? I am married - suppose I am married - I have children, what is my relationship to my wife, to my children, and what do I mean by relationship? Am I related to nature, to the world, to the ecological world? Am I related to what is happening in Nicaragua, between the Arab and the Jew, the starvation and so on and so on? So what is my relationship with the most intimate and the most far, outward? We have to begin with the near, the closest, and then work forward. So if you are married, if you have got a girl friend, or if you have no girl friend, and so on, what actually is our relationship with another.

Q: We don't seem to have any.

K: Please, investigate it.

Q: There is always a barrier whenever you meet anyone, or a separation between what is happening outside, nature, each one of us.

Q: I feel that with my family it is a succession of trying all the time, and shifting, and to a certain extent with nature, just around, and farther issues, it doesn't extend to any extent.

K: Look, madam, relationship is one of the most important things in life. Relationship between me and another, me with many others, which creates society. And in my relationship with another there is always tension, there is always a sense of division, and therefore conflict, and a sense of guilt, a sense of possession, a sense of responsibility, a sense of protection, all that is involved in it, not only with children but with each other. And that apparently

from the ancient of times until now it goes on that way, constant conflict between you and me - not you and me, you know what I mean, my wife and myself or with another. Why do we go on that way? Why do we live that way? What is right, or wrong in our relationships with each another? I want to begin closest and then gradually work to the world about us, not only in England but in India, Japan, the whole world. So I must begin near to go far. So I say I see as it is now without exaggeration, without giving false values, it is a constant struggle, constant pain, constant tension, a division. If we accept that as being normal then it is all right, but if one doesn't accept it as being normal, healthy, then we have to proceed to find out whether it is possible to end that kind of relationship, in which there is no shadow of conflict with each other. Is that possible? What are the implications if it is possible, and whether one can actually in daily life do it. That's the issue we are going to talk about this morning.

Q: I have relationship with another in those moments when I am aware of them and I am aware of myself - in those moments. But as I approach it I feel fear, and I feel either pain or a threat.

K: That's right, sir. So all that is implied - pain, attachment, jealousy, anxiety, fear and the great sexual pleasure, and so on - the whole of that is implied in our daily relationship. Why do we accept it? Why don't we question it?

Let me again repeat: we are here, this gathering, the group of us are supposed to be serious people, with a serious intention to understand our problems and resolve them, not in ten years time, but here, now. Otherwise it is not worth talking about it, it becomes theoretical and nonsensical. Personally I am not interested in that

kind of stuff. If I am married, if I have a problem of that kind, I want to resolve it instantly. That may be my peculiar tendency, or my way of looking it, I don't want to carry a problem overnight, specially a psychological problem, which is relationship with another. Either I say, that's normal, I can't help living that way and for the rest of my life it is that - I may change wives, I may change husbands, but the same pattern is repeated over and over again. And as I am a serious man I want to find out if it can end, what is the manner of ending it, and what is a way of living in which there is no conflict at all. That's what I want to find out. At least that we are gathered here, to do that.

Q: Can we then look at the original meaning of that word relationship, which means to carry back.

K: What sir?

Q: Relationship is something that goes out from one person and something is carried back from the other.

K: Yes, yes.

Q: Without the carry back, the re-late, there won't be anything called relationship. It can't be carried back. We have been talking so far as though one person were doing the relating only.

K: I think you heard all that so I don't have to repeat it. Please, enter into the discussion, sirs.

Q: Is it possible to look at why we do that.

K: Yes, why do we support this kind of life, why do we live this way.

Q: Is it possible to know what is our motivation?

K: No, I am questioning it now, sir. I am questioning why human beings, including us, we live that way. Is it part of our

heredity, part of our tradition, part of our habit, so we have got used to it and say, yes, that's the way to live. The trees struggles, everything struggles, this is part of nature, inevitable that in our relationship there must be conflict. We can find all kinds of excuses but the fact remains which is a relationship between two people, give and take, and looking back, and all the rest of it. Now why, we are questioning, why we accept that way of life. Why we accept wars, why we accept violence and so on and so on.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: So, do you say you accept it as it is?

Q: I don't know, but not wanting to get entangled in something false, and yet not wanting to isolate oneself.

K: I don't quite follow this. I mean others may follow, please answer him, I am not the oracle.

Q: You said relationship creates conflict.

K: No, no, I didn't say that. Not, I said, what is the fact. The fact is in our daily relationship with each other, man, woman and so on, there is division, there is conflict, there is struggle and all the things involved in it, which we don't have to describe in detail because everybody knows what our relationships are.

Q: If all those things are eliminated, if all those things are acknowledged...

K: No, not 'if'. You see that is supposition.

Q: When all those things...

K: The same thing - if, when.

Q: Sir, isn't part of the tension in relationship because another can hurt you, you are afraid of this.

K: Sir, first let's see what actually is taking place and then we

can move from there. If we accept that this kind of struggle in relationship is healthy, and in nature everything is struggling - a tree in a forest is struggling to have light, a tiger is chasing a deer. You follow, there constant struggle. And you may say to have this conflict is healthy, helps us to grow, all kinds of things, and you accept it. Right? One generally accepts it unless the struggles become utterly intolerable, there is divorce, then there is the breaking up the family, which affects the children, and so on and so on. If that is a fact, and it is generally a fact, then how do we approach the fact in order to bring about a transformation in the way we are living? I can't explain. I think it is fairly clear what we are talking about, isn't it?

Q: Sir, I feel there is no true relationship if there is no love.

K: Then we come to the question, what is love. We may come to that question presently, or we may begin with that, if you wish. Then we have to enquire into what we call love. Have we love for another? One may say, I love my wife, but is that love? You follow, sir?

Q: Why is there no love in us?

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: If there is no true relationship I think it is because there is no true love in us, inside us.

K: Sir, I want to find out - I don't know why I am answering, please we are all supposed to take part in this discussion, every one of us, not me talk all the time and you listen, all of us are supposed to engage in conversation, when one question is put by another to answer it as well as we can, find out how each one of us reacts to these things.



Q: Before I can come to any consideration of love I have to somehow face the fact that I am threatened by a relationship.

K: That's what I am saying, that's what I am asking. Are we clear what our actual relationships are at present, now, not at some future if and when.

Q: We are all afraid of getting hurt.

K: So is our relationship based on fear, getting hurt?

Q: It is unconsciously based on fear, pressure and images.

K: Tunki, you have heard me talk about images infinitely, for a number of years. Are you repeating what we have said, or you have discovered that for yourself?

Q: Well, you see I need somebody and then that person does something which I like and then I would have a certain image of this person - he is named such and such, and I think, this very kind person.

K: So you are clear - it is your own discovery. I haven't told you that you have got an image about that person. It's your own discovery that you have an image about a person?

Q: Yes.

K: That's all. So it's yours, not mine.

Q: I think we do have relationship with people but they are limited because we are always looking for something to share. For example, nationalism will bring a lot of people together and they will have a sort of relationship, but the moment there is nothing that interests you in a relationship with someone, you won't care.

K: Interest brings us together because of a particular interest. Is that it?

Q: Like here we are sitting together and we have relationship

because we all care about the same thing.

K: Aren't we moving away from what we are talking about? I am just asking.

Q: There is also another factor of relationship which he was talking about.

Q: Might it help, can we go back to the question of how is it that we can approach this, so that it will bring about a transformation in relationship.

K: And also the gentleman raised the question, we are anxious about our relationship because it is based on fear of getting hurt.

Q: I don't understand this 'getting hurt'.

K: We will go into it, sir. But first do we realize, if I may ask, that at present, as we live daily, our relationship is a peculiar affair - to put it mildly? A sense of division, you and me, you with your ambitions, you with your career, you with your passions, you with your ambitions and so on and so on, and me with my ambitions, and greed and so on. This is our actual daily state. I have a profession, and I spend ten hours at it, earning money, I come home, and she has also gone out to earn money and comes home, and we are both tired, irritation - you know all this, why should I discuss it. I am not married.

Q: And also we enter a peculiar relationship with very little children where one feels they can look through one, so there is a block in the relationship.

K: What I am asking, madam, is, do we realize actually the way our relationships are? Do I know my relationship with my wife, or with my girl or boy, is divisive and because it is divisive there must be conflict? That's all, I am starting from there

Q: I don't think we do know it - at least I don't think I know it most of the time. It's a sort of compulsive thing until I can allow it to be different, then I have got no choice.

K: Now how do we discuss, madam, this problem? Nobody seems to want to join except a few of us. All of us, it is all our problem, why don't we talk about it, why don't we go into it. Are we afraid to go into it? Wait, sir. Are we afraid to go into the fact?

Q: I think we are.

K: That's just it. We are afraid to go into the fact, and face the fact, and the very facing of the fact may produce certain reactions, and of those reactions we are afraid. Is that it?

Q: I am nearly crying when I think about it.

K: So what shall we do? Just verbally talk about relationship? And keep our fears and let things go on as they are?

Q: That's what we generally do.

K: I know, sir, is that what you want?

Q: No.

Q: How can we at every moment recognize division? It seems that we see it in retrospect afterwards, but at the moment we have our barriers. How can we recognize this division every second?

K: I don't have to recognize something, it is there. Why do I have to say I have to recognize that I am in conflict with my wife? It is there.

Q: Because I am afraid of saying so.

K: Therefore, is it a question of fear that we don't talk about our relationship?

Q: Yes, in case...

K: If it is fear, let's tackle fear. Let's go into the question of fear.

But if you say, sorry, I don't want to discuss any kind of relationship with my wife, or with the world, or with anything because I am afraid if I do go into it something may happen in our status quo, therefore let's leave that alone and let's talk about god and golf, or the beautiful days. Is that what you want? If you want to talk about god and the beautiful days or something or other, cut me out. It's very simple.

Q: Well for me, I again come back to the level of getting hurt.

K: All right, sir. Do I really want to find a relationship with somebody in which being hurt is impossible? Is it possible never to be hurt? Even that, to discuss it.

Q: Well you ask is it possible never.

K: Of course.

Q: Never to be hurt?

K: Never to be hurt.

Q: Not physical wounds?

K: In all relationships.

Q: But I sometimes feel hurt.

K: I don't quite follow.

Q: Sometimes.

K: Why should I be hurt? Why should another hurt me? Why should my wife hurt me? Or my children, or my boss, or anybody, it doesn't matter who it is, why should they hurt me?

Q: They do.

K: No, why, I know they do. I know we have been hurt.

Q: Because you have different feelings and different thoughts.

Q: It seems we have a self, and that self is what gets hurt, and that self is what prevents us from having any relationship.

K: Either we accept being hurt, that's inevitable; or there is a way of living in relationship where there is no hurt at all.

Q: It is all a bundle of hurts.

K: Apparently you don't even find out.

Q: It's also that you don't want to hurt the other person.

K: What do we know, sir? Do you want to go into this question of being hurt?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes.

K: Which means, a way of living with another, intimately or not intimately, in which there is no possibility at any time of being hurt. Right? Is that possible? So let's find out. Right?

Q: It's not possible.

K: If you say, not possible, then it is finished.

Q: I didn't say it was not possible.

K: No, if you say it is not possible you have closed the door on it.

Q: It is possible.

K: If you say it is possible you have also closed the door. Let's find out. Do you really want to go into this?

Q: Yes, I have never thought about it.

K: No, all of us, not you and I but all of us, is this a problem that you want to discuss, go into and resolve it, not next year start again and say, 'I am hurt, please tell me how to get rid of it' - that becomes too silly.

Q: Probably I want to find out because I don't like being hurt.

K: If you want to go into this question of being hurt, what is hurt? When you say, I am hurt by my wife, or by somebody, what

is the thing that is hurt?

Q: Some feeling about it.

K: Examine it, madam, don't answer me. Forgive me. Find out for yourself what is the thing that is hurt.

Q: One can see if one looks at it that there are areas of rigidity in oneself that are hurt.

K: Rigidity. All right. You say that. Please, all of us take part in this, for god's sake.

Q: It is the self, Krishnaji, that's hurt.

Q: What is the self?

Q: It's the self images, it's what you consider to be you.

K: No, sir, look, I want to find out, I am hurt for various reasons - we can find out what has hurt me, but I want to find out what is the thing that is hurt. You understand sir? Is it my thought, is it my body, is it my image about myself, is it a sense of wanting not to be hurt and therefore being hurt. You follow? So what is it when you say, I am hurt? Is it physical hurt, or a psychological hurt?

Q: It's a psychological hurt we are talking about.

K: I am asking you, sir, please tell me, or tell each other.

Q: We are talking about psychological hurt because physical pain I can understand.

Q: But doesn't psychological pain give you physical pain as well?

Q: In the sense do you mean that if you are tense.

K: I am married, or you call me a fool, and I am hurt. My wife says something to me and I get hurt. Right? Or you call me a perfect fool, an idiot, and I get hurt. Now I am asking you - please stick to this one point - what is the thing, when I say, 'I am hurt' -

what is hurt?

Q: It seems to me that I am hurt because I have a certain idea of myself.

K: All right. Leave it there. An idea about myself. Right?

Q: An interpretation about myself.

K: Keep to that one thing, don't add more to it, we will come to it. I have an idea about myself. Right? I think I am a great man, with tremendous reputation, and you come along and say, you are a perfect ass, and I get hurt. Right?

Q: That's not the primary observation. The first observation is sensations in the body, and heat.

K: No, no. I am hurt because you called me a fool. Right? Now, what is the thing that is hurt? When I say, I am hurt, what is this 'I' that is hurt?

Q: There are certain things that compose our self. Our conditions, our ideas, everything our self is made up of, so for that matter we have certain desires, certain goals, certain ideas. If someone comes along and contradicts what I think, what I know is myself, is my knowledge, is my idea, is my condition and breaks it at a certain limit, well then it is for me - not for him, because he has other ideas and other conditionings.

K: So for you - leave the other fellow alone.

Q: For me it is not enough, the line is broken at that point.

K: So you have a certain idea.

Q: I have a certain goal.

K: Certain idea - keep to that word 'idea' which that gentleman suggested. That idea is broken, is modified or shattered. And that idea, being shattered, hurts you.

Q: Well, yes, of course.

K: Keep to that, don't expand.

Q: OK, yes, of course.

K: So what is hurt is the idea about yourself. Keep to that simple thing.

Q: What is hurt, yes, is my idea.

K: Keep to that simple thing. I have an idea about myself, or I have an idea, or a belief, or a conclusion and so on and so on, you come along and break it, kill it, or chip it, break it up.

Q: Modify it.

K: Modify it. So I get hurt.

Q: Yes.

K: That's all. That's all. Keep it there. So what happens? You come along and break my idea, or you give a shock to that idea and I get hurt, I shrivel up. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: That's all. Right, sir?

Q: It's not just an idea I have about myself, it's the idea I have of the other.

K: Oh no, how could I have the idea of the other?

Q: Because I have an idea - I don't get hurt if people I don't care about, don't respect, say that I am a fool, it's only if there is someone says this that I care about, something that is between us, or that I respect his opinion.

K: It is still my idea.

Q: It's my idea, but not entirely only inwardly about myself, it is also...

K: It is still my idea about her.



Q: Well, yes. If I have an idea and you come along and chip off half of it, or say, if I think I am something, and you say I am something else, I don't necessarily have to be hurt. I can say, well, he's the fool, I am not the fool. He's a fool for saying I am a fool because I am not a fool and therefore I avoid the whole issue.

K: Which means I have an idea I am not a fool. I don't see why we scramble all over the place for a simple thing. I have an idea. And you come along and chip that idea, break it up and I get hurt. That idea gets hurt.

Q: But she is saying that not necessarily one will get hurt.

Q: Is the point that one is depending on other people to keep this image?

K: Partly, sir. I am dependent on you, or on my wife, or on somebody, and I am afraid that dependency might break down and therefore I am frightened, and so I get more dependent on her, or him. It is still me getting hurt. I am asking you what is the 'me' that gets hurt?

Q: It seems like desire, ideas come out of desire.

K: No, you are going off to a little more complex thing. Have you an idea about yourself which can be hurt? You have, haven't you? Now that is, you have a picture, you have an idea, you have an image, or conclusions about yourself, and that image, conclusions, ideas, get hurt. Right? Then the next question is: why do you have images about yourself? Why do you have a conclusion about something or other? You don't go into all this.

Q: To give the self a meaning.

Q: That's a conclusion.

Q: Well, conclusion is a meaning.

Q: What is looking for meaning?

Q: To give it importance, to have the idea that one is important.

Q: I think it is for security.

Q: Somehow there is an energy that tries to be important.

There's something that wants importance.

Q: But can we really try to nail down what is this energy which seeks importance. Is that just a different word for the same thing we are trying to catch hold of? A 'me', an ego, an idea, an energy, what is that thing, or is there such a thing, why is there a moving towards, a generating thing?

Q: I think it creates all these ideas and gives meaning to them.

Q: So shall we try to find out what it is?

Q: I even don't know if has got something to do with my idea when I get hurt I seek violence.

K: You see you are moving away from something, which is, sir, we are talking about relationship. Relationship with my wife, or with my girl friend, or with my boy, or whatever it is, relationship. In that relationship we get hurt. Right? Is that what you are saying?

Q: Yes.

K: Or am I saying it and you are accepting it?

Q: No, we are saying that.

K: People are frightened about this matter, you know, that's why they are all very quiet, because it will open Pandora's door. You know what that is? The devil is inside, so he is frightened, he keeps it all very closed. So I want to open it for myself, you don't have to listen. I've opened it for myself umpteen times.

So I am hurt. I question, I say, why. Why am I hurt and what is hurt? As he pointed out, as many of you have pointed out, it is my

idea, my belief, my conclusion, my dependency, my sense of belief and so on which I have got, which all goes to make up a picture about myself. Right? Right? I am a - what? - a scientist, a professor, a businessman, or something or other, and I have a picture of myself. Right? And you come along and say, you are not as good as I am. I have discovered much more, or I have done this, I have done that. I get a shock. So then my next question is, why do I have these pictures, images, ideas, conclusions, which can be hurt? As long as I have them they are all going to be trodden on. Right? No? No?

Q: Are we asking, Krishnaji, why do we maintain the self?

K: No, no. My question is - just listen - I have got them. Right? And I see as long as I have them somebody is going to tread on them. It doesn't matter, it may not be my wife, it may be some stranger or somebody whom I know, somebody is going to tread on it, then I get hurt. So I am asking myself, why do I have these images, pictures, ideas, conclusions about anything which can be hurt, which can be trodden on?

Q: Isn't it to build up an identity about ourselves?

K: So are you saying, I have identified myself with my belief, with my picture, with my image and so on, so I am all that. Right? And when any of you tread on any of these things I am hurt. Keep it as simple, let's keep it simple first and we will make it very, very complex as we go along.

Q: Because I feel I need to know and to be sure, to be secure

K: But it is so, isn't it. If you have no picture, madam, about yourself, I am a marvellous woman, marvellous man, I am very good at this and so on, if I have no pictures at all about myself, you

can't hurt me.

Q: Then I am afraid that I might not exist if I don't have images.

K: So wait. Then you say, if I don't have these images, pictures, conclusions and so on I am nobody. So fear of being nobody creates these pictures. Right? The fear of being nobody is conditioned by society, by your parents and so on and so on, they say you must be somebody. Right? You must be good at mathematics, you must be good at being a professor, businessman, or a violinist and so on and on, and society has imposed this through education, or you have your own capacity. And so you have a picture about yourself. You say, can I live without a picture about myself, and you say, I can't, because it is too frightening to be nothing. Wait, wait. Which means what? You actually have not given that up, the picture, but you are afraid of what might be. It might be something entirely different. It's like a person who is attached to another tremendously, and won't let go because he says, my god, if I let go what will happen. 'What will happen' is creating fear, not the letting go. But if you let go then you will find out what might happen. Right?

Q: Part of the trouble seems to be you want to know what will happen before you let go.

K: Yes, yes. Before I give up I must have some reward at the end of it. This is the good old game we all play. So I am asking myself and you, why am I hurt? Can you be - can I and you be free of the idea, the image, the picture? If you can't, then get hurt and accept it, and live with it, don't say, oh, my god, is it possible to live without fear. I say it is not possible if you accept it. But if you say, look, I know I am hurt, now I see why I am hurt, you know,

the reason, the logic, the sequence of getting hurt, now let us find out a way of not being hurt. That is, let's find a process or something which will completely wipe away any image I have. And I don't create future images. Is that possible?

Q: Not creating the negative, saying I am bad, I am worth nothing, therefore I can't be hurt.

K: That's a game you are playing. Do you really seriously want to find a way of living in which you cannot possibly be hurt? Do you want to find out?

Q: Yes.

K: No, no, it isn't a game you are playing.

Q: But we think that these images about our self are necessary for some reason, so we won't drop them.

K: Let's find out. Are they necessary? If you think they are necessary it is going to be hurt. Right? So anything that can be hurt is not necessary. Right? Anything that can be destroyed, trampled upon, broken up is not worth keeping. You wouldn't buy a cheap dress which would last half a day. Right? You may say it is necessary to have a dress, agreed.

Q: But sir, also along with those hurts comes pleasure.

K: I just want to keep this one thing, sir, that comes a little later. Now do we want to find a way of living in which there is no possibility of being hurt?

Q: It seems that if I have an image of myself it is because I always refer to the past.

K: Which is, the past is your knowledge about yourself, what you have accumulated, and so on. I am asking a different question, sir, if you don't mind. I am asking, do we want to discover for

ourselves a way of living in which the picture is not?

Q: Is there a way?

K: Dead silence!

Q: Can we want to if we are afraid of being totally alone, totally empty, can we want to find out how to?

K: Ah! That's not the point. The point is, is there a way of living not to be hurt? Not how to be empty, what it means to be empty, what it means to be lonely.

Q: Well not to be hurt, implies to be empty, as he mentioned.

K: Look, sir, that's not the point, we are not talking about emptiness. You see, you won't face the fact. You talk about non-fact, emptiness. You don't know a thing about emptiness, why talk about it?

Q: Surely if you don't want to be hurt, that is possibly a wrong way of putting it. That seems to have a motive.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: You see if you live and you are prepared to look at hurt, and you will get hurt, but able to look at it and say, why am I hurt, I see what I am doing, but not to avoid hurt, to live without hurt. You learn by living, and seeing all these things happening.

K: But it is happening everyday of my life.

Q: Yes, how do you solve that?

K: Why should I look at it, I know that I am hurt.

Q: But it is not necessarily a question of hurt, it is a question there is a problem has arisen, how do I solve it. How do I meet this?

K: I am showing you.

Q: But if it is recorded in the memory and it is a return always

of the memory, the same words.

K: Mrs Simmons I am asking you, or we are asking each other, knowing that one is hurt, either...

Q: I don't think it is a question of hurt necessarily, I think it is a question of looking at difficult facts.

K: No, no, you are introducing something entirely different.

Q: It is the meeting of the facts that causes the difficulties.

K: I don't know how to meet the fact.

Q: Well I am finding out in living.

K: Which is, that is in living I have learnt the fact that I am hurt.

Q: Krishnaji...

K: Answer her.

Q: Well I think she was trying to say that if you say, how can I not be hurt, there is a danger of just avoiding being hurt.

Q: Yes, that's about what we are doing right now. Are we trying to move away from hurt?

K: No, Mrs Simmons is saying something entirely different. As far as I understand she is saying that as I live I begin to learn the way I am hurt, and why I am hurt, and not make a problem of it.

Q: I don't think that was what she was saying.

K: Wait, let me finish. I am trying to understand what she said. I am not hurt, but I am learning as I live that I am getting hurt, and as I am getting hurt I learn about the hurt and act upon it immediately. Is that what you are saying?

Q: That is what life is about.

K: Yes, I understand. Is that it? Is life like that? You may think life should be like that, but is it like that?

Q: I find it so.

K: Actually?

Q: Actually.

K: Actually that you find that living you are getting hurt and you are learning about that hurt, and wiping away that hurt. Is that it?

Q: You tackle one hurt after another?

K: So you have learnt about that hurt. And next time again you learn.

Q: That seems to me just putting it off.

K: No, answer her, I am not. I am trying to understand the problem as she raises it.

Q: You see you are the common problem all the time.

K: Yes, I am the common problem, which comes to the same thing.

Q: You say, what is it about me that I have got such a fantastic ego that I refer everything back to how I feel, so you begin to perhaps say, perhaps it doesn't rest with me, perhaps there is something else.

K: So you have learnt through a series of days, through a series of events that you get hurt, and that you have this enormous ego that is getting hurt through a series of days, and then tackle the problem of why you have built this extraordinary importance about yourself. Is that it?

Q: Not quite.

K: I say, why do that? Why wait till the very end to discover...

Q: No, you do it as you are living, you don't sit down like...

K: Can one do that - I am saying the same thing, probably we are saying the same thing in different words - can you as you live



your daily life observe that you are getting hurt and wipe it away instantly? Can you? Will you?

Q: I want to learn more about these hurts, hurt itself.

K: I tell you, it is hurt because I have got an image, a picture about myself. You come along and say, you are not as good a pianist as I am, and I get hurt, because I have got a picture that I am one of the best.

Q: But...

K: Listen to it sir, that gentleman hasn't understood the idea that we have got a picture about ourselves.

Q: I have understood.

K: Then as long as you have that picture you will be hurt.

Q: Yes.

K: So the next question is, is it possible to wipe it out?

Q: The hurt you mean?

K: No, the picture.

Q: The picture.

K: Which gets hurt.

Q: If I can accept the hurt then that wipes out the picture.

K: No.

Q: It is no longer hurt.

K: Why should you accept a hurt?

Q: Because if I accept the hurt I am not longer hurt. It is something different if I can accept it.

Q: Is that so?

Q: Yes.

Q: As well as destroying all our images, all our conditionings.

Q: You talk about yourself as if you are able to accept hurts.

Q: No, no. My question was, the gentleman said if you accept it then it was no longer hurt, I just wanted to know if that is really so, is that a real experience of his.

Q: It is for me, yes.

K: Why should I accept anything? Why should I accept war? Why should I accept violence? Why should I accept I am hurt and it's all right?

Q: But it is the truth that is hurt, so why should I not accept it? I am hurt by the truth.

K: All right. If you are hurt by the truth, and you accept that hurt, who is accepting the hurt?

Q: Well, it is not the image.

K: No. Who is accepting the hurt? It is another image which is accepting the hurt.

Q: You don't accept it, you react to the hurt, we don't just let it pass by and say it is nothing, we are obsessed by it because it drives you to do things.

Q: Even after having discussed all this hurt will go on tomorrow I am sure.

K: What sir?

Q: Even after having discussed all this today hurt will go on tomorrow I am sure.

K: Yes. So we are hurt by the world events, by...

Q: Violence.

K:... violence, and we are hurt by our immediate friend. So we are saying, as long as we have an image, which you may discover at the end of ten days, learning about get hurt, and what is getting hurt, and so on, can't you see directly now that as long as you have

an image, either the accepting image or the denying image, they are still the images, you say, all right, as long as I have an image I am going to get hurt.

Q: But it seems to me that if one is thinking only in terms of hurt, then one is rather trapped because one may convert the hurts one knows.

K: Yes.

Q: That is a possibility.

K: We can enlarge the whole thing, not just hurt. As long as I have an image there is no possibility of love.

Q: Image seems to be all there is, so why should one want to get rid of it?

K: That's all my point. As long as there is the image you are going to be trodden on.

Q: It seems that that's all there is, so what can get rid of the image?

K: What will you do?

Q: We said looking at the image.

K: So let's forget it. Let's start it again. As long as - please help me, sir - I have got an image about myself, a marvellous image. I have talked for fifty years, and I am a great man, I am extraordinarily clever, this, blah, blah, blah. You come along and tread on it. And I get hurt because I have this immense egotistic picture about myself. Right? Now please help me to be free of that picture because you have told me that as long as you have that picture somebody is going to put a pin in it. Right? Right? Now help me to understand the picture and wipe it away so that nobody can put a pin into me at all.

Q: There are so many pictures.

K: There is only one picture-maker, in Bond Street - sorry!

There are not many pictures. Right? This is not clear?

Q: There are many pictures, but only one picture-maker.

K: No, only one painter painting many pictures.

Q: Yes.

K: That's all. Right? So who is that one painter who is painting innumerable pictures: I am a great man, I must be rich, I must have a position, I must be nice - you follow - I am beautiful, I am lovely, I am great. You follow? These are all pictures.

Q: All our judgements.

K: All judgements, pictures, convictions, beliefs, dogmas, the whole circus.

Q: That's what I think of as myself.

K: Which is the image-maker. Which is what? Thought.

Q: Yes.

Q: Thought in a certain direction.

K: Yes, thought in one direction one day, the next day another and so on and so on.

Q: Well isn't thought...

K: No, Tunki, don't move. First let me understand - you have said thought - let me understand that, don't jump to something else. Is that so? Is the central painter of innumerable pictures, the one painter, who is that one painter who is doing all this? You understand my question?

Q: Yes.

K: Who is that one painter who is painting so many pictures according to circumstances, according to desire and so on and so

on, who is that?

Q: It is a thing that you used to call the 'me', but I now don't know if it is me.

K: Not what I call, forget what I call it, what do you call it?  
How do you look at the painter, the one painter?

Q: As I.

K: Who is the one painter? Tell her.

Q: Thought.

Q: Wouldn't you say that this painter is made up by everything, everything around me. I mean because in relationship everybody has images and it's like a whole ball of bits, whereby you put some over there and the others there and yourself on a certain place on the ball, and it seems our relationship is...

K: Look, Tunki, Picasso painted a thousand pictures, let's say, different periods, different ideas and so on. Picasso was the painter all the time. Right? Who is that Picasso?

Q: His talents.

K: What is a talent? Who is that painter? Don't reduce it to talent. Who is that painter? The talent, the greed, money, communist, the dove carrying peace, all that is Picasso, and more, his sexual appetite, his jealousy. So there is only one painter which is me, Picasso. I am not Picasso, me Picasso, thank god. Now as long as there are pictures I am painting somebody is going to come and tear it. And that tearing I call being hurt. Right? Now can I - what's the good of my repeating something all the time - I want to find out a way of living that whatever I paint can never be trodden on.

Q: Well, then...

K: Listen to my question, don't jump.

Q: Yes, it's the second time it's aroused in the conversation. I see the question very clearly. For there not to be hurt I think it is necessary for all the paintings to be eliminated.

K: Which means what? That I don't paint at all?

Q: Yes, right.

K: Wait, wait, no go into it, old boy. That I don't paint at all, that I don't act, that I don't express, that I don't give way to my talent, I do absolutely nothing.

Q: Yes.

K: I can't live like that. What are you saying?

Q: Maybe one starts with not putting a name on the picture.

Q: What do you mean by picture? The picture is the image of ourselves, right? So I mean, if you don't have those pictures.

Q: There is no self, no.

Q: Then we get the painter without paintings.

Q: No, there is no painting, there is no painter.

K: Look, old boy, that's just an idea, enjoying the expression of ideas. But you haven't helped me. I have asked you to help me. I have asked - listen, sir - I have asked you all to help me to be free of this hurt. And I also say not only these peculiar hurts, but to be completely without fear of being hurt. Help me.

Q: Well, the at the same time there is no fear to be hurt means that there are images, that there are paintings.

K: Please help me to be free from being hurt.

Q: I am doing the best I can.

K: You are not helping, you are putting it into another set of terms. I am afraid - listen to it carefully - I am afraid. Afraid of getting hurt. Now please help me how to be free of my fear of

getting hurt.

Q: Nobody can help you.

K: Otherwise you stop discussion.

Q: Could be go back a little bit. There is something I don't really see well, which is we stated the painter is the 'me', and that's quite easy to say, and I could have said it, and yet I still don't see that entity, it's nothing.

K: That's just the point. You don't see the truth, the reality of it, but you have accepted the ideas about it.

Q: Which is like another painting.

K: That's what we have spend, an hour and a quarter on ideas. We haven't faced the fact, which is my fear of getting hurt. And Mrs Simmons says, learn about it as you live. Right? Learn what fear is, go into it, daily, as it happens, and learn all about it. Right? And at the end it is finished. But I am saying quite the contrary. Forgive me. Which is, don't spend a day on it, an hour on it. Look at it, understand it immediately, and wipe it away, finished. There is no choice between the two. You don't say, I like her way, or I like your way. Let's find out what is the truth of the matter is.

Q: Is it an accumulated process where I acquire knowledge about being hurt and I slowly want, today or tomorrow, to go into it day after day.

K: Talk to her, not to me.

Q: How can I begin to look at this so that I see it much more clearly? Because so far I haven't been able to do that.

Q: Can we see the perception that we create something, like a toy, hold it up to the world to show it, that we are admitting this failure but creating a nucleus which is very vulnerable and paint it

red.

Q: So if we actually saw it as clearly as that...

Q: Yes, it's our fault, it isn't necessarily something that is outside, that is inevitable, but we admit that hurt psychologically, by the formation of this notion of the self, this dependence.

K: Is it that we are afraid to discuss this question of relationship? For you it is very easy, you are not involved for the moment, but if you get married, have children, then it will become a problem. So for you it is not problem so you would say, I am not afraid of it. But having married, with children, the whole business, somebody comes along and says let's talk about relationship, I am frightened because I may discover things which may be shattering.

Q: Well, there's relationship without marriage.

K: Oh, darling sir, don't. Yes, I can have a relationship with getting married.

Q: Krishnaji, doesn't it naturally refer to sorrow? That we live in sorrow, hurt is part of sorrow.

K: Yes, quite.

Q: And afterwards there arises the image.

K: Is that all. The image exists and I get hurt, not after. You see, please, sir, I am asking you a simple question, first, if you don't mind. Is it that we are frightened to discuss relationship, in which is involved dependency, attachment, and jealousy, sexual pleasures, remembrances of all that, is it that we are avoiding to look at it? That's why we are all so silent.

Q: Wouldn't you go into the question how can we get rid of the image and the image-maker, because that's the problem to me, how to get rid of it.



Q: There is a difficulty here in words - how do I get rid of it, how do I wipe it away. Surely if it is an image, I want to see that it is an image first.

K: Sir, is the image different from you? Is the picture, the image different from you? Separate?

Q: I don't know.

K: Is it, I am asking you. Or you are that picture?

Q: It seems that we have to...

K: No, I have asked sir a simple question: are we frightened to discuss about our relationships?

Q: Yes, sir, it would seem so.

K: I am just asking sir, forgive me, for just two minutes. Are we frightened to discuss relationship, in which is involved attachment, dependence, sexual pleasures, the separateness, my wife and me are two different beings, there is a division, and open up this enormous complex thing in relationship. Are we frightened to look at it?

Q: I don't know.

K: No, I am asking, is anybody frightened about it?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes, because..

K: Yes, one is frightened, so you are avoiding it are you?

Q: It seems we have to start at the beginning.

K: We start at the beginning.

Q: Which is conflict and relationship.

K: Which is conflict and relationship. You are attached to me and I like it, so as long as both of us like it there is no conflict. But suppose I begin to say, no sorry, don't depend on me, it is rather

irksome, then conflict comes in you. So again, you see, I have asked this question, please answer it, loudly or to yourself: are you frightened to discuss this whole question of relationship?

Q: No.

K: My darling. Wait till you get married.

Q: Well I am sitting here and I want to talk about it.

K: Yes, I am talking. Are you frightened?

Q: No.

K: Why? Why aren't you frightened?

Q: Because I want to find out.

K: What? Verbally?

Q: It seems that there is necessarily a certain reluctance to look at it because it involves the self.

K: No, Scott, I am asking her whether she really wants to find out. She has no problem about it, she says, by Jove, I must understand this before plunging into all that. Now can she understand it? Or must she plunge - listen carefully - must she plunge into it and then understand it? Or can you look at the whole thing non-verbally and see what is involved in it and begin?

Q: How can we look at something not letting it...

K: Why not? Must I become a murderer before I find out about murder?

Q: Not unless you are a self murderer.

K: It is the same thing. It is exactly the same thing.

Q: We are talking about marriage!

K: Are you saying marriage is murder? No, you asked me whether it is possible to understand something if you are not experiencing it. To that I said, must you understand murder and

therefore to understand murder you must commit murder? Must you get drunk to understand sobriety?

Q: But we all have relationships whether we are married or not, or whether we have them just as friends, we all have relationships.

K: That's the whole point, sir. If you acknowledge that this problem of relationship is one of the greatest importance in life, and I am not frightened to look at it, frightened to go into it, see the whole picture of it, what is its nature, its structure, what is involved in it. And you can only do that if you are not frightened. But at the beginning if you are frightened you can't open the door.

Q: Not to be frightened to stand alone.

K: No, no. You see you have drawn a conclusion. I said do we want to go into this question, whether we are married, or have a girl friend, or boy and all the rest of it, the meaning and the implications and the nature and the whole business of relationship. And I say if you really deeply want to go into it and understand the whole beauty of it, the greatness, the tremendous involved in relationship, you must approach it without fear. But if I am already caught in it, and my wife and I, I am afraid to open it because something might happen between her and me. I would rather remain in status quo, as we are, rather than open the door. That may be most of us.

Q: How can I know this room without sitting in it? From outside, you mean?

K: No, I am asking in return, must I get drunk to know what it means to be drunk? Must I get drunk?

Q: Yes, I think so.

K: So why should I go through that? Why should I go through

being drunk? I don't want to drink. It is stupid. Why should I go through that?

Q: I can't know you without knowing you.

K: You can't know me?

Q: Without knowing you, without seeing you.

K: You can't know me. You have met me, you can't know me. You can know the picture of me, the reputation, or non-reputation about me, and so on. You can't actually know me because the thing is living. So a living thing can never be known, it is only a dead thing that can be known. So I can never say, 'I know my wife'.

Q: You can only follow the life.

K: Can you follow the life of another? All the variations, all the subtleties, all the nuances, the movements. What are we talking about. Do we want to go into the question of relationship without fear?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? All of us, or one or two, the rest say, piano, piano! Sir, we have come together to have a serious enquiry into our relationships, into our pleasures, into sorrows, into the whole problem of existence, if you are afraid at the beginning you can't go into it. So if you want to discuss fear let's talk about it and wipe it away. Don't say, well, next year I'll come back to fear.

Q: There seems to be a question whereby this painter is still painting this image, because the human mind wants to be liked, wants company.

K: Yes, I know all that, Tunki, look, old boy I am asking something else, before you put your own question, I put it first, so give me... I asked you, do you really want to go into the question of

the great complex question of fear without fear, do you want to into the question of fear and therefore enter into the whole problem of relationship. And you can only enter it if you are not afraid of it.

Q: Yet, I can see that I can only enter it with fear.

K: You can't.

Q: You can't at all?

K: It's like you can't climb the Everest with all your burden.

Q: No.

K: So you throw away lots of things and have a few things - metaphorically speaking. They carry a terrible lot of things.

So do you want tomorrow morning to discuss the question of fear? What do you say, sirs, do you want to?

Q: Is it only fear that is preventing us from going into it?

K: Yes, sir, may be.

Q: I question that, sir, because I am not so sure.

K: Then what is preventing us from going into it? Is it verbally that we don't understand English? Don't understand the expressions of the English language, and therefore you are doubtful? So let's make it very clear of every word we use, so that linguistically we understand each other. We are not doing anything but just throwing words at each other.

Q: Sir, that is part of the problems that here and now we don't have a problem with relationships because we are only talking, the problem is later. And now we can understand the words, that's quite easy, it is not necessarily fear of going into the problem that makes it difficult. But there is another kind of communication.

Q: It is not a problem right now because we don't know the right question to ask.

K: No, Tunki, that's not it. I am frightened because I have committed myself to a woman or to a man, and call that relationship, I am frightened to open that cupboard, there may be terrible skeletons in it. So I would rather discuss round it and go anywhere but say, look, I want to go into this, understand it, and go fully into it. But apparently you don't.

Q: Can we discuss tomorrow, and go into this without fear?

K: I am saying, sir, perhaps the language difficulty here is, we are saying you cannot understand the depth, the beauty and the whole complex question of relationship if there is any kind of fear in you about it. That's clear. If I am afraid to enter, to understand the relationship, what is involved, I am afraid because, you follow, god knows what is going to happen. I might leave my wife. I am not saying that - you follow. So, I say, please let's talk about relationship.

So do we talk tomorrow morning about fear? What do you say, sirs? Which means do you want to be free of fear to live differently?

Q: There's tremendous fear of going into the question, but yes.

K: What?

Q: There's enormous fear of going into the question of what is fear.

K: Yes, sir. There is fear. That's what I am saying. There is fear, and how can you examine anything if there is fear. How can I understand what love is if there is fear? I can tell my wife I love her, but that means nothing if I am afraid.

Q: Sir, may I ask a question?

K: There is no chairman here.

Q: I wonder if it is possible for us at all to approach things in this way. Like today we tried to talk about relationship and we find that when we are afraid we cannot discuss it. You see tomorrow we will talk about fear, we will find something else will stop us from talking about fear.

K: That's right, sir. That's what is going to happen.

Q: How are we going to approach all this?

K: Therefore that means you are not serious. I want to live a life without fear. I will do anything to stop my fear - give up my property, give up my wife, give up everything because I want to live without fear. You follow? That's the only way to find out. You can't just sit and talk about the mountain top, you have to climb it.

Q: As I understand that question, it is almost the same thing as saying, I want to live a life without any hurt.

K: That's right, same thing, sir.

Q: And as far as I can see we haven't really finished with that question, we haven't discovered what it means to live a life without hurt, or how one can come to that.

K: Look, Scott, I want to find out why I am hurt. Right? And I find verbally at least that I have got an image which is going to be hurt, and that image is me.

Q: But will I satisfy with just the words?

K: That's a rationalization, logic and all the rest of it, but isn't an actuality. So how are you going to make me understand and see the actuality of it? You can't do it. You can't hit me on the head.

Q: No.

K: You can't bully me into it, you can't persuade me into it, you can't give me a reward to see it; you say, well here it is, look at it.

But if you refuse to look at it what am I to do?

Q: Or, if one is unable to look at it.

K: I say, why are you unable to look at it. Stop there and find out. Don't go off to something else. Why are you unable to see something dangerous?

Q: Because of fear.

K: So it may be fear - wait - it may be habit, you have never even thought about it, you are so heavily conditioned you refuse to see it.

Q: Or the brain just keeps on...

K: Your brain may not be active enough to see it. So these are all the factors. So we then have to examine why your brain when faced with something very, very dangerous refuses to see it. Is it made dull by drink? By sexual over indulgence? You follow? Is it by continuous traditional acceptance of things? And so on. So the brain has become mechanical. Right? And so something new put in front of it, it says, I don't understand. Is that so? Is your brain like that? Is your brain mechanical?

Q: It is very mechanical. But I don't know if...

K: Stop there! If it is very mechanical, why? What has made it mechanical? Knowledge?

Q: Partly. Habit.

K: Habit.

Q: Partly.

K: Routine. Can the habit be broken without the man who says, I want to break it? Which is mechanical. You follow? So then you do all that. Not take years and years and days, now instantly, do it, completely free of habit. You can only do it when you see the fact



of it, when you see the danger of a habit. Going day after day to the office, you know, habit. The mess of it all.

Q: What comes first? Free to see, or see to be free?

K: No, no. Sir, we said, why has the brain become so mechanical. You understand? Why? Is it we have accepted tradition, habit? Habit - living in a routine. You follow? So if all these are the causes of a mechanistic mind then why don't you break it?

Q: Sir, somehow the self is involved in all this.

K: Yes. Don't involve it.

Q: It survives and maintains itself.

K: That is just an avoidance of breaking the habit - the self is involved, and so on. Here is a factual thing, that is, habit in any form becomes mechanistic. Right? Habit implies mechanism, the very meaning is a habit. So the brain might have got into the habit of living this way and it says, please leave me alone, I am used to this, don't break it up because I don't know what will happen. You follow?

Q: I feel a kind of laziness to break habits.

K: Yes. If it is laziness, go into it, break your laziness. You see we all talk about this.

Shall we talk about fear tomorrow morning? Not for the fun of it, but actually say, I am afraid, I want to be free of the damn thing. Then it is worth it, it is fun to talk about it. But if you say, I am afraid, but let's talk about the window - there is no point. Right, sirs, it is time to stop.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD SEMINAR MEETING 14TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: Shall we go on discussing, talking over together, the question of fear? Do we? We were talking about relationship, and perhaps most of us are frightened to face that reality of relationship, and so, from that arose the question of fear. So that we can face our relationship, when there is no fear - that's the question, that's the point we're going to talk over together.

Is it really possible to be completely free of fear, both physiological as well as psychological? One may be afraid of death, of so many things, neurotically, and perhaps healthily, sanely, like fear when you face something dangerous physically, to meet it healthily, which is normal, not neurotically, with fear. So there is both physical fear and psychological fear. Perhaps they are interrelated, one giving emphasis to the other and so on. Can we go into all this? Why do you want to go into it, if I may ask?

Questioner: I had always thought that the way of dealing with fear, was the way Mrs Simmons spoke about it yesterday, and the fact that there might be another possibility of it.

K: Why does one, I mean, if one is afraid, do you, does one want to go really deeply inside the whole business of it, and be free of it. Does one demand that? Or we don't know how to deal with fears and so we run away from it, avoid it and explain it away. Is that it, we never really want to go into it and completely dissolve it. Is that what is the problem?

Q: I think that when one realizes that fear is one of the most inhibiting factors in life, one is bound to go into it, isn't that so?

One must first realize how inhibiting it is.

K: Yes, sir, but what I'm asking is, do we really want to go into it, do we really say, this is a terrible burden, a devastating factor in life, it brings darkness, you know all the nervous responses to fear, and psychological shrinking, withdrawing, resisting, fighting back ; all that which is a form of violence - do we really want to go into it so that our minds are completely free from it? That is the first question I would like to suggest to ask.

Q: I think the answer is no, I think we prefer to go from solution to solution.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: We'd rather go from the solution to the solution of the fear, rather than to go into the fear.

K: That's it, we want rather a solution of it, how to, the ending of it rather than the finding out the whole movement of it, the whole contents of it, the nature of it. Is that what we're trying to do?

Q: Yes.

Q: Right here we are looking for the solution, too.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: Right here we are looking for the solution.

K: Of course, of course. Are you looking for a solution for fear? Or investigating, exploring, finding out the whole nature of it, and so when one really has an insight into it, it's gone.

You know, I'm not a brain specialist, perhaps Professor Wilkinson, Dr Bohm can help us. I think it effects the brain, the brain cells - fear. I watch many, many people in fear, their minds, their brain is not active, is not agile, fresh, young, it's a kind of

disease that eats into one's mind and one's heart, one's whole being. And if we don't understand the disease but are only concerned with the curing of it, then it will never - we are just playing with each other.

So I want, that's why I ask, if I may, of course most respectfully always, do we really want to go into it, are we deeply concerned with the resolution of it, not how to be free of it, but take step by step into it and discover the whole nature of it and understand it, have an insight into it, and then the thing dissolves.

Q: Are we really aware that fear does play such a large part in our lives?

K: I'm asking, sir. How destructive it is, because from fear arises violence, all kinds of neurotic behaviour. Please, enter the game, I throw the ball and you don't even play, return it to me, it is always in your court. You understand what I'm saying?

Q: Doesn't it have something to do with the immediate response to fear, the immediacy of response.

K: Yes, sir, but I want first to be clear that you and I and the rest of us, really want to find out the whole movement, the beginning and the ending, the in-between, the nature of it, the content of it, the destructive nature of it, the real disease of it - it's a much greater disease, more, it's a fearful disease, rather than cancer. Cancer may be partly the result of fear.

Q: I don't want to go into it, it's very ugly, it's very...

K: No, you see, you say it's ugly, I don't know if it is ugly, I'm just frightened.

Q: Fear is ugly.

Q: None of us like fear.

K: You say so. You say so. You've given a name to it, an adjective, calling it ugly and...

Q: Well, we want to get rid of fear because we don't like fear.

K: Therefore...

Q: No, I question that. No, we don't want to get rid of fear.

K: That's what I am questioning.

Q: We want a solution to fear - solution, that's different. We want to be free of fear.

Q: We want to be able to manage fear, be free of fear.

Q: OK, then not get rid of it, but free of it, control it.

Q: Be able to handle it.

K: Control it.

Q: But that's not dealing with it.

K: No, that's just it.

Q: But we don't want to deal with it, we don't want to deal with it, we just want to control it.

K: That's right, sir, let's be clear. Do we want to control it, we don't want to put our teeth into it, but waiting for somebody to help us to be free of fear - a psychologist, some incidents, some external god and so on. And so, remaining in the meantime in fear. Which is it we want? Please let's be clear on this point.

Q: I think often the fear of something is worse than that thing itself. And so that if one could find out what fear actually is, then...

K: We're doing that. Do we want to go into the whole problem, the nature and the structure of fear, which is structure in the sense, not a building but the movement of it. Structure means movement - the movement of fear, understand it, go very, very deeply into it, and resolve it completely. Or we are waiting because we want to

control it, we want to escape from it and so on.

Q: Well, I think that's where we have to part from our likes and...

K: No, just - don't like and dislike, don't bring that in.

Q: Want and not want.

K: No, I don't want, that's another problem.

Q: You're asking if we want to go into it.

K: Want in the sense, sir, is that our intent.

Q: Well, then, then there is no question of like.

K: Is that our resolve, it doesn't matter what word you use. Is it our intent to go into this very deeply and resolve it, by understanding it, looking at it and so on. Or we just want to control it, suppress it, and not discover what it is. Or wait for somebody to help us to be out of it.

Q: Yes, but aren't we...

K: This is, please this is a very serious question, give your thought to it.

Q: We say that if we want to, we look at fear in order to get rid of it, then that's a bad reason for looking at it, we won't discover anything.

K: Is it our intent?

Q: What would be a correct intention? What would be a correct reason and therefore a correct approach to looking at fear? Because there's obviously some bad ones.

Q: I was just going to say, what is the fact, start with the fact of fear. If you have the intention of going into it, or do you just want to resolve, find out what the fact is in you and start from there. If you haven't got it, if you can discover that, whether you want to

resolve it, then you can start from the fact. And move on from there. You have to find out in yourself what the fact is about fear, how you feel towards it, whether you want to resolve it, or go into it. That's where you start. I'm not explaining well.

K: Is this clear to each one of us?

Q: But you need space to look at and the space could be caused by an escape.

K: No. I'm asking a simple question, for god's sake! It's simple: do we want somebody to resolve it for us or - wait sir, I haven't finished yet, please.

Q: Excuse me.

K: Forgive me. Somebody to say, 'Well, do this and you'll be free of it'. Or do we want to go together into this whole nature of fear, not suppressing it, not avoiding it, looking at the whole movement of our fears, avoidance, escapes, and trying to find a solution for it and so on. Which is it you want?

Q: Are you suggesting that most people haven't got serious intention of going the whole way into it?

K: That's right, sir. That's all I'm trying to find out.

Q: I think most of us do have the intent to go into it, but we're afraid of...

K: Afraid?

Q:... of what we're going to see.

K: Yes, so still fear, it is still fear.

Q: It seems that you're saying that we cannot have the serious intention to go into fear unless we are free of fear.

K: What, sir? I can't hear.

Q: It seems to be implied that we cannot have a serious

intention to investigate fear unless we are already free of fear.

K: That's right. Have we - let me put it as Dr Bohm points out, have we the serious intent to go into it. That's all I'm asking.

Q: No. Dr Bohm says, he said you first had to be free. Being serious implies that you are already free from fear. Is that true? Do you think that? Dr Bohm just said that we have to be free of fear before we can even be serious.

K: Oh, no. No. Then I'll wait till Doomsday.

Q: That's right. That's the problem, but that's what he said.

Q: But you see, you begin with apparently a serious intention to investigate fear, and then one finds that one is afraid of what one will discover.

Q: Yes.

K: This is a simple thing, I can't understand why you are making it so complicated. I'm afraid. I know I want to find somebody to help me to be rid of it. Or I'm waiting for god to help me to get rid of it, to be free of it. That's one thing. Either control it, suppress it, run away from it. Or do I want to go into the whole nature of it. You understand, sir? Put it the other way: I want to learn all about fear. Can't I do that?

Q: To be afraid without resistance, you mean? Just to be afraid, stay in it.

K: No, sir. See how difficult it is to come to some common factor.

Q: One can have the conscious intention of investigating fear, but then you've added a further thing; you said, in order to be free of it we don't know at this moment what will happen.

K: But you do know you're frightened, aren't we?



Q: Yes, I know that. And I know I want to investigate it.

K: That's all, that's all we're asking. Do you want to investigate it, or do you want somebody to say, 'Do this, and you will be free of it'.

Q: No, I want to investigate it. I want to investigate it.

K: Let's be sure, all of us, what we want to do about this, don't waste time, please.

Q: Obviously we don't want to analyze it.

K: I give up.

Q: We want to find out the whole structure, nature, mechanism of fear.

K: You want to understand it?

Q: Absolutely.

K: So, which is it, all of us, which is it that you want to do?

Q: I want to do the same. I want to understand the mechanics of it. But I am afraid of what will come or what will go, if I do understand it.

K: Yes, which means you're still frightened of what might happen.

Q: Yes.

K: So that's also part of fear.

Q: Yes.

K: So we're investigating fear. That's all. Please, sir. Look, we've talked about one simple thing for 20 minutes and we haven't come to the point yet.

Q: I want to open it up. I want to open up the whole subject, that's all I can say.

K: That's all. All of us want to do this?

Q: Yes.

K: Avanti.

Q: There we go, well, there we go, I say. We all want it so.

K: So, are we conscious, aware, of our fears and what we do with our fears?

Q: I don't think we are aware.

K: Are you Tunki?

Q: No, I think it is so deep rooted.

K: No, keep to what you were saying, Tunki, which is, are you aware, know, recognize, that you are frightened. And what you do with that fear. Are you aware of this? Tunki?

Q: Well, I can recall my past fears.

K: No.

Q: I think at the moment it doesn't jump up.

K: I'm asking, do we, each one of us, recognize our fear, know that we are frightened of something or other, and what we actually do with that fear? Do we run away from it, suppress it, control it, or accept it as part of life and drag on with it for the rest of your life? Are we aware of this? That's what I'm asking.

Q: I think we're probably all aware of the fact that we drag on.

K: Yes. Are we aware of it?

Q: Yes.

K: So you know what you do with your fear. Why do you do that? Drag on, as Professor Wilkinson points out, how we drag on with it, we go on with it. Why? We are investigating, opening up the whole box - Pandora's Box.

Q: I haven't been able to find an answer to a particular fear, real fear.

K: Not an answer.

Q: This is what I've been doing. You said, are you aware of what you do.

K: Yes.

Q: This is what I do: try to find an answer. And it hasn't really deeply dealt with the whole matter, in the past, so it's dragged on.

K: I'm asking, sir, if you are aware that you have a certain fear and how you deal with that fear, whether you control it, suppress it, run away from it, or wait for somebody to resolve it, and so on. Are you aware of your fear, and your reactions to that? That's all I'm asking.

Q: Now then, you asked another question, why do we do that.

K: What?

Q: Then you asked another question, why do we do that?

K: Yes, why do we do that? That's all I'm asking.

Q: Krishnaji, I think part of it is because we maintain a facade of ourselves that we present to others, and we want to continue to maintain this. And if we begin to face the question of fear, we will have to deal with this facade.

K: Not facade. All right. I'm just asking, if you don't mind, apart from the facade, why do we do this - that is aware of our fear, control it, suppress it, avoid it, run away from it, or wait for some incident to resolve it. Why do we wait? Why do we go through this process? You understand my question?

Q: Couldn't it be because we don't know anything else?

K: What?

Q: Couldn't it be through ignorance, we don't know how to deal with it, otherwise?

K: No. We know what we do, don't we?

Q: Yes, sure.

K: Then let's ask the question, why do you do it?

Q: Perhaps ignorance, because we don't know any other way.

K: You don't know any other way? Is that it?

Q: And also the entity which is afraid remains the same.

K: No, don't complicate it, sir, just go step by step: I am afraid.

Suppose I am afraid. I know I have controlled it, I know I have suppressed it, I know, you know, all the rest of it. And I ask myself, 'Why am I doing this?' That's all I'm asking.

Q: Somehow that fear seems to threaten something inside you.

K: What?

Q: The fear you have inside you seems to be a threat to something, which is why...

K: A threat?

Q: A threat. It seems to threaten and challenge something.

K: So, all right. So I ask myself, why do I do this and you say, it's a threat. Threat to what? Threat to my house? Threat to my relationship? Threat to my way of living?

Q: The image.

K: Please, just go into it step by step.

Q: To my whole structure.

K: Which means, threat to my whole way of living. Is that it?

Q: No, deeper I think, it's a threat to my effort to solve it. In other words, I can't go on doing this, going from solution to solution, that action will be threatened.

K: So, would you say it simple, sir.

Q: Well, you said, why do I do it.

K: No, I said, why do I live in this way, being threatened, feared because that fear may bring certain catastrophes, I ask myself, why am I doing this, who is - you follow, sir? Why do I go through the cycle?

Q: Because the whole thing will be threatened. In other words, keeping doing, if I stop doing this, I don't want to give that up, that structure will be threatened, the solution will be threatened.

K: How do I know? That's my point. You're not getting my point. How do I know that my whole structure, which I've built up, will be destroyed? Or am I projecting an idea that it might be destroyed? And therefore frightened of that. You get what I'm saying. Now, which is it we're doing - please, that's why we want to go step by step into it. Let me do it for myself, talk about it.

First, I am unaware that I'm doing this. Then I become aware. I am aware that I'm frightened. I am aware, know, that I control it, suppress it, avoid it. And I drag on this way for the rest of my life. And I am saying now, why do I do this, why do I live this way? And I find there is a threat involved in it, the threat of something that might happen. So what might happen is creating more fear, adding more to the already accumulated fear. I live this way. Right? And I say to myself, why? Why am I doing this? What am I being threatened about? You follow, we are investigating, don't accept what I'm saying, we are investigating. Threat to my relationship, with my wife, girl, boy, whatever it is? Threat to my existence? The way of my life?

Q: Yes, that you won't exist.

K: I don't know. You see, I don't know.

Q: You don't know?

K: You've already projected what might happen. But I don't know. You see the difference? By projecting it, say what might happen, it might destroy my house, my relationship, I'll lose my job - all that adds more fear. But it may not be like that at all. You follow? Threat implies that you have a certain standard of life and if you investigate into fear, that standard of life may be broken up. Therefore, you say, 'My god, I won't go into this problem at all'. You have made a picture of what might happen, and so you carry on as usual. Right? You understand?

So I'm asking, if you do not project, the idea of what might happen, but say let's investigate fear, not the future fear. Is that clear?

Q: Yes.

K: The surgeon tells me I must be operated. And I'm frightened, because I might not survive. And so the fear of not surviving adds to my already greater fear of the operation. But if I have no fear of what might happen, I can face the operation, though I am afraid. I can face it. But now I've introduced a double kind of fear: the future, what might happen, and the actual fear of being operated. So I say, please, look, I'm investigating, so I won't, I see the silliness of it, the foolishness of it, so I say, 'All right, I won't project.' I don't know, something may happen, which is quite different. So I won't project. Right? Is this clear? Can we go on from there?

Q: Yes.

K: So I ask now, why am I doing this? That is, not the future, what might happen, but why am I carrying on this way, controlling it, suppressing it, avoiding it, waiting for somebody to resolve it

and so on. Why do I do this?

Q: It seems I'm holding onto something.

K: You're holding onto something. What?

Q: The idea that...

K: What are you holding onto, actually? Do look at it. You say you are holding on. What are you holding on? Your relationship? Your money? Your way of life? Your profession, your career, your - whatever, you know, a dozen things. Are you holding on to them?

Q: All that, yes.

K: To all that. What is that, to all that? To your life?

Q: All my structure.

K: The way you are living - let's put it that way, it's simpler. The way of your life, you're holding on. And you say, 'In that way of life, fear is involved'. So you're holding onto fear. Right?

Q: There is something about that, Krishnaji, that I think that it's more than just holding on to the structure, it's as if you're holding on to the fact that if you don't have the capacity to deal with it.

K: Wait, that's the whole point. I was coming to that. You see, is it that we think we have not the capacity to deal with the fact that I'm afraid, because I've been discouraged - listen carefully - I've been discouraged that I cannot do it by myself. I've been discouraged by the religions, Jesus will save you, outside agency will save you, go to an analyst, professor, this, that, they will resolve it. So society, education, has helped me to have no capacity to deal with it. Right? Would you agree to this?

Q: Yes.

K: Oh, come on!

Q: One could also feel that one has the capacity.

K: I don't know but I reject all that, I reject somebody's going to solve my fear, Jesus or the priest or the Pope or the Archbishop or the analyst, nobody, I can see how foolish it is.

Q: But I might think I can do it myself.

K: No, I don't say that, myself. I reject that, therefore I can say I will solve it, which is another vanity. I wonder if you see this. Right, sir? May we go on from there? We are all together, are we? So what have I left now? I think I have not the capacity because I have been educated to think I have not, haven't got it. But now I am free from that educated conditioning. Right? Are you?

Q: Are you?

K: Am I?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. I wouldn't talk otherwise, I wouldn't be a hypocrite. Sir, we said at the beginning of this discussion, that to be a light to oneself, this is a part of it - I don't want to go into it now. Have we - are we free of this educated conditioning which makes us incapable? The intellectuals have made us incapable. Right? The intellectual priest, the intellectual structure of religions, you follow, the whole intellectual world of knowledge - all that says, you can't do it, old boy, we will do it for you.

Q: It seems this educated conditioning has a life of its own.

K: No, of course it has, but don't go off into that, Tunki, forgive me for bringing it back. Are you aware that you have this educated conditioning, which destroys your incapacity, and therefore put it aside. Have you? Which means, you're no longer dependent. That's all I'm trying to get at.

Q: But if one were free of this intellectual conditioning, surely



that in itself would not be enough?

K: No, just the beginning, that's part of it. Of course not, sir. So, look, Dr Shainberg raised the question that we, most of us, have not the capacity to deal with it.

Q: I did not say we didn't have it, I said, we feel like it.

K: Sorry. We feel that we have not the capacity, which is different. Quite right. So we are investigating why we don't feel capable, and we don't feel capable because of this. So are we free from that, because we can't investigate further if you are not free of that. This is rather fun, isn't it?

You see, this is different from analysis. I must make it quite clear. You are just observing this whole movement, there is no analyzer and the analyzed. I don't want to enter into that for the moment. We are just observing. We have been educated by all the priests, intellectual theologians and philosophers and so on, that we don't feel at the end of it capable. If you reject all that, what has happened?

Q: You become...

K: Go into it, sir. Watch yourself. If you reject it, the intellectual education, quotes, what has happened? First, why have you rejected it? Under my pressure? Because of logic, seen the sequence of it? Or you yourself see that you cannot possibly understand fear if you have not the capacity, and that capacity has been taken away from you, taken away from you by others. Now, if you realize that, what have you come to? Please go into it.

Q: To the insight of this?

K: Which means what?

Q: It means you're no longer dependent on someone else.

K: No, listen, go into it. We're exploring, please.

Q: You are free to learn, you are free.

K: You are free of what?

Q: This conditioning.

K: Which means what? Free. How did you get that freedom?

Let's - all right. How did you get that freedom, how did you have that feeling of being free?

Q: By doubting.

K: By doubt, by questioning, which means what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: At the end, when you have rejected through doubt, questioning, seeing what its value is and so on, which is you have intelligence, haven't you now? Right? No?

Q: Yes. Your own intelligence.

K: Not your own. You have intelligence.

Q: Yes.

K: Which is capacity. I wonder if you see this. We've a lot to go, come on, sir. A long way to go yet.

Q: There's a quality there. You used the word 'happen'. I think that's exactly it, that you become a happening.

K: Yes, there is a movement, a happening, which is intelligence, not that intelligence which is yours or mine, it's intelligence.

Q: Which is not a function of the brain?

K: You have used the brain to see. The brain sees what people have done to it. Right? The intellectuals, the priests, the authoritarians, the philosophers, the Freudian, Freud, and all the rest of it, they have made you dull. And if you say, I see the whole thing, what they have done, and the very seeing is the movement of

intelligence, it's not your seeing or my seeing, the fact that it is so.

Q: Sir, what they have actually done, religions, when you say they have made you die, I see that...

Q: Dull.

Q: Did you say die or dull?

K: I don't know what I said.

Q: I see that they have stopped you, the religions, I feel that they have stopped me from enquiring.

K: Sir, I don't know if you know in India you can be a religious person without believing, without having any god. You understand, sir? And therefore they have questioned the whole, they have doubted, questioned. In Christianity you mustn't question. You can question up to a certain point, after that, it is mysterious, mystery. So you never are encouraged to question, ask, demand, find out. Right? That's all we're saying.

Now are we in this together, now, so far? No, have you that intelligence? If you haven't you can't enquire.

Q: But, sir, one of the main things here, it seems to me, is a sense of self-doubt, a self helplessness. The insight you are talking about, doesn't one already have to come to some grips with the fear, because...

K: No, we said at the beginning, are you aware that you are afraid, do you know what your action to that is? Control, suppress, run away, resolve - we went through all that. So if you say, mustn't you have a grip on that first, I say, 'Look, you're asking a question that has been dealt with'.

Q: Well, I'm trying to suggest that the experience of fear is so tremendous.

K: And we...

Q: To have that intelligence at that moment is...

K: Not at that moment.

Q: No, but in examining. When you are fearful and you examine it, you come to that perception with extreme difficulty.

K: We are not dealing with that. Look: I've reached a point in a discussion, for each one of us, we've reached a point where our capacities which have been made dull, by rejecting those factors which make us incapable, the very rejection of it is the awakening of this intelligence. Then that's one thing. Wait. We haven't finished with fear yet. That's one thing. So I'm saying the next step is, I don't know if you - I'm talking all the time, will you please come on.

Q: Sir, I question whether one has totally rejected all that.

K: That's up to you. Haven't you?

Q: There can be no...

K: Find out, sir. Sit for two minutes, you can, a minute, you can know, if you put your mind to it. If you're sloppy you won't know.

Q: I still have the feeling that it will be a verbal game.

K: It's not a verbal game with me. You can have the verbal game, but I want - sir, I said from the beginning, are we serious enough, intent, having strong intent to go into this whole movement of fear. If you have the intent and the seriousness of it, you cannot remain verbal.

Q: Sir, it seems at this point the fear is still there. Now fear hasn't been dealt with. All you've done is put aside incapacity and the intelligence has been awakened. Once that's awakened then it can start dealing with fear. The fear is still there.

K: Of course. Sir, I'm going to deal with - we're going to go into it.

Q: Can I raise another point?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Having got these, cleared the space, so to speak...

K: Cleared the decks.

Q:... got the intelligence, I mean, to do that didn't one need some kind of motivation, driving force, some sort of passion? And doesn't one then need that to continue the process? I mean, or are you including that in the intelligence?

K: I think that the passion, the drive is inherent in this intelligence.

Q: It has its own momentum.

K: It has, yes. To put it, no, let's use the same words, otherwise you'll give a different meaning to momentum and so on. I may too. So as Professor Wilkinson points out, doesn't one need passion, interest, a drive to have this, to bring about this intelligence, or to awaken this intelligence. I say, by observing, by looking into this whole movement of fear, as we've just begun, that intelligence has in it this passion, this intent, the drive. I won't sit still any more. If I have fear, I'll go, with that intelligence, with that energy, that drive, I'm going into it.

Q: Could I return to your point about the man having the operation?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Then surely he decides to have the operation and run the risks of what might happen afterwards, if he's sufficiently dissatisfied with his past life before the operation.

K: Quite right, sir, that's what...

Q: Is this it?

K: You're quite right, sir. Are we dissatisfied now, as he points out, with our ordinary, mediocre, dull life, part of which is fear? So am I aflame to resolve this thing? Which immediately makes me non-mediocre - not that it gives me vanity. I'm out of that group.

Q: I think that's important. Yes, I think there's a real fear of getting out of the groove, because it puts you into a whole new space.

K: That's what the Professor was pointing out. Unless there is this feeling - look: I've lived with fear for so many blasted years, wasted my life, and I must do something about it, which immediately puts me out of society. And I don't mind. But if I say I like the pleasant, the niceties of society, dinner parties, night clubs and blah, blah, then of course there is no communication.

Q: And relationship. That's where you come back to relationship. I'd like, I know that relationship...

K: I'm coming to it, slowly. So what shall we do now? I have now - there is this intelligence operating, which is capacity. And I have started out with the discontent to live, to be, to understand this whole fear - you know, work at it. I've come to the point, I'm afraid. Right? I have fear. Are we aware of fear. Fear of what? What are you afraid of? Are you?

Q: The future.

K: I'm sorry, I'm asking her. You're a teacher. She won't answer, you see. None of us want to be put on the carpet. Right, sir? You can put me on the carpet, I'm quite willing. I'm asking, what is it you are afraid of. Afraid of loneliness, afraid of not having

communication with another? The other is the only person with whom I can communicate and with nobody else, therefore I'm afraid. And therefore I get attached. So, go on, please. What am I afraid of, each one of us? My wife, losing my job, having no status in society, nobody recognizing me as a great man? Afraid of death, afraid of darkness, afraid that I might physically get hurt? Go on, sir, please, what is it that you're afraid of?

Q: Practically all those things. All those things.

K: Are you afraid of all these?

Q: Practically, yes.

Q: Getting hurt. Yes.

K: Jesus!

Q: In one form or another, yes.

Q: I'm afraid of being a... my whole life, just letting everything drop by and...

K: Wait, wait. She said, 'I'm afraid of all these things'. What does that mean?

Q: Afraid of life.

K: No, no. What does that mean? That I'm afraid of that, afraid of that, so you have separate fears. Right? Or fear has different expressions.

Q: It seems to enter into practically everything.

K: Yes - no.

Q: I'd say we're afraid of fear itself.

K: No, madam, no. I'm asking something. She said, I enumerated various forms of fear. I can add more to it, or take away, it doesn't matter, she pointed out many forms of fear. Do you want to get rid of those various expressions of fear, or the fear that

creates? You follow? Desire creates many objects of desire. I want a house, I want to be famous, I want to be known, I want to have money. But it's still desire. So, though fear has many expressions, the common denominator, factor is fear. So we are dealing with not the objects of fear - I am afraid of the door, I'm afraid of light, I'm afraid of - but fear itself. Do we see this?

Q: Yes.

K: Fear I am ill, fear I may never get well, I am crippled, my arm is frozen, my god, I can't move it - I'm afraid. You follow sir? Fear. Are we aware - you know, this is an important question, please - aware of the objects of fear, or fear itself? I may be afraid of death, and so I'm greatly concerned about death, and therefore I enquire into death, go into it, and all the rest of it, and I forget fear, I've pushed it away by saying, I'm going to enquire into death. Or I might want a very good career, job, position, and I am intent on that, therefore my fear is abated, because I've concentrated on it. So we are discussing, talking over together fear itself, not the various forms of fear. Right? Can we move from there?

Q: Don't these fears indicate that one is actually afraid to be left alone?

K: Yes, sir, loneliness. Loneliness, isolation, building a wall round oneself, being hurt from childhood, build a wall round yourself and fear never to meet anybody who might hurt.

Q: There's also the fear of building the wall, not just the isolation, secondary to building the wall, the fear that you will build.

K: Of course, of course. You build a wall and then feel isolated and say, 'My god, why am I isolated?'



Q: I take it there is a deeper fear.

K: Yes, yes, of course. So are we all, can we move together in this, know that fear we are concerned with, not with fear of darkness, fear of death, fear of this, fear of that.

Q: I'm not clear on this, that I am afraid of fear. I live in a state of fear but I'm lost on this thing about being afraid of fear.

K: I don't say, afraid of fear. I only know fear; that is, later on I say the word and so on, the complications of it, and just the fact that I'm frightened.

Q: Could we take a look at the process by which a single fear arises, by which, you know, fear comes into being? And take a look at it from that point of view.

K: Take it, sir, go into it, take one fact, if you're afraid of something, take that and go into it, one fact. What would you like? Loneliness?

Q: Fine.

K: So I am afraid of being alone - not alone, this feeling of loneliness, which is isolation. Right? I'm frightened of being isolated. You want to take that?

Q: Could we start just before that though? I'm sitting down, walking around and I'm not afraid. And then suddenly this fear arises.

K: Arises.

Q: Can we look at that?

K: I'm doing that. We'll see how it comes and then we'll see how the before and the after. I'm talking all the time. I am lonely. And I try to do all kinds of things to escape from it. Right? I'm attached, I need somebody to have a conversation with - you

follow - comfort and so on, I escape from it. That's a fact, isn't it?

Sir, how am I to talk to an audience if you all keep quiet.

Q: Sometimes we all agree with you.

K: Right, then if you all agree, if you all see the point, if you are all aware of this, loneliness, and running away from it, trying to cover it up, trying to fill it with various forms of entertainment, religious, football or this or that. So that's what we do. Now I'm asking myself, what has brought this loneliness about. Right? What are the reasons for it? Can we go on? What are the reasons? It may be...

Q: Probably deep comfort, probably the comfort through contact with somebody. I probably need comfort from contact with somebody.

K: No, I know, I am in contact with you, you are my friend, I have a conversation with you, I'm escaping from this fact that I'm lonely. So I escape through contacts, through entertainment, through this and through that. Am I aware of this movement away from this thing which I have called loneliness? Right?

Now I want to find out why this loneliness has come into being, how is it that I'm lonely? Right? So I question. Is it my way of life? Right? That is, the way of life, I am acting for myself all the time, in my most intimate relationships, or business, whatever it is, I'm always acting from a centre. Right? Could we go on with this? So what happens? I'm all the time emphasizing by my actions, by my thought, this void in me, this emptiness, this sense of loneliness. No? Do we all see this or not? Silence indicates we are in agreement or disagreement?

Look, sir: I go to the office. There I am battling with my

superior, and I want his job, more money and so on. I'm acting there, emphasizing myself, me first, and all that. I come home and there's my wife and I go through exactly the same process there. Right? So I'm building, through my actions I'm bringing about this sense of loneliness.

Q: It is isolating itself.

K: It's isolating itself all the time. And suddenly, walking in the woods or sitting in my room or whatever one is doing, suddenly one feels tremendously lonely, isolated, having no relationship with anything. Don't you know all this? I'm not inventing all this.

So I have done everything to avoid it. Right? And I want to find out how it arose, and I see how it has come about, how through my daily actions I've isolated myself. Right? Which is my loneliness. And I suddenly become aware of it. And so instead of running away from it, I say, all right, old boy, let's see what it is about. You follow? What is the state of the mind that is lonely? Of course lonely in the sense your body is separate from mine and so on, that we're not - the sense of psychological loneliness in which there is no contact with anybody. Sense of tremendous isolation. And if you don't resolve it, and you know you can't escape from it, then you become neurotic. Because that is the only thing you have left. Before you escaped, before you did all kinds of tricks with it, now you realize that you can't do anything - those are all to no avail. So you're stuck with it. And if you don't resolve it you become every kind of neurotic human being. No? This is a verbal description, don't be deceived by the description, it's a fact.

So what shall I do with this loneliness? You've understood my question? What shall I do with the loneliness: the 'I' who has

created the loneliness, the isolation, says, 'What shall I do?' I wonder if you see this. Please.

Q: Yes.

K: Thank god, somebody sees it.

Q: That's the act of trying to solve - again you're back in the solution.

K: Of course. But I've put the wrong question, that's why. I've put a wrong question to myself when I say, 'What shall I do?', or 'Tell me what to do', I'm still isolating myself. So the next question is, is that loneliness separate from me? You follow, sir? Or I am that?

Q: Who is the self?

K: Tunki, have you listened to what I have to say. We have reached a certain point, Tunki, which is, I used to escape from this loneliness, I see the absurdity of it, and so I won't escape. But there is this loneliness, this isolation. So I'm still trying to do something about it. So I must find a solution, I must operate, I'm doing something - but is that loneliness different from the actor who says, I must do something about it. Or the actor himself is that. I wonder if you see this.

Q: Yes. Isn't that fear, right at that second?

K: No, no. I have no fear yet. I'm coming to that. Mr Scott asked me, take one example, say, loneliness, and go into it. That's what we're doing, which is, I have done everything about it, run away, rationalized it, all the rest of it. And when I reject that, then I still say, 'What am I to do?' We're pointing out it is a wrong question because you are still operating as though that loneliness, isolation, is different from the actor, the doer. The doer is that.

Q: He's sustained it artificially.

K: Yes, so the observer is the observed. This is difficult for most of us to get. I'm sorry, I must keep at it.

Q: Now, when we..

K: Scott, have you got this?

Q: I think so.

K: You think so? Is it so?

Q: I can see the actor has created that. I see that the actor has created that.

K: Yes, the actor has created that and the actor is that, because he has created it.

Q: That seems particularly difficult.

K: Of course, because our conditioning is to keep the two separate. Our conditioning is to act upon it.

Q: Krishnaji, isn't that the problem, that the actor creates the symptom. And then immediately the actor continues to create a reaction

K: That's right sir, that's right.

Q: So one is continually trapped.

K: That's right. But when you see the actor is the action, you have quite a different - your mind is quite different when you see that.

Q: But may I ask, in a sense, a degree, how different, one sees that and yet one feels, in one's awareness there is an extraordinary habituated...

K: That's our conditioning. So I say, look, what am I doing. I have been caught in a tradition, educated and so on, to separate the actor from the action.

Q: I don't think that's it. I don't think that's it at all. I think something else happens, something else. It's like trying to switch something, it's not the conditioning, it's something else.

K: All right, sir. What is it? Now let's find out. You say it's not the conditioning, all right, we'll put it aside for the moment. I don't reject it - put it aside. I say, 'Is that so?' I say, 'Why is there this division?' Right? Before I've acted upon it, run away from it, suppressed it, controlled it and so on, and so on. I must have a conversation with you only, and with nobody else, and therefore I get attached to you, and this attachment has made me more and more isolated. And then I say, I'm isolated, lonely. And I say I must do something about it. Or tell me what to do about it. Which means I'm still maintaining the division. Right sir? Now is that a fact, is the division a fact? But is that not an illusion? Though we accept it as a fact, is that not an illusion? Go slow. Right, sir?

Q: You mean, this division is an illusion?

K: What, sir?

Q: You mean, what is an illusion?

K: The illusion is...

Q:... the division.

K: Yes.

Q: Krishnaji, I can see that that's an illusion, and I can, without meaning to be presumptuous, I can see that I am that loneliness, and that there is not a division.

K: So what happens? How did you come to - no, be careful - how did you come to that?

Q: Well I don't think he would talk about it if he really saw it.

K: I know, but I'm asking something else. I'm asking, how did

he come to it?

Q: I don't think he came to it, that's the point.

K: All right, put it differently.

Q: I can see, I'll tell you now, I can tell you how I came to it. In listening to what you said and in seeing the entity that was, that felt that loneliness, that was the same, that was the loneliness came from the same source that felt it. So I could see in my way, what I thought was that I was the loneliness.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: But that doesn't give me any insight yet into...

K: That's the whole point. Which he is pointing out, which Dr Shainberg is pointing out.

Q: Is it that one has jumped and then you know you have jumped. But you don't know how you've jumped, yet.

K: All right. If that is so, that is, have you jumped? It doesn't matter how. Have you jumped to this fact that the division between the actor and the loneliness, the actor says, 'I must do something about it', therefore he's still in the same area of loneliness. If you see that, then there is no division.

Q: Could I pause there for a moment, because you say we are going very slowly. I see the symptom, the expression, the jump that has occurred. That's different.

K: No.

Q: From what you're saying.

K: I understand, sir. I'm asking, when you have jumped there is no conflict about loneliness.

Q: Otherwise you wouldn't jump.

K: Wait. He and I are talking for the moment. Forgive me, sir.

He says he has jumped to that. And it may be still an illusion, so I'm asking respectfully - when the observer is the observed, there is no conflict. When the observer who sees he is lonely and the observer says, 'I am that', then there is no conflict. Right? Is that a fact to you, no conflict about loneliness?

Q: It's not a fact for me.

K: And therefore that jump is not what we're talking about.

Q: I was just going to say, I think we are not so with communication. You see, if I sense that I am lonely, and in my investigation I see the fact that I am lonely because of the existence of an 'I'...

K: No, existence of various actions, in daily life, which has brought about this loneliness.

Q: Yes, sir. The continual operation of the 'I'. What I am saying when I use the word 'jump' is the fact that I have become aware...

K: That's all.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's a different jump.

Q: Exactly.

K: Quite, quite. So I'm asking something else, which is, do I realize the illusion I've been living in, where I have separated loneliness from me, and therefore 'me' can act upon 'it'. Right? Do I see that?

Q: I'm sorry, could you clarify, Krishnaji - you just said 'me' can act upon...

K: Yes, sir. Look: I am lonely. Let's follow slowly, step by step. I'm lonely. Realizing the terror of it, the feeling of complete lack of relationship with anything, I'm afraid of it. So I run away from it. I



suppress it, control it, all kinds of things I do. And the loneliness still remains. Because then I ask myself, 'What shall I do about this?' Right, sir? I read books, I read, etc., which means what? I am still in the same relationship as I was before, with regard to loneliness.

Q: Yes.

K: Loneliness hasn't been resolved. I'm still in the same position as I was before when I went round escaping from it. And I'm still in the same position when I ask the question, 'What shall I do about it?'

Q: Yes.

K: Which means I don't see that loneliness is the action of my thinking which has brought about this division, because I thought I must be a great man, I must do this. You follow, sir?

Q: If I might just continue on that point, Krishnaji, just at that point. You see, the stumbling block, I found, the stumbling block is that from the moment of being aware of the symptom and then, as you suggested rightly, the 'I' says, 'How can I deal with it?' My point is, the question which is organic and totally asked, which the 'I' is asking, has an electrifying speed, it is born so fast that you can't get hold of it.

K: Of course, of course, because it is part of our illusion. So, you see, sir - no, please, sir, just listen. Have you see that you are escaping from loneliness?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait. Which means you are acting upon loneliness. All right. And you see you can't escape from loneliness. Wait. Next, you say now I'll not escape.

Q: Sorry, may I correct that. I'm not saying I can't escape.

K: Ah, well then we're lost. Then we're lost.

Q: What I'm saying is my escaper continues to escape from loneliness.

K: Then we have to investigate why the mind will not face the fact.

Q: Yes. That's it.

K: Will not face the fact that I am silly. Now wait a minute, go slowly. Is that fact that I'm silly the result of comparison? Take it slowly, I'm going slowly into it. You are bright, you are intelligent, you are this and that, and in comparing myself with you, I say, 'My god, how silly I am'. Wait, that's one factor, sir. One factor. I'm going into it - piano, piano. Non troppo allegro. What is the other factor?

Q: Isn't it part of the incapacity we were talking about earlier?

K: Incapacity. What is the question we are asking?

Q: Why we can't see the fact, why we can't.

K: Yes, why can't we face the fact - fact, not what I think about the fact. Right? But the fact.

Q: I don't accept being lost.

K: Wait. I'm investigating. The fact. Look, I say the fact is I am silly. Is that fact the result of comparison? Obviously.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, no, don't agree so quickly. If it is the result of comparison, if I don't compare, am I silly? You follow, sir? If I have no comparison at all, what am I then? I don't know.

Q: Exactly.

K: Wait, wait. Which means what? I am incapable of facing the

fact because you have pointed out to me that you must be intelligent to face the fact. Intelligent, without fear, or whatever the word you like to use. To face a fact I mustn't run away from it, obviously. But my whole education has been to run away from it. Why can't I face the fact? Because of education or I have lived all my life comparing myself with somebody else. I'm going slowly. Is it I cannot face the fact because I have not the capacity for it? Ask yourself, sir. I have the capacity now, you follow? I've understood what capacity is. Is it I cannot face the fact because I don't know how to look. Right? Slowly, slowly. I'm exploring, sir. Is it a fact I can't face the fact because I don't know how to look at it?

Q: Now you've already looked at the fact that you are isolating yourself.

K: That's all.

Q: You've already seen that. Now how come you can't see that fact? What happens?

K: You see - I'll tell you how I do it. Not through the observation of escapes, controls, and all that, I say, loneliness, isolation, because of that, my daily life. So my daily life changes completely.

Q: Yes, but that's the jump. That's not true, you didn't do that. You said, what am I going to do about loneliness. Yes. You yourself skipped that.

K: No, sir. I myself expressed the question of others. No, don't brush it aside, don't brush it aside. I am not lonely. I won't go through that. Cut me out as a person.

Q: Ok, forget you. Let's go back, now we have seen the isolation, then we go to - I'm going to do something about that, I'm

going to go to the movies.

K: You go to the movies, but when you come back home, it's still there. So can you face the fact? That's what we're discussing. Which means, can you face the fact without running away, looking at it correctly, without any deviation, which means, can you look at it without any motive, which is deviation and so on. Can you look at a fact? Can any of us look at a fact that one is violent. Take that fact. Fact, that one is violent. Can you face it? Sexually, competitive, doesn't matter, you know, violent.

Q: But do I have to compare to see that I am violent?

K: What?

Q: Do I have to compare to see that I am violent?

K: No, I went to comparison through another matter. I'm violent. You know what violence is, getting angry.

Q: How do I know what violence is unless I have a comparison?

K: No, sir, getting angry is violent, trying to be something when you are not, is violence.

Q: You see, we're used to working through comparison, that's part of the difficulty. Part of the difficulty is working through comparing what I see of violence with what I see outside as violence. And so we work in the world of ideas. That's one of the chief difficulties.

K: Look, sir, Mr Smith, I'm asking, can you look at a fact. That's all we're concerned with for the moment. Can I look at the fact of my loneliness, not running away from it, not trying to find an answer for it, or trying to have a motive to say, 'Look, what am I to do with it?' Can you just look at a fact and keep looking at it?

Q: The point is that most people find this very difficult.

K: That's right, sir. Most people find it most difficult to look at a fact; look at the fact that you're jealous, look at the fact that you're violent, look at the fact that you are ugly, both externally or inwardly, or you may be most beautiful and look at the fact, in the mirror. To look in the mirror and not compare yourself with somebody else who is more or less. So what happens? Can you look at that loneliness, without any deviation, without any motive, just look? Now this is most difficult. You follow, sir? Because observation is the movement of thought, which is deviation. I wonder if you see?

Q: Yes.

K: I'm just discovering what I said.

Q: Well, this, Krishnaji, is again the problem, the observation of thought.

K: No, I don't want to enter into that for the moment. Just a minute, sir, purposely, because it's complicated enough.

Q: So it's always...

K: Yes, sir. Look, can I observe my loneliness. And hear all the noise, the emptiness, the silence, the inwardness of it - observing means also listening. Can I do that? It might tell me, it might tell its content, you follow? If I know how to look, if I know how to listen to the thing that I call loneliness. It may be the most extraordinary factor involved in it. But if I run away, escape, and all that, it's not telling its story to me, it's not revealing its story.

Well, sir. So you find it awfully difficult to face a fact, face the fact that I've told a lie. And not say I told a lie because this, protecting somebody, you frightened me. You follow? But the fact that I told a lie. See how extraordinarily difficult it is, sir, isn't it?

Why? Answer me, sir. Why? Why is it so difficult for most of us to face a fact?

Q: It's only difficult when it refers to oneself.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: If it doesn't refer to oneself it's easy enough.

K: That's right, sir. I am lame. I won't accept the fact. I met a man once - he had no hand, right hand. So he put out his stump, he said, 'Don't be frightened, I've no hand'. You follow, sir? He faced the fact that he has no hand, and said, 'I don't mind, shake my stump'. He said that.

Q: I think it was rather inconsiderate of him.

K: Can I face the fact that I am absolutely nothing. That's the - you follow, sir? This is really...

Q: That's the key point. The key point.

K: Can you face the fact that you're absolutely nothing? You know that is really...

Q: All the problems are solved.

K: What, sir?

Q: There are no more problems.

K: No, no, there is. No problem, but there is something much more when you come to that point. Point not verbally but actual fact - the fact that you're nothing, your clothes you've got, ideas you've got, beliefs you've got, experiences, all those are words, words, words.

Q: What makes it difficult is that you are always comparing.

K: No, sir. I'm asking, just say, I can't do it. That's simple. I cannot face the fact that I'm absolutely nothing.

Q: I've not discovered yet what you mean by nothing.

Q: Yes.

K: Oh, no, I can tell you. All the structure that you have built about yourself, the speaker, tremendous knowledge, a violinist, pianist, all this is what - what are they?

Q: You mean not nothing but a miserable human being?

K: Yes, sir. The professor says you may be nothing but you're a miserable human being. No, you don't see, that's why we never face the fact that I'm that, as he points out, I'm a miserable human being. My quarrels are petty, my relationship with my wife is so tawdry, misery, confusion, I never face it.

In India they've got a marvellous solution for this - karma, past life. The whole Asiatic world is soaked in this ignorance. In the past life I did something that was wrong, therefore I'm paying for it now. Or, I'm living in a good palace because I did very well last life.

So, why is it so intolerable to face a fact? If you tell me that I'm really an ignorant fool, actually you tell me that, and I say, all right, let me look. I am not frightened, I want to find out if I am an ignorant fool, or it's your reaction which makes you say that to me. I want to find out. Which means - you follow, sir? - I've got intensity as passion, as he pointed out, because I'm not satisfied with things as they are, in myself.

So now, can I face the fact that I'm frightened, and not do a thing about it, just face it. Can I? Can you? If you face the fact, then a whole series of enquiries begin, real enquiries, not intellectual, verbal enquiries. That is, I'm facing the fact that I told a lie last year and I'm frightened that you might discover that lie, because I've got a reputation to keep up, that I never lie. But I have

told a lie and I don't want you to discover it. Can I face that fact without any sense of guilt, without any sense of saying, it was right, I should have lied because of this, that and the other? Just to know, look at it. See that gives you tremendous vitality. Has, if I may ask, has it given you that vitality, that sense of drive, with passion? Say, I've faced the fact, it's finished. I may lie but that's over, you can tell everybody about it, if you want, you follow, sir? And I'm out of it.

I think we had better stop. Tomorrow is a holiday, for everybody. For me too. I have to go to the dentist. So we meet on Saturday. Shall we go on with this fear question?

Q: Yes.

K: Right.



## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH SEMINAR MEETING 16TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: May we go on with what we were talking about the other day, the day before yesterday morning. How difficult it is, we said, to face facts, facts being that which is actually taking place now. The word 'actual', not the potential or the possible but as in French, what is now, what's going on. And for most of us it's very difficult to face that, without any distortion or deviation or the division between the observer and the observed, the actual thing that's going on, and the one who is watching that which is happening. That's what we came to in our talk the other day. Shall we go on from there?

Q: Sir, you said something the other day which I hope you'll go into a little bit more. You said, thought is a deviation which had many implications in seeing the fact that...

K: Yes.

Q:...is a deviation.

K: That's right. We said, yes, we'll go into that presently. May we go on with this, most of us want to? Can we, each one of us face the fact, the actual reaction which we call fear. That's what we're discussing, the whole question of fear. Watching it without the interference of thought, which naturally distorts or moves away or deviates from that which is actually taking place.

And is there the division between that which is happening psychologically, inwardly, and the one who is observing what is taking place? That's the question we must seriously go into, because where there is division between the observer and the

observed, or the thinker and the thought, there must be conflict, there must be contradiction, there must be either control, suppression or running away - the observer imposing what he thinks is right according to his value, his tradition, his conditioning. So we must really understand this question very carefully and deeply, whether there is such a division between the actual reaction that is going on within us, when there is fear, and the one who says, 'I am afraid,' and so there is separation from the entity or the thinker that says, 'I am different from fear.'

Because, you see, this is a question which leads into rather complex things, which is, if the division exists, then the doer, the actor, the observer, the thinker can operate on that which he is observing. Then he can control, shape, alter. And that's what, traditionally, we have been doing. And we're asking now, is such a division between the observer and that which is actually going on, is it a reality. We have made it into a reality because it's become our tradition, our habit to divide, 'me' and the 'not me', we and they, my belief and your belief and so on. Now is this an actual fact, that that which is happening, can it be observed without the observer, without the one who says, 'I can do something about it.' Then if it can be done, then you will remove entirely and completely the whole question of conflict between this and that. I hope I'm making myself clear.

Please don't listen to me, I'm nobody. But let us, each one of us, find out the truth of it.

Q: How about the question, Krishnaji, that when something is happening you actually can't observe, you cannot observe? In other words, if I get up and I have an inclination to run down the road, or

I have an inclination to hit someone, that inclination, if I observe it, has already happened, the observation has already actually happened.

K: That's it, it's already happened and therefore the observer created it. But as it is happening, which is the fact, that's what we are discussing, not after it has happened or before it will happen, but actually as it is happening.

Sir, if we are interested, if we are concerned with the question of struggle, conflict, then we must find out if it is at all possible to eliminate in life every sense of conflict, in oneself, in one's relationship and so on. Is that possible? We say - I say it is possible only when the division between, psychologically the division between the observer and that which is actually going on, when there is no such division, then you eliminate altogether conflict. When there is such division, the observer then can analyze that which is happening, and go into the whole process of analysis and so on, which we won't go into for the moment. But if it is not, if there is no actual division, then that which is happening undergoes a radical transformation. That's all my point.

Q: Sir, in that observation, would you define, maybe say that there is a certain degree of thought in that.

K: No.

Q: But what is it....

K: You've made a statement - let's make it clear. When we observe - when there is division, then thought is in operation. Thought then can say, 'I will control it, I will run away from it, I will suppress it, I will analyze it,' and go through all that process. When there is no observer, who is the very essence of thought

which is the past - I don't know if you are following all this - then there is only actually what is happening. Can that actuality, the fact, be observed without the movement of thought? If the movement of thought takes place, then you're acting from the past, and therefore distorting it, deviating it, run away from it and so on. Full stop.

Q: Sir, but can we describe that examination? We need the qualities of thought which are from the past, which are value judgements, which are associations, if we can say that when the observer and the observed are not separate, that those qualities are not present, then what is going on?

K: Find out! Don't ask me. I'll tell you, if we can discuss this, you see, if you say, what's then going on, you're asking an abstract, hypothetical question.

Q: No, I'm trying to find out if there is a, quote, thinking, not the one who is thinking.

K: There is no according to me - I may be totally wrong, I may live in an illusion, etc., etc., but I don't think so, when I say, then there is no operation of thought at all. Then there is pure observation. Just a minute. And in that observation the thing which is being observed undergoes a change, a movement, a mutation.

Q: I think you're wrong there.

K: Good!

Q: I think it's that observation - I think there is pure happening. It follows, this is followed by observation. But the pureness is in the happening, not in the observing.

K: I don't follow this.

Q: In other words, if I say to you, 'What do you see in this

room?'

K: Just a minute, sir. What is it you don't agree with?

Q: I think that the happening is the primary thing, and observing is something that follows on

K: I see. That is, the happening at the moment of anger, there is no observer. Only the observer comes into operation, into function, a moment or a second later. Obviously. Then the operator, the doer, the thinker acts upon it, and then the whole problem of conflict arises. Now can you observe that happening without the whole rigmarole of thought coming into it?

Q: Only if one is interested and not on the defensive, against the fact.

K: What?

Q: Only if one is really interested to see, not on the defensive against the fact at all.

K: I don't quite understand, sir.

Q: This happened to me following your last talk.

K: Not my thought. I won't - please forgive me.

Q: Sorry, I didn't make myself clear. I was accused of something, a fact, that I'd done something I should not have done.

K: You see, the moment you say, 'I should not have done'.

Q: I was accused of something that they said I should not have done. You see. And I looked at that moment at what was being said. And it was true, what was being said. My relationship was with the truth of this observation.

K: So - no, not my relationship with truth. I am angry. Right? Suppose I am angry, there is anger, not I am angry - there is anger. Can I - is there an observation of that feeling, that reaction, without

the whole movement of thought coming into it? That's all my question.

Q: Sir, for the most part there isn't. Most of the time there isn't. Most of the time there is the anger and then the observer looking at that anger, and thinking that it's separate. So could we take a look at the process by which we move from that state of the observer being different from the observed, to where the observer would be the observed. In other words, that the observer being the observed is not the normal state, is not the normal frame of mind, is not the normal consciousness. So could we take a look at how that could come about?

K: Scott, would you consider for a moment, observing that which is happening now, just to observe. Can you do it? Can I observe my jealousy, can one observe jealousy as it is taking place, not say it's right or wrong, or rationalize it, why it should not be, but just to, as it arises, as a flower blooms, just to watch it.

Q: But when you ask, can I observe...

K: Not I.

Q:... there already is the division.

K: No, that's a way of talking which is - please - not I - all right. There is jealousy. Is it possible to observe that reaction which is called jealousy without the movement of thought?

Q: In other words, can there be constant awareness.

K: No, I don't want, in other words. You see, the moment you go off into something, then it becomes - 'what is awareness' and so on - complicated.

Q: So the moment you use the word 'observe it', can one observe it or whatever, there's a duality implied.

K: I've said that, sir, observer implies a duality. Agreed. But try it. Just a minute. You are jealous, sometimes. What is your actual feeling now?

Q: Bafflement.

K: Wait, bafflement, puzzle - can you watch that puzzle, that state of the mind which is in puzzle, just watch it, not say, 'I must be clear, what he's talking about,' just watch it, see.

Q: There seems to be a physical resistance.

K: What?

Q: There seems to be at some point a physical resistance to that, to that watching.

K: Why? Is it physical? The gentleman says there is a certain resistance, physically, to watch. Because you're not comfortably seated? Or it is happening in the bus? Or when you're walking?

Q: No.

K: Are you saying there must be certain relaxation to observe?

Q: No, I meant some disturbance that you feel in the body, a physical reaction.

K: To?

Q: To be watching.

K: Why should there be?

Q: I don't know.

K: I'm asking, sir, why should there be a physical reaction to watching? Maybe, I don't know - please, all of this is supposed to be a discussion in which each one of us takes part, not one or two and the rest keep silent and listen.

Q: I'm going to ask you, actually, when you, for instance, I think you were saying, if you're looking at fear, just trying to watch

it, you're saying there's a physical resistance. Is this what you're saying?

Q: Not especially of fear.

Q: Because I would have thought the reason is because you want an answer, the mind always seems to want an answer to a problem instead of just opening out.

Q: When you start staying with something, at some point there's like a refusal, physical refusal.

Q: We can't hear back here - sorry.

Q: I'm sorry. It seems that at some point when you kind of started to stay with the fact, there is a physical refusal in your body to go along with that.

K: Because that refusal may be the result of strain. Just a minute. Don't say, no. Or your body's not comfortable. Or there is a certain sense of resistance to the intensity of watching.

Q: Perhaps, yes.

K: Physical resistance to watching intensely. Because perhaps is it, that we're not used to watching anything intensely? The moon, the sky, the trees, whatever it is? To watch. Now, can we put the question differently - apparently this seems to be rather difficult, all this. Why should thought interfere with anything, psychologically?

Q: Somehow time comes in.

K: Just a minute, sir.

Q: There are the extremes of jealousy, the immediate of that seems to be, well, if I indulge the jealousy, what's the result of it.

K: All that's implied thinking, isn't it? I'm asking, can I - is there an observation - the moon - without the interference of thought?



Q: It is a state of mind. It's a state of mind, awareness.

K: No, don't, please, sir, don't introduce state of mind, awareness. I'm just asking, can you watch the moon without thought drawing a curtain across it? No?

Q: Occasionally.

K: Yes?

Q: Occasionally.

K: Occasionally? All right. Can you watch a movement of cloud, occasionally? Now can you watch your reactions in the same way?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes, this morning I have occasionally the experience of...

K: Not you, sir - just to watch something without any movement of thought.

Q: Krishnaji...

Q: Sir, a subjective experience inside oneself, isn't that of necessity a kind of thought?

K: Why?

Q: Because it's inside, it's not an outside thing that you can just look at and not indulge in thought about it.

K: Because it doesn't affect us.

Q: Well, it...

K: Unless we are lunny.

Q:.... is in a sense an abstraction, it's going on in the mind.

K: So can I - can there be an observation without abstraction? Put it ten different ways.

Q: Would it be called observation?

K: Do I give up, or do you give up?

Q: There can be and there sometimes is, but it's infrequent.

K: Sir, may I ask another question. Has it ever occurred to you, whether it is possible to live without any conflict?

Q: That's totally different.

K: No, it is not, it's not.

Q: I am not the moon, there is a division.

K: No, sir. I move the same thing, which is, we live in conflict. Right? Now I'm asking a question related to what previously we talked about, the conflict between me, the duality - I'm asking the question, is it possible to live, if you have ever asked yourself, without conflict. Have you? Between yourself, your wife, between yourself, and somebody else and conflict within yourself.

Q: Yes, and one says, why should there be conflict, one is implying...

K: What, sir?

Q: When one says, why should there be conflict, one's implying that there mustn't be.

K: Have you ever asked yourself?

Q: Not until you suggested it the other day.

Q: Yes.

Q: Not until you suggested it was possible.

K: So, I suggested it. All right. Have you found out whether that is possible or not possible?

Q: It is possible

K: No, then it is not - you're already saying, it is possible, then you've blocked it. Or if you say it's not possible, you have blocked it. But to find out whether it is possible to live without conflict implies there should be no division. Right?

Q: Yes.

Q: I do not agree.

K: What don't you agree with?

Q: The division between me and the moon...

K: No, moon...

Q: Yes, you talked about the moon.

Q: There's no conflict there.

Q: There's no conflict, that's right, but there is the division.

K: No - the moon doesn't very much affect us, unless we are peculiar, neurotic - the moon does affect them. But we're not peculiar, I said it's easy to look, one may look at the moon intensely for some time, because it doesn't affect us deeply. But I can equally observe - can there be observation of our reaction without any shadow of thought? That's what we're discussing.

From that arises whether it is possible to live a life without any sense of conflict. And conflict exists wherever there is division. Right? The Jew, the Arab, the Dutch, the Malays, the English and so on, division, national division, psychological division, religious division and so on. So as long as there is a division in oneself there must be conflict. That's obvious, sir. Right? You agree, sir? If you say so, how is one to eliminate that conflict? They have tried different ways, that is, identify yourself with god, god will save you, abandon yourself to god, some principle, or surrender yourself to something greater, forget yourself. We have tried all those various systems which we hope will eliminate this conflict. Right? But it hasn't. Right? So I'm asking a question, which is, as long as there is division in the observer and the observed, there must be conflict, because there is division. Right?

Now, is that division artificially created by thought or is it actual? You follow my question? If it is actual - you understand - which is not an illusion, not a fancy, if the division is actual, then I must live for ever in conflict. One must live. Right? If the division is not true, accurate, factual, then as there is no conflict - right? - then the very thing which is being observed undergoes a change. I cannot put it more differently.

Q: Sir, what one is observing is often thought itself, so are you saying that the change comes about in thought itself?

K: Yes, sir. Can you observe - not you - can thought - please, just listen for fun - can thought observe itself?

Q: We acknowledge thoughts going through our minds.

K: No - not through our - I'm asking a question which is, is there an observation of thought by thought? Or can thought itself be conscious of its own movement? One thought can say, I'll watch the other thought moving. And so control it, shape it and so on. But I'm asking a different question, which is, can thought be conscious of itself as a movement?

Q: Are you saying that the whole of thought is conscious of thought?

K: What, sir?

Q: Are you saying that the whole of thought is conscious of thought, not one part of thought?

K: That's right. Thought.

Q: Not just the essence, the whole of thought.

K: Thought, thought is - the whole of thought.

Q: Yes, but usually we say one part of thought is conscious.

K: Of course, You've understood? One thought is part of the

whole. So can thought, which is the whole, be aware of itself?

Q; That raises the problem - you have said before, thought is always fragmentary.

K: Yes, sir - no. Thought is fragmentary. Right?

Q: But not always?

K: Wait. Can thought which is fragmentary, can that thought be aware of itself?

Q: But then that thought is the whole.

K: No, wait - particular thought. Let's - leave the whole for the moment, because that leads to a little more complex. Say you have a particular thought - no. You have a particular thought, a thought, a thought. Can that thought be conscious of itself. Not, another thought is conscious of it.

Q: That thought has to be conscious of itself, but if it moves it cannot be conscious of itself. It becomes another thought.

K: I don't quite follow this.

Q: If you say thought is to be conscious of itself...

K: I'm asking, sir - let's leave out thought. Can consciousness be aware of itself? Consciousness being the whole content, thought - I say I don't want to bring in whole and all that.

Q: Can any kind of consciousness be aware of itself, or must it be a particular kind of consciousness. In other words, could the kind of consciousness which...

K: Look, Scott, just a minute. You know what your consciousness is, do you?

Q: No, not fully, no. Most of the time I'm just caught up...

K: No.

Q:... it's operating.

K: No, if you look - please, just listen. Your consciousness is made up of its content. Right? The content is your jealousy, anxiety, fear, love, hate, sexual demands, the whole of human endeavour, struggle, pain, pleasure, sorrow, death, and so on. The whole of that is made up of all these little parts. Right? Can that consciousness be aware of itself? Or is that not possible?

Q: And would you differentiate this from thought, is this something different?

K: No, I've moved away for the moment.

Q: It must be. You see, the whole of it, the whole consciousness must be aware of itself, no particular aspect of it.

K: Yes, put it that way if you like.

Q: But what in the world can that mean, the whole of consciousness being aware of its whole self - what does that mean?

K: I don't know. What does it mean to you?

Q: There are two ways...

K: No, what does it mean to you? Don't ask me.

Q: To me it means a confused entity looking at itself.

K: I give up.

Q: To me it means a confused entity looking at itself.

Q: Krishnaji, could I just ask you, isn't this a matter of seeing something, understanding something false which is going on in the mind and that coming to an end, and then the possibility of something else? If I think now about being aware of my whole consciousness, and I make effort to be aware of my whole consciousness, I mean, that's just, you know, that has no meaning.

K: You know we began by asking - Thursday morning, the day before yesterday - can we observe a fact. Right? The fact, we mean

by fact that which is actually taking place. Not a second later, or a minute later, but actually that which is going on, which is happening, not happened and then observed. But the very happening itself. Right? That's what we were discussing. Let's stick, let's forget all that we've said.

Now that's all I'm asking. I'll put it in ten different ways. So that is the central issue that we're trying to talk over together, and find whether it is possible to look at, to observe that which is actually taking place. That's all.

Q: Krishnaji, can I just ask, would you say that really it's simple to do this, really in essence it's simple to do this. Would you just say it's a simple thing to do? This is what you're saying, how I interpret it or it looks like to me. Thought comes into the mind, that's all. There is the thought. That's the fact, there's no movement, nothing, just aware of the fact.

K: It's more than that, sir.

Q: Is there more?

Q: May I ask, when you say observe what is actually happening now, at first it appears that what is happening takes time, when thought comes in, then another comes in. Is that what you were talking about when you say what is actually happening?

K: I'm lost in all this.

Q: Can I...

K: Good, sir - come in and join us.

Q: Is what you're saying, that there must be a form of immediate apprehension in observation which is then followed rapidly by thought but which precedes thought?

K: That's right.

Q: Do you apprehend a feeling, then you move away from that feeling, for a thought.

K: That's right. That's right. Can you as the Professor pointed out, Mr Wilkins, can you apprehend that which is happening. It seems so extraordinarily difficult. Am I cuckoo, or what?

Q: I experience the fact that there is so much movement which rarely tells what is happening. If something's happening it's really happening.

K: Let me. Sir, look.

Q: Really happening.

K: No - we have been envious, haven't we? Now wait a bit. You know what the feeling of it is. Can you - is there an observation of that envy as it arises, just to observe that which is happening, this, called envy.

Q: Can I put it a different way? What about, let's start with envy. Now a real actual event, envy, is before any observation, in other words, it really happens.

K: That's what the Professor said, sir, that which is happening.

Q: Right.

K: Now can...

Q: Stay with that.

K: That's it, stay with that.

Q: No observing.

K: All right, I'll use another word - stay with that.

Q: OK.

Q: Don't bring time into it.

Q: It's just being a feeling, isn't it?

Q: You just feel it.



Q: It's just being a feeling.

Q: Therefore physically and psychologically there is something that may be called envy. Is that right?

Q: Just a feeling, surely just a feeling. And as soon as the thought comes in...

K: Sir, we began by asking, we were talking about fear. Can you - is there an observation of fear as it is happening? That's all. To put it very ,very simply, after a lot of words.

Q: Well, the funny thing is, as soon as I observe, it seems to go, it's hiding, it disappears.

K: Now does it disappear so that it doesn't return, ever?

Q: I don't know.

K: Or is it something, because you are observing with attention and it goes.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, wait. So it's only when there's inattention fear comes.

Q: Very much so.

K: So, then what is that attention?

Q: It's like space, isn't it?

K: What?

Q: It's like space.

K: No, it's not like - what we're saying is, what is that attention?

Q: You have simply taken the focus off the sensation of fear and onto, and focusing on something called attention. Therefore the fear diminishes. Like looking at that wall instead of looking at that wall.

K: No. As the gentleman, as he pointed out Maria, please, don't explain it away, just see what he is saying. He says, when I attend

to that fear, it disappears. And I ask, we asked, does that fear return, in another form. So doesn't that indicate - I'm just asking - that when there is attention, fear is not. So can I attend fear, which is taking place, with that attention. You follow, sir? We're putting it ten different ways.

Q: Can I put it this way?

K: No, I want to stick, not your way.

Q: No, I know, but if I am confused, and if I stick with my confusion, now the confusion may disappear but I don't know any, I still don't know anything, I'm still in the same state.

K: No. I am - one is confused. And I watch, and I attend to that confusion, look, attend, give attention to that confusion. For the moment it is not. So I've learnt something, which is, when there is attention, confusion is not.

Q: Yes, but did he put his finger on something important there, which is the fact that the way you say it, when there is attention, confusion is not, but equally there is something there that is not thought, in other words, there's a new state.

K: That's all, sir.

Q: But that new state is really thought. He seems to be going away from that.

K: What's that?

Q: He said he was in a new state, when confusion...

K: Not, he was in a new state.

Q: Right. Yes.

Q: But sir, you asked, what is this attention, this most extraordinary thing, this attention - I don't know what it is, I can't find out, but I know it is an extraordinary thing. I do not know

what it is.

K: We can go into that, sir. Let me put the question differently. Can you, when there is fear, can you - is there an attention of that fear, attention. That's all I'm asking, we are discussing. When there is attention, will there be fear? So does attention contain or hold thought?

Q: No.

K: Wait.

Q: Krishnaji, there is implied when you say can there be attention there, that there is no movement of thought. So...

K: You have to find this out, sir. That is, I'm asking, is there in that state of attention any movement of thought?

Q: It merely seems to me that this attention doesn't belong to me, it's a non-physical or...

K: It is not yours, that's all - I agree. It's nobody's.

Q: But Krishnaji, here is the brain, say it's feeling fear or whatever the emotion is. Now the attention comes about. What is going on, the brain is looking at it.

K: Would you want to discuss that?

Q: Yes, I do.

K: Wait, Maria, please for god's sake go slowly. I don't know, you may be interested, but the others may not be interested. So I'm asking. When there is attention, she asked, what is going on in the brain. Don't you want to find out what goes on?

Q: Yes.

Q: I'd rather understand how attention comes about, rather than what is happening.

K: Wait. We can come to all this slowly, please.

Q: Does this attention use the brain?

K: Is attention to be learnt? Practised and repeated?

Q: No. It's there.

K: I attend, there is attention about something and that thing disappears. Then I say, 'By Jove, I've learnt something, I'll attend, I'll keep on attending, and practise attention'. Then it's nothing, then it's gone. Right?

So, Maria asks, what is the quality or the state of the mind, the brain, when there is total attention. Right? Are you interested in this?

Q: Yes.

Q: It's very active, I think.

K: What?

Q: Highly active. The brain is highly active in that state of attention.

K: I don't know, we're going to enquire, sir, we're going to - don't let's state anything definite. What do you say, Dr Bohm, and you, sir, you're all experts at this. What is the quality or the state of the brain when there is total attention?

Q: Does the brain become quiet?

K: The brain, you suggest, becomes quiet. Wait, sir, wait. Does attention spring from quietness or you're... you see.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, Tunki, don't - I don't know - we are enquiring, old boy.

Q: Sir, it's a funny thing, as soon as I have intention, why does everything disappear?

K: Wait, sir - that's not the problem. Please, we're asking...

Q: I want to look at it.

K: What is the state of your brain, the brain, when there is complete attention?

Q: Nearly nothing, quietness?

K: Why are you looking at me? The bird in the cage?

Q: Or is it attending to something?

K: I want to find out - one wants to find out what attention means, and if there is such a thing as attention, what is happening to the brain. That's one of our questions. Right? Right, sir?

Pundits?

Q: I think we must say that, the brain, the people who do research on the brain don't really...

K: What, sir?

Q: The people who do research on the brain don't understand attention, and they admit it openly.

K: What? I don't quite follow.

Q: I said that the people who work on the brain do not understand what attention is, and they admit it.

K: You see, are they working on the brain objectively, something over there, or the brain here.

Q: They work objectively.

K: Then we'll have gone off to something else.

Q: But children have attention naturally, don't they?

K: What?

Q: As children.

K: I don't know about children, don't bring in children.

Q: Sorry.

K: This is important to discuss. I want - don't you want to find out, sir, for yourself, what this attention is, and what is the quality

of the brain - your brain, not objective brain under a microscope, and operation and all the rest of it - what is the quality of it when you are totally attentive.

Q: It doesn't produce...

K: Don't say - please, sir - we haven't...

Q: Don't we have the most evidence for inattention?

K: What?

Q: I think we can look at inattention, because we don't have attention.

K: All right, look at your inattention.

Q: Are we talking about a focused attention? In this case on inattention, if you like, or something. Or are we just talking about something without focus called attention?

K: Are you attending when one is speaking to you?

Q: Yes.

K: I'm speaking to you now. Are you attending?

Q: Yes.

K: What do you mean by attending?

Q: The attention is focused.

K: No - what do you - Maria, just listen carefully. Don't say, attention - just listen. You are listening now to me, which means, I hope, you're attending. What do you mean by that word 'attending'? Don't say focusing, just find out. Which means you are listening to what I have to say, we both of us know English, therefore you are able to understand the words, and you know the words are not the thing that he is trying to convey. Right? So you're not caught in words. And you are listening with your ears, and also observing what is being said through your optical nerves and so on. So your

whole nervous, physical organism is alert, listening, watching.

Right? Would you call that attention?

Q: Well...

K: Keep it simple, don't say, well - there's lots more I can add.

Q: That's it, that's rudimentary attention, it seems to me.

K: Just keep to one thing.

Q: In that is left out what to me is the whole of...

K: Emotion.

Q: Well, emotion...

K: What would you call?

Q: The cerebral whatever it is going on in my mind, my eyes are not important, I can pay as much attention if I close my eyes. But what is being said is registering in the brain. And some process is going on.

K: You see, you're going off, you're doing something which - it's impossible to talk. I'm asking, when you listen totally, is there registration?

Q: Yes.

Q: No.

K: I cannot - one says yes, one says no, you say yes. Is there? Find out before you answer.

Q: Is the first stage one of a positive, open-minded receptiveness?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: That is the initial stage.

K: Yes. Open-minded, that's a rather different word, open-minded generally means a mind that is like a sieve, everything pours in, everything, you follow? But I'm asking something, very

simple, sir.

Q: It seems that there is a sensory sensation, and then the words take a quite different place.

K: Sir, I'm asking, do we attend to anything, attend?

Q: If we were attending now, we would understand you.

K: Not me.

Q: Well, we would understand what is being said.

K: You'd understand your own - you'd understand what attention means, not what I mean by attention. Do you know what attention is? Maria says, attention implies focusing. You are focusing on what I am saying, and therefore you think you are attending. I say that is not attending. I may be wrong, but I want to question, presently. That is, when I listen to you, in attention, something that you are saying seriously, there is immediate - there is no registration - immediate understanding.

Q: How can there be no registration?

K: Wait, find out what I've said.

Q: I think perhaps our problem is that our thought is so quick, it comes in so quickly.

K: I know.

Q: And in a way that seems to be the problem, it's so quick.

K: Is it that we don't listen?

Q: Yes, I think we always move away one step.

K: Wait - do you listen to the fact, to this statement, I'm making a statement: can you observe - is there an observation of that which is actually taking place. That's the question, that's a statement. Do you listen to that? Or do you say, 'What does he mean by attention, what does he mean by fear,' wait - 'what does he mean by



observing.' So you're off.

Q: Yes, that's what happens I think.

K: Whereas, can you listen to that statement, and the impact of that statement, and in that attention is there any registration at all? There is verbal communication, we have understood each other, English, but is there the registration of the statement, the meaning of that statement, the effect of that statement in your observation, and all the rest of it.

Q: Are you implying, to do something with what you've said. You made a statement. Now I've got to understand the statement.

K: No. No. Wait a bit, sir. I say to you, I love you. You say, 'Just a minute, let me understand what you mean. You mean love, what, sexual?' You don't go through all that circus.

Q: No, but..

K: No, I'm asking.

Q: You said, can I observe something.

K: I'm asking, no, I'm asking something. When a woman or a man comes up to you and says, 'I really love you.' And he means it, not just some kind of trick to catch you or something. When there is a statement made like that, with full meaning, 'I really love you,' - do you go through all this mental process?

Q: No.

K: I don't know, you may - probably you do.

Q: The funny thing, at such a moment, there is complete...

K: No, sir - I'm asking - it's not what is taking place. I'm asking if I may - I'm not being impatient, sir, but you're not answering my question - how do you listen to a man or a woman who tells you from his heart and means it, that he loves you. What takes place?

Do you register that statement? And remember it? And say, 'Yes, I remember you told me you loved me.' You follow, sir?

So I'm asking, in registration - I mean, in attention, is there any registration at all? In attention, when there is attention, there is already a focusing, but it is not the focusing of concentration.

Q: Does it help at all to draw a parallel between this giving out of attention and the giving out of love?

K: Aren't they both the same, sir?

Q: Yes, that's what I'm getting at.

K: Yes, aren't they both the same? When a man or a woman comes to you and says, 'I love you,' because he's so tremendously - you follow? And you say, 'Yes, jolly nice, but tell me all about it.'

Q: I'm much more interested in the lack of attention, because that's the problem.

K: What, sir?

Q: I am more interested in the lack of attention because that's the problem.

K: Lack of?

Q: Lack of attention.

Q: Attention.

K: Lack of attention.

Q: Because that's the problem

K: No, that's not the problem.

Q: It's my problem.

K: No, say it's not your problem, it's all our problem.

Q: All right.

Q: Krishnaji: could we say that when someone comes up and says very sincerely that they love you, could we say that there is an

impact?

K: Yes, and then what?

Q: Well then, how does this impact differ from a registration?  
In other words, this has an effect, there is an impact of some kind.

K: Look, Scott, just listen. Would you listen to me for a minute, a second. When I say to you, I really mean it, 'I love you,' is there an impact?

Q: Yes.

K: No. Is there? Or what - tell me your own thing, what takes place?

Q: There seems to be something - one wants to hold on to it.

K: Yes. So, you're not listening to what I'm saying, you're listening to your own reactions, your own responses, say, 'How very nice of him - he's a nice man, he's a beautiful man, I'm so glad.' But you haven't received what he has told you.

Q: No, I don't agree with that, I think something has happened, something actually happens when you say it, something happens, something to carry forward. There's a whole - millions of events have occurred.

K: That's right, sir. As he, Mr Wilkins pointed out, attention may be love. And when there is attention which is equal to love, do you register? Now, most of us are inattentive, not attentive. Can you move inattention to attention. You follow, that's your question, sir. Can you make inattention by some miracle, turn it into attention. Or be aware of not attention, that very awareness is attention. Capito?

Q: Yes.

K: You know, we are going off from - you see how we refuse to

face a fact. That's all I'm getting at. We refuse to face the fact that we are frightened, frightened animals, or human beings, or lovely human beings. We are frightened. Can we look at that fear? Can we pay attention to that fear? (Pause) Well, sirs?

Q: Well, to do that, one must be in step with fear, pay attention to it, and then if one's in step, there's no step before, no step afterwards.

K: That's not - you know what fear is?

Q: Yes.

K: Both physical and psychological. Can you observe that fear as it is taking place? That's all.

Q: I'm always afraid when I'm not attentive.

K: So you're afraid of not being attentive. Now face that fear.

Q: That's attention itself.

K: No, look at it, don't say attention, look, this, - just find out if you can look at that fear.

Q: If I'm afraid of losing attention, I'm seeking for attention, surely.

K: Of course, then it's all gone. What do you say, sir?

Q: It seems to me that what just happened here is that there was attention when you said what you said, then somebody said they started trying to hold onto it. And it seems to me that that's there were the fear is, right when you said, 'I love you', a thousand things that happen and might be there in the fear.

K: I don't quite follow.

Q: There is fear in what happens when there is attention.

K: Look, Dr Shainberg, my question is very simple, I'm going to keep on persisting. You're all deviating from that question. Can

you look at your fear? Stay with it, stay in the sense, no thought deviating from that fact, the fact being what is going on, that which is happening, the actual, the actual is the now. Can you watch it - use the word 'focus', whatever - can you observe that thing without any movement, both physical and non-physical.

Q: Sir, the difficulty is, as soon as I do that, it disappears.

K: Which means, sir - we've been through that, sir. We've been through that. It disappears because you're attentive at that moment.

Q: Then what happens?

K: Then, does that fear recur, come back? Then you say, I must be attentive and it will disappear. So you play this game. So we have learnt a trick for the moment, that being attentive to that thing, it disappears. You have learnt the trick, so you practise that trick, but that fear hasn't gone.

Q: Right.

K: Which means what, you have merely learnt a trick, a mental trick. I want - one wants to find out, if one is at all awake, intelligent, to say is it possible to be free of fear altogether, not this superficial trick of attention and disappearance and coming back and so on, that's all too - I want to ask you a much more serious, fundamental question which is, can fear disappear altogether, never to return. Otherwise I'm playing games.

Q: You automatically enter into the field of desire, I think.

K: No, fear, I don't want to enter - please, sir, stick to one word, and then go into it. When you say desire, of course desire has its fears. There are many forms of fear, desire and so on. Don't - we're talking of fear at the very root, the fear at its very root.

Q: Suppose I say no. To me the answer is no.

K: Then what will you do, just live in fear?

Q: I don't know.

K: But that's what you're doing, when you say I don't know.

Q: That's a fact - I don't know.

K: So, no, when you say, 'I don't know', the thing goes on, under you, like you're on a bridge which says I don't know but the water of fear is flowing. Now can you stop that water, fear, end it.

Q: If presumably that fear cannot be stopped, well then we automatically accept it, I can't stop it, let it go. And then that's when it disappears. But that is something we can't attain.

K: You see, you're talking of attainment, you're talking of stopping - I know, I say I want to understand the whole movement of fear, how it arises, what is its structure, nature, the whole works of fear, I can't stop it, because who is the entity that's going to stop it?

Q: Something different from fear

K: Is it? You see, you just invent these things, you don't - we've been through that, the entity that wants to stop it is part of fear. So he's playing a trick, he's mesmerized, living in illusion, when you say, 'I'll stop fear,'

Q: Sir, being attentive twenty four hours a day.

K: I never said that, sir.

Q: But I am saying that, that will end the trick, because then it won't come back.

K: So be attentive the whole twenty four hours.

Q: Sir, isn't it related to doing nothing?

K: Do nothing - Tunki, you pick up a phrase out of its context and say, 'Do nothing.'

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, Tunki, this is my point. May I repeat it again. One is afraid, there is a great deal of fear in life, of many, many kinds. We are not dealing with the many kinds, but fear itself. Just a minute. And what is this fear, how does it come into being, whether it is possible to end it, not I stop it - is it possible to end it. That's my whole question. How does it arise, what is the root from which it springs. Right? What is it's beginning. I know what the ending is, darkness, you know, all the rest of the ugliness of fear.

So I want to find, is it possible to find out the root of fear. What do you say is the root of fear?

Q: The sense of identity.

K: No, root, sir, root. Identity takes place when there is fear. Because I'm afraid to run, afraid of this thing, I must cling on to something which will get rid of it. I'm asking, please, sir, what is the beginning of fear?

Q: Being inattentive.

K: No, don't use...

Q: Sir, isn't it when you feel insecure in any way, that fear?

K: Is it - is the root of fear the desire for security? The root of fear, to find some absolute, indestructible security? And as there is no such thing, so, you're back again: what is the beginning, the root, the source of fear?

Q: Thought.

K: Who says it?

Q: I do.

K: What, sir?

Q: Thought.

K: Have you found this out for yourself? Or are you repeating what this person has said. What do you say, sir?

Q: I say that, when you say something to me and I really listen to you, there is an event, that at that moment fear is born, that's all I can say.

K: No, look sir.

Q: There is an event.

K: No, no - don't call it an event. Just between the two of us, talking casually or seriously, I say, Look, Dr. Shainberg, what is the beginning of it? It seems to be, everyone has it, the child, the grown-up man and the young man, and every human being has some kind of this tribulation, this movement, which we call fear. We both of us agree what it is. And I say, look, what is the beginning of it? Like a river, you know where it begins, the source, it gets wider and wider, or narrower and narrower and dies. But we're talking about the river, which widens, goes on. And I say, where does it begin?

Q: Deception, isn't it deception? Illusion.

K: Is it from illusion? Illusion of what, who has created this illusion? Who has created this deception? And the gentleman said, the real root of fear, the source, is thought.

Q: Fear comes with time, the idea of time.

K: What?

Q: When thought is time, that's...

K: No, thought - just hold on - for a second - is that so? I've stated many times, I may be wrong, but I've stated it, and I wanted to prove that I'm an idiot and live in an illusion, that the whole movement of fear comes through thought. Thought which says, I



must have security, thought says I must be attached otherwise I'm lost, thought would say, where is there security? And invents beliefs, gods, Jesuses, Christs and the Buddhas, you follow? All that. So we say, the root of fear is thought. Show it to me, sir.

Q: Well, my sensitivity is that you can say that to me, and that doesn't add one inch to my illumination of the fact that when you say to me, 'I love you'...

K: No, you're not listening to this. No. You're not listening to it. It is as potent as 'I love you.' It is as vital as the other. Which is, thought is the source of fear. Do you listen to it? No. You've all kinds of conclusions - that's all. I said I may be wrong. I want you to show me I'm wrong. Which means that you first must listen. And you can't listen if you say, 'Sorry, I disagree with you, you're this and you're that and you...'

Q: I think the only suggestion I have about your being wrong is that maybe that the thought, that it is lack of love which precedes the thought, rather than the other way round.

K: All right. If it is the lack of love, then how am I to get it?

Q: That's a miracle.

K: No, I think there is. It's not a miracle. I won't say Jesus will save me, mankind has not been saved by any Jesus's

Q: I'm not suggesting the miracle is impossible, but it seems to me that you are suggesting that there is a possible miracle.

K: There is, but we don't capture it, we don't listen to it.

Q: The way we are listening now, there is no fear, but the moment we rest, I'm wondering what's happening.

K: No, that's not what I'm saying.

Q: It comes in.

K: No, I'm saying, the source of fear of every kind that human beings have is born from thought. Will you listen to that statement, as you will listen when I say I really love you? Because it's too simple your mind immediately says, 'No, that's too damn simple, it's not, it is much more complicated than that'.

Q: Actually my mind says it's too complex.

K: What?

Q: I say, if you want to know what my mind actually says, 'That's too complex' my fear.

K: Yes. So - no, I'm interested to find out the source of it, not the river that is flowing, the source.

Q: In thought being the source, it implies behind that is the self-preservation.

K: I said - is it self-preservation. We said that. Self-preservation, all right. Is that the source of it, that is, security, physical security. Is it possible to have complete physical security? Never to be ill, never to have to go to the dentist. (Laughter) I have been there a dozen times - never go to the dentist, doctors, the organism functioning healthily all the time, which is to have complete physical security. Is that possible?

Q: That's what thought is trying to do but thought fails.

K: Thought says I must - that's right, sir - thought says that - I'm asking, we're pointing out something, sir, I want to find - perhaps if you can tell me what the source of fear is and I listen to you with great attention, because I want to, really want to find out if fear can disappear totally from my whole thinking, living, acting. Then you say, thought is the source. I listen to you, I don't dispute it, I don't say it is right or wrong, I'm going to find out. But first I must listen

to it without any abstraction. Then I'll see how extraordinarily complex it is, and in the complexity of it, I may lose it's simplicity.

So I say, thought is the fear. Thought is fear. Thought is time. Thought is measure. I have lived, I have had no pain, now I'll go to the dentist and have pain. It has measurement, and therefore I'm frightened. And thought is time, because tomorrow, I've had pain yesterday and I hope to god tomorrow I won't have it. Time. Right?

I'm afraid of death, which is, I'm living now, death may happen. Or I'll invite death and live with it, life and death, I say, are together, I can play all those kind of tricks. But it's still thought. Thought has invented all the churches, all the contents of the churches, the symbols, the Jesus's, the rituals, the dogmas, everything. And the Christian world, Jesus will save, save quotes. Then I'm afraid that Jesus doesn't exist, ho's going to save me? You follow? Thought has built the most marvellous cathedrals, and the most absurd religious illusions inside.

So, show me, as we said, I may be totally wrong, show me.

Q: It seems that thought combined with the instinct of self-preservation.

K: No, show me if I'm wrong, Tunki.

Q: Well, you can think of something else...

K: No, I'm asking a simple question - answer it directly. If I'm wrong, I like to destroy what I think is true - it may not be true but you may show me that I live in illusion - I'm willing to examine it.

Q: First...

K: Or if this is true, why don't you take it.

Q: There is some..

K: No, don't argue with this - why don't you, if it is true, then

what is truth you also must take. If you want to find out the ending of fear.

Q: What is the source of animal's fear?

K: What, sir?

Q: What is the source of animal's fear?

K: Not animals - please, sir, it may be thought, it may be there but only instincts - don't enter into animals, please.

Q: I think it's the truth, what you say. What's the next step?

K: What, sir?

Q: I think what you say is the truth. What is the next step.

K: Next step is, if that is the truth, and I say it is the truth, don't accept it, please, for god's sake - I'm not your guru, or your philosopher or your analyzer. I say, that is the truth. Then, the whole question arises, can thought come to an end.

Q: But for me it's not true.

K: Tunki, look, I'm asking - don't go off to something else, Tunki, old boy.

Q: About fear, I mean, its not fully so.

K: What is not fully so?

Q: There are things which we don't like, like say, we don't know.

K: What?

Q: There are things which you don't want, you don't like.

K: You don't what?

Q: We don't want, we don't want, we don't like.

K: We don't like and what?

Q: Say pain, physical pain.

K: Can you - you've been to the dentist?

Q: Yes. I have also great fear of dentists.

K: Can you at that moment of pain, just remain with that pain, not think about it and say, 'My god, tomorrow', just say, 'Yes, he's drilling, pulling' - all the stuff that goes on,' hold it. The last two months I've done this. Sir, just a minute, Dr. Bohm asked a question, which sir, they don't, they won't listen, they go on with their own ideas. Dr. Bohm asked if that is so, that is, thought is the source of all evil, fear - then what is the next question. The next question is, this movement of time as thought, and thought as movement of time, can that stop?

Did you listen to that? Won't you ask naturally that question? If thought is the very root of this fear, then can thought come to an end? Not how can I stop thinking. Now will you tell me the way or the method to end thought, but if you see the truth that thought is the root of this fear, all fear, then your next question would naturally be, healthy question: can this movement of thought as time, time as movement of thought, can this whole movement come to an end, unwind itself?

Q: I find myself asking another question, which is in a sense, Krishnaji, is the other side of the side of that coin, it's the same question. How does thought begin?

K: What?

Q: How does thought begin?

K: Oh, that's fairly simple, sir. What is the beginning of thought. I don't have to tell you, you can watch yourself. The pleasant experience is registered, brain, unpleasant thing is registered. So all registration is the beginning of thought.

Q: Yes, but I keep registering.

K: No, therefore you ask, is it possible to end registration.

Q: If thought is always time or future, if you only operate in the actual, you're not actually beginning thought.

K: I haven't understood, sorry. What does she say, sir?

Q: She was saying that thought is the past and the future, so..

K:... it's time. I said that.

Q: Yes, but if you are operating in the actual, you are operating without thought. But I think the problem is, for me the problem is, that I am continually up against registration.

K: Sir, we are asking first - is that statement, the root of fear is thought, is that statement valid. You haven't found that out. Or am I imposing on you, a statement which may be false, which may be inaccurate, and therefore illusory. So you're caught up in that illusion, if you accept. If you don't accept, and say, 'Look, is that so?' Go into yourself, find out.

Q: Shouldn't one distinguish between different types of fear, psychological fear and other types of fear which may be natural like survival fears or...

K: Yes, sir.

Q:... fire and that kind of thing?

K: I said fear. If violence comes tomorrow and hits me, all right, I'll take it. But to be afraid that it might. Dr. Shainberg you have disagreed with it. I know if you agree with it, all your analytical structure collapses. Forgive me.

Q: Does agreement...

K: No, wait - forgive me, he's talking, he's going to say something.

Q: I don't have anything to say.

K: What? Would you please, this is really important. I must stop now because I said we must stop at one o'clock and now it's past one. We'll continue tomorrow, but this is really an important question. If fear comes from the beginning of thought, which is, the beginning of thought is registration, the registration is the memory, collected through millennia, or the memory gathered through the last few days, from that arises thought.

Then the whole question arises, is there a possibility of not registering, psychological events?

Q: Do you think it is possible, sir, that I register because my listening is focused.

K: No, no, Mr Jenkins, please, I'm asking a question - you have to think about it, you can't just say yes or no. It is something, a scientist puts forward, you don't say, yes, right, wrong and no, I don't - you follow? He puts it out for you to study it and say, look, you're wrong, you're nonsense. What you're saying is so absurd. I haven't said the whole of it, I've just stated one simple fact: as long as thought moves psychologically, there must be fear. That's the root of it. And thought is the whole movement of registration in the brain. So can - I'm asking a question - is it possible not to register, psychologically, anything?

Q: That can only happen if you have understood.

K: No, no. Sir, just, not - if you have understood.

Q: When.

K: When you have understood - no. Just see the truth of it. Either the truth or the falsehood. Then from truth you can argue, you can explain, it will always be true. But if it's false, equally your explanation will be false.

I think we'd better start tomorrow, don't you?



## **BROCKWOOD PARK 5TH SEMINAR MEETING 17TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: I think we began by asking ourselves, in the first dialogue we had here, whether one can be a light to oneself. And that problem was never touched upon. Then from there we went to the question of relationship, what actually our relationships are with another. And we went into that question rather briefly and from that observation of our relationships, we talked about fear, fear of losing somebody, not being attached to somebody, and all the misery and confusion and the broken-hearted affairs that come about. I don't know why you call it broken heart, but it's rather silly. And so on.

Then we talked about fear, what is the root of fear. And somehow I feel we are not facing the problem, which was, can one observe the fact, the happening, the actuality which is the now, whatever the reactions, the attachments, the fears - can we face them. And I'm afraid we've never gone into that question, we've never held onto it, investigated it to find out for ourselves if it is possible at all to observe what is actually taking place, the happening, whatever that happening is, whether that happening is imaginative, actual reaction, the potentiality of it, or the possibility of it, and so on. We never stayed with that question.

So can we go into that this morning? Do you want to go into it? Please, sir, it's all up to you.

Can we face, for example - we'll leave fear, we'll come back to it later - face the problem that we're attached to somebody. Attached, cling to, look to, hold on to some belief, to some dogma,

to some ritual, some belief, some experience, or some person. Can we observe the actual implications, the actuality, of attachment. I don't know - please, sir.

One is attached to - we'll go through the whole business of it - one is attached to one's experience, from which there is certain remembrance, knowledge, and holding on to the knowledge, experience, the memory of it - holding on, never letting go. Or some ideal, cling to those ideals; all the politicians, all the priests, all the bishops and all the rest of the whole business, they all have ideals. And we all, some of us have ideals too, and we hold onto them, which is a form of attachment, form, other forms of belief, certain routine and so on. And principally in our relationships we are attached to a person. Can we watch, stay with that fact that we are attached and watch it. And let the attachment, the whole nature of attachment, reveal itself instead of you telling one must be attached, one must not be attached and so on. Can the story of attachment, can it be revealed by observing it. I don't know how to put it. From which arises fear. I might lose. And from that loss, I feel hurt, broken-hearted, or wounded, jealous, anxiety, the whole nature of attachment. Can you remain, watch that, and let the story involved in that reveal itself? (pause)

Perhaps that might be very complex and rather difficult. Can you watch, observe and remain with what is going on, what is happening, such as fear. And why is it we find it so difficult to remain with a fact?

Q: Krishnaji, I think one of the difficulties with watching attachment in relationship is something you brought up on the first day, I think, and that is that the very participation in the

relationship obscures the fear, somehow or other, as long as the relationship is there, the real facets somehow are covered over. It's like, let's look at it very practically, you go into a day and you experience things in a strange way, and then the relationship is there to run back to. You can always hide in the relationship.

K: Yes, so what are you trying to say, sir? I don't quite follow.

Q: I am trying to say that relationship acts like an umbrella, under which all experience occurs.

K: In that, under that umbrella of relationship, isn't there attachment?

Q: Yes.

K: Now can you, can one stay with that, watch it without any deviation, and let the thing that you are watching tell its story, rather than you tell it what it should be. You follow, sir, what I mean? Can you do that? Can one do that? So that it reveals everything. Like a flower, when you watch it very, very closely, there it is, you see everything in its detail, the delicacy of the vein, you know, the beauty of the whole thing. In the same way, perhaps, if we could watch this burden of attachment - I won't even call it a burden, attachment - it may contain an extraordinary beauty in it, and go, from that move. But apparently we can't do it. Why not?

Q: Sir, could we go into just what's happening in that observation?

K: Slowly, slowly - would you kindly tell me.

Q: Because in itself, the definitions of thought in all this, is hard to understand. If you observe something, you let the thing as you say, speak to you, unfold and reveal itself. But in that process it would seem, at least to me, that there is a moving of thought,

taking it in, seeing it, examining it, seeing the different parts, the different action of it. Now is that what you're talking about as thought, the destructive element of thought. Because to watch the action one has to feel it, one has to see it working.

K: No, Maria, I'm talking of something else. Just a minute.

Q: Well, what do you mean by thought?

K: I want to, go into it - may we go into all this, or are you not...

Q: Yes.

K: Don't you watch a flower in the bud, then as it blossoms fully, and then a few days later dies, collapses, vanishes. In the same way, perhaps, if we could watch this sense of attachment, let it flower, without you telling it, thought telling it what it should do.

Q: Then, do I understand you correctly, that where the word thought that you are using in this sense, is a sort of censor coming in.

K: Yes, the censor coming in - put it that way.

Q: And there is something else which for want of a better word I'm calling thought which is that seeing.

K: I don't, I have no feeling, I have no thought, I'm just observing.

Q: But what if you're observing something that isn't an outside thing like a flower, you look at it and it's there. You're looking at something within yourself. Therefore there is a movement of that attachment or whatever it is, going on in the mind, in order to look at it. Now is that thought or not?

K: No.

Q: Krishnaji, I think Mary is raising an important point. If you are actively involved in attachment, who's going to do the

watching? I'm attached, I'm quite clear here, every part of my life is organized by the attachment, now how am I going to watch that? I have been watching attachment but there's always going to be a piece that's going to get away, as long as I am in that situation of attachment.

K: All right, sir - let's go into it slowly.

Q: We can't...

K: You answer him, please.

Q: Let me ask Dr Shainberg, can you see that very thing happening? Can you see that involvement, as part of the whole thing you're looking at?

Q: No, that's just what I'm saying, I don't think you can, as long as there is always ingredient, in other words, in many observations it's almost that the urgency of life is absorbed by that attachment. And it's only if you stop the attachment, that's a different thing, then that's removed. but as long as the attachment is there, I don't think you ever see it, because you're attached.

K: Are you saying, sir, the very attachment prevents you from observing?

Q: Right.

K: Is that what you are saying?

Q: That's it, in simple terms.

K: Is that so?

Q: I just see the problem being that the past immediately rushes in, it seems to automatically habitually rush in.

K: Yes, I understand, but, Dr Shainberg is asking a question which is, when one is attached to somebody, when I'm attached to you, can I be aware of that attachment? You follow? Go on, sir,

you answer me, please - I am attached, one is attached to somebody. Do I know I am attached? Or I discover I'm attached through pain. Let's go slowly - through pain, through jealousy, through anxiety, then I realize I am attached. Right, sir? I have realized that I am attached, which means I know I'm attached. No?

Q: No, I think that your experience of the pain, jealousy, and anger is a reaction, not a real awareness, you're reacting to the loss, the moment that you have lost the attachment.

K: How do I know I'm attached, sir? Let's begin with that. How do I know I'm attached? I'm very friendly, etc., etc., and I live like that. And how do I know, how does one know, that one is holding on, having put a hook in somebody, holding on to that. How does one know it? You tell me, as a friend, 'Look, you're going, be careful, when you get involved with tremendous attachment, you're going to pay for it.' Right? I don't pay much attention to you, because I like this attachment. I like this feeling that somebody owns me, I own somebody, you know, possessed and be possessed. And there is a sense of gratification in that. How do I know that it is attachment? The actual fact, not the word. How do I know? I don't know till something happens in that relationship.

Q: But Krishnaji, don't I know because my attention is drawn in one direction, it's not in...

K: No, I'm not interested, in whether I am in one direction or another. Let's stick to one thing, sir. That is, I only know when there is some kind of discomfort, some kind of pain, some kind of, you know, quiver.

Q: Insecurity?

K: Insecurity. Call it what you like. Now it's only then I say, 'I

am attached, this is coming from that.'

Q: But Krishnaji, I think what Dr Shainberg is saying, if I've understood correctly is that what you're seeing is not the attachment, you're seeing how you are reacting.

K: So, wait - I've said that, which is, we are explaining to each other, that is, the reaction I have as pain, in attachment. So this whole process, can I observe, is there an observation of this whole thing, this happening, whatever word you like to use, the actual state and the nature of it, instantly? You follow, sir? Or must I go through years and years of pain and I at last give it up - for goodness sake. Break it. You follow, sir? Now, I'm asking, that is a fact, there is pain, there is the reaction, which is, the reaction to attachment. Right? Does one realize all the implications of attachment by observing it, not letting thought wipe it away or distort it. Just watch it. Can't you? Is that not possible?

Q: Isn't the potential of pain immediately there if you examine attachment?

K: Pardon?

Q: If you look at attachment, you immediately perceive the possibility of pain in it.

K: So - That's what I'm asking, why is it we can't see the whole implication of attachment instantly, and finished. Where is the difficulty in this?

Q: Are you saying that attachment we see from its consequences, and therefore we infer the attachment - but you are asking that we might see the attachment unfold from the bud.

K: I don't quite follow you, sir.

Q: You said that we see attachment through its consequences -

right? Not directly.

K: Yes, consequences.

Q: And infer the attachment.

K: So through consequences we realize attachment.

Q: But on the other hand, is there the origin of attachment, the bud from which it unfolds - are you suggesting that we see it from the inception?

K: Yes.

Q: Directly.

K: That's what I'm asking. Why can't we see it, the whole nature of it, instantly?

Q: From its inception. From the point of its inception.

K: From the point of inception, the whole story of it.

Q: Yes.

Q: In point of fact, though, because we see it from consequences, we don't go to it direct, we go to the solution.

K: Yes, sir, I know, that's what - yes. Either through consequences we realize we're attached, or we have instant realization what attachment implies and end, finished. Which is it we do? I wish you would stick to this.

Q: Do we really want to end the attachment, because surely...

K: Sir, wait - I'm not asking whether we end it - why don't we see the nature and the structure of attachment instantly, all its implications. That's apparent, we can't do it. But what we generally do is consequences, and then realize I'm attached and therefore pain.

Q: And then fix it up.

K: What?



Q: Fix it, Fix it up, in other words.

K: Yes.

Q: I think pain is the obstacle in every direction, because surely we became attached in the first instance because we felt here is one person who's not going to hurt me. And then when we feel we've lost that, we're going to be exposed to other hurts, we've got no refuge.

K: Yes, sir, but can you watch your attachment, sir? You or any of us, can we watch our attachment?

Q: Sir, this implies that we have to learn to watch.

K: Do it now, sir, not learn and then - see. learning implies, doesn't it, that you have accumulated knowledge and then watch with that knowledge.

Q: Are you going to suggest that there's another kind of learning where you listen and observe and learn?

K: Yes. You see, sir, what is happening now? We are dissipating by talk, by words, by explanations, so we're not actually saying, 'Yes, I am attached, let me look.'

Q: Krishnaji, when I try to do that my mind immediately brings an abstraction of what it is, and then I find myself looking at that, I'm not looking at the real thing.

K: So, which is, that you're making an idea of attachment and not the actual fact. Is that what you're doing? Or that is just an idea for you. Is that what you are actually doing and not looking at attachment.

Q: That's what is happening and perhaps we could go into how that happens, how can one step out of that.

K: I don't know. Let's first watch it and then see what happens,

whether it continues or whether it stops. Let's first remain with that fact and let the fact tell its whole story. Gosh, how difficult this is. I am attached to my wound, psychological wound, suppose. I like that wound, I hold on to it, it gives me some anchor around which I can worry, I can fuss around, you know, carry on the game. Can I watch that wound which I have received from childhood and let the whole thing flower, without you making it flower or denying it, controlling it, loving it, holding onto it. Let that thing flower and see what happens.

Q: It's a very painful thing to do.

K: Is it? You see what you've done - you've told it. You have told, 'That's painful'. It may not be. I said, let it tell the story, not you say it is painful.

Q: Pain is surely a completely subjective thing, I just feel pain, full stop.

K: What?

Q: Pain is such a subjective thing, psychologically, that I just feel pain.

K: Pain is the consequence or the effect of attachment. So when you say it is painful, are you watching the thing, or you have said, 'It will be painful'.

Q: Isn't there a chain in all this, the attachment is arrived at as a defence against another thing, pain, whatever it is, so that there's a series of attachments.

K: Yes, but - please, can you remain with the fact.

Q: Attachment is so many things - we are attached to so many things.

K: No, please.

Q: I don't know which fact to stay with.

K: I am trying to ask, if I may, etc., etc., ask whether the mind can remain quietly observing the fact, observing 'what is'.

Q: My curiosity must be greater than my defences.

K: What, sir?

Q: My curiosity must be greater than my usual defences.

K: You see, you are telling, you are again talking what you might - your curiosity, your effort - you're not observing it.

Q: That's what I meant by being curious, to see, to look, rather than the automatic.

K: That's it - look, look.

Q: The looking comes out of curiosity to see.

K: No, there is no curiosity, sir. What is the difficulty in this. I'm at a loss.

Q: It was our first question, Krishnaji. We said why can't we, or why don't we look at a fact.

K: That's all I'm saying.

Q: We're not any closer, or I'm not any closer to seeing why.

K: I think, sir, we are using, we are trying to avoid the issue.

Q: Yes.

K: I think we are trying to, because there is a sense of apprehension about it. What might happen, which again, you follow?, which prevents you from looking at the fact.

Q: Are we saying that fear prevents us from looking at facts then?

K: It may be fear, may be that you're not really concerned about watching. Or you like the state in which you are. You follow? Don't disturb me, for god's sake. I am attached, I am wounded, I

am this - don't disturb that because I'm used to it, and I like that, I am wounded or attached, that gives me a certain sense of security. You follow? Don't disturb that security. Is that what is happening? No? Then what is happening, why can't we look, without all this verbiage.

Q: One problem is, it's very difficult to see the attachment here, in this room. In this room the attachment is sleeping.

K: Throw out attachment, sir, you have something or other, why can't your own feeling of anger, jealousy, whatever it is, just watch it.

Q: It's the same problem, whether its jealousy, or attachment or whatever - you're in the room, you're in a certain state of attention, and the attachments are outside, when you go out.

K: You see, you're not watching.

Q: I agree.

Q: I think one of the problems, Krishnaji, is I don't think we can get at it by going from consequences. It seems that there has to be another kind of watching.

K: There is, but you're not willing to. I think the watching through consequences is absurd, it has no meaning.

Q: That is a deviation in itself.

K: Yes. Whereas, I've said all this, sir, now please watch. Can you watch the fact, because I think this is very important, if we can understand this very seriously and integrally, the thing that we call fear may disintegrate through its own flowering. You follow? Look, sir: I am - one is angry. And when we are angry, at the second of anger, there is no identification with it at all. A few seconds later the whole business of identification, I should, should

not control and all that arises. But in watching without any movement of thought, actually, watching, then in that watching let anger - anger flowers, blooms, expands, and withers away. That is what I want to get at. So that instead of suppressing it, which makes it stronger, by watching it, it expands, the chapter comes to an end, the book comes to an end.

Q: But as he said, we can see that as an abstraction quite easily.

K: What?

Q: As he said, we can see that as an abstraction.

K: What?

Q: The problem, the anger, here and now we can see anger as an abstraction - but we are not angry.

K: No, I took that as an example.

Q: Yes, but it's the same for whichever example you take.

K: What?

Q: It's the same for whichever example you take.

K: Yes. What are you trying to say, sir?

Q: If we are angry - right? - the problem is we're caught in the anger and the reactions of the anger and so on. OK. Here we are not angry, here we are not attached.

K: What are you doing here - all right. What are you doing here? Would you kindly tell me, what you're all doing here?

Q: Maybe we could look at the fact that we're not quite meeting, understanding each other.

K: No. I'm asking, why are you here? Absolute silence.

Q: To understand oneself.

K: Comment?

Q: Se comprendre soi-meme? To understand.

K: Comment?

Q: To know oneself?

K: Is that why you're here?

Q: To learn.

K: What?

Q: To learn.

K: To learn. But you're not learning. You repeat. Learning implies that you listen. Right? Learning implies that you're sufficiently curious, sufficiently intense, sufficiently eager to find out, learn. But apparently you're not, because you have been telling me what the flower is. Right? We're not learning at all, we're not learning from each other, we're telling each other what each one of us thinks.

Q: So we are attached to what we think.

K: That's all.

Q: And what you think.

K: What I think.

Q: I think we are...

K: I haven't told you what I think.

Q: Oh yes, you have.

K: I have not. I have not told you what I think.

Q: Oh yes, you have.

K: All right, sir - since you know it, would you kindly tell me what I think. (Laughter)

Q: I know that game. (Laughter)

K: That's a very good question - please think it out, why are you here. You're free, you came here - why? As Mr Maroger said, to learn about oneself. Have you learnt anything about yourself?

Q: Yes.

K: Learnt what? At a superficial level? The top layer? You don't have to come here to learn the top layer. You follow? So have you learnt about yourself, learnt all about yourself, not just one layer of yourself - the whole content of yourself. Now, the whole - can you watch - coming back to the same thing - can you watch the whole content of yourself? Don't throw it away with a lot of words. Can I know myself totally - all my anxieties, fears, sorrows, pain, my psychological wounds, my attachments, my hopes, my fears, my longings, my loneliness, my - you follow? - the whole of it.

Q: Can you?

K: Do you want to learn about it?

Q: If you can. If you did. It seems so difficult.

K: No, my question, sir - you said you came here to learn about yourself. I say, have you learnt anything? Or have you just scraped the surface and say, yes, I've learnt a little bit. That's not, that's not good enough. So I'm asking in return, can you learn all about yourself, not over the years, the months and days till you die. Can you learn about yourself completely now, as you're sitting here.

Q: That means we'd have to see the root of ourselves.

K: No. You see, you're going off to something else.

Q: Sir, perhaps we could go into what happens when you ask that question.

K: Yes, sir, ask yourself. I'm asking you, again, can you learn about yourself, which is very complex, intricate, subtle thing, completely.

Q: But I can't answer yes or no. Right? I can't, I have no means to proceed.

K: No, I've asked a question, sir. Do you want to learn about yourself completely?

Q: If you say, do you want to learn - of course.

K: Wait - what is your reaction to that question. Can you say, of course?

Q: Is it possible - one asks, is it possible. You've asked a question...

K: Yes, I've asked the question.

Q:... do we want to learn about ourselves. My response to that is, how is this possible?

K: If I say yes, what will you do?

Q: I still don't know.

K: So you want to learn about, learn - no, learn whether you can have an insight into the whole nature of it. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Then you can learn. Right? Is that what you're...

Q: That's one thing.

K: Yes, sir, I'm asking generally. Is that what you want to do, learn - please listen carefully - learn the whole nature and the structure, which is a movement of yourself. That's why we have come together. Is that it? Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Right, sir? Right. Now who is going to teach you? Please listen carefully. Who is going to teach you? The man sitting here?

Q: No.

K: Why do you say no?

Q: Because I have to learn for myself.

K: What do you mean by that? You see, you're not, you're not



carefully watching what you're saying. It's extraordinary. You say, you've said, no - you can't learn the entirety of yourself from me, from the speaker. One has to learn from oneself. Is that so? Wait - remain with the question for two seconds. Is that so?

Q: I think the trouble is we are relying on someone else to do the work for us.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: I think we say we want to learn about ourselves, and understand ourselves. But actually we want somebody else to do the work for us.

K: Yes, you're saying, really, I can't do it by myself, you tell me all about it.

Q: I think that's what happening, yes.

K: Yes, that's it. You want me to do all the work and then you listen to it, and then you take it home with you or not.

Q: And in that way we make it into an idea.

K: Yes, so, are you depending on me?

Q: Yes, I think we are.

K: Why?

Q: Because we feel we can't do it on our own.

K: No - why? Why are you depending on me to tell you, to teach you how to observe the totality of yourself? Is it a habit, depending on another? Is it tradition? Is it what you have been educated into - to accept another to help you to understand the totality of yourself?

Q: Sir, it's a state of immaturity - it's a state of being immature.

K: Immature? Yes, if you like to put it that way. But, sir, look, it's very interesting, this, if you go into yourself. Who will teach

you? Or the whole question is wrong.

Q: There is no 'who'.

K: What?

Q: How can there be a 'who' to teach me. How can there be a 'who' that will teach me when I want to learn, not from information but from the inside. I'm learning about this person.

Q: Krishnaji, I think there's another piece here that you've added, I don't think you're being radical enough about it.

K: What, sir?

Q: I say, I don't think you are being radical enough about it, because what you're really saying is, no one really wants to learn.

K: That's all.

Q: But that's quite a radical statement.

K: Nobody wants to - I was being too polite. Sorry.

Q: I'd like to ask you - please don't jump on me, because...

K: I won't jump on you, old boy - I won't jump on you.

Q: I've often heard you say this about understanding, all about myself, instantly. Now I find with myself that whenever I'm approaching anything I'm approaching it in a very separated way, like I talk, I try to find out about relationship, and then I try to find out about attachment or fear. And I would like to ask whether this whole approach is wrong - this whole approach is self-repeating, approaching things one by one, because there are so many things, you know, one can go on and on in this way. Or whether there is a stage where one prepares oneself to learn how to question, learn - you use the word 'art' of questioning, to learn how to approach things, to learn how to see.

K: What are you trying to say, sir?

Q: I'm trying to say, I'm trying to ask you whether before one can see, come to this point where one is looking at everything together...

K: Yes, looking at something holistically, as a whole. Is that what you are trying to say?

Q: I'm asking whether there is something that happens before that, one prepares oneself for that.

K: No, there's no preparation. You see, you're going off to something else. I'm not jumping on you, forgive me - if anybody thinks I jump on anybody, if I do, please forgive me. Do I want to learn about myself? Do I want to know, actually, not theoretically, is it my deep committed, irrevocable interest to know myself? Is that it? Is that what you have? Irrevocable, that you are so completely committed.

Now, just a minute, sir. What is there to learn about myself? Nothing. Right? There's absolutely nothing to learn about myself, because myself is nothing. I've put lots of things on it, on this nothing I have education, science, philosophy, all the things, you follow? - piled it on, all the things religions have said, which are the most destructive things, what religions have done - they have put all this on me, on this essentially nothing. And we're battling, struggling, on these things, you follow? - about these things, changing from one thing to another.

What have I to learn about myself? That I'm crooked, that I don't think straight, that I'm vain, that I'm arrogant, I am proud, I am this - what does it all mean? Words, don't they, memories, ideas. Have ideas any content, except what thought gives to that idea? I wonder if you capture all this. No, this is too radical, as you

said.

Q: Sir, when you say nothing, I have the feeling of an empty room.

K: Oh, sir, you follow - you know the meaning of the word 'nothing'? Not a thing.

Q: That is why it is so difficult because we are still attached to all these things.

K: What, sir?

Q: If we were not attached to things there would be no problem, but being attached to all those things...

K: That's right.

Q:... we don't learn.

K: If you understand, sir, the whole of my existence, the whole content of me, is put together by thought. Right? And thought is memory. Right? So I am living, I am a whole structure made by memory. And I can't touch it. I can't, there's nothing to say. It is totally unreal, living on memory. This is too radical, so I won't go into it.

Q: Sir, it seems to me that the interesting question is how I have made the illusion that I am something. You see, it appears in ordinary life, to each person, he is really something.

K: Yes.

Q: And he creates somehow that illusion.

K: Yes, the illusion created by thought.

Q: Yes.

K: Which is, I am something.

Q: Yes and what?

K: Yes, I am something. When that thing, when that thing is

not, I am nothing. And therefore it is still - sir, when I say I'm nothing, it is still thought. It is not an actuality.

Q: Because there is that illusion that...

K: Of course.

Q:... thought is always creating.

K: So, how do we accept this illusion, why do we accept this illusion, about which we must learn. You follow, sir? Spend years, spend money, books - what? No, this is too radical, I won't go into this, much too...

Q: Not too radical.

Q: It's not too radical, we want to go into it.

K: You don't understand it, then. You understand that it means one has to reject, psychologically, everything that thought has put together. Right, sir? And that's why it's too radical, you won't, I mean, it doesn't - it sounds nice, it looks, it feels, by Jove, there's something in it, but one has to go into it very, very deeply, you can't just say, well, go into it.

So here we are. We all say, I'm interested. Why, I ask. We asked the question, why are you all here. To learn, about oneself. And you say, have you learnt anything about yourself, while you're here? That you are jealous, anxious, fearful, have a position which you must maintain, you have got a, you have been wounded and cling to that wound, and so, kind of - you know, live in that, which becomes totally neurotic and all the rest. Have you learnt anything? Or are we all playing tricks with each other?

Q: Sir, when we say we come to learn about the nature of the self, we are really learning, I mean, learning takes place on that score, it is learning about the nature of illusion.

K: Sir, I am asking a question. Why are you here? I know why I'm here, I'm very clear. Can we be, can you be - just a minute - can you be as clear as that? I'll tell you why I'm here. I want to tell you a story. I want to tell you something which is tremendously important, all the rest of it. I know - K knows exactly what he wants to do. Are you clear? Or you've got innumerable motives.

Q: Innumerable contradictory motives.

K: Yes, that's it - innumerable contradictory - anyhow, have you? Sir, how can we communicate with each other, you follow, sir?

Q: Krishnaji, I feel that the basic difficulty is that to learn, the learning process is twisted, so if we continue in this twisted process we won't, I mean, we won't be able to learn.

K: All right, now, wait a bit - can we take up learning, go into it completely, what is implied, and actually find out what it means to learn.

Q: Because I think implied in the learning process we carry out day to day are the tricks we play with ourselves.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: So we'll be playing tricks all the time.

K: Wait, that's why, I'm asking, do you want to learn?

Q: I would say, to learn about the process.

K: No, to learn - no. What does it mean, the act of learning?

Q: How can you learn if you are attached?

K: What?

Q: Can you learn if you are attached?

K: I can't hear.

Q: Can you learn if you are attached?

K: Oh yes, no, sir - forget attachment for the moment, don't bring that in. Do you want to find out, sir, the art of learning, the art, what it is, you know, the whole business of it. Do you want to learn? What am I to say? If you want to learn, if you want to learn the art of learning - right - what price do you pay for it? Seven pounds a day?

Q: Our reservations.

K: What, sir, look, sir - you go to the cinema, pay ten pounds, five pounds, three pounds, to be entertained, for an hour, two hours. And you come here, and you pay something for lodging. I'm not talking of that kind of paying. What are you willing to pay, not in coins, not in paper, actually, that you say, 'Look, I'll give everything to find out.'

Q: That's a point.

K: Or, you say, 'Sorry, I can't give everything but I'll give you 50% of it, or 25%. Don't ask me 100%. I'll give you 10%'. Is that what we're doing?

Q: I hope no one is coming up against a reservation.

K: I don't - I'm asking, sir - don't tell me. I'm asking you. There's someone who says to me, 'I'll give everything I have to learn, to find out.' Nobody has said that to me, here or in India or anywhere else. Perhaps one or two have. But I'm asking you, out of politeness, kindness, etc., respect, what do you pay for something which is unpayable. So, sir, I'm asking, we come back, how much pay are you giving, how much are you giving to find out for yourself, to stay with the fact. I'm taking, going back to that one thing, because that's very important.

To stay with falsehood, you follow, sir? - with an illusion and

don't call it an illusion but to stay with the fact that one is caught in some idea, you follow? - and live in that idea, work for that idea, sacrifice everything you have for that idea. What amount of energy, which is the pain, are you giving to it, to stay with one fact.

Because, sir, you see, if you want to go into the question very deeply and it's necessary to go into this very deeply, then meditation is to remain so completely with the fact, with what is happening, it is totally dissolved, every reaction allowed to flower, wither away, so that there is no psychological, inward reaction to any challenge. I wonder if I'm talking...

Q: To become totally aware of one's quality or the condition of one's...

K: Yes, sir, can you, can I or you be aware totally of our conditioning, not bit by bit, bit by bit, but the nationality, the superstition, the beliefs, the educated, sophisticated self, you know, the whole thing. There's so much to go in.

Q: Implied in staying with the fact, is the disillusion of the illusion, but the illusion itself is trying to survive.

K: No, it won't, illusion only tries, illusion survives because you are strengthening it by fighting it, by saying I must be free of illusion. But if you say, yes, what is an illusion? You understand? What do you call an illusion. What's the meaning - the word, what does it mean, sir?

Q: The word is ludere, to play, it's to act falsely, to have a false play really.

K: Yes.

Q: That's what is meant.

K: Now I'm asking, what do you call illusion?



Q: A nothingness.

K: Oh no, that is illusion. For you it is an illusion. Do you know, if you go to church, if you are all Catholic, Protestant, all Christians here, except a few, do you know the whole of that is vast illusion?

Q: Are we in church now?

K: No, sir, we are saying, those of us who go to church, or have been brought up in this religion, Christian religion, with their symbols, with their saviours, with their Virgin Marys, with their rituals, etc., etc., is that not an illusion? I'm asking. Would you say anything thought has created, psychologically, is illusion? Right sir? Are we living in that illusion? Now, can you remain with that illusion, let it flower, don't say, 'What is an illusion, what is not an illusion, how can I get rid of it, isn't it good to have a little bit of illusion,' you follow? But just to say, yes, I see I am in illusion which is psychologically, thought has created something which - understand - all that, is totally unreal, reality being that which is touchable, you understand, taste and so on. So anything thought has created psychologically is illusion. Can one remain with that fact, and not say, not let thought move away from that? Of course if you told that to the Archbishop or the Pope, he'd say, 'Don't be silly, I'd lose my job'.

Q: However, it seems at first sight that the self is touchable, it has a sense.

K: What, sir?

Q: It seems to be the illusion that the self is touchable.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: You said reality is touchable, but I think one feels that the

self is also touchable.

K: That's right. You see if there is only an observation of the fact, of the happening, don't you remove all conflict? Look, I am attached, I've seen how attachment arose, all that business. Now I'm just watching being attached to that person. I've seen the whole consequences of attachment, the pain, the jealousy, the suffering, the so-called, absurd broken heart and all that business. Now I'm just watching. And in watching won't it expand? And therefore wither away? So there is no conflict. You follow, sir? Because when we are attached we say we must be detached, and the struggle to be detached. So I've learnt something out of that: attachment and detachment are similar. Right? I wonder if you see.

So if I remain with that fact of attachment, see how quickly it withers, sir? I wonder if you see this, if you do it, actually do it.

Q: I wonder if there's a problem, you see, it's clear what you mean by watching something outside but in a sense it's not so clear what you mean by watching something inside.

K: You understand? Dr Bohm is asking, there are two different kinds of watching: watching something outside of you, and watching inside of you. Isn't there a difference? Now how do you watch - please, discuss - how do you watch something inside yourself, inside of yourself?

Q: To remain with it.

K: No, no - you haven't - I'm asking you, how do you watch it, look at it, observe it, hear the noise of it, the music of it, the story of it. You understand the question, sir? Please understand the question first. It is easy to watch outside. Right? Something outside, like the moon, the trees, the birds, the water, the stray dog

or your pet dog, and so on, or your wife, your husband - it's easy to watch. But is it as easy as that to watch what is happening inside? That's a question, you understand, sir - answer it, find out.

Q: It's not done with the senses, when we watch something outside.

K: Why do you discard the senses?

Q: Sir, I pose a thought, and then I feel some reaction, this is the only way I can watch, I can't watch, I don't watch a whole movement.

K: Look, sir - you've been wounded, haven't you, psychologically?

Q: Mm.

K: Don't say mm. You have, haven't you? Can you watch that wound?

Q: At that time or now?

K: Now, now, don't...

Q: So I must recreate the wound.

K: No, it is there.

Q; I don't see it.

Q: Oh, but it's there.

K: That's just it.

Q: Inside you.

K: Listen to the very interesting thing that is said. He said, 'I don't see it.' Which means what, it is there but he doesn't see it. Why? I have a wound, psychologically I've been hurt, suppose. And that wound is there. I may forget it, I may not think about it, I may have thought of it and don't know, what to do with it, so I say, 'Keep quiet, old wound - I can't do anything.' So, but it's there. So

he says, 'I can't see it.' Why? The wound is psychological, inside - why? You're not...

Q: You only know that you have the wound if you think about, it or something prompts you to think about it.

K: So only when you think about it you know that you have a wound. Is that it?

Q: Yes.

K: So when you don't think about it, it's not there?

Q: It's there, even though you haven't thought about it. It's still there, you still carry it.

K: It's still there, even though you haven't thought about it.

Q: Even though it hasn't come awake.

K: Yes, that's right. The moment you think about it, it becomes alive. If you don't think about it, it is dormant.

Q: Dormant.

K: So it's there.

Q: It's still there.

K: Now, can you see that wound, psychological wound, not physical wound or physical disability, can you watch that wound as it is now? This is a common factor, isn't it, sir? Everybody in the world is wounded. Some cling to it and worship it and adore it and say how lovely it is. Others say, dormant, the thing is dormant, only occasionally it wakes up, and all the rest of it. As it is a common problem, can we all, can each one of us observe that which is common in each one of us. Watch it, I've been, you've been wounded. Is that wound a reality? Reality, let's begin clear: reality in the sense, anything that thought has put together is reality, whether the reality be an illusion, the wound, the

architecture, anything that thought has put together is reality.

Q: Yes, it's real.

K: Reality, real.

Q: It is.

K: Yes. So this wound is a reality. Right? Can the mind watch this reality, and let that wound flower, not control it, suppress it, run away from it, just watching it. I see you can't do it.

Q: I don't think - I haven't understood. If we are only aware of the wound when we think about it, are you saying it's possible to be aware of it without thinking about it?

K: So, think about it, think about it, and it's there then. Right? Now can you watch that thing. And let it come out, you follow? Let the wound tell you all its story, from the first word to the last chapter.

Q: Do we watch that also with the senses? Can we watch that also if the senses - you said before the senses may take a part.

K: Of course.

Q: Could you explain that.

K: You explain it, sir.

Q: I mean, do you feel the sense of the wound, when you recall it.

Q: You mean the physical sense?

Q: Yes.

K: Sir, that brings a very interesting question - I don't know, this may not be the right occasion. The psychological state, is it the result of senses at all?

Q: What do you mean - it's not clear.

K: You understand my question? That is, have the senses put

the thing there, or it lives apart from the senses.

Q: Perhaps it lives in memory.

K: I don't want to go into it for the moment, it's too...

Q: It is a part of the senses - the psychological state is a part of the senses.

K: I'm sorry - don't - forget what I said - let's go back to this.

Sir, I want to find out how to look at my wound, not the physical wound, that's fairly easy, I can observe it, it pains, it hurts, you can do something about it, but the psychological wound, the more I do something about it, the more I try to avoid it, the wound survives, begins.

Now can I watch that wound, which is not an illusion, because thought has created that wound. So therefore it is a reality, a reality as real as the things that exist in a church. Right, sir? Both are real. So can I watch the reality of the wound.

Q: Sir, I can bring that feeling up inside me, I've done that, I've remembered a specific occasion, I've brought it up in me, the feeling how I felt. But you talk about going a stage further, where you've read it from the beginning.

K: Watch it, take time. You follow, sir? You're wounded, aren't you sir, all of us, like all small children, from childhood, the wound has grown, this human relationship, the world and everything is intent on this wounding each other. Or praising each other, you follow - same thing. Now can you watch that. If you watch, doesn't it grow, flower? Doesn't it tell you how it came into being, how it...

Q: It doesn't have the same power, it doesn't hurt so much, just by being with it.

K: Who is very badly hurt here? All right, I'll take it. I'm very

badly hurt, I'm not but I'll take that - I am very badly hurt, psychologically, I have done all kinds of things to avoid it, suppress it, control it, resist other people hurting me more, built a wall round myself, isolated myself, and hoping thereby nobody will hurt me. But in that isolation there is always fear. Right? This is all the flowering, because I'm watching it. I wonder - you follow? It's all the story which is being told by watching the wound, how it arose. It arose because I had a good picture of myself, and that picture has been hurt, the image, the idea of myself has been hurt. And the hurt is, you've told me that I was naughty, that I was ugly, that you must be better than your brother, that you must be a saint, you must be a businessman - you follow? By watching the wound, the wound is telling me the whole thing. Right? Is it, with you?

And so I am giving it freedom to open itself up, you follow, sir? Because of that freedom, it opens and withers away. So there is no wound. I wonder if you see it.

Q: So the wound is there because one has inhibited it from flowering.

K: What?

Q: The wound is still there because one has inhibited the natural flowering of that wound.

K: The wound is there, but you have never looked at it.

Q: That's right.

K: That's what - you've never looked at it, and said, 'Look, old boy, I'm hurt, let me look at this hurt.'

Q: I think you under-estimate the fact that approaching the wound hurts itself.

K: Of course, sir.

Q: There is tremendous pain on approaching the wound.

K: That's why I talked previously, I said how do you approach a problem, do you come to it freely or with a prejudice, etc., a conclusion, this must be, this must not be, I must - or do you come to it, you follow, freely. Then the problem is like a wave that breaks down, withers away.

Q: Yes, but Krishnaji, the fact is, I have the feeling you want to stay with the fact, the fact is that when you approach it there is tremendous pain.

K: Is it?

Q: Yes.

K: I question it. You know, sir, this...

Q: I think it's more than pain.

K: Wait, he's saying - it's more than pain. I agree. He's asked a question which is, he says, the very approach awakens fear. That's what Dr Shainberg says. I say, is that so? Or I have an idea that it might cause pain and therefore I'm afraid. You follow, sir? Therefore I'm not approaching it at all.

Q: Isn't that what fear is about, the idea that I will have pain?

K: Yes, that's an idea.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Therefore I'm not approaching it. Sir, look, I want to know, or anybody, any religious man wants to know, if there is god. Right? In India that's the eternal song, and also in this country if you are religious, Christian, all this business, don't you want to find out if there is god? Or do you say, yes, I believe in god. I mean, that means nothing. To find out you must come to the problem



freely, without any conclusion, your belief, your prejudice, your conditioning. Right?

So your conditioning is the god. You follow? No, you don't get all this.

Q: But you move away again, I think you move away. Let's stay with this issue of the fear on approaching the wound.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Let's stay away from god.

K: I brought in god, because that is fairly demonstrable. All right. I am psychologically wounded, if I am. And what is my approach to that wound. What's your approach to the wound that you have, if you have any? Come on, sir, tell me what's your approach?

Q: There is no approach, that's just it. We just run away from it.

K: I'm asking. Running away is your approach?

Q: It's not an approach.

K: It's not an approach, I agree, but the fact is you run away from it.

Q: Yes.

K: So I'm asking, what is your approach? Your approach is that you are running away from it.

Q: The fact is that I am.

K: That's all. How is your approach? Won't somebody tell me.

Q: We think about it.

K: What, sir?

Q: We think about it.

K: You think about it. That's your approach. How do you think about it?

Q: There's a whole picture of it.

K: Tunki, how do you approach your wound? You see how we avoid every question. For god's sake.

Q: Well, I know this is a process but after a while it's not. After a while it stops and is a stumbling block and it won't go further.

K: So your approach is that you have a block. That is - keep it there. Your approach is you can't approach it, because you have a wall.

Q: Right.

K: All right. And others?

Q: It seems to have formed already certain conclusions about this problem.

K: So your approach is that you come to certain conclusions about this problem.

Q: And then no longer am I able to see it.

K: So, I'm asking, your approach is with conclusions, another is with ideas, the other is to run away from it. So our approaches are preventing you looking at it. Right? Now if you want to look at it, want to observe the fact that you're wounded, then you have to be free of your conclusions, you can't run away from it, you can't approach it with an idea. Can you approach it freely? If you are reading a detective thriller, if you know the whole plot before, you'd throw the book away, but if you don't know it, and it's rather exciting, you go through the whole book.

Here in the same way, you're hurt, and you really want to watch it, see what happens - for god's sake, find out what happens. To find out you must come to it with the same curiosity, with the same eagerness, if you read a good book, a novel, then you watch it and

see what happens. You don't even do that. Because then you may totally eliminate altogether conflict. That means, a very sane mind.

Q: So is it that we are not afraid of the wound itself but what happens if the wound disappears.

K: Partly. Because the wound has given me some sense of identification. You follow? I am somebody with a wound, without a wound, I'm nobody.

Q: Can it be said that the wound is caused by - we would like to have a pleasant image...

K: About yourself.

Q: From other people.

K: And yourself.

Q: Yes.

K: Mostly about yourself.

Q: Right.

K: So that pleasant image you have about yourself gets a pin prick. Somebody puts a pin into it.

Q: That's right.

K: Then you get hurt.

Q: Yes, but I think there is a basic craving and wanting to be accepted by others.

K: What?

Q: There is a basic craving in us.

K: Basic craziness?

Q: Craving.

K: Which is - rather good, quite. (Laughter)

Q: No, a basic craving that we have to be accepted by others.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: That's why we conform with this image.

K: Yes, sir, we've got basic craziness, sir.

Q: Not craziness.

K: Yes. (Laughter) We are basically crazy, quite right, sir. I think we'd better stop, don't you?

Q: Being crazy?

K: You see, sir, it shows that we cannot remain with something and let it tell the whole story.

Q: Well, isn't that's how we're doing now - my mind tells that story. My main problem is that I can conform to the acceptance of the surrounding, but...

K: Wait, Tunki, we've been through all that.

Q: Yes, but how am I to drop this.

K: I said, just watch it. That you are - just say, take one fact, for god's sake, Tunki, which is, that you are influenced by your parents, by the school, by teachers, you are being influenced all around. Can you watch - just listen to it, Tunki - can you watch this influence being a pressure on you? Just watch it.

I'm afraid we must stop. We'll do it tomorrow.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 6TH SEMINAR MEETING 18TH SEPTEMBER 1978**

Krishnamurti: I believe this is the last discussion or dialogue. Tomorrow morning at the same time there's going to be a dialogue between Dr Bohm, Dr Shainberg and myself, and those who want to, can join us, to really discuss, the rest can observe.

Can we now go back to what we were talking about the first time, which is, to observe what actually is happening, to observe actually what is taking place in our relationship, with each other, whether it be husband and wife, girl, boy and so on. Can we go into that. Or as this is the last discussion or dialogue, what would you like to talk about?

Questioner: I came in here this morning and I saw quite a few people and myself thinking over what was going to happen when the discussion came about, what we were going to talk about. And it came to me: what we really are here for, what we are creating within ourselves, and what's going to become of us.

K: That's quite a different matter. What's going to become of you, when you leave here. Is that it?

Q: Well, out of what we have done here and what we have talked about.

K: What have you learnt here, what have you found out for yourself.

Q: Yes.

K: What you will do with it, or how will you carry on from where you are now.

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. Do you want to discuss that? Or do you want to go back to what we were talking about the first day, which we haven't really touched on at all. Which is, be a light to yourself, and not depend on anybody else. That's what we began to talk about. Are you avoiding relationship, discussing relationship? Frightened to open that Pandora Box? Please, just tell me which you want to discuss.

Q: Are they both related?

K: Both?

Q: Related.

K: Maybe.

Q: Could we discuss both of them?

K: I mean, not discuss - as we said yesterday, can we remain with the fact, without any deviation, without the interference of all the accumulated memories of the past, which is thought, to observe what is taking place without all that, the past, thought acting as a barrier in observation. That's what we were discussing.

Now can we talk over together the question of relationship, and if it is possible to be a light to oneself, not dependent on anybody. Is that possible, to be so completely, totally free from all influence, from all propaganda, from all the tradition man has built, superstition, and so on, every form of influence, both external and inward? And then only it is possible to be free from all pressure, and so discover what it is to be a light to oneself. Either that or we can talk over together this question of relationship. It's up to you.

Q: I would like to talk about the possibility of being a light unto oneself.

K: What do you want to do?

Q: If we talk about relationship to begin with, then come to the other.

Q: The other way round, it seems to me...

K: Which came first, the egg or the chicken and so on. Is this a game you are playing, Tunki?

Q: The actual problem is relationship, obviously.

K: Do you want to go into it?

Q: Yes.

K: Now wait a minute. Do we know - let's start - do we know exactly what our relationship is now. Are we aware of it, it doesn't matter, with my mother, with my father, with one's father, wife, husband, mother, sister - relationship, intimate and not intimate, far and near. Are we aware - please, this is not a talk by me, join in this. Are we each one of us aware what our relationship is with another.

Q: As we pointed out yesterday, we are aware when there's pain.

K: Aware?

Q: We are aware when there's pain.

K: No, no. I'm sorry, I'm not making myself clear. You are related to somebody, aren't you? Are you aware of the significance of that relationship? What it means, what is involved in it, what are the reactions, pressures, you know - whole interaction between two people. Are you aware of it? Possession, domination, being possessed, and liking to be possessed, belonging to somebody. And attachment, the pain in attachment, the fear, the pleasing another and the other liking to be pleased and so on, the whole area of our relationship. Are we aware of it?

Come on, sir.

Q: Well, we can think about it.

K: Not think about it, no. Then you project what you might like, or what you - just actually what is our relationship.

Q: It includes the intrinsic loneliness of life.

K: What?

Q: It includes the intrinsic loneliness of life and the desire for a companion.

K: All that's implied. Are we aware of all the implications and the consequences of our relationship, sexual, non-sexual, companionship - all that. Do I know, do you know, each one of us, know what exactly our relationship is with each other? Or is it all superficial, casual, merely sexual or a resistance, an avoidance of relationship.

Q: I think it includes a bit of everything.

K: I beg your pardon?

Q: I think it includes a bit of everything. A little, it includes all that you said.

K: All right. Are you aware of it?

Q: No. I don't think we are aware of it at all.

K: Then what do you mean by the word 'relationship'. You are related to somebody - what does it mean?

Q: I have contact with them, with almost everyone I meet, I have some kind of contact.

K: You know, sirs, this is a dangerous subject, you understand, sir? Right? Agree? It's a very dangerous thing, because...

Q: I think it also means sharing.

K: What?



Q: Sharing things together. Sharing.

K: Sharing. Yes, all that's - don't - we know. Are you aware of it? Are you aware actually what is going on in your relationship with another, actually?

Q: I can't be, or I wouldn't have asked the question I asked.

K: No. So I'm asking - if you have a girl friend or a husband or a wife, what is your relationship with them, with each other? Sexual, superficial, companionship, each separate from the other, each concerned with their own ambitions, vanities, pleasures and the other also, in a different way. So separate movements.

Q: You relate in different ways with different people.

K: Don't describe it any more, we know - I'm asking, two separate movements coming occasionally into contact sexually, but keep the two movements separate. Is that what our relationships are?

Q: Yes, it seems to be that.

K: What, sir?

Q: It seems that we are separate.

K: What?

Q: It seems it's as you described it. Separate things that come at this moment.

K: Yes, separate, but not only coming together occasionally, but sustaining this separation, maintaining it, nourishing it, creating it, driving along these separate paths.

Q: That's one feature of it, Krishnaji. I think there's another feature, that in many relationships there is also a movement where there is a kind of sinking in, sort of merging where everything becomes one.

K: Do you merge with another? Just a minute, sir. What do you mean merging?

Q: Where there is no separation, where everything is sort of mixed up, it is joined.

K: Is it, everything is mixed up. Right? Merging, separating, companionship, no companionship, follow? - it's all a jumble. Would that be right, correct?

Q: It is so, it is as you describe it.

K: Not as I describe it.

Q: Well, not to repeat the whole description, but there is another problem, that one of the related people might be interested to change this whole relationship. And the other might not be interested.

K: Yes, I am interested - you are interested in going to church and your husband, wife is not interested in it.

Q: No, I mean that one is interested, one finds that this kind of relationship is a problem that has something to be done about, and the other just continues like that, so he doesn't find...

K: Yes, but do I - madam, you're not answering my question. Forgive me for repeating it. Forgive me if it's a boring thing, but I'm asking you, are we actually aware, the happening in our relationship. Apparently we don't seem to be.

Q: In certain relationships, yes. In certain relationships, yes.

K: In certain relationships.

Q: Yes.

K: In all relationships - you don't - you see how we are...

Q: Krishnaji, I think we're superficially aware, but we're not deeply aware of all the implications.

K: No. All right, are you aware that your relationship is confused, mixed up, one moment this, next moment that - it's a kind of, you know.

Q: I think to that extent we are aware.

K: Are you? Now just begin with that simple thing. Are we aware, each one of us, that in our relationship there is a great deal of confusion. Right, sir? Would you accept that? Not what I'm telling you.

Q: No.

Q: So I'm aware of that at some moments but most of the time I'm not aware of it.

K: Now, sir, I'm just asking now, are we aware that our relationship is so mixed up, so unclear, so confused, so, you know, nothing - all the rest of it. If we are aware of that we know - if you say I know, my relationship is really quite confused, I am this at one moment, next moment something else and so on. So there is never clarity in it. Would we say that? Could we - no?

Q: Yes.

K: You don't agree with that? What don't you agree with?

Q: Because I think I am clear about certain relationships.

K: Certain - I said in all. I said in all relationships, I may be very clear, in my relationship to - what? - to my father?

Q: Yes.

K: To your father, it might be clear. But with your boy friend, if you have any, with your boy friend it's mixed up. It is mixed up, is it confused, is it not as clear as pure water.

How can we move if we're not facing what actually is?

Q: Sir, I'm clear about it at some moments. I am more aware of

this as we speak about it. But I don't remember it. If I remembered this all the time, I would always be...

K: No, sir, it's not a question of remembrance, it's a question of what actually is going on.

Q: But I'm not aware of what is going on.

K: Therefore, which means you're confused.

Q: That's right, but I don't know I'm confused because I'm not aware of it.

K: All right, can you, can one be aware of it now? You see what you're all avoiding? I told you, this is really a very serious subject, and we don't want to enter into the complexities of it, the fear of it, what might happen, whether I will lose my wife, husband, all the rest of it.

Q: Sir, I'm afraid we do not understand what it is, being aware.

K: Know, recognize, actually see what is taking place, what is actually happening - not all the time but say now. How can we go forward if we're not aware or know, recognize, cognizant, conscious of what is the movement in our relationship, whether it's that movement is distorted, confused, wobbly and so on. See how difficult it is?

Q: Sir, are we looking at the entire problem of relationship, including the relationship to nature, to...

K: I beg your pardon, I can't hear.

Q: Are we looking at the whole problem of relationship, or relationship with our fellow man in certain fairly close...

K: No, Maria, I'm asking you, are you aware, do you know, recognize, conscious, all the rest of it, what your relationship is actually? What is happening in that relationship?

Q: To whom or what?

K: To you.

Q: No, I mean my relationship to what or whom?

K: To your husband, son, wife, boy friend, girl - relationship.

Q: In other words, other human beings?

K: Of course, I said that at the beginning.

Q: And is that only close relationships or...

K: Close, I said intimate - I've been through this, intimate, personal, extended, far, near - all that is involved in relationship. What's my relationship when I go to India, or America, and, the whole problem of it.

Q: It seems to me I do see the difficulties and the motives.

K: Comment?

Q: It seems to me that I do see all this but still it goes on, it doesn't prevent the difficulties. It is still difficult, relationship. Is it because I don't see it really?

K: How shall we deal with this problem? Each one of us has a different opinion about it, haven't we? Different explanation, different approach, different attitudes and values and so on. Now what is the common factor in relationship? As it is, not as it should be, romantic, lovely, beautiful, love, I love you, darling, you love me, darling - no, I don't mean all that. Just actually what do you - I give up.

Q: Two separate people.

K: I said all that, sir. Two, between you, your mother, between you and your wife, between you and your friend, and so on.

Q: But essentially separate.

K: I don't, I'm asking you what...

Q: If there is a relationship...

K: What's your relationship to your mother, or to your father?

Q: Everyone seems to admit that there is at least some confusion.

K: Right, could we start with that, sir. Dr Shainberg could we start with that? Could we start with that? Or is my relationship absolutely clear? That I quarrel with my wife, that's very clear. I dominate, I want to possess my wife, she is my wife, I'm going to hold on to her - that's very clear. I depend on her, sexually, physically, as I'm weak and she's strong, so I depend on her. That's very clear. Do we know at least that clarity?

Q: Yes.

K: Then what takes place, if you are so clear? You're very clear that you love, in quotes, a woman or a man. And in that love you depend on her, you're attached to her. Just take those two: you depend on her, you are attached to her. In that, isn't there pain, anxiety, disappointment, hurt? And she might throw you away, get rid of you one day and you are hurt, your heart is broken, whatever that silly word means, and so on - you cry over it. Right? Do you want to live in that kind of relationship?

Q: I see it's worth nothing. It's worth nothing, this sort of relationship.

K: I'm asking, each one of us - talk about it, sir, I'm not talking all the - talk about it, sir. Do you want, does one want to live that way? To know what it is to live that way and to know it and to pursue it is the essence of neuroticism. No? What, sir?

Q: It's a fearful existence.

K: No, isn't that...

Q: A fearful existence.

K: Look, I know I'm attached, suppose, one knows one is attached, and also you've seen that attachment, dependence, holding on, great pain, suffering, anxiety, and fear. Knowing that, and to live, continue that way, is neurotic. No? Are you neurotic?

Q: I must be.

K: Sir, come on.

Q: Sir, the question that comes up is, how can a man and wife, if we're talking about that relationship, be related in any other way?

K: No, if this is not the right way to live, in that relationship - fear, attachment, all that - why don't you drop it?

Q: That's easily said.

K: What? What is that?

Q: He said, that's very easily said.

K: Is that very easily said? If you see that certain action leads to pain, and you keep on acting in that way, what does it indicate? Either one is completely idiotic, or you like to act that way, that's perfectly all right. But here we're trying to be serious, to find out. You follow?

Q: It seems there's more pain in acting - it seems we think there is more pain in doing something else.

K: But that's again not facing what actually is going on. We went through all that yesterday and the day before. You project what might happen and therefore be afraid of what might happen and pain and all that. You don't say now, this is my actual relationship with another. I'm attached, I depend on her, physically, morally, sexually, you know - depend on her, so I am attached to her. And in that attachment the sequence of that thing is pain, all

the rest of it. And this is the actual fact. Right?

Q: Isn't that taking us back to what we were saying before, yesterday, Krishnaji, that we are unable to face the fact?

K: That's what I'm asking.

Q: We haven't really seen it.

K: That's just what I'm saying - we are unable to face something actual. Why? Listen to it - why? I mean, if I have great pain and it may be cancerous, I must do something about it.

Q: Krishnaji, I think there's one thing that comes in there immediately is the fact that the very relationship itself is attempting to deal with a pain. That the relationship itself is embedded in a protection, is a protection from another pain.

K: So you call all relationship pain?

Q: No, I'm saying, relationship is functioning to protect from pain. And then creates more pain.

K: Wait, sir, therefore what does it mean? You protect yourself against pain and in protecting yourself against pain you create more pain. What does that mean?

Q: It is.

K: What, sir?

Q: I said it is. It's no protection at all.

K: Apparently we are not facing this fact. As Mrs Porter pointed out just now, we are unwilling to face a fact. So what do we do? Wait till that person leaves, then the whole thing - follow, sir? Wait till the calamity takes place? Psychological earthquake?

Q: With the pain always comes the pleasure, and I think that because there's pleasure involved in it, we accept the pain as part of it.



K: I see. You like, in this relationship there is greater pleasure than pain, and so you accept this relationship. Is that it? Is that a fact, is that so, is that what you are facing? If you are facing that, that there is greater pleasure and not so much fear, then the greater pleasure eventually ends up in fear.

Q: Yes.

K: Obvious.

Q: Why is it so obvious?

K: Ask Dr Shainberg, he agreed with me, so ask him. I'll take a rest!

Q: No, I think that the whole thing of creating a relationship to protect against pain gives the pleasure of the relief from the pain, and then the frustration of that or the stopping of that gives more pain. In other words, first is the pleasure of relief, then there's the pain of not getting the relief. So the initial relief is a pleasure and a continual pleasure.

K: So you see that, actually see, not verbally, that where there is pleasure and the pursuit of pleasure in relationship, it will inevitably end in greater pain. It's so obvious. Because you are giving another great pleasure, and therefore he holds on to you. Right? He won't let you go, he wants to possess you, he wants, he says, 'she's mine'. And if you both like this thing, one day it's going to - you follow?

So are you actually aware, know, face the fact of what your actual relationship is now? You see, we've spent, how long, half an hour about something which is so obvious, which we are unwilling to face. And that's why you slither all around.

Q: What can a person do if he finds he is unwilling to face it?

K: What?

Q: I said, what can somebody do if he finds that he is unwilling to face it?

K: To face pleasure?

Q: Yes, to face the problem.

K: I can't do anything. His own intelligence, discussion, talk, observe what is happening must show him this.

Q: But Krishnaji, David has raised a good point, because if I could say, the drug addict goes down to the corner and takes some heroin, his consciousness is blurred to see what he's done, he's got a kick out of it.

K: All right.

Q: The same thing with relationship.

K: All right. Are we in that position?

Q: Yes.

K: Are we in that position, that we are drugged?

Q: No, sir.

K: Our brains are affected. Maybe - sir, don't deny it so quickly. Maybe.

Q: Personally, I am not certain. I am not.

K: That's one of the most difficult things to say, I am not. I may be.

Q: I think that in a way we are because, we want to be in a certain way but we are trying to keep certain forms, and we are afraid to open up, and change to be something else that we don't know anything about. And therefore we keep to what we are even if we are in pain or in fear.

K: So, sir, I'm asking, can you face the fact of it, the actuality of

it, not the description, not the word, but the actual state that you are this in relation to another. Come on, sirs.

Q: I think from what I see of myself is that one can be awake and very clear of certain facets of certain relationships, but as to the totality of the whole basis inside of oneself, it's much harder, although one can awaken at certain times to certain facets of certain relationships, it's still a fragmentation, but realizing the whole, and a direct whole, it's a much harder thing.

K: Sir, how can I comprehend the totality of relationship, the wholeness of relationship and the real extraordinary beauty of the totality of feeling, unless, if I'm not clear at the beginning, now, what it actually is? You follow? From there I must move. I must go forward in this realization, I am, my relationship is actually this.

Q: And that one can sense it.

K: And face it. Not avoid it, not dodge it, not push it away or run away, just face it. And then see what happens when you face a relationship which actually is attachment - let's use that word for the moment to cover a whole field - face that attachment, without the interference of thought, without any motive, without any direction. Then see what takes place. We are not willing to do that.

Q: I am simply...

K: That is what I'm sticking to, I won't move from that, till you, and I understand it and go beyond it.

Q: We agree to face a thing when it is important to us.

K: What?

Q: We agree to face things when they are important enough.

K: That's up to you. As Dr Shainberg pointed out, a man who takes heroin day after day - habituated to it, he's involved,

committed to it, and he says, 'What are you talking about? I want my heroin, everything's all right, give me that.' Are we in that state, because one has lived with one's girl or husband, wife, say for God's sake, everything is perfect here, leave it alone. Apparently you don't want to join in this. You see, sir, what I am trying to say, what one is pointing out is, that when you face a fact, without the interference and the barrier of thought, the very thing that is being observed undergoes a fundamental change. You won't try it.

Q: Perhaps the question, Krishnaji, is that we actually do know what our relationship is, if we're very honest.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: But we also have a trick whereby there's an idea that it really shouldn't really be that way, and we ought, it ought to be different, and we like to believe it's different, and in that way we kind of, we falsify the evidence.

K: And we say, 'Yes, it should not be that way,' and just carry on.

Q: Quite.

K: So I am saying, face the fact that it should not be that way and look at it.

Q: It seems to me that discussing the fact is not facing it, because we can't go on.

K: That's right, sir. So what shall we do? We've come to an impasse each time because we are refusing to see, to face the thing. Sir, have you ever watched an ant, or a bee, closely? You must have. There you're not telling what the bee should do, or the ant should do. Just watching. Can you do the same thing about your reaction in your relationship with another? Just watch it without

any interference. Apparently you can't - that's one of the most difficult things, apparently.

What shall we discuss, then?

Q: Is it possible, Krishnaji, is it possible to discuss the point before relationship. It was said that there was a pain which relationship was being used to cover up. Is it possible to look at that point before relationship gets involved, and see how...

K: I see. Are you saying, can one be aware, know, etc., the words, that in relationship there might be pain, therefore understand the whole nature of pain, before you are related. Is that what you are saying?

Q: No, it was said, I think Dr Shainberg said, that some, many relationships were painful but we stuck with the relationship because we were trying to cover up another pain, or another inadequacy.

K: Yes, that's - yes.

Q: It seems we should perhaps give attention to that first inadequacy.

K: So, you are trying to cover up other pains? And establish escape through relationship?

Q: Sir, It seems to me, the separate streams of life are distinct, come together occasionally, only partially...

K: Sir, I'm asking...

Q:... relate wholly when we come together.

K: I'm asking, one is asking, sir, I keep on, I'll keep on till you get bored with me and throw me out. Are you facing the fact of your relationship? Or are you avoiding it?

Q: Excuse me, that seems to be how the relationships come.

K: What, sir?

Q: That seems to be how the relationship takes place, how it comes about.

K: Now, just a minute. Here we are, all of us. What is your actual relationship to the speaker? Do you know it?

Q: Sir, I have been asking myself that throughout the meetings, and I have reached an impasse, I cannot go further, I cannot go through a block.

K: I've asked, sir - what is your relationship with the person who is speaking here, on the platform, the actual relationship, not invented - what do you - you must be related otherwise you wouldn't be here. So what is your actual relational with this person?

Q: Well, I've told you, sir, I've reached this block, I come to a position where I cannot experience it.

K: No, so, you've come - no, sir, please, sir, you've not, or I haven't made myself clear. There you are and here I am, two people. Why have you come?

Q: To listen to something we don't know.

Q: I think there are a couple of reasons for coming. One is there is a sense of sharing in investigating together into how we don't see. That's one. In other words, to tear down together.

K: Are you rationalizing, sir, just a minute, sir. Dr Shainberg, you and I have met for years, talked to each other a great deal etc.,. Now what is your relationship with this person?

Q: Immediately...

K: Don't flirt around it. I'm sorry to pin you down.

Q: That's all right. I have a feeling of going together or working

together in some way.

K: I'm not talking of doing something.

Q: Yes, that's what I first said.

K: I'm not talking of that. I am asking you, before we do something together, what's our relationship?

Q: There are no words for it.

K: No, come off it, you're full of words, Doctor - don't - come off it. (Laughter) Don't say there's no word for it.

Q: Sir, can I try to answer it for myself. I have come to get something from you.

K: Yes, So - that's good enough, sir - that's good enough. You want something from me. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: What is that relationship?

Q: I cannot get it because...

K: No, no, please, sir - I come to you to get something from you, whether it is money, sex, psychological freedom, etc., I want something from you. Then what is my relationship to you?

Q: Attachment, dependence - attachment.

K: What?

Q: Attachment and dependency.

K: No, no. I want something from you.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, Tunki, be simple. It's a merchandise.

Q: There is no relationship.

Q: Utilitarian relationship.

K: I want something from you, I'll give you this, and you'll give me that.

Q: A transaction.

K: It's a transaction, all right.

Q: It's worse - I don't even give anything.

K: No, but, you see what I'm trying to get at. You're not willing to face something actually, which is really important, and you are missing the whole thing. Why don't you ask me what is my relationship to you?

Q: Ok, sir, we'll ask that question: what is your relationship to us?

K: I put it, not you. (Laughter) You see, that's...

Q: You put the idea in my head.

Q: You care.

K: What?

Q: You care.

K: You care. Do I?

Q: Yes.

Q: No. (Laughter)

K: No, you're playing - no, sir, this becomes too serious. I'm not going to play games with you. What's your relationship to the man that's speaking here? Is it a transaction, is it a business thing, that you give me this and I give you that, you have something and I want that something from you?

Q: But that's not so, you don't want anything from us - we haven't got anything to give, and if he says he wants something from you, then surely his relationship to you is one of depending on you.

K: That's just what I'm pointing out. So am I facing the fact that when I want something from another, that brings about the great



pain of dependence, which we are unwilling to look.

So how can one be a light to oneself if there is any kind of dependence? Right? Now, which is more important, the light to oneself or dependence? Which is more vital, energising, passionate?

Q: How do you distinguish that from pleasure? We are trying to distinguish the fact that you're saying, you know, which one is going to give me the more pleasure?

K: Yes, put it - which is more pleasurable, to be a light to oneself, the implications of that, to be a light to oneself is quite, you follow? We haven't gone into it, it is a tremendous thing, light to oneself, will that give me greater pleasure than the other?

Q: Can I say until I am a light to myself?

K: Therefore, what will you do. You want to find out, don't you?

Q: Of course, yes.

K: You see, you want to find out, don't you, if being a light to oneself, the implications of it most of us don't understand, but will that give me greater comfort, greater strength, greater energy, greater, much more vitality and passion, than dependence. Will dependence give me vitality? Deep abiding strength? Or it's going to waste away my energy? And so I think dependence may be greater pleasure, so I pursue that till I am awakened to it through pain. Then I say, 'My god, I must struggle to be independent,' or that person is not right, I'll go and take on that person. Right? This person has the same, in the same field as the other, because that person is going to cause the same problem.

So I'm asking, as Dr Shainberg pointed out, does dependence

give great pleasure?

Q: One realizes that dependence is limited, then it stops.

K: No, do you realize in the sense, the actuality of dependence and see the whole consequence, step by step what is involved. Not imagine, not forecast what might happen, but actually, the truth of dependence, the insight to dependence.

Sir, don't you depend on your wife, husband, girl, or whatever - don't you? No? Then we are all marvellous saints - finished.

Q: We're all on heroin but everybody is unconscious of it. Everybody is on heroin.

Q: I don't think everybody is unconscious of it - I know I'm dependent. I may not see the full, all of it, but I certainly do see that I am dependent on others.

K: All right, don't you see, in that dependence, that there is a great deal of pain? Though it may be pleasurable for the time being, in that pleasurable state for the time being, see the pain going on at the same time. Then why don't you drop it.

Q: I'm afraid that relationship will stop, if we drop it.

K: What?

Q: Are we frightened that relationship will stop when we drop it.

K: So relationship...

Q: I think the relationship is based on that pain, on getting that, because...

K: That's what Dr Shainberg was pointing out.

Q: That's why I don't drop it, because if I drop it, then that is the basis of the whole relationship.

K: If you drop it, there may be a different kind of relationship.

You follow, you're not facing the issue.

Q: Sir, what on earth do you mean when you say, 'Drop it.'

K: What on earth do I mean - it's very simple, sir. Don't you drop something when it is dangerous, drop, that is, put it aside, avoid it.

Q: What do you mean, put it aside? I don't understand at all.

K: All right. I see dependence implies pain. Right? Do I want more pain in this dependency? A continuous pain for the next thirty years?

Q: I think this is a confusion of words, Krishnaji.

K: I know, sir, I know.

Q: When you say can we drop it, we're probably thinking can we drop relationship.

K: No.

Q: You mean, can we drop the dependence.

K: Yes, can we drop - drop in the sense, be free of it. All right. Not relationship, but be free of dependence.

Q: What does that mean, be free of? What do you mean by being free of? That's the difficulty.

K: No, it's not the difficulty. Free of, in the sense, if you have a pain, physical pain, what do you do - you try to get rid of it, don't you? By talking of pain or going to a doctor or dentist, whatever it is. So in the same way, psychologically dependence breeds pain. Do you see that? Don't say what do you mean by seeing - can you face it? Can you face that in dependence there is pain?

Q: This is what I see.

K: See it, feel - you know, realize it, know it, it is so, it is an irrevocable law. Right? Now if you like pain and hold on to that

attachment, then it's perfectly all right. But if you see it is useless, it's not worth it, don't you let it wither away, dependence?

Q: I think there's a step missing, you see, that a person may stick to something that is painful if he feels that he needs, that he has a necessity for it. One does not always drop the painful thing because one may feel one has to have it, one needs it.

K: Oh, I see. One needs pain?

Q: Not pain but whatever, one needs the dependence that produces the pain.

K: One needs the dependence..

Q: One needs to depend, you see, that's my point.

K: I see, I understand. Do you need to depend? I need to depend on the postman. Right? As things are. I depend on the dentist, as things are. And so on. On this corner petrol station, I depend on it. Now psychologically...

Q: A person may be convinced that he is too weak to stand alone, for example.

K: Much better. One is convinced - you see, when you say one is convinced, one is convinced that one cannot stand alone, therefore I depend on you. How do you know you can't stand alone? Who told you? Psychologically - you don't stand, that's obvious. How do you know you can't stand alone?

Q: Experience seems to indicate that.

K: What?

Q: Experience seems to indicate that.

K: What?

Q: Experience seems to indicate that.

K: That you can't stand alone. Experience - whose?

Q: Well, of our own.

K: No, Scott, go into it a little bit. Has your experience told you that you can't stand alone?

Q: In a sense, yes.

K: Not in a sense - face it. Your experience has told you, my friend, you can't stand alone.

Q: It has told me that I haven't stood alone, that as I live my life, I don't live it very intelligently, and so I am not a light unto myself. So I come to depend on others.

K: No, no. As Dr Bohm pointed out, we are afraid to stand alone. Right? And that fear makes us rely on another. Right? How do you know or aware or recognize, what tells you that you can't stand alone? Is it our education, our religions, our society, your mother, your father, say, 'You can't, you can't, you can't, you must depend.'

Q: I think all those things have happened.

K: Have happened.

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. Therefore, what do you do. Don't you test it out? Why should - sir, the churches have said to you, you can't be a light to yourself, you can't be, you must depend on Jesus in the West. Why do you accept that statement. Who tells you, the priest, the whole seven million Catholics, they may all be absurd - why don't you test it out?

Q: Sir, could you deal with the fact of being alone, what happens when you are alone.

K: You've not - you see. I'm asking, sir, is it because you are afraid that you cannot stand alone, that you depend.

Q: It's not right to say that you're afraid of standing alone, because we've all stood alone at various times. What happened in that state...

K: All right, what happens in that state when you have occasionally stood alone, can you face that fact and look at that thing, see what happens?

Q: But you've got to want to stand alone.

K: Not got - all right, don't you want to? To use your own phraseology - want to - don't you?

Q: Not until you really dislike and are uncomfortable in your dependence.

K: Not until you have pain, then you - madam, I'm not being personal - but haven't you had pain?

Q: Yes.

K: Then why can't you stand alone?

Q: I think I'm starting to stand alone. Because I don't want any more of that particular pain.

K: So.

Q: Until you see a worse pain.

K: Comment?

Q: The very nature of the dependence, makes you perceive any examination of that is too scary, too painful.

K: So any examination of dependence is impossible.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's it, you're saying, I depend on you, Maria, therefore I am incapable of examining that dependence. Is that it?

Q: More or less.

K: I won't, I don't see the reason of it.

Q: The reason is that, any action that upsets that is perceived as a disaster or a worse danger.

K: You're going back again, you see - that's what I'm saying, you're not facing the fact, you're projecting what might happen.

Q: Right, but that is the nature of the dependence.

K: Therefore I say, face the fact.

Q: I mean if I see that pain comes out of dependence and I avoid becoming dependent, that doesn't...

K: I said, not avoid, face the fact that dependence means pain, look at it. Be in total contact with that fact. You see, you can't do it. What am I to do? I can't hit you on the head and say - face the fact. That is meaningless. I can't persuade you, I can't give you a reward, so what are we to do? And this person is saying that's one of the major factors in which, if you do this, conflict totally ends, completely, in life. You don't test it out. And if you like conflict and say, 'Yes, all nature is in conflict, the trees are in conflict, seeking light,' you follow? - that's a different argument altogether.

Q: Sir, your relationship with another will be as I feel it, just now, will be completely different when you are free of dependence. I mean, you're not trying to get anything, you're not trying to acquire anything from them, you're not...

K: We've been through all that, sir. All right, let's leave that. Apparently you can't face it. Let's face the other fact. What does it mean to be a light to yourself? Why is Dr Shainberg, I've known him, so I can address him directly, dependent on analysis? Why doesn't he throw the whole thing away and say, 'Be a light to yourself. I will talk about that, help you to be completely free from all this, so that you stand alone. So that there is no Jesus, no Christ,

nothing, nobody, except you. And nobody is going to help you. They'll give you comfort, hold your hand, take you to their church - wipe away all that and say, look'. Can you do that?

Q: When you stay with that fact, there's no thought, no question of it, stay with that fact, there is no thought.

K: No, sir, look. man historically, politically, even religiously said, 'I must be free.' Right? There must be freedom in life. There must be, as they put it, individual, who is not controlled, shaped, driven. Man has always sought freedom, from the most primitive till now. So many are rejecting the churches, all the rest of it. Freedom means to be alone, to stand alone. Right? Which means, freedom - this becomes very complex if you want to go into it - freedom from the known.

Q: Just facing the fact.

K: What?

Q: Just take the point of facing the fact. You are facing the fact. Whatever that may be, you're facing the fact.

K: Yes.

Q: So you stay with the fact.

K: Yes. I'm not describing, I'm stating...

Q: That's right, you - I'm just using words - you stay with the fact, no words involved. You're with the fact.

K: Yes, sir. The fact is, there must be freedom from the known. Wait - that's a fact to me. Not to you. The known is all the memory. Right? The past, which is knowledge, that is the known. Now to be, to be a light to oneself, or to stand by oneself, the past with all its tradition must totally vanish.

Q: So you stay with the fact and its implications, totally.



K: Which means, sir. Look, which means, what has been registered on the tape of the brain, that registration must end, the past, and no present or future registration must take place. Sir, you don't know what this means, you see, this is one of the most...

Q: Sir, you can say all that now, what it means. I want to know what it means.

K: What?

Q: I have to know what it means, I'm interested to know what it means.

K: I'll tell you what it means.

Q: Whatever you tell me what it means...

K: Therefore you can find out for yourself, not from this person, find out for yourself how tremendously important it is to stand alone, which doesn't mean isolation, which doesn't mean non-cooperation. You follow, sir? To stand alone means to live a life without any pressure from outside or inside. Oh, you say, that's impossible. When you say it's impossible, you're not facing - follow? - you've just projected an idea that it is impossible. Find out whether it is possible for a human being, who is the representative of all humanity. Right? That's a fact, because every human being suffers agony, goes through all this business. So you are like the rest of them, that's a common factor, therefore you are the entire humanity. And the entire humanity has said, 'I must depend,' right? They say in India, I must depend on god, on this or that, on this deity, on the book, on that, this or that. And in the Christian world they say that.

So our conditioning is this tremendous dependence. Right? And completely be free of that conditioning, so that you're really a

whole, undivided individual. Now, that means, no external imposition by another, whether it be Jesus Christ, Buddha, anybody. One has to face that fact that one is imposed upon. Right? That is a fact. Through education, through constant repetition of the Mass and so on. And to see the absurdity of it and wipe it out. Then you ask, is it possible to be a light, not only to yourself, because you are the humanity, therefore light to humanity. You follow? I wonder - right, sir? I don't think you capture this.

Q: There's one important thing you said, you switched over from saying can I be independent, to saying can any man be free.

K: Yes.

Q: Making it universal.

K: Yes, that's right.

Q: Therefore it becomes, as long as you say, 'Can I be free?' then you're stuck.

K: Of course. That's why I said, I am as a human being, I'm the rest of mankind. When I said, can I be a light to myself, I am talking, I am saying, can I be a light, representative of humanity. Therefore can I be a light globally, not for my petty little backyard light. My backyard light is just electricity. Right? Which can be switched off and switched on from the main dynamo. But I'm not talking of such a thing. I don't know if you have gone into this at all. Which means, to be free of all institutions, political, religious, economic institutions. That does not mean I don't have money, of course one has to have a little money. But the conformity to an institution. Otherwise how can one come upon something which is true, which is the truth, irrevocable truth. You understand my question? Not your truth or my truth, Jesus truth or Mr Freud's

truth, but truth. How can one perceive that thing, if one is not free.

You see, most people in the modern generation have displaced Jesus in the Western world for a guru from India. It's the same thing.

Could we, at the end of this gathering, discussion or dialogue, could we say to ourselves, 'I have faced a fact.' It may be the most unpleasant fact or the most pleasant fact, but at least I have faced one thing, and discovered what actually takes place when I've faced one thing. Could we at least say that, the least thing.

I think we'd better stop, don't you? Five minutes to one.

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 1ST APRIL 1978

I am very sorry not to have these meetings in the Oak Grove, perhaps next Saturday it might be possible.

If I may ask, and please give your attention to it, that we meet here to talk over things that concern the whole of life, not any particular part of life, or a segment of life, but the whole content and the beauty and the greatness of life, the whole of it. But our minds unfortunately are educated, conditioned to deal with parts of it. If we are artists, we are only concerned with the world of art, if we are business people we are concerned with business, politics, if you are a scientist your mind is specialized in a particular way and you do not take the whole of life. Even the so-called religious people do not take the whole content of life. And if we may during these talks here and discussions, we are going to concern ourselves with the totality, the integrity of the whole of life. So if you are expecting a solution for a particular part of life, like a physical pain, or some particular personal emotional problem, or if you are going to concern yourself with the intellectual part, I am afraid we shall not be able to meet each other. As I said, we are concerned with the whole of life. So please if I may ask we will deal with the particular later as we go along, whether it is a problem between man and woman, whether it is an economic problem, or a social problem, or an ethical problem, or economic and so on and so on, we will deal with that as we go along. But I think it is very important, if one may point out, to observe and learn about the whole movement of life. So it becomes very difficult for those of us who are specialized or concerned with one particular part,

whether it be sexual, romantic, occult or seeking a fanciful fulfilment, I am afraid we shall not be able to communicate with each other. I hope this is clear that we are concerned deeply with the whole of life, whether it is sexual, all the various forms of occult powers, which I am afraid are inundating this country, or a particular relationship between man and woman. So let us be from the very beginning very clear what we are talking about so that we can communicate with each other, so that we can in our talks meet each other.

Our brains, our brain, are very, very old. That's a fact. And throughout the millions of years it has evolved, grown, experienced, recorded, stored up various forms of experiences, knowledge. If you have observed that you can see it for yourself very clearly. So it is conditioned very, very deeply. Our reactions are very old, our fears, our desires, our pleasures, our sorrows, are older than all the hills and the mountains and the rivers. So we are conditioned through the ages to perform, act, think in a particular way. And we are going to examine together, please when we say together, I mean together, you and I are going to explore together, not that I talk and you listen, but we are both of us going to examine, explore into the whole content of our mind, the conditioning of the brain and the nature and structure of the self, the 'me', which is as old as the hills.

Please, I must keep on repeating this, because most of us are accustomed to listen to a talk, to accept or reject what is said, but what we are trying to do, what we must do together is to examine together, explore together, find out together, learn together, otherwise these meetings have no value whatsoever. We can repeat

phrases, or some acquired knowledge, but when we are walking together the whole issue becomes entirely different, doesn't it? Walking together in a lane perhaps we see the same things together, the same shadows, the same outlines of the hill, the majesty of a mountain, the swift flowing river, when we see it together our communication becomes extraordinarily simple and clear. But if you are looking at the stream and considering what a bore it is to walk, or this or that, then we are not walking together. So please, if I may repeat it over and over again, and I will during all these talks, that we are working together to find out, to learn together.

So learning together means that there must be a common interest, a common enquiry, a common urge to find out, not to be told because we are not an authority, though the speaker sits on a platform it is merely for convenience, it doesn't give him any status. So having no authority, and you obviously if you are at all enquiring have rejected all kinds of authority, which we shall presently go into it. But it becomes very important that you and the speaker move together, find out together. Then communication becomes not only easy but also we are not driven by language. Most people are driven by the language they use. They are compelled, forced, their reaction is according to the verbal language they use. Please, this is again very important to understand. I hope you are also working as the speaker is working. We use language to communicate, to inform, to see clearly. But when language uses us, when you use the word 'socialism' in America, it has all kinds of implications, and that word with its reactions which awakens the reactions makes us act in a particular

way. Right? So you are driven by language, compelled by language, you react to language. And when we do that communication becomes extraordinarily difficult. After all, language is an instrument, and the instrument mustn't drive us, we must drive it. Is this clear? No, please, see it for yourself not because the speaker is saying something which you perhaps have not thought about. But if you could observe it in yourself, that is, how any word, specially a word very loaded like socialism, or communism, or Catholicism, or Protestantism, Hinduism and so on, they have a particular influence, pressure on you, so the instrument is using us, we are not using the instrument. You can only use the instrument if you understand the exact meaning of words, unemotionally, without any reaction. Say for instance, when you use the word 'communism' generally that word makes us antagonistic to that word, if you are a Capitalist, or whatever you are. But if you observe the word, use the word without any emotional content, without any reaction, the word 'communism' becomes very simple because both of us understand, if you know all the implications of that word, what it denotes, as it is, totalitarianism, Marxism, Maoism - if we use those words knowing their meaning, their content, then the word is not using us but we are using the word. Can we go on from there? I hope you see this point very clearly because we are going to see how language acts as a great pressure on us. And this pressure distorts communication. Right?

Is this the first time that you are hearing all this? If you are, please learn about it, find out whether the word is using you, or you are using the word. If you are using the word, which is the

language, which is communication and so on and so on, if you are using the word, then if you use the word knowing what it means without the emotional content, without the reaction to that word, then - and I also use the word in the same way as you do - then communication becomes very simple. Right? But whereas if you have certain reactions to the word, and the speaker may not have it, then communication is not possible. Clear?

So one of the factors in our life is that language acts as a great pressure on us, and therefore distorts not only communication but the clarity of thinking. Any pressure, whether economic, social, moral, idealistic, or the pressure of authority, or the pressure of language, is a distorting factor. May we go on?

If you have a pressure, a weight on you all the time, physically, you cannot walk straight. But if you have pressure, emotional, linguistic, economic, social and so on, any form of pressure distorts action. This again is obvious. If one is married, or has a girl friend, or a boy friend and the man or the woman is constantly exercising pressure on another, then communication is not possible, and his pressure is reacting against the other pressure. Right? So there is this constant pressure in which we live. Our whole moral, ethical, religious, political, economic, structure is based on this principle, pressure. Do you see this? There is pressure not only climatically, but there is the pressure of a linguistic reaction, the pressure between man and woman, the pressure, economic, social, ethical, religious, ideological pressures, we live, all of us, under pressure: weight, strain, and therefore our action is always distorted. If you are acting under pressure you cannot act freely or rightly, or accurately. So we are going to, together, explore if it is possible -



please listen - if it is possible to live our whole life without any kind of pressure. Don't say, it is not possible - then you have blocked yourself. Whereas if you begin to enquire, find out, go into it very, very carefully, then you might find it is possible, entirely, urgently possible to live without any kind of pressure. Therefore when there is no pressure there is freedom. And it is only in freedom there can be total observation of the whole totality of life. I hope we are together in this.

First of all we said, there is the pressure of language, the whole commercial pressure through language - buy this, buy this - on television, you know, that's what goes on in this country. Unfortunately America is becoming the standard of the rest of the world - most unfortunately. So please bear in mind that we are not doing propaganda, the speaker is not trying to convince you of anything, trying to persuade you, trying to dominate you, trying to frighten you. But together you and the speaker are going to examine these pressures in life, and whether it is possible to be totally and entirely, absolutely free of pressure. When there is the cessation, when there is no pressure whatsoever, the brain itself undergoes a radical change, which we will go into it as we go along, which is part of meditation. Don't go off to sleep now, I am not talking about meditation. I am afraid the people who have brought it from India, or from Asia, or from Tibet, their type of meditation is no meditation at all. Please, I am not being prejudiced, not dogmatic, or assertive, but we will enquire into it as we go along. The whole idea of meditation practice is too mechanical, too absurd, too childish. And in this country you have swallowed the whole thing without examining it, paying lots of

money and all the exploitation that goes on with it, the racket. The gurus have become industrialized, which is inevitable in this country.

So we are going, together happily, easily, if I may use the word, affectionately, to see if it is at all possible to be entirely and completely, absolutely free of every kind of pressure. Then one can live happily. Is pressure necessary at all? Do you understand my question? First we live under pressure, that's obvious. Then the question is: is it necessary? What would happen if man, or woman, if a human being - I use the word 'human being' implying man or woman, I won't differentiate, that's too silly, human being - why does he live under pressure? Is it ethically right, correct, socially necessary? Is it necessary, this so-called pressure, through religious images, concepts, conclusions, beliefs and rituals? That's what is happening in the world, constant pressure. And we are asking, is it necessary to live under those conditions. What would happen if you did not live under those pressures? We are going to find out.

So we must keep, have a mind that's enquiring, not accepting, not rejecting, not saying, 'It is possible' or impossible. We are going together to observe these facts. When you observe, what actually takes place? When you observe yourself or another, do you actually see 'what is', or do you imagine what you see, or interpret what you see, or in the observation twist what you see? You understand my question? We are asking, is observation possible which is without any distortion? And distortion takes place if you have pressure: that you must see, that you must understand, that you must go beyond this, that you must become a great success in your observation. Again, the American way of life

- make a success of everything. Do you understand?

So we are asking, is it possible to live without any pressure and why do we support, why do we acquiesce, why do we live under pressure? Is it because it has become a habit with us? Please, we are enquiring, so go into it with me. Is it that we are accustomed to it, we are conditioned to it, from childhood, through school, through college, through university, if you are lucky to go through university, from the very childhood there is a pressure - through examinations. And learning has become a pressure. I hope you are watching all this. Why do we accept it? Is it natural? Or is it unnecessary, abnormal? Is it if we are free of pressure of every kind we might face great danger and fear because we are so accustomed to live in pressure, under pressure, it gives us, perhaps, a false security? So we would rather accept what is known, which is, the various forms of pressure, and rather frightened of the unknown in which there is no pressure. So we must find out for ourselves, each one, what is the truth of this - not your opinion, or my opinion, the actual truth why each one of us accepts this tremendous pressure of society, tremendous pressure of so-called learning, the pressure of knowledge. Do you understand all my questions? We accept it probably because we are conditioned to live with it. The pressure the woman exercises on the man, and the pressure the man exercises on the woman - you know that very well. And each person accepts it because that may be a way of living in which there is no love, there is no sense of deep communication and it has become a habit, a normal thing in our daily life. So that is a fact, that is 'what is', and can you observe it without distortion, without becoming romantic, foolish, you know

all the imagination, just to observe actually 'what is: that you are living under various kinds and forms of pressures, weight, strain. And wherever there is any kind of pressure, it doesn't matter what it is, there must be a distortion. If you have great pressure on your tummy - put stone, it must react, it is not normal. So in the same way a brain under pressure cannot be normal, it becomes extraordinarily neurotic, distorted, deformed. And probably we are all deformed, and we don't see it.

And our intention in this meeting is to learn to observe: to observe the fact, actually see what is going on. Therefore there is no propaganda, no sense of being convinced, or making you believe in anything. So we said, one of the great pressures in life is the usage of words, how language drives us, the instrument of communication has become more important than what we are seeing. So can you please not tomorrow or when you go home but sitting there actually observe how unfortunately the instrument of language has made us react according to its conditioning. If you observe it very closely then you can ask the question, why has it become such pressure, and is it possible to use language, the word, with its content, knowing its content, without any emotional, romantic, psychological pressure. You understand this? Please do it now as you are sitting there, watch how words act as pressure. And is it possible not to let the instrument use us, but we use the words. So you are free of one extraordinary weight. It's like the cello, the musical instrument, the cello weighing down on you. But if you use it, quite a different action takes place. Right?

Then there is the pressure - which would you like to take, instead of my telling you? Don't immediately answer, find out.

Q: Ideology.

K: Ideology. Right. Most people have ideals. Why? The Marxists, the totalitarian attitude, the future is all important, not the present. The ideals of Lenin, Marx, Mao; why have ideals, the Christian ideals and so on and so on, why have ideals become so important, and why do they act as an extraordinary pressure on us? Don't they act as a pressure on you? So why do you accept the pressure of ideals? Go on, sirs, it's so simple. Please, perhaps at the end of the talk, or at another time, we can discuss it, you can ask me, but let me talk for a while. Probably you haven't thought about these matters at all. Perhaps it may be something totally new and your mind is already rejecting it. Or you say, 'What would happen if I had no ideals? I have lived so long with ideals, they have given me comfort, they have guided my life, they have acted as a solace and so on and so, the mind being used to ideals, and when it is challenged it recoils, and reacts. So please don't do it. Just find out, learn about it, not from me, not from the speaker. The speaker is teaching you nothing. He is just pointing out, showing you-take it, or leave it. It doesn't matter to me. But it's very important for you to find out why ideals have become of such extraordinary importance.

Ideals are always in the future, something in the distance, which indicates, doesn't it, that you are not concerned with actually what is. Right? You are observing 'what is' through the ideals of a future, so you have never come into contact directly with 'what is'. The ideals of a good life, the ideals of an American way of living - whatever that may mean - the ideals of having no war, peace, the ideals of love, the ideal of perfect marriage, perfect relationship.

Now who has created these ideals? Who has created this whole monstrous society, this immoral society? Obviously thought. No? Thought - please observe, learn, don't reject, don't say, no, it's not like that, go into it. After all you are here, perhaps some of you have come a long way, you are here to find out. You know your own thoughts, you know your own reactions, you know your own way of thinking. So you are here to find out what somebody else has to say, so listen to the poor chap! Don't say, no, it's all wrong. So thought not being able to deal with the present - please listen carefully - to 'what is', creates an ideal in the distance, hoping that ideal will help to understand the present, to deal with 'what is' and there is this constant battle between 'what is' actually and 'what should be'. This battle, this conflict is one of the great pressures of our life. Right? Why? Why do you have pressures of ideals? If you knew, or when you understand how to deal with actually 'what is', then ideals are not necessary at all. Right? Please investigate what the speaker is saying, don't reject it. That is, why should you live in conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', why? If you understand 'what is' then the conflict ceases between what is actually happening and what should be happening, which is so ridiculous. So our question is then: is it possible to observe clearly without any pressure 'what is'? There is a pressure if you want to change it. Right? There is pressure if you say, this is ugly, brutal, and I must change it to something else. That becomes a pressure. So can you look at 'what is' without, again, using a word which drives you? I wonder if you understand all this. Look: if one is greedy, or angry, jealous, the word 'jealousy', 'anger', 'greed' have their associations of condemnation, rationalization, saying, it's all

right, why shouldn't I be jealous, and so on and so on - so the language is driving you. Right? Do you see that? Can you observe that feeling which you call greed, which you call anger or jealousy, without using the word? If you don't use the word 'greed', 'jealousy' and 'anger' then what takes place? The weight, the pressure of language has ended, stopped, therefore you are looking at a feeling which has no name, and therefore can go beyond it. Right? Have some of you understood all this? Or shall I go into it much more?

Q: More.

K: More. All right, sir. You see the ideal has become a part of knowledge. Right? So knowledge has become a pressure. I'm an American, or I'm a Hindu, or whatever it is, some idiotic name. And that acts as a great pressure, and that pressure divides people - the Arab and the Jew. A very good example - the Indian and the Muslim, the Hindu. You follow?

So as most of us unfortunately live in the future called the ideal, we are never capable of observing actually what is going on. Either we are living in the past - the past is our knowledge, accumulated through millions of years, which has conditioned our mind, our brain, and so we are either living in the past yesterdays, or in the future yesterdays. The future is the past yesterday passing through the present, modified and going on. It is still yesterday. I wonder if you see all this. We are not talking about philosophy. I particularly don't like philosophy. It means - philosophy means the love of life, love of truth, love of wisdom, not theories, not ideals, but actually the love of wisdom. But you cannot love wisdom, something in the future. But you can only love something that you look at, what actually is in your hand. And to observe what is actually in your

hand with all your heart, with all your capacity to look, without naming it, then the thing that you look at becomes extraordinarily beautiful, or something that has no value at all. Are you following all this? Are you doing all this? Or am I talking to an empty wall?

So can you be free of ideals and the pressure of the conflict that comes about between actually what is and what should be? It's a cruel way of living, isn't it - twisting your whole life into 'what should be' - your education, your religious institutions, everything has made you accept the pressure of ideals and live with it. Right? So are you free of that so that you are capable, that you have energy to look at 'what is'. You have no energy if you are wasting it in some ideals. That's real wastage. It saps your energy because ideals bring about conflict: your ideals, my ideals, somebody else's ideals - it's too complicated and too silly.

Now, can we move away from that? Move away in the sense that you have understood it, you have grasped it, learnt about it, therefore it has no value any more, and you are a free human being who is only observing 'what is' and nothing else. Right?

Then there is the pressure of institutions - democratic institutions, republic institutions, labour institutions, totalitarian institutions, educational - you follow - we live, and our life is built in institutions, we become part of institutions. Right? Haven't you noticed this? If you live in India, you are a Hindu, that's an institution. The word 'institution' implies to stand, and when you identify yourself with an institution and you become that institution - most of our brains are institutionalized - therefore you stand, it's safe in an institution. And that institution is a great pressure. Institutions, I mean by that word, routine - go to the office, do this,



do that, live according to a routine, which doesn't mean when you leave institutions you do nothing, or do whatever you like, which is too equally absurd. Institution means routine, status, the presidents and down the line, and also it means conforming to a pattern, whether it is the American pattern, or the religious pattern, and all that. It's obvious, you can see this very clearly.

So we are saying, any form of institution is a distorting factor in life. When the brain has accepted the institution as a means of safety, security, status, a position, then it functions mechanically. And to live mechanically we think is the safest way. Right? The national institution, the nation - the American nation, the Russian, the Indian, German, French, English, they are nations, with their institutions, with their tradition, with their hierarchy, with their - all the rest of it. And we live in those institutions, we have become the institutions. You understand? I wonder if you see this.

Meditation has nothing whatsoever to do with any kind of institution. There must be freedom from any routine, from any sense of position, achievement. We will talk about it as we go along: the importance of meditation and where every form of pressure has gone. It's only then the mind can really ecstatically meditate.

So are you as a human being - please listen - are you as a human being who represents the entire humanity, which is a fact - as a human being, you as a human being represent the whole world, the whole world of humanity because you suffer, you go through anxiety, jealousy, fears, despair, moods, elations, sorrow, like everybody else. So you are actually the representative of all humanity. This is not an intellectual idea, it's not an ideal, but it's a

fact. So what happens to you is happening to everybody. And if there is fundamental deep transformation in you, you are transforming mankind. I wonder if you see all this.

So wherever you go, institutions have become more important because the brain thinks it can function effectively if it is caught in a routine - right? - if it acts mechanically all the time. Therefore we accept the President, the Vice President, you know, all the way down, and all the way up - the pope and down to the poor parish priest, and from the parish priest up to pope. It's an institutions. They are good institutions, some of them, but the good becomes the bad when it becomes an institution. You understand what I am talking about? So are you living, living with an institutionalized brain? Marriage has become an institution. Right? And those who don't marry live with a girl or with a man, and say, 'That's an abomination, I won't, that's just a piece of paper. I won't go to church, and all the rest of that, it's nonsense. But we, who live with a girl or a man, are free of institutions.' Rubbish! Because that has become another institution. Which means - please understand, go into it, for God's sake, it's your life - which means, what is the common factor between the two, married and unmarried - both have become institutions. The common factor between both is possessiveness - it may be temporary, and it is also in the married life temporary, you can divorce, convenient, sexually pleasing, comforting, you can rely on each other, attachment, each person living inwardly, his own life, but saying, 'My darling, you are part of me'. Don't laugh, these are actual, unfortunate miserable facts. So what is the common factor? They are both the same, whether you get married through a paper, or live with another person, the

common thing is the same. Which means what? No love at all. When you live with another and derive comfort, escape from loneliness, become attached, jealous, how can you have love when there is jealousy, anxiety, fear of losing, attachment, how can you have love. So find out for yourself.

So it is very important to discover for oneself whether your whole attitude, your way of life, your way of thinking, your actions, are the result of institutions. This is a tremendous question, you understand. It isn't just, yes and no, it's a very complex thing. How to live a life without belonging to anything, belonging to no institutions, whatever. Which means you must have a different kind of mind. And you cannot have a different kind of mental, or cerebral action unless you understand how we are a slave to institutions.

What is the time sir?

Q: Five past one.

K: So we have talked for an hour and five minutes. You know we can go on talking about these things, it is like a man ploughing, ploughing in the sand and never sowing. Most of us are so accustomed, our habit is to go a meeting and learn something, or be told, or be informed, but I am afraid this kind of meeting is not like that because we are both investigating, exploring, learning, finding out. Finding out how language has become such an appalling weight on us. The instrument is using us, we don't use it properly, accurately. And also how the ideals - the extraordinary thing is really, wherever you go, as I happen to go, ideals are the first thing they talk about. The philosophers, the theoretical politicians, the experts in theories as the Marxists, the Maoists, they have theories.

Think of it. And one finds very, very rarely a human being who has no ideals whatsoever, but is only living with 'what is', actually, so that he lives then without conflict. If you see 'what is', how can you have conflict? You understand? Only conflict arises when you want to change 'what is'. When I want to change jealousy into something else then conflict arises. But if I understand, look at jealousy, as I would listen to a child who is telling me about himself, about his ideas, his feelings, I would listen to it, I wouldn't interrupt, I wouldn't say it is right or wrong because it is a child, and he wants to tell me all kinds of things. So in the same way 'what is' is telling me enormous things, if I know how to listen to 'what is', or see 'what is'. But we haven't the patience or we do not want to see what actually is because our minds are so conditioned, we must change 'what is', it isn't right to be jealous. Or we say, 'Why shouldn't I be jealous?', rationalize it.

So to look at 'what is' without any distortions, which means without any pressure - the pressure of ideals, the pressure of wanting to change 'what is'. Do you understand all this? Then you begin to have an insight into something which is not the action of memory - we will go into it another day, tomorrow perhaps - which is not the action of remembrance, but an insight which is totally divorced from thought, from memory, from experience, that insight gives you an extraordinary release. That insight also, if you go into very deeply, transforms the very structure of the brain.

So at the end of the talk, of our talking over together, have we understood, or learnt, or seen, how language uses us, and the pressure of language; how ideals with their enormous pressure are distorting life, deforming our actions; and how institutions,

whatever they are, which is a routine, and we think there is safety in routine, in being mechanical. Now we are saying it is possible to be free of all pressure if you know, if you understand the nature of pressure and what it means to observe. There must be freedom to observe. Look, if I am married, or if I have a girl, and I want to understand her, I must look at her, I must listen to her, I must find out, but I cannot find out if I have an image about her, if I think she is this, which is, all the words that have been accumulated through the past, which has become knowledge and that knowledge is observing. Can I look at my wife, or husband, or the tree, or the mountains, or the lake, or the beauty of a flower, without the word - the word being the image. And the image is a tremendous pressure too.

So at the end of the talk, conversation rather, have we understood this simple fact that to live under pressure of any kind brings about distortion of fact, distortion of action?

It's over. We will meet tomorrow.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 2ND APRIL 1978

I hope you can hear me clearly. May we go on talking about what we were discussing yesterday morning? I hope I may continue with that.

We were saying that any form of pressure on the brain affects our whole way of life. We were also saying that this pressure affects our activities, our attitudes and our character and our way of living. The pressure, economic, social, ethical, and religious pressure invariably distorts, not only our actions but the quality of the brain. And we went into the question of the pressure of language. Language uses us, rather than we use language. The instrument, which is the language, influences our action, our attitudes, thought and so on. We don't use language, language uses us, and therefore language becomes an extraordinary pressure. I do not know if you haven't noticed it in your daily life. When you say, 'My wife', there is already a certain pressure.

And we were saying also that when we use language, words, clearly, without the association connected with that word, either imaginative, romantic, or reactionary, then that word will convey exactly what one means. Therefore communication becomes much easier when we realize that the word is not the thing, that the description is not the described, then language doesn't act or bring about a change in our attitudes and actions. We went into that yesterday sufficiently.

And also we said, ideals affect, oppress and act as pressure upon our daily life, and is it possible not to have any ideals but only deal with actually what is, then there is no pressure whatsoever. I do not

know if you have thought about it, gone into it since yesterday, and I hope some of you have, then you will find out for yourself what effect ideals bring about: a conflict, a confusion of thought, contradiction, and therefore perpetual struggle between 'what is' and 'what should be'. And we also said, is it possible to live without ideals whatsoever. Which doesn't mean that one becomes 'non-idealistic' - in quotes. On the contrary, one lives with facts, with 'what is', and therefore our action is always accurate, correct, in relation to 'what is'. We talked about that too yesterday.

And then we also went into the question of institutions, how all our life is controlled, shaped, directed by institutions, whether it is democratic, religious, republican, labour or socialist or totalitarian structure. I do not know if you have examined it further for yourself since yesterday, and if you have you will see, you must have found out how institutions control our life, direct our life. Therefore there is no freedom - institution being routine, hierarchical outlook, status, position and control by various directors, secretaries, presidents and all the rest of it. So is it possible to live a life without institutions, which doesn't mean that one leads a sloppy life, a shoddy life, but when one understands the nature and the structure of institutions, has an insight into it, has comprehension in its full depth, then life becomes much more rigorous, much more orderly, and there is a certain quality of freedom. We talked about that yesterday.

And also we talked rather briefly about meditation. You know that word means not only to ponder over, to think over, but also it comes from the root, Sanskrit, as well as Latin and so on, to measure. And the whole western world is based on the Greek idea

of measurement, the western world is built on that - right? - which leads to extraordinary technological advancement. Whereas in the east, measure was considered an illusion because to comprehend the immeasurable, the whole, the mind must be free of measurement. We will go into that when we talk more about meditation.

Also if one may point out, we are sharing this thing together, we are examining this thing together. You are not merely listening to a talk, to a series of ideas, or conclusions, because the speaker has no conclusions, no ideas, but merely is stating what actually is, and if it is possible to go beyond. So when we are talking over together it implies that you and I share, partake in what we are examining. It is not the speaker is examining and then you receive, then you become a disciple and I become the authority. I do not wish to become your authority, nor your guru and all the rest of that nonsense. But whereas if we both of us share in our examination then there is no hierarchical attitude at all, both are learning.

So we must go into the question, if I may, of what is learning, what is the actual fact of learning. Learning implies, doesn't it, accumulation of memory, of facts stored up in the brain. All our schools, colleges and universities train us with facts, which are stored up in the brain, which becomes memory, and act skilfully according to that memory, or unskilfully. This is a fact. Right? You go to school to learn mathematics, or geography, or history, register it in the brain, and as you go along to college, university, that registration becomes more and more and more, and then you have all the facts, all the information, and according to that information you get a job, and in that job you act skilfully or not.



That's what we generally call learning.

There is also learning by doing. The totalitarian attitude, which is go out, act, then learn. I don't know if you know about all this. Which is both; that is, accumulate facts, learn all about mathematics and so on, accumulate knowledge and act according to that knowledge. The other the totalitarian other attitude is, go out and act and from there learn. Both are accumulating knowledge. Knowledge then becomes important to act skilfully.

Perhaps there is another way of learning also, which is not either of these two.

Are we meeting each other? Please, if I may point out, this is a serious gathering. If you are not serious it is not worth listening, but if you are serious in the sense that you want to live a totally different kind of life, not the life that we are leading, which is constant struggle, battle, violence, antagonism and so on in all our relationships, if one really is committed to find out if there is a different way of living, then one is serious, then you apply your capacities to think clearly, your energies in exploration. And those who are really serious live and those who are not, they do not live. So if one may point out, please, this is not an entertainment, this is not something you play with for a few days, and then drop it. It is not something intellectual, theoretical, problematical, hypothetical, we are dealing with actual daily life. And perhaps some will radically in understanding themselves bring about a different quality of mind. We also said yesterday, each human being, each one of you, if I may point out, represents the whole of mankind. That's an extraordinary thing to realize, because wherever you go, whether to the totalitarian states, Europe, or America, or India or

Asia, human beings, the common factor of every human being is that they suffer, agony, despair, loneliness, unhappiness, a great deal of sorrow, fear and so on. So you are actually the representative of all humanity. When you realize it, not verbally, not theoretically, not hypothetically as an ideal, but as an actual fact, then you cease to be an individual. You understand? Individual implies, the meaning of that word, indivisible, not a human being who is broken up, as most human beings are, fragmented, broken up. Such human beings, humanity which is broken up is not an individual. So please bear in mind when we are exploring, we are exploring the whole nature of man, including woman of course. And in the exploration you are not only exploring yourself and therefore exploring the whole of humanity. It gives you such depth, width and a great sense of energy. In that there is no despair, depression. I do not know if you have realized all this. Probably some of you have travelled, but we travel for amusement, or to have better food in France, or to see the latest pictures in museums, but you don't look at man, human beings all over the world. If you do then you will see how important it is that your consciousness, which is the consciousness of the whole of mankind, when you realize that there is a certain quality of depth in it.

All right. So we are going to investigate together not only the ideological pressures, the pressure of institutions and language, but also we are going to enquire deeply and in detail if we can, into the pressure of knowledge. May we do that? Because there are various forms of pressure, we are taking one by one as we go along. Because until the mind is free of pressure there is no new way of

living: you may join communes, start a new way of cooking and all the rest of it, but that is not freedom from pressure. This requires a great deal of investigation into the whole nature and the movement of pressure. So we are examining together, if I may repeat the word 'together' over and over and over again, there is not the speaker who is examining but together you and the speaker are investigating into this question of pressure, whether it is possible at all to be free of all pressures - the pressure of relationship, the pressure of fear, the pressure of the pursuit of pleasure and the ultimate pressure of god. Right? Really a greater pressure than god is oneself, which is the ultimate pressure. So we are going to examine all these very, very carefully, reasonably, logically, and realize that reason, logic cannot solve these problems. A different quality is needed, which we are going to examine as we go along.

So we are going to enquire into the question of what is knowledge, the nature of knowledge, the movement of knowledge and whether it acts as a pressure, and so on. So please together. What is the function of knowledge, and what is knowledge? Is knowledge wisdom? Is knowledge the means of the ascent of man? Is knowledge going to free man? Is knowledge going to bring about love? Don't agree, or disagree, we are going to examine. Will knowledge bring about a radical change in our relationship with each other, man, woman? So what place, what importance, what is the use of knowledge. We are going to look into it. Please, don't depend on my investigation because if you depend on the investigation of another, then you are investigating according to the other person's investigation, therefore it won't be your own. If you are going to examine yourself, the pressures, according to some

psychologist, however renowned, however famous, then you are merely imitating his concepts, his ideas, his conclusions. Whereas if you examine your own pressures, disregarding what the others say, then what you discover becomes an extraordinarily reality. It doesn't mean you cling to your conclusions, which the philosophers and psychologists do. You then are constantly moving, constantly examining, and you cannot examine if you are frightened, if you say, 'This is not right, it shouldn't be'. Like a scientist, like a good scientist, not the government scientists, but a good scientist, or not the scientist who is part of the institution of a university, if you are good scientists you examine through a microscope 'what is'. In the very observation of that 'what is' the thing is undergoing a change. We will go into that as we go along.

Am I acting as a pressure on you? I feel I am. Because the speaker is intense about all these matters. I mean intense. And one feels very strongly about these matters, and being energetic, asking each one to do now what should be done, what must be done, that may act on you as a pressure, which I do not in any way wish to do. Then it becomes propaganda, worthless.

So we are going to examine together the whole structure of knowledge. Knowledge, as far as one can observe in oneself and in others, knowledge is the outcome of past registrations. Right? The original ape, anthropoid ape, registered danger. You are following this? Like a computer registers on tape, so the original anthropoid ape registered danger, pleasure, fear, the so-called instinctual protection of its young. That registration is the beginning of knowledge. Right? I wonder if you see this. Right? Please don't agree with me, but see it for yourself. When an incident takes

place, that incident is registered on the brain, when it happened. When a word which you do not like to be used against you, that is registered. When somebody flatters you, that is registered. When somebody hurts you, that is registered. When somebody is cruel, that is registered. So the brain is a recording instrument, recording all the incidents that are going on, whether it is conscious or unconscious, whether it is waking hours or sleeping hours. The sleeping hours are the continuation of the waking hours. I wonder - am I going to quickly? Right, sir? I hope not. So knowledge is the accumulation of various experiences, various incidents, accidents, dangers, and so on, registered as memory. Right? That memory is stored up in the brain, in the very cells of it, which is the whole structure of knowledge. Right? And according to that knowledge we react, or act. So knowledge is always in the past. Right, sir? So when we are acting, we are acting from the past. When we say, we are living, it is from the past. Or, we say, we are living according to the future, which is the past, modified through the present, which becomes the future. All that is based on knowledge, which is the past. So our life is essentially, basically based on the past. So - I must go slowly, I mustn't jump. I want to jump.

So what place has this enormous accumulation of knowledge, knowledge gathered through millions of years, stored up in the brain, instinctual, instinctive and remembrance. So the brain is extraordinarily old, conditioned according to its memories. Right? We are challenging that very conditioning, whether that conditioning is necessary. If it is not necessary then what place has knowledge? You understand all this? So we are asking, our life, our actual daily life is based on the memories of the past, our

relationship with each other, man and woman, friends and so on, is based on the past. I must go slowly.

So what is the relationship between thought and knowledge? Do you understand my question? All our activities, all our social, moral, religious, the gods, the pictures, the images, the cathedrals, everything is based on thought. Thought has produced them - the paintings, the culture, the things that are made out of marble, marvellous things, like Michelangelo and so on and so on, they are all based on the movement of thought. Right? Isn't that so? Those who worship Christ, those who regard various gods in India, are created by thought. You may say, well, they lived - but you thinking about him, that Christ, or that image you have, is self-created and so it is the result of thought. If you say there is god in you, that's created by thought. Or if you say, there is nothing but materialism, that's also created by thought. I wonder if you see all this.

Thought has not created nature - the mountains, the rivers, the trees, but man thinking about them makes use of them, like the chair. So thought has created the world in which we actually live. Right? That's obvious. And can thought see the whole movement of life? You understand my question? Perhaps I must explain a little more. Must I?

Let's begin: thought, we said, is the response of memory. Right? Without memory there is no thought. You cannot function radically, or sanely, or logically, or illogically, without thought. Thought has created illusions, which are also reality. You may think that you are god and you may act or think or do according to what you think god is, but yet it is the product of thought. We must

be very clear on this point, that everything that we do, the most beautiful architecture, the greatest paintings, the marvellous music, the great scientific inventions, the marvellous, beautiful poems that are written - not modern poems, sorry! - are based on thought. And thought, we said, is the accumulation of knowledge as memory, and according to that memory, responding according to that memory is thought. Right? So thought is fragmented, broken up. I wonder if you see that. This is important, please, this is really important to understand this. A fragment, a broken piece, which is thought, says, I will understand the whole universe. It will understand the universe according to what it has created, but not the actual extraordinary nature of the universe. I wonder if you see this. Please, we must clearly explore this question very, very carefully, that thought in itself is broken up. Why? Because its memory is always limited. Right? It's very narrow, memory cannot contain the whole universe. So memory in itself is limited, therefore thought is limited. And thought means, the movement of thought means time.

Any movement from here to there, both physically as well as psychologically, implies time. Right? Any movement. Movement means time. So thought is a movement, so it is part of time. So it is limited, it is part of time, therefore it is incomplete. Right? Have I made this clear, sir? Yes? Good! Somebody has got it.

So being limited, being broken up, being part of time, thought is never complete. But it thinks it is complete, so it has created gods, which thought says, 'They are complete'. So whatever - however extensive, however deep, however wonderful, thought is limited, broken up, is based on time, therefore entirely limited - whatever it

creates is limited. So thought is the outcome knowledge, therefore knowledge is limited, however much you may accumulate as knowledge, it is always limited. So can thought understand itself - please follow this - can thought see itself limited and therefore places itself in its proper place? Am I conveying anything? All right, I'll do it. It's my job to explain it.

Now first of all, to learn the art of learning, the art of listening, the art of seeing - the art of seeing, the art of listening, the art of learning. We mean by that word 'art' not the institutionalized idea of art, which is to paint, write poems, you know, all that - and we do not consider those people who live, or paint, that they are real artists, because art means in its root meaning, to put everything in its right place. Right? The meaning of that word 'art' means to give everything its proper place. So if that is clearly understood then has thought its right place? Not that thought puts itself in its right place - please understand this. Do you understand my question? Are you used to this kind of thinking? Are you used to this kind of exchange? I'm afraid not. All right, I'll go into it again.

As we said, learning about art, that is the way of living where everything has its right place, therefore complete order. You understand? If you put everything in your kitchen in its right place there is order, you don't have to chase around looking - which we are doing in the new house. If thought puts everything in its right place, then can thought see itself putting itself in its right place, everything in its right place? You understand my question? Can thought put everything in its right place, thought being fragmentary, broken up, can thought put anything in its right place? You understand my question?



Look: we have seen that thought itself is limited. Right? Can that which is limited put anything in its right place? Then the next question is, does thought itself realize that it cannot? Or, thought says, I can, tell me how to do it. You understand the question? Are you moving quickly?

So we are asking: does thought know itself limited, and therefore when there is to be order thought cannot bring about that order. Right? Is this complex, or too subtle? I don't know, I have lost you.

Q: No.

K: Right, if I haven't lost you then we can proceed. Then what brings about order? You understand my question? Whatever thought has created, being limited, being a fragment, broken up, being the past, whatever it does must create disorder. I wonder if you realize this. Whatever it does - all the political promises, all the economists saying, this is the solution, all the philosophers saying, do this, all the psychologists with their extraordinary capacity to analyse - they don't really analyse because they don't know what analysis means, because there is a division between the analyser - I won't go into that for the moment. And whatever thought has done, or is doing, killing animals, whales, dolphins, baby seals, worshipping in a marvellous cathedral, the beauty of the Roman Catholic mass, all that is created by thought. And therefore whatever it has done must create disorder. Right? Do you see that? No, not as an idea, but actually. Look, thought has created nationalities, hasn't it - American, English, German, French, linguistically driven each one in a different direction and so on. So thought has created nationalities. So thought says, 'I will bring

nationalities together', United Nations, so it is disorder. I wonder if you realize this.

If thought has created disorder, what will bring about order? You understand my question? So man says, 'We cannot do anything about this disorder, god will bring about order'. An external agency, the guru, the priest, somebody will bring about order. The nobler the entity, the imagination, the god, that external agency will bring order, therefore let's pray, let's attend the churches. It is all the movement of thought. I wonder if you see this. So thought, whatever it does, is disorder. If one realizes that, sees that, that is, the perception of that is intelligence, isn't it. I wonder if you see that. The perception that thought, whatever it does, has created, and is creating disorder, that very perception is insight, which is intelligence. Right? So that insight brings order. I wonder if you see this. We will go into it.

So we are asking: what is the relationship between knowledge, which is the outcome, which is the past, out of the past comes thought born of memory, stored up in the brain; the brain depends for its security on the past, because memory gives it security, survival - so what relationship has knowledge to order, which must be absolute, not relative? Because the universe is in perfect order, and the scientists are trying to find out what that order is. Then the order they want to find out thought is investigating, therefore the investigation into order will bring further disorder. I wonder if you see all this. Do you? Somebody, please.

Audience: Yes.

K: Not that I want your agreement, or disagreement, do you see it actually? So we are saying, what has knowledge, which has

become of such importance, all the scientists are accumulating it and praising it and saying, through knowledge we will ascend more and more and more - what is the relationship between knowledge and order? Do you get it? Or is there no relationship at all?

We are saying order is only possible, complete order inwardly, therefore outwardly, complete order is only possible when thought has realized its limitation and therefore accepts that limitation which has its proper place. Got it? No, please, this is rather a complex question, go into it very slowly. Can that which is limited, broken up, realize itself being broken up? Or thought says, I am broken up? You see the difference? Oh, no. I'll keep at this until you understand this.

We said thought is limited, broken up, part of time, which is the movement of knowledge, therefore utterly, completely limited. And whatever that thought does, being limited, must be continuous disorder. That's an absolute fact, irrevocable. You can see it: they talk about peace and they are preparing for war; they talk about united nations and they are all separate nations, fighting each other, wanting this, that and the other. Look at the division thought has created in religion, the Baptists - I won't go into all that. Thought is really the most mischievous thing in life, the greatest criminal. And what place has that limited thought, what relationship is that to order? Thought cannot bring about order because it is self-limited. Does thought realize that it is limited? Or, thought says, I am limited, which is still the movement of thought. Do you see that? So how is it possible for thought to realize that it is limited, without thought saying, I am limited? Therefore thought then says, let me proceed to find out how to break down that limitation - which is

still thought. Right?

So, we are asking - please listen - the art of listening. To listen implies that your mind is not occupied with your own thoughts, with your own prejudices and you say, 'Yes, I understand it, get on with it', or draw a conclusion. But to listen as you would listen to a small child who is telling you all about his troubles, you don't interrupt him, you don't say, 'That's enough, for goodness sake, I am getting bored', you hold his hand, or cuddle him, put him on your lap and you listen to all the things he has to say, you don't interrupt. In the same way, listen, which means care, attention, affection. If you listen that way then the problem is solved. The problem is this - your problem: realizing that thought has created an awful mess of the world, thought says to itself, I must bring about order. The order according to Marx is totalitarianism, probably there is order there; no poverty, there are no flies, they are honest, everybody is drilled, frightened, obeying. That is disorder. And in the western world, the same thing, disorder. So thought, whatever it does, is disorder. That's one point.

Now my next question is: what will bring order? Because without order life becomes a confusion, a conflict, a miserable state. So can there be - please listen - can there be absolute order, not relative order, order depending on the presidents, or your guru, complete order. So thought can, whatever it does, create more, more and more disorder. And one realizes intellectually perhaps, or verbally, that there must be order. So is it possible to bring about order without the operation of thought? You get it? You understand the question? Without the movement, the functioning of thought? Because thought itself is confusion. I'll go into it. If you don't mind

listen to it.

How have you approached this question? You understand? That is, order and disorder, disorder created by thought. And thought cannot bring about order. Now how do you come to it? What has been your approach to this question? Because on your approach depends the answer. You understand? This is simple, isn't it? If I approach it with fear, with anxiety, with wanting to understand, fight, fight, I won't see the full significance. Therefore I must be very clear, you must be absolutely clear how you approach the question. So we are examining how you are approaching this question: order and disorder. Are you approaching it in order to solve a problem? Therefore you are more concerned with the solution rather than with understanding the problem itself. Or are you approaching it with a desire to bring about order, which is the operation of thought? So please investigate for yourself how you are approaching this problem. Through fear, through expectation that somebody will tell you therefore you will bring about order? Or you don't know, therefore you are groping to find? Has your approach a motive? Because if you have a motive, that motive is going to dictate the answer. Right? I wonder if you see all this.

So one must be very clear how you approach. If you approach it totally freely, freedom, without wanting something out of it, then you can investigate whether thought can bring order, if thought cannot bring order, the very realization that thought cannot bring about order is intelligence, isn't it. I wonder if you see that. You see that, don't you?

Q: Yes.

K: That thought, which has created disorder, to see that thought

in itself is the mischief maker, that is an extraordinary revelation. That is insight, isn't it. Therefore insight has nothing to do with memory, has nothing to do with thought, nothing to do with the past. So that insight is going to bring order. I wonder if you understand this.

Now just a minute: if you have an insight that institutions, whatever they are, will not resolve our problems, do you realize it logically, rationally? Or you have an insight into it? You understand my question? If you have an insight into it you are free of all nationalities, the feeling of belonging to a particular nation. So in the same way, when you listen to the fact that thought cannot bring about order, that very act of listening is an insight to the fact. That's why it is tremendously important to listen. So that insight, which is totally unrelated to memory, brings order. And that order is the order of the universe, complete, total, irrevocable. It's not order one day and the next day mess.

Have you got some of this? So we will go on with it perhaps as a discussion the day after tomorrow, or next Saturday or Thursday. I hope it will be in the Grove, which will be much nicer. Right.

(clapping) Please don't clap. You are clapping for yourselves. You are not clapping for me. (clapping and laughter).

## **OJAI 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 4TH APRIL 1978**

Krishnamurti: I believe this is a dialogue or a conversation between us. We are not offering one opinion against another, or one thought against another, or one judgement or conclusion against another, but what we must do, I think, is to talk over as two friends our problems, friends who are concerned with their life, with their problems, with their relationship, with the whole of life. So what would you like, if I may ask, that we should begin to discuss or have a dialogue about?

Questioner: Some of us have written a question here.

K: Before I answer this what would you like to talk about or have a dialogue or conversation about? Yes, sir?

Q: I was wondering if you could elaborate on how to create interest in students to learn something they are not interested in.

K: The questioner asks, how to create an interest in something that you are not interested in. Right, sir?

Q: I wonder if we could go into the question of the mystical, mysticism and so forth.

K: You want to discuss mysticism, occultism, telepathy, levitation and what else, kundalini - is that what you want to discuss, sir?

Q: I want to discuss education, especially the different ages of children, how they should be educated at different ages because I think they are not all the same.

K: How children of different ages should be educated. Yes, sir?

Q: I want to discuss how do you listen to the movement of thought without getting caught.

K: How does one listen to the movement of thought without getting caught in the meaning and the associations and so on.

Q: The gentleman who preceded you said that he felt that moving here was the most important thing he did in his life. Can you tell us how we each can make every moment in our life the most important thing?

K: Are there questions enough? Yes, sir?

Q: I have fear and isolation.

Q: Could you talk about meditation and whether it is good to set a time to practise every day, keep a kind of schedule, to put aside other activities?

K: If I understand it rightly, the questioner asks, is it possible to meditate without giving a special time to it and not putting other activities aside. Is that right?

Q: I think it is obviously possible to relax but I am asking is it also beneficial to set aside a time every day.

K: Is it also beneficial to set aside a period of time every day to meditate. Yes, sir?

Q: How to live without belonging to anything.

K: Now that's enough.

Q: You have said that to observe you have to be free, but isn't it also true that to be free you have to learn how to observe. So could you comment on that and also perhaps on the context in which you use these words which might have created a conflict between those statements.

K: How to?

Q: To be free, you say, one must observe, but to observe one must already be free. How can that be?



K: Which came first, the egg or the other? Now that's enough if you don't mind. Which of these questions would you like to talk over together? The questions are, if I can repeat them: if there is no interest how is one to create interest. Right? That was one of the questions. How to meditate, is it beneficial to meditate at certain periods of the day and all that; and would you also talk over mysticism, occultism, telepathy - what else is there - kundalini and levitation. Would you also talk over how to educate children at various ages. What else?

Q: Observation.

K: Observation, how to observe without association, without remembrance. Right? Now which of these questions would you like to talk over together?

Q: Observation without association.

K: Would you like to discuss observation, perception, seeing without introducing words with their associations? Do you want to discuss that?

Q: Yes.

K: Why?

Q: Why not?

K: You say, why not. Are you interested in this question, does it mean anything to you to find out seriously how to observe - is there a way of observing without the interference of words with their association, with their condemnations and approval, the whole movement of verbal remembrances. Are you deeply interested in this, does it mean anything in your life? Because if it does then we could discuss it seriously. May we go into that, is that what you want to discuss?

Audience: Yes.

K: You are quite sure? Isn't one of our difficulties when you listen to a statement to make an abstraction of it, to make an idea of it - isn't that a fact that one listens to a particular statement or opinion or judgement or evaluation and immediately there is a conclusion away from the actual statement. Has one observed that? Which is, making an abstraction of a fact into an idea. Right, sir? So when we talk about observing, is that observation an abstraction or an actual perception, seeing? You understand? I hope I am making myself clear. You tell me to observe without the association that observation brings about. I hear that and from that I make an idea and from that idea ask myself, please tell me how to do this. Which is, I have moved away from the fact to an idea and want to find out how to carry out that idea. So let us be very clear right from the beginning, if one may point out, are we making an abstraction, that is, away, to abstract, away from observation, making an idea of it, a conclusion of it? Or one wants to discover the actual, if I may use the word, purity of observation. I wonder if I am making myself clear? Which is it that we want to do, which is it that we are doing? Are we making an abstraction, or do we want to find out for ourselves the act of observation, what is involved in that? Not the idea of observation. Am I somewhat making myself clear?

So if we are not running away or abstracting or moving away from the act of observation then we can ask, what is the act of observation. What is the actual fact of observation? Do we see anything, the hills, the mountains, the rivers, the sky, the wife, the husband, the girl and the boy, the nation, anything without the idea

interfering with it, without the image coming in between, without my conclusion about it? Now which is it we do? Is there an observation without interference, interference of thought, the thought being the word, the word awakening the associations connected with that word and denying the associations and trying to go beyond the word and therefore now in that process you never observe. Can we go on from there? So which is it that we do actually? Do I observe those flowers, does one observe those flowers without naming them - look at them, you will see how extraordinarily complex a problem it is - to observe them without naming them; the moment you name them there comes the association of like and dislike, that they are carnations and I don't like that particular colour, or I like that colour, all that interferes with the actual seeing. Right? In the same way, can I look, observe my friend, my wife, the girl and so on - not mine, one's - observe without the interference of the various imaginative, thoughtful associations that I have had with that person? It is a very complex problem this because for most of us observation is always through an association, through memories, through images.

Then the problem arises - won't you discuss with me, I might make a statement and then you can discuss with me - then the problem arises: is it possible not to create images, pictures? You understand my question? Because they interfere with the clarity of perception. So one asks is it possible not to have these images, these pictures. You understand?

Q: Up to a certain point there is clarity of observation but some mechanism at some certain time takes over and clarity disappears.

K: That's right. At some time the mechanism of thought, the

mechanism of images, takes over and clarity disappears. That's what you were saying, sir.

Q: My condition is that the associations are there, one is becoming aware of them all the time. Then what, in the sense of observing without association?

K: Can we go into this very slowly and carefully, in detail, then perhaps we can understand each other. Please I am not persuading you to think the way I observe or I think, I am not fostering something upon you. We are together looking into the whole complex problem of perception. First of all there is the perception through the optical nerve and so on, and then you see. When does the mechanical process of creating images about what you see take place? When? You asked that question. Sir, let's make it much more simple. In your relationship with another intimate, or not, when does the mechanism of creating an image about that person take place? How does it happen? You understand my question?

Q: Possibly when the mind first recognizes something and creates part of the relationship and brings it back into the foreground, that's when the images may take over, or memory.

K: Sir, look: let's keep it very simple, still simpler. One meets a person, is introduced to that person, then that name, the face is remembered, recorded. Then when you meet that person next time that recording says, you are so-and-so, I met you the day before yesterday. That's this whole mechanical process of registration, which interferes with perception. Right? Go slowly. Wait a minute, lady. Right, sir? Are we clear on this point? You insult me, it is registered, and when I meet you next time I am a little bit nervous, withdrawn; or you flatter me, it is registered, and I say, how nice of

you. We are friends. So this kind of registration is going on all the time. Right? Which obviously, logically, reasonably, shows all this interferes with observation. Right?

Now the question is - please, let's find out - the question is, how is it possible - not 'how' - is it at all possible to observe without the whole mechanical process of remembrance interfering?

Q: It should be possible.

K: It should be - I am hungry, you should be able to eat, but there is no food!

Q: What I mean is you should be able to learn how to do that.

K: We are going to find out.

Q: It doesn't have to be a question, sir, that's all.

K: We are going to find out. That's why I want to go step by step into it.

Q: Sir, it seems to me that as long as we are concerned with the accumulations surrounding the perception we cannot.

K: Yes, we are stimulated and so on. All that is another form of remembrance, registered and that registration is memory and that memory interferes. Sir, you are married, some of you, or you have got girls, or boys, haven't you images about that person? Don't those images interfere with your actual relationship with that person? Right? Obviously. Now we are asking, the mechanism which is constantly operating, can that mechanism stop for a few seconds even? You understand my question? Am I making it clear? Please I want to get on with this because it is very complex as we said.

So one sees there is the registration taking place when the name is remembered, the face is remembered, the particular association

with that person is remembered. Right? That goes on all the time, pleasant or unpleasant, dangerous or safe and so on. So we are asking, can this mechanism come to an end so that I can look?

Q: It is impossible to observe without making a judgement, or naming it, and accept it for what it is.

K: No. Is it possible to observe without judgement, just to look at 'what is' - is that it? Is that the question? Right? We are doing that, we are exploring that. Why does this mechanism operate? You understand my question, sir, just listen to my question first. I am not stopping you from discussing or have a conversation with the speaker but I am asking, why does this mechanism of creating images, conclusions, opinions, why does this mechanism operate, why?

Q: If we don't pay attention then the mind starts to move.

K: Yes, sir, but we are saying, why does this mechanism function instantly?

Q: Experience.

K: Are you sure it's not guesswork?

Q: Sir, when I have a strong emotional reaction, only then if I hate someone or admire someone, or am afraid of someone, then the image persists. Otherwise if there is no reaction the person is new to me every single moment. Now the emotion, if I ask myself why do I have the emotion, then I have to ask myself why do I have hands and feet.

K: No, no, why do I have hands is different from why do I have emotions.

Q: But I have them, they are just there.

K: Why? We have emotions of anger, hatred, resistance and so

on and so on, why? Is it inherited from the anthropoid apes, right from the beginning? Or is it a temporary passing thing? You understand? Please go into this a little bit. You are going too far ahead.

Q: Is not love a faculty equal to hands and feet which we have allowed to atrophy?

K: Is not love, like any other faculty, been atrophied. You see, sir, we are talking about perception, sir, love is something which we have to go into it, if I may suggest, perhaps after this question.

Q: But sir, I am answering you question. You asked why, where does it begin, where does the mechanism begin. I say it began when love was atrophied.

K: Yes, it began when love was denied, was dead, was killed.

Q: I don't think it is dead.

K: Atrophied, all right, it is paralysed, any other word you like to use. Are we answering that question, sir, if I may ask, why does the mind, the brain create images? The images are very active.

Q: From fear.

K: Fear, which means what? As the gentleman suggested it may be because in remembering, in association, in the image there is great security. Right? Somebody has robbed another of his things, that is registered, the next time you meet that person you are very, very careful, which is security. So is the brain registering all these things in order to have security?

Q: Sir, if someone can rob me of something that provides me with security, am I not already lost?

K: Lost? What do you mean by that?

Q: If I establish myself on a basis of something, if I have my

security involved in a thing which somebody can rob me of, am I not already lost?

K: Yes, sir, probably. If somebody takes away all your things you are obviously lost, but we are not discussing for the moment that. We are asking why does the brain register at all. You follow? Please go into this, please, for a few minutes. This is very important because we are always living in the past and the past is the registration movement. Right?

Q: As the future.

K: As the future or the past.

Q: Anything to do with time.

K: So do we all understand clearly that this registration takes place because the brain can only function when there is security properly, clearly, efficiently. Right? No sir?

Q: I am not sure I understand that. Security...

K: When it is safe, when it is not damaged, when it is not hurt.

Q: Physically you are saying?

K: Both physically as well as psychologically. If it is hurt then you behave neurotically, if it is damaged in any way all its actions will be deformed. So the brain says to itself, thought says to itself, there must be security. Right, sir? No?

Q: But isn't it that the desire for security is seen as being hurt.

K: We are going to find out, sir. Of course. First see how the brain demands, asks that it should be completely secure, whether it is secure in actuality or in an illusion, in a fancy or in 'what is'. One might find security in a belief - it has no validity, I believe the earth is flat, but the belief in the earth being flat gives it security until you come along and say, 'Don't be foolish it is round'. I am



frightened, then I begin to investigate and say, 'Yes', and in that I also seek security. This is simple and clear. So the brain - have you watched a child, it wants security from its mother and so from the original ape the instinct is to be protected, to find safety, to have somebody to hold you so that you are comfortable. You have seen all this in a baby.

Now what do we mean by safety? You understand? What do we mean by being secure? Right? We say the brain must be secure, must have security to function efficiently. Right? Has it found security?

Q: No.

K: I am asking, sir. Has it found security?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? Physically? Has it?

Q: Physically.

K: No, just listen, sir, has it.

Q: I think it probably hasn't.

K: Not your particular brain, your particular brain is the result of millions of years of evolution, growth, it is not your particular brain, it is the brain of man, of a human being. And - just a minute, let me finish what I am saying, forgive me - we are saying, it needs security, it must have security, but has it? It has said there is security in tribalism. Right? Belonging to a tribe. Glorified nationality is the continuation of the tribal instinct. Now when there are nations separate from each other and each group belongs and says, I am safe here, then is there safety? There are wars, so you are not even physically safe.

Q: There is just an idea of safety.

K: That's what I am coming to. So what are you saying when you say the brain needs safety, at what level, at what depth, or vertically, horizontally, is there any safety at all in what we are doing? The rich and the poor. You follow? The whole social structure, does it give you safety, not for your particular period of life, it may be thirty years, of fifty years, or a hundred years, but for the brain of a human being, of humanity, of which you are.

Q: Sir, we are discussing, I believe, the fact that the brain wants self-preservation.

K: Yes.

Q: Then I have briefly security. But also the brain, I believe, strives more than this, and that is self-perpetuation.

K: We are coming to that.

Q: It is coupled with the problem of acquisition, wanting more.

K: Self-perpetuation because in perpetuating itself in another, separating itself and thinking it is separate and perpetuating in another, that idea gives it safety.

Now we are asking, is there safety in what we are cultivating, what we are demanding, what our society, politicians, economics, etcetera, etcetera, is creating around us - which we have created, not somebody else has created it but we in our desire to be secure, the brain has created this extraordinary society which thought etcetera, etcetera. Yes, madam?

Q: I wanted to ask is there security, psychological or physical, because what we are doing all the time is creating these images which are at variance all the time. Our life is false security from illusions.

K: I understand. Look, madam, is it an illusion when you have

got a husband and a wife and each person seeks security in the other? Actually face it. Do you call that illusion? This is what we are doing. I wish you would go step by step. All right.

So we are saying the brain needs security. It has found security in religion, in conclusions, in concepts, in ideas, in images, which prevent seeing clearly. Right? That is our question.

Now can this desire or the urge or the compulsion to be secure, can the brain activity stop for a few seconds even? Do you understand my question? Am I explaining myself clearly?

Q: How can we answer that question without it already being a conclusion from a previous experience?

K: No, no. That's why, if you conclude it is from a previous experience, so we are saying without conclusion. Sir, can you observe that flower without conclusion, without naming it? Can you observe your girl or your boy, the politician, the priest, whatever it is, can you observe without some kind of opinion, reaction, judgement, evaluation, jumping and interfering with your observation?

Q: It seems to me that all we are concerned about is stimulation.

K: Yes, sir, it is part of simulation. We all agree. But would you please consider this for a few minutes: that's why we asked from the very beginning if you are serious in the pursuit of this question you will have to find out for yourself whether this perception can ever be clear, not distorted. It can only be clear, not distorted when there is no interference from the past, the past being the remembrances, the associations, the ideas, the images and so on and so on. So to make it very simple now: can you observe without the past? That is, can you observe your friend, your girl, your

husband, your wife, or your man, without all the remembrance of the past interfering with your observation? Yes, sir?

Q: Without the past I wouldn't be able to understand a word you are saying.

K: No, sir. Look, sir, may I put it differently. The observer looking at that flower, the observer who looks, is not the observer the past? Is that clear? You observe, you observe your wife, the observer, the 'I' who says, I am observing, is not that observer made up of all the images, of all the remembrances, of all the insults, of all the pleasures, of all the sexual etcetera, etcetera, which is all the past, so is not the observer the past? Right? That's simple. Now, so the past is looking at the flower and saying, that is a chrysanthemum, that's a rose, that's pink, that's violet and so on, so the past is always observing the present. Right? I don't know yet, sir. We are asking when one sees the observer is the past, which interferes with perception, then one asks, is it possible for the past, the observer, to end and look? This is complex and if you want to go into it I will go into it much more deeply. We must come to this point first. So the past with all the memories, hurts, insults, happiness, boredom, tears, everything is the past, that is the essence of the observer. Now the observer then says, that is a chrysanthemum, names it and thinks it has understood it, thinks it has seen it. Right? Now I am asking, can that observer come to an end? I have asked the right question therefore it must be the right answer, you will get it in a minute. Do you understand my question? Am I making myself clear?

So is love a remembrance? No, don't shake your head, please. Go into it, see what we are all doing. So I won't bring in love,

because that's complex. So can that observer come to an end so that there is clarity of perception? It can come to an end only when the observer says, when the observer realizes that which he is observing is the observed. The observer is the observed. You understand? Right, sir? No. Go slowly. Now wait a minute, sir. How do you listen to that idea, to that statement? The speaker said just now, the observer is the observed. Right? It is a statement. You don't understand it, you say, what the devil are you talking about. But how do you listen to it? Do you listen to find out or you are listening saying, I don't understand? Are you resisting? Are you trying to make it into an idea? You follow what I am saying? Which is it that you are doing? When the speaker makes the statement that the observer is the observed, how do you listen to that, how do you approach that statement?

Q: You don't want to approach it. You don't want to listen.

K: All right, don't approach it. Who cares? Don't listen.

Q: When the observer is the past, the accumulation, the memories, the hurts, everything from the past, then you say the observer is the observed.

K: I said to you, sir, how do you listen to it? How do you listen to any statement which you have not heard before?

Q: I see images.

K: I am asking a question: how do you listen to some statement or some fact which you have never heard or listened or seen, how do you come to it, how do you receive it?

Q: With joy.

Q: I believe it.

Q: It seems that the way I look on it is that I form an image, you

say, the observer is the observed, I form an image of something which is the observer.

K: Therefore you have already come to a conclusion. Therefore you are not listening. I am not saying you should.

Q: No, I don't know what listening means.

K: No, sir. Look, may I put it in a different way: how do you approach a question which you have not heard before, a statement which you have not listened to before? How do you approach it.

Q: Sir, it seems a little odd to look for an answer.

K: What is your actual approach, because your approach is going to dictate the answer. Right? If you are frightened your answer will be a thing that will be frightening; if you approach it saying, I must get agitated about it, your answer also will have no meaning. So you must find out for yourself, if I may ask, what's your approach to a statement like, the observer is the observed?

Q: Sir, one is with the observed, on the same vibration.

K: Look, sir: how do you observe your wife, or your girl friend, or your boy friend, how do you observe them? Please, I am asking you. You are observing the image that you have created about that person. Right? So the observer is the observed which is the image. Do you see that? It's very simple. Don't move away from it for the moment, please hold on a minute, you can discuss it a little later, I am not preventing you from discussing or contradicting, or saying, you are rotten, what you are talking about. But I am just asking, when you observe your boy friend or girl friend or your husband or wife, the observer is the past, the memories, all that, when he observes the wife, or the girl or the boy, he is observing, the observer is the observed, is the picture. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, wait. So the past has created the present, which is the wife or the girl or whatever it is. All the churches are filled with this. The past has created all that and when you observe the past is observing. So the observer is the picture, is the image which he has created. Clear? Have you got it? This is really very important once you get this. So the observer is the observed, which means there is no longer the difference between the observer and the observed. Right? And so you remove the conflict, the division. Right? Is this clear? May we go on with this? I am working, I hope you are also working.

So we have found something extraordinary. Right? You have found something extraordinary, which is, you have removed the cause of conflict which arises when there is division - the Arab, the Jew, the Muslim, the Hindu, you follow?, the communist, socialist and so on. So you have removed the conflict that comes about when there is division. Right? That is, when the observer realizes that which he is observing is himself. Right? So we are left now with the fact that the observer is the observed. Right? The fact.

Q: So what takes place with the observer?

K: We are coming to that. First see the fact, sir, what happens. So the observer is the observed. Right? Then what happens to the observer? Listen, I have put you a question, if I may, what happens to the observer?

Q: He becomes the observed.

K: Look at yourself. You have a girl friend and so on, I don't have to repeat this eternally, you have an image about her and the image is the past and the observer is the past, so the observer when

he looks at her or him is seeing himself as the observed. Right?

Then what happens? Go slowly. Then what happens actually?

Q: There's...

K: No, sir, go into it very slowly, patiently.

Q: If you make a judgement you create another conflict.

K: So don't make judgements. You don't struggle with it, so it is. Right? So it's a fact for the first time you are seeing, a fact.

Wait, go slowly, what happens?

Q: Sir, after a judgement is made a person, a mind, is no longer able to enquire anything about the observer.

K: Look, let's move in another direction for a second. The thinker is the thought. Right? If there is no thought there is no thinker. Right? So the thinker is the thought. So before he divided thought and the thinker. We said the thinker is the thought, without the thinker there is no thought. So there is no division between the thinker and the thought. Right? There is only thinking, not a thinker. Right? Now wait a minute, go slowly. The experiencer is the experience. Now you are going to rebel against this! Right? Go into it carefully because most people are seeking experience, super or physical experience, various forms of experience, thinking that the experiencer is different from the experience. Right? But we are saying, the experiencer is the experience. The experiencer, if he doesn't recognize the experience it has no meaning. Right? He can only recognize and explain the experience according to the past memory, so the past is the experience. Right? I wonder if you see this clearly. So there is no seeking of experience. You won't like this! Right? Before you went out seeking experience, went to India, followed the gurus, did all kinds of silly nonsense thinking that was



experience, but when you realize that the experiencer who is the past, with all the memories, goes out there, he recognizes the guru or the experience according to his conditioning, the past. So the past is that which he is experiencing. No? So the mind then says, I have seen this, I am not asking any further experience. This is a tremendous thing if you discover this. Then you are a light to yourself - I won't go into that, leave that for the moment.

So we said, the past is the observer who thinks he is separate from that which he is observing and so he says, I am looking, I am examining, I am drawing a conclusion. Right? All that is the action of the past. So when one realizes the observer is the observed then what takes place?

Q: No more images.

K: Sir, talk from direct...

Q: If I observe the flowers with an image, do we mean I am in contact with the image and not the flowers, then I am the image?

K: No, sir. If you understand, if you realize that you, that the observer is the observed we have gone into it enough for the moment - when you realize that as a fact then what takes place?

Q: I become the observed.

K: Then what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, go slowly, madam, you are too quick.

Q: The tension of accumulation round the observation ceases to be added to. There is no additional accumulation around the observation.

K: So what does that mean?

Q: To go beyond.

Q: That means we are free to...

K: Not, we, not we.

Q: When this happens to me my mind relaxes.

K: Please, you haven't really seen this. You haven't actually seen, realized, as you realize pain, hunger, sexual demands, you haven't seen the actual fact that the observer is the observed. Then what takes place?

Q: We are no longer taking any more sickness into our body. Then the sickness that is present in our body at the moment is not being added to. There is no more sickness, there is only that that is. We are not reinforcing the accumulation, we are not reinforcing the sickness any more.

K: Do please, if I may request you most kindly and respectfully, do you actually see the fact that the observer is the observed?

Q: Sir, if I see that, then at that moment there would be a...

K: No, not, 'at that moment'. Always.

Q: I see that fact and I don't know what to do with it.

K: Not, 'what you' - you see you have separated yourself and said 'I don't know what to do with it'. So you are acting still as the observer.

Q: When you say, observed, you mean the observed as image?

K: Yes, sir. We said from the beginning, sir, that the observer, when you observe your wife or your girl friend, the observer is made up of the past, past memories, past hurts, past insults, the image that you have made about her. When you observe those images, those hurts, those remembrances are observing, you are observing that, not your wife, not your girl, you are observing that, so the observer is that. Right? Just a minute. If that is absolutely

clear then what happens?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, madam.

Q: I feel alive.

K: Who is 'you' feeling alive?

Q: There is aliveness.

K: You haven't gone into this. Look, this is part of meditation, you want to know about meditation, this is the beginning of meditation, the vitality of meditation, if you don't understand this you can go off into meditation and go off into all kinds of illusions and silly nonsense. Because we are eliminating totally the division between the observer and the observed who creates conflict, me and you, we and they, the Arab and the Jew, the American, the Russian, the Indian, and the Muslim, we are eliminating totally all that if you see the observer is the observed. Look: the Hindu in India and the Muslim in Pakistan divided by a boundary, divided by nationality, divided by language, divided by their religious beliefs, all that is created by thought. Right? The thought is memory, the past. So when you see that, that one is conditioned by belief, whether it is Hindu, Muslim, Jew, you are then observing the belief. So what happens when the observer is the observed because there you have eliminated - there is the elimination, not you have eliminated - there is the elimination of all conflict.

Q: There is no direction.

K: Oh, no, you are guessing, madam, please.

Q: Doesn't the mind become quiet?

Q: There is silence.

K: I don't know, sir. I don't know what happens, you have to

find out.

Q: At this moment there is a feeling one must experiment with this more.

K: There is no experiment. May I go into it a little bit? Please, I am not trying to influence you, I am not trying to make you think the way I think - I don't think. If you think, you are going your own way. There is only the observation of the fact that the observer is the observed. Right? That's the fact. And that realization has come because I have carefully examined the whole process, it was not a stupid conclusion, an illusory conclusion, a desired conclusion, it has been logically, reasonably, sanely examined. And that examination shows the observer is the observed. Right? So what has happened? Before the observer tried to do something about the observed, he tried to control it, he tried to shape it, he tried to deny it, he tried to suppress it, he did everything to conquer it one way or the other. Here there is none of that because he realizes the observer is the observed. So the central point of conflict has been eliminated. Right? Have you? Therefore what has taken place? Through conflict you have wasted energy. Right? The mind in conflict which is division, the observer and the observed, in that division energy has been expanded, wasted. Right? Through conflict. When there is no conflict what takes place? There is no wastage of energy. Right? So what happens? Then that which is observed, because there is only pure observation not the image observing itself. I wonder if you see all this. Look, sir, when there is no observer, there is only observation, isn't there. Not conclusion, not opinions, not fixations, just observation. Then when there is that observation that which is being observed

undergoes a change. I wonder if you see this. Look, sir, take a very simple example - you are interested in all this?

Audience: Yes.

K: Good, good. Am I stimulating you? I am afraid I am. That's why, you all have depended so much on stimulation and you add another stimulation to it, but I am not acting as a stimulation at all, I am just showing it to you, and if you want to look at it, look at it, if you don't, don't. It's very simple.

I am greedy, let's suppose, I am greedy. So far my conditioning has said, I am different from greed. Right? I can control greed, I deny greed, I say, what's wrong with being greedy. But when there is the realization that the greed is me, of course, right?, then what takes place? There is the observation of that reaction which has been named as greed. Right? There is only observation of that feeling, of that reaction which has been named as greed, I don't name it now, I just observe it. In the observation that feeling is undergoing a change. I wonder if you realize this. So the thing that has been called greed is non-existent. I wonder if you see this. This requires - right, sir? The very thing you observe - the very thing that is being observed undergoes a radical transformation if there is no observer. We don't change fundamentally as human beings because we have divided the observer different from the observed. Right? So there is no fundamental change. But there is a fundamental change radically and at great depth when the observer is the observed so there is only pure observation. When there is that pure observation that which is being observed undergoes a radical change because there is no naming it, no conclusion about it, no abstraction, no escape, just observe. Have you got this? Are

you doing this?

Look, sir, let me put it round another way: we are used to self-analysis or professional analysis. Right? Introspection, or inspection by another, which is called analysis, professional analysis or self-analysis. Now is the analyser different from the analysed? I am sorry, there are here some psychoanalysts, I hope I am not pulling the rug from under their feet. This is a fundamental question even the analysers must ask. I am analysing my greed. Right? Is greed different from me? Obviously not, I am greed, then what am I examining and who is it that is examining? Right? So the analyser is the analysed. No? So I don't analyse. There is pure observation of that which before was being analysed. Right? So there is no analyser at all. Right, sir? That means you are denying the whole concept of division, the analyser and the analysed, you are my patient and I am analysing you, or you are analysing me. But when you and I realize that the analyser is the analysed, that greed is me, how can I examine the `me'. I can only examine the `me' if there is a higher `me', which is another part of my invention. I don't know if you follow this. So I invented god, or super ego, or super consciousness which is examining. That super consciousness, or super self, or super god, is still me. Right? So I stop analysing - not, I stop, analysis stops. Then what happens to that reaction which I called greed? You follow? I have analysed greed and I say, it is right, wrong, good, bad, why shouldn't I and all the rest. Now I realize - not, I realize - there is the realization that greed is the observer. So there is observation of that thing called a feeling. Right? Just observation. When there is this clear observation that feeling undergoes a radical change, it must

because you are not naming it, you are not denying it, you are not suppressing it, that changes. I wonder if I've made this clear. Right, sirs? Have I made this clear? Not, I - do you see it clearly for yourself, therefore you are out of this conflict, greed and not greed, you follow, the battle that goes on inwardly all the time.

So when this takes place there is always clear observation without any motive, without any conclusion, just to observe. Sir, you don't know what it means. To observe a flower without naming it, to observe the person whom you think you love, to observe. Perhaps the lady or the man won't like it because you have suddenly brought about a radical transformation in yourself.

Now to observe without association, that was the question. This is part of meditation, to remove totally the observer who is seeking god, seeking enlightenment, seeking, fighting, fighting, fighting. Right? So meditation comes then as you live - we will talk about it later.

Is it time, sir?

Q: It's five to one.

K: I hope it will not rain Thursday and we might meet in the Grove or another place. May I go?

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH APRIL 1978

Krishnamurti: This is a dialogue, a conversation between two people, but unfortunately there are too many people to have a conversation with two people. When we have a conversation of this kind we are talking over together as two friends perhaps our innermost deep problems that concern our daily life, not some theory, not some speculative ideas or hypothesis, but rather be concerned with something that affects our daily constant life. And so we are not opposing one opinion against another or one theory against another theory or hypothesis and so on but rather as two friends who know each other fairly well so there is a certain sense of affection, care, attention to what each one is saying to the other, and with that I hope we can talk over together any question, any problem that we have. So what would you like to talk over this morning?

Questioner: Krishnamurti, when you become aware that you have just had a reaction, some thoughts, do you ever go back and look at all the thoughts that comprise that reaction?

K: When you have a reaction of a particular kind must you trace it to all the other reactions one has - is that the question, sir?

Q: The question is actually, do you look at all the thoughts that bring that reaction about?

K: To look at the whole content of thought that brings the reactions. Is that right?

Q: Right.

Q: I'd like to hear your thoughts concerning what you consider telepathy to be, suggestion, magnetism, also what you think of the



idea that the present, like I can talk and learn differently as to what the present is and how you differentiate that from the past, sort of why you make a difference. Also why you many times make a part of the whole thing, such as the experiencer, there is a difference there between the experiencer and the word experience, to me the experience is the whole actuality, the experiencer only perceives a relative portion of that actuality, and I'd like to know why you see no difference between the parts and the whole, and concerning telepathy, suggestion and magnetism.

K: Yes, sir. I don't really quite understand your question. Would you make it brief?

Q: What is the difference between a part and a whole, and what are your thoughts concerning telepathy, suggestion and magnetism, and this is kind of three questions, you've had two of them there, and this is the third, how do you distinguish between the present and the past?

K: I've got it, sir. That's enough. You are asking, how do you differentiate between the present and the past.

Q: No, what do you think the present is.

K: What is the present.

Q: A simple idea of 'what is', as I've been taught. The past is only memories, it does not any longer exist, the same as the future does not exist, it's only today, it's only here and now.

K: Yes, sir, I understand your question. So you are asking, what actually is the present.

Q: Yes.

K: And the other is about magnetism.

Q: Magnetism, telepathy and suggestion.

K: Ah, magnetism, telepathy, occultism, mysticism, all that is implied in that question. And the first one, sir?

Q: What is the difference between a part and a whole.

K: Oh, yes, what is the difference. That's enough.

Q: When you say that the observed is the observer, and I then take that to other psychological relationships to the observer, such as anger, envy, grief, I believe I see what you are saying. I have difficulty with only short glimpses of what you refer to, as when you really see that the observer is the observed and there is pure observation, that there is an immense release of energy. I see only footling bits of it. Is it that it is so terribly difficult to really see what is involved?

K: All right, sir. The questioner asks - have you heard all of his question? - so I don't have to repeat it, have I? No? All right.

Q: The question in my mind is that when one is investigating it's clear then and one begins to see how to translate this seeing into an action which is not somehow in the confusion and disorder, perhaps the mind becomes occupied with communicating this seeing or formulating an action, and the action itself turns out to be destructive.

K: I don't follow your question, sir.

Q: Well it seems that the mind can either see or it can communicate, formulate, and when you see and somehow relate this to other human beings, the mind can do one or the other but to translate the seeing into an actual action which has an effect in the world seems to be a very difficult thing to do.

K: I don't quite follow it. If somebody else follows his question would they make it clear for me?

Q: The different between thinking and clarity and putting it into action.

K: What is that, sir?

Q: He felt it was difficult to express the clarity that he is thinking about in his everyday life, how do you translate it into action.

K: When you see something very clearly how do you express that clarity in daily life, which is through action. Is that it?

Q: This follows the question that was being asked, in the matter of the observer and the observed there seems to be a fear that exists that one will be overwhelmed by what one sees in that way. Could you comment on this - overwhelmed by whatever one is looking at, in particular fear.

K: Right.

Q: Sir, I'd like to extend upon a topic we discussed this last weekend about pressure and what sort of pressure becomes ambition exerts on the brain; and the next part of this question involves self-improvement because I have noticed that within the past ten years in America, and especially here in California, there has been a vast proliferation of many sorts of methods of self-improvement. I can separate these into two basic categories, you have the psychological area where many people report that new creation and reality by certain visualization techniques, and the others are in developing motor skills and technical experiences, things like that; also the question is, all these sorts of meditation systems put pressure on the brain and that included with the pressure to become successful in life, and that type of pressure.

K: I am lost! I am sorry, you are asking, sir, are you, would we

discuss more deeply the whole question of pressure, is that it?

Q: Yes, pressure.

K: Yes, that is, are you asking, sir, could we discuss this question of pressure and its effect on the brain and when there is a release from pressure is there a different structure in the brain - is that what you are asking?

Q: Yes, and also the fear involved of not getting on this escalator of pressure, when you jump off of it. Do you still follow?

K: I don't quite follow it, sir. Put it just simply, very simply. Sir, would it be helpful if we discussed this question of pressure and go into it in detail, in detail, then perhaps your question will be answered fully?

Q: Yes.

K: Right, sir. Could we discuss that, do you want to discuss this question of pressure?

Q: I would like to go into why you say the body must be light and sensitive in order to be attentive.

K: The body must be light and sensitive - mustn't the body be light and sensitive to pay complete attention. Not too many questions, sir because...

Q: And how one can become light and sensitive, to be attentive without taking time.

K: Yes. Sir?

Q: Sir, I can understand all that you are saying and what you write and lecture, but to transform it in actuality becomes very difficult in the sense when you say investigate and be aware of experience, it becomes an action but the experiencer as me is always there, and it is becoming rather than being all the time.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: How do I get free of this, it's like a dog chasing a flea all the time and I'm caught.

K: Yes, I understand. Please, that's enough questions - I am not preventing you from asking your questions, sir, but there are so many questions I don't know what question you would like to talk over together. There is the question of pressure: could we discuss that in our daily life, how that pressure and the various forms of pressure affect our actions, distort our way of life, perverts or deforms the total comprehension of life. Could we discuss that? Perhaps all the other questions will be included in that. Would it help if we discussed that?

Q: Yes.

K: You are sure? I wonder what we mean by the word 'pressure', to exert pressure, to weigh down by a burden, by a weight, by propaganda, by various assertions of people that this is right, this is wrong, this should be, this must not be - the weight of nationalistic attitude, religious pressures, economic pressures, the pressure of knowledge, the pressure of tradition, and so on, do you want to discuss that?

Will it affect our daily life, which is our daily action, if we understand the nature and the structure - we are using the word 'structure' as a movement, not a physical edifice. So we are trying to find out together in a conversation what pressure does on our action, how it deforms the activity of the brain, both physically as well as psychologically - can we go into this. Is this what you want to discuss?

So we are asking, what do we mean by pressure, the word, the

actual word not the result of it? You may mean one thing and the speaker may mean a different thing, so we must both have the same meaning to that word, must give the same significance to that word. We mean by pressure, an imposition, a weight put on one, put on the brain and therefore on thought, on feeling and all the rest of it. Pressure in the sense of forcing you to a particular direction, compelling you to act in a limited way, making you do something that you may not totally agree with. The economic pressure of a society that is broken up, there is the pressure of the climate, the food, the coarseness, the insensitivity of one's organism and so on - do we agree to the meaning of that word together? Is this what you and the speaker mean when he uses the word 'pressure'? Right? Are we clear on this? So first of all are we aware, know, conscious that we are acting under pressure? Whether it be religious pressure, economic pressure, climatic pressure or the pressure in relationship with each other and so on, are we aware that we live under tremendous pressure, tremendous strain? We mean by 'aware' very simply, know, recognize, see, observe, feel. Are we? This is a discussion please, this is not a conversation with myself.

Q: Could you repeat what you said?

K: I'm afraid I can't but I will put it differently. Does one know for oneself, without being told, that you are under pressure, does one know for oneself that your whole life is lived actually under pressure? The word 'pressure', we know what we mean by now, because we both understand the meaning of that word. Don't at the end of the talk, discussion, say, I didn't agree with you. If we don't agree with the meaning of that word now let's be clear on that point.

Q: We are not referring mainly to physiological pressures.

K: Both physiological as well as psychological.

Q: Well I think most of the times that you refer to the psychological, social life pressures and a little bit more than that is that if we choose to live without those pressures, how can we go about it.

K: We will find out, sir. We will find out first of all if it is possible to live without pressure, and then how will we act if we are not under pressure, both physiologically as well as psychologically. So that's the first question: do we know, recognize, be conscious, be aware that we are living under pressure?

Q: Most of the time, no.

K: Perhaps not, most of the time, part of the time. But it is really most of the time, but it doesn't matter, we will begin with part of the time. Are you aware that you are aware, know, recognize, see that you are under pressure? Then if you recognize it don't you ask yourself, why do I live under pressure. Right? Do you?

Q: Is it possible to live not under pressure?

K: We will find out, sir. We will find out later if it is possible or not possible. First of all we are asking, do you know, if you do know that you are under pressure, don't you ask yourself, why do I live under pressure? Does the society demand this pressure around you? We are just asking, don't say, yes, or not, we are going to find out, we are going into it very deeply. Does society act as a pressure? If you say, yes, is society different from you? The society has been created by you - not by you actually, by your grandparents, by your past - so the past with all its traditions has

created this society, of which you are a part, you are not different from society. I wonder if you see that. Do we see that? That you are society. So don't say, I am acting under the pressure of society. So if that is very clear, please I am not forcing you to think in one particular way at all. I am not exercising pressure. I am trying to point out.

So we say society is exercising pressure, economic pressure, national pressure, colour prejudice pressures, black and white and blue and yellow, all the nationalistic, racial, communal pressures. Right? Are we aware of them? Right? Are you aware of the pressure of the past? Which is, tradition, that tradition may be two days old or ten thousand years old, or a million years old, the past - (noise of clocks striking twelve) I was once speaking in Rome and there are a thousand churches there! And you can imagine what happened! Shall I go on? Yes, sir?

Q: I wonder if you might add in your discussion the pressures brought by lack of unity within an individual? There are different centres for things in man, emotional, intellectual, in his mind and well whatever else you want to add. Can you include that perhaps?

K: Yes, sir you can include all those. Please, if we leave out one kind of pressure it doesn't mean that we are not taking that into consideration, we said, pressure implies all this, pressure. The pressure of those bells, and the reaction to those bells and so on and on. Is this a joke? Is somebody pulling our leg?

Now if we are aware of these various kinds of pressure, which is the pressure of the past, the pressure of relationship, the pressure of not knowing and wanting to know, the pressure of emotions, desires, fears, all that, if you are aware of them, don't you then ask,



why does one have to live under this kind of pressure? Is it that we so easily accept, that we are so conditioned to live with these pressures it has become a habit, it has made us dull, therefore we don't break away from that pressure? So what is the fact, or the truth, why do human beings right throughout the world, wherever you go, live under pressure? Why? Why do you as a human being representing all humanity, which is an actual fact, why do you live under pressure?

Q: If we broke away from it we would be afraid.

K: If you broke away from this pressure, are you saying that you would be frightened?

Q: In some cases it is because of a threat to life, many people live under pressures and for others it is because they enjoy pressures.

K: Some people escape from one kind of pressure but live under other pressures, or others may enjoy the pressures. They must be a little odd if they enjoy the pressure which brings about neurotic activity - then if they like that kind of activity, they are welcome to it - we can't discuss that now. But we are asking: why do we live under pressure? Ask yourself please and find out why, the truth of it, not the opinion of yours or somebody else's, why? Is it habit? Is it that we are lazy, indolent and that's the easiest way to live? We have never even probably questioned it, and perhaps this is the first time you are questioning it. And if you are questioning it for the first time, what is your reaction?

Q: Sir, I feel myself to be the pressure.

K: Yes. That is, you are saying there is no outside pressure but the very essence of pressure is myself. Is that what you are saying?

Q: Yes.

K: Is that so? I am not saying it is not. We are enquiring, we are exploring into that.

Q: Perception of that pressure, like you can't really say, that's pressure and the self is only a part.

K: Sir, we said there is the social pressure, there is the family pressure, there is the pressure of the girl or the boy, the husband over the wife, and the wife over the husband, the pressure of knowledge, the past, the pressure that is exercised by the propaganda of churches, of various religions, of various gurus, of ideals and so on and so on, does all that include the pressure in oneself? You understand my question, sir? Is the nature of pressure essentially the nature of desire? I am just asking, I am not saying it is. Wanting to be something, or not wanting to be something? Because it is very important, it seems to one, that we understand the nature of pressure and find out if it is possible to be free of pressure and what is the state or the quality of the mind, the brain, that is no longer functioning under pressure? These are the questions. Because a person who is living under pressure of any kind is not free. Right? If one lives under the pressure of a philosophy, which is the pressure - philosophy means the love of wisdom, the love of truth - if that love of truth acts as a pressure because it is just a theory then that also brings about a distorted action.

Q: What is the difference between that and passion? You talk about passion.

K: No, not quite sir. Is that what you mean, passive awareness?

Q: Not passive, passion.

K: Passion. Not quite.

Q: Passionate more than pressures.

K: It all depends what you call passion, what do you mean by that word? Do you mean by that word, lust?

Q: No, I think what you referred to as passion...

K: Just a minute, sir, I am exploring that, it's not what I mean but what we together mean by that word passion. Does it imply lust? Or there is a passion of a person who wants to make a tremendous lot of money. There is a passion or desire or the urge of wanting sexual release, or wanting to be somebody or other. We mean by passion, at least what the speaker means by that word, there is passion when there is the ending of sorrow. We won't go into that for the moment, if you don't mind.

So are we aware of these various forms of pressure? If we are, why do we accept these pressures? Is it that we are indolent? Indifferent? We have got used to them and therefore we accept them? This constant repetition on the television, commercially, buy, buy, buy, buy, that acts as a pressure. So why do we live with pressures? Is it that we don't see what pressure does?

Q: Is it that some are positive, whereas some are negative?

K: No, there is no negative or positive pressures, there is only pressure.

Q: Can't you see the difference between destructive and constructive?

K: Just as minute, sir, by using the words constructive and destructive, we are then emphasizing there is a pressure which is constructive, a pressure which is destructive; we are talking of pressure, not whether it is creative or not creative. If you are under

pressure obviously you cannot be creative, whatever that word `creative' may mean. If you are under pressure whatever you do will be destructive.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir, that's what I am asking you, sir, pressure. Now if one is aware of it, one has asked the question, it is absurd to live under pressure - not absurd, see first of all the reason, the logic, the sanity of being free from pressure. Right? Because one has exercised reason, logic and being sane about it, you say, is there a way of living in our daily life, which includes business action and all the rest of action, without pressure? Which means, is there a way of living completely free from every form of pressure?

Q: Perhaps we should be free of our expectation.

K: The pressure of expectation?

Q: You would have to be in a spiritual state if you want to be free of all pressures.

K: No, sir. First of all find out, sir, please be good enough to listen.

Q: I have, I have thought of these things that you have already talked on, and like I said, I know some people, we have made decisions concerning what pressures we desire and what ones we don't...

K: Yes, sir. You may like one form of pressure and you don't like other forms of pressure. We are saying any form of pressure, any form whether you like it or don't like it, whether it is pleasant or unpleasant, whether it is profitable or not profitable, to live under pressure is to act not only defensively but also your actions will inevitably be deformed, incorrect, not actual.

Q: The air pressure helps hold up our corporate form, keeps our physical form in place, there are gravitational pressures and physical pressures in the universe.

K: We said that, sir. First of all do we see clearly that to act under a pressure brings about a deformation of action, it is not straight action.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir. First of all, pressure exists, and then do we react to those pressures.

Q: That's what the discussion is about.

K: Wait. That's what I am saying. Do we react to those pressures, some pressure you like which is pleasant, another pressure which you don't like and therefore avoid it. Sir, please let's be clear. We said every form of pressure, pleasant, unpleasant, good, bad, psychological, physiological and so on and so on, any form of pressure must deform action. That's all. If you say, I don't agree with you, then we can discuss that: I think you are talking nonsense, then we can talk about it. But don't say, certain pressures are necessary, certain pressures are not necessary.

Q: Pressure is life and if we are life then we are pressure, and the fact that we respond to pressure.

K: We said that. Pressure exists.

Q: Yes, they exist without a reaction.

K: Yes. First of all, do you see pressure exists and then your reaction to those pressure, that you like some pressures and you don't like some other pressures.

Q: No, I don't see that. I just see pressure.

K: Yes, that's all I am saying, just pressure.

Q: Sir, would we be able to have a meeting like today without pressure, from our side perhaps the pressure of wanting to know, from your side perhaps the pressure of wanting to communicate?

K: Did you come here under pressure? Did somebody force you to come here?

Q: No, but it is the internal pressure.

K: Wait, wait. That's what we said too, internal or outward pressure exercised by another or your own desire, any form of pressure is distorting. That's all I am saying, you may agree or disagree, go into it, let's go into it.

Q: Could you go into as I didn't quite grasp your idea of the difference between the pressures in form and those that deform. One pressure puts together, it brings an ideal...

K: Sir, wait a minute, perhaps mechanically or technically or welding together two metals, it's under great pressure. And the other is the pressure exercised by each one on each other, does that bring about a union.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We said, sir, if you were there the other day when we were discussing in that little hall, the observer is the past. You may disagree with that, you are perfectly welcome to disagree, let's talk it over, don't say, I disagree with you, and walk out, or shut yourself and resist. We are saying the observer is the past, the past projects and that which is projected the observer sees. That's clear, isn't it? No? So the observer is the observed.

Q: There is a sense of separation between the two.

K: When there is a separation between the observer and the observed then there is conflict. That conflict acts as a pressure, or

the division itself is the cause of pressure. Take, sir, what is happening in the Middle East, in the Far East, there are the Israelis, the Jews and the Arabs, the division, racial, communal, religious, territorial division, so where there is division there is pressure: the Muslim and the Hindu, that goes on all the time between various nationalities, this pressure. As long as there is division between man and woman, or between a group of people against another group, that very division creates pressure. Under that pressure we act, as an Arab, as a Jew, as a Hindu, as a Buddhist, as a Christian. So we say, any form of pressure which brings about division will inevitably be incorrect action. That's one problem, division. Division in myself. Right? Division in one's ideas, the ideal - I am this, I must be that - which is a division, therefore conflict, therefore pressure. I wonder if you see. Right? Pressure under communists brings about conflict.

So we find, again logically, reasonably, observing factually, that where there is division that division brings pressure, as, I am a Hindu, or I am a Christian, I am a Jew, or I am an Arab, a Muslim and so on, that brings inevitably a division, that division brings a pressure because I believe in this and you believe in that. So out of that pressure there is effort, conflict, and we live under that conflict, with that conflict which acts as a pressure.

Q: Are we saying that our likes and our desires of society are invalid?

K: Yes, I am questioning the whole thing, sir.

Q: If you say there is an incorrect action, you must have an idea of what correct action is.

K: Yes, all right. If you say, this is wrong action, incorrect

action, you are asking what is correct action. Right?

Q: Your idea of it.

K: Not 'my idea', sir. You see.

Q: You have to know it if you are to recognize it.

K: Sorry, it's not 'my idea'. You want to know what correct action is. If I tell you what value would it be?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir, just look, listen quietly, first find out what the poor speaker has to say.

Q: Well, I agree with this lady in observation, I would not see something if it was not a question of sensation, although I am in the present and I may be only seeing the past around me because it has taken time. But you exist in your present at that point, and I exist in my present here, perceived in the past or having a memory of the past. The past is what has been and not 'what is'.

Q: Give the speaker a chance.

Q: I thought this was a discussion in which I thought everyone was to be talking back and forth. Perhaps many other people have no thoughts and are not thinking, or just following the sentences as they go along and have not thought about it.

Q: Mr Krishnamurti, assuming one has completely realized and understood what you are pointing out to us about all the pressures and even though one can throw the television set away, and try and dispose of as much as one can, there is still society. I personally have the same conflicts, if I go out with my friends there is always the pressure and then the only way for me to escape it, not to escape it, is to walk away from it. It's just instead of exchanging for one pressure to become a recluse which would create pressure



again, just to walk away from it. But it's again pressure because then I miss people.

K: Yes, of course. Quite. So would it be right if I suggested that, or said, put into words, does one see the danger of pressure, as you see the danger of a precipice, or the danger of a snake? If you see something is dangerous both physiologically as well as psychologically then it is a danger, you don't go near it. But apparently it is extraordinarily difficult to see the danger about something with which we are completely identified. If the speaker is totally identified with India, with all the superstitions, with all that goes on there then he belongs to a group of people opposed to another group of people. This division is the most dangerous thing. Right? If I see the tremendous danger of it I drop it, I am not a Hindu. That's all I am pointing out. I am sorry if you are cold.

Q: I am sorry if you are.

K: I am not, I am talking, it makes you warm.

Q: This dropping bit that you speak about it sounds very easy but the vision that I recognize is not to say that I am this or I am that, but to say that I am.

K: Instead of saying I am that, I am this, just say, I am. You know, just a minute, sir, when you say, I am, I wonder if you realize the meaning of such a word, those two words, I am. I believe, or rather I have discussed this point with some people, well-known scholars and religious people, only god, according to them, can say, I am. Right? And nobody else can. If you are god, then it's all right.

Q: Well, all right. Is god separate from myself?

K: Sir, then you have to enquire, what are you, when you say, I

am, what are you?

Q: I don't really know that.

K: We are going to find out. You can't leave it to god, so you will have to find out when one says, I am, what does that mean? The name, the form, the bank account, if one has one, the attachments, whether to furniture or to a person, attachment to an idea, all that and more is what you are. If you say, I am not all that, then what are you? An idea? A conclusion? A supposition? Then it is the result of thought. So as long as you think, you say, I am; if you don't think, what are you? This is an old problem, this.

Q: Sir, it may be right to say that I am a manifestation of man.

K: All right, sir, what does that mean? Why do I have to assert, I am, and then give a meaning to it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Find out, madam, what it means. First of all, do you see the danger of it, that's all first. Do you actually see the danger of it, or is it an idea that it is dangerous?

Q: I think it is the idea.

K: That's right, sir. Like you don't actually see the danger of nationality, if you saw the real danger of nationality you would not belong to any nation, or to any group. Right? So do you actually see the danger of pressure? Don't include the pressures to everything, just pressure. One pressure is good enough, if you understand the danger of one pressure.

Q: I don't know how to actually see.

K: Sir, actually see it. What do you mean by that?

Q: I see ideas, intellectually I can see the danger of nationality.

K: Now wait a minute, if you see the danger of nationality are

you free of it? You may carry the passport.

Q: I think I see only the image of nationality but I do not see the actual danger.

K: We will go into it, sir. Nationalities imply, don't they, glorified tribalism. Right? That means different tribes calling themselves different nationalities bring about one of the causes of war. Right? Don't you see the danger of war? Is that an idea? Or is it an actuality, people going about maimed, all the horror of war? That's not an idea. If you go to a veterans' hospital you will see the appalling things there. You see that is one of our difficulties, sir, that when we hear a statement we make an idea of it but we don't actually see the fact without the idea. That's one of our conditionings. Right? And also the word `idea' I believe in a dictionary means to observe. You understand, sir? The word `idea' has its root in seeing, it means to see, to observe, not conclude, not make a conclusion of what you see. Right? So if you see the danger of nationality, it's finished. Though you may carry a passport you are no longer a citizen of a particular group of people, of a country. Right? Now in the same way, does one see the fact, not the idea, that division brings about conflict: your belief and my belief. Right? Your conclusion and my conclusion, your god and my god, or your guru opposed to my guru, if I have one, thank god I haven't got any. So this division will inevitably bring conflict. Now if you see the danger of conflict, it's finished. If you see the danger of falling down a precipice you are very, very watchful of precipices, therefore it is not a temporary danger, it is a permanent danger.

Q: We don't see the danger of a lot of pressures.

K: That's it, you don't see the danger of pressures. That's all my

point. Q: Isn't it a little bit easier to see the division between nationalities, races, those kind of external things, but I don't see how there is not a division between the observer and the observed.

K: Oh, you don't see that. Sir, the division between the observer and the observed exists, doesn't it?

Q: Yes.

K: When there is that division there is conflict between the observer and that which he has observed.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Watch it, sir, just look at it, sir, just consider for a minute. When the observer says, I am greedy, or, I am angry, then the observer acts upon anger. Right? Either he suppresses it, rationalizes it, runs away from it, he is acting upon it, therefore there is conflict. Isn't that so? So is that conflict necessary?

Q: Sir, if that action is not taken...

K: We will find out, sir, we will find out. If you see when there is conflict, out of that any action will be distorted. So if you want - if one wants to act correctly with regard to that greed then one has to find out why this division exists at all, division between the observer and the greed. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I question it.

Q: It is impossible.

K: Is your anger different from yourself?

Q: It is part of that response.

K: It is part of you. You say that, do you, actually it is part of you, therefore there is no division.

Q: But then there is something else.

K: Ah, the something else is the good old idea that there is some super consciousness.

Q: No, I don't mean that. I mean, well, I feel I am greed, and I know that is part of my personality at the moment, but I also feel myself as an actor who can possibly act.

K: All right, at the moment of anger, at the moment of anger are you different from anger?

Q: At the moment of anger I don't think I am completely conscious of myself.

K: That's it. Which means what? You are anger.

Q: Anger is that which...

K: Wait, there is that state of anger.

Q: Yes, it's my consciousness.

K: That state, don't bring in consciousness and all that because then we go off into something else. So at the moment of anger there is not me who is angry, there is only that state. Then a second or a few seconds later the division takes place: I have been angry.

Q: Yes, but...

K: Wait, go step by step. I have been angry, so division has taken place immediately. Why? Why does this division take place?

Q: Because that which says, I have been angry, that I is dependent on that anger.

K: That's what I am saying, sir. When you say, I have been angry, the I who says, I have been angry, is different from anger, is that so?

Q: It seems to be because at the time when there was anger there was only anger, later on something else says, I have been angry.

K: Yes. What makes you say that, that I have been angry?

Q: Bad feelings.

Q: No, it's not even the bad feelings.

K: Wait, don't please accept what I am saying. Why should you say, I have been angry, why bring the division in?

Q: Because that anger destroys the process.

K: No, go into it, sir, look into it a bit more.

Q: I feel that I should not be angry.

Q: At the moment of anger there is an active threat.

K: At the moment of anger, sir, there is not you who says, I have been angry, there is just that feeling, that reaction. Then a few seconds, or a few seconds later you say, I have been angry.

Q: My ego.

Q: You mean that when I say, I have been angry, that is merely another thought?

K: No. Just find out, sir. First of all when you are totally angry there is no division. Division takes place when you use the word 'anger', because at the moment of that feeling you don't say, I am angry, there is only that state; then you recognize it, the recognition, the process of recognition is through words. You recognize, or put it differently, you recognize it, you can only recognize it by knowing that you have been angry, which means the past. So the past, which is the observer, says, I am different from anger. This is so simple.

Q: If we said, I am anger, would that be no pressure?

K: At that second there is no pressure. I may be wrong, find out. Sir, which indicates something extraordinary, if you go into it: facts, 'what is' can never be under pressure, doesn't bring pressure.

Right, sir? Say when I say, I am jealous, the feeling at that moment has no pressure, later on when you say, I have been jealous, then you try to do something about it, then that is a pressure. So facts have no pressure. Like seeing the fact that nationality is a danger is not a pressure.

Q: Direct action.

K: Direct action takes place when there is no distortion of pressure, you act according to facts. What time is it?

Q: Five minutes to one.

Q: There's an answer to the question and it's quite simple and it's just one word - which came first, the chicken or the egg, and there is an answer, which came first. It makes quite a lot of sense. And it fits. It's a question which has been asked for a long time, many people ask it and never bother to answer it. It's almost the difference between nationalism and nationality. To me nationality is a world that people come from, it's just a geographical location where a person is born and does not create a conflict, but nationalism is a travesty of one's nation's state over another and brings us into conflict and division. To the question, which came first, the chicken or the egg.

K: The egg or the chicken?

Q: Yes.

K: I don't know.

Q: There were eggs before there were chickens, reptiles laid eggs.

K: It seems that it is rather an irrelevant question which came first, the egg or the chicken.

Q: Not in the whole logic of the thinking involved in any of the

questions about conflict.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, sir, is there an observation of that feeling without naming it? The moment you say, anger, it is violence. Right?

Q: I don't know what is happening, but it is violence.

K: What we are saying, sir, is when we use the word 'violence' is has got so many associations with that word, that you must not be violent, you should be violent, under certain circumstances you must be violent and so on and so on, whereas is it possible to observe that feeling without naming it. You can if you are really aware of the thing taking place. I think we had better stop now, don't you.

Q: How do you observe without bringing in the observer?

K: By not naming. By looking at something, sir. Experiment with it, try and find out, whether you can look at something without naming it.



## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 8TH APRIL 1978

I am very glad that you have got a lovely view of the mountains with snow. I hope you are looking at it.

We have had the last Saturday and Sunday two talks, and some of you may not have been there so I am afraid one has to go over what we talked about, and I hope those who heard it will not be bored by my going over what we talked over together.

If one may point out, we are considering rather complex problems of life, our daily life, and we are not in any way concerned with theories, hypotheses, speculations and ideas. We are going over together, and I mean together, the whole problem of the weight, the pressure, that exists all around us - socially, religiously, ethically and politically and economically and so on. This pressure, if one goes into it as we shall, affects our whole conduct. It brings about a different kind of reaction, not natural, but rather abnormal. I do not know if you have gone into this question: whether it is possible to live in this world without any kind of pressure, and therefore with complete freedom. And that's what we are going to talk over together again this morning. And if I may again point out, you are not listening to a talk, you are not gathering some ideas, or be told how to act, how to behave, how to live properly, but rather we are going together to examine this problem, which is very, very complex, and needs a great deal of attention, and reason, logic, into this question that human beings right throughout the world, it doesn't matter what nationality they are, what religious group they belong to, what institutions they accept, they are always acting under different kinds of pressure. I

do not know if one is aware of this. And if you are aware of it, why is it that human beings support, or hold on to these pressures.

As we were saying the other day, there is the pressure of language. I hope you don't mind if I go over it again. There is the pressure of language. Language uses us but we don't use language. The instrument uses us rather than we use the instrument. A word, like communism, socialism, in America has a tremendous significance and a great antagonism to it. And so the word, if you will kindly listen, the word shapes our thinking, shapes our reactions, controls our attitudes. The word drives us. But we don't use language, language uses us. I do not know if you are aware of this. And if we use language correctly, without all the emotional content which is attributed to words, then if we do that, you and the speaker use words without reactions, without prejudice, without any kind of emotional content attributed or given to that word, then communication between you and the speaker becomes very simple, very clear, and can be understood very easily. That means we partake, share together in the examination, in the exploration, together into this whole question why human beings right throughout the world live under a great deal of pressure, strain, weight.

First of all we also said there is the pressure of institutions - the democratic, the republican, the labour, the socialist, the communists, and the Mao and so on, various forms of religious, economic, social, political institutions. The word 'institution' means to stand, not move, to accept direction, to obey certain rules, which gradually become, however lightly accepted at the beginning, become routine; and a mind which belongs to institutions becomes

mechanical. If you will consider that and go into it, which we did last Saturday and Sunday, perhaps you will then see how it important it is for human beings not to belong to any kind of institutions. Which implies that to solve our problems a different kind of mind is necessary, not a mind that is mechanical, not a mind that has accepted rules, regulations - which doesn't mean that you disobey laws - but psychologically accept the implications of institutions, the hierarchy, status, position, rules and so on.

And also we talked about, together, the pressure of ideologies, ideals. Most human beings throughout the world have unfortunately accepted ideals. Perhaps you also have many, many ideals. And to have ideals is considered highly respectable, highly noble, gives one great character and so on, this phrase right throughout the world - a man of ideals. I wonder is the function of ideals at all, if you have any. The speaker hasn't any because ideals imply, if you go into it very carefully, the avoidance of 'what is', what actually is going on. You are translating what is going on according to 'what should be'. The 'what should be' is not the actual. The 'what should be', the ideal, brings about a conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. And we live within this field of conflict which exists between ideals and what is actually going on. Most of us are concerned with the transformation of 'what is' in terms of ideals, in the context of ideals. These ideals are projected by thought - thought being the response of memory, response of experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain, recorded, and according to that record thought projects the ideals. And thereby thought thinks it can deal with 'what is'. I hope we are communicating with each other. The speaker hopes that he is

making the thing clear.

Please bear in mind, if I may again point out, this is not a lecture, we are trying together, I mean together, you and the speaker, together explore, go into, investigate into this question of pressure, why human beings, you who represent all humanity, live from birth to death under pressure. And one finds that the ideals act as a great pressure on human beings, and so they are always living in constant conflict, in trying to change 'what is' according to 'what should be'. If one is angry, the ideal is not to be angry. So using the ideal as a means to change anger there is always a conflict, a battle, a strife. One hopes this is made perfectly clear. And also I hope you are not cold. If you are you can lean against each other and look at the mountains, or if you want to listen, listen.

You know there is the art of listening, the art of seeing and the art of learning. The art of listening implies, to listen not to your own thoughts, not to your own reactions to what is being said, not to conform to a conclusion, but rather knowing what you think, what you feel, what your ideals are, putting those aside, listen to the speaker, if you can do that, then we are in communication. But if you go on with your thoughts, with your reactions, with your memories, then there is no communication, then there is misunderstanding, then there is mere repetition of what the speaker said, either accepting or denying, agreeing or not agreeing. So there is the art of listening. The word 'art' means according to an excellent dictionary, to put everything in its right place. When you have put everything in its right place there is no confusion, there is no disorder. It's only when you have not put everything in its right place there is disorder. The speaker means by 'putting everything in

its right place', to learn for oneself what is right, what is correct, what is actual. And that's why it is very important to learn the art of seeing. We have talked about the art of listening, we are now talking about the art of seeing.

Most of us actually do not see. We see through the image which we have projected. Please do consider what the speaker is saying. You look at that mountain, the beauty of those lines, that snow, and the trees, and the valleys, with the image that thought has created about them. That is, the word interferes with your observation. And you look at another, your friend or your wife, or your husband, girl, or boy, through the image that thought has projected about them. Don't you do that? If you have observed closely yourself, if you are married you observe your wife through the image that thought has created for ten days, or thirty years. So there is no actual observation, seeing the wife, or the girl, or the boy. You are always looking at each other with the images that thought has created about each other, so there is no actual seeing. Which again is an absolute fact. When you observe a fact there is no disagreement, it is so. You all agree to say, that grass is green. That is a fact. But if you like to say it is all a matter of illusion, if we both agree it is an illusion, then it is also a fact. So one learns the art of observation is to observe clearly without the image, so that image doesn't act as a pressure. Right? Are we going along together. I am sorry we are not closer together, and I hope the speaker is making things clear.

Then there is the art of learning, which is a little more difficult. Learning for most of us is memorizing. From school, to college, to university, if you are lucky enough to go through that conditioning, or unlucky enough, there you accumulate facts, cultivate memory,

store that memory about those facts and act skilfully or unskilfully according to the knowledge that you have acquired. That's one kind of learning. And then there is the other; which is to go out, act, and from action learn. That is, both accumulating knowledge and then acting, the other, acting and accumulating knowledge from acting, both imply the accumulation of knowledge. The art of learning implies to put knowledge in its right place. And there is the other kind of knowledge, other kind of learning, which is non-mechanistic, non-accumulative, but learning constantly. Therefore learning becomes extraordinary, a movement of vitality, not merely routine. I won't go into this now because we have other things to deal with.

So there is the art of listening, there is the art of seeing, there is the art of learning. If we do not put everything in its right place then there is confusion, and that confusion acts as a great pressure on our life. If you don't put money in its right place and make money as though it was the most important thing in life, then inevitably you create, bring about confusion. If you do not put knowledge in its right place, knowledge, to act skilfully, to think clearly, in its right place, then knowledge becomes a tremendous burden, a pressure. And if you do not put sex in its right place, then all life, all our existence is based on pleasure. If you do not put politics, which is the government of people, and if the people are not able to govern themselves then there are these extraordinary people called politicians who rule our lives. And as one observes what is happening in the world they are creating more and more confusion, more and more wars, bitterness, anxiety, tears, division. So to learn that institutions have no place for a mind that can learn

the whole of existence, not through any specialized groups or teachers and so on. Now that is what we discussed, more or less, last Saturday and Sunday.

Now if we may go on to another thing. We are talking about pressure. There is no good pressure and bad pressure, pressure that is necessary, pressure that is not necessary. We are talking about pressure, not the opposites of pressure. There is the pressure of relationship, pressure of family, pressure of children, the pressure of the husband over the wife, and the wife over the husband, the girl over the boy, and the boy over the girl. Where there is this pressure there must be conflict. Now, please don't accept what the speaker is saying at all. We are examining together the facts of our life, our daily constant life. We live in this pressure of families, of relationship with each other. Don't you? Or am I talking to myself? There is the sexual pressure, the demand over each other, the possessive, dependence, attachment, jealousy, anxiety, hatred and so on. This exists, these are actual facts in relationship. Why do we live like this? Why do we accept this way of living? I do not know if you have considered it, if you are serious enough to find out a way of living in which this conflict ends, completely, totally, not for a few days, not for a week, but entirely, absolutely the ending of conflict in relationship. We are going to examine that - rather you and the speaker are going to examine this thing together, why you, as a human being, live like this. When we use the word 'human being' we mean by that word you are the representative of all humanity because all humanity lives like this, in constant struggle, constant effort, jealousy, anxiety, fear, the pursuit of pleasure and so on. So you as a human being, please do listen to

this, and don't translate it into an idea, but as an actual daily fact, that you are the representative of all human beings, which again is a fact of tremendous significance.

So why do human beings throughout the world live like this? Is it because they are lazy, indifferent, callous, they talk about relationship and they don't mean a thing by that word, is it habit, is it tradition, is it that we do not know how to break through this? And perhaps that may be one of the reasons why human beings do accept so easily to live in this conflict. Which again becomes a tremendous pressure on our brain, on our life.

What do we mean by that word 'relationship', to be related, to be in contact with. When you use the word 'contact with', not only physically, sexually, but psychologically much more, to be in contact, psychologically with another implies that you are actually in contact psychologically with another. Is that so? Or you are in contact with the image that you have projected about her, the image that thought has created during a thirty year or forty year relationship, intimate and so on, or a relationship that lasted for ten days, you create an image about that person; and that image is projected by memory, by experience, by the knowledge that you have accumulated about her, or him. That knowledge is stored in the brain, and that becomes memory, so you are looking - please listen - you are looking at the woman or the man from the knowledge that you have acquired about her. You project that knowledge upon her and you see the image that you have projected, and you think you are in contact with that person, but actually you are only in contact with the image that thought has projected about her or him. Right? This is not mere analysis. This



comes when you observe. Observation is entirely different from analysis. Analysis implies a duality: the analyser and the analysed. The analyser is the analysed. Right? I wonder if you see that. This duality between the analyser and the analysed is encouraged by the psychologists, by the psychoanalysts. All right, sir? Forgive me if there are any psychologists and psychoanalysts and the rest of the specialized group, if there are some here, forgive me. The analyser thinks he is separate from that which he analyses. Is that so? Is anger different from you, or you are angry? You are angry, not you think you are angry, or you realize that you have been angry after that emotion is over. I hope you are following all this. Do follow it for your own sake because then you will live a totally different kind of life with absolute order, and therefore a mind that is not caught in any routine, in any ideologies, in any community, in any nation, in any group, in any sect, religious or otherwise.

That is, the thinker - please listen - the thinker thinks he is separate from thought. Right? Because the thinker says, 'I can control thought, I can shape thought, I can alter thought, or suppress, control, direct thought'. But is the thinker different from thought, or the thinker is the thought? You understand my question? If the thinker is the thought then there is no division. Wherever there is division there must be conflict - the Arab, the Jew, the Hindu, Muslim, the American against somebody else, and so on and so on, the black and white, and purple and blue. So when one sees the fact that the thinker is the thought, the thinker doesn't exist without the thought, so when you see that, when you realize that, as you realize danger, when you see this the whole movement of thought has a totally different meaning. May I go on? I hope you

are following all this, or I am making myself clear.

So thought has made itself - no, sorry. Thought in itself is broken up because memory can never be complete, and thought is the response of memory. Right? And thought has created this extraordinary mess in the world, including the religious confusion, all the images that churches and the temples, and the mosques have. Thought, when it has created these images in temples and churches, is worshipping itself. I wonder if you see that. So thought in our relationship with each other has created this image about each other, and therefore there is no relationship at all.

Relationship implies being completely in contact with each other. Not only as is generally translated sexually but much more deeply, more profoundly in contact. And that contact with each other implies no division. And perhaps then one can use the word 'love', though that word is so abominably misused.

So is it possible not to create images about the other? First of all one must realize that we do have images. Then to ask, how do these images come into being. We explained that, that thought in its very nature is a broken up thing, a fragment. It's like a vase which is a marvellous thing and is broken, and a little piece of that vase thinks that it can put together the totality of life.

So thought, which is born of memory, memory being knowledge, experience, thought is in its very essence the past, and so when you observe another through the eyes of the past you are not observing at all. Now is that possible not to observe through images, through your projection of another? It is possible only if you are interested, if you are serious, if you really want to find out a way of living that is entirely different, then this mechanism of

bringing about images, one has to go into that very carefully. How does this mechanism come into being? You understand my question? How does the image-making come into being? Now you ask that question, if you ask it at all, and how do you approach that question, any question? Do you approach it with previous knowledge, with a conclusion, with fear, with asking somebody to tell you? How do you approach a question which is a human, deep, fundamental question, how do you come to it? Because how you come to it, what your motives are, dictates your answer. That's obviously a fact.

So how do you approach this question: why does the mechanism of making images come into being? And can that mechanism have its right place, and not interfere or project in relationship? Do you understand my question? Do you?

Q: Yes.

K: Thank god, somebody does! If you do, then you have to ask, what is the function of the brain. We don't have to be specialists of the brain, you don't have to read books about the brain. You can observe it yourself, how you talk, how you listen, how you see the whole operation of the movement of the brain, you can see it in yourself. The function of the brain is to register, like a tape recorder. The tape registers, so does the brain. It registers in order to acquire knowledge and to be safe, secure. The brain demands that it be completely secure from danger, so it registers. And in that registration it seeks security. The registration is a means of finding security. Then there is security in the past, because there is no security in the future, you don't know what's going to happen in your relationship. So the image is formed the moment you register

any incident, any word, any insult, any flattery, that exists between man and woman, that is immediately registered, and that becomes the memory; and according to that memory projected, you observe the other. Now we are asking - please listen to this, if you care to - we are asking, is that registration, which is necessary in certain places like driving a car, technological knowledge, reading, writing and so on, is it necessary to register when your wife, when the girl or the boy insults, flatters, hurts, says something which is ugly, why should the brain register this? Do you understand my question? If it doesn't then there is no image made. Right? Right, sirs?

Now the question is: can that registration come to an end without effort, because you have put the necessity of registration in its right place? Which is, when you drive a car, you have learnt after several lessons how to drive a car. That is, you have registered, the brain has registered the knowledge of driving a car; the care, the brakes, and all the rest of it. That is its right place, to register what is necessary, technological knowledge, driving a car, learning a language and so on, in its right place. And we are asking, the registration of an insult or a hurt is not necessary, why should it be necessary? It becomes a necessity, or it is inevitable, when you, when you have an image about yourself. Are you following this? That image about yourself is hurt. If you think you are a marvellous speaker, or a marvellous person, highly evolved and terribly intelligent and all the rest of that blah, when you think all that and you create an image about yourself as an American - the American way of life, American freedom, American abundance and so on and so on - you have an image about that, about yourself.

And that image is hurt. Can you live without an image? You understand my question? Can you? Don't say, no, yes, sir. It implies a great deal. Which means thought doesn't create, or build, the image that is me. The 'me' being all the ambitions, corruption, status, position, ambition, all that is the 'me'. The essence of the 'me' is conflict. Can one live without any of those attributes? Which means to be totally, completely free of self-created images.

Then in relationship there is no division, not you and I, I seeking my particular ambition, my particular position, my particular desires, and she also doing the same thing according to each other's images. So when there is no image there is actual relationship. Which may be called, if one can use that word without its ugly content, love. Love has no pressure. Everything else has pressure. That's one point.

And also we ought to consider the pressure of fear. Most human beings throughout the world are frightened, about their physical existence, about their, you know, outward fears. And also there are deeply rooted fears which are embedded in the psyche. You know most people in the world say, 'Why bother about all the investigations into something psychological, depth and all that, why don't you live with the things around you happily'. That's what America is trying to do: have more things, enjoy your life, more money, more cars, everything outward. You know you can't live just outwardly, there are all kinds of problems if you live outwardly, if you are totally, completely caught in the worldly things. Because one is caught in the worldly things there is going to be more and more confusion, more wars, more misery. Do you understand this question? You know Marxists, and the Mao's, and

all the rest of those people, say, control the environment, the outward circumstances and you change man. It has never happened? You can't change man through control of the environment. They have tried it for centuries in different parts of the world; man has never been changed through compulsion, through dictatorship, or through what is called 'non-socialism'. So one has to go into this problem of fear, not only the outward insecurity of physical existence, but also the deep layers of fear, of which one may be conscious or not. But one has to investigate, go into it. Will you? Will you go with the speaker and investigate your fear? Your fear is not your own, it is the fear of mankind. Man wants physical security, so do you. That physical security is denied if you have wars, with all your talents, your industry is geared to war. Right? For god's sake, how can you live this way - I don't know.

So you seek physical security by accepting nationalities, accepting little groups, little communities, little groups together, little families together. And when you do you are separating yourself, and that very separation brings about conflict not only outwardly but inwardly, which ultimately projects itself in war. War is not only for economic reasons, political reasons, geographical reasons, but also essentially because man is violent. You know all this. So we are concerned with the examination, with the investigation, to see if man, you, can go beyond all fears. Right?

What is fear? One is most familiar with that sensation of fear, which we name as fear, what is that, how does thing come about in our relationship, however intimate we are with each other? What is

the source of fear? What is the beginning of fear? You know man throughout the ages has never gone into this question of ending of fear, but always looked to some outward agency called god, or some means of escaping from that terrible burden, that burden that brings about darkness, paralysis, incapacity to think clearly, we run away from it, and we are very good at cultivating the net of escapes that we are caught in. So what is fear? Not a particular form of fear. If you understand the nature of fear, how fear arises, how fear dominates, consciously or unconsciously our life, then if you understand the nature of fear then you can deal with the particular. But by talking about the particular, the fragment of it, you can never understand the totality of fear. Am I making myself clear on this point? Yes? Good. So we are concerned not with the particular fear, which we will understand or be free of when we understand the whole tree of fear, with its roots, with its leaves, with its flowers, with its expressions, all that, the totality.

What is fear, how does it come about? Is it based on the past? Does it spring from the past? Or does it have its source in the future? Or is fear in the present, now? You understand my question? Does it come out of the past, or the future is so unknown therefore fear, or is the fear now? I don't know how to put it. Is the fear unrelated to the past or to the future? That's better. You understand my question? Yes?

Audience: Yes.

K: That is, does the source - the beginning of fear is in the past - please listen - or the future and what is the future? Is the future different from the past, or is the past modified through the present, through the incidents and accidents, exigencies of the present,

modifies itself, the past, and becomes the future. You understand? So the past is continually moving to what is called the future, modified. I wonder if you see all this. So we are asking, the past is the source of fear. Right?

Q: Not always.

K: Generally, sir. Don't say, not always. Look at it, consider it, don't reject or accept. Look at it, first observe it, not with your conclusions, your judgements, your evaluations, just to observe those mountains, you know, look at it. In the same way, look at fear. So when you look at fear, we are asking, does it come from the past, and not from the future, as we think of the future, because the future is the movement of the past through the present. One loses a job, the memory of that losing, unemployment, and all the rest of it, is cultivated by thought as memory: I have had the job, I have lost it, I hope to get another. And the fear comes when I have lost the job, and I hope to have the job tomorrow. I may not and there is fear. Right? So the source of thought is in the past - the past being the experience of having a job, losing it, the knowledge of it, the pain of it, the anxiety of it, and the fear of not having another job. So from the past the whole movement of fear takes place. One has had a toothache, been to the dentist, no pain, but the memory of that pain is stored up, and again you are afraid that pain may return. So there is this constant movement from the past, physical, physiological as well as psychological - psychologically one did something, one said a lie and one is frightened and so on, all from the past. The past is knowledge. Right? You are following all this?

So thought is the outcome of the past. Right? Thought which is



the outcome of the past, thought engenders fear. Right? Fear of death, that is, fear of dying in the distant future, it may be tomorrow, or ten years later. Thought has projected the idea of coming to an end and afraid of coming to an end. It has lived in the outcome of the past, projected itself into the future as coming to an end and is frightened of it. So thought, which is the outcome of the past as fear, so thought is fear. I wonder if you understand all this. So can fear come to an end? Now, please I am asking you that question, the speaker is asking you that question, can fear come to an end? How do you listen to that question? Do you make an abstraction of it, that is, draw a conclusion from it, an idea of it, or do you actually listen to it without a conclusion? You understand my question? Which is it that you are doing: do you actually listen without conclusions, without ideas? If you do, then as you are listening, at the moment, there is no fear, naturally. But when fear arises from the past, can you look at it without any reaction, to observe it? Then you will find both consciously as well as unconsciously that thing which was born out of the past comes totally to an end, though it is deeply embedded in the recesses of one's mind.

Now how do you examine, or explore into the hidden parts of the brain where fear may exist. Do you understand my question? Do you? You think you understand fear - may be consciously. But there are unconscious fears, deep down, how do you examine those, how do you look at those? Can you bring them all out, expose them, not through analysis, not through going to a professional and lying down on a couch and saying all - I don't mean that, that's all too childish. Forgive me. But to open the

content of your consciousness and see where the fear lies. Now this becomes very difficult perhaps and subtle, so please listen.

Can consciousness - you know what consciousness is? To be conscious of the mountains, to be conscious of the green grass, to be conscious of the person sitting next to you, to be conscious of the colour, the beauty of the hills and so on, to be aware, to be cognizant, to know. All that is implied in the word 'consciousness'. Consciousness is made up of its content. Right? Without its content there is no consciousness. Its content is fear, jealousy, anxiety, saying, I am an American, not an American, I am a Russian, Jew - part of that also, all the ambitions, greed, envy, hurts, fears, pleasures, so-called love, sorrow, death, all that is the content of that consciousness. Now we are asking - please listen - can that consciousness become aware of itself? Can it look at itself, as it were, in a mirror? You see yourself, your face, your figure, in a mirror. You may say, I like, I don't like it, I must be thinner, I must be fatter, I must have longer hair, shorter, whatever it is, you can look at yourself in a mirror. In the same way - please listen, I'll show you something - in the same way, can this consciousness, which is made up of you, you are that consciousness, you are not separate from that consciousness, you are that, can that consciousness see itself - not partially, not in little bits, as anger, jealousy, this, or that, but see.

We are saying, can that consciousness, yours, that consciousness is the consciousness is the consciousness of mankind, your consciousness is not different from mine or somebody else's, consciousness with its content is like every other human being. One may call oneself an American, or a Hindu, or a

Buddhist, or a Catholic, but it is still part of that consciousness, conditioned according to climate, culture, position and so on and so on, but it is still within that area, within that field. So can consciousness see itself as you see yourself in a mirror, your face? I don't know if you ever put that question to yourself.

Then we would like to ask the question, who is the observer who is looking at that consciousness? Is the observer different from that consciousness? I hope you are following all this. Is the observer the higher state of consciousness which is looking at the lower state of consciousness? Is the higher state of consciousness projected by thought, which thinks there is a different state of consciousness, but thought has put the content of its consciousness, which makes up consciousness. It may invent a super consciousness but it is still the product of thought. Right? I wonder if you follow all this.

So we are asking can consciousness observe itself totally? That is, is consciousness alive, active, and can you observe anything active, moving, changing, reforming, reforming and forming itself again, this constant movement is going on. Therefore it is extraordinarily alive. And can that consciousness watch itself in action, in movement? Am I making the question clear? How do you answer it? How do you answer it, not me answer it, not the speaker answer it, how do you answer a question of that kind? Because that's your life. Your life, your daily life is composed of this, fear, pleasure, sorrow, pain, hurt, jealousy, ambition, greed, envy, all that. Can all that observe itself? Or is there an observer who is totally different from the thing which we call consciousness? So man has said, yes, which is god. And god

becomes one of the greatest pressures in life. You understand?  
Because again that is an invention of thought.

Now the thing is, it is only possible to observe the totality of consciousness - or rather when the mind is totally, completely silent, without any movement, then any movement can be watched. I wonder if you understand this. We are going into something which is called meditation, not all the silly nonsense that has been spread around by the industrialized gurus, that's not meditation, that's just some form of mental tricks and habits, and the cultivation of new habits. Meditation is nothing whatsoever to do with all that. We are saying, a mind that is completely quiet, totally quiet, can watch any movement. And it's only in that state, in that quality of silence consciousness can be watched completely. Then the problem is, is it possible to bring about a mind that is totally quiet?

I am afraid it is time to stop. You must be frozen and if you want to go into this further we will do it tomorrow morning. Perhaps it won't rain and there will be more sun. May I get up and go?

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 9TH APRIL 1978

May we continue with what we were talking about the last three meetings that we have had.

First of all I think it should be made quite clear that we are not doing any propaganda, to propagate any series of ideas, or a way of life, but rather together each one being free, independent, to observe very clearly what is taking place, not only in the external world but also what is happening inwardly. I think it is becoming more and more obvious for those who are at all aware, and concerned with the world, which is gradually deteriorating, disintegrating morally, ethically, and if I may use the word, spiritually - observing all this, no obvious solution for the confusion and the misery and the sorrows of the world are present. What is required, if one can so point out, which is based on reason, logic, and clear thinking, that a new mind is necessary, a mind that is not reformed, or reconditioned, but a mind that is totally new so that it can face the political, religious, economic, social problems of the world, a totally different kind of mind, not put together by thought. And therefore it behoves us, if I may again point out, the importance to find out for oneself what is the movement of thought: how it arises, what is its nature, whether thought can transform itself at all. Or that in the very approaches of understanding the whole movement of thought, perhaps that very observation might bring about a different quality of brain and mind.

As we said before, if we may again point out, that this is not a lecture, the speaker holding forth on some speculative, theoretical,

hypothetical ideas, but rather we are thinking together, not agreeing together, not accepting anything that the speaker says, but together freely, without prejudice, examine the nature of thought.

As one observes, thought has created the modern world with its extraordinary technological advancement, thought has divided the world into nationalities, into particular groups, one nation against another nation, one group against another. Thought also has divided the world into various religions: the Christian, the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Islamic world, and this is the product of thought. The contents of the churches, the temples and the mosques, are put together by thought. That again is fairly obvious for those who want to go into this question whether it is possible for a new mind to come into being. So it behoves us and becomes important to find out whether thought, the whole process of thinking, can solve all our problems, both domestic, international, family, religious and so on. Thought, as we pointed out earlier, is broken up, thought can never comprehend or perceive the total, because the fragment can never understand or see the totality of existence because thought in itself is a fragment, is a broken up thing. We said thought is broken up because it is based on memory, and memory can never be complete, you can always add to it, or take away from it, extend it, but thought, which is the outcome of memory, knowledge, experience, can never, under whatever circumstances, comprehend the totality of existence. It can understand one fragment of it, or one piece of life, and try to alter it, disfigure it, reform it, but it is still a fragment, a broken up thing, because it is based on knowledge, on time, on the process of evolution. I think this must be clear for each one of us if

we are going to understand, communicate with each other whether thought, the whole movement of our thinking can solve any problem, any psychological problem, any problems of relationship and so on.

And also one must be clear that thought has not created nature, the tree, the mountain. But thought has made use of nature. So thought, whatever it creates, is a reality, the actual. Thought can create illusion - that's also actual, real. But it cannot possibly bring about or understand what is truth. That truth is not yours or mine or somebody else's, belonging to a church, or to a group of people. That truth can only be understood when we comprehend totally the whole movement of thought. That is, to give thought its right place, and for thought to realize for itself its own nature, its own fragmentary quality. And that is one of our difficulties, that thought cannot possibly understand that it is a fragment. It can imagine that it is a fragment, it can think that it is a fragment, but to actually perceive, to actually go into the question whether thought is a fragment, to observe its movement as fragmentary, broken up, is that possible?

As we have said before in all the talks, previously and now, we are examining together. It is not that you are accepting what the speaker is saying, you are free to get up and go, or free to listen. But if you do listen please be good enough to listen without prejudice, without some conclusion, without some pet opinion, because we are not opposing one opinion against another, one conclusion against another, one hypothesis against another. Together, you and the speaker, are examining, exploring, whether it is at all possible, observing what is going on in the world, and the

confusion, the mess, the misery, the wars, the economic condition and so on and so on, whether it is possible to bring about a new mind, because the old mind, the conditioned mind cannot possibly solve these problems. Thought cannot solve these problems, because thought itself has created these problems. If this is absolutely clear, not because the speaker says so, but because you yourself clearly see for yourself, therefore there is no divergence of opinions. You are only dealing with facts, and not your fact or my fact, but the fact, the actuality, what is happening in the world. From that, in that observation one realizes completely that a new quality of mind is necessary, not a mind that is reconditioned to a new pattern but a mind that is totally free, therefore a quality of a creativeness that is so necessary.

If you have observed, a new culture can only come out of a religion, not the orthodox religion, not the religion of thought, not the religion of images, of beliefs and authorities, dogmas and rituals, but a religion that is capable of perceiving what is truth - not your truth or the speaker's truth, or somebody else's truth, the philosophical or psychological truth, but the absolute truth which is the essence of religion. We are using the word 'religion' in the sense of gathering all energy, not dissipated, not controlled, not given a certain direction, but this quality of energy that comes into being when there is total freedom. And that energy is only capable of enquiring totally into what is truth. In that sense we are using that word 'religions'. Not the institutionalized religions, with their priests, with their dogmas, with their rituals, with all their imaginative, romantic states.

So to understand all this, as we said, the mind, the brain must be



free from pressure because if there is any kind of pressure, both physiologically as well as psychologically, any kind of pressure, there is distortion. That's clear and very simple. It's not a matter of acceptance, it is so. If I push you in a certain direction, whatever you do will be according to my pressure. Or if you yourself have your own pressures, your own demands, your own desires, which act as pressures, then whatever you do will be deformed, distorted. That again is a simple fact.

So we are going together to examine, as we said, the pressures of language, the pressures of ideologies, the pressures of institutions, the pressures of family, the domination of one over the other, and also we discussed yesterday about fear. We should also go into the question together of the whole problem of desire, which is perhaps the greatest pressure one has. If I am too intent, please forgive me, I can't help it. One must be passionate, one must have intensity, otherwise you can do nothing. We have destroyed that intensity, that passion, through perversiveness, through all kinds of idiotic pursuits, we have destroyed that capacity of great intensity through following somebody, through accepting various fads, religious fads with their gurus and all the rest of that nonsense - we have lost all that. Perhaps in enquiring together into this whole question of pressure we may come upon that intensity, not eventually, not just before you die, but in the very process of enquiry that passionate intensity can come about. It can only happen when there is no pressure whatsoever, of any kind, outwardly or inwardly. Actually there is no difference between the outer and the inner, it's one unitary movement, but we have divided the world as the outer and the inner. But when we see the inner has

created the outer - the inner being the whole movement of our thoughts, our fears, our greeds, our anxieties, and our pleasures, we have created this world, the world doesn't come into being by itself socially. That's what we have created. So the outer and the inner are one constant interrelated movement.

So we must also, as we said, examine together the question of desire. To enquire into that we must be clear that the word is not the thing. The word 'desire' is not the actual feeling, the actual emotional urge, or the reaction. So we must also be very clear that the description is not the described. One can describe the mountain, most beautifully, all the shades and valleys and depths, and the dignity and majesty of mountains, but the word, the description is never the actual. The painting, the poem, the statue of the saints that thought has created through words is not the actual. So we must be very clear when in examination, in investigation, that the word 'desire' is not the actual. We are now examining the actual, not the word. But we must also be very clear that the word 'desire' is not driving us. I wonder if you understand what this.

So what is desire? Because for most of us it is one of the most important pressures. Desire to be successful, desire to have more money, desire to obey, desire to follow, sexual desires, the desire of pleasure. So as it's one of the most important pressures in our life - not precious - you understand, it is not precious, but pressure. Perhaps my English may not be the American English, so please forgive. We are talking about pressure.

What is the nature of desire? How does desire arise? Why is there such urgent constant desire to fulfil, to become, to achieve? So we are looking into the nature of desire. What is the relationship

of thought to desire? Are they related, or are they interrelated? Is desire and thought a movement? Or is desire something separate from thought? So we are asking, what is desire? We have gone into the question, what is thought. We said thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain, and there in the very cells is contained the memory from which thought arises. So what is desire? Is desire brought about by thought? Or is desire independent of thought - please listen to this - or in the movement of perception, seeing, in the seeing thought takes control - which we will go into as we go along. All right, sir?

What is thought? How does it come into being? As I said, please, don't accept a thing that the speaker says, there is no authority here, though unfortunately he has to sit on a platform for the convenience of others, it doesn't give him an authority, a position, a status. When we are examining together there is no status, there is no authority, there is no conclusion. So we are looking together into this question of what is desire. How does desire arise? I do not know if you have ever enquired into that question. Or you are so accustomed to the expression of desire, and whenever desire arises there is this fulfilment of desire. (Pause while bells ring) May we continue now?

We are asking what is the nature of desire, and how it arises. (Further pause for bells) Imagine when you are in Rome where there are three hundred churches or more, one round every piazza, every via, all of them ringing for some time. I hope your Christian reactions are fulfilled!

I hope we can start again enquiring seriously, not facetiously, not for the time being, but as it is a very important factor of our life

to go into this question of what is desire, and what is its place in life, and what value has it, and so on. If you have observed most of the religions have said, deny desire, control desire, subjugate desire, deny desire in the service of god. The monks throughout the world, of different colours, have said, don't have desire. But when you deny desire, suppress desire it has greater strength, greater vitality, so inwardly burning with desire, outwardly have a calm face, read the book, don't look at a woman, don't look at the beauty of the world, nature, the marvellous earth, because that might awaken desire, so don't concern yourself, you are a monk, don't look at anything but the book. And when you do look at a woman, consider her as your sister, your mother, anything but what she is. This has been the way of the monks throughout the world. But we are not saying suppress, control, deny, run away from desire, on the contrary, we are trying to understand the nature of it. And when we have comprehended fully its structure, its nature, then it has its right place, then it doesn't fill your horizon, your whole life, therefore there is neither denying it nor suppressing it.

So it is important to understand the nature of desire, what is desire. Surely desire is a reaction from a stimulus. The stimulus is when you see something, in a shop window, when you see a woman or a boy, or a man, or a beautiful car, or a dress and so on. So desire arises through perception, seeing - please observe it for yourself, it is not because I say so - seeing, then contact, then sensation, then thought creates out of that sensation the image, and that very creation of that image is desire. Right? Please don't accept what the speaker is saying, observe it in yourself. You see a beautiful dress, shirt, trousers, or whatever it is, and seeing it,

touching it, then the contact, the sensation, and thought creating the image of you wearing it and desire arises. Right?

Please, as we said, this is not analysis. This is observation. When you observe, analysis has no place. When you observe the movement of sensation, the sensation, whether it be sexual, whether it be any kind of sensation, arises through seeing, the optical seeing; the observation, the contact, the sensation, and the image-making. That is the whole movement of desire. Right? But the problem is, that movement demands fulfilment, demands that it should gain what it wants, should buy, or whatever it desires. Now the problem is, where does thought come in and make it into a desire, into that desire demanding fulfilment? Where does thought come in? You understand the question? I must make it clear.

You see a beautiful car - I am taking the car, it may be a woman, it may be a man, it may be a marvellous picture, piece of furniture, piece of jewellery, whatever it is. You see a car. Then the contact with it, the sensation to own it, the sensation, and thought creating the image of you sitting in the car and driving it. Then the whole problem arises whether thought can separate itself from sensation. I wonder if this is clear. No, it is not, I'll make it a little more clear. You see the car; sensation, and desire, you sitting in the car, driving it. And if you haven't got enough money to buy a car you are jealous, you are anxious, you want it, you do all kinds of things, you steal cars. I believe that's the latest thing, you know, going on in this country. So the problem arises when desire demands fulfilment. Right? You see a beautiful woman, or a beautiful man, sex, urge, all the rest of it. The desire always wanting its fulfilment. The desire is constant, the objects of desire

may vary, but desire is constant. I don't know if you follow this. And then the struggle begins: I must not desire, I must desire, the edict of religions - if you pay attention to that kind of thing any more - or because you desire you fulfil whatever you want, this permissiveness of this country, which is spreading unfortunately throughout the world. You are setting the standard unfortunately.

So this constant struggle to do whatever the desire demands. It may bring pain, it may bring satisfaction, it may bring pleasure, it may bring all kinds of things, but it is a constant struggle. Where there is struggle there is expenditure of energy. Right? So the monks have said, don't waste that energy, therefore withhold desire, that energy is necessary to serve god - or whatever it is, Jesus Christ, and all the rest of it. All put together by thought. I am sorry we are speaking next to a church. So how to prevent the conflict, is the question. You understand? Desire is always creating conflict. You may be satisfied with one fulfilment of a desire, but that satisfaction demands more, so there is constant pressure, constant drive, which brings about a great deal of conflict. The question then is, is it possible to prevent this conflict? Because one realizes conflict is a wastage of energy, when you are related with another, man, woman, to be in conflict with each other is so futile, meaningless. And in the same way, one must find out whether this wastage of energy through conflict, which desire inevitably brings about, whether that conflict can end. Have I made this clear? I can go on.

How does this conflict arise in the movement of desire? Are we together in this? Please. We are understanding each other. Some of you perhaps will, some of you don't, it doesn't matter, it's up to

you. We are asking, where does conflict arise in desire?

Observation, sensation, contact, sensation. If that stops there then there is no conflict. Right? I wonder if you see that. You see the car: contact, sensation. That's normal, natural, you see a beautiful thing, a beautiful mountain, beautiful trees, lovely morning, sensation, but thought says, I wish such a beautiful day will continue tomorrow without rain. So is it possible - please listen - is it possible to be so alertly aware for sensation to stop and not let thought interfere with it? That is, have you ever observed the sea, or the mountains, or your friend, or your boy, or girl, with total awakening of all the senses, not just the eyes, or the ears, with all your senses to observe? I wonder if you have ever done it. Then you will see there is no division between the observer and the observed. That is, when you observe totally, with your heart, with your mind, with your eyes, with your ears, with all your senses awakened, with all the senses observing, then there is no desire as thought interfering with sensation. I wonder if you are seeing this. Do try now, as you are sitting there, to observe, it doesn't matter what, the tree with all your senses, not only with your eyes. If you do, the sensation of seeing colours, the sparkling leaves in the sun, the clarity of the blue sky, the sensation, if you so completely observe there is no centre from which you desire. I wonder if you have got it.

So we are asking: when thought interferes with sensation then desire begins and the demand of desire to achieve, to fulfil. If you see this very clearly then there is no suppression of desire. Which doesn't mean you fulfil desire. You have to go into this. If you are listening you will be doing it and therefore you will understand it;

if you are not listening, in the sense we are using the word 'listening', when you listen you listen with all your heart, with all your mind, with all your being, and not make an abstraction, an idea of what is being said. Then you are doing it, then you will see for yourself that desire, as we know it, has very little importance.

From desire there is the whole movement of pleasure, which is gratification, satisfaction, both sexually and otherwise. The pursuit of pleasure, which man throughout the world is doing now, it is becoming more and more exaggerated. The more sophisticated, the more civilized we become the greater the pleasure apparently, the pursuit of it - sexually, entertainment, football, you know, the whole cultural pressure which is based on pleasure. And what is pleasure. Why does man pursue everlastingly pleasure? We are not denying pleasure, we are not saying it is right or wrong, but why does man, wherever you go, pursue eternally this pleasure? The pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of worship, the pleasure of being a great man, a success, a reputation, the whole urge to pursue that which you have enjoyed yesterday and give it time and then pursue it. Don't you know all this? It's your life. Your life is based on this: pleasurable experience, pleasurable thoughts, pleasurable actions, gratifying. And the pleasure of attachment, the pleasure of possessing something, whether it is a furniture or a person. This is what is actually going on in all of us all the time. And when there is no pleasure there is anger, there is violence, there is destruction, hatred. Again these are facts, not my invention. And when there is no pleasure you get hurt. And when one is hurt from childhood - this actually goes on throughout life - when you are hurt you resist, you build a wall round yourself, you isolate yourself. And action



from isolation is neuroticism, incomplete, incorrect, destructive. That hurt is not having, not pursuing pleasure, but somebody preventing you from pursuit of that pleasure, and so on and so on and so on.

So one must go again into this question of what is pleasure. Is love pleasure? Is love desire? What is the relationship, if there is any, between pleasure and love, or desire and love? If there isn't any, why does man pursue this everlastingly, pleasure? You understand? Why do you do it? Your search for god is pleasure. All the things that you have created by thought, through sensation, gratification, satisfaction, is the pursuit of pleasure. Those of you who follow gurus, go to India and all the rest of that nonsense, is to have the greatest pleasure, which you call enlightenment. So we must enquire, if you are at all serious, what is pleasure. Because pleasure is also becoming very destructive: the pleasure of belonging to a certain group opposed to other groups, little sect opposed to another sect, the pleasure of being somebody in this world. You follow? All that. So it is very important, is it not, to understand what is the nature and structure of pleasure, how does pleasure arise, and has it any relationship with love. We will find out if there is any relationship between pleasure and love if we enquire into pleasure, joy and ecstasy, and their relationship to love. But merely to try to find out what love is without understanding pleasure it will lead you totally to a different kind of illusion.

So what is pleasure? How does pleasure arise? Is pleasure the expression of desire in its fulfilment? You have had a marvellous evening yesterday, sexually or otherwise, that is remembered, the

brain has recorded that event, it has been put on the tape, and thought says, 'I have had that marvellous time yesterday, I hope we shall another evening like that.' Right? You have seen a marvellous sunset, clear, golden, radiant, filling the earth with such marvellous light, there is tremendous enjoyment of it, delight in it, there is the remembrance of it. That very remembrance and the pursuit of that remembrance is pleasure - or sexually and so on, you can imagine all the rest of it.

So pleasure, at the moment of pleasure there is no registration. Right? I wonder if you have noticed it. The moment you say, I am happy, you are not happy. Happiness - we will use that word just for convenience-at the moment of being happy you are totally unaware. But a second later you say, 'I have been happy'. The remembrance of that thing a second later registers, and the registration of that happiness, which is gone, which is dead, that registration is thought remembering that incident, and demanding more of it. Right? So thought remembering an incident, however marvellous, beautiful, exciting, that incident has been registered, then thought takes it over, remembers it, and then demands more of it. And the 'more of it' is the pleasure.

So joy happens by itself. It occasionally, if you are lucky, quiet, unaware, not concerned with your little self everlastingly, it happens. Then remembrance of it, and the pursuit of that joy which merely becomes a pleasure. Joy is not pleasure.

Now the problem is, modern civilization is encouraging, commercially, in other ways, to pursue this pleasure, more, more, more, waste and so on. We are destroying the earth, we are destroying nature, we are destroying ourselves. And the problem is,

seeing the operation, the function of pleasure - again can one observe an incident like a beautiful sunset and end it, not say, 'Well I must have it tomorrow'. You understand my question? That is, see something extraordinarily beautiful and that's an end of it. Why carry it over for the next day? Which means, to observe totally with all your senses, then there is no registration. It is the registration, the remembrance of that incident, or that happening, and the pursuit of that is pleasure, with all its conflicts, with all its pain, you know all the rest of it.

Then we are asking, what is the relationship between pleasure, desire and love? Is there any relationship at all? And why has man made love so pleasurable? You understand my question? So one has to ask, go into the question of what is love. That word is so heavily loaded, so misused, so corrupt. Love yourself, love your soap, love your hair - all that nonsense of commercialism. So one has to, really if you are serious, find out what love is, because without that you are going to destroy everything in life. What is love? Surely a man who is ambitious has no love. Right? But you are ambitious. You want to be somebody. Or if you are not, you hate somebody, belittle somebody, and a man who is aggressive has no love. Obviously. A man who is completely concerned with himself, as most people are, and they may talk about love, surely there is no love. A man who is jealous, who is greedy, who is possessive, and attached, a woman who is attached to a man, or a woman, attached, is that love? Please, sir, don't agree or disagree. Just enquire, find out for yourself. Does attachment with its misused word of responsibility, is that love? Attachment implies owning somebody, fear of losing them, being attached you are

afraid to lose, and become lonely, frustrated, miserable, so more and more and more you attach - it may be a person, it may be a house, it may be a furniture, it may be some belief, all the rest of it. Is that love? Attachment breeds fear, attachment breeds anxiety, attachment breeds guilt because you then become responsible for that person, if you are not responsible you feel guilty. Is all that love?

And if you are serious, you see all that is not love, then put aside all that. Then you have that extraordinary quality of that flame, the real thing, not the word. Then love has no relationship to pleasure. It is not related to desire, because desire is based on sensation, sexual or otherwise. Pleasure is the pursuit of a remembrance, and love is not a remembrance, love is not something to be cultivated by thought. And that's why it is important to understand the nature and the structure of thought.

So when you see all this, not verbally, not theoretically, but actually in your daily life, then out of that comes not only love but a different kind of mind, totally new. It is only such a new mind that can solve our various complexities of our problems.

May we get up? May I get up and go?

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 11TH APRIL 1978

Krishnamurti: I think it would be good if we could talk over together as two friends who are not too opinionated, too dogmatic, too assertive or aggressive, but rather in friendly spirit without any animosity or antagonism, to talk over together their daily problems, not some abstraction, not some theoretical ideas but rather their daily unhappy, sorrowful, frustrating life. So could we have a dialogue about such matters. So what would you like to take up this morning?

Questioner: How does materialism affect clear thinking? There's a lot of thought in people's minds about the material world, and we are told by certain people that we should give up material things in order to find clearness of thought.

K: Does a material way of life or existence, money, work and so on, does it affect a different way of life - is that it, sir?

Q: Well not so much that but as to say if you are thinking on ideas in general, the problems in your life, when I make a decision about something or when I try to find an answer to the speaker's question.

K: I don't quite follow your question, sir.

Q: It's hard for me, I'm nervous speaking to you. I see people and I see myself, when I try to make a judgement or form an opinion, I find that it is coloured and shaded by my desires here in the physical world.

K: Your opinions, your ideas, your thoughts change according to the environment and so on - is that it?

Q: I think so.

K: All right, sir. Good lord!

Q: The life that we have put together, wired together, the game that we all play is materialism that the gentleman was talking about, is it possible to be clear and yet have to continue along the way we are going now?

K: Could one live a clear life, with clarity, the way we are living - is that it, sir? Obviously not.

Q: Do you have to give up everything?

K: We will discuss that, sir. We will go into it.

Q: There is a large amount of time I spend looking for someone to help, and then there are periods of time when there is apparently a communication between someone and myself, and there is a communication, a rapid fire of communication between a large number of series of people and it seems to be communication but it always comes out, help - help me in the way I need it. What is the difference between helping in the way I see it and the helping a way a person asks for? What is the quality of help?

K: What is the quality of help. I am not the chairman. Yes, sir?

Q: Sir, I'd like to know if we can discuss today these questions and begin with: can intelligence, not mental capacity, and maturity not related to time grow through right questioning and right enquiry? And if it can grow will this growth ever bring forth a flower that is a total transformation of the mind?

K: What is the question, I can't quite make it out.

Q: It's can intelligence and maturity, intelligence that is not linked to capacity and maturity that is not related to time, can this sense grow through putting the right question.

K: Is there maturity, right thinking which is not involved in time

but constant questioning. That's enough, sir, one question at the time. You don't mind?

Q: I don't mind.

K: All right.

Q: I find desire for transformation leads to tremendous conflict, yet without transformation I keep projecting violence and hatred. What is the solution if transformation is not possible?

K: Can transformation, a different quality of mind come about without conflict - is that it? That's enough, please.

Q: You said biologically man needs through the brain security and order, I want to know at what point does this demand begin to create disorder and insecurity, and why at that point does the brain not see the danger of it?

K: I'm afraid I can't make it out.

Q: There is a biological demand by the brain for security and is there a conflict as a result?

Q: At what point does the brain begin to create disorder?

K: Just let's keep to that. How does disorder come about - is that the question? At what point, or what is the beginning of disorder. Yes, sir?

Q: Could we go into this problem of acting with integrity in a society that is becoming desert, that is rapidly deteriorating and is fragmented, and the problems of being an oasis in that desert?

K: Could we go into the question of integrity in a society which is rapidly declining, deteriorating.

Q: I want to find out is it possible to come sweeping without effort upon inaction?

K: Is there a way of living which means action which doesn't

involve effort - is that it?

Q: Well, a way to sweep forming a corridor.

K: Yes, quite right.

Q: I want to find out if it possible.

K: Is it possible to live a life without deep conflict - is that it, sir? Is that your question?

Q: May I try again? Is it possible to come sweetly, effortlessly, without decision upon an ending to former activity.

K: I am afraid I can't make it out, sir.

Q: Without decision, without choice.

K: Without choice. Right. Sir, look there are so many questions what shall we take? Yes, sir?

Q: Boredom. What is boredom?

K: Yes, can there be an end to boredom.

Q: Sir, I must find out, when my mind is quiet action comes with a word, and I do not know how to go beyond the word, because my answers always come in words and thoughts. I don't know how to go beyond the word. Do you understand?

K: Not quite, sir.

Q: I reason in words, and I find that words are useless, I don't know what to do about it.

Q: He wants to know how to go beyond the word.

K: Is it possible to go beyond the word. Is that it?

Q: How?

K: Now, look, which of these questions shall we take so as to cover most of the questions?

Q: About integrity.

K: Integrity.



Q: Boredom.

K: Boredom. Which question which would include all the others so that we can go into that one question which will cover all the others.

Q: Is it possible to be without conflict?

K: Yes, I think that may be it, may we take that up, sir? Do you want to say something special, sir?

Q: Just along these lines, I want to know if there is any action we should make at all from an ego centre?

K: Could we take that one question and go into that, which is: is it possible to live a life without choice, without conflict, without division? Could we discuss that? Would that cover all the other questions, including what does it mean to help others and so on, could we take that? Would you agree to that? I am not particular about that question, any question would do which would cover all the others. So if in exploring this other questions would be answered then it would be worthwhile. If you all agree then we can go into this one question. May we? Shall we?

Audience: Yes.

K: Right. First of all why is there choice? And what does choice mean? To choose between this and that, between certain material for a cloth and other materials, why is there this emphasis, this constant choice going on? And we are asking, we think that where there is freedom there is choice, choice to go from one job to another, from one town to another, from one idea to another, from one belief to another, one from one guru, system, this and that to another. So why is there choice? Please, we are exploring it, I am not telling you what to think, or trying to persuade you to think in a

particular direction. So we are asking, what do we mean by that word `choice'? Choose between this road and that road, between the right action, what is right action, what is this constant endeavour on our part to choose? When does this choice come into being, what is the beginning of choice? I am not talking by myself, so please join me in the game.

Q: Would it be out of confusion?

K: We are going to find out, sir. You are saying, are you, where there is choice, or rather choice springs from confusion. That is, if one does not know a particular road, then you ask somebody, then there is no confusion, but if you are confused between this road and that road then you have to choose. Are you saying, sir, that where there is confusion there is choice? Is this, if I may most respectfully ask, is this out of your own discovery, or you have read about it? Because otherwise if you are merely repeating what somebody has said, including the speaker, then you are not entering into the game, you are not playing tennis, you are not playing the game.

Q: I know you have said it but before I knew about you I saw this.

K: Good. So you are saying where there is confusion there is choice. Where there is clarity there is no choice. So what do we mean by that word `confusion', disorder, uncertain. What do we mean by confusion? Please, sirs.

Q: One is confronted by two of several different things and one doesn't know which one to try.

K: That's right, sir, out of that comes choice. But we are asking, what is the origin of disorder, what is the origin of confusion.

Q: Desire.

K: Conflicting desires, opposing desires - does that make for disorder?

Q: That is disorder.

K: We are trying to find out a common meaning so that we all see the same thing together. What is the origin, how does disorder arise?

Q: From desire.

K: Now, may I ask, does one live in disorder? Right? What do you mean by that word 'disorder' in your life? Is your room untidy, you have not put things where they belong, socks, shirt or whatever it is, and so there is disorder in your room; there is disorder in the world. Right? One group against another group, one nation against another nation, one set of ideas, opinions against another and so on and on. So we are asking: what is the origin, the beginning of disorder?

Q: Thought.

K: It is suggested by that lady that thought is the origin of disorder. Is that so?

Q: Thought creates the possibility of the idea.

K: Yes. Before you jump straight off into thought, is one aware, if I may ask, this is not a group therapy or a confession, but one should ask oneself, do I live in disorder, both outwardly and inwardly; then what does that mean, not the origin of it yet but what does it mean when you say, yes, I live my life inwardly as well as outwardly in disorder? Right? Are we aware of that disorder? Or is it just an idea to say we live in disorder? You understand? Which is it we are talking about it: the idea that it is

disorder, or the actual disorder?

Q: The actual disorder.

K: The actual disorder. Now are we aware of it?

Q: No.

K: Quite right. Now if one is not aware of actual disorder in one's life how is one going to be conscious of it, who is going to make you conscious of it? Another war? Somebody telling you, hitting you on the head? Somebody you forcing you to see that you live in disorder? How will one become aware that one lives in disorder? Is it a deception - you follow - one deceives oneself so easily, thinking I live in disorder. So deception, a conclusion, an idea, is not the actual fact of disorder. So is one actually aware of this disorder? If one is then we can proceed from there. You understand my question?

Q: Don't we have to know first what order is?

K: No, first disorder. When we understand the whole nature of disorder, out of that comes order. You don't have to seek order. I don't know. All right, sir, let me put it this way: if we negate what is not order, negate, see what is not order then out of that perception comes order. If I see what is disorder, disorder is conflict. Right? Disorder is constantly deceiving myself, constantly living in a confusion, in illusion, escaping from actuality, thinking I have achieved something when actually I am rather silly. All these deceptions bring about disorder and other factors. Now am I aware that I am living in an illusion? I am taking that for the moment. Illusion being something which is not actual. You understand? Deceiving myself, hoping that I will be different and acting actually differently. So am I aware that I am living in an

illusion, in a make-belief?

Q: Sir, if we are aware that we are in the illusion when we question it, but other times when we don't question it we are not aware that we are in the illusion.

K: Yes, sometimes we are aware that we live in disorder and then question it, at other times we are not aware that we are in disorder. Now wait a minute, sir, please, let's look at that question. Which is, sometimes I am, sometimes I am not aware of disorder. Do you consider generally - not you particularly, sir - do you consider living in disorder is a danger? Actual danger, like meeting a rattler, or some poisonous insect or a dangerous animal, then when you are faced with that animal, or insect or snake, you know it is the most dangerous thing. So in the same way, does one realize living in disorder is essentially dangerous? Not say, I occasionally am aware of the danger; you are not occasionally aware of the danger of a rattler, you are constantly aware of the danger of a rattler. So in the same way, is one aware of the danger of disorder? By disorder we mean confusion, self-contradiction, saying one thing, doing another, thinking one thing and hoping differently; disorder comes where there is division, where there is duality, me and you, we and they, my belief and your belief, my god and your god, my guru and your guru and so on. So do we realize where there is division, nationalistic, religious, belief, ideals, wherever there is a division between man, woman and so on and so on, there must be conflict. And the essence of conflict is disorder. If this is clear we can proceed. You may question it, I am not saying I am right or wrong, we are putting this forward for you to examine, explore, find out.

Q: By division don't you mean more than a separation?

K: Doesn't division mean more than separation, both separation, division in the sense psychologically.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, sir. Superior. When I think I am superior, I know and you don't know, that is division, that is separation. But if we both start not knowing and enquiring there is no separation. So we have made it clear that where there is psychological division, belief, nationality, gods, rituals, my country, your country and so on and so on and so on, that division brings conflict and the essence of disorder is conflict, nationally, politically, all the rest of it. Are we together in this? I am not asking you to believe what I am saying. Yes, sir?

Q: Most people never get to that point, it seems.

K: You asked that question, I didn't ask that question. When a question was asked, sir, what is the origin of disorder, why is there conflict, what do we mean by helping somebody who needs help, all that is involved when we talk about disorder. You asked it, I didn't. I observe personally throughout the world there is constant psychological as well as physical difference, and out of that division, out of that corridor of opposites, power (noise of bells) - shall I go on in spite of that? You can hear it all right.

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! One noise I hope is not fighting another noise! So we are asking, is one aware first of all of one's life being in conflict, is one aware that this conflict arises from disorder and disorder exists because of division in oneself - I desire one thing and I am opposing that very desire, I want to achieve something and I know

I can't, I want to be the queen of England, I can't, and so on and on and on. So I am asking, is one aware of this? If one is aware, when one is aware what is the next step? You understand my question? I am aware - suppose I am aware that I live a disordered life then what is the next thing I have to do? One knows that one lives in disorder - one deceives oneself, one says one thing, one tries to be frank with another, all the time wanting to exploit another and so on and so on, then what is the next step?

Q: It is important to recognize the danger.

K: It is important to recognize the danger of it.

Q: Can we go into that a little bit?

K: There are now three noises - your noise, my noise and that noise! It becomes rather difficult. I believe that's a tape recorder! Can't something go wrong with it!

Q: It seems to be that we can't go any further until we recognize the danger of it.

K: Yes. You cannot go further until one recognizes the danger of it. Now, wait a minute, sir. What do we mean by the word 'danger'?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right, sir, that's right. What do we mean by danger? A car is coming towards you as you are crossing the road and you might die and all the rest of it, so you move away from it. Self-preservation. The instinct to preserve one's being, both physiologically as well as psychologically. Now is not conflict similar to that? Let's keep it very simple. Is not conflict similar to a car rushing towards you?

Q: It is certainly similar but then there is danger, there is danger

to the health from smoking yet one still continues to smoke although one is aware of the danger.

K: Smoking. One is aware of the danger of smoking, it might lead to cancer of the lung, but the taste, the habit, the custom, the tradition, the advertising, all that helps you to keep up smoking, so there is contradiction, wanting to give up smoking, seeing the danger of it and yet going on with it. Now which is the most dangerous thing there, the most? Smoking, obviously. Then can one - please listen - can one give up smoking without effort? The body has got used to the nicotine and all the rest of it and it demands it. I have never smoked in my life but I am taking that. So what shall we do? How do you give up something, a habit, not only physiological but also a deeply psychological habit, custom, routine, without the slightest effort? You may never have asked this question, we are asking it now.

Q: Can you just drop it?

K: Yes, sir, find out, have you dropped a habit? I am talking not of unpleasant habits, that's easy, you drop it, but the most pleasant habit, have you ever dropped a pleasant habit easily without effort?

Q: Does one have to see the habit before you can drop it?

K: Obviously. If one doesn't see it then you are playing with words. If you actually see a habit, a habit that has been formed for a long time, to give it up completely, to drop it.

Q: Don't we get used to habits?

K: Then what will you do? You don't resist it. Go on, sir, explore it. You don't resist it, you don't fight against it, you don't suppress it, you don't run away from it.

Q: You become aware of it.



K: No, see what happens, sir, please look. You say you become aware of it. Right? Then you don't suppress it, then you don't run away from it, then you don't wish to change it even. Therefore there is no resistance. Right? Now please watch it. If you do all this what has happened to your mind which has been working in habits, in routine? You understand my question? What's happened to a mind that has lived in habits, that has functioned in routine, in methods, in systems, under pressure, when it realizes that to be free of any habit, no suppression, no running away from it, no trying to reason it out, not trying to say, I must get rid of it - all that implies conflict. So does one realize it, first that the mind is conditioned to function in habits, because then it thinks there is security in habits. But when one realizes very clearly that a routine is a mechanical thing, it isn't alive, and is there a way of abandoning that habit without any pressure? After asking that question - you understand, we have said, is one aware of the habit, then seeing it is no good escaping from it and all the rest, does one see this? Right? Not as a theory but actually does one see that it is no good escaping?

Q: We have tried that, that's no good.

K: Then what takes place?

Q: The mind becomes quiet.

K: Is that so?

Q: I begin to question.

K: No, sir, when one becomes aware that one lives in habit you have already questioned, you are questioning it right from there. Why do I live in habits, why does my function run along a particular groove and so on and so on. You have already, by becoming aware of your habits you are already questioning it.

When you are questioning it you see it is no good running away from it, no good suppressing it. So what has happened to your mind? Go slowly, sir. I have become aware that I have a habit, a belief, a tradition, an acceptance of authority and so on and so on, it's a habit, my country, your country and all that. You have questioned it and you see the danger of it. Do you see the danger? What is it that sees the danger? You understand my question? One sees the danger of war, the cruelty of it, the bestiality of it, the futility of it, the whole thing. When you actually see that what is making you see that it is terribly stupid?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, what makes you see, sir, please look at it before you answer it, what makes you see the car coming, running towards you and you hop out of the way? What makes you do that?

Q: That's self-presentation.

K: Wait, that's good enough. Which means what? There is an act of intelligence there; it is the most stupid thing to stand in the way. That's an act of intelligence. Now when you see the danger of war, the futility of war, the ugliness, the whole of it, the very perception, is that not intelligence? Right? That's all I am asking. So intelligence says, don't suppress, don't run away from it, it is there, look at it, hold it, don't make an abstraction of it, look. The very questioning, awareness, seeing the danger of it, the perception itself is intelligence. Right? That intelligence says, drop it, don't do anything. You understand what I am saying? As you didn't argue with the car coming towards you, you got out of its way. That is an act of intelligence. In the same way if you see the futility of religions as they are now, the very seeing of it is intelligence. The

man who says, 'Well, I am sorry I don't want to listen to your nonsense', and goes on with his own life, he is what he is.

Q: I see the need to give up the habit, intelligence tells me that.

K: Ah! There is no giving up.

Q: Abandon?

K: No, there is no giving up. The moment you say, I must give up, it's an effort, a conflict.

Q: I don't mean it in that way but I see the danger of the habit yet - and this is the problem - there is pain, there is resistance in abandoning the habit. I am used to living in a pattern and it means I have to give up that pattern and there may be pain in giving up the pattern.

K: No, sir. Please forgive me for contradicting you, I hope you don't mind, I am not really contradicting you but we are trying - look, you have said that, please listen to what the other chap has to say. He says when you see something dangerous, that very seeing is intelligence. Right? When you see the danger of habits, it is intelligence that is saying, it is not worth it. So which is dominant, the habit or the intelligence? You understand my question? Which is the dominant factor? When you see a car coming towards you, intelligence says, move - which is the dominant factor there?

Q: Intelligence.

K: Obviously. But to you the other is not a dominant factor.

Q: Isn't there a danger of you becoming against habits, like every time you see a car you run?

K: That's not a habit. Surely, that's not a habit.

Q: Why do we function in habits?

K: Therefore, sir, you are asking a question which one has to go

into much deeper. Why does the mind or the brain function in habit? Right? What is the nature of habit? I must go into it a little more deeply - shall we? Do you want to go into it more deeply?

Audience: Yes.

K: All right. Are you aware, is the brain or the mind aware of the beginning of a habit? Or is it aware after forming a habit, wanting to get rid of it and then fight it? You understand my question? There are two questions involved in it: one, is one aware of a habit being formed? If one is then you don't enter into the other. The other being, forming a habit, fighting it, trying to get rid of it, conflict and the misery and all the rest of it. So to go beyond that, is one aware of the beginning of a habit?

Q: One is aware of the beginning of a habit too, certain things...

K: I am asking, sir, please be good enough to find out do you know when habit is beginning.

Q: I am aware of it.

K: No, you are not meeting my point. I am not trying to tell you what to think, but I am saying, am I aware a habit is beginning, or I have been so conditioned that I only live in habits? As most of us are, we are so conditioned that we live in habits - I believe, I don't believe, you follow, sir, all that. So which is it now? Are we discussing a mind that is so heavily conditioned by habits, habits being belief, you know, all the rest of it, and how to be free of it, and to be free of it without any conflict, and to be free of it without conflict implies seeing the total danger, not of a particular habit but the whole structure of habit. Is one aware of the danger of habit? That awareness implies intelligence. Then that intelligence says, finished. The moment you see the danger it is finished. As the car

coming towards you, the danger, you move. You don't stand there and argue with the car, I am going to run away from it, how shall I run away from it, what shall I do, is it right to do, is it wrong to do - there is no argument. There is direct perception, action. Here there is no direct perception and action because you are conditioned. That's one problem.

The other is: is there an awareness of the beginning of a habit, both physically as well as psychologically? Now which is it we are dealing with? Are we dealing with a mind that is constantly functioning in habits? That is, I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a whatever it is, I am a Hindu, Buddhist, you follow, I am an American and all the rest of it, which is all conditioned habit. If you say, how is one to be free of that, first one must see the extreme danger of it, not theoretical danger but the actual danger as that of a car coming towards you. Do we actually see the danger of it? Or is it all a theory? When there is seeing the danger, that very seeing is intelligence. And intelligence says, move. There is no conflict. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

Q: I do understand what you are saying on that yet the conditioning is still there.

K: Now, wait. So do we see the danger of conditioning? The danger of being conditioned as an American with all the problems, with all the separate nationalistic - all that problem, does one see the danger of being conditioned?

Q: Obviously not.

K: I don't know, sir, I am asking. Then if you don't see it, now wait a minute, sir, what will make you see it? We have had terrible wars, most appalling destruction both outwardly and inwardly,

maimed, blind, tears, agony, despair, that hasn't shown us the danger of nationalism. I am taking that as one issue. Or the danger of dividing the world into groups. We don't see that. Our economic conflict that is going on between countries, that's a danger. If we all got together and said, for god's sake, let's all move together, it is finished. But we don't see the danger. So what will make you or help you to see the danger of being conditioned?

Q: Well...

K: Go into it, sir, look at it carefully, go into it a little bit. If you go to the Arab and say, 'Look, my friend, you are conditioned therefore you are fighting; he would say, 'Get the hell out of here'. Right? 'I am an Arab. The Jews have destroyed my country', and so on and so on. So what makes you - please listen - question the danger of conditioning? Is it because you have leisure? Leisure, you are not immediately in war, you are not immediately challenged about anything, so you say, 'Well, I have time to think about this'. Right? So you only apparently respond when something is tremendously dangerous, either act according to your conditioning, or totally differently from your conditioning. Now which is it? You don't see all this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Which means, does it mean we are only concerned with being immediately safe, secure? You understand my question? Therefore we don't think about the world, we are not concerned what is happening in the Middle East, Far East, in Europe and in Russia, we are only concerned with our little world of our own making. Right? Is that it?

Q: I keep going back to the simple idea of the car coming at

one. And the perception and intelligence and the action of moving away. There is no thought involved there, is there?

K: No.

Q: There is no thought there.

K: No, but that's a form of conditioning which has helped you to preserve yourself physically.

Q: Like that in itself?

K: That itself is part of your conditioning. That's a natural, healthy conditioning.

Q: Is there no emotion there also?

K: No, sir, only there is danger. Look, sir, you haven't experimented with the rattler. Right? You don't say, 'Let me go and play with it and learn', but you have been told for a thousand years or more, be careful of snakes. That is part of your conditioning, which is intelligence, which is natural, which is healthy, but the others are unhealthy, dangerous, and we don't see the danger of it because we are so concerned with the immediate security. Right?

Q: For me personally in my experience I lack the capacity to be able to see the chain of events that brought this destruction upon me, for example, the car, that's immediate, that's easily understood and it is completely within the capacity of my intelligence, but say, when I do an action as I recently had an accident on my bicycle, I had a bag and I placed it around the front, near my spokes in the front wheel and it eventually got caught, I had the capacity to see it.

K: So what makes you see the danger? That's what I am trying to get at.

Q: Waking up.

K: What will make you wake up?

Q: By seeing that the conflicts are what give us pain and agony.

K: My lady, I agree, but what...

Q: But we are conditioned to see pain and agony as important to life. We do not see life without pain.

K: Yes, but what will you do about it?

Q: Until I am tired of the pain and the agony you suffer.

K: So you are saying, through suffering, through pain, through sorrow you will awaken.

Q: No, you are in love with this, nothing will awake you. While each of us thinks we are conditioned about nationality, we are conditioned to enjoy suffering from the day we are born, we are taught that this is what life is. So we all cling to it, we are secure in our agony.

K: So you like your suffering, you like your agony, you like your sorrow, you like the danger - all right, have it.

Q: I don't like it.

K: That's the very essence of neuroticism.

Q: Talking about when we see things and it might be worthwhile if we examined different ways of perceiving things. The point about the car is that you can see it with your own eyes, you don't have time for thought, and when you start talking about smoking and about how we give it up effortlessly, and things like that, I think we have to examine different ways of perceiving things in a different perspective.

K: All right. So you are saying there are different ways of seeing the same thing. You see it in one way, another sees it in



another way, I see it in another way and so on and so on, which is our conditioning, obviously. If I am a Hindu, brought up as a Hindu, with all the superstitions, caste, and so on, I see it only that way. That's my conditioning. And you see it your way because of your conditioning. And the opposing conditionings are our problem. So please look at it, we said, let's go deeply into the whole movement of habit-forming. Right? Now just take one incident, small, but it covers a great deal, one incident: you are hurt, psychologically, in the school, in college, university, you are hurt. The hurt comes into being when you compare. Right? When the teacher, or the mother, or the parent say, 'Be as good as your uncle, you must be as clever as your brother', or your aunt, or grandmother. So through comparison you are hurting a person. Right? I wonder if you see that, do we? Come on! No?

Q: Yes.

K: You don't see it?

Q: Yes.

K: Now the hurt has become a habit. Right? Which means that in order to prevent yourself from being hurt further you resist, you build a wall round yourself. In building a wall round yourself you are afraid to be further hurt. And gradually you isolate yourself. Right? Now that is a habit, isn't it? Just take that, a great habit which humanity has learnt: to be hurt and then resist, build a wall round yourself in resisting, isolate yourself, and never explode. Right? So that's become a habit. How will you break that habit? Do please listen to it, quietly. Let me talk for two minutes. I am not prevent you from talking, from expressing, from anything, I am just pointing out. Are you aware of being hurt, going through all

the resistance, building and isolating yourself, are you aware of that? Which is a habit. No? Are you aware of this?

Q: Yes.

K: Because I point it out to you, you say, yes, I am aware of it, or are you aware of your hurt for yourself? From that hurt all kinds of neurotic illusory actions take place. Right?

Q: The next question might be, are we aware of the danger of isolation.

K: We are coming to that, sir, first see how we have come to isolation, how we have developed slowly, carefully this sense of being isolated. America is isolated, Russia is isolated, the Jews, the Arabs, the Hindus, are isolated. So do you realize, see, conscious that from being hurt this whole movement takes place?

Q: The problem is the hurt hurts.

K: I am coming to that, sir. Wait. What is it that is hurt?

Q: My image.

K: The image that you have about yourself. If I think I am a very great man and you come along and say, don't be an ass, I feel, good lord, I am hurt, because I have an image about myself, a reputation, this, that and the other. I want a reputation because I think I have found something and nobody will listen to me and so on, I want a reputation. And if I am not respected, if I am not popular, then I am hurt. So the image is hurt. Right? From that hurt all the other things take place. Are you aware of this as a habit? It is habit, a tremendous habit. Now then do you see the danger, the real danger of isolation? Then you have no relationship with anybody, you may pretend, you may say, I am married, I love you, I am this, I am that, I am really in communication with all of you,

but if I am hurt isolation is inevitable. Now to see the danger of it, will you see the danger of it through sorrow? You understand?

More sorrow, more pain, more agony?

Q: By the fact that you name it, that's what the result is, and it's immediate and destructive.

K: Yes, but lady, we are asking the same thing: what will make you see the danger? Propaganda? All the magazines telling you, don't be isolated? It wouldn't be a popular magazine anyhow! So please, I am asking you, this is a serious question, what will make human beings awaken to the tremendous danger which they are creating, which they are building?

Q: No matter what we do we are creating a conflict.

K: Perhaps if a few of us understood the nature of conflict and so end conflict in ourselves it may affect the whole world. You don't see all this. So the question then is: what will make you see the danger? Apparently nothing.

Q: Sir, to overcome the point is just to increase the quality and quantity of thought, so thinking about it and trying to understand in general and not particular things but to have and hope that people are going to begin to start just thinking and trying to understand.

K: Sir, look, some of you, unfortunately or fortunately, have listened to me for many years, or you are hearing it for the first time, what will make you see the danger of this thing, isolation? Talk, my talking endlessly, you attending the talks endlessly?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Will earthquakes, lack of water, fire? What will make man transform himself?

Q: When I see even a three year old child is conditioned, it

makes me want to act.

K: If you have a two years old child, how you educate, how you bring him up, whether you are conditioned, therefore you will condition the child, it's all so obvious, all this. You are not answering my question if you don't mind my repeating it: what will make you change, drop all this nonsense, which is so fundamentally dangerous for your life, for your children, for the whole world?

Q: You have to see it, not say it is isolation.

K: I am pointing it out to you.

Q: No, but why do you have to say, it's isolation? As soon as you think that don't you breed isolation?

K: Yes, sir, I am using the word `isolation' to convey all that.

Q: So if you say, isolation, you breed it, so why is it necessary to say, I am isolated - just realize it, not put it into words.

K: Then realize it, sir, without my saying it, see it as a danger, the way we are living, which doesn't mean you go and join a little community. That doesn't solve anything. The danger of the way we are living totally, economically, socially, religiously, politically, in every day it is the most desperate danger. You don't see it.

Q: Then if a few people feel like this, and if I don't, then they make their own group, then it's another group.

K: I know, I know, that's just it. Don't join any groups. I am not telling you what to do. Keep out of all groups, keep out of all institutions, keep out of all following anybody.

Q: Sir, doesn't it come down to individual effort?

K: If you like to put it that way. What will make you take interest in this?

Q: To be serious.

K: All right. You have changed the word! What will make you serious?

Q: Sir, observing your own fear.

K: Yes, sir, that's what we are saying. See it sir.

Q: Our isolation allows us no contact, no relationship with anything, not even to danger. This is perhaps why we don't see the danger so what will make us see is intelligence.

K: Do it. Will you drop your hurts, will you drop your isolation?

Q: Sir, I see that natural instinct, or natural conditioning is intelligence, which is awareness. Intelligence is awareness, which is a natural innate thing within us all that is in conjunction with natural environmental things, and to interpret that into a thought and awareness is an intelligence, which can be divided, I think, into a positive and negative.

K: Wait. There is no positive intelligence or negative intelligence, good intelligence or bad intelligence. Intelligence is intelligence.

Q: But rationalizing a habit is an intelligent awareness.

K: No, sir. It is not. Rationalizing is another form of escape from habit.

Q: So what will make us see?

K: What will make you see, sir? Do you ask it from another or from yourself?

Q: Myself.

K: Then what is our response? If you are really honest - I am not saying that you are not - but if one is really honest, and says,

'Why don't I see the danger?', what's your response to it? Go slowly, sir, go slowly. What's your response to it? Your actual response?

Q: My response is that I feel sad that I can't see it.

Q: My response is that I am afraid.

K: Afraid. We dealt with that, sir, fear, we went into it, but that gentleman, I am asking him, do you ask this question of yourself? If you do, what's your response? Now wait a minute, sir. To see danger one must be sensitive, mustn't you? Now how will you become sensitive? Wait, no please, go into it. How will you become sensitive, both physically as well as psychologically, inwardly as well as outwardly, how will you become extraordinarily sensitive to all the danger?

Q: By...

K: Wait. What, sir?

Q: Giving up the fight.

K: No, don't give up anything, sir. We have talked about it. To give up implies conflict, doesn't it?

Q: When we want, I don't know how to say it - when we give up our wants the conflict ends.

K: No, don't give up, sir.

Q: We want to give up, then there is conflict, so the only thing we can do is just lead a life of destructiveness.

K: Yes, sir. Now we said, when a car comes towards you, you are sensitive. You are not blind, you are not deaf, you are not dumb, your body isn't rigid, paralysed, you move which implies a certain quality of sensitivity. Now you don't see the dangers of other much more serious things, so I am suggesting you will see

the danger if you are sensitive, psychologically. Now what will make you sensitive? Just listen to it. What will make you sensitive?

Q: By using one's senses.

K: You have used your senses, haven't you?

Q: You have to be willing to experience the feeling from the danger, or whatever.

K: Experience. That means, must you be killed? Must you get drunk until you find out what it is to be sober? Answer me, sir. You all take a drink.

Q: You don't have to do it to experience it.

K: Must you experience at all? I won't enter into that, it's a much larger field.

Q: Sir, a new way of living might create suffering for me and I may be afraid of that suffering, I think fear does enter in here.

K: That's right, sir. You are afraid by giving up your conditioning you may be in greater danger. So what is that? Thought has projected an idea of danger and you are afraid of that idea, but you don't see the danger of conditioning. So please what will make you see the danger, not a particular danger, the danger of the way of our living? I am suggesting first to be aware of the danger one must be sensitive. Right? Which means psychologically you mustn't take drinks, drugs, do things that make you dull. Right? What makes you dull?

Q: My fears.

K: Go slowly. Don't assert. What makes one dull?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do please listen. Just look at yourself, sir. Are you dull because you compare yourself with somebody else? And therefore

say, I am dull? Right? I am just asking this. Do you compare yourself with somebody who is extraordinarily bright and clear and all the rest of it, and say, my god, how dull I am compared with that man, or that woman. So I am asking, has that dullness come into being through comparison? Or if you don't compare what takes place? So we have found one factor, that is, we become dull, or we are made dull through comparison. Is that so? So will you stop comparing? That's all.

Q: When I compare, will I notice I am comparing and not believe it?

K: Find out, first stop comparing. Comparing means measurement, to measure one's image against another image. Can you, can one stop comparing? My god! See what happens when you are not comparing? You have thrown off an enormous burden that is making you dull, heavy. Then imitation makes you dull, insensitive, imitation. Right? You know what that word means. Can you drop imitating somebody, following and so on and so on. So if you do these things actually then it is finished, you are extraordinarily sensitive, alive without any pressure, without any burden.

So we will meet again the day after tomorrow if you want to meet.



## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 13TH APRIL 1978

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about this morning? You are very quick!

Questioner: May I ask you when there is looking during the day what prevents the attention from being total enough to end the me completely?

K: When one observes why is it not possible to observe totally during the day.

Q: And end the me completely.

K: And bring to an end the me, the I, completely.

Q: You have often referred to yourself as the speaker, but last Tuesday it seemed you weren't even bothered by referring to Krishnamurti as he. Could we examine how language affects the development of ego?

K: Could you examine the language which cultivates the ego; you referred to yourself as the speaker and on other occasions, I, is that cultivation of the 'I'.

Q: Will you please speak about meditation and what is the relation of intuition to insight?

K: Could you talk about meditation and the relationship between insight and intuition.

Q: I think I am going to ask what I asked on Tuesday, could we go into the question of living and acting with integrity in this human desert we have created? Living and acting with integrity in the human desert we have created.

K: Is it possible to act with integrity and what do you mean by that word 'integrity'.

Q: And the problems and pressures involved in doing so in the human society we have now, which we have created.

K: How can one act with integrity in a society in which we have to live. Right, sir.

Q: When I find myself in negative emotions like fear and resentment, how best can I get out of them?

K: How am I to be free myself from negative emotions. I don't know what negative emotions are, so let's go into it.

Q: You have often spoken of the metaphor of jumping away from a car that is coming at you. I have difficulty with this because I feel that instead I am in a veritable fortress of conditioning which would place me into the car in the metaphor which is racing towards a precipice and how do I get out of the car? The point being if you are in the fortress of conditioning looking out, how do you see clearly enough to get out of the fortress or leap from the car?

K: You have used the metaphor, jumping away from a car which is coming towards you and the danger of a precipice, is it possible - I am not quite clear of your question, sir, I am trying to understand it - is it possible to be equally perceptive of the danger of conditioning.

Q: To see it clearly enough when you are entrenched in it.

K: To see the danger clearly enough and jump away from it. Quite.

Q: Could we go into that silence that we talk about that is indescribable when you write because I have can see my noise.

K: I didn't quite catch that, sir.

Q: Can you go into the silence that you write about.

K: Could we go into the question of what it means to be silent.

Q: Could you go into the difference between intensity and desire?

K: Could we examine intensity and desire, what is the relationship between them.

Q: Or the difference between them.

K: Yes. Now just a minute. Yes, please, you can ask all the questions you want, but I don't know where it is going to lead us.

Q: When does the need to secure psychological security for oneself in any form, come totally and completely, to an end?

K: Is there, if I understand it rightly, is there complete and total security psychologically and physically. Is that the question?

Q: The need to secure that security.

K: The need to have that security.

Q: Will that end?

K: Yes. Can that end. The need to have complete and total security both physiologically as well as psychologically, can that end.

Q: I want to continue something you were talking about last time: you talked about is it possible to look at one's habits without direction, without wishing to change, and not compare oneself with another, and yet there is this desire to transform oneself which I find becomes an entrenched idea in the mind, a goal. And then the question of technique comes up, or how, so despite all the efforts again I find myself looking towards the 'how', the technique, and again looking in a direction.

K: Yes, I understand. You have heard the question, need I repeat it? All right. Now may I - just a minute, I am not asking you

to stop asking questions, I don't know which of these questions we are going to ask, there are so many of them.

Q: Meditation, insight and intuition.

K: What were you going to say, sir?

Q: I was going to ask if right action is not according to a blueprint how can one ascertain if what one is doing is correct?

K: What is right action. Yes?

Q: What is implied in being a total human being?

K: What does it mean, or what is the significance of being totally a human being. Now which of these questions would we take?

Q: What is right action.

K: What is right action. Could we take that?

Q: Mr Krishnamurti, you speak sometimes of choiceless awareness and in other words one should be totally aware and what if one is born into slavery, and for example, Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King and these people, if they hadn't stood up and thought, in a sense, their people would be still in a much more unrespected place.

K: I understand. So what is the question?

Q: How can one be aware and be without conflict?

K: Yes, could we talk over together the question which may cover all the other questions, what is correct action, given all the circumstances, what society is, what religions are, what other people have said and so on and so on, what is correct action in our life, living in modern society? Could we discuss that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Yes, sir, what were you going to say?

Q: Please cover why we do not take right action. Why are we so confused?

K: Yes, can we take that question, which might cover all other questions: what is correct action, could we go into that? Do you want to discuss that? Yes sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I can't hear you, sir. Could we go into this question of what is correct action? Would that be worth while discussing and is that what you are really interested in? Could we go into that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Right. When we use the word `correct', don't we mean accurate, an action which is not only correct for the day or in certain circumstances, correct right throughout one's life. Would you agree to the definition or the expression of that word, correct, right, accurate action throughout life, not under varying circumstances - could we go into that? Is that what you want to discuss? Please tell me, I don't know.

Audience: Yes.

K: Good! Does accurate action depend upon opinion? Your opinion and another's opinion, or the opinion of a scientist or a person who is very well read, full of knowledge. When we talk about correct action is it a specialized action? Please, this is a discussion, a dialogue. Is it an action not based on a conclusion: you may have your own particular conclusion and another may have another, his own and therefore each conclusion and acting according to that conclusion may be incorrect action. Or your experience tells you what is correct action, another's experience perhaps different tells him, that is the correct action. So we are

asking does correct action depend on knowledge, opinion, choice, experience?

Q: You said, is it a specialized action.

K: Is action dependent on a specialized attitude, specialized knowledge, specialized as a scientist, as a businessman, as a psychologist, as a religious man and so on, does it depend on specialized knowledge?

Q: No.

K: I am asking, I am not saying yes, or no. Does it depend on opinions?

Q: Sir, I am trying to get to action which does not conflict with other's actions. Or I may have my own feeling of what is right but then someone else will have a feeling what he thinks is right.

K: That's right, that's what we are saying, sir.

Q: So therefore there will be conflict if we both hang on to what we both think is right.

K: That's what we said. So we are asking, does correct action depend on conclusions, yours or another's, opinions, judgements, evaluations and conclusions. You understand? Does it depend on those?

Q: It does from the physical standpoint like the act of driving a car, for example.

K: According to one's genes? According to one's character - character being the cultivation of certain types of resistance to a particular society and so on.

Now please just listen, let's find out. I am not saying this is correct, or this is correct, I want to find out, if I may, as a human being I want to find out what is correct action throughout life.

Throughout life not just for one or two years and then slip back and so on. I want to find out for all my life so that correct action implies no conflict, no contradiction, no imposition. There is no correct action under pressure. So one must find out what is correct action. How will you find out? So we are asking, does it depend on time, culture, environment, what other people have said, including the greatest religious teachers, if there are any, and so on and so on. So what is - now wait a minute, let me put the question differently. How do you approach this question?

Q: We don't know what correct action is.

Q: We won't know until the time comes.

K: There is the question, please just listen. I am not asking or oppressing you or pressurizing you to listen, you have asked a question: you said, what is correct action in life. How do you approach this question? You understand? How you approach it will dictate the discovery of right action. So how do you as a human being approach this question?

Q: Openly.

K: What do you mean by that word `openly'?

Q: Realize we don't know anything at all about correct action.

K: So we say, I don't know what is the correct action, so my approach is, I don't know. Is that it?

Q: We may know only what is incorrect action.

K: You may know what is incorrect action. Do you? No, please, you haven't answered my question. Forgive me, sir. How do you approach such an enormous complex question of, what is correct action? That lady says, openly.

Q: May be if we knew what is action.

K: We are coming to that, madam. How do you approach either action or correct action, what is your way into it?

Q: With intelligence.

K: What do you mean by that word? I am not quibbling over words but we must be clear when we use certain words, like intelligence, openly and so on, that we understand exactly, you and the speaker and others, the meaning of that word 'intelligence'.

Q: Look for the obvious.

K: What is the obvious?

Q: We need to set a goal through which these actions come.

K: A goal? Are you approaching it with a motive, with an object in view, with a purpose, with a goal?

Q: All goals are set to be broken. If we had a goal it would certainly dictate.

K: Of course. So what is your approach? Look, sir, this is a very, very complex question because if the mind is in contradiction and I am not aware that I am in contradiction and try to answer this question it will be too silly. So I have to find out for myself how, in what manner I come to the question, in what manner I receive the question, in what way I look at that question, because the way I look at it, the way I approach it, if there is a motive, that dictates, directs my enquiry into it. So how does each one approach this question? Are we aware how we approach it? Are you and I approaching it through some conclusion? Are we approaching it through a particular opinion, fixed idea? If we are we shall never find out, obviously. So I am asking, shouldn't there be freedom from all this to find out, from prejudice, from conclusions, from opinion, from a belief and so on and so on?



Q: If you approach it with the idea that every thought you have regarding the subject comes from the past.

K: Yes, sir, that's what I am saying. How do you approach it?

Q: I would observe the thoughts that arise.

K: Do it, sir. The thought that arises, will that thought help to bring about correct action?

Q: The observation of the thought is limited.

K: So when one realizes thought is limited and exercises thought to find out what is correct action, that action will also be limited. So do we realize that thought is limited and therefore if thought approaches this question then obviously it is limited?

Q: Must we not approach it in silence?

K: Can you approach it in silence - now what do you mean by that word `silence'?

Q: A quiet heart.

Q: A mind that is not occupied.

K: Look, please, this is just theories. Are you actually doing it or just throwing out words hoping that it will be correct? You see if I...

Q: You have to develop your intuition.

K: Oh, develop your intuition - what do you mean by that word `intuition'? You see. Would you kindly find out, as this is a very complex question, shouldn't you come to it with freedom to find out? Not offer your opinions, your conclusions, your judgements, your ideas, but come to it with a freedom to find out. Can we do that?

Q: If there is a judgement or a conclusion that I am aware of, that I can bring to it, to suppress it or put it aside certainly wouldn't

help.

K: Therefore you won't find out what is correct action, will you?

Q: No.

K: Therefore can't one put those aside?

Q: I put them aside but I see they creep up again.

K: No. This is an important question, isn't it? This demands your energy, doesn't it to find it? This demands that you are aware of your limited thoughts and so on and so on. So you say, as this is most important to find out, as it is essential to find out, as it is of the greatest necessity, you naturally drop the others. Don't you? If you see this is the greatest importance the others don't play any part - your conclusions, your opinions, your judgements, your beliefs, opinions and so on.

Q: Is it not necessary to go into it to find out what your opinions and ideas are?

K: If you want to. Is it not necessary, the lady asks (noise of bells)-can we go on in spite of that?

Audience: Yes.

K: The lady asks, is it not necessary to go into the question of why we have opinions, why we always function according to some conclusion, why do we have strong beliefs, all that, should we examine all that?

Q: Yes.

K: Why do you have opinions, about politics, about god, about me, about XYZ, why do you have opinions?

Q: Because we are compassionate, we care.

K: Because we have no compassion we have opinions, is that it?

Q: Because we have compassion therefore we have opinions.

K: Ah! We have compassion therefore we have opinions. What a statement to make: we have compassion and therefore we have opinions.

Q: No, that is not what I said. We have compassion therefore we care, not that we have opinions, but we are being attentive to the need of the moment because we have compassion.

Q: But how do you form an opinion - that's the question. Why do we have opinions?

Q: Well, I'm against them.

K: I didn't catch that. I missed that joke.

Q: She said she was against opinions. That lady said, why do we have opinions; and that lady said, I am against opinions.

Q: Opinions could be the illusion of security.

Q: Some people even sell their opinions.

K: All the editorials.

Q: Like a flea-market.

K: Yes.

Q: Isn't a judgement an opinion?

K: Thank god those bells have stopped!

Q: Could we just say that opinions are part of the reality of thought?

K: Would you kindly consider - I am not saying you should but would you kindly consider why your minds are so occupied that you can't look even at this question. You understand? Why you have so many ideas about it, why you should have opinions, why you should not have opinions, it is necessary, compassion, etcetera, etcetera - can't you just listen to the question first? One means by

listening, giving attention to the question. You know what you think, you know what you feel, you have your own conclusion, can't you put those aside for a minute, for a few seconds even, and listen to the question itself? What does the question imply? Is there correct action at all? We want to find out what is correct action, but our minds are so confused, so uncertain, so opinionated we can't even listen to the beastly question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am afraid I can't hear, madam.

Q: She is questioning the word `correct', she is saying that perhaps the word itself is a danger.

K: Look, madam, we don't know what that word `correct' means yet, we don't know what action means yet, we have to first listen to the question, not oppose the question, not agree with the question, or deny the question, but first listen to some question that a man has asked. He said, I'd like to find out in my life before I die what is correct action throughout my life - he is asking that.

Q: Sir, if we can listen, truly listen in freedom, there is no question.

Q: You are asking, why are you asking?

K: No, forgive me, sir, I am just asking, if you don't mind, would you listen please to the question. That's all.

Q: Can we listen?

K: Apparently you can't. That's a simple fact.

Q: What is listening?

K: When your wife or husband or girl or boy says, `I love you', do you listen? Or you take it for granted? In the same way, do you listen when a serious question is put about life, which involves

what is action, and if there is accurate, true action which has no conflict, which doesn't bring regret, which doesn't bring fear, etcetera, etcetera, he is asking that question. Please listen. And you say, what do you mean by listening. I mean by listening, with attention, with care, with affection, with a sense of responsibility, which doesn't bring guilt - just listen. And apparently that is one of the most difficult things here that we are facing, that we don't listen. Now what will persuade you to listen?

Q: Understanding.

K: No, sir, just listen to the question.

Q: May I try to answer your question?

K: If you like.

Q: I tried to talk last time about perception and the way you see things; and you talk about a car coming at you and you jump. If you stop and think about the car coming towards you, it's over, there's no decision to make, there is no action to make because it's hit you. If you don't stop and think because you see what is happening, you jump. So in order to get that action which is correct for the moment for that situation you have eliminated thought. So I suggest that in order to get correct action in any situation you have to eliminate thought, you have to perceive the situation exactly as it is, your own position in the correct perspective of it, not just a part of it but perception of the whole and then there is only one action that can be made.

K: Madam, I have listened to it, I have listened to your question, your answer, but you haven't, forgive me if I point out, you haven't found out if you are listening to what the speaker has to say. He is asking, do you listen to this question at all, because - please

understand this - it is a very complex question. And if you don't listen even to the question how can you answer anything about it? That's why when somebody says to you, 'I love you' and he means it, he says it with his heart, with his mind, he feels totally that he loves you, do you listen? Or do you say, 'Yes, what do you mean by that?' Or do you argue? Do you love me more than the previous girl or man? It is something he wants to tell you and you don't have even the courtesy to listen. I am not bullying you but I am just finding out how impossible this is becoming.

So, sir, what is correct action? If we say, I really don't know, then we can begin. You understand? I really don't know what is correct action in life, because that is such a tremendous question. First of all, what is action? What do we mean by action? The word 'action' means doing, acting in the present, not in the future, but our action is according to some principle, according to some ideals, or according to some standardized memory. Right? I wonder if you see. So we are never acting. The verb 'to act' means to do, to do means the movement in the present. Is there a present? You understand? Or is the present contaminated by the past? Tremendous things are involved in this question. So I must find out if what I do is based on a remembrance, on some hope, on some desperation, guilt and so on, which is all the past. So can the mind observe action which is springing from the past? That's one problem. And the other is: is one acting according to some ideal, a principle, according to some goal, a purpose, which is in the future, the Utopia? Then I am acting according to something that may be or might be in the future, which is not acting. Right, sirs? So I have to find out if there is an action that is totally in the present,

uncontaminated by the past or the future. Is that possible? You understand my question?

Q: Sir, in saying that there is another question, what is now?

K: I am doing that, sir. The present is the now.

Q: That is another question, what is the now?

K: Is there such a thing as the now, what does it mean? It means it must be totally independent of the past and the future, which is, is there a time which is not a movement? I am going into it, sir.

There are scientists here, I must be very careful! First of all, time is movement, the movement from the past through the present to the future, if that movement is a movement of time then the now is non-existent. Right? Please understand this. It is non-existent. It's only when time stops as a movement then the present is. You won't understand this. Right, sir? So the now is without time. Do you see? So I see that, I apprehend it, I don't know quite if it is correct, if it is true, I just observe it, I don't say, yes, I've got it. I observe that all our actions, whatever they be, noble, ignoble, personal, communal, every type of action is based either, as it is now, on the past, memory, remembrance, or on some Utopian ideal. Right?

This is a fact. So all that implies there is no acting, you are acting according to a principle, to a memory. And I call that non-action. I don't know if you understand this. If I say, I love you, because I remember the pleasures that you have given me, or the comfort, the encouragement, this or that, is that love? Is love based on a remembrance? So then I have to enquire whether that remembrance which is bringing about action and so on, can that remembrance, the tape that has recorded stop? All that is implied in this one thing.

Then also I have to find out what is correct action. What is correct? Is it according to you, or according to him, or according to some divinity, or some idea? I don't know. So I have to say, look, what is correct action? First of all there must be no contradiction in it. Right? It mustn't come out of some fear, it mustn't come out of some pleasure, it mustn't come out of some future hope. So I must find out if my thinking can ever find out what is correct, what is accurate, or is it nothing to do with thought? You follow all this? Perhaps you are not interested in all this. So you see how very complex the question is.

Q: What am I going to look with if I am not looking with my thought?

K: What am I looking if I am not looking with my thought.

Q: What am I going to look with?

K: What am I going to look with if I don't use my thought. We have been through this.

Q: Another way to put it might be, who is going to act?

K: I am going to show you in a minute, who is going to act.

Q: Every cell in your body acts.

K: All right. Yes, we don't deny that. Are you really interested in this?

Audience: Yes.

K: I am not sure.

Q: Haven't we already done something by the time out thought is going?

K: I don't know, madam. Personally I have always been interested to find out what is correct action. Because if there is no correct action there is unhappiness, there is regret, there is a kind of



saying, 'I wish I hadn't done that, I wish I had done that' and so on, this constant battle going on if I don't act truly, correctly, accurately. So I have to find out. Now how do I find out? Because it's very clear that thought is limited, thought cannot possibly find out what is correct action because whatever it does is very limited, broken up, therefore it never can be correct. Right? This is fairly obvious because you can look at it with reason, with logic, you can see it. So action born of thought can never be correct. You know that is a tremendous thing to discover. Not be told, not, you've said that, please explain it - I'll explain it but for each one of us to discover it, that thought is limited, it is limited because it is based on memory and memory can never be complete. You may gather more and more and more information, more and more facts, but it is still limited. The word 'more' is limited, therefore thought is relative, therefore incomplete, is broken up, is a fragment of something which is based on memory. Right? So thought cannot answer this question. Then what will? You understand? If thought cannot possibly answer this enormous complex question of correct action, what do we mean by correct, what do we mean by accurate, true and what is action. We are using logic not some brave ideas about it. Action can only be when there is only the acting, not, I have acted, or will act. I wonder if you see all this.

There is only acting. If that acting is based on some past memories, conclusions, hurts, fears, then it is coloured by the past, therefore that action undergoes various types of modification, therefore it is not accurate action. Therefore I say to myself, is it possible to be free of the past and act? Which sounds most extraordinary, it's idiotic, unreasonable. So I say, wait, let's find out

if it is unreasonable. That is, I want to find out any action born out of some memory, that action must be incomplete. Right? So then what is action which is totally complete? You understand? I wonder if you are following all this. So what is total action? Now total, I mean by that word `whole'? Whole implies healthy, physical health, that word implies sanity because otherwise if the mind is insane, as most people's minds are, neurotic and confused, then you can find out. So I say to myself, is my mind sane, can it think objectively, not personally, not according to my pleasure, can it think clearly? So whole means having a healthy body, and also having a sane, clear, healthy mind, not drugged mind, a mind that has been ruined by drugs, by drink, alcohol and all the rest of it. Then whole means also holy, h-o-l-y. I don't know what holy is yet but I am enquiring. So is it possible to perceive action as a whole? You understand? Whole being healthy, sane and holy, is there such action which is never contradictory, from the age of twenty until you die there is an action that is complete all the time? I am talking to myself, you are following all this, I hope - not following, don't follow, but observe it in yourself.

So one has discovered for oneself that thought acting can never be whole, therefore thought whatever it acts upon or does will be incomplete, incorrect, limited. Then the problem is, is there an ending to thought? And if there is an ending what is action then? One has only known action according to some principle, some idea, some conclusion, some remembrance, hurt and so on and so on, according to that one acts. But if all that doesn't exist then what is action? You are following all this? Then action may have a totally different meaning, not, I acting. So I cannot find out action

which will have a totally different significance if I am confused, you follow, all that is going on in my mind. So how am I - how is the mind to be free from its occupation? You understand my question?

Q: How is the mind to set itself in order?

K: Now is that a right question or a wrong question? Just listen. She asked a question. She says, how is the mind to set itself in order. Is that a right question, or a question that will lead to some wrong conclusion?

Q: Can the mind set itself in order?

K: Did you say that?

Q: No, that's another question.

K: Ah! That's a different question altogether. Can the mind set itself in order, that's a totally different question. Now who is to set it in order? Some external agency, the environment, the politicians, the priests, the society, the culture? You understand? All that, which is your own thinking. So can the mind - I am only asking what is correct action, not what is order yet, because when there is correct action the mind is totally in order.

So without order there is no correct action. Right? So what is order? The politicians will say, that is order; the dictators will say, this is order; and the priests and everybody says different things about order. So what is order? Is order according to a blueprint? According to the Bible, according to some figure in the Bible? Is it laid down by some religious fanatics? Is it a conclusion of some scientists? So how are we going to find out what is order? You can only find out what is order if you understand what is disorder. Right? So don't you live in disorder? What is disorder to you? You

see, we are going away from this thing.

Q: The fear and conflict give it continuity, they are disorder.

K: What is that, sir?

Q: Well, if it was a whole that means it would be free of conflict.

K: How can a mind that is so confused, so disorderly, saying one thing, doing another, thinking about something and doing quite the opposite to what he is thinking, how can such a mind find out what is order? All that it can do is to say, why is my mind so terribly disorderly.

Q: We cannot use thought if we want to arrive at the place where we can seek order. This is what I hear you say, is that correct?

K: Madam, it is not what the speaker is saying, please, these are facts put before you.

Q: I see that as fact. I wanted to know if you were clear. Now if order is to be sought, what do we do? We first of all have to watch our process of thinking, and in watching that process we do not judge, we do not compare, we listen completely with attention, and then in the process of not judging, not comparing and not allowing that thought to be there, something happens.

K: Look here, madam, you have said some things which point to some other direction, which is you say when there is complete attention, when you say, 'when there is complete attention' there is no attention. Right? When I say, 'when I am attentive this will happen', which means I am not attentive now. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand, sir. Now what is the speaker to do? You are all

here, and you all have expressed, what is the speaker to do? He wants to tell you something, which is, there is an action which is totally, absolutely correct right through life, and for that you have to listen to it, find out for yourself. Which means find out what is action. Is your action based on the past, on some memory, or is your action based on some Utopian ideal? If it is based on some Utopian ideals, it is such a monstrous thing to live in the future. Or it is a monstrous thing to live in the past. Are you? If you are, then you will never find out what is correct action. It is as simple as that. So how will you find out whether you are living in the past? To be aware that you are doing it. Or if you have ideals, marvellous super super ideals, perfect Utopia - you are somewhere far away.

Q: This correct action, will it be different for different people?

K: No. Correct action is correct action whether it is yours, mine or his.

Q: But what are the things that I do with my mind, and other people do, and I look at you and I say, you are acting correctly, now I am going to try to follow the way you act.

K: Then you are merely a follower, therefore a destroyer. I wonder if you have understood that? If you follow somebody you are destroying that person, and yourself.

Q: What perceives correct action?

K: What perceives correct action - it is a good question if you will go into it. Who will see what is correct action? Now we see from the past, don't we? No? And that is the 'me', I, who says, 'I observe correct action'. Right? The 'me' is the essence of the past. No? My memories, my pleasures, my mistakes, my regrets, my

anxieties, my hopes, despairs, attachments, all that is the `me'.  
Right? All that is based on something that has happened. Or the  
`me' is what I shall be, what I must be, what I am going to be. So  
the `me' is either in the past or in the future, the `me' never exists  
now. I wonder if you see that. You see that's a tremendous  
discovery, not just words. Is there a `me' that is neither the past nor  
the future?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is the `me' the result of time? Right? It is the result of time.  
Time is a movement from here to there both physically as well as  
psychologically. So it is of time. Time is the movement also of  
thought. So thought has put together the `me', and the `me' is  
thought. This is all logic, reason, and we object to reason  
apparently - we call them egg-heads or something or other.

Q: Sir, when we speak isn't that based on our memories and  
therefore incorrect action?

K: Quite right, sir, quite right. But what you said is correct, but  
find out, sir...

Q: At present I am constructing the `me', that's what I am doing.  
What I am now is from my memories, that's what I am.

K: That gentleman asked a question, sir, didn't you. What was  
the question, sir?

Q: While we are speaking we are using memories.

K: That's right, that's right, sir. When we use language, when  
there is the usage of language, the language is recorded,  
memorized and the words express that memory. Right? And all the  
rest of it. So language drives us. We went into that the other day, if  
you were there. And we, we never use language. There is a

difference. The instrument uses us but we never use the instrument. It may be that we are the instrument, there is not, 'we use the instrument'. Wait, sir this is quite important. I want to tell you something so I use language; I know language is memory, cultivated, carefully learnt and stored up word by word, syntax, adjectives, adverbs and all the rest of it, verbs and so on, it is all through constant repetition of words, it has been stored up. Right? But also the word is never the thing. Right? The word 'tree' is not the actual tree. Right? So if you and I understand that the word is not the thing, that the description - I may describe the mountain but the mountain is different from the description - if you and I understand that very clearly then we are not slaves to words. I wonder if I am making myself clear? Right? We are not slaves to words therefore is there - this is too complex. I'll go on with it. Is there a talking, an expression, a saying, using the language but without the emotional, other reactions entering into the word? I wonder if I am making myself clear? No, please, this is extraordinarily difficult. Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, he asked a question, which was: aren't you speaking when you use words from memory.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I haven't understood, sir.

Q: When you go beyond the word I understand the message.

K: No. There is no message.

Q: It is a feeling, you can sense it instead...

K: I am sorry, sir, forgive me, but I can't get your meaning.

Q: Sir, I'd rather listen to you.

K: I would rather listen to the birds! You are not meeting me at

all, sir. Look, sir, we have asked the most tremendously complex question: what is correct action. You have never finished it, you won't let the speaker or yourself find out, you are always projecting, projecting, you never find out. Now when we leave you won't know what correct action is. Right? As we have so far discussed you won't realize or see what is correct action for yourself because you are constant interrupting yourself.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, may I ask, if I may, have you found out for yourself what is correct action at the end of an hour and a half? Please, sir, listen, I beg of you. Have you found out for yourself, all of us, what is correct action? Have you?

Audience: No.

K: Good! Why? You have spent nearly an hour and a half talking about it, why haven't you found out?

Q: Because everyone is so full of their own questions.

K: That's right. All this indicates, if I may most respectfully point out, that you are not interested in the question at all.

Q: Sir...

K: If you were really interested, vitally, you would shed blood over this, tears to find out. I am afraid we want to lead a soft comfortable life. Yes, sir?

Q: I would say that perhaps correct action is when we do not impose our will on life.

K: Sir, that is a definition. I am not interested in definitions. I want to find out for myself a way of living which will not be contradictory, which will have no regrets, which will not be under pressure, of fear, of hope or despair, nothing, I want to find out



what is correct action throughout my life.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, at the end of it I am asking you, an hour and a half nearly, have you found out? No. Why? Are you interested in this?

Q: Yes.

K: I am not sure. Interested so that it's your life you are giving.

Q: Sir we were talking about language.

K: I am not.

Q: But we were talking about language.

K: Because he raised that question, yes.

Q: May we get back to it?

K: We can do it, sir, but have you found out at the end of it what is correct action? That's what we started out with. Language, we can learn a great deal about language, the usage of words, how the words are formed, what is the root of words and so on, go into it, but does that solve the problem which we raised at the beginning which is: what is correct action throughout life? The speaker has given his life to it to find out. He doesn't want to live in contradiction, it has no meaning, or on some memory, which has awakened some regrets, hurts, all that is absurd when you want to find out what is correct action. You watch it, you observe it, you go into it with all your vitality, energy, intensity to find out.

So I am afraid you haven't found it, until you find it one lives a miserable, confused, contradictory life. And if you are satisfied with that, that's perfectly all right. I am not telling you what is correct action. If I were to tell you what is correct action it would be a blueprint. Then it would be totally incorrect action. Then it would be based on authority, or he says, that is correct action, I

think it is not correct action - so we are back again. So unless you are very, very serious about this, one leads rather a shabby empty life. If that is the way you think to live, live it. May I finish now?

Q: Will you go into again at the weekend?

K: Yes, we will do it in a different way at the weekend.

## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH APRIL 1978

I wonder if we should apologise for the weather!

We have been talking about the pressure that one bears in so many ways, which obviously must distort our thinking, our whole life. We talked about the linguistic pressure, the idealistic, the fears, the pleasures, the desires and so on. I think we ought also to talk about other things, perhaps somewhat much more seriously. We are apt, I am afraid, to take one part of what we have been talking about and try to investigate that one part, or try to understand that one segment of life. I think we ought to understand the whole of the field of life, the whole area of our existence, from the beginning of our birth until we die.

So we ought to consider what is the wholeness of life, what is the structure and nature of our whole consciousness, its content, and what is the state of the mind that is free from all pressures and therefore can act correctly, truly, without any distortion. And that's what we are going to perhaps this morning investigate together into this question: what is the wholeness of life, the totality of life, not one part or one segment, or one fragment, a broken piece, but can we understand and go into this whole problem, not as one problem which is detached from other problems, but see that all problems of our life are totally, completely interrelated, acting upon each other, shaping the problem according to circumstances, environment and our pressures. So that's what we are going to do this morning, if we may, together, and I mean again, let me repeat, together, to investigate, find out whether one can perceive, observe, or be aware of the whole of existence - economic, social, ethical,

religious, spiritual, death, love, sorrow, and the implications of meditation, and what is there in meditation that is so important. That's what, if we may, we will go into together.

The other morning, in the other place, we were talking about correct action, action not based on some memory, some hurt, fear, or an action which is based on what one likes to do, which are all, it seems to one, distorting, deforming the actual action. We talked a little bit about it; we said that action is only - the active present of that word, to act, is always now, at the moment. And we said, the past modifies that action, and if one has a future ideal one is acting according to some Utopian, conceptual, theoretical ideas and therefore it is not action. Right action is when neither the future nor the past interfere with the present. That is, when time comes to an end, which is now.

So we have to enquire into the question of what is time. May we? Is that all right? Shall we go on with this? Because that is part of our life, and perhaps that may be the whole of our life, this complex problem of time. What is time? Time surely is a movement from this to that, both physically as well as psychologically: one moves from here to one's home, that will take time, to reach a certain place, it will take time, that's a movement from here to there. And also there is the psychological time from the past, through the present, to the future. The past being modified through the present, but the past modified continues into the future. That's a movement. Is that fairly clear. And this movement is essentially the movement of thought. One is here in this hall, and it will take time to go home. And also psychologically 'what is', the actual, and 'what should be' - the pursuit of 'what should be' is a

movement from 'what is', to 'what might be', 'what shall be', 'what must be'. That's a movement of thought. Thought has created the 'what is', the actual, the real, whether that reality is illusory or actual - all right, may I go on, are we all following each other? And thought projects 'what should be', that's the ideal. So there is the movement from 'what is' to 'what should be', which is the movement of time, in any direction, vertical or horizontal, subliminal, or linear, in line. That is the movement of thought. If you have noticed for yourself you will see that thought has created, brought about the actual, the real, 'what is' - my anger, my jealousy, my fear and so on and so on and so on, 'what is' - and moves to 'what should be'. Right? That movement is still time and thought. So our minds are occupied with this, with time and thought, this constant movement, this constant chattering, constant occupation, which is a movement - from the kitchen, bathroom to meditation, to relationship, jealousy, it's a movement, that's our whole life, from the moment we are born until we die, a constant restless chattering, endless movement. You must have noticed this. That is the nature of time. That is, perhaps, the whole of our life; in whatever direction we move it is still the movement from a centre to something thought has projected. Right?

That is, we are always acting from a centre. You must have noticed too, if you are at all aware, if one is at all serious, there is always a centre from which you are moving. And that centre is made up of the things which thought has brought about - the 'me', with all the desires, urges, reactions, with all the longings, the loneliness, the misery, the confusion. And from that centre we move, we act, and thinking takes place from that centre. Again this

is obvious if you have observed yourself a little.

So there is this problem: time as movement, time as thought, and thought which has created the 'me', the centre, so the centre is moving constantly. Right? I want this, I don't want it, I must have it, I must not have it, I am unhappy, I must be happy, I want more, I want less - it is this endless movement of time and thought. That is the whole movement of our consciousness: I must get that, I must not get that, I want to be successful, but I am not capable of being successful - therefore there is a sense of unfulfillment, misery, confusion, jealousy, and so on. This is again very obvious. I hope we are thinking this out together.

Now, let's make this very clear: we are not analysing, we are merely observing. When you analyse there is a division between the analyser and the analysed, so that division creates conflict, the analyser saying, this is not right, this should be that. But the analyser is starting from a centre. right? The centre which is the accumulation of the past, past information, past knowledge, past analysis and that analyser is then analysing, but the analyser is the analysed. I wonder if you see this. Please, this is really very important. If you really, deeply see this, not because the speaker says so, if you see the rationality, the truth of it, that the analyser is the analysed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience - if you once see that, analysis comes totally to an end. Then a different process comes into being. Can we go on with this? Have we understood, please I am not persuading you to think in any particular direction, I am not trying to pressure you to buy this, or not buy that, I am not a commercial person, I am not selling you a thing. But unless one understands this fundamental principle, that

is, the analyser, the thinker, the experiencer, is the experience, is the thought, is the analysed. Once you have that insight into that then one can observe without analysis, let the map unfold and tell you what it is. I wonder if you see. Is this somewhat clear?

That is, we are used to tell what it should be, what it must be, describe, go into it, but we never allow the fact to tell us - no, no, the fact to reveal itself. You are always telling the fact what it must do, we never let the fact tell its story. It can only tell its story if you are listening, if you observe. Right? Then you listen with care, with attention, watching every detail, every movement, which has nothing whatsoever to do with analysis. Perhaps this may be rather difficult because most of us are highly educated, conditioned, accepting analytical process as the way out of our confusion, out of our misery, out of our neurotic habits, we are so conditioned by that, that we have never questioned it, we have never said there may be a different way altogether. One of the unfortunate facts is that we like to obey, we like to follow, we like somebody who says, 'I know, I will tell you all about it'. And you being rather gullible, if I may say so, accept it, you never question. And to question there must be doubt, a scepticism, healthy, normal scepticism, but to have this normal scepticism, doubt one must be free of fear. And also doubt must be kept on a leash, like you keep a dog on a leash, doubt must be kept on a leash, one must know when to let it go, run at full speed. And also when it shouldn't run. All this needs a great sense of awareness, attention. Right?

So when there is no analysis whatsoever - you understand, this is quite difficult for a mind that has been analysing all its life, when all the propaganda says, analyse. When the professional people, the

analysts, are encouraging analysis, we laymen we are so caught in that we just accept it. But I think there is a totally different way of looking, which can only come about when one realizes the whole nature and the structure of analysis, and therefore you abandon it, let go, not fight it but letting it go, then there is only observation of the fact, and the fact tells you what it is; not you tell the fact what it is, but the fact, the 'what is', the actual, the real, tells you what it is. Then it opens itself up completely, both the unconscious as well as the layers below the conscious. I wonder if you follow this. Are we following all this a little bit?

That's what we are doing now, we are observing without analysis the whole movement of time; not only the chronological time by the watch, but also the whole psychological time which has been invented by thought - I am in despair, one day I will have hope and fulfil. You understand this? I am not good, but I will be good. The 'better' is the enemy of the good. Right? Isn't it? Goodness has no future. Right? It is good, not, it will become good. So the flowering of goodness can only take place when there is no time. At least, please, even grasp intellectually, see the reason, the logic of it, and then let the logic end and observe what is going on. You follow? Don't, if I may point out, don't let reason function all the time, because reason is just thought, and thought in order, in sequence, but when the sequence is not proper there is disorder, illogical, unreasonable, neurotic, but when the sequence is right, which is mathematics - I won't go into that for the moment - when the sequence is right then reason finds there is an action which is not based on logic, reason, conclusion. I wonder if you are getting all this.



So we are observing only the fact that thought is time, thought as time created the centre, from that centre we act. And therefore all action is illogical, is not accurate. That's one problem, whether it is possible to act, to live - please listen, find out whether it is possible to live, act, without a centre. Do you understand? One has to find out, one has to investigate, not accept it, because it demands a discipline which comes out of observation - not the discipline that you impose. You know the word 'discipline' comes from the word 'disciple', disciple who is learning. Right? Not the disciplined mind, but the disciple who is learning and the very act of learning has its own order. Whereas for most of us discipline has become an imposition, conforming to a pattern, like a soldier, highly disciplined to kill. The Roman soldier, somewhere I was told, perhaps in Italy, the ancient Roman soldier was trained to kill for twenty-five cents, it only took twenty-five cents to train him. So little. But now it has gone up into millions. That is civilization.

So we are not imposing any will in observation. Do you see that? We are not saying, 'I must observe', then there is the pressure, then your observation is distorted. So one must learn the art of observing without pressure. And in that observation one asks, is it possible to have no centre at all? And what then is action without a centre; what then is life without a centre? Please ask yourself that question, not me asking you to ask. You understand, having a centre is the very essence of sorrow. Right? Need that be explained? It has to be explained? Right. The centre creates the tomorrow, thought which is the centre, which is the movement of time, creates the tomorrow. And in the tomorrow there is hope, in the present there is despair. Right? In the present there is

ignorance, in the tomorrow there is knowledge. In the centre is the attachment. Right? Am I making this clear? The centre is attached to you, and in that attachment there is pain, there is anxiety, there is fear, there is jealousy. I am attached to you, and you may leave me, you may go after somebody else, or look at somebody else, or sleep with somebody else, so in that attachment there is sorrow, there is pain, there is tremendous sense of not only guilt but anxiety. Right? This again we are observing, we are not analysing. So that centre is the essence of sorrow. Is that clear? No, not verbally clear but for yourself, in observing yourself that centre is the state of sorrow.

So you ask the question: is there an action which is not of the centre and therefore which is not of sorrow? You understand all this? Don't go to sleep, please! This is a very serious question. One observes very cautiously, hesitantly, listening to the centre, what the centre is saying; it is saying, 'I am the cause and the essence of misery, confusion, sorrow'. And the question is then: can I live without sorrow, is there a living without sorrow? Do you understand my question? Come on sirs! That is, is there a living without attachment? Is there a living without loneliness? Most of us are lonely, loneliness is the essence of isolation. And most of us whether we know it or not are actually creating, functioning in isolation. Right? So one asks, is it possible to live without isolation? Not the isolation brought about from hurt, the hurt which makes you build a wall round yourself and therefore isolate yourself. We are asking a much deeper question, which is, this sense of great loneliness, sense of deep unfathomable dissatisfaction, discontent: the dissatisfaction with everything.

Have you been through all this? Do you understand all this? Not dissatisfaction with one particular thing, but the flame of dissatisfaction, not with the object of dissatisfaction, not the cause of dissatisfaction, but the very burning of it.

And one asks, as the centre is the cause of all this, attachment with its anxiety, fear, and the struggle to be detached, and the pain of detachment, and the worry, the anxiety of being detached, wondering if you are isolating yourself, and then plunge into relationship hoping in there you will find no isolation. And this isolation, this sense of completely away from everything, realizing that, there is a sense of deep sorrow, isn't there. Right? Please, don't be mesmerized by the description. This is not a romantic, emotional extravaganza. Don't be stimulated by the speaker, he is not your opiate, or your drug, or your stimulant. Then you depend on the speaker, then the anxiety and all the rest of it. Whereas if you watch yourself, if you watch this whole movement of life from the centre, all the travail and all the anxiety, the guilt, the misery, and the deep sorrow.

So one asks, not another, there is no other whom you can ask. The other is you, who is also in sorrow. So can you ask if there is an ending to sorrow, and the ending of that centre which is the essence of sorrow, then what is action, then what is life. You understand my question? If there is no centre, and therefore no sorrow, no travail, no anxiety, then what is action?

And also you have to go into the question of space, not the scientific romance of space, but actually in our minds is there space at all. You understand my question? Or it is so occupied, so cluttered up, so full of knowledge, experience, wanting, occupied,

occupied. When the mind is so completely occupied there is no space. Right? And the problem then is: can occupation end, being occupied? When the mind has leisure, leisure, then it is not occupied. You know the word 'school' comes from the word 'leisure'. You can only learn when you have leisure. You cannot learn when your mind is fully occupied, cluttered up like a disordered cupboard in which you put everything, then it cannot take in, it is full. So it is only when there is leisure, that is when there is no occupation, when the mind is not occupied then you have leisure, then you can learn. That is, our minds are occupied - with god, with mischief, with sex, with money, with god knows what, you know better than I do. It's occupied, and therefore there is no space at all. And you must have space to see. If you are too close you can't see, there must be space, a distance, a hiatus. Now in our minds there is none of that, because the mind is filled with the movement of this centre, the mind is filled with the movement of time - I will be, I must be, this must not be, I wish it weren't - time, time, thought.

Then the question arises: is it possible to end the movement of chattering? Not through volition, not through will, then you have divided this chattering into the will which is controlling the chattering. Part of the chattering is also the will. I wonder if you understand this. And without any sense of pressure, to observe the chattering, and let the chattering tell you all the story it has, and it has very little to tell you, I don't know if you have observed it. When you observe it and listen to the story of that chattering, the chattering it's telling, it's so trivial, it's nonsense, superficial, nothing at all to tell. But if you exercise pressure on it, it becomes

active, it becomes deeper and deeper and deeper - at least you think it is deep. I wonder if you get all this.

So we are asking: is there a way of living without chattering, having space, not created by thought, science fiction space, but space which is the ending of occupation? Right? One is occupied with so many things: one is occupied with meditation, when you practise meditation you are occupied. Right? And therefore you have no space. Oh, I wish you would see all this.

And we are occupied with one of the factors of life, which is death. Right? Whether you are old or young there is this great occupation, consciously, or unconsciously, with death. Aren't you? The older you get, diseased, weak, feeble, a little bit gaga - perhaps we are gaga from the very beginning - and there is this great occupation with what happens after death, the whole revelation of reincarnation, the hope in that, is it true, is it not true, it must be, it must not be, there is evidence, there is no evidence - you know the thing that is going on in the world now. You know the word 'reincarnate' means reborn. Right? You understand? To be reborn. Why are you reborn next, after death, why don't you be reborn now? You understand my question? I wonder if you do. Incarnate now. (Laughter and clapping) No, no, this is not an emotional applause, or agreement, this is very, very serious. Listen to it, please. We are so occupied with death, books have been written, we read them, we are frightened of death. We see the cemetery and we say, 'My gosh' - we go through all that. And there is this eastern, Indian-India has played a tremendous part throughout the world in so-called religious and spiritual matters, and one of their concepts is, ideas is, or what they think reality is, that you, the

centre, which is you, will be born next life. If you are living rightly now, next life you will have a better opportunity, either to become a millionaire, which is generally understood, or marvellous priest, or a marvellous enlightened human being. Which implies, doesn't it, what is important is not the future, but what you are now, what you do now, how you act, how you behave, what you think, what you feel now, this life. Right? And the believers in reincarnation don't pay attention to that, they say, 'I believe in that', and in the meantime lead their shoddy little life. You understand what I am saying?

So to incarnate without the future. I'll go into it in a minute. So we are occupied with this tremendous thing called death, from the most ancient civilizations to the present sophisticated abnormal civilization. Right? Every age is concerned about this, much more than how is it possible to live rightly. You understand? To live with tremendous dignity, grace and love. You know they are all occupied with what happens hereafter. And most of us also are occupied with that. To end this occupation totally, not when you are young, or when you are old but to end this occupation completely, which means to end the fear that is involved in this occupation. Why are we, if one may ask - why is one so occupied and frightened about death? Would you answer to yourself. This is not a group therapy or confessional - too many to confess - but would you ask yourself why you are afraid of death. I can understand the fear of pain, disease, the agony of some disease, cancer and others, but the ending, why is one so frightened of an ending? You are not frightened about the ending of sorrow, are you. On the contrary. Please listen carefully. The ending of death,

and the ending of sorrow - the one which is the ending of sorrow you want, you crave it, you want it, you want to find out; and also the ending of one's life, when the brain, through an accident, disease, old age, lack of oxygen and so on, becomes senile, and gaga, and the ending of that. You follow my question?

Why is there fear of ending anything? Ending - please listen - ending your relationship with another. You understand this? Then you have to ask, what is your relationship with another which must continue, which under law, tradition, custom, habit, says, continue. Right, sir? And that continuity also through divorce, I divorce and continue with another.

I wonder if you are gathering all this. I am not informing you, I am not telling you, I am not giving you ideas, knowledge, but this you observe as you move, as you live. You want the ending of sorrow, the ending of pain, but the continuity of pleasure, and the ending of life as death. So we have to find out what it means to end, terminate. Right? If one grasps the significance of ending, the truth, the extraordinary quality that comes when you end, to find out what that quality is, you must enquire what it is to end. You understand? Are you asking these questions? Please do ask. What is it to end? And what is to continue? You understand? When we talk about ending, we must go into the question of what is continuity.

I am getting tired. Not tired, I don't think we are meeting each other, are we?

Audience: Yes.

K: Are you sure?

Audience: Yes.

K: I don't want your encouragement, that's not it. I just want to be clear that we understand each other.

So these two things are involved - ending and continuity. What is it that continues? The centre? Which is thought in action, accumulated experience, knowledge, the centre is the essence of all that. Right? And thought says, I must continue. Right? We want continuity only without pain. Right? Without anxiety, without the agony of uncertainty, without sorrow, without all the rest. Which is - please, continuity in pleasure, avoid everything else, pain, anxiety, guilt, hurts, fear, sorrow, but let me have this one thing. Right? Is that accurate? The description, is this an accurate description of a human mind that is only pursuing that, and saying, please take everything away from me. So that is what we call continuity. Right? The continuity of something which I have known, which one has known, delighted, taken a delight in it, the remembrance of it, and pursuing the remembrance of it, which is the great movement of continuous, endless pleasure. Is that what we want to continue, if you actually look and are honest with yourself? That pleasure may be enlightenment, in seeking god, in becoming a priest, in becoming a success, in owning something, possessing something, persons, ideas, furniture, house. Right? The continuity of the centre, with its misery, with its confusion, with its sorrow, with its fears, with its guilt, hurt. We never observe the centre and its content. Right? There is no observation, or listening to the story of the centre of that, the story which is the centre is showing you. You understand? The centre is telling you the story, which is fear, pain, anxiety, pressure, loneliness, agony, despair, hope, longing, isolation, death. You follow? Right? That is the



centre, that centre says, I must never end, which is death. Right? Death is not only the organic death when the brain has not sufficient oxygen, withers away, and dying, through accident, through old age, disease and so on. We accept that as something natural, inevitable, but we don't accept the ending of this centre. This centre which is the essence of sorrow, we don't want sorrow, but we say, well I would rather have pleasure; but in the pursuit of pleasure sorrow is its shadow. Do you understand what I am saying? For god's sake.

So what is there to continue, what is there to end? You understand my question? And when there is an ending, total ending, there is a beginning. Do you see this? When one ends attachment, with all the implications of it, completely ends, then there is a totally different state, different beginning. So the ending is the beginning of incarnation. You understand? I wonder if you see this. Do listen, find out, sir, find out, go into yourself and find out. In dying there is the beginning, there is a total renewal, there is an incarnation, that is, to be born, not as Mr Smith - you understand? - with all the misery, confusion, sorrow. The ending of that is a beginning of something totally new. So is that possible, to totally end? Not a hankering, a longing of some deep memory. You understand? The ending totally of all that.

The question is then: how is to end? You understand? I see it must end, or you may not see it must end, if you see it, observe that it must, that is the only way of living because if you continue with all your memories, it leads nowhere, it leads to what is called death. But if you see the truth of this continuity, then will you ask the question: how is one to end attachment? Take one simple thing,

like attachment, how is one to end attachment? You understand my question? How to end attachment without conflict, without will, without the pressure of the wife, the husband, the insurance man, and so on and so on, without the pressure of anything, is there an ending?

You understand, sir, this question is very complex, because our whole conditioning, which is the brain is conditioned - right? - conditioned after millions and millions of years. This brain is very, very old, it is very ancient. And it is asking itself - not you are asking it - it is asking itself, if you observe it, it is asking itself, can this conditioning, which is the very centre, end? Can this conditioning ever disappear, vanish, be abandoned? So the brain says, can I ever be free. You understand? Or must I enter from one conditioning to another conditioning, from one guru to another guru, from one sect to another sect, from one group to another? You follow? This is a very complex question, which is, can this conditioning with its centre, is very ancient, is very old, has been operating from childhood to now, it is of tremendous depth, so it is facing a new question, not an old question. Do you understand what I am saying? Right? It's asking itself a tremendous question. It realizes that it is conditioned, shaped, controlled, under great pressure from the ancient times, from the beginning of the anthropoid ape. You understand? Which means, can the registering process on the tape, which is the brain, the brain is registering like a tape recorder, and it's so used to registering continually, registering everything, unpleasant, pleasant, happy, joy, ecstasy, experience, it is used to registering, and it is asking, is there an ending to registration. You understand my question? Which is, can

I observe - the brain is talking to itself, I am not talking to myself - the brain is saying to itself, can I observe without registering? Do you understand my question?

You know, this is meditation, you understand, sir? For the brain to find itself conditioned, for consciousness which is the essence of the brain with all its content, misery, confusion, can all that end, otherwise there is no beginning, there is nothing new under the sun - which means, no registration whatsoever. Is that possible? One sees that, so one says, now, I see that, the brain says, yes that is so obvious. Now is it possible not to register? Not to register a hurt. You understand? Not to register somebody saying, a marvellous chap you are, that was a wonderful speech - I have been often told that. So can there be no registration whatsoever? You understand? Then what is the state of the mind, the brain that doesn't register?

It registers because in the registration, in recording there is security. And when there is no registration is there security at all? You follow all this? Because the brain can only function in security, efficiently or not efficiently, it may find security in some stupid belief, and hold on to it, in that stupid belief - all beliefs are stupid anyhow - but in that particular stupid belief it has found security - in some romantic, conceptual, mystical - you follow? And when you take drugs, whatever you do, when you take drugs it brings out certain experiences, and in those experiences there is security. And so the more you take, the more you are in illusion.

So the brain asks itself: there has been security, at least I thought there was security in those things which I have held - belief, you understand, the whole thing. And is that security, it is asking itself. Is there security in belief? You believe in Christ, or

whatever you believe in, and in India they believe in something else, that belief is based on your conditioning for two thousand years you have been conditioned in that, and for five to ten thousand years they have been conditioned there. So conditioning is both the same, one is not superior to the other. So the brain says - it realizes there is no security in belief, but where am I to find that security, if there is an ending. You understand all this?

What time is it? Quarter to one.

Where is there security? The centre is created by thought, thought is so limited, conditioned, so narrow, a broken down thing, and it has discovered that in that broken up thing which has created this whole world in which we live, if there is no security there, then where is there security. You understand? Because it can only function effectively, sanely, rationally, skilfully when there is complete security. Because most of us are insecure, uncertain, confused, our actions are neurotic, confused, mischievous. You follow? And it says, I have seen - please listen to this - I have - the brain says, I have seen - thought doesn't say this - the brain itself is in operation, the brain says, I have seen that, there is no security in all this. Right? When is it capable of saying that? Do you understand my question? You understand my question?

Q: Yes.

K: When is it capable of saying, yes, I have seen all that, there is no security in all that? When it has very carefully observed, reasoned, logic, and seen that it is really empty. The perception of that futility is intelligence, isn't it. Be quite clear on this point. Right, sir? To see the illusory nature of that centre, to see the falseness and the unreality of that centre, which is verbal, which is

memory, which is the past, and so on, to perceive that is intelligence, isn't it. Are you quite sure? I mean, suppose you go to a politician, and if you talk to him about the absurdity of nationality, and dividing the country into parties, into little parts, and his whole life is vested in that he won't even listen to you, he will say, you are fantastic, you are not practical, you are not this, you are not that. Right? I have talked to many politicians, I know that. Their idea is, be practical, factual, you must deal with the workers, that is you. You are confused, you are - you follow - and you help him to be confused also. So the brain is saying, I can only function when there is absolute security. I realize that I have lived in illusory security. Is that so, to you? And if it is, then that perception is the very act of intelligence. That intelligence is complete security. Right? See the sequence of it, not just casual observation, see clearly the sequence of what we are saying, therefore it is orderly. Because it is orderly it is the essence of intelligence. You understand? It is the disordered, not sequential mind that is stupid, dull, not intelligent.

So the brain has discovered for itself, not somebody has told it, that's too stupid, the brain has discovered for itself the quality of security that can never be destroyed, can never be changed, it is immovable, everything else is movable. I've finished.

I wonder if we are going to meet tomorrow, because if it rains, what happens?

Q: We can meet here.

K: We meet here? All right, sir.

## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH APRIL 1978

I believe this is the last talk.

As we were saying yesterday morning, we are concerned, if we are at all serious, with the wholeness of life, not a particular part, or a particular attitude, a particular conclusion, or philosophy, but rather to be concerned with all the action, with all the ways of life, which is the wholeness of life, of our living. And as this is the last talk, or conversation between us, we should also, if I may, go into the question of what is meditation.

Before we can really understand the nature of meditation we must find out for ourselves, I think, what is it that we are all seeking, searching, or longing, what is it we want. I think if one is at all serious, one begins to question the way of our living, why we live in such disordered confused, uncertain ways, why we accept conditions as they are, why the eternal wars, the division of people, the division that belief brings about, the division in religions, and so on. One must surely ask what it is that each one of us is seeking. Is it a personal search for more and more sensation, more and more excitement, more and more pleasure? Is it that we are so discontented, dissatisfied with the things around us and in us that we are seeking a way out of all this deep, abiding, flame of discontent?

As we said in our previous talks, if one may again point out, we are conversing together as two friends, neither one is trying to persuade the other to believe or not to believe. Two friends talking over together their life, their problems, their confusion, their utter lack of relationship and so on. So that's what we are doing together,

so this is not a talk to which you listen, agree or disagree, and go away dissatisfied still more. But rather enquire into what it is that we are all seeking, and why we are seeking. Seeking what? Why is there this going from one saddism to another fad, to one religion, to one group, to one guru and so on and on and on? I think it is very important to understand this question, and to ask oneself, why and what we are seeking. And who is the seeker, and will the seeker find what he thinks he must have or must discover? Is the seeker projecting what he wants? Is the seeker saying to himself, I must do what I want? Because society is so confused, corrupt and immoral, and one feels, perhaps, that if one could fulfil what one deeply wants, and the fulfilment of that may be one's search.

And also if one is at all serious, one must, as we have asked throughout these talks, ask why we put up with various pressures in our life, on our brain, on ourselves, why do we accept all the confusion, and why we accept the way we are living. I do not know if you have asked all these questions of yourself. If you have - I am not suggesting that you should, or that you must, but as two friends talking over together, each points out to the other, asks questions of each other, doubt what the other fellow is saying, so there is interaction between the two, there is a communication. And communication implies not only a verbal statement, but also sharing, sharing each other's problems, each other's struggles, trying to understand each other's misery, confusion. And that's what we are trying to do here during all these talks.

So, as we said, in enquiring what we are seeking, in perceiving the various forms of pressures, one comes to the point, doesn't one, that we know so little of ourselves, we never ask what we are, we

never go into the great complex problem of knowing oneself completely - which is self-knowing. Can one know ever oneself? Or is it always illusive? Or does it take time to know the whole content of our consciousness, our existence?

So before we begin to talk over together - I mean together - meditation, we must begin I think with the enquiry whether it is possible to know oneself. Because if you don't know totally the whole content, the depth, the width of oneself, or the pettiness, the narrowness, the shallowness, of oneself, without laying that foundation very, very deeply, which is the total comprehension of oneself in which there is no deception whatsoever, there is no illusion of any kind, no pretence, no sense of pride and arrogance - without knowing all that one cannot obviously lay the foundation to go much further.

So this morning, if one may, we are going to together enquire first what it is we are seeking, under what pressures we live, and in that enquiry we will begin to see the nature of ourselves, what we are, what we are made up of, not merely chemically, biologically, but much more psychologically. Because the nature of psychology, what is inwardly, inside the skin, as it were, if that is not clearly understood and delved into very, very deeply, we will live a very superficial life, as most of us do.

So we are going to enquire what it is to know oneself entirely. Will you please join in this game - this is the real search - to know oneself completely. To know what actually is without any distortion, to be aware of the actual in ourselves, the actual, without any imposition, without any deforming what is there. You understand? So to understand this very complex thing called the



self, and to understand it there must be obviously a very clear free mind. If I am enquiring into something very seriously I can't come to it with a prejudice, with a conclusion, with any sense of achievement, I must first learn how to look, and how to listen.

So first I must learn the art of listening to 'what is'. I don't know what I am, I am not going to accept any philosophy, or any assertions of the psychologists, however well-known, professional, all the rest of it, because if I do accept it I investigate myself according to what they have told me, which becomes another pressure, a boredom, an acceptance of authority, which one must totally discard if one begins to enquire deeply into oneself. I hope you are doing that as we are talking: that you are not looking through the eyes of another, not enquiring according to some psychologist, psychoanalyst, some philosopher. Which means that you mustn't be secondhand. Right? And most of us are secondhand people, or third-hand people, and therefore there is never any serious deep delving into this enormous content of oneself. We live a superficial life because we accept the specialists about ourselves. And the specialists themselves have accepted the specialists of others; so it goes on, each specialist accepting another specialist. But whereas if we are enquiring into ourselves very seriously one must discard the authority of another totally, completely. Do you?

And also when one is enquiring into oneself, and the enquiry is to lay the foundation which will be totally orderly, which is not a foundation based on sand, on something unreal. And to enquire into this the mind itself must be free to observe. That is, to learn the art of listening to oneself, not tell what you want to observe, but to see or to listen what the self is saying. Do you understand?

The art of listening to oneself, not according to anybody. Right? Will you do that as we go along? Then you have no authority to tell you what to think. We are educated from childhood what to think, and the teachers and the educators, the professionals and the politicians and so on and so on and so on, the priests, everybody, tell you what to think. It's so obvious, specially in this country. It is happening all over the world but here it is becoming more and more acute, because the specialists are multiplying and we become their slaves. Please, this is very, very serious, I do not know if one realizes how serious it is. Which means that one has lost freedom. When you hand over your life to another, however well intentioned, however professional, however specialized he may be, to hand over yourself to somebody, to a guru, to a priest, to some psychologist, then that very freedom is denied, and you need freedom to enquire. I do not know if you realize what is happening in the world, slowly we are becoming slaves to tyranny. Please, this is very serious - the political tyranny, the religious tyranny and so on and so on, which is the actual pressure on our life.

And to enquire into ourselves, if one has abandoned because you see the truth that authority about spiritual matters, or psychological matters, has no place in enquiry, then you drop them naturally, easily, happily, not with regret, not saying, 'I don't know if I drop these specialists, these people who have told me, how shall I enquire?' So we are going to enquire freely, not according to the speaker, not according to your desires, not according to what you think you want, but actually 'what is'. You understand? What is actually going on within oneself - the reactions, the compulsions, the pressures, the infinite varieties of desire, the exhausting

anxiety, the arrogance, the pride, the sense of assertion, aggressiveness, you know, all that. To enquire into all that one must have the sense of freedom to observe. You understand? I hope you have it now, not only while you are sitting here, but when you leave this hall to have that extraordinary quality of freedom, not to do what you like, which you have done all along - only you hide it under the cloak of religion, under morality, under culture, but freedom doesn't mean to do what you like. On the contrary, freedom implies freedom from authority, freedom from pressure, freedom from your own demands, urges, wants, so that you are able to look very, very clearly at what is going on within yourself. Right? Will you do it as we sit here?

And there is the art of seeing, not through the eyes of another, not through the projection of your own desires, thoughts, but seeing actually what is going on. That's an art - art in the sense, not a painting, not in a museum and all the rest of it, but the art of seeing which brings order. And order can only come when you put everything in its right place. Right? That's order, that is the essence of art - when you have put money, sex, knowledge, in its right place. And learning the art of seeing what actually is, without any distortion, without any motives, without any pressure. Will you do that, to observe yourself without the least pressure, which means not to achieve something, not to gain something, to become something? I wonder if you can do all this.

And there is the art of learning. For us learning implies accumulation of knowledge, memory, cultivating memory. Schools, college, university helps us to cultivate this memory, and to function according to the formula which memory has cultivated.

But there is another form of learning, never accumulating but having insight into what is seen. Now this is rather difficult, I'll go into it perhaps, if I may.

We know what learning is, don't we, accumulating knowledge, and acting according to that knowledge, therefore learning and the accumulation of knowledge becomes mechanical. You get a job, and you act skilfully or not skilfully, but you are learning, accumulating and acting. Now we are talking about learning in which there is not only not accumulating but seeing, having an insight into something which is not related to memory, because if you relate all action to memory, then it is incomplete, it is a fraction, it is broken up - because knowledge can never be complete, obviously. So what we are saying is there is an art of learning in which memory doesn't operate; you see things, you see the truth instantly. Now I'll show you an example - I am not good at examples but I will tell you one, you can take your own example and look. To see instantly the total implication of institutions - religious, political, social - to see all the significance, the meaning, the nature of institutions. Which is, everything is lived, put into a formula, into a pattern, and you function within that pattern, with the hierarchy, the higher man, the lower man, the whole of it. Or you take another instance, the institutions of religion: to see the nature of religion, to see what the priests and we have done to religion. Right? Which is seeing the truth of it, and when you see the truth of it you are finished with it. I don't know if you understand this. That it is based on belief, it is based on authority, it is based on conclusion, it is the projection of thought, that projection of thought in a church means thought is worshipping

itself. I wonder if you understand all this. So you have an insight into it, not a conclusion, not brought about through argument, logic, but having an insight into the nature of what man has called religion, the whole thing of it, you can argue logically then. Having an insight, from insight you can argue, but not the other way round. The other way round is the cultivation of memory, which is being conditioned. So insight implies freedom from conditioning. I wonder if you see all this. All right? May we go on?

So there is that art of learning, which is the insight into ourselves, and the things that we have projected outwardly. Right? So what we have projected, what we are inside, is the movement of thought. Right? So thought has created the outer and the inner, interacting all the time; therefore there is no outer and there is no inner. I wonder if you get this. There is only this movement, like the sea going out and then coming in, this constant movement, which is the 'me'. I wonder if you see this. Which is the self. And we are going to investigate into that. Right.

So in our investigation we are not cultivating memory. Please understand this. Look: I look at myself, and in looking at myself I have seen that I am this and I must be that. Just go with me for a little minute. I observe what I am and I say, I must not be that. In the very observation of myself I am accumulating memory about myself. Right? That memory will examine the next movement of the self. I wonder if you see that. Do you? So there is this constant learning, memorizing, and examining. The examination then is the continuation of that memory. I wonder if you see all this. It is fun if you see all this. It is real fun because you are then entering into something very, very deep, and tremendously subtle. That is, I

examine myself - because I see it is not quite clear - I examine myself, that examination of myself leads me to a certain conclusion. Right? With that conclusion I examine the next movement of myself, the next reaction of myself. And so I strengthen the memory of myself. Right? Whereas if you have an insight you don't cultivate memory. I can't explain more. Is this somewhat clear? Am I making myself clear? So that is what we are doing. We are going to examine ourselves, what we are. And it is also very important to find out how to observe.

If you observe according to somebody you are not observing, obviously. Right? Is this clear? Can we go on? If I observe according to Mr Freud, or Jung, or the latest psychoanalyst with their newest theories, I am just looking at myself with their glasses. Very simple. When I discard them totally then how do I look at myself? You understand? Am I looking at myself with fresh eyes, or am I looking at myself with memories which I have about myself? Can I look at myself each time as though it were the first time? The seeing oneself for the first time is insight. You get it now? So each insight is new, it is not a continuous insight, then it becomes a memory. Right, you are getting this? So insight implies no struggle, because it is so.

So what are we? Just look at it, I am not telling you what we are, you don't accept me instead of another guru - I abominate all gurus, including myself if I am a guru. I am not. So how do I, how does one look at oneself? Is there an observer looking at oneself? You understand? Is there an observer looking, adding something, saying, I am going to look at myself. You get the point? Please understand this. It may be a little boring, but go into it. Who is the

observer? We said the observer is the past, all his conclusions, all his memories, all his experiences, all his failures, all that, and with those eyes he is observing - right? - himself. Is himself not the observer? You get the point? So the observer is observing himself, therefore there is no division between the observer and the observed. Get it? Right. So he is looking at himself. So if he is looking at himself, what is there to look? I wonder if you get this. We'll go into it a little more, some of you have caught on to it, and the others have not, so I must go into it, if you don't mind.

We said the observer is the result of a million years of accumulated memories. That's logic, sane, that's a fact. And he says, I am going to look at myself. Which means he thinks he is different from what he is going to see. Please see this point. So I am going to examine myself who is different. Right? Then you have created the division, then in that division there is conflict, saying, 'I must do something about what I see, I don't like what I see, I must change what I see'. So there is conflict, suppression, all the rest of it follows. But when the observer says, I am examining myself, he is examining himself not something outside there, or separate from himself. You have got it? Are you also working as hard as I am? You must, otherwise the ball is always in my court, not in your court. If it is in my court there is no game.

So the observer is examining itself. You understand what is taking place? That is, he is seeing himself as he is, not as something to be observed. I wonder if you see this. You know it is like looking at yourself in a mirror when you shave, or comb your hair, or when you make up your face, there it is. In the same way, the observer is watching himself. Right? Then what takes place?

Do it, please, find out. What takes place when the observer is watching himself? Isn't there - I am just suggesting, I am not saying it is, or it is not, it's for you to look to find out - isn't there a sense of observation without the observer? Right? Do you understand? Which means there is neither the observer nor the observed. I wonder if you get this. This is very important because we are leading up to meditation. Have you got this? That is, when the observer is looking at himself, the observer is absolutely silent. No? When you look at something, unless you are very silent, quiet, you can't see it. You can't observe it clearly. You may see a bird on a flight, or a tree, but if the observer is absolutely quiet you see what actually is, don't you. So there is only 'what is', not how to change 'what is'. You get it? And if you observe - if the observer is totally silent, then that which is, is non-existent because it is changing too. I wonder if you see this.

This is very important because meditation means, if I may go into it, I will go deeply further - meditation means that there is neither the observer nor the observed. Do you understand this? The observer is put together by thought. Right? The observed is also put together by thought. Anger is brought about by thought, reaction. And the observer who says, 'I am angry, I must do something about it' is also part of thought. Right? So thought has divided itself as the observer and the observed, and has brought about conflict between the two. So when there is this insight into the observer there is no conflict whatsoever. Because meditation is the total elimination of complete conflict, no shadow of conflict. I'll go into it a little later.

So the observer is not, only 'what is'. Right, do you see this?



Only 'what is'. That is, one is the result of cultural, social, ethical, religious, spiritual, economic pressure, for a million years one is that. And that is what is actual. Without understanding the actual there is no movement away from it. I can escape, but the escape becomes an illusion. You can take drugs and have an extraordinary experience through drugs, which destroys the mind, which destroys the quality and the sensitivity of the mind. Here in this country drugs have become such appalling things.

So in meditation there is no observer or the observed. Then what takes place in meditation when there is this total absence of conflict between the observer and the observed, and they both cease to be? We will go into that after we have understood a little bit of this.

So I am examining myself. I want to know myself because I see without knowing myself as I actually am, not according to anybody, actually what I am - my reactions, my miseries, my confusions, my loneliness, my despair, I have lost somebody, I am in agony and so on and so on - to know all that without the observer distorting it. Get it? Right? Can you do it? As you are sitting there listening, not to me, but to yourself, and observing without the observer, therefore - and learning, which means not memorizing, but learning the art of insight, can you observe yourself as you are. Then what you are is what actually is going on in every human being. You understand? I wonder if you see this. In every human being whether you live here or in Russia, or in India, or in China, therefore what actually you are is the rest of humanity. Do you understand? I wonder if you get this. It is not a theory, it is not a conclusion, it is not a wish, it is not a strength, etc., etc., but

what actually you are. You are the representative of all humanity. Right? See what the implication is, the depth and the beauty of it. Then you are not alone. You understand? Now you are isolated, in isolation you are seeking strength. That strength is to depend on somebody, and dependence on somebody ultimately results in weakening because in that there is sorrow, misery, confusion, jealousy, all the rest of it. Whereas the fact - the fact - that you, what you are, is what all human beings are, therefore you are all humanity. You understand, sir? And there is no individuality to play with, which is an enormous discovery, and therefore gives you extraordinary vitality.

So what are you? What you are is the movement of thought, whether it is in the church, in the temple, or in the mosque, anywhere, it is the movement of thought projecting itself, saying, I am a Hindu, I am a Buddhist, I am a Christian, I am this or that - the other human being is doing exactly the same thing. So when you realize - when there is the insight into this there is a freedom from all the things that thought has put together psychologically. You understand? I wonder if you see this. Look, we will go into it a little more. Otherwise if I go into meditation you won't see this thing.

Thought has put together the external world. Right? Thought has put together the churches, the temples, the mosques, the ideas of god, the devil, evil, thought has put together all this, and it has created also marvellous cathedrals, marvellous temples, mosques, the extraordinary advancement in technology. Thought has also created war. Thought has also created the 'me' and the 'you', the 'we' and 'they' - we are more important than they. So thought is

responsible for this confusion, for this uncertainty, for this insecurity, the division, the misery, the confusion, the sorrow. Have an insight into it, not a conclusion. Then thought has not created nature, the beauty of these hills, the hills are there but you can call them beautiful, but the word 'beauty' is thought, the feeling behind it is still thought, but thought has not created those excellent, marvellous, stupendous mountains. Right? Thought has not created nature, the birds and the trees, and the rivers, but thought utilizes them, and what thought has created out of them is a reality, like a chair. I wonder if you are getting this. I must move quickly, because my time is limited.

So please follow this carefully - if you will, I am not urging you to follow it. So whatever thought has created, the actual, the figure in a church, in the temple, in the mosque, whatever thought has created is the actual, is the real, which includes also the illusions. Right? The illusion that you are somebody, or you must be somebody. And so thought in that illusion finds security, safety and so it clings to it. And from that illusion all neurotic action takes place. Whether it is fashionable neuroticism, or not fashionable neuroticism - it is fashionable neuroticism to belong to some group, to some church, to some temple and all the rest of it. I wonder if you see this. Right?

So thought has created all this. But thought, has it created love? All this is the enquiry into oneself, don't forget. Please, you understand? I wonder if you see this. Thought has created the 'me' - my memories, my anxieties, my fears, my joys, and all the rest of it. That is the actual, the 'what is'. But has thought created love? Please, careful, this is very important because if thought has not

created love, then why do we get so upset, so miserable, so confused, so antagonistic, so full of hatred, jealousy, when somebody says, 'I don't love you', when somebody leaves you and goes off with somebody else, or when there is the death of somebody? You understand all this? So if thought has not created love, then what is the relationship - please follow this - the relationship between love and compassion? You follow? Because one must find out all this, this is part of self-examining.

The word 'compassion' means passion for all, for all living things. If thought has not created love, which obviously it has not, when one really actually looks at it one gives the word 'love' its right meaning, which has nothing to do with desire, pleasure, sex and all that, which is the result of thought. Then does the movement of love become compassion? You understand what I am saying? That is, compassion cannot exist when there is sorrow. Right? Because sorrow is the movement of thought. I wonder if you see all this.

Then there is a further question to ask: what is the relationship between compassion and, if there is, truth. You understand? We said thought has not created love. That's an absolute fact. Love is not desire, love is not pleasure, love has nothing whatsoever to do with fear or attachment. Then that thing that is not created by thought is reality. I wonder if you see all this. That movement of the reality is compassion - truth, sorry. I must begin again. Forgive me, if I mislead you for a second. Thought has not created love, has not brought it into being - the love between a mother and child is inherited from the ape, a million years, and that you call love. We are saying love is not the product of thought. Love is the

movement of compassion. Then we have said reality - you know what reality is, everything including illusion is the product of thought, that is actual, real, like the microphone is real. Then, what is truth? You understand my question? Now the enquiry into that is meditation. The enquiry into that is not based on systems, on practices; that is too mechanical, too absurd, it is totally the product of thought. Right?

So what is the quality of the mind that is not enquiring, allowing truth to appear? If I can use those words, you understand - forgive me, they are ordinary words, but for truth to take place, truth to be born, because thought cannot create it, then it becomes a fragment, broken up thing. So truth is something that must be whole, not created by thought. So now how do we enquire into something that you don't know? You understand? You get the point? I have enquired into what is known - thought, all its movement, what it has created, the destruction and so on, it is known; but how do you look into something of which you know absolutely nothing? Do you understand my question? Now this is meditation. Because practice, following systems are all mechanical, too utterly stupid to even think about it, you know, even to investigate because you can see what it is, including transcendental meditation and all the nonsense the gurus have brought into this country. They are really racketeers. They are industrialized gurus making money.

So we are saying, what is the quality of the mind that says, I must find out what is truth? You understand? You can't enquire into something you don't know. Right? Just see the very statement of it is something extraordinary, if you realize it. It can only know what is unknown when the mind itself becomes the unknown. You

understand? Which is, there is neither the observer nor the observed. I wonder if you see this. Come on, sir. Look: I don't know you, because I have never met you, perhaps I have met you, shaken hands, but like two ships passing in the night. We may sit next to each other and disappear in the darkness. I don't know you, so to know you I must come to you with complete not knowing. Is that possible? It is possible only when I - you understand - when there is the enquiry into the whole movement of thought. Thought can only function within the field of the known. The freedom from the field of the known is not that you have no knowledge and all the rest of that business, but now the mind is asking what is my quality when I know nothing. You can only say that in all humility and tremendous honesty when there is neither the observer nor the observed. Which means complete silence. Not the silence introduced by thought, not the silence between two noises, not the silence between two thoughts. You understand? Those are all parts of thought. To see that which is eternal, nameless, the truth, the mind must be absolutely still. And that stillness cannot be manufactured. That's what you are all trying to do, to manufacture it through will, through practice, through all kinds of stupid things. So forgive me if I use the word 'stupid'.

So is it possible for the mind without effort, which means without will, to be absolutely still, without a single movement of thought? I said it is only possible when you have an insight into all this. Insight is not memory, it has no relationship to memory. So the mind is now absolutely quiet, therefore no time. This is not a scientific fiction or anything of that kind. It is actual, and that demands tremendous honesty, without any sense of illusion.

Because you can create all kinds of illusions.

Then what is truth? Can you describe it? The moment you put into words what is truth, it is not. The moment I say, 'I love you', the very words deny something tremendous. So that is the most sacred thing in life, not the things which thought has put together, they are just images, projected by thought. And those images you worship, and that means thought is worshipping itself. How foolish we are! But truth is indescribable. And that thing which is most sacred can only be when the mind is absolutely quiet. This is meditation, from the beginning of this talk until now, that is meditation.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 9TH JULY 1978

I am sorry the weather is so bad. It isn't our fault.

As we are going to have seven talks and five discussions, I think we should go into things very carefully, deliberately, perhaps in greater detail, taking time, going into all our problems and trying to find out if there is any solution to all of them. So those who may have heard me before please have patience.

I think most of us are concerned with ourselves, either desperately or casually or neurotically. Those who are concerned widely in relation to the world and themselves, to their little family, their responsibility to that family, to their children, and those who are already so neurotically conditioned. All of us in different degrees and different depths are concerned with ourselves, not only physically - having enough money, food, clothes, shelter, which is perhaps fairly easy to come by - but it is much more the concern psychologically which we are going to discuss, talk over together and perhaps then we shall be able to find our relationship to the world and to each other.

Why psychologically are we so concerned about ourselves? I think this question must be asked. Either you put this question to yourselves seriously, trying to find out a true correct answer, or you put that question to yourself rather superficially, casually. Only when there is a vital problem then you are concerned with yourselves, or when there is a crisis, or when there is some incident or accident that brings about misery, confusion, uncertainty, then you put that question to yourself. And so according to our conditioning, according to our temperament and experience,



according to our economical social conditioning, we question about ourselves, this tremendous concern why?

If I may point out once again and I hope you will not mind, we are sharing this thing together. There is no speaker. The speaker is yourself, the speaker is only voicing your own thoughts, your own feelings, your own conditioning, your own unhappiness, sorrow, misery, fears and so on. So actually, though the speaker sits on a platform for convenience, in actual psychological fact there is no speaker, only you and I examining ourselves, exploring into ourselves greatly, deeply - or if you are very, very serious, much more profoundly. So please bear in mind, if I may point out, that we are examining, exploring, investigating together, that there is no speaker as such. And I mean this very seriously.

So we are asking why most human beings right throughout the world are so concerned with themselves - with their relationship with another, with their unhappiness, their psychological ugliness, their schizophrenic or various complexes - or they are asking themselves if they can ever find something everlasting, beautiful, true. And in their search, those who are serious get caught up in things like religion, caught up with the various gurus, caught up in some belief or in some idea or in some conclusion. All this indicates, doesn't it, that essentially we are concerned about ourselves, and therefore we, as an individual, or as a human being, become the centre of the universe, because we are so absorbed, we are so committed, we are so entangled, we are so desperately wanting something or other - happiness, enlightenment, to behave properly, what is correct action. Or, if you are neurotically minded, that neurosis becomes stronger and stronger because you are

concerned about yourself. And there are all those psychological priests who are trying to help you. So one observes this fact. Why is it that human beings are so self-centred, so appallingly selfish, so caught up in their own anxieties, in their own longings, loneliness, despair and so on? This is an ordinary daily fact. Some of us may be willing to face it, and others may be evading it, or taking a flight away from ourselves and identifying ourselves with a nation, with a god, with a priest, with something or other. But this identification is still the concern about oneself. The more we are concerned about ourselves, the more our capacity to comprehend the whole becomes impossible. It is like a mountain stream that is roaring down the hill, but man has held it with cement and rock, not to overflow. And we are doing the same thing with ourselves. This concern with ourselves has a certain quality of energy. And that energy is bound, carefully canalized, and being caught in that, the more we are concerned with ourselves the narrower, the more rigid the world has become. You must have observed this.

So we are going to investigate together why human beings throughout the world are so eagerly, so subtly, in a very, very refined way if they are not brutish, if they are not callous, if they are not indifferent, in very, very subtle ways, they are concerned with their centre. And that centre, with its enormous energy, either brings about a catastrophe, or there is a possibility of breaking down these narrow walls which we have built artificially around ourselves - they may be broken down and therefore the release of tremendous energy.

So that is what we are talking about: whether it is possible for human beings, wherever they are, socially, economically, in the

various forms, whether it is possible to break down the narrow walls which man, human beings throughout the world, have built round themselves. And whether it is possible without any effort, not intellectually, not theoretically, hypothetically, but actually in our daily life, whether it is possible to break down this self-centred concern with his conditioning, can it ever be broken down, and therefore releasing an extraordinary quality of energy? And that energy is needed when there are no walls at all, it is needed for meditation, for the enquiry into what is truth, for the ending of sorrow and discovering what is compassion, love.

So I hope we are serious enough, when you have taken the trouble to come here in this dreadful climate, at least this year. So let us be serious, because this is not an entertainment, this is not an intellectual amusement, or romantic, intellectual investigation. We have to put aside, I am afraid, all our sentiments, all our romanticism, imagination, sensations, the desire for more experience, and face the central fact. I do not know if we can face it because we are very clever at hiding behind a facade of theories, opinions, judgements and clinging to them aggressively, passively, or unconsciously. So it is going to be very difficult to explore easily, without any compulsion, without any pressure, without any reward or punishment, just to go into ourselves and look, and find out, if we can, why you and human beings right throughout the world, have made this a central issue, central problem. And that means having the capacity to look. To look without any distortion, because every idea, every conclusion, every opinion, every experience is a distorting factor - right? Please understand this. Your very experience, whether it be sexual, the various types of

experiences stored up as memory, in investigation, in observing, become a distorting factor, obviously. Those of us who have very strong opinions, aggressively so, or judgements, again they become factors of distortion. And if you believe - whatever you believe in - according to your particular conditioning, that belief with all its associations, with all its tradition, with all the past, becomes a factor which will prevent clear observation.

So in order to enquire deeply into this enormous complex problem, there must be freedom to observe; not what you think and I think, what you feel or I feel, what your conclusions are or mine, none of those have any importance when observing, in seeing clearly why human beings are so desperately concerned with themselves - right?

When you listen to these statements of the speaker, do you actually listen? Or, do you make a conclusion or an idea about what you hear? You understand? Do you actually listen to what is said? Or in listening you have made an abstraction of it, and that abstraction becomes an idea with which you agree or disagree, or if you agree argue about that idea, or if you disagree you throw it out? But actually you are not listening. So one has to find out if you are listening to find out for yourself why this narrowing, resisting expenditure of energy, which is becoming more and more narrow, more and more selfish? And that selfishness is either so domesticated and you say it is not selfish, or you have identified yourself with something greater and say that is greater, I am not great, therefore my concern is with that, not with this. But that identification is this in a bigger way, or a smaller way.

I hope you are following all this. As we said, there is no

speaker. Isn't it a marvellous idea that there is no speaker! I have just found that out. We are looking at ourselves in the mirror, and the mirror is telling us the whole story. But you must know how to look in the mirror - not how to interpret what you see in the mirror, or how to act what you see in the mirror, but if you know how to look, that very observation will bring about right action, everything falls in its right place. This is not a rhetorical statement. It is an actual fact.

So we are enquiring seriously why human beings with this marvellous world around them, the beauty, the extraordinary nature, the quality of water, the birds, the sea and the land, and the sky and the heavens above them, why they have reduced everything to this narrow little atom, small thing, and writing enormous books about it, and how to get rid of it, what to do, practise, meditate, sacrifice, deny, starve, fast, everything to get rid of the small 'me'. The futility of sacrifice, the futility of denial of the 'me' and identifying itself with something else, with the family, with the nation, with a belief, with a god, with international - you follow? - umpteen forms of identification, will not solve the problem. What will dissolve this thing that is so corrupting, that is always seeking power, position, authority, grabbing for itself everything, utilizing knowledge as a means of further success, further power, further indulgence and so on?

Can we factually observe? - not only the idea of 'me', the idea of the centre but also observe the movement of the senses, the various senses, which is actually sensations. These sensations, touch and all the rest of it, these sensations exist, are actual, they must be, you cannot deny sensations. But when thought identifies itself with

those sensations then the structure of the centre is beginning to be formed - you understand? Right? Please, this is not intellectual observation, just ordinary daily fact if you observe the senses. One likes a particular form of food, drink, smoke, drugs and thought then identifies itself with that particular food, and the taste of it, the smell of it, the delight of it, and with that identification, in that identification, the centre is formed. That is obvious.

Now can you observe - please listen to this, it is very interesting if you go into this - can you observe the movement of the sensations whether it be sexual, whether it be taste, hearing or seeing, can you observe the movement of those ordinary natural sensations without identifying? Do you understand this? Am I saying something strange, or neurotic, or bizarre? It is very important to understand this because we will go into this problem of identification. Where there is no identification there is no centre - right? It is this constant identification with my senses, with my body with my thoughts - you follow - the whole movement of identification, identification being attachment, inseparable attachment and with all its associations, and so this identification is movement of energy and that energy becomes more and more limited, which is the centre - right?

So we are asking: is there an observation of the senses without any form of thought identifying itself with a particular sensation? You understand? Sensations are natural. If you have no sensations you are utterly paralysed - perhaps most of us are, only in one particular direction, sexual or another direction. But we are talking of the movement of all senses, not one particular sense. If you see the logic of it, the reason of it, that the moment thought identifies

itself with a particular sensation, or with all the sensations, that identification is the movement of building this vast energy into a narrow channel. Right? Have I explained? Have I made it clear? Not I - there is no speaker, only in conversation between ourselves, as two human beings, we are discovering this - you are discovering, not the speaker, there is no speaker. So you are discovering that any form of identification, not only with the senses, with the family, with the nation, with ideas, with conclusions and so on, is the beginning of narrowing down this vast energy and limiting itself, therefore resisting the vast movement of life - right?

So we are asking as you are sitting there: can you observe your senses without any identification? Identification with the body - look, it is very, very serious what we are going into, if you don't want to listen don't listen, think about something else. But if you listen, listen with your heart, with your mind, with your whole being, as we are going into this question of releasing the tremendous energy, which is now canalized into a very, very small narrow prison, from which we act. And there is not only the identification with the senses, therefore with the body, then identification with the name, of course, even if you give yourself a new name, or a new number that is still identification - which the monks do and so on. Why does thought constantly identify itself with something? You understand my question? - which you are doing, my wife, my son, my family, my girl, my boy, my house, my quality, I have experienced so much I must hold on to that experience, I am identifying myself with Christ, with Krishna, you know, the whole gamut of objects of identification. Why does

thought always identify with something or other?

Don't you, if I may ask, not as a speaker, you are asking yourself, don't you ask yourself why? Why do I identify myself with the form, with the name, with all the experiences which I have gathered, or the future identification? Why does thought do this all the time? My house, my wife, my belief, my god, my country, I am British, you are French, I am German, you are Russian - you follow? Why? Is it because thought being in constant flux - please find out, I am just enquiring, find out - being in constant flux, movement, needs security about something? You are enquiring, asking yourself this. When you say "It is my house", that gives you certainty, stability, security. When thought identifies itself with a house it is necessary - isn't it? - it gives it security, shelter, safety, protection, the physical identification with the house gives it security. But watch it. That movement of identification with a physical necessity is taken over psychologically - right? There it is physically necessary, but psychologically it may not be necessary at all. But we are constantly doing this - from the necessity, that includes, although I may not identify myself with my trousers, or shirt or whatever one wears, but the attachment, the physical needs and from that need move into a psychological ground and say "It is necessary there too" - and it may not be. You are following this? I wonder if you are?

Doesn't this take place always, generally from the purely physical, the need for food, the need for clothes, the need for cleanliness and all the rest of it, that movement spills over into the psychological area, and the spilling over from that to this may be totally unnecessary, it may be an illusion. There is only that and



not this. I wonder if I am making myself clear? We will go into this very carefully. After all, what is the ground, the area, the field of the psyche? You understand? We understand more or less the physical. One needs food, clothes and shelter, that is obvious. And the danger comes when we identify ourselves with that. We say, "It is my clothes, it is my property, don't touch it". Now that necessity has been identified by thought as mine, and it is that same movement from the physical to the psychological: my experience, my desires, my longings - you understand? I wonder if you are understanding this? Because you see what we are trying to point out is there is no speaker. In the mirror if you observe very carefully, you might see that what is necessary physically, that same idea has been brought over into the psychological realm and that has become much more important than the other. One can have very little food, not be concerned, but don't interfere with my power - I want position, I want this, I want that psychologically - you understand what I am saying? Are you discovering this in the mirror for yourselves? Or I am pointing it out and you observe it and accept it? That accepting is merely a form of persuasion, a form of pressure. Where there is pressure, acceptance, there is no investigation.

So we come to something else, which is: can you be free of pressure? You understand? To observe the pressure of institutions - right? The institution of the church, the institution of the government, the institution of so many things. The word 'institution' comes from the Latin and so on, to stay, be put where it is, don't move. So we are generally under great pressure of institutions: perhaps you may not be aware of it, but if you observe

you are. Institutions democratic, totalitarian, socialist, economic - you follow? - this constant pressure. Then there is the pressure of ideologies, the ideal, which is perhaps more deadly than the economic pressure; the pressure of theories - right? Do you know all this? Are you aware of all this? The pressure of books, the pressure of knowledge, the pressure of authority, the pressure of a family, the pressure of the wife or the husband, the girl and boy - this constant pressure. And the pressure of experience, of knowledge - do you understand? It isn't just the pressure of somebody over you, the government or somebody, but inwardly this enormous pressure of having acquired experience, knowledge, and that knowledge is putting pressure all the time, do this, don't do that, this is right, that is wrong, you must have more knowledge, is one aware of all this? I am afraid not. And the pressure of relationship - right? We won't go into all that. We will a little later as we go along.

So we are saying: you cannot observe this extraordinary structure of the centre, the concern about the centre, and to observe that freely without any pressure there must be freedom to look. But most of us are under pressure. Most of us when we observe have a motive, the motive becomes the pressure. "When I observe I must understand it, I must get beyond it, there must be a reward at the end of the beastly show". You understand? This great constant pressure through motive, through desire, through reward, avoiding punishment and so on; as long as there is that weight, observation into the cause why human beings have reduced themselves to such narrow little human entities, so concerned about themselves from morning till night. Otherwise you wouldn't have gurus. Otherwise

you wouldn't have priests and religions. Otherwise you wouldn't have all these enormous complex psychological priests - you understand? All that indicates naturally this concern about oneself.

And can one live without this concern at all? Then only there is peace, then only there is love and compassion. Where there is a centre held by thought as the 'me' in a narrow groove there must be suffering, and the violence and the brutality, the cruelty, the hate, the whole of that is centred there. That is an actual fact.

Then the next question is: is it possible to break it down? Not with a chisel and hammer, as most of us are apt to do, psychological hammer, psychological chisel - making an effort, discipline, control, sacrifice, denial - which are all hammer - right? So we are asking: is it possible to break it down, these walls that one has built round oneself, without a single movement of effort? Because if you make an effort you are identifying yourself with what will happen when you break down the wall - you understand? Which is still another structure of the narrow self, I wonder if you see all this? Yes? Right? So can this be broken down? That is the problem. That is really the central issue for all humanity. There is no other issue, politically, religiously, economically, than for man to end this colossal self centred thought, this subtle selfishness which breeds division and all the rest of it. That is the central issue. And that is the central issue of religion, not all this circus that is going on in the world, in churches, in mosques, in temples, in religious gatherings. The essence of religion is the ending of the self, totally, completely.

If you have looked into the mirror carefully, seriously, not merely at your face, or your hair, or your eyebrows, your colouring

and all the rest of it, but look without any direction, because the direction is a distortion. Please understand this one thing and then you will be able to see in the mirror very clearly. We are always acting in a particular direction - success, you know all the rest of it, I don't have to go into details. So can you observe without any movement - the movement being thought looking? I wonder if you see that. When you look at anything, it doesn't matter what it is, thought is looking. Have you discovered that? Or imagination, fancy, memory, the past - right? Can you look without the movement of all that? Otherwise you can't see clearly. See the logic of it, the reason of it. If you see the reason, the logic, the sanity of it, that very sanity will put that aside. You understand? It is the unhealthy that bring all this in. It is the healthy that look because they are sane. Which means sanity is not possible when you remember all your illnesses, all the past pains, but when those are put aside you can look very clearly without any difficulty. The looking then pushes aside all those things which are not sane - you understand what I am saying? The very urgency of looking puts aside those things that prevent actual looking - right? Is this clear? One thing clear. The very urgency of something - you understand? - you forget about everything else. The urgency of someone dying, of fire, the urgency dispels totally the movement of the past: you act.

Looking in the mirror, and you are looking in the mirror without any persuasion, without any pressure because there is no speaker but you are just observing yourself in the mirror - and the reason, logic has told you the world with all its violence, brutality, insanity is brought about by this centre in the name of peace, in the name of

Christ, in the name of nationality, brotherhood, and all the rest of it. Can you look? And the intensity and the urgency of watching dispels any interference of thought, with all its images, associations. Are you doing it? Or are you listening to the speaker when he says there is no speaker? You understand? There is no speaker, and I mean this desperately, passionately. And I say this with great affection, love, because then you are looking at the mirror yourself, not the speaker is influencing you, coercing you, urging you, persuading you. So you are here, if one may point out, not to listen to the speaker, but to listen, observe yourself in the mirror. And the whole history of mankind is revealed there. And when you look with intensity it becomes so very simple.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 11TH JULY 1978

May we continue with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? Before we go into that, I would like to ask if I may, with all due respect and all the rest of it, why you are here? Why you come to these talks and discussions? Is it out of curiosity? Is it that you have nothing better to do, therefore you might just spend an hour or so here? Or since you have apparently taken a lot of trouble to come, you must be fairly serious? If you are serious how far are you willing to go? Not another long journey physically, but inwardly, psychologically, inside the skin as it were, how deeply you are willing to go? One can go very deeply only, if you are willing, not with an intellectual concept of depth, then if you have an intellectual concept of depth, then it takes time to travel into that depth. And you may be serious enough to find out for yourself whether you can observe this whole movement of time, the measurement, height and depth, climbing and descending, enquiring into depth, which requires also a great deal of time and energy? Or there may be a totally different action, which doesn't involve physical expansion, the travelling from this country to India to find some ugly guru or beautiful guru, but rather to have a quick perception into things, to have an insight, an immediate understanding, immediate contact with actually 'what is'. Not with what you think 'what is', or what you might want it to be, but actually perceive in its entirety what actually is taking place. When one observes so totally, holistically, then that gives an insight. From that insight you act; therefore insight and action are immediate, not a postponement of action. So that is what we are

going to enquire, if we may this morning, if you are willing, and if that is what you want to discover.

And as we were saying the other day, why throughout the world human beings are so occupied with themselves, with their groups intellectually, with their physical beauty, or whatever it is, and psychologically, inwardly, so anxiously occupied with themselves, with their understanding, whether they are meditating properly, whether they do the right posture, whether it is the right thing to do, what one should do - this constant expanding enquiry and occupation about themselves. If one discovers for oneself the danger of such occupation, the actual, not only psychological as well as physiological danger of this centralized occupation, then perhaps one can clearly and easily go into the question 'why'. Why human beings, of which we all are, and every human being if you enquire into it more deeply, is the representative of all humanity, and that is very important to understand because every human being right throughout the world suffers, is anxious, uncertain, in despair, elated and confused, attached. So all human beings are that. So you, when you look at yourself very carefully, objectively, non-personally, then you will see that you are like the rest of humanity. And that discovery that you are actually, truly, irrevocably the representative of every human being, that gives you an extraordinary sense of vitality, strength. This is not mere sentiment, a romantic concept, an intellectual idea but an actual daily fact.

So we were saying the other day, this occupation limits energy. And when energy is limited, narrowed down, canalized, it begins to lose its pristine vitality, energy. And from this narrowing down

of self occupation with oneself, if one observes, this has created a lot of misery in the world, when each person is occupied with himself, with his ambitions, with his fulfilments, with his despairs, with his fears and so on and so on, you have no relationship with anybody else. You may think you have but actually you have no relationship when the whole of your mind is occupied with one's own progress, with one's anxieties, with one's problems and so on. It is so obvious. But though it is very obvious we do nothing about it. On the contrary we work at it, improve it - it is called self-improvement, to become better, but always within the narrow limits.

So, that is what we were talking about the other day. Perhaps some of you are new to this, so if you are new to what is being said, don't say to yourself, "Oh, that is old stuff. We have heard all this in different ways before". Or say that he is repeating what somebody else has said. Or you don't quite understand the vocabulary - we are using ordinary English language, no jargons, no specific meaning to special words, but ordinary, daily English. And if we both are speaking English communication becomes easy, but verbal communication is not nearly enough. You can understand that it is a lovely day, fortunately, but when one goes deeply, enquires extensively, wisely, hesitantly, the words are not enough. Words are never the thing, the description is never the described. So one must be not only aware of the meaning of the words but also the word is not the thing.

Then one begins to enquire very, very deeply, slowly, hesitantly, without any conclusion - right? Like a first-class lawyer or a surgeon, he doesn't bring all his concepts, he first enquires into



the case - the case is us, we are the problem. So we must be very clear what is our problem, which I begin to question whether we are. We are so diffused, emotional, sentimental, so we are always colouring the problem, looking at it from a very, very narrow, limited point. Isn't that so? So one has to be very advisedly careful that in our examination into why human beings are so destructively occupied with themselves, in enquiring into that, and whether it is possible to be totally free from the occupation, completely. Freedom is the complete dissolution of the self. Then there is freedom. We are going to go into all that.

Does one see the actual danger of this self-centred occupation? That occupation may identify itself with a nation, with a group, with a particular ideal or belief. It is the same process. I hope this is clear. When I identify myself with a group, with an idea, with a belief, with a conclusion, that identification is the very essence of being occupied with oneself - right? When one is occupied with say, internationalism, you have moved from occupying yourself with yourself to something with which you identify yourself. Therefore that identification is still the occupation with oneself. Is this clear? When I identify myself with Christ or Jesus, or Krishna, or whatever it is, I am still in the process of identifying myself with that, but it is still occupation with myself. I wonder if this is clear? Can we go on if that is clear?

So this central issue is whether one can exist healthily, sanely, harmoniously without identifying with anything? Not only outwardly but inwardly. Identifying myself with my experience, identifying oneself with the family, with beliefs, with institutions and so on. That means can one live in this world with no

identification? Which means can one live harmoniously, both with the outer and the inner without any sense of occupation and identification? Is this clear? Let's be clear of the problem first before we operate on it. When one is occupied with oneself, with one's body, with one's beauty, with one's eyes - you know, this constant occupation with oneself, you deny actually all relationship, though you may sleep with another, you may hold hands with another, say "Darling how are you" - all that, but the identification process separates human beings. And from that, violence, wars, division of races, everything takes place - right?

Now the next question is: whether it is possible to live in this world daily without any sense of identification? Not only with the senses, with the body, but with the day, with all the past, the heredity - you understand? - the Englishman, the German, all the history of all the past, to be completely free from all that and yet live in harmony with activity in daily life. Is this problem clear now?

First of all there is no speaker. As we pointed out the other day, you are speaking to yourself, you are looking at yourself. The speaker may be the mirror, but the mirror has no value. You use the telephone to speak, but the telephone itself has very little importance. What you say in the telephone is important. So similarly, there is no speaker here. You are talking to yourself, you are observing yourself, you are observing your occupation with yourself, and the result of that occupation in your daily activity, which is creating such chaos in the world. When people identify themselves with Russia, with a certain ideology, you become terribly brutal, you are willing to torture people and so on - we

won't go into all that, everybody knows about it, every magazine, every newspaper goes into all this.

So the next question is: can the mind totally dissociate not only with the knowledge which it has acquired and stored up to which it becomes attached, but also can the mind remain not in isolation, because when one thinks, if one is not occupied oneself you have no relationship to others. You are so totally isolated. Those are all concepts, conclusions, theories. So what we are saying is: can the mind, including the brain, the senses - when we use the word 'mind' we are including all that, the brain, the movement of thought, the experiences accumulated as knowledge, memory, the whole momentum of thinking, and the senses, all that is the mind, which is essentially consciousness - right? - can that mind, which has been so conditioned through millenia, because our minds, brains are very, very old, it is not something new that we have acquired when you are born, it is a tremendously old mind heavily conditioned to occupy itself with itself. Can that mind free itself completely from the past, which includes knowledge, tradition, heredity, all that, and actively, sanely, live in daily life harmoniously? Is this possible? Right? You understand the problem? The identification between the Jew and the Arab in the Middle East, what happens when the Russians are occupied with an ideology and forcing man to shape himself according to that ideology, the authoritarian totalitarianism, which is destroying and so on and so on and so on. Does one see this centralized occupation is an enormous danger that is going to destroy man?

Then the problem is: how to disentangle, how to unravel all this and put it all away? Right? Now what is your answer? I am not

answering it, you are answering. You are looking in the mirror. There is no speaker. You are looking and asking this question. If you ask this question looking in the mirror you might say "It is not possible" - that is the instinctual response, to say it is not possible. If you say it is not possible then you have blocked yourself - right? That is natural, isn't it? But if you say it is possible, that also means you have blocked yourself. Both negative and the positive is a way of avoiding the issue - right? So you are looking at the mirror, there is no speaker, and you are neither accepting nor denying, saying it is, or it is not possible, but looking.

So here comes the problem: whether you are actually looking, or you are looking at an idea which you have projected. You understand my question? Whether you are actually looking in the mirror, or you are looking with the conclusion or idea, or a hope and through that hope, through that idea, through that conclusion looking at yourself. You understand? When you do that you can't see. If I am prejudiced about you because you wear a white shirt, or a blue shirt, or crinkly hair, or this or that, I can't - it is silly, if I want to have any contact with you it is not possible. But to look at oneself in the mirror and find the answer for yourself in the mirror, because nobody is going to answer it, then you might say, "Why are we here? If you don't answer this question as the speaker, what the dickens am I sitting here for?" Which would be a natural response. But as we said, we are human beings. There is this immense problem confronting us, a crisis, danger, destruction, and sane, healthy serious people must answer this, find an answer out of all this. So looking at the mirror where there is no speaker, you say is this possible at all, to move out of this habitual constant,

apparently irrevocable movement of this occupation? Right?

So, are you looking at the mirror? Or looking at the idea that you have a mirror in front of you? You see the difference? Do you? The idea, which is not the fact. The idea is an abstraction of the fact, a movement away from the fact. So if it is terribly important that you find the answer urgently, seriously, then ideas have no place, you are actually looking. Then what takes place?

Here comes a different problem: whether you are looking as an outsider in, or you are in it, not outside. That is, are you looking as though you were different from that thing which you see? You have understood? This is fairly simple, isn't?

Now I am going to begin differently: which is, when you are jealous, greedy, angry, violent, are you different from that violence, greed, envy, anger? Are you? Or you are that anger? That greed? That violence? So can you observe yourself in the mirror not as an observer but only the thing that is being observed, without the observer? Does this become rather difficult? Or is this old hat that you have heard before umpteen times and you say, "Well, please get on with it"? But this is very important to understand, because as long as there is a division between the observer and the observed - you understand? - there must be conflict, there must be effort, there must be a sense of either conquering it, suppressing it, or avoiding it. So to totally eliminate altogether effort there must be no division - right? If there is no division between the Jew and the Arab, it is finished. From North Ireland to South Ireland - it is over.

So in ourselves there is this division, the observer and the observed, which is dualistic - you follow? And we are conditioned

through education and culture and all the rest of it, through religion, so-called religion, to maintain this division, to see god. You are nobody - you follow? - this whole division, which is the corridor of opposites. And when there is the corridor of opposites there must be conflict, effort, practice. So it is absolutely necessary to understand that there is only observation, not the observer trying to control the observation, that which is observed. Is this clear? Can one do this? You may hear this. You may say, "I see the gist of it, I have a feeling for it, I think what you are saying is true", but it avoids you, it escapes, but it is yours, you have to find out. Which means that as there is no division between yourself and anger - right? - you are anger, at the moment when you are angry there is no observer, you are only that. Later on you say, "I have been angry" - then you say, "I shouldn't be angry" - or you give reasons, explanations for being angry. Or you suppress anger. The moment of anger, of greed, of violence, there is no division. This is a fact. So similarly, is there an observer at all? Please give your mind, your attention, your love, your care to understand this because we are totally, completely eliminating conflict, if you understand this. One can live a life in which there is not a shadow of conflict, not only within yourself but outwardly. And this is immensely important to understand, because, as we said, the manner of your observation in the mirror - there is no mirror, you are watching yourself, but for the moment we invent the mirror. Who is the observer? You understand? When you say, "I observe the tree, the stream, I observe you and I observe myself", who is this observer? That is very important to understand before we begin to understand the observed - right? Are we coming together?

Are we communicating with each other? Say yes, or no, for goodness sake. Are you all asleep?

So who is this observer? When you say "I have been angry" or "I have been violent" - who is that entity that says, "I have been"? That entity is the observer, isn't it? Who says, "Yes, I have been angry" Is not the observer the past, who says, "I have been angry"? Right? Not only in that instance, but whenever he observes, the whole observation is the movement of the past. I observe a Frenchman - because I have been told he is a Frenchman, you follow? - the conditioning, the past, knowledge - right? So this whole movement of observation is born from the past. So the observer in essence is the past. Right? Don't accept what I am saying. That is a fact. Looking in the mirror there is no speaker, because you are questioning desperately, anxiously, passionately, you are questioning. I hope you are!

So the observer is the past - past memories, past experiences, past knowledge. With the past he is observing himself in the mirror - right? So you have created a division between what you see now and what has been. So there is a division between the observer and the observed - right? Are you getting this? So the conflict begins. In your occupation with yourself, don't you have a conflict with another, however intimate your relationship be? So to totally eliminate that conflict permanently, everlastingly, one must understand the nature of the observer - right? And as you observe and enquire, and learn, the observer is the past, so the past is always divided - right? I am a Jew and you are an Arab. The Jew is tradition, propaganda, belief, certain mode of life and so on and so on and so on; and the Arab has his own mode of life and so on -

right? So wherever there is division there must be conflict, not only outwardly but inwardly - right? Is this clear? That is, if you are serious, if you want to live completely without contradiction, without effort and therefore live in peace, live in love and compassion. If that is to be, you must eliminate totally the division in yourself outwardly - have you understood this? This is not an idea, an intellectual concept but actuality.

So can you look at yourself in the mirror without the observer? This is the real issue in which identification ceases and therefore division. You understand? Where there is no identification there is no division. So can you observe your anger, your violence, your hurts and all the rest of it, without bringing in the past memories, past knowledge, past struggles, just to observe without the observer? Then what takes place? I am not asking the question, you are asking the question yourself. Then what takes place when you are looking at the fact? Not with the memories about the fact - right? Is this possible? Can you do it? If you can't you cannot go further, because this is a very important issue as man has lived millenia upon millenia, constantly in battle with himself, with the devil and god, with the lower self and the higher self - you understand? This battle, this conflict, you see it in all the ancient pictures, drawings, the division between that which is good and that which is bad, constant battle. And why should we live in this way?

So we are going to enquire and find out if it is possible to live totally in a different way. That is if you are serious. So do you see the truth, not the idea, but the truth, the fact, the reality, that the observer is the past, accumulated memories, knowledge, and so, he



never perceives the present? To perceive the present there must be the absence of the past, obviously. And there is no effort involved in removing, or putting aside the observer, because you see it is so - you understand?

Let's put it differently: is love a remembrance? What do you say? Is love something that you have remembered and then you say, "I love you"? So if it is a remembrance, a thing that is past, then it is merely pleasure, and that pleasure says, "I love you" because it wants more of that pleasure - is that love? The speaker is not here, you are asking this question yourself, you have got to answer it, you can't sit there and deliberately think about it. You have got to answer it.

So can you observe this fantastic enduring occupation with yourself? Observe it without the observer - you understand? Then is there an occupation? I wonder if you see this? Occupation with yourself is the movement of the past. "I have been that, I must be different from what I have been. I am a failure, I must be a success. I am depressed, I must be happy. I am not good but I will be good. I am not virtuous but I will have virtue. I will understand" - you follow? This whole movement of identification and occupation is born from the past. Because if you don't identify yourself with something, with a human being, with an idea, with a country, with a family, with something, with a rock, what are you? So the fear of being nothing makes you identify, makes you occupied - right? Face it. That is a reality, it is not an intellectual structure. If you are not identified with your country, with your body, with your god, with your knowledge, with your wife or girl-friend, or boyfriend, you are empty, aren't you? Right? If you are empty, in that

emptiness there is tremendous energy. But we are so frightened of this emptiness, this void in oneself. And to avoid that void we occupy with god, with society - you follow?

So the next question is: are you listening to the mirror which is telling you that there is no observer, that the observer is the past, and most of us live in the past? "How beautiful I was when I was young. How quickly I could walk when I was young. What a lovely time I had, I ate so much, I enjoyed so much." - you know the past, living, living in the past. That is the observer. So the observer creates the division, and the whole conflict begins. Now do you see the truth of that? Not the words of it, not the meaning of the words, but the fact of it? If you don't, why don't you? Is it that you are incapable of thinking, observing, watching, or your brains have gone so old, or you are not concerned?

So is it that you don't actually see this fact: the observer creates the division, which is the past - the Jew and the Arab, the Hindu and Muslim, the Catholic and the Protestant - the past creates this division and conflict, both inwardly and outwardly? Do you see what danger that is for humanity, for you and your children and all the rest of the stuff?

Then when there is no observer then there is only observation; the observation of the senses, without identifying with the senses - you understand? Can you observe without identifying yourself with the senses, can you observe the movement, the activity of the senses, whether it is sexual senses, taste, smell and all the rest of it, the activity of the senses? From which arises the question: is there an observation of the whole movement of the senses? Not one particular sense. Are you meeting all this? Then when there is an

observation of the whole movement of the senses, there is no centre which identifies itself with the senses.

Am I talking to myself? If I am talking to myself I will go in my room. But I am not, you are talking to yourself. There is no speaker. So this requires no discipline, no practice - right? When you practice, again there is a division - right? But to see instantly the fact, the truth, that is insight, which we began this morning talking about having insight; having an insight into the whole movement of identification.

To observe the whole movement of the senses without identification, which means, is it possible to observe without forcing yourself, without disciplining yourself to watch, to practise? Because when you do, again you have brought in this whole dualistic effort. And can you disassociate, can the mind disassociate with its tradition, with its conditioning of identifying, which creates duality? You understand? Do it! Can you disassociate and not identify with your girl-friend? Can you be free of attachment, which is identification, obviously? Attachment to your country, to your group, to your family, to your children - you follow? - attachment, holding on to your name, to your ideas, to your conclusions. Does that non-identification with another, does it end in isolation, does it end the fact of love? Do you understand my question? Do we know what love is? Not know intellectually, verbally, volumes have been written about what love is, good god! Can we, looking in the mirror, ask these fundamental questions? When there is no identification or attachment with another, does it mean the end of affection, the end of tenderness, the end of love? Because now when you are attached we say, "I love you". You

have to look at it, answer it.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 13TH JULY 1978

I am glad it is such a lovely day. We ought to be in the woods.

We were saying, weren't we, the last two times that we met here that this identification with our bodies, with our experiences, with the house, with the family, with the nation, with a particular ideology or belief has brought about the emphasis on the self, the 'me', the ego. And that has cultivated this idea - and I am using the word 'idea' in its proper sense - the idea of an individual, that we human beings are separate, distinct individuals apart from everybody else. This emphasis on individuality has created a lot of mischief. It has destroyed families - I don't know if you are aware of that - it has brought about excellence in achievement, in technology, a sense of highest endeavour on the part of a particular human being, the individual, the individual enterprise. Opposed to that there is this whole ideology of the totalitarianism. So we have these two opposites. On the one side freedom, so-called freedom; on the other no freedom at all, except for the few. And as one observes throughout the world, the excellence of the individual has brought about certain beneficial results, not only in the technological world, but also in the artistic world. And though the individual thinks he is free, is he free actually? And on the other side of the coin, is the totalitarianism where there is no freedom at all, except for the few.

Now what is the truth of this? It is obvious there must be freedom. What do we mean by that word 'freedom'? Again let us be very clear that we are asking this question of ourselves, that the speaker isn't asking, you are asking. As we said, there is no speaker

here. You and I are the speakers. You and I - this person talking - are enquiring together into this question: on the one side the enormous importance given to individuality with all its identification, nation, house, family, capitalism and socialism, whatever it is; and the other identification with the ideological society. Society there becomes all important according to the few. And in enquiring into this we must first ask, if I may suggest, what is it we human beings are trying to do? What is it that we human beings, not Mr So-and-so, Mrs So-and-so, as human beings without labels, without nationalities, without all the rubbish that has been pushed down our throats by other people as well as by us over other people, what is it that we human beings are trying to do in this world? What is it that we are seeking, that we are searching, that we are longing for? And one of the questions involved in this is: what is freedom? We think we are free because we can travel, go to America, go anywhere you like if you have money and the inclination. And on the other side you can't travel, you can't leave the borders, they are controlled.

So what is freedom? Perhaps most of us, at least those who are serious and thoughtful, aware, must inevitably ask this question: what is freedom? Is freedom to do what you like, as an individual? Is freedom a permissive activity? That is, each one wants to do what he wants to do. If he wants to believe in god, he believes in god. If he wants to pursue and take drugs and sex and all the rest of it, he is free, if he has the money and if he has the inclination and all the rest of it, to go with it. And we have considered this kind of activity freedom, to do what one likes to do, what one wants to do, what one wants to fulfil. Or trying to find in freedom identity. You

know all this. So is this freedom? Or, is freedom something entirely different? We think of freedom as being free from something, from poverty, from a person you have married that you don't want any more and you are free to divorce and all the rest of it. Free to choose your activity in the business world, or in the psychological world, or free to believe what you want to believe and so on and so on and so on. One is free, one thinks, in our choice to become a Catholic, or a Protestant, or not to believe in anything at all. You know all this.

So is that freedom? Please ask yourself this question, not me. You are facing the mirror, looking at yourself, investigating into the whole psychological structure of yourself. And our conditioning has been to do what we want to do. And we have never enquired into what it is that urges us to do, either to go Left, Right, or whatever it is. And as long as there is identity with a nation, with a family, with a husband, with a girl, with this belief, with that dogma, ritual, tradition, is there freedom? You are following all this? You are asking these questions. I am only voicing your enquiry. As we may point out again, we are not authoritarian here, there is nobody as far as the speaker is concerned with any sense of authority, any sense of superiority. There is no dogmatism, there is no belief. And if the speaker is rather emphatic, it is not an assertive, aggressive expression, it is his natural self.

So we are enquiring if there is freedom in its total sense, not from something to something else, or from something else to something else? We are enquiring into this whole feeling of freedom, if there is such a thing. And as long as the mind, thought,

sensation, emotions identify themselves with a particular object, a piece of furniture, a human being or a belief, is there freedom? Obviously not. The moment you identify yourself with something you are denying freedom. If I, because I like the idea of some supreme being and all the rest of it and I identify myself with that and pray to that, worship that, is there freedom at all? So we are discovering that there is no freedom as long as there is an identifying process going on - right?

Please, words are dangerous, don't, if I may suggest, don't translate what is being said into your own words, into your own language, into your own opinion, but actually listen to the words we are using, because then we are in direct communication. All right, let me put it this way: language, that is the usage of words, the meaning of the words, the syntax, language drives most of us - right? When you say, "I am a Frenchman" - the word is active and forces us in a certain pattern. So language uses us - right? I do not know if you have not noticed it. When you use the word 'Communism', or 'Socialism' or 'Capitalism' or a Catholic, a Protestant, a Hindu, a Jew and so on, these are the words which act upon us and force us to think in a certain way - right? So language is driving us, using us. I don't know if you are aware of it. And if you use language, not language drive you, then we are using words without any emotional content. Then there is a possibility of exact communication. Are we getting somewhere together? Please understand this because we are going to go into something which I think, I am not sure yet, which will come out of all this in our enquiry into freedom, in our awareness that identity destroys freedom, curtails freedom, limits freedom. And if you are satisfied



with that limitation of freedom then you must also be aware of its consequences, which is separation, which is continual lack of relationship, effort, war, violence and all the rest of it follows.

And in enquiring into ourselves we must also be very clearly aware that language is not driving us. That when we use the word 'Communism' we kind of withdraw from it emotionally. Or if you are socially inclined the Capitalist world of America and so on, again the same thing. So one must be aware very seriously, if you at all want to go into all this, which I am not urging you to do, then being aware that language is not driving us, then we can use words in their simplicity, in their meaning without any emotional content. Then you and I are in constant communication - right? Can you do this? Not tomorrow, now? Then we can proceed together, not at a slow pace, but galloping along.

So if freedom is not all that; that is, there is only freedom when there is absolute non-identification with anything, with the church, with the gods, with beliefs, with a statue - you follow? - with nothing, then what are we, as human beings? Do you follow my question? I will go into it.

If we are not attached to anything at all and therefore under no influence - right? - and under no pressure, then what is the whole meaning of existence? I wonder if you follow all this? Do you understand? Does somebody understand what I am talking about? I am sorry if you are Spanish, or Italian, or French, that you can't understand what is spoken in English, but perhaps this afternoon or tomorrow it will be translated in your own language, so please have patience.

We have filled our minds with all kinds of ideas of what we are

- you are noble, ignoble, we are divine, we are experts - you know  
- filled ourselves. And this acceptance of what we are is the result  
of the movement of thought. Right? We will have to go into this  
again.

If you have observed, whatever we do, act, emotionally or non-  
emotionally, all our activities are based on thought. Now thought is  
limited. I do not know if you accept that, or if you are aware of it.  
Why is it limited? We think it can do everything, climb Everest, go  
to the Moon, go to the depths of the sea - thought is the most  
active, most important, vital thing in our life. All our education is  
to cultivate knowledge and encourage thinking clearly, if you can,  
and act from thought. And thought has created not only the  
technological world, but also it has created wars, not only  
marvellous surgery but also thought has created conflict between  
two human beings. These are facts. Thought has created the quick  
transportation. Thought also has created the destruction of all  
human relationships. And one must, if you are at all serious, go  
into this question: why thought has become so urgently important?  
As we are talking together you are thinking - right? You are  
following verbally. So the activity of thought is going on; trying to  
understand what is being said, trying to judge whether it is right or  
wrong, what value has it in daily life - you are all the time  
enquiring with the instrument of thought. And thought has created  
heaven and hell, not only the Christian world of Hell and Heaven,  
but also actual hell and heaven. The enormous poverty, the misery,  
the confusion, the uncertainty of existence.

So how is it that thought has created these problems, and  
thought thinks it can solve these problems - right? And all the

politicians are trying to solve our human problems through thought, either cunning stupid, devious, dishonest, but still thought. Can thought solve this problem, which thought has created? Right? You understand my question? So one must ask: what is the meaning of thinking? What is the source of all thought, not only yours, mine, or somebody else's, the root of thought? If the root is limited, the outcome of that must also be limited - right? You can't think thought will do something extraordinary, if the root is limited all its activities must be limited - right? So what is the root, the very source of thought? Find out sirs. I have asked the question, don't wait for me to answer it. Then you accept what I am saying, that would be disastrous. But whereas if you are really passionately, urgently demanding to find out, you will find out what is the essence, the beginning of thought. I will point it out, don't accept it.

The beginning of thought is the brain registering danger or not danger, the pleasure and the fear - right? The original man - or the ape from which we have come, or same source from which we have come - that the brain which is very, very old, ancient beyond words, it must have registered danger, death, fear, security - right? So the beginning of thought is the process of registration, which is memory - right? We are not saying anything extraordinary, these are facts. And what has been registered is knowledge, knowledge of danger, knowledge of pleasure, knowledge of the fear between the two. And this accumulating process of knowledge, which is constant registration, day after day, centuries upon centuries, registration, which is the accumulation of knowledge, that knowledge is in the brain, and that knowledge, which is memory,

and from that memory thought is born - right?

Questioner: Rubbish.

Krishnamurti: One moment. Sir, if you are disagreeing with me it is all right. Don't agree or disagree. We are not arguing, showing off who is clever, who is less clever. But we are just enquiring, not asserting anything.

So memory, knowledge is the outcome of the past - right? So the past is limited, knowledge is limited. You may have more, more, more but it is always limited. And there have been people who say man can ascend only through knowledge, rise higher and higher and higher. The philosophers, the speculative romanticists, say that knowledge is the essence of growth. Which is, the past will always remain, the past, by accumulation, is evolution. As an acorn, a little thing grows into a marvellous huge oak tree, so that same attitude, or that same example is transferred to this accumulated knowledge, growing, growing, growing. We have never asked whether knowledge is limited and therefore can knowledge end and something begin? You understand my question?

So thought born of memory, knowledge, is always everlastingly limited. And our activities therefore are always limited, based on thought. Right? It is not my argument. It is not what I posit and start from there. But if you go into this yourself, not according to some professor, not according to some theoretician, psychologist, then if you do you become secondhand human beings, which you are. But whereas if you look into yourself and go at it surgically, not emotionally, then you will find out that thought because of its very limitation has created all the problems - right? Is this clear

between us? Is this clear to yourself, not between you and me? All the scriptures, all the poems, all the literature, all the rituals, the gods, the images, everything is the product of thought. Horrible idea, isn't it, when you realize it?

So when there is identification with something, thought is a process of identification, therefore that identification limits, limits the energy, and that energy is used as an individual. Therefore the individual becomes more and more limited, and his action then will be limited, obviously. Which is what is happening. England on one side, Europe on the other, America, Russia, racially, politically, religiously, in every way - all that is based on thought. And is there an action - please, we are enquiring - is there an action which is not based on thought? Therefore an action which is not limited, confined, which means is there an action which is not based on knowledge, on memory, on remembrance? Don't say, "That is impossible", or "It is possible" - we don't know, we are enquiring, we are asking. Because in limited action there is regret, mischief, pain, anxiety, whether you have done the right thing or the wrong thing - all that follows from limited activity, which is called the individual. And the individual, limited, is seeking the infinite. Theoretically they can assert there is the infinite, but to find out, to come upon that infinite, that thing which is not measurable, one must go into the very, very depths of thought. And is there a possibility of action without registration? Got it!

You understand? You tell me something, you use cruel words and you call me a name. I am hurt. And most human beings in the world are hurt, not only physiologically but much more psychologically. You are hurt, aren't you? And from that hurt we

do all kinds of things - resist, withdraw, fear, violence, bitterness and so on and so on and so on. This hurt is, if you examine it very closely, is the movement of thought in the formation of the image - right? Thought has created an image about oneself, that you are beautiful, that you are intellectually marvellous, that you are etc. etc. And when you use an ugly word, angrily point it out, that image gets hurt; which is, thought - please follow all this - that thought, which has created an image about itself, that image gets hurt. Which is: can one live right throughout life without a single hurt? Then only is there freedom, then there is only sanity.

So is it possible not to register the hurt? You understand my question? All our brain is in constant registration, and when you say something ugly to another that is registered, that is called hurt. And is there a possibility of not registering at all? Do you follow my question? Therefore we have to go into the question: why the brain registers certain things and avoids other registration? And it never avoids the individual concepts, images, structures, ideas. One must obviously register when you want to drive a car, to do certain kinds of skills you must register. If you want to be a good technician you have to have a great deal of technological knowledge stored up in the brain, which is a process of registration - right? So knowledge as a process of registration is, in certain fields, absolutely necessary - right? That is clear.

Then why should there be any other form of registration? Do you understand my question? I have identified with myself, with my image; that image is put together by thought, the thought of another, parents, education, whatever it is, society, culture. That image has been put together by thought, which is a continuous

process of registration. And is that necessary? You follow my question? It is your question. Why is there psychologically, inwardly this constant activity of accumulating round the centre, which is the self? Right? Which is obviously limited, which has been cultivated by thought and therefore essentially limited. When I think about my own occupation, how I must be happy, how I must be a success, I must be this, I must be that - it is all the movement of thought which is bringing about constant limitation, throttling, narrowing down, which we call individual. And that individual has activities, naturally, which activities are essentially mischievous because they are limited.

Now we are asking, knowing logically, sequentially, reasonably, that any form of registration, apart from the registration of necessities, technological knowledge and so on, every other form of registration limits action, and from that limited action comes all our misery. And that limited thought says, "I am going to meditate, I am going to practise, I am going to find god", or whatever you like to call it. You might just as well call it dog, it is as good. So thought is the registration of an incident, accident, anything that is registered must be limited, and that limitation, in its action, will create a great deal of mischief. So we are asking whether it is possible not to register, except in certain fields, not to register at all? This is real meditation, you understand? Nothing else is meditation. Because when there is no registration the whole brain cells themselves have become transformed. It is not the same old brain cells, new things are taking place, because there is no need for registration - you understand?

That is, thought is measure - right? Thought is the out come of

time, which is the accumulated memory of five, ten million years, centuries - whatever. It is the result of time - right? So thought is time. Time is limited, obviously. That is, there has been yesterday, today, and tomorrow. But thought can say there is still further, but it is still the movement of thought in time. Right?

So we are asking: is there a possibility of no registration at all, except there? What is your answer to that question? You understand? This is a tremendously important question. Don't brush it aside as an intellectual something or other of this or that. Because so far we have lived in action which is always bringing sorrow, misery, confusion, uncertainty and fear, regrets - right? We have lived that way. It is our heredity, it is in our genes, it is our conditioning. And is it possible never to register at all, and therefore no identity with anything? You understand? The moment thought identifies with something, with a piece of furniture, with a shirt, with a blouse, with a house, with a wife, with a husband, girl, or whatever it is, that limits thought and therefore that limitation is born out of registration. That is, as long as you remain a Catholic you are limited. As long as you say, "I am an Indian", or I am this or that, you are limited. And any action, action of love, any action must be limited.

So if you are serious you are asking this basic question, a fundamental question, which you must answer: is there a possibility of not registering at all? That is, is there an action not born of thought? Do you understand my question? All our action is based on thought, with all its consequences. Now we are asking: is there an action, is there a way of living in daily life, in which thought doesn't operate? You understand this is very serious, it isn't



a question that you just play around with and discuss and all the rest of it, one has to find out. That means you must put passion into it, vitality, energy to find out. Those who do research, scientific research, or technological research, they love it, it is their life, their blood, their bread-and-butter, everything is first, and their wife, their family comes second. In the same way we are asking, passion, is it possible? I say it is, I will show it to you. Please don't accept it because you don't know what it means, so don't come to any conclusions, don't translate what is going to be said into your own terminology - then you are lost! Then you are driven by the language which you know. Therefore you become a slave to a language. But we are using language, not your conclusion, my conclusion or his - just words without any circus round it. Then we can communicate happily and easily.

There is an action, a total, complete, holistic, whole action in which thought doesn't interfere at all. Are you waiting for me to tell you? That's rather cheap! I do all the work, the speaker does all the work and you just listen and say, "Yes, I agree". What is the point of that? But whereas if you really, you know, desperately want to find out, like an unhappy man, a drowning man - you know there is desperation to find some kind of thing to hang on to, so he can be saved. There he exerts all energy. And that is what we are doing.

First of all, do we see very clearly, each one of us, wherever we are, whatever our situation, whatever our conditioning, however neurotic we are, and most of us are, do we see very clearly that thought under all circumstances is limited? Not a verbal acceptance of it, but an actual fact, which you in your blood see it,

irrevocably? Then if you see that, not as an idea, not as a conclusion, not a thing reasoned out and therefore it is still thought. So when you realize that thought is completely, totally wholly limited, and from that limitation all our activity, whatever type it is, must be limited and therefore in human relationship it creates havoc, misery, from there you ask the question. You understand? Not if you haven't done all this. And you can do all this instantly, not take time, years, months. Then you can ask: is there a perception devoid of memory, devoid of remembrances, totally divorced from the past, is there an observation and therefore out of that observation action? Do you follow what I am saying? You all look puzzled. All right I will take it up again.

You understand our action is based on memory. Either ideological memory, a Utopian memory, or memories of past actions which have left certain marks on the brain, and all such activity must be continuously destructive in human relationship. If I love you because you have been pleasant to me, which is, you have given me something, sexually or in this way, or that; which is from memory, with the pleasure of it I say, "I love you." So is there a love which is not born of memory, which is not the result of give and take, which is not sensation? Obviously there must be. There should be. Or is this all we know? Let us put it that way. This thing that we call love is all this. And that love breeds jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, attachment, you follow? And out of all that there is great misery. And is that misery love? Don't say "No" or "Yes". If that is not love, and you have totally abandoned jealousy, anger, all that, that which is left completely, that is love - right? So in the same way, if one understands the whole movement of thought, as

measure and time, and born out of the past and therefore endlessly curtailed, limited, narrow, if you see that very clearly and therefore abandon it, then you have what one may call insight. I am going to go into this very slowly.

Insight: insight, we mean by that word, according to the dictionary, to have a sight in something, an immediate perception of truth in that which is being talked about. That is, you have talked to me about the limitation of thought. You have talked to me. I have listened to you with all my energy because perhaps there is a new way of living, a new way of action, and I have realized my actions have always been bringing such sorrow, confusion and misery. I have listened to you. And you say to me, "Have you really seen the truth that thought is limited?" - the truth of it, not the idea of it. Seeing the truth of it, is to have insight. Have you got it? That insight is not memory, is not idea, is not something out of the past. You see directly the truth of it and from that there is action, which is complete.

So do you, as a human being, and you who are the representative of all humanity - so you are the world - if you see the truth of this then that truth will act in the world. You don't act.

So we have seen the mischief of thought which is limited, which has created the individual, and the opposite of non-individuality which is totalitarianism and all the rest of it. We have also seen that thought, stored up in the brain as memory, knowledge, those very brain cells have become limited. For god's sake see this. Of course, obviously. But when you have an insight into all this, the very brain cells are no longer limited. The brain cells are functioning totally differently. Do this, please, do it. Don't

say, "Yes, how marvellous". "What a wonderful speech that was" - which is all romantic nonsense, emotionalism. That has nothing to do with actuality. Can you see the truth that knowledge has its place, technologically, and has no other place psychologically, which is to register? So if you see the truth that registration, like hurt, brings narrow action, limited action, from which hate, violence and all the rest follows. To see the truth of it, then you have an insight into the whole movement of thought. Therefore thought then limits naturally itself and remains there. You don't have to say, "I must stop thinking" - that is too silly. When you understand thought as measure, measure being comparison and the whole - oh, there isn't time now. I must stop. So, if this is clear then we will talk about other things on Sunday.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH JULY 1978

Probably this morning there are some new people who have come for Sunday and I hope they won't treat this as an entertainment, or some intellectual, oriental, romantic nonsense. At least for some of us this is a serious meeting, those of us who are committed, involved in trying to find out a new way of living, not based on some ideological belief, on some authority, on some speculative conclusion and so on. We are concerned, as we were saying the other day, about freedom. And also we were pointing out that we were influenced, shaped, controlled by the environment, by institutions, ideas, beliefs, and conclusions. And also, as we were saying the last three meetings here, we are driven by language, and this is very important for us to understand how language, the words control us, shape us and drive us - which we went into sufficiently deeply and I'm sorry we are not going to go into it again this morning.

And also we said where there is identification, not only with the family, with a belief, with a nation, with a group, or identifying oneself with a particular object, whether it is handmade or created by the mind, to be attached, to be identified with any of these things prevents complete freedom. And that freedom is necessary, as we pointed out in our investigation together, which doesn't mean doing what one likes, fulfilling one's own desires but freedom from all the things which are binding us, like jealousy, fear, pleasure, beliefs, identifying oneself with a particular group or idea, guru and ideology, practices and so on. That is more or less what we have been talking about the last three times that we have met here.

I think this morning we should go into something which is part of what we have been talking about. Most of us are afraid to use reason, to think clearly, objectively, non-emotionally, not from a particular centre, either the centre outwardly or inwardly. And to think clearly implies that there is no centre from which you are operating in your thinking. I think we should go into this problem fairly deeply.

Most of us think along a particular line: if you are specialized you think along those grooves; if you are committed to a particular religion, an ideological structure, again your thinking is conditioned by that. So we begin to lose the capacity to reason. Reason implies a certain quality of scepticism, doubt, not accepting anything, either from the psychologists, professors, or from the sacred books - there are no sacred books, they are only printed books, like other books, but we give them importance because they happen to be old, people have said they have been uttered by saints or by some teacher, and so we give to a printed word tremendous importance, which is to be driven by a language. So where language drives us we cannot reason properly, sanely. Or we cannot possibly reason logically if you are committed to a particular belief, or to a particular ideology because then, if you are committed or identified, you go round and round that circle, round that particular ideology or belief. You don't think wholly, completely, deeply. So reason we thought is something intellectual and anything intellectual we throw out - that is the latest fashion! Whereas we need this capacity to reason, which I said implies doubt, scepticism, the freedom from every form of authority, including that of the speaker, specially so, because the speaker is

rather intense about these matters therefore you may be influenced by that. So don't. Think clearly for yourselves, and to think clearly you must have no motive, or goal, a direction. If we have a motive that controls your thinking, if you have a goal, a purpose, a direction that controls your thinking. And you may logically, reasonably think along those lines, but they are conditioned thinking, narrowing thinking - right? Is this clear?

So as we said, the other day, there is no speaker here. We are looking at ourselves and our activities, our beliefs, our fears, pleasures and the whole problem of life in a mirror. The mirror is objective - if your face is clear, it reflects exactly, if it is a good mirror, your face. Similarly, we are together exploring, together going into - as we have done in the previous talks - our human ordinary daily problems. Because if those are not very clear, if those are not established deeply we cannot go any further. It is like building a house on sand.

So as we said, we are talking to ourselves. We are questioning ourselves, whether we think logically, reasonably, and therefore sanely; or our thinking is illusory, based on some belief, based on some ideals, or on some past experience. Then if it is so you can't discover anything new.

And also we were saying the other day, all our activities are based on thought - whether you build a marvellous building, the technological extraordinary advancement, and thinking in your relationship with each other, every action is based on thought. And we said thought is always, under all circumstances, limited. We went into that very carefully, why it is limited. Because thought is the outcome of knowledge, which is the past. So thought is time

binding - right? We are using ordinary, daily English. This is not a special jargon. So thought is time binding, time being the past and thought is the outcome, response of knowledge, memory stored up in the brain. This is obvious. Think for yourself, observe for yourself, it becomes very clear. We are not brain specialists. But we can see that the brain is an enormously ancient instrument, very, very old, conditioned by recording danger, pleasure, fear and so on. So thought is the movement of time, and thought is measure: "I will be better. I think I am this but tomorrow I will change to something else" - all this is a matter of measurement. The more, the less, depth and height, horizontal and vertical, is all this movement of measurement - right? Measurement implies comparison. Most of us compare ourselves with somebody else, always something much greater, not with the poor people, but higher, more intellectual and so on. So thought is limited under all circumstances, therefore thought is never free, thought is a movement in measurement.

And we asked ourselves the other day the question: as all our action is based on measurement, the past, the present and the future, and therefore limited, and any action that is limited is bound to bring about great sorrow, great conflict, travail, anxiety, fear and so on; and we asked ourselves: is there an action which is not based on thought? Probably none of you have asked this question. Some may have asked it casually when you yourself perceive that thought has brought about certain troubles, certain fear, then you begin to question it. But you don't go very deeply into it. You say, "Yes, is there a movement, is there a state of mind in which thought as measure, as time, in action doesn't operate?" - right? We went into that very carefully. We said that there is an action which



is not based on memory, which is not based on knowledge, which is not the result of some wish fulfilling, but when one understands the nature, the structure of the whole movement of thought, not intellectually but factually, that thought has its right place - when you want to go to your home, when you want to drive a car, when you are involved in technological business, there thought is necessary. But is thought necessary in human relationships? You understand my question?

We are going to ask this now: is thought in our relationship with each other, man, woman, intimate, not intimate and so on, in that relationship what place has thought? Or, thought has no place whatsoever. We are going to enquire into this together and find out, not speculatively, but factually, actually in daily life.

So we are enquiring into relationship, to be related to another. Is relationship a movement of identification - you understand? I am asking these questions for you. You have to answer it for yourselves. You are related to somebody, no one can exist without relationship. In your relationship with your wife, or with your girl friend, with your boy friend, or whatever it is, is it based on thought? Or you say, "No, it is not based on thought, it is based on love". That is the most phoney word ever used because through that loaded word 'love' we escape. We never face the fact. The fact being whether in our relationship with each other, intimate or otherwise, is thought bringing about this relationship? If it is not thought is it senses? Sexual sense, sense of the feeling, the sensation of being together, companionship and so on and so on, all based on thought. The senses become the instrument of thought. Thought then identifies itself with the senses - right?

Please don't go to sleep, don't meditate. You don't know what that word means, we will go into it. You are investigating, you are exploring, you are searching to find an answer to this. You can't just go off into some kind of dreamy state. Because all our life is based on relationship, whether that relationship is very near or very far. And also may I request you - I am not forbidding it, I am just asking you - if you take notes you can't pay attention to what is being said. That is obvious. What matters is that you listen, ardently, passionately to find out, listen. Then if you want to find out, no guru, no system, you have to throw all that out to find out. Which means, you have to find out on what basis your relationship is. If your relationship is based on thought, which actually it is if you investigate deeply, then thought being limited your relationship with another must be limited. And hence two limited relationships bring about conflict. Don't you know in all our relationships we are in conflict with the other - no? The wife, the husband, the girl and the boy and so on.

Therefore to find out what relationship is, not only must we enquire into what it actually is, which is based on thought, conflict, quarrels, jealousies, fears, domination, possessiveness, identification, and all the rest of it, we have not only to find that out, be aware of all that, but also one must enquire: is it possible to be free of all that in relationship? You understand my question? Right? Please, I am not talking to myself. We are together, and we mean together. It is your life. Together we are trying to find out - no, not trying - we are finding out, there is no trying. That is another lazy word. "I am trying to do my best" - which means nothing! But we must find out if there is a relationship which is not

based on thought, thought being remembrance. You have hurt me, I remember that. And you have given me pleasure, sexually or otherwise, I remember that. And also you have hurt me, you have praised me, you have given me comfort, all that is stored up as memory, and on that memory thought is born and I say I am related to you. This is normal daily life.

And we are asking - or rather you are asking: is there a way of living where thought, which has its place, naturally, even in relationship - but in actual relationship is there the absence of thought altogether? That is what we are going to find out. You understand? I hope we are making the question clear to each other. That is: one is related as in most cases, which is a relationship of pain, anxiety, identifying oneself with that person, quarrels, nagging, jealousy, annoyance - you follow? Those are the daily, common, routine facts. If one is aware of that very, very clearly, not escape from that, then we can ask the question: is there a relationship with another which is not based on thought, that is on remembrance - right? Are you also working? Not casually. You are working so that you are perspiring? To answer that question you must investigate why the brain records. That is, you have said something to your boy or girl, or husband or wife, some ugly words you have used in annoyance, or you have used a pleasant word to each other - all these words are registered. You follow? That is the process of the brain to record in order to protect itself, because the brain can only function in perfect security. It is only when it is insecure that it acts neurotically. Right? Or being insecure you find somebody, a guru or some priest, or some psychologist, and accept him as your authority, and the brain says,

"Yes, that is quite safe" - do you follow?

So we are asking - please listen to this - is it possible in your relationship with each other, in one's daily activities of relationship, is it possible not to register either the insult or the flattery? Not to register at all. Find out. If you don't register your relationship is entirely different. Right? Now is that possible? It sounds a marvellous theory, an extraordinary idea, a way of saying "By Jove, if one could live this way it would be very simple". Now please don't translate what is being said into an idea, into some kind of visionary, hopeful, happy theory. We are actually trying to find out if it is possible not to register either the sexual remembrances, which makes one further sexual, the pictures and all the rest of that business that goes on with regard to sex, and that is remembered, stored up, encouraged through the cinema, films, pictures, the whole western world which is spreading all over the world, encouraging this memory. Can you as a human being find out for yourself why a hurt, a pleasurable incident, is registered? From that registration thought begins - you understand? Is that possible? It is only possible when there is attention, non-identification is relationship. Am I making something clear?

One takes one's wife, or one's girl, or one's husband for granted. Right? No? You get used to it, it is part of you and you have got used to so many things, and so you add another addition to this. Now to be attentive, and that is only possible when you don't identify yourself with that woman's or boy's mind. Right? Can you do this? Non-identifying oneself with another, and therefore being free to be attentive. Not attentive and then free, non-identification. But non-identifying first and then out of that comes attention. You

understand?

Now can one, as a human being, non-identify yourself with another? Not only with another but with ideas, with a group, with a sect, with a guru, with the whole business of it, which means you are free? Out of that freedom there is attention. How can one be attentive if I have identified myself with you? You may be most affectionate, most kind, I may want your kindness because I am lonely, I feel desperate, so I identify, you encourage me, you say, 'That is nothing, you will get over it tomorrow old boy, get on with it' - you give me comfort, you give me sex, so instinctively I identify myself with you. The moment you identify yourself with another you bring about a separation. Right? Obviously. So when there is separation there must be conflict - right? So can you find out now sitting here, not tomorrow, not when you go home, actually now, find out if you have identified yourself with her or him. And extend that identification extensively - ideas, beliefs, dogmas, with Jesus, or with Buddha, this or that, or ideologically, nationally and so on. Begin with the nearest and expand - you follow? We are apt to begin extensively but not near.

So can you find out if you are identifying yourself with another? The moment you use 'My girl' or 'My boy', you are caught. So the 'My wife, my girl, my husband' - the words are driving you, because those words are emotionally explosive. So you are being driven by words, whereas if you are free from identification and therefore from the emotional content of 'My wife, my husband, my girl or boy', then you can use words normally, unemotionally, sanely. I wonder if you get all this?

So can one not identify? And why do you identify? You

understand my question? Why? Is it that through identification with another you are escaping from yourself? Go into it, please. Are you? Or you may identify yourself with another because you are lonely, or you are frightened to be nothing. You understand? To be absolutely empty, psychologically, I don't mean biologically, food, I don't mean that. Are these the reasons that you have never asked this question and if you ask this question is it that you are frightened to face yourself as you actually are? Therefore identification with another becomes a means of escape from what you are. So then you ask: what are you? Of course you are your name, your form, the body, the organism, the face, but that is a biological or physiological nature. But what are you? Are you not the result of all the structure and the movement of thought? Don't say, "I am the higher self" - if you do say that, that is part of thinking. Or if you say, "I am divine inside, covered up with a lot of muck," that is also thinking. So are you, apart from your face and curly hair, or dark brown, black or purple or whatever it is, apart from that, stripping yourself of words, are you not the result of words? "I am British" - or French, "I am a Russian", "I am a Catholic", "I am following this guru" - so are you not the result of thought? And we said thought is limited. So what you are is very limited. That limited entity says "I am this, I am that, I have got millions of dollars, or I have a jolly good life, or I have a miserable life, or I am this or that" - but it is still in the narrow, limited area of thought. The Hindus, the ancient Hindus invented a very good thing. They called it the Atman, the Higher Self, the Supreme thing. And that supreme thing is still born out of thought. But people are so gullible, so unreasonable, like to live in illusions and

make-belief, they accept all this.

So we are saying: when you strip yourself of your conclusions, of your words, of your experience, what are you? You are nothing. You are empty. So consciously, or unconsciously, the feeling that you are nothing, you get frightened of it and then you begin to identify. Then you fill that emptiness, at least you think you can fill that emptiness with lots of ideas, with lots of relationship, with lots of knowledge, etc. etc. Right?

Now, just a minute: can thought, can the mind observe that emptiness and not move away from it? You understand my question? That is, one must understand something here. Are you getting tired? If you are, it is all right. We must go into something else here. which is: most of us are accustomed according to tradition and conditioning to be active, to do something - right? So we are accustomed to what is called positive action. Anything that is not positive action is called negative action - right? You are following this? Our brains, our minds, our habits act according to this positive action, to do something: I am afraid, I must control it; I am greedy, I either act to fulfil it or control it. So most of us are trained to act, which is called positive. And in that positive action there is also negative action which is not to do anything about it, go off to sleep, or cover it up, run away from it. But there is another action, which has nothing to do with the positive - I wonder if you understand all this? - which is no action at all. You understand? The one is to act: I am lazy I must get up, force myself. I must do yoga, I don't want to do it this morning but I must do it, it's good for you. You know the word yoga - I won't go into it now, sorry, we will go into that another time. That is an exploiting,

moneymaking concern, that word.

All right. So we are trained, our habit, our tradition, our conditioning is to do something about what we feel. And in that positive action there is negative action, not to do anything about it, just to run away from it. Now there is, we are suggesting, enquire into it, please don't accept it, we are saying there is another kind of action unrelated to the positive, which is non-action. We will go into that in a minute. You understand? The non-action is not the opposite of action. That action is very limited because it is based on thought. Whereas non-action, not being related to the opposite, is entirely different, which we will enquire into presently.

So our question is this now: one has heard, if you have paid attention to it, one has heard that identification with another brings about separation, because that identification with another is based on your own emptiness, on your own loneliness, on your own desire to escape from yourself, but the escaping from yourself, your loneliness, is always there. You understand? It is always there, you may identify yourself with another but it is there. Therefore that creates separation - you understand? And hence quarrels and all the rest of it follows, divorce and everlasting struggle in relationship. Now can you observe this identifying process and the cause of identifying without any positive action? Without doing something about it? You have understood what I am saying? I will go into it, if I may.

One becomes aware if you have listened to it very carefully, that you are identifying, that is an actual fact. And the actual fact is that you are identifying because you are frightened, you are lonely, you are empty, you feel anxious, therefore you identify. Now can



you observe that without any action? Just to observe it, as you observe the majesty of the mountains, the running waters, just to observe. Then if you so observe, which is non-action, then the thing that you are observing undergoes a fundamental change. It is only when we are positively acting about it, then we are acting as a separate entity and therefore conflict. I wonder if you get all this? Right?

Now, let's go into something else, which is: most of us, probably all of us in some measure or other, are frightened. Our life is so uncertain, specially now. There is uncertainty of livelihood, uncertainty of wars, uncertainty of these pressures of the world, the enormity of two powers, what is all going to come out of it, and so on and so on, politically, we are anxious. That means we are frightened. You may lose your job. Physiologically as well as biologically one may get ill - again there is fear. And psychologically, inwardly there is the fear of loneliness, fear of not succeeding, fear of not being loved whatever that may mean, fear of dark - you know, fear, with all its many, many branches. Right? If you are not afraid - good Lord! There is no guru, there is no authority, there is no search, you are a marvellous human being.

So we are going to find out, enquiring together, not me alone, find out whether it is possible to have no fear whatsoever, both physically as well as psychologically. Are you interested in this? I am not asking for encouragement. Because to live under fear is the most appalling thing, it is living in darkness, it brings a sense of shrinking, isolation, you cannot solve this thing, therefore you withdraw. And from that withdrawal, fear, all kinds of neurotic actions, ill health, psychosomatically it reacts - right? So you must,

if you are at all serious, go into it very deeply, you must find out for yourself if fear can end.

If one may ask, are you aware of your fear? This is not group therapy - you understand? We are just enquiring for each one, not a group of us enquiring, that is too meaningless. I am asking you: are you aware of your fears? If you are, do you see the consequences of it? The running away from it, rationalizing it, suppressing it, or avoiding it and the identification becomes greater and greater and so on? Now what is the root of fear? You understand? Not, I am afraid about something, or because of something, or I am afraid that you might do something, but apart from that, the very root of it? Do you want to find out the root of it, or are you waiting for an answer? I can answer it. But then what happens you either say, "Yes, that is so", you accept it and it becomes an idea and you have gone away from the fact. So you have to ask this question for yourself. What is the root of all this enormous sense of fear, in our relationships, in our activities, in our jobs, in our future life - you know, the whole business? Do you ask it, ask the question to totally cut the root, or you are asking intellectually? You follow? I wonder if you understand? Look, I will explain it.

I want to find out why I am afraid. I can find out the various causes of it, that is fairly simple. I am afraid because I have done something I shouldn't have done, and you might discover it, therefore I am frightened. Or I am afraid I might lose my job, I want a better job, and so on and so on. Or I am so attached to my wife, I feel at any moment she might leave me and I am frightened - you follow? The whole business of fear. Am I actually in contact with fear? Or am I in contact with the idea of fear? You

understand? Which is it? The idea of fear? Or, actual fear? Come on somebody. Please, madam, don't take notes for the love of Pete. If you take notes, you can't listen. It is your problem. The writing down is not at issue now. But to find out.

Now I can investigate, analyse the cause - right? The cause and the sequence. I can analyse it. But analysis doesn't solve the problem. You must know that. Because the analyser thinks he is different from the analysed - right? You may have heard this before so don't get bored with this, or smile and say "He is going back to the old stuff" - but you have to understand this. If you understand it, if you see the truth of it, then you will do something. We are not analysing but observing. Analysis is entirely different from observation - right? Observation implies without the observer, to look. Whereas if you analyse the cause why, and the reasons and go on analysing, analysing, there is implied several things. Which is: that the analyser is thinking that he is different from the analysed, and that involves time, an endless process of analysing, analysing, analysing, and at the end of your life you are still analysing, without bringing about a fundamental transformation. Whereas if you observe, just to observe, that is, without any analysis, just to look, which is negative action. The positive action is to look, analyse, do something about it. Whereas the negative action, which is totally different from the positive action, is to observe - right? Then that observation not only tells the story of what is being observed, it tell you the story of what is being observed, and also that observation itself brings about a movement of change in that which is being observed. Right? Do get this. Even the so-called scientists are agreeing with what we are

talking about, so we are quite safe! That is, if you watch through a microscope some cell, if you come to it with a conclusion, with wanting to use it for further purposes and making money, or whatever it is, then you don't see the movement of the cell itself changing. You understand this? So to observe without any movement of thought, any movement of trying to change it, any movement to go beyond it, just to watch. When you watch so closely, without any sense of direction, motive, the thing that you are watching itself undergoes a fundamental change. Full stop. Are you doing it? Not agreeing with it. Can you watch your fear in this manner? It doesn't need practice. That is one of our pet theories. If you are interested, if you are concerned in the freedom of fear, you observe. And that observation is passionate. It is not just casual, intellectual observation.

So can you observe the fear, the root of it, which we will go into in a minute, without any analysis? Now what is the root of fear? All fear? What do you think it is? Is it not time? Right? I might be ill. I might lose my job. I might be discovered in the wrong things which I have done. I am afraid of death, which is in the distance. I am afraid my wife might get angry - might. Just look at it. I am not asking you to accept it. Just observe it. First reason, logic, non-personal and therefore look. Is not fear the movement of time? Movement means time, from here to there, from the past to the present, from the present to the future. All that is movement, which is called time. Now, is that movement of time not thought? I think I might lose my job. I think my wife may be angry, or my wife may discover that I have looked at another woman, and so on and so on. So can you observe the movement of time, which is thought, which

is the root of fear, observe it without trying to do something about it? It is like a scientist looking through a microscope, and if he projects what it should be, or what it might be, that remains as is, because he is dictating what it should be. Whereas if he is not dictating, if he is just looking, that very thing at which he is looking through a microscope begins to change, begins to move. You understand?

Are you doing this? Which means: observation implies the absence of the observer, who is the past, who has got theories, conclusions, hopes, fears, directions and so on and so on and so on. To look without the observer. That does not need discipline, that does not need practice, just to look without you wanting something out of it. Then you will see, if you so look, the very root of fear is beginning to completely change. That means the root, observing so carefully, alertly, with passion, the root begins to dissolve, which is the action of negation. Have you got something of this? You know this is part of meditation. Meditation is not repeating some words, sitting quietly cross-legged for 20 minutes in the morning, 20 minutes in the evening, all that nonsense. How can a mind meditate if it is full of fears? Or is attached to something? The understanding and the freedom from fear is part of meditation, it is totally, entirely related to daily life.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 18TH JULY 1978

We have been talking over together the question of fear and whether after hearing it, after hearing our conversation together over this weight of fear, if one is at all free of it. Or one has merely heard it, saw the reason of it, the sanity of it and cannot do anything about it, and then just drift along. I wonder what one actually has done, each one of us with regard to that question of fear, and the identification of oneself with one's friends, family, furniture, house, country, ideas and so on. Whether after these four talks one has actually ended all identification and therefore there is a great deal of freedom, not relative, but freedom.

And when one asks these questions of oneself, whether we ask superficially, intellectually or as you would ask a question that affects you most profoundly, most seriously. (sound of an aeroplane) I am afraid, we are going to have lot of disturbance today; it's a lovely day for flight. And after asking these questions of oneself, and if we are at all serious, getting the house in order - our house, which is you. And when we put things in order in our house we are free, we have more energy. It is only when there is disorder that we waste energy. And order implies that one has understood deeply what are the movements of disorder in oneself, why we live, perhaps even in our own rooms, in such disorder. Or having in one's house order, in oneself there is such abiding deep disorder, uncertainty, why such human beings live in this disorder, from the moment they are born until they die - why? Why do we tolerate to live in such conditions?

I wonder if you have asked yourself these questions. If you have

- perhaps some of you have - and discovering that one is in disorder, mechanically sets about to put everything in oneself in order. Thereby one cultivates discipline, follows a pattern, a pattern laid down after two thousand years, or ten thousand years, or the patterns laid down by some guru, some priest, some specialist in so-called spirituality. Or try to escape from this abiding, endless, seemingly endless, disorder, try to identify oneself with something that is supreme order, which is the cosmos, the heavens, the whole universe. I wonder what you, looking at yourself in the mirror which tells you exactly what is, I wonder what you do about this disorder? Is one aware that one lives in disorder? Is one aware that one lives in contradiction? This constant conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'.

(sound of an aeroplane) I told you, it's going to be a difficult morning. If one asks oneself these questions, are you listening for an answer from yourself? Or are you listening for an answer from somebody else? I am afraid most of us are inclined to find order, not understanding disorder, in investigating what is order we easily accept some specialist, some authority, some priest, some guru who will tell us what is order. So our minds are becoming more and more mechanical because we accept a pattern of order, like a soldier drilled day after day, day after day, month after month, drilled, the drums beating out his brains. So we follow, accept, obey, conform. Is not that conformity, obedience, acceptance the very root of disorder? As we said, please do not accept anything whatsoever the speaker says. And I really mean it. These are the questions you are asking of yourself.

So does one discover for oneself how extraordinarily

mechanical our actions are, our attitudes are, our reactions are? And so our brains, our whole existence becomes a routine. And that routine has made our minds - I mean by mind the brain, the thought, the whole content of our consciousness, the senses, all that I mean by the word, is conveyed by the word 'mind': consciousness, the senses, the movement of thought, the content of our consciousness, all that is the mind. I am using that word in that sense. We may alter later on, next year or tomorrow use a different word, but for now we are using mind to convey all that. If you observe in the mirror, don't you find that your mind, the whole content has become extraordinarily mechanical? You are Christians, or if you have given up your Christianity, you belong to something else, or if you have given that up you belong to something else. Or you follow a certain routine, a certain way of thinking according to your opinions, experiences, which always function within a narrow limit - right? Have you noticed this, that your mind is mechanical? Because please, we are going into something which is perhaps rather difficult. I don't know where it is going to lead us. It may become a little more complex therefore please give a little attention.

You know when you have a small child with you, you listen to the cries, you listen to the words, the murmur, you are so concerned, you listen - you may be asleep but the moment he cries you wake up. And you are all the time attentive because the child is yours, you must care for it, you must love it, you must hold it, and so you are tremendously attentive even though you are asleep, you wake up. Now could you so listen with that same quality of attention, affection, care, listening to every movement of that



child? Could you do it in watching the mirror, not me, you are not listening to me, listening to the mirror, which is yourself, to what it is telling you, with that extraordinary concentrated affection, care? Will you do it?

So we are asking: why have human beings become so mechanical? That mechanical habit obviously produces disorder because if you are all the time functioning within a narrow limit, in that narrow limit there is always this energy limited and therefore it is struggling to break through, which is the essence of conflict - you understand? No, don't understand me, understand what the mirror is saying, there is no speaker here. So can you observe with that care, with attention, which is the feeling of great affection for what you are going to listen to?

We are talking about disorder. And we live in disorder, of habits, of beliefs, of conclusions, of opinions. This is the pattern we live in, which naturally, being limited, must create disorder. Now when one is in disorder to seek order is wrong, obviously, because the mind that is confused, unclear, seeking what is order will also be confused, will also be uncertain. That is clear. But whereas, if you look into disorder, if you understand the disorder in which you live, the causes of it, the movement of disorder, in the very understanding of it, out of that understanding comes order naturally, easily, happily without any compulsion, without any control. You understand what I am saying? This is what the mirror is telling you: that to understand, not verbally, intellectually or emotionally, but to understand the movement of disorder in oneself, why this disorder comes about, and you can discover the causes instantly if you give attention, that attention which you give

to a small, defenceless child, which is to have an insight into disorder.

So what is the root of disorder? The root of it. There are many causes of disorder - comparison, comparing oneself with another, comparing oneself with what he or she should be, imitating an example, example being somebody who is a saint - you know, all that stuff, I don't have to go into all that nonsense. Or conforming - right? Conformity, imitation, adjustment to something you think is beyond that which is - right? So there is always conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. Got it? Which is to compare, which is the movement of thought: I was this, or I was happy and some day I will be happy again. So this constant measurement between 'what has been' or 'what is' and 'what should be'. This constant evaluation brings conflict and that is one of the basic reasons of disorder - right?

And another cause of disorder is operating from the past. Now is love a movement of time, of thought, of remembrance? You understand? Do you understand my question? The question the mirror is asking you, in which you are looking. And is this love, so-called love, not creating such extraordinary disorder between human relationships? Right? Look at it yourself, for god's sake.

Now what is the root of disorder? You can see the causes and we can add more, that is irrelevant. In examining what is the root of it don't analyse, we have been through that, just look. If you look without analysis you have an immediate insight into it. If you say, "I will examine, I will deduct," or from outside analyse, induction and deduction, it is still the movement of thought. Whereas if you can observe with that care, with that deep attention in which is

involved a great deal of tenderness, affection, then you have an insight. So we are asking: what is the root of it? Go on sirs, find out. What is the root of our disorder, inward disorder and therefore outward disorder? You can see what terrible disorder there is in the world, agonizing disorder, people are killing each other, and the dissidents are being tortured, put into prison - you follow, all that is going on. We tolerate all that because our minds accept things, or try to change a little bit here and there. So what is the root of disorder? Which means you have to go into the question: what is our consciousness? You understand? What is your consciousness? As you look at yourself in that undistorted mirror, what is your consciousness? And that may be the essence of disorder. So we have to investigate together what is our consciousness.

Our consciousness is a living thing, a moving thing, it is active, not something static, closed, locked up - it is not like that. It is a thing that is constantly changing, but changing within a small limited border. It is like a man thinking he is changing when he changes a little bit there, in one corner, and he doesn't transform the rest of the field. So we have to understand the nature and the structure of consciousness. We are doing that to find out if that is the root of our disorder. It may not be. We are going to find out. So what is our consciousness? Is it not everything that thought has put together? The form, the body, the name, the senses with which thought has identified itself, the beliefs, the pains, the tortures, the agonies, the discomfort, the depressions and elations, the jealousies, the anxieties, the fears, the pleasures, my country and your country, I believe in god, I don't believe in god, Jesus is the most important, Krishna is much more important - and so on and

so on and so on. Is not all that your consciousness? No? You can add more to it, in detail - I am brown, I wish I were lighter, I am black but black is beautiful and so on and so on. The past, the tradition, the heredity, the whole tradition of mankind is based essentially on this, its mythology - all that is the content. If you were born in India, or in Africa where Christianity is not the fashion, they have their own gods, their own images, their own forms of worship, that is part of their consciousness, as you have it here, only they call it by a different name, but essentially it is the same pattern. Right? And as long as one is unaware of the content of consciousness and acts, then that action must be limited and therefore disorder - no? You understand? Thought in its movement must create disorder unless thought has realized its proper place, which is knowledge. Knowledge is limited and therefore it has its proper place. That is clear. We have gone into this. I won't go into it over and over again.

So thought born of yesterday, or ten thousand million yesterdays, is limited, and the content of our consciousness is therefore limited, and our consciousness, however thought may say that this consciousness isn't limited and there is a higher consciousness, it is still a form of consciousness. You have got it? So thought which hasn't realized its proper place is the very essence of disorder. Right? Do you understand? This is not something romantic, vague, nonsense, but you can see for yourself if you are logical, sane, clear, that thought, being limited, must create disorder. Like a man who says, "I am a Jew", or "I am an Arab" - or a Chinese - he is limited, and therefore closing himself, resisting and therefore wars and all the misery begins. Right? Do

you actually see this fact? - not as an idea, not something that somebody is telling you, but see it for yourself as you see, hear the cry of the baby. Then you act. You get up.

And part of our mechanical way of living is born out of this limited consciousness - right? So is it possible not to expand consciousness? Do you understand the meaning of that word? To expand, to enlarge it, to add more things to it, more knowledge, more experience, more moving from one corner to another, trying to enlarge it. There are schools which are doing this, by practice, by discipline, control, all that. So when you are trying to expand consciousness there is a centre of measurement. You understand? When you try to enlarge anything, enlarge a house, there is from a small foundation, a large foundation, you enlarge, there is a centre from which you enlarge. Similarly there is a centre from which there is an expanding, which is measurement. It doesn't matter if you don't understand: look at yourself. Aren't you trying to expand your consciousness? You may not use that word. You may say, "Well, I am trying to be better" - "I am trying to be more this or that" - or to achieve. So as long as there is a centre from which you act there must be disorder.

Then the problem arises: is it possible to act, function naturally, happily without a centre, without the content of consciousness? Do you understand these questions? We are putting fundamental questions. You may not be used to that. Most of us put questions rather slackly, or indifferently and move off. But we are asking questions that you must answer, must find an answer, go into it to discover for yourself the answer. Is it possible to act, to live our daily life without the centre? - which is the essence of disorder.

That is, in your relationship with another, however intimate it may be, if you are all the time concerned about yourself, your ambitions, your personality, your beauty, your habits, you, in your relationship with another, and the other is also doing the same naturally there is conflict, which is disorder.

So is it possible not to act from a centre? We have gone into what is the centre. The centre is this consciousness with its content, and the content is all the things which thought has put together, with its sensations, with its desires, with its fears and so on and so on. Right? What is that action in which there is no contradiction, no regret, no reward or punishment, therefore an action that is whole - you understand? We are going to find out. We are going to find out, not I find out and answer it, tell you, but together we are going to find out, remembering that there is no speaker but only the mirror in which you are looking. To understand it we must go into the question of what is love. Because if we can find the truth of what is love that may completely dissolve the centre, completely bring about a holistic action. So we must go into it very, very carefully, if you are willing. That means are you willing to listen? You have your opinions about love, obviously. You have your conclusions about love. You say love cannot exist without jealousy, love exists only when there is sex, love exists only when you love all your neighbours, love the animals and all the rest of it. You have a concept, an idea, a conclusion about what love is. If you have then you cannot possibly investigate - right? If you already say, "This is so", you are finished. It is like one of those gurus who says, "I know, I have reached enlightenment" and you being gullible follow him. You never question him.

So here there is no authority, there is no speaker, but we are asking a very, very serious question, which may resolve the conflict, the control, the constant battle between oneself and with another. And to find that out we must go very deeply into this question of what love is, not what compassion is. I am talking of love. Don't bring in another word and then confuse it. We are just talking of what human beings call love. Love their animals, their pets, love their garden, love their house, love their furniture, love their girl or boy, love their gods, love their country - you follow? - this thing called love, which is so loaded, which is so trodden upon. We are going to find out what it is - right? Don't go to sleep! Or take notes. I believe you are going to have cassettes, which you can hear afterwards, if you want to. But to take notes while the baby is crying, that is a good simile for you, you will understand it, saying why is he crying, writing it all very carefully! (Laughter). So please pay a little attention, that is, to hear, that means the art of listening. You know that baby when he cries, you are listening with all your mind. The art of listening means - the word 'art' implies to put everything in its right place. If you understand the meaning of that word really, that is the real art, not painting pictures and all the rest of it, that comes secondary, or tertiary. But the art of putting your life in its proper place, which is to live harmoniously, when you have put everything in yourself in its right place you are free. That putting everything in its right place is part of intelligence. Then you say you are giving a new meaning to that word 'intelligence'. One must. Intelligence implies reading between lines, between words, between two silences, between speech, listening, so that your mind is all the time alert to listen. You not only hear

with your ear, but also you hear without the ear.

So we are asking: what is the meaning and the beauty, if there is beauty, of love? That gives me an idea - not an idea. Have you ever considered what beauty is? What does beauty mean? Is it connected with desire? Don't deny it, look at it, carefully listen, find out. Is beauty part of desire? Is beauty part of the senses? You see a marvellous building, the Parthenon, an ancient Greek or Egyptian, or one of these cathedrals, marvellous buildings - your senses are awakened by the beauty of that. So is beauty part of this? And is beauty the face, the colour, the shape, the bones in the face, the clarity in the eyes and the skin and the hair, and the expression of a man or a woman? You understand all these questions? Or there is another quality of beauty which may transcend all this beauty, which when that is part of this life then the form, the face, everything has its place. Whereas if that is not captured, if that is not understood, the outward expression, the outward - all that becomes all important - right? So we are going to find out what that beauty is. If you are interested.

You know when you see something like that marvellous mountain against the blue sky, the vivid bright, clear, unpolluted snow, the majesty of it drives all your thoughts, your concerns, your problems out of it. Have you noticed that? You say, "How beautiful it is" and for two seconds perhaps, or for even a minute you are absolutely silent - right? Haven't you noticed it? Which means what? The grandeur of it drives away for that second the pettiness of ourselves - right? So that immensity has taken us over - right? Do you understand this? Like a child with an intricate toy - for an hour he is occupied, he won't talk, he won't make any noise,



he is completely absorbed in that. Which means the toy has absorbed him - you follow this? I am getting tired. You understand?

So the mountain absorbs you and therefore for the second, or the minute you are absolutely quiet, which means there is no self. Now without being absorbed by something - you understand? - either a toy, a mountain, or a face, or an idea or this or that, to be in oneself completely without the me, is the essence of beauty. Do you understand all this?

So we are going to find what is love. Because if we can find that out our life may be totally different. One can live without conflict, without control, without any form of effort. We are going to find out.

First of all, as we said the other day, there is positive action, an action which is non-action - I went into that, right? Need I go into it again? In positive action there is doing something about it, controlling, suppressing, effort, dominating, avoiding, explaining, rationalizing, and in the very process of analysing, rationalizing, there is an action which is considered positive, doing something about it. Right? And we are saying there is non-action, which is not related to positive action, it is not the opposite of it, which is to observe without action. Then that very observation, as we pointed out, brings about a radical transformation in that which is being observed, which is non-action. Do understand this, a little bit. It doesn't matter. It is your life. We are so used to doing positive - right? "I must", "I must not", "This is right", "This is wrong", "This is correct", "This should be", "This must not be", "I'll suppress it, I'll control" - all this is struggling with the me, which is the essence

of disorder, which is the essence of conflict. If you see that, not verbally or intellectually, or optically but actually see the truth of it, then there is non-action, in which there is no effort. Mere observation itself changes that which is being observed.

So we are asking: what is love? And we said that we have got so many opinions about it: opinions of specialists, opinions of gurus, opinions of priests, your wife says or your girl says, "This is love", or you say, "This is love", or you say it is related to sex and so on and so on and so on. Is it? Is it related to senses? From the senses arises desire. Have you followed this? Desire is the movement, the concentrated movement of desire, the movement of the senses is desire, obviously. Don't look puzzled! I see a beautiful thing, which is the senses are awakened and I want it. Come on! Look at it for yourself. You see we are saying when there is the movement of the total senses, the whole senses, not a particular sense, then desire is non-existent. You think it out.

So is love the movement of the senses with its desire? Right? Is love, to put it differently, desire? Sexually senses are in operation, the remembrance, the pictures, the images, the sensations all the time. And that movement of all that is considered love. Love, as far as one can observe, is part of desire. Go slowly. We haven't enlarged it. Don't look puzzled or say, "No, that can't be" - we are going into it. Is love attachment? You understand? I am attached to my girl or boy. I possess. So is attachment love? And our whole life is based on attachment - attachment to property, attachment to a person, attachment to a belief, to a dogma, to Christ, to Buddha, whatever it is, attached. Is that love? When you are attached, in that attachment there is pain, there is fear, there is jealousy,

anxiety, you may lose. So we are asking: where there is attachment is there love? When you observe it and you are concerned deeply, most profoundly to find out what love is, then attachment becomes unimportant, it has no value, because that is not love.

So it is not desire. It is not remembrance. It is not attachment. Right? It is not that I am telling you and you accept it. It is so. And is love pleasure? Don't look so depressed. I am sorry. It doesn't mean you can't hold the hand of another. But we will find out, if you understand this. You see desire, the outcome of sensation, sensation attached to thought, thought attached to sensation, and from that sensation desire, and that desire wants to fulfil and we call that love. Is that love? Is attachment love? In attachment there is conflict, there is uncertainty and therefore the more there is uncertainty the more the fear of loneliness, the more you become attached, possessive, dominating, asserting, demanding, and hence conflict in relationship. And this conflict you think is part of love. And we are asking: is that love?

And is pleasure love? Pleasure is the movement of a remembrance - right? Don't memorize this phrase. Just listen to it. I remember how nice you were and how pleasant, how tender, how comforting, how sexual, this, that and the other - I remember that, and I say, "Darling, I love you". Is that love? And is pleasure to be denied? You must ask all these questions I am asking. You must ask, find out. Doesn't it give you a pleasure to look at the waters of a stream? What is wrong with that pleasure? Doesn't it give you pleasure to look at a solitary tree in a field? Doesn't it give you pleasure to see the moon over the mountains as last night, you saw it perhaps, some of you? A great delight wasn't it? What is wrong

with it? But the trouble begins when thought says, "How beautiful this is, I must keep it. I must remember it. I must worship it. I hope to have more of it." - then the whole movement of pleasure comes into operation. And that pleasure we call love.

The child, the baby with the mother, she is full of that tender affection, the feeling of holding, is that love? Please don't jump on me, I am asking. Or that love is part of your heredity. Have you seen the monkeys holding their babies? The elephant caring for the little one infinitely. It may be that we have inherited this instinctual response to a baby. And then, "It is my baby". No, don't shake your head. "It is my baby, it has got my blood, my bones, my flesh, I love it". And if you do love your baby so greatly you will see he is properly educated, you will see that he is never violent, he is never killed or kills another. But you don't care. You only care for that little baby until he is about four, five, six and then throw him to the wolves - right?

So is all this love? Now the positive action is to say, "No. I will no longer have sex," I will no longer - you know, I will do this, I will get rid of this attachment, I will be free of attachment, I will work on attachment - you follow? Work, do something about it all the time. Whereas the negative action is to see it in its entirety, therefore have an insight into it. Then you will see that love is not any of these things, but because there is love, from that love all relationship changes. You know the ascetics, the monks, the sannyasis in India, in Europe and monks all over the world, they have said "No desire, no sex, don't look at a beautiful woman. If you do, think of her as your sister or your mother. Or, if you do look concentrate on the divine" - you follow? And all the rest of

that. And they are burning inside. Outside denying but inwardly burning. And that is what they call a religious life; which means they have no love. They have an idea of what love is. The idea is not love. The idea, the word is not love. But only when you have seen the whole movement of desire, attachment, pleasure, then out of that depth of perception comes this strange flower with its extraordinary perfume. That is love.

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 20TH JULY 1978

What shall we talk about? If I may, I would like to go into the question of what does it mean, not merely words or ideas, that a human being, as we are, should bring about a deep profound change in himself. What does that mean? We are using the word 'change' not from this to that, but rather bringing about a transformation or a mutation in the very structure of our consciousness. That I would like to talk about, if you will permit me, because we human beings seem to remain in our tradition, culture, social, economic structure, and psychologically, inwardly follow a certain pattern for the rest of our lives, whether it be sexual, imaginary, fanciful, mythological, or a very matter-of-fact worldly life. That seems to be the pattern of our existence. Either we are very worldly - I mean by that word 'worldly', very superficial, living only at a level of the senses, with money, position, freedom, casual freedom, indulgence and so on, superficially, and recognising what society is, what the economic structure is; there are those who want a bloody revolution along a certain ideology, a physical upsetting of the whole apple-cart. You know what I mean by the apple-cart? Not actually apples, but the idea of it. And they have tried every kind of physical, economic revolution. And apparently that hasn't brought about a change in man - control the environment, impose certain economic laws, impose according to totalitarian beliefs and ideologies and so on and so on. They have tried every form, every means, or every structure, economic, social, cultural, to bring about a fundamental change in man. Religions have tried it - right? They say, "Forget

yourself and give yourself over to Christ" - or this person or that person. Or, surrender yourself to some guru - which is very convenient for the guru. And so on. And apparently from everything one observes, and this observation is not casual, or according to one's desire, but if one has observed very closely, deep down, fundamentally man has not changed for millenia upon millenia.

Now, we are asking: is it possible to bring about a fundamental psychological revolution? Not just trimming the tree here and there, but deep, abiding, enduring, irrevocable change, transformation? Because we are not happy as we are. I don't know why we live the way we do. We are generally miserable, in conflict, jealous, anxious - we have been through all that. We accept all that. We are conditioned according to that. If you live in a totalitarian state, after a certain time you get used to it. You accept all the restraints and the compulsions and the terror and all that. So, is it possible for a human being to bring about an enduring transformation? That is what we are going to - if I may - talk about.

One should ask this question of oneself: why we human beings live the way we are doing? And can we live in this world, bringing about this fundamental, psychological revolution or transformation and yet live in this world, sanely, and rationally with an occupation and all the rest of it? May we go into that? - if you are interested in it, and I hope you are.

First of all, the Western world has divided consciousness, the unconscious, deeper, and the superficial, conscious. And one may temporarily bring about a modified change in the obvious superficial consciousness. That superficial consciousness can

adjust itself to anything; to terror, to wars, to all the travail of human beings, superficially. And the unconscious, the deeper, the hidden layers of the mind - the mind being consciousness and we are using that word 'mind' which we have explained carefully, we won't go into that further - and that deep unconscious entity is part of the race, part of the deep unconscious demands, fears and a sense of deep sorrow. I think it is a great mistake to divide consciousness into these departments: conscious and the unconscious. Consciousness is whole. You may divide it for convenience, for exploration, for investigation, but as long as one maintains this divisive consciousness, the consciousness which is broken up into the deeper and the higher, there is not only conflict but also, if one goes into it, a sense of the abiding past, always controlling, shaping the present.

Now please, as I said, as we said, the speaker is not here. You are asking these questions yourselves. And we are using words that are common. And we are not being driven by the words. You have read psychological books and have certain jargons, certain ideas, and those ideas, those words, drive you, control you, control your thinking, control your reactions and so on. If you do that our communication with each other becomes extremely difficult. Whereas if we use the word without all its associations, which our education, our reading has brought about, emotionally or not, if we can use the word plainly, simply then we are in communication with each other. Right? And I hope you will do this while we are talking together.

Now can the unconscious, the deeper, be revealed? Or revealed totally, completely, exposed to the bright light of perception? Or



must it be investigated through dreams, through occasional hunch, occasional intimation, or some form of intuition? I personally don't like that word 'intuition' because you can have an intuition about anything, it may be your own desire, prompting you to have certain feelings about something. So we are not using that word at all. So is it possible to investigate without analysis the whole content of the deeper layers of one's mind? Do you understand my question? Please follow this. It is your life, not mine.

Since the psychologists have divided this, the conscious mind thinks it can investigate into the unconscious. It can then proceed to analyse its dreams, its superficial activities, its reactions, always from the superficial. From the conscious delve into the unconscious - right? And in that there is a great deal of danger because the conscious mind is full of imaginary sensory demands, beliefs and so on. With all that, it is trying to investigate something which is hidden. You are following this? And there are those people who try to investigate their reactions, their actions and so on, in a group, telling each other, which is the same as talking to oneself. You are following all this? And this division is always maintained. So there is always conflict between the outer and the inner: the outer being conscious, the superficial and the deeper. I do not know if you have not noticed all this? You don't have to go to any psychologist, philosopher or any professional specialist in psychology, you can observe all this in yourself if you know how to read yourself. And most of us haven't got either the energy or the interest, or the demand that says "I must find out". But when there is a crisis then we go to some specialist hoping he will solve our problems. So we are always dependent on somebody. And he on

whom you depend is equally conditioned, perhaps much more divisive, a little more neurotic and has to be analysed by another analyser and so on, the game goes on. This is what we are doing: depending on somebody to tell us what to do, how to think, how to move out of our own problems, out of our own desperate crises.

Now is it possible to observe our consciousness, not at two broken levels, but totally? You understand my question? Can I observe my consciousness, not as the unconscious and the conscious but as a total unity, not divided, but a thing that is intrinsically whole? Right? Is it possible to so observe? You understand my question? It is only possible when I understand very clearly that this division is artificial, perhaps convenient and perhaps it might explain certain neurotic activities, but actually it is totally brought about by man, by thought. Are we following each other? You are asking these questions yourself, I am not asking you to ask them.

So we are asking: is it possible to observe without any direction, without any distortion, this whole movement of consciousness? It is possible only when you have no direction. Which means the moment you have a motive you give it a direction - right? The moment you want to get something out of it, it becomes distorted, you say, "Well I must go beyond this limited entity" - the very desire that wants to go beyond this limit is born out of its own conditioning, therefore it is still distorted. I hope you are following all this. So is it possible to observe without direction, without motive, without reward and punishment - is that possible? Don't say, 'yes' or 'no'. One has to find that out for oneself, for yourself. Can you observe your wife, your girl, whatever it is you are

observing, without a motive, without a direction, without wanting something out of it? Which means then your whole attention is there, there is no deviation. You are following this? Then you are completely alert and aware. And then only it is possible to observe this whole phenomena of consciousness in action. And can you observe without all that? So we say, "As it is not possible to do it instantly, I will practise and gradually, day after day, cultivate attention" - right? Practise a sense of awareness which is the essence of sensitivity. To be so tremendously sensitive. If you are not sensitive you can't be attentive, so you practise sensitivity, a kind of - you know. We are monkeys really. Which means we haven't basically understood that wherever there is an intention, a desire, a cultivation in order to do something then that kind of mentality is devoid entirely of sensitivity, attention. I hope you are doing all this. Are we doing this as we are talking to each other? Not tomorrow or another day, but actually as you are sitting there, talking together, will you do this? Are you doing it? No direction, no motive, no desire for reward, for doing something, if you don't do it punishment, to be totally out of that field altogether.

Then is there an observation of the whole nature and the structure, the complex movement of consciousness as a whole? Then only it is possible to bring about real deep fundamental transformation, because in that there is no positive action. We explained that, what we mean by positive action. That is, try to do something about your consciousness, try to force it, try to control it, try to expand it, suppress it. Consciousness means all its content, your angers, your desires, your sexual demands, your beliefs, dogmas, belonging to a certain culture, all that is part of

consciousness. To observe it, as most people are, if they do observe it, try to do something about it. That is, I must be free of the Church and in freeing themselves from a particular organized religious body they topple into another religious body and think they have changed tremendously. It is the same pattern repeated over and over and over again.

So can you observe this whole movement? Or must you take each reaction, bit by bit? You understand my question? I think it is clear. I am making it clear. If I am sexual, I am concerned about that. If I am worried about my relationship to my wife, not only sexually but in other ways, I am concerned about that. I am concerned about my health. We lay emphasis on one thing and neglect the others - right? We must have perfect health and therefore you become a vegetarian and god knows what else and become neurotic about it. This is what we are doing all the time. Go to India to find god, or enlightenment. You know there is a lovely story from India: a young man leaves his family and goes to various teachers all over India and asks them to teach him truth. He wanders about thirty, forty, fifty years and doesn't find it. And ultimately as an old man he comes back to his house. And he knocks on the door and the door is opened by somebody and just then he sees the truth! You understand? It is there, not over there.

We were talking the day before yesterday, about the whole question of what love is. And can this totality of consciousness, which is made up of the incidents, accidents, knowledge, practice and beliefs and so on and so on and so on, can this consciousness live or understand what love is? Our consciousness obviously is put together by thought. And thought, if you have gone into it, is

limited, time-binding, and so can this consciousness, which is the result of centuries of various reactions and dangers and so on and so on, pleasure, fears and so on, can that consciousness contain the thing that we call love? You understand my question? Or love lies beyond that consciousness? Which means, thought has no relationship whatsoever with love. Right? Do you see the truth of it, not the idea of it, the actuality of it? Therefore it becomes extraordinarily important if you want to find out what that extraordinary thing called love is. There must be a transformation in our consciousness. How is this possible? Without effort, that means motive, without any strain, without any exercising of thought in order to go beyond itself - is this possible?

You know, to find this out is part of meditation. That is, can this consciousness become completely empty, except in the area where knowledge is necessary? Do you understand? Are we meeting each other, some of us at least? That is, can thought, with all its activity, end, except in that limited area? That is the art of perception. The art of perception, the seeing, is to give everything its place.

From this arises another question, which is: consciousness contains mankind's sorrow. That is, you as a human being are part of the world. You are the world. Not an idea, not something that has intellectually been put together by reason and you say, "Yes, quite right", but the reality, the truth of it that you represent, as a human being, the rest of humanity. You suffer, you are anxious, you are uncertain, confused, miserable, fearful, hurt, everything, and every human being has this. So your consciousness is the consciousness of mankind. If that is the truth to you, not an idea, then what takes place? You understand my question? One has lived

as an individual, fighting, struggling to express oneself, demanding - you follow - as a limited, contained, narrow individual. And it is very, very difficult to see the truth that you are the rest of mankind, that in you is the whole of man and therefore his fears, his anxieties, his mischief, his arrogance, his pride, his violence, all that, and his sorrow - right? And mankind has lived with this sorrow - right? Lived with sorrow, has accepted sorrow as part of his life, and if he doesn't accept it he runs away from it through every form of entertainment, religious and otherwise. Or he personifies this sorrow into an image, which the Christians have done, and think they have solved this problem.

Now our question is: can this sorrow, not only your particular little sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, end - you understand. What an enormous perception that is if you see it, that your sorrow is not yours, it is the whole of mankind's. Then you don't cry. Then you don't shed tears about your little wounds, your little failures, your little anxieties and so on. But when you realize you are the representative of all mankind it brings about an enormous sense of vitality, energy. It is only when you are thinking about yourself, your sorrow, that vast energy is limited into a small little channel, and it becomes rather dirty. Now is it possible for sorrow to end? If there is an ending in one human being - please go with me for a little while - if there is the ending of sorrow in one human being who is the representative of all humanity, that ending affects the whole consciousness of man. You understand? Stalin has affected the whole consciousness of man - no? Hitler and all the rest of those world people, national people. Through the priest the idea of Jesus Christ has affected mankind - right? You will accept that

more easily. So when there is a fundamental ending of sorrow in a human being who is the representative of all humanity, then that brings about an action in the totality of mankind - I wonder if I am making this clear? Have you understood something sirs? Not what I am saying. Do you see the truth of this, the fact of this?

That is, most of us have some kind of sorrow, either we are unhealthy, or our children are not what they should be and so on, or we can never reach the other side of the river, or we can never be as intelligent as somebody else, or there is the love of someone who dies - the sorrow of thousands of people who have been killed in the wars. Now what can a human being, you, do, or not do to end this? Take an ordinary everyday incident of death. Someone whom you so-call love dies; old age, disease, accident and so on, dies. And you have lost him or her, and you shed tears of loneliness, shed tears of sudden loss, irrevocable loss, nothing can bring him back, or her. You are left completely, suddenly isolated because you are so attached, given yourself over to that person so completely and when that person ends you suddenly discover how empty you are. There are tears of self pity, tears of loss, tears of loneliness - right? Which we call sorrow. And can that sorrow end? It doesn't mean that you are callous, that you are indifferent, that you become totally isolated from everything and therefore self protected. Is it possible to end sorrow? - not the sorrow of somebody whom you lose but the whole meaning of that word grief, the depth of it, the enormity, the weight of it. It is possible only when you as a human being, who are etc., when you observe without action, without doing something about it, just be entirely with it. You understand? Your wife or your girl friend has left you.

You are jealous, angry, vicious, hating and you realize that, if you are at all intelligent, aware, then you say, "I must get out of this". But to remain with it, to remain totally without any movement with your jealousy, with your anger, with your hate, you understand, completely one with it. Not identifying yourself with it, because you are that, but to remain with it without any movement. I wonder if you are capturing something?

Then you will see that there comes an extraordinary transformation. The transformation that comes about with the ending of sorrow is passion, not lust. Passion is something entirely different. If you have no passion you are non-existent. So you will find, if you actually, without moving away from that thing called sorrow, a totally different movement takes place. And that movement is this extraordinary endless passion - right? And that passion is compassion. The word 'compassion' means passion for all things, for birds, trees, for human beings, for the rock, for the stray animal. But when there is compassion for one person then it is limitless because in its very nature it includes all things. Right? Don't go to sleep please. Or don't go off into some kind of imaginary, mystical, romantic idea. Compassion is not romantic. It is not intellectual. It is not sentimental.

From that we ought also to talk over together the common factor of all mankind, which touches every human being, young and old, which is the ending of life, which is called death. Right? We should go into that. It is really a very complex question, like all human problems, it is very complex. And man, every human being or woman in the world, has tried to find a way out of it, tried to immortalize himself, or her, through some action, through some



book, through some way of life. So that this idea of ending has become a terror, has become something that man must avoid at all costs, postpone it as long as possible. And there have been a thousand explanations, rational, irrational, based on belief, conclusion and hope, because man doesn't want to end, because he says, "I have gathered so much experience. I have cultivated my house and my garden so carefully, inwardly and outwardly. I have accumulated so much knowledge. I have lived so clearly and why should I, who have gathered so much, end all this, what for? And if that is all then I might just as well live very superficially, enjoy myself, do whatever I want and call the whole business a jolly good life." You understand, the two extremes, the one who doesn't care, the one who has had many experiences, of every kind, sensuous and otherwise, and he says at the end, "All right, dust to dust." The other says, "Why should I die?" - you follow all this? "I have loved, I have known beauty, I have swam against the current, I have followed nobody, and I have tried to live as a human being who is not second-hand". And unfortunately most of us are secondhand.

So we must find out for ourselves what it means to end, not the ending of death, that is one of the things, but what does it mean to end? The ending of man's life, ending, not what happens after I end, we will find out. Ending my desire, my longing, my frustrations, ending my hurts, ending the desire to fulfil, ending it - right? You understand? The ending of something psychologically, and even physiologically. The ending of your attachment to another. The ending of your belief, the ending of not belonging to any institution, the ending of it. What happens? You follow what I

am saying? If we understand one thing then we can move to the ending of what we call life, which is death. The ending of attachment, because most of us are attached to something or other - right? To our bodies, to our looks, to our husband, to our girl, to our belief, to our gods, something or other, attachment. Now can you end attachment, not say, "I will get something out of it", just cut it, surgically, rationally, seeing all the causes of what is implied, which we went into, we won't go into all that, and to end it completely? Have you ever done this, ending something completely? Specially attachment, do it now as we are talking. Become aware of your attachment, end it. And see, observe, then what takes place? You cannot observe very clearly if you don't end something. What happens? Right?

Say for instance, you are attached to nicotine, smoking. I am taking that very ordinary, rather stupid example. What happens, without fear, you end it because it is irrational, why waste money and all the rest of it. If you end it because it affects your heart, your lungs, then you are not ending it, you are ending it out of fear. But being aware of all the results and so on, the causes of smoking, drop it completely, today, now. Then what has taken place? Isn't there not only freedom from smoking, but isn't there a new sense of freedom, a new beginning? You are following this? If you end your attachment to the country, you know, attachment, to a piece of furniture, if you end it completely then there is a new beginning isn't there? No? There is no new beginning if you do it out of fear, if you do it out of rationalized careful analysis. But if you see the whole nature of attachment, what is involved in it, completely, and end it, then you will see there is totally a new beginning. Because

the ending is the past, and when you are ending the past then there is not only a new observation but a sense of extraordinary freedom and movement not born out of the past. I wonder if you get all this? Do it and you will discover this for yourself.

And death: we are all going to die one day or another. If everyone of us lived for ever and ever, amen, think what the earth would be like! Filled with ghastly, old, decrepid - you follow? So I am asking myself, and you are asking yourself, why shouldn't I die? Not commit suicide, that is too silly. Why shouldn't I die, what's wrong with death? Why is there this colossal fear about it? I know very well what it means to end smoking. Right? I took that silly example. I know, there is an awareness of ending attachment to a guru, to ideas, to a pattern, ending. What happens when I end? There is such a great sense of freedom and beauty in it. So why shouldn't there be an ending, ending to what? You understand my question? I know I can end smoking, ending attachment, but ending which is death, what is this ending? You are following this? Does it interest you, all this?

So I enquire into what is living - you understand? Not what is ending, what is living? It is odd that you should all be listening to this man, isn't it? So we are asking, what is living? Can there be an ending to this thing called living? Right? Then I am asking, what is this living? The daily living, monotonous routine with all the problems, that is my life, your life - not mine, sorry. Your life. Not that I am separate, I don't enter into it. What is this ending? Ending to what? Ending to my attachment to my husband, wife, girl, boy, ending knowledge, ending experience, ending all the sensations, ending sex - right? Ending this constant battle in oneself and with

others - right? This thing is what we call living - right? It is not my idea, this is what you are doing. Now is there an ending to all that? Ending to your sorrow, ending to your ambition, your pride, your vanity, your arrogance, violence, can you end all that? Of course you can. As you have ended smoking, as you have ended attachment, you can end your ambition, your vanity, your hurts, you know the whole thing, I don't have to go into it, you can end it.

If you have ended it actually, not theoretically in daily life, then what is death? Death is then the ending of sensation, ending of the brain cells - you understand? Ending. Like a leaf in the autumn. That leaf in the autumn has beautiful colour, full of colour, in that leaf the whole universe is, not theoretically but actually. So if we end the way we are living, then there is a totally different beginning; not I begin totally differently, because when you left attachment completely there was no I beginning, there was a state of total freedom from a particular thing, and in that freedom there was a great sense of release, a great sense of freedom, a totally new beginning without the anchors of attachment.

So can you end what you call the living, the worries, the problems, ending the problem, never to carry it a single minute over, because if you have a problem and you carry it over and over, day after day for another year, that deteriorates the brain. So we are asking if you end the way one lives now, there is a new beginning without the 'me'. And then death has no meaning. Then you don't ask what happens after my life - right? Because you have ended the thing that you call living, which is me, with all my problems, my anxieties, my worries, my pride - you follow? Will you do it? Or say, "Yes, it is a marvellous idea" and carry on your daily

monotonous useless life?

When you understand the whole meaning of death and the ending of what it signifies, time as such has come to an end. I am just talking to myself, unless you do it. Time in the sense of non-movement of thought. And this whole enquiry is really a profound meditation, not sitting cross legged and doing all kinds of silly stuff. Because then in this total ending creation takes place. Then there is really an extraordinary sense of tremendous passion and energy, which is not a reward.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 23RD JULY 1978

I believe this is the last talk. There will be discussions, or dialogues, or conversations - whatever you may like to call them - on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. Then we can bombard each other with a lot of questions and try to find answers for them!

During the last six talks we have talked over together a great many things. We talked over how we are influenced by institutions, controlled and shaped by them. We also went into the question of ideals, how they distort our lives, making us violent, ineffectual, not dealing with realities of life. And also we talked about the pressure of knowledge: knowledge we said is always in the past, how that knowledge controls, shapes our thinking, our actions, and we are influenced by that greatly, by the past; the past being experience, accumulated as knowledge in the brain and the response of that is memory. We also talked about the pressure of ideas - ideas in our relationship with each other, what must be, what should be and so on. We also talked about the various forms of illusion in which we live. And we talked about fear, and whether fear can end, completely, totally, eradicated from our very depths, so that a human being is totally free from that darkness. We also talked about the pursuit of endless pleasure, pleasure being the response of the senses as desire and the expression of that desire in the present from the past, and to the future.

We also went into the question of whether human beings can ever end their sorrow, not only their momentary passing grief, but also the deep sorrow of man who has faced wars, destruction,

endless conflict without any meaning to life. And we also went into the question of what is love, whether a human being can love another without all the problems that is involved in it: ambition, personal concern, jealousy, antagonism, domination, attachment and so on. We went into all that. And where these things exist, we said, there is no love. And when our action is based on merely thought, which is memory, then that action is incomplete, and being incomplete it must invariably bring about conflict. Any action that is not total, whole, holistic, complete, must breed contradictions. We went into that very carefully.

And the other day we talked about the ending of sorrow, and with that ending, compassion. And I think we ought to talk about various other things too, this morning. I hope you are all comfortable, it is pretty hot!

We ought to ask ourselves, I think, why we follow another, which apparently you are doing. Why we become disciples of somebody. If there were no disciples there would be no teachers; and because of disciples the teachers multiply; and the disciple then destroys that which he started out to look for. He wants to find out, if he is a really serious person, he wants to find out what truth is, if there is freedom, if there is a sense of timeless existence. And if you follow another, whether it be the priest, a book, a guru, an authority, then you will never, under whatever circumstances, find all that. So can one ask oneself seriously why we follow another? This is really very important because it denies freedom. And one has followed the priest in western Europe as well as in Asia for thousands and thousands of years. We are still in agony, uncertainty, miserable, unhappy, in conflict, endless travail. And it

may be essentially the fault of the disciples, of the one who follows, either the book, the word, or the person. And when you follow you deny your own investigation, exploration into truth. And so, if one may suggest, don't follow anybody, including the speaker. I have made that very clear from the very beginning, that we are talking to each other, that the speaker is not here, that you are looking at yourself, and discovering all the problems, the confusion, the uncertainty, the extraordinary demand of desire and so on. You are asking these questions of yourself, therefore there is no teacher and no disciple, only learning; not learning from another, but learning about yourself, looking into yourself. You cannot possibly look into yourself objectively without any directional motive if you are all the time consumed with your own importance, with your own ambitions, with your own problems.

I wonder if you have ever asked yourselves why you have a problem of any kind - perhaps a mathematical problem, scientific problem, problems of knowledge, but psychologically why do you have problems? And if you have a problem, why do you not end it immediately and not carry it over and over and over again for the rest of your life? You see when the problem presents itself to you and you do not solve it instantly, and you think about the problem, worry about the problem, that deteriorates the brain cells, obviously. To solve a problem, human problem, psychological problem, the problem of relationship, it matters enormously how you approach it. Do you understand? Please, We are talking to each other. There is no guru, there is no teacher here, there is only the problem, and how you approach the problem, because in the approach to the problem may be the solution. You understand what



we are saying?

Suppose I have a problem: if I approach it with a desire to end it, I'm already coming to it with a determined purpose, which may distort the problem itself. If I come to it with a motive, the motive will dictate the answer of the problem. We are following each other? I am not talking to myself, we are talking to each other. We are sharing this thing together. Or rather, you are investigating and discovering this thing for yourself, that you cannot solve a human problem if you approach it wrongly. There is a correct approach, which is: without a motive, without trying to end the problem, otherwise you approach it with a conclusion, with already premeditated intention, so the problem remains. Whereas if you can free yourself from the motive, from the direction, the desire to find an answer, then you come to it freely, whatever that problem is. Even if it be the most scientific, complex problem, because the free mind doesn't create a problem, it meets a problem, then answers it, but it doesn't create a problem. But whereas we create problems, and having created it we approach it with fear, with anxiety, consult others, you know, go through all the movements of trying to solve it. Or you investigate the problem very thoroughly, observing it, let the problem tell you the whole story of itself, then perhaps during the day you find a complete freedom from that problem.

So what we are saying is: our human minds, the brain, the mind, the thought, the emotions, the senses are millions and millions of years old. It is heavily conditioned and that is creating the problem. And as long as the brain is still thinking of ways out of it, it is still furthering the problem, enlarging the problem. Are we making this

clear for ourselves?

So we are going to discuss, non-problematically - you understand, it is not a problem, nothing is a problem until you make it - we are going to investigate, not make it as something that you have to solve. And please understand this, it is very important because we are going to enquire into this whole question of what is a religious life, whether it is terrible, or possible to live that religious life in this world. That is one of the problems - I won't call it a problem - that is one of the things that we are going to look into. And we are also going to enquire into the whole movement of the mind, the brain, not only during the day but when it is asleep. We are also going to enquire and not make an issue of it, into the question of time, the question of space, distance, and the very complex problem - not problem - the very complex state of mind that is capable of real meditation.

We are going to go into all that, and as we said let us approach it without wanting to find a solution for any of it. You understand? Then it becomes fun. Then there is a certain sense of joy in enquiry.

First of all let us enquire, look, observe, what is the movement of our life when we are awake during the day, and what is that movement when we are asleep. We have divided sleeping and waking, which may be entirely wrong. One must sleep, darkness is necessary for nature, so we need to have sleep. But we have separated sleeping and waking. And we have never enquired into the state of the mind that is not sleeping, that is awake - I won't use the word 'awake', that is not sleeping, let us put it that way. And the state of the mind that is asleep during the night. Right? Because it

is important to understand this because - not because, sorry - it is important to understand. What is the state of the mind in which is included the senses, the desires, thought, memory, experience, knowledge and all the movement during our waking hours, what is that state of mind? - not how to get out of it, or how to resolve it, but to look at it. You understand? You look at a flower by the roadside, there you are looking at it, seeing the beauty of it, the quiet state of its existence, the colour and the perfume. And you just look and you go by. In the same way let's look at the movement of our life during the waking hours, just like that, without wanting to resolve any of the complexities, any of the issues that are involved during our day. During our day in which there is constant relationship, whether in a factory, office, or in the house, everything, it is based on relationship. And why has everything become a problem? I hope you are asking this question of yourself. Why we take on certain roles, follow certain people, carry on their message, all that filth - I call it filth because it is not reality, it is not truth, it is just an evasion from enquiring into the enormous complexity of our existence.

And does that same movement, which is during the day, carry on when we are asleep? You understand my question? Please put this question to yourself, although I am putting it to you, you are putting it to yourself. Does the daily movement of reactions and responses, all the things that are going on in our daily activity, both technologically as well as in human relationships, the observation of the beauty of a mountain, the running waters, the still sky, and the majesty of a mountain, and the solitary tree in a vast field, all that movement does it go on when you are asleep? How will you

find out? It is important to find out. Obviously, if you have an issue, a problem, something that has not been resolved, you carry on that problem during the day to the next day, and so on, that problem goes over and over and over during the day and during the next day and so on, which means, the problem is carried over during the sleep, obviously. A problem implies disorder - right? Any problem you have, human problem, especially human problems, implies that there is a state of disorder in your mind, in your way of thinking, looking, and so that disorder is carried over during the sleep and continues the next day - right? I am not stating this, you are discovering this for yourselves.

Now the brain is constantly active with one, or a dozen, problems, and the brain can only function clearly, efficiently, intelligently, with all its energy, when there is order. That is obvious too. When you have order in your life, or even for a day, or an hour, you feel full of energy. So the brain demands order - right? But during the day we have problems, we have disorder, and the brain during the sleep has to bring about order, otherwise it can't function the next day properly. And the speaker is not a brain specialist, thank god! But he has observed this phenomena in himself, watched it.

So can there be order during the day? Order being: any problem that arises, dissolve instantly. If you are jealous, solve it, get free of it immediately, as it arises. To be so totally free of it, look at it. That is, look at it not as an observer separate from the thing he has observed, as jealousy, but the observer himself is jealous otherwise he couldn't recognize it. You are following all this? I hope you are. It doesn't matter if you don't. It is your own life. If you are envious,

as most people are, and in being envious there is comparison, imitation, conformity - then end envy immediately. Which means to look at it and not run away from it, translate it, justify it, just look at it as you would look at that wayside flower, with its colour, with its beauty, with its life, with its extraordinary strength, growing out of poor soil. In the same way, look at it. You cannot look if you say, "That is jealousy, that is envy" - which means you are looking at it with the word, which is a means of remembering that you have been jealous, been greedy, envious. So you are looking at it with the eyes of the past - right? You are getting all this?

So when there is complete order during the day the brain then hasn't to work, work while you are asleep to bring order. Then when there is complete order - I mean absolute order, not relative order - then the brain is renewing itself and the dreams, which for so many people become so extraordinarily important, do not take place, except very, very physical, superficial dreams. You understand all this? Unless you test this, test it, go into it, find out for yourself: if you accept this, then you become a disciple, then you become something utterly useless.

So the brain, which is very old, so heavily conditioned, in disorder - right? - look, if you have seen those ancient pictures in the caves, or seen the pictures of them, the problem exists between good and bad, evil and right, fighting, fighting, fighting, symbolized, and so on. Man throughout the ages has lived with enormous problems, and therefore there is never a renewal of the brain. We are talking about the transformation, the mutation of the brain cells themselves, which can only happen, which we went into

the other day, when there is direct perception and action; not perception, then later on action, which only creates a problem. The insight into any problem, into any issue - insight, which is not memory, which is not an intuition, which is not a something that you have stored up and act; insight is not a continuous thing. It is only from moment to moment. When it happens there is an insight into it and there is action in it and resolve.

So we are talking about the nature of our action during the day and that same action taking place during the night; when there is complete action during the day, which means no disorder, then the brain becomes, during the night, it can function totally differently. We are going to go into that when we talk about meditation.

Then also we should understand the whole nature, the whole concept man has of time. There is not only the time according to the sun, but also psychologically, inwardly we have developed time. Right? "I will do this tomorrow. I will arrive at a state of beatitude, or happiness, or enlightenment" - or whatever you like to call it - "Give me time, give me a sense of practice, discipline and I will have it". Time, which is to evolve. You understand? "I am this. I will, through time, evolve". So there is the question of evolution, which means time. Perhaps man has developed this idea of evolution through watching a little bush grow into an enormous tree, the baby into manhood, the developing of a muscle, that muscle is weak but practice and exercise and it gets strong. So this idea of evolution, growing, psychologically thought has taken it over saying, 'I need time to become something'. I don't know if you are following this? Not me, you are watching yourself. Is that a fact? We have accepted it. We live by it. We are accustomed to it.

It is our habit: "I can't do this", psychologically, "Tomorrow I will work at it. I will try", which means you have developed a duality: "I am this, but I will be that". - right? "I am angry, but I will get over it", which is, the little seed growing into an enormous tree, the baby growing to manhood, the little animal which hasn't the strength to walk, run, will take time. So that same observation has entered into the psychological field and there we say we will be born, we will become. Is that so? You understand? That is, there is physical time and we have cultivated the psychological time. Now why have we created psychological time? You are following all this? The baby is crying in the nursery and you are half asleep and you instantly wake up and run to the baby. Right? The mothers and the fathers know about this. You might say, "How do you know about it?" Because I have watched, I have taken care of a baby for four or five days, I know about it. Not my baby, somebody else's baby. Probably when you are looking after a baby you do it much more attentively than the mother! So in the same intensity, with the same urgency, with the same immediate action - you don't let the baby cry, you keep on, you jump out of bed and run, change its diaper - so in the same way look at this problem, with the same urgency at this question. Which is, why has man created, cultivated this psychological time, which he calls evolution, which is, "I will be better. I will attain" - why? And when you have that spirit everybody is willing to exploit it - right? The gurus are excellent at this exploitation, the priests are excellent. And of course the politicians love this - why? What is the truth about it? Please listen to what I am suggesting. What is the truth about it? Is truth a matter or argument? Is truth a matter of opinion? Is truth a matter

of experience, arguing, opinion, knowledge, hoping you will find truth? Will these things point out what truth is? Or is truth not related to thought, not related to memory, not related to past experiences? - and so on and so on. You understand my question? Because if truth is related to the past, it is time-binding - right? I wonder if you understand all this? Or is truth something entirely different? And to find out the truth, whether there is psychological time at all, will you argue about it, the pros and cons, and the clever quotations, people saying, "It is", people saying, "It is not". Or you want to find the truth of it, so you come to it without any prejudice - right? - without any conclusion, without being attached to this idea of evolution; which means truth can only take place when there is absolute freedom to observe.

So can you so observe without your conclusions, saying, "Yes, it is possible", "It is not possible", "What nonsense you are talking about", or finding out from books, from your teachers - all that, throwing all that out, free to look. That is, to have an insight into the problem, into this issue, why man has cultivated the psychological time. When there is insight into it, the brain cells, which have been conditioned by the idea of evolution, psychological evolution, the brain cells themselves undergo a change. Don't accept what we are talking about. Find out. Test it. That means you have to be free to observe, to observe without any wish, any longing, any pressure - you know to observe as you observe a lovely flower. Then you will find that time psychologically has ended. There is no becoming, or "I am" - which is the same.

Then also we have to find out, as we said, what is space. It is



important to have space. Nothing can mature, grow, live, if you don't have a space. Physically it is becoming less and less space. We live in cities - unless you happen to live in the country and I hope you do - if you live in cities there is hardly any space physically. And perhaps out of that lack of space there is violence. That violence is increasing day by day, and one of the reasons of this multiplication of violence is perhaps that there are no wars - you understand? If you had a war you can go and explode in violence. Now you have no wars, you are crowded in cities, you live practically in a drawer, these high rise buildings, and so you have no space. And also you have no space in your mind because you are all the time occupied with something or other - right? The wife with the cooking, her utensils, cleaning and all that, the husband occupied with the work, with the office, with whatever he does, or he is occupied with his own ambitions, with his own vanity, with his own success. And she with her own beauty, with her own enjoyments and so on and so on, with sex - occupied. Have you noticed how occupied you are? And your guru tells you, "Be more occupied. Only not with that, with this." And you, so gullible, say, "All right, I will do that", which is still occupation. I am not reacting to the gurus. I was a guru myself, long ago - thank god - and that is all too silly. You have been under the pressure of the priests for two thousand years in this country and you are bored with it and take on the guru from the East, who is equally the same and you love that, you think you are achieving some nonsense.

So if one sees space is necessary - obviously, - what will you do? That is, space between you and another is necessary, which doesn't mean isolation from another. Space. Space implies

independence. Space implies non-attachment. Space implies a consideration for each other, to allow them space. And you must have space in the mind, which means, the mind is never completely occupied with anything. Can you do it? Test it out. Test it. Don't accept the speaker - you are not accepting what I am saying because I am not here. And I mean it. The speaker, K. is not here. You are learning from yourself, by observing, so there is no authority.

So why is the mind occupied so endlessly? The businessman with his business, the artist with his painting, the pianist with his - you follow? And you and I, ordinary people, have a dozen occupations - why? Is it fear of not being occupied? If you are not occupied, what? What are you then? You follow? If you are not thinking about yourself, how you look, how you dress, how you walk, your feelings, your desires, your ambitions, your vanity, your arrogance and all the rest of it, if you are not occupied with all that - you might be occupied with the United Nations, which is the same thing. (I won't go into the United Nations, it is not very pleasant.) So we are occupied with something or other - sex, good or bad, and all that - why? Is it because - please, look find out, ask, find out - is it because if you are not occupied you are absolutely nothing? And, realizing I am nothing I say, "My god, I must fill that, I am frightened."

So can you be nothing, actually which you are? You may call yourself by a name, your particular face and so on, bank account, house, but strip all that, what are you? Strip your knowledge, your occupation, your endeavours, all that - those are memories, words, remove the words, remove the memories, consciously, you know,

not become insane or lose your memory, or senility, but actually when you are alive, full of energy, which is being wasted in occupation, when that is not occupied, when there is no occupation, there is tremendous energy in nothingness. Test it out. Don't accept a thing from anybody.

So we said problems, time, space. Man or woman - when I say man it includes woman, so don't be Women's Lib. - when we say man and woman, they have always sought power - power over themselves, controlling themselves, which gives a certain sense of power in oneself, if you can completely control yourself - you understand? - you feel very strong, a sense of power; or the power of a politician whom you have elected, or, like in the totalitarian states, they have assumed power. And power is one of the problems of man - you understand?

And there is the other power, which is clairvoyancy, reading thoughts, all that, so-called the occult. You understand? So there are these two types of power: physical, psychological power over another, the power that comes when there is complete, absolute control of oneself; and then there is the hidden power, persuasive power, the power of propaganda, the power of authority and those who are in authority are always seeking to entrench themselves more and more in power - right? Why does man demand power? You understand? Why? Why do you want power over another? Wife over husband, or husband over the wife, or the girl, or whatever it is, why? Which is, power means arrogance, power implies vanity, "I know, you don't know. I am the boss and you are not. I am the acknowledged guru, and you, poor chap, you are a disciple down below." - why? Why do we accept this? Because that

is destroying man, you follow? Because again it emphasizes the 'me' - the 'me' which has identified itself with a nation, with a group, with a country and in that identification I feel very strong - you follow? All that follows. And man has never been able to solve this question of power, which means man doesn't know what it means to have humility. You understand? Because without humility you can't investigate, you can't look, without humility you can't love another, without humility there is no compassion. The man who has power tries to become compassionate, tries to love. That is obviously nonsense. Like a man who is ambitious, he cannot love.

So humility comes into being when you understand the nature of power. You can't cultivate humility. Then what you are cultivating is vanity under the cloak of humility - right?

So it is the same thing, man now, it is one of the fashions, a passing phase, to talk about the occult, wanting to find out. The speaker - I am sorry to bring the speaker into this - knows quite a bit about all that. They are part of the senses. If you are highly sensitive you can almost read somebody - no? Of course. If you are sensitive to your boy friend or your husband, or your wife, you know exactly, almost quickly before she tells you something, or he tells you something. And you can cultivate that - you follow? - and have that peculiar power of reading people's thoughts. Please, when the speaker is talking about this, he is talking of what he knows, what has happened, and the speaker considers all that childish, absolute childishness. You may be able to read other people's thoughts, you may be able to do all kinds of extreme extra sensory perception, extreme extra sensory perception - E.S.P. with

all the business involved in it. If you are caught in that trap, walk out of it, completely. It is the most dangerous trap, because it is only the extension of highly sensitized senses.

Then having established all this in our life, order, which means the art of learning, the art of putting everything in its right place - sex in its right place, money in its right place, everything - and you can only do that when there is freedom from thought which is always creating problems, issues because thought is limited. So put thought in its right place. Then we can proceed - or rather from putting things in their right place we are beginning to meditate. Shall I go into all that? Do you want me to go into all this?

Now first of all, that is a new word introduced into the west - right? It has existed in India for thousands of years. So there are different forms of meditation: from India, the Hindu type of meditation, there is the Buddhist type of meditation, there is the Tibetan type of meditation, there is the Zen meditation, and the gurus that invent something new but along the same line. So there are different types of meditation in the world. And there is that absurd transcendental meditation with all that nonsense. So we are going to find out what is meditation. We are new - you understand, we are new to it, we haven't been conditioned by what people have said about meditation and practice - all that is too absurd and too childish. But we are going to find out what is meditation, what is implied in it. If you have not put everything in its right place, to find out what is meditation is impossible, because then you will get caught in some illusion - right? That is, if the mind is not free to look into what is meditation, how can you learn about it, how can you understand it? You must come to it like a child who goes for

the first time to learn how to write. He goes to it fresh, innocent, curious. But if you already say "This is meditation, you must sit in a certain way, you must stand in a certain way, breathe in a certain way" - then the trivialities become all important.

So we are going to find out what is meditation. And why is it so important to meditate? Why has the east given such extraordinary importance to it, which is now gradually sweeping over the west? It is a very complex problem this. If you have time and the energy to listen, listen, if you don't it doesn't matter. You can observe that the Grecian evolution, Grecian culture from Greece, ancient Greece, has swept over the west - I am not an historian but I can see it, you can observe it. To them the intellect mattered enormously, their theories, their discoveries, their arguments, their democracy - you follow? That is, thought was tremendously important for them. That is, thought being measure. Go into it. You can see it. Thought is measure. That is, measure means from here to there. Also it means comparing, measuring. So the west has cultivated enormous technology. If you had no measure there would be no technology - right? Obviously. And the other side, the Asiatic in India, the Indians said, "All measurement" - the ancient Hindus, not the modern ones, they are all as crooked as the rest of the world, including the gurus - the ancients have said, "Measurement is illusion" - consider it, see the reason of it. They said, "To find the immeasurable the mind must be free of measure". One side measurement, the other side, non-measurement. Right? To find that which is eternal, which is timeless, which is immeasurable, which is nameless, which is Jehovah, which is God, Brahman, and all the rest of it, there must

be no measure. That means no comparison - they don't say that, I am saying it, the speaker is saying it - no comparison.

So the west laying complete, all emphasis on thought, memory, knowledge, experience and through knowledge ascending more and more and more. And the other said, no measurement; but to find that which is immeasurable they began to think about it, they began to evolve, grow - you follow? - practise, do this, don't do that - which is all based on thought. Only here technology, there non-technology. But technology is now conquering India too. So you have this problem. Can the mind be free of all measurement? Measurement is to think in terms of the past, or the future. The present being measured by the past, modified by that measurement and that measurement continuing into the future, which is our life. Measurement. Yesterday I was, today I may change, tomorrow it will be something different.

So the movement of meditation is to live in daily life without measurement. Which means, without the movement of thought, which is measure. The ending of time can only come into being, which is the ending of time as thought, as movement, all that, when thought has discovered its own limitation - right? - and puts it in its right place. Are you following all this? It has been one of our problems, of man and woman, he has been always asking if there is an end to time, stopping of time. Not the stopping of time in science fiction, which you can imagine and all the rest of it, but actually the ending of thought, which is the movement of measure, which is the movement of time. I don't know if it interests you - not interests, it is part of life. As we said, the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning, consists in understanding the word 'art' -

art means to put everything in its right place, the actual dictionary meaning of that word. When everything has its right place, then the mind is completely at rest - right? Because it is obvious.

So from that there arises the question: what is awareness, and what is attention? Is awareness part of attention? Is awareness part of concentration? You aren't tired of all this? You should be. It doesn't matter. Or is attention nothing to do with concentration or with awareness? So we have to examine those three things because - not because. Meditation is involved in this. Awareness is to be aware of the things around you - right? To be aware of the mountains, the rivers, the shadows, the snow, the birds, the ravens, the people, the things they wear, and so on and so on, to be aware of this tent, the shape of it. But in that awareness your prejudices enter, your opinions enter, "This isn't right, it should be that way, I don't like that colour but I like the other colour" - you follow? You are aware of this constant choice, constant evaluation. So can you observe, can you be aware without reaction? Which doesn't mean that you don't have reactions. Just to observe the mountain without any reaction, to look at it, just to look at it. The moment you bring in your prejudice, anxiety and all the rest of it, you are not aware, you are caught in your own net.

Concentration implies exclusion and giving all your energy on a particular point - right? "Don't look out of the window but pay attention to the book" - that is what we are told in school. But if you are the teacher and you say, "Look, when you are looking out of the window do look at it completely, don't be frightened of looking" - you understand?

So attention is freedom from every form of evaluation,



measurement. Because in that there is no centre - I don't know if you have discovered it for yourself. If you attend completely to something there is no centre. There is no 'me' being attentive, that is too silly. If you see that, see the fact of it, then you realize there is no practice, there is no system to be aware, to attend, to concentrate. That is all again so extraordinarily silly. The moment you see, understand this whole business of awareness, concentration and attention, then you are attentive. That attention may last two seconds or five minutes, and you may lose that attention but don't go back and say, "I must be attentive". You understand? Attention came because you knew what it meant - you follow? There was an understanding of it, deep understanding, not intellectual, of what attention is, so it came naturally. But if you begin to say, "I must have constant attention during the day", you are being terribly greedy and it is no longer attention. It is a desire to have something, which you call attention.

So when there is such attention the mind, because there is no centre from which to attend, the mind is completely quiet. Not that you train the mind to be quiet, which all of them practise to be quiet. One has often heard this phrase, "I must have peace of mind" - they will have a piece of mind but it is not peace - you understand? It is just a little piece of something!

So when there is complete order in our life, which is the beginning of meditation, and one understands the nature of awareness, concentration and attention, then all effort has come to an end. All effort. When you put everything in order there is no effort. So the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet, uninvited, not cultivated, something totally new.

And religion, not this nonsense that is going on around us, with all their priests and ceremonies, and all that circus that goes on, then religion means the ending of the self, the 'me'. It is only then that the mind can be absolutely, irrevocably, quiet, and therefore silent, which means the ending of thought as time and measure. Then if the mind has gone that far, in that silence which is vast space and energy there is totally a state which cannot be put into words. But if you put everything in order and so on, it will come to you without your invitation. You cannot invite truth, there is no path to truth, there is no intermediary or gateway, or anything between you and truth. If the field is right then that thing comes to you with such glory. That is ecstasy. In that there is great sacredness. That is holy.

## **SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 26 JULY 1978**

I believe this is a discussion, or a dialogue, or a conversation between ourselves. I don't know what questions or subjects you want to talk over together but I would suggest, not that you must accept it, I would suggest that we are not exchanging opinions, we are not trying to convince each other of anything, we are not trying to persuade or coerce or subtly control each other's thinking, or trying to be clever with each other. I would suggest that before asking questions, any problem, any issue, we should be clear in ourselves who is going to answer the question. Do we, in our conversation, dialogue or discussion, discover for ourselves the answer, the fact, the truth of the matter, or expect someone to answer it for you? And if one expects the speaker to answer the question, or the issue, then I am afraid you are going to be disappointed. But whereas if we could talk over together, find out the answer for oneself, then that question, the issue, will have meaning.

So please bear all this in mind, that we are not trying to convince each other, that we are not doing propaganda, that we are not trying to persuade each other to believe or not to believe, to follow or not to follow; but in our conversation we are going to find out for ourselves the correct, the truthful solution to the issue.

So what shall we talk about this morning?

Q: It appears that one of the biggest barriers to perception, to insight, to relating to a fact is that when we see the fact of our self interest at work, our self-centredness, that we mind. That we can see, and therefore we do not go into what we see.

K: I understand. When we observe, the questioner asks - and if I am putting it wrongly please correct it - the questioner asks: any issue, or any problem into which we have to have an insight, or a perception, is controlled by the mind, and it is not the perception, it is not the insight, but the quality of the mind that is capable of insight. Is that right sir? Have I put it wrongly?

Q: Not quite. The point seems that there is the nature of our self-interest that we are investigating, and when we look, when we admit momentarily to our self-interest at work, we wake up to what is actually happening, we mind what we see, we don't like what we see each time. Sometimes we do observe it clearly but the problem is when we will not look clearly at our selfishness, at our self-centredness.

K: We do not see our problems, our selfishness very clearly. That is one of the questions we want to discuss. Any others?

Q: When we are aware of people there can possibly be compassion, or there can be very cold awareness. What is the relationship between awareness and compassion?

K: What is the relationship between awareness and compassion.

Q: We generally intellectualize everything we hear, or when we read something, a statement of any kind, we immediately translate it into an intellectual process. Why does this happen and can that end?

Q: I perceive that I can be conscious of my conditioning, of certain conditioning, yet this will keep on coming up and up, and it feels that though I am aware of it I am still caught in it, and I can't seem to free myself from it.

K: When I am aware, or observe my conditioning, I think I am

somewhat free of it but I come back to it again over and over and over. Is that enough for this morning?

Which of these three questions, or four questions, should we take? Why, as that gentleman asked, we don't have a deep insight into our selfishness and be free of it? Then the other question was, what is the relationship between awareness and compassion? And the other question is, why does the mind always intellectualize and therefore avoid the main issue? And the other is, one is aware of the conditioning and one perhaps slightly loosens up the weight of the past but it recurs over and over again? Now which of these four questions do we take up and go into? No answer?

Q: The last one.

K: The last one? Perhaps the other questions can be included in the last question of this person, which is: it seems to happen that occasionally when one is aware and one is interested that this conditioning of many, many centuries is broken down somewhat, but it comes back again and again. What is one to do? Shall we discuss that?

First of all if we go into it seriously, and I hope you want to go into it seriously, we must be very clear not only of the question but also how we approach the question. The approach matters enormously, perhaps more than the question itself. May I go into that a little bit?

There is this question: whether it is possible for the mind to uncondition itself completely and not occasionally? That is the question. How do you approach that question because the manner of your approach will find a solution? But if you approach it with an intellectual concept, then your answer will also be very

superficial. Right sir? Or you want to be completely free of this conditioning and therefore your desire to be free of it is much stronger than the problem itself. Right sir? Or is it a problem to you at all? A real problem, a real issue, like wanting food, or is it merely a superficial, casual question you put while you are here, and then you forget all about it and say, 'Well next year we will trot it out again'?

So do you approach it intellectually, conceptually, do you approach it with a desire to find an answer? All this indicates you are giving a direction to your enquiry. You are directing your enquiry, you are not free to enquire, so you will never find the answer because you are directing what the answer should be. So first please, if you are serious at all, find out how you approach this problem, the question, which is: is it possible for the mind to completely uncondition itself and not occasionally think it is free? Now how do you approach it? The approach is serious and the problem is urgent, demanding, and the problem says you must find a way out of this - right? That means you are deeply concerned with it - as you demand sexual fulfilment, as you demand money, hunger, demand it. Or do you say, 'Well, let's talk about it casually while we are here, and afterwards we will forget all about the beastly thing'? So if you are serious then let's investigate together. I am not investigating, you are investigating, you are enquiring, you are not accepting a thing - right?

So what do we mean by conditioning? Education in certain ways conditions us - going to school, college, university, if you are lucky, or unlucky. And conditioning by the environment in which you live - the economic condition, the political condition, the

cultural condition, the religious conditioning, the conditioning of what you eat, which obviously conditions you, and your relationship with another, intimate or not intimate is a factor of conditioning. So this is what we mean by conditioning. Is that also your perception, understanding, not intellectually but actually, that is the nature of conditioning. That is, if the speaker is born in India and is conditioned by the superstition, by the culture, by the family, and so on and so on and so on, that conditioning is part of the mind, part of the brain, part of his actions, part of his reactions. Now can one be aware of all this? That is the first question. Can I be aware that I have been brought up as a Hindu, with all the superstitions, with all the certain qualities of excellence and so on and so on? Is one aware of that?

Then what do you mean by being aware, conscious, know? Is it an intellectual comprehension - I have understood my conditioning intellectually, which means verbally. That is, when we use the word 'verbally', we mean by that, you hear the statement that you are conditioned, probably you have never even thought about it before, you hear that statement and make that statement into an idea - right? I hope you are following this. Into an idea, and pursue that idea, that you are conditioned. The idea is not the fact - right? So what is it that you do when you say, 'I know I am conditioned', is that an idea with which you are familiar, or is it an actual fact, fact, that you are conditioned as a Christian, as a Swiss, as a Frenchman, an Englishman, or whatever it is, with all the religious superstitions and so on and so on? If you are aware, or if you know you are conditioned as a fact, are you aware of it - not an entity who is aware of something - you follow? You see the difference? I

wonder if you do. When you are hungry you say, 'I am hungry'. That hunger is not different from you - right? Is that right? Is what we are saying, is that correct? I am hungry. You don't say, 'I am different from hunger', you see the fact and you say, 'I am hungry' - right? The 'I' is not separate from hunger. Is that a fact? Please discuss this, go into it, I may be wrong. Let's find out the truth of the matter.

When you are angry is that anger different from you, or you are that, at the moment you are that? Later on you say, 'I have been angry'. Therefore later on you disassociate yourself from anger. Right? So are you aware, or know, or cognizant of the fact that you are conditioned? You are conditioned, not conditioning is different from me. You understand the question? This is really important, if you don't mind, go into it patiently. We will go into it in different ways. Let us stick to this one thing so that we are very, very clear about the matter.

If I say to myself, 'I am different from my conditioning', then I act about the conditioning - right? Then I do something about the conditioning. I work on it, I say, 'I must be free from it', so there is conflict between me and the conditioning. Right sir? Are you doing that? Or you are that conditioning? You have understood? You are not different from the conditioning because you are Christian, you are the result of all the things that go on round about you, so you are that. You are not separate from your conditioning. This is a very complex question because one has to go deeply into it. One's thinking is the result of the conditioning. Right? Please discuss it, don't accept anything I am talking about. This is not a talk by me. We are discussing the thing together, talking over together. The



'me' that observes the conditioning, that 'me', or the observer who thinks he is observing, looking into the conditioning is not different, he is part of that conditioning. If he is different you take a positive action about the conditioning, you say, 'I must get rid of it', 'I must be free of my religious conditioning'. So how am I to be free, what will happen when I am free, will I fall into another conditioning, what will I do, what practices must I do to get rid of my conditioning. All that takes place when the 'me', the observer, says, 'I am different from my conditioning'. Is this clear? Not clear for me, clear to you. It has been clear to me since I was twenty.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, it is not a question of identification. I don't identify myself with my conditioning.

Q: But I am not that conditioning.

K: No, madame. First of all madame, do you know you are conditioned? What do you mean you know you are conditioned? That you are a Catholic, Protestant, or a Socialist, Liberal, or belonging to this Institution or that Institution, that you believe and don't believe.

Q: I can see it but I cannot verbalize what is me.

K: Now wait a minute. I understand the question. I cannot verbalize what is the 'me'. Can't you? The 'me' is your senses with which you identify. Or you belong to somebody, or you have identified yourself with a particular nation, with a particular name, with a particular family, with a particular group of people, with a particular series of conclusions, ideals. If you are none of these, actually none of these, then you are free from the conditioning.

Q: If I see astrology I feel that is true also.

K: I am afraid I don't understand what you are saying. You are not explaining clearly madame. What is it you want to say?

Q: We are just playing at something, acting in life, but it is not that. There is an unconscious conditioning as well, a deeper conditioning.

K: Do you mean, consciously you are not conditioned, but deep down you are? Is that what you mean? If you don't know what you mean, I give up.

Please, this is an important subject because if you can understand very profoundly this question, whether the mind can be really completely free of conditioning; if it can then all our problems will be resolved, both economic problems, social problems, and so-called psychological problems, the outer and the inner, by understanding the whole nature and the structure of conditioning and being completely free from it, then the whole thing becomes entirely different.

So what we are saying is: are we aware, know, conscious, recognize that we are conditioned? That is the first thing. If you are conditioned, and you say, 'Yes, I am', is the 'I' that says, 'I am conditioned', is that 'I' different from the conditioning, or both are the same? This is an important question you have basically to understand. The 'I', the observer who says, 'I am conditioned', that observer is not different from the thing which he calls conditioning. He is that. Without that conditioning what are you? If you have no name, don't identify with your body, no group, no nationality, no belief, no religion, you follow, if you discard all that, where is the 'I' with all the selfishness, ambition? It is washed away. So this is a very important question, if you are at all serious,

to go into.

So if you see that the 'I' is separate from the conditioning then you act upon it. This action is called positive. The positive action of this kind is to struggle with it, to find out the causes of conditioning, how deeply you are conditioned, whether you can do something about it, or go to somebody and ask them what to do, they will tell you what to do, which is practice, you know all the rest of it. Whereas the actual fact is the entity that says, 'I am conditioned and I want to be free from it', that entity is also conditioned. Therefore there is only conditioning, not 'I am conditioned'. You have understood this simple fact?

So the battle is over between me and the conditioning. Then we can examine without division. You understand, sir? Have you got it, really got it? That you are part of that conditioning, you are not different from that conditioning, therefore you cannot analyse that conditioning - right? If you analyse there is the analyser and the conditioning - you follow. So if you see the actual fact that the analyser is the analysed - please, I happened to discuss this matter, the analyser and the analysed, with a lot of professional analysts, very clever, top people, they immediately said, 'We don't understand this, please go and talk somewhere else' - because it means they lose their job - don't laugh, we are all in that position - lose their job, their position, their victims or patients, and so on and so on. So this is really a very, very serious question.

The conflict between the analyser and the analysed gives strength to the analyser, which is the 'me'. The analyser is the past, the past is conditioning the analyser - right? Do see this. The past is conditioning, or has conditioned the analyser, and the analyser then

says, 'I am going to analyse my conditioning'. So he is going round and round in circles. So to realize the absurdity, the fallacy of analysis is to break down this division. Which means, the conditioning is me. The conditioning isn't over there, it is here.

So then arises the question which is really important from there: then if I am that, what am I to do? You have understood sir? I am not persuading you to anything, don't accept it, find out these facts for yourself.

Q: I don't accept anything. Why does the observer separate himself?

K: Why does the observer, the analyser, or the experiencer, or the thinker, why does he separate himself - right? Why?

Q: He wants to be free from it.

K: He wants to be free of it. That is, the analyser wants to be free of the analysed, therefore he separates himself.

Q: To make himself more strong.

K: That's all. No, go into this question, it is important too. Why is there division between the analyser and the analysed? That is what we are discussing. The conditioned and the entity that says, 'I am not conditioned but I am going to uncondition myself'. So what is the problem? We are saying, why is there this division? Go on.

Q: The analyser is the fact, he is actually in the present.

K: But why is there this division?

Q: Because we always want to identify.

K: Don't throw out ideas, guess.

Q: Shouldn't the analyser accept his own conditioning?

K: Madame, let's put the analyser differently. Is the experiencer different from experience? Is the thinker different from thought? If

there is no thinker there is no thought. Or there may be a totally different state. The experiencer says, 'I am different from the experience, I must have that experience, because I am different'. We are asking, why is there this division between the experiencer who says, 'I must have more of that experience' - sexual experience, or the experience of power and so on and so on - why is there this division?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do you know, or are you merely guessing? Please find out. If you know why the division exists, is it an intellectual conclusion, an argument, a deduction, from that deduction you say, 'It is so'? Or you say, 'I really don't know'?

Q: Sir, there seems to be no space in the consciousness. When I observe the observed there seems to be no space.

K: I see. So by creating space between the observer and the observed have I understood the whole business? Have I? You have space between the observer and the observed. You have space when you say, 'I want that experience', there is space.

Q: Why does it matter, why do you have to find out?

K: I will tell you. Why do you have to find out? Are you asking this of me, or of yourself?

Q: Myself.

K: If you are asking yourself, why do you ask it? Just out of curiosity?

Q: No, I was thinking..

K: No, just see. When there is a division there is conflict, isn't there? When there is division between the Arab and the Jew, between the Catholic and the Protestant, or the North Irishman and

the British, division in any form must bring about conflict. So when there is a division between the experiencer, the analyser, the thinker and the thought, the experience, there must be conflict. Right, sir? So it is a law that where there is division there must be conflict. If there is a conflict between me and my wife it means there is no relationship. Right? There is conflict.

Q: Sir, the other day you told us that when we are in sorrow and we are not trying to escape from it, but just watch it. But you warned us too when we are watching our sorrow not to identify ourselves with the sorrow. It seems for me quite impossible just to watch it. While I am watching my sorrow I am watching with a part of me. With what part of the mind do I have to watch my sorrow?

K: That is what we are going to find out, sir. You use sorrow and myself. I am different from sorrow. And if there is that division then I do something about sorrow. I work at it, I say, 'I must not be sorrowful, what is the reason for that sorrow' and so on, analyse. The moment I begin to analyse it I separate myself from the thing I am analysing. Is this clear?

Q: It is very easy to look at the manifestations of your conditioning. But what we are trying to do here, if I have understood it: I, inside myself, am trying to look at my own conditioning inside myself. That is a different question. My consciousness is trying to be conscious of itself. I am conditioned to say something.

K: Yes, what are you asking, sir?

Q: I am just pointing out that the conditioning we are trying to look at is not really an outer manifestation. We are looking at the

conditioning in here, if you see what I mean.

K: I am afraid it is an outward manifestation. When I am a Muslim and I hate the Hindu, my conditioning brings war.

Q: But that is not the problem.

K: That is one of the problems.

Q: That is one of the consequences of being conditioned.

K: That is what I said, sir. That's right. One of the consequences of being conditioned.

Q: But the truth is one is conditioned, and we are trying to look at what is conditioned, not the manifestations of that conditioning.

K: I must not only observe..

Q: All right, I will put it in a question. Can my consciousness be conscious of itself, and will that promote a proper change within me?

K: Yes.

Q: Is that a promise?

K: Oh no! It is not a promise. How can I promise somebody will be free? What a ridiculous question that is.

Q: Then it is a ridiculous answer.

K: Probably.

Q: Sir, may I say something. Many of us have been here many years.

K: I agree!

Q: Many times, probably thirty or maybe twenty years. I am exactly where I was on the very first day.

K: That's right, sir.

Q: What I feel about it is that you have made the present point over and over again in different words - I am sorry if I am talking

too long, because when you cover your face I know you are impatient, I don't want that. Can you hear, because I can speak a little louder if you can't.

K: The gentleman says, he has been here a number of years, hearing over and over and over again the explanations, the various forms of analysis, all that, and he says after these number of years he is where he is - as most of us are.

Q: May I continue a little bit, sir? Because that is not really my question, that was a preamble. What I feel is that you have got a certain point to make, and you are making it in a multitude of different ways, whether it is the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, experiencer and the experience, and so forth, it is all really one point. If we can't understand that point when you put it in one set of words we are not going to understand it if you change it into another set of words. What you want to do - and I don't blame you because you are impatient with us, sitting here asking the same old stupid questions again and again and again, you want to get off and in a very little while from where you reached a little while ago where you pointed out that the mind that was observing the conditioning was itself conditioned and therefore couldn't do a thing about it. That point seemed to me to be the crux of the whole issue.

K: Quite right sir.

Q: If we really see that in five minutes we are with you on Cloud 9, we have seen the lot. If we don't see that we will come back here tomorrow and every year thereafter. We are obviously very stupid people because you have evidently done something on your own without having to be pushed and goaded into it. We are



impervious to being pushed and pushed, and goaded, but if you really want some chance of this point which you have been trying to make for fifty years, to get across to us, I am afraid you will have to be a lot more patient because it is no use your continuing from the point which you reached, thinking we have got that far, we haven't got that far.

K: So what shall I do, sir?

Q: It is a very big problem, sir, I don't know what you should do. Next year we will be exactly in the same position. If we delude ourselves that we have understood something, but actually we have understood nothing.

K: So here we are. We have come to an impasse. You have heard the speaker for ten, thirty years, or two years, or a day, and we haven't met each other at the central point. And the speaker makes this in ten different ways, using a new set of words, speaking in Dutch or French or whatever it is, but the central point has not been understood by each one of us and there you are. It is an impasse. So what shall we do? Why don't you walk out? I am asking, why don't you say, 'Sorry, this is impossible, nonsense' and walk out?

Q: I see we are conditioned by your presence.

K: The lady says, we are conditioned by your presence. I will walk out. I think we are playing with words. Madame, just a minute, please. That gentleman raised a very good question. We have heard you for a number of years, we haven't changed. Perhaps a little bit, a little bit here, a little bit there, but actually we have not changed at all. We are not totally unconditioned ourselves. And if there is a total unconditioning the thing is over - we shall live

differently, there will be etc. etc. So what shall we do? Would sitting together quietly uncondition you? No. Talking about it has not unconditioned you. Whose fault is it? Not fault, whose responsibility - without the word responsibility involving guilt, remove that word guilt away from responsibility. Whose responsibility is this?

Q: It is our responsibility.

K: Then if it is your responsibility, what are you doing about it?

Q: Do you wonder whether it might be yours in part?

K: I am asking myself. I said to you, is it my fault, is it partly the speaker's impatience, the speaker's presence, the speaker's dominance, the speaker's personality?

Q: The way you put it.

K: The way I put it. The way I put it. How shall I put it? Please tell me how I should put it. I'd be delighted to know.

Q: I would say we are taking the wrong approach. It is not a cause. I think we are looking for the cause of us being here. I..

K: You are not helping me, sir. You are not saying something.

Q: I am saying why have you made it into a problem?

K: I have not made it into a problem. Please sir, just a minute. I am not making a problem.

Q: Isn't it a fact that all this talking here of us, is just the talking of the 'me'? And the 'me' actually has to vanish.

K: Quite right, sir.

Q: The one who talks with the 'me' receives extra benefit, though he makes suggestions, he never makes suggestions of any such thing. So these talks we cannot say anything about it. But the one who is speaking only becomes stronger so he talks like this.

K: I know sir. Could we put it very, very simply. We are selfish people - right? Our actions are selfish.

Q: Totally?

K: We are selfish people. I didn't say totally, or not totally.

Q: I want to put it: totally or not?

K: You may be occasionally unselfish.

Q: We must leave that aside, but the drive is within one, to be, to have, not to do.

K: All right. To be, to have, to possess, that is part of selfishness.

Q: That's why I ask, is it total.

K: All right, if you want me to put it that way. That is essence of our existence. That is the total drive, as you could call it. Now is it possible - I am just putting it quietly, gently - is it possible to be free of that tremendous drive of wanting to be, wanting to become, wanting to possess, wanting to identify with something, can all that drive end?

Q: That drive also goes with the direction of the next year, a higher year, the ending being a higher year.

K: No, no, no. That is where you and I part company. You insist on going higher and higher, becoming more and more refined. I say that is still the same drive.

Q: I say the same.

K: Madame, just listen. The same drive refined, but it is still the same. So I am asking, is that drive, which is the essence of the self, selfishness, and all the rest of it, can that end?

Q: At which point does that question become clean?

K: Clean? What do you mean by that, I don't understand?

Q: Every step that one takes poses a question: is there any point where the question is clean of that drive?

K: Yes. There is a point when the drive cleanly ends.

Q: Ok.

K: There is no Ok! Please listen carefully. Either you are trying to find out whether that drive can end, or you are just arguing.

Q: I asked the question for me. The drive and its perpetuation and its ending seem totally unrelated to each other.

K: Maybe. But do I know the limits, the expanse, the extension, the extent of that drive? Because in that drive there is every form of violence and so on and so on. So I am asking myself, or you are asking yourself, can that drive end?

Q: I ask, who is asking the question? And I know for myself who is asking the question.

K: Obviously, you are asking yourself.

Q: The drive continually takes a step back, it tries to simulate a disinterestedness, an objectivity, which is not inherent in its nature.

K: Madame, what are you to do? You insist on one thing. Perhaps, if I may respectfully point out, you have perhaps not listened, you are sticking to your point. You may accuse me that I am sticking to my point.

Q: No, I am prepared to say that here we part company. Let's put it this way: that here we part company.

K: Look, please, as I said before and I repeat again, I am not trying to convince you of anything. I am not telling you what to do. I am not your guru, or a subtle form of - you know, all that stuff. I am saying because we are conditioned, from that conditioning all problems arise. That's all. From that conditioning there is a certain

drive - to use her word. The drive is more and more to be separate, more and more violence, as objectively it is happening in the world and so on and on and on. A man, a woman, who is serious, says, 'Will there be an end to all this?' - that's all. Or must this go on in a refined state, more and more subtle ways of violence, more and more subtle ways of conflict, more and more subtle ways of keeping up the division and so on and so on. That is what it comes to, essentially what that lady says.

The speaker says, for himself, not that you must accept, don't accept, he says there is a total ending of this drive, which is in essence the self. Then you will say, 'How does it manifest itself in daily life?' I say to that, 'Find out'. Find out to what extent you are selfish, to what extent you are self-centred, concerned about yourself both inwardly and outwardly - find out. And see if that is not causing tremendous harm in the world, when each human being is occupied with himself, which is our conditioning. If you want to find out if one can live harmoniously, happily, supremely intelligently, outwardly and inwardly, you have to find out for yourself whether you can be free of this drive. Which means, are you willing to give time, energy - you follow? Apparently, although you may listen for ten years, or fifteen, or a week, apparently this doesn't exist. And to that you may say you are using wrong words, you may use different expressions. To that we will say, we are using ordinary, everyday language.

Q: All that you have said up to now belongs in the same package.

K: Of course madame. Of course it belongs in the same package. But to explain the content of the package one must use

words.

Q: Yes, that is the content. The different aspects all carry the same ego.

K: Yes, madame, understood.

Q: The examination is no different to the content.

K: What will you do, madame? You know the content as well as I do, and most of us know what the content is, what we are carrying in the bag for the rest of our lives, most of you know. Then why don't you, or another put it aside?

Q: No, it can't be done.

K: Well it is finished. Madame.

Q: Because I putting aside is for the same purpose.

K: You say it can't be done. Wait. That's enough.

Q: Now when there is tremendous effort, in whatever disguise, one can wait for the full scheme of self improvement. Ok Now we leave that aside.

K: I don't know what you are talking about.

Q: Drop it. But when you say to me, 'Why don't you drop it?', I say, 'First of all I am not interested in making efforts to drop. If my shoes pinch I will buy another pair of shoes'.

K: But madame, that is not the question.

Q: It is the same thing. You say to someone, drop it, it doesn't happen that way. It can't be done that way. Everyone here knows that it doesn't happen that way. I don't know what makes it different, why it should happen, when it should happen, it doesn't seem to have any cause, any reason, it seems to be unrelated to all that rubbish, or desire, or being so objective about it.

K: If a particular diet doesn't suit me, I change the diet.

Q: I know why I change the diet.

K: Wait madame.

Q: You always want to go away. You always want to go and seek in terms of changing the diet. You think it is a clean action. It is not.

K: You say you cannot change. You cannot radically bring about a transformation, it is impossible. All right, finished. Then why do you stay here?

Q: Go home.

K: No, please.

Q: I find again and again, and you yourself reiterate the point, there is nothing you can do. Only when the observer is the observed then, only when there is no experiencer, the first step is the last step. You yourself point this out again and again.

K: The conversation between us ends.

Q: I didn't understand one thing. I am conditioned (inaudible)

K: I don't know quite where I am, do you?

Q: I feel that I am seldom free of my conditioning and of my replies, I don't know if I am existing any more.

K: What will happen to me, the questioner says, if I end the drive? We are using a new set of words. What will happen, will that be the end of me? Probably.

You see apparently any amount of our talking together doesn't do anything. You can cleverly oppose what one says, or say, use different language, different expression, this and that, but as we said we are using ordinary common English. Now we have come to a point when apparently the words - knowing the word is not the thing - the word and the description - the description is not the

described - knowing all that, we are confronted with a simple problem, which is: we human beings are very selfish, limited, and from that limited state of mind our whole problem arises. We are destroying the earth and so on and so on, which all of us know. Now what shall we do? To me, personally, if I listen, that is enough for me. If I listen accurately, that is enough for me. To me, personally, someone says to me, 'Is it possible to end this drive of the self?', which is the selfishness and all that, will you end it, is it possible to end it and will you end it if you find it? If I hear it completely, as I do, then the very statement of that is acting on me. I don't argue, I don't say, 'Show me'. I have learnt the art - not learnt - the art of listening. That's all. If I listen accurately the thing is embedded in me, it works.

Now this morning we have talked an hour and twenty minutes. Where are we? Are we going to say, 'I am in exactly the same place as I was ten years ago' - or the same place, not the actual physical space, in myself, I haven't moved. I am still appallingly selfish. I am still being driven by that. All right. Is that what you have learnt this morning? Is that what we have learnt, that we are terribly selfish people, that this selfishness is the drive in our life, and there is no answer to it? We will go on our way as we have been doing for millennia. If that is so, we can't communicate with each other because the speaker says, it is not only an absolute necessity to end that drive because it is creating havoc in the world, and also he says, yes, it can be done. Will you listen to that? Or say, 'No, I have listened to you for ten years and nothing'? Will you listen with your heart, with your mind, to something - when you love something you listen? Right. When you love your little baby



you listen to it. So can you listen so carefully, so attentively, with affection, to this statement: that we are being driven by selfishness and are you aware of it, can you end it? Let's find out whether it is possible. If you don't want to end it, it is perfectly all right. Nobody is asking you to end it. If that is the way you want to live - conflict, wars, you know all that is going on in the world, one superstition against another, which is called religion, one nationality against another - if you want all that it is your affair, go on. But if you say, 'That's all wrong, that is all the drive of the self, is there a different way of living?' I say, let's talk it over together. That's all.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 27TH JULY 1978

Before we begin to bombard each other with a lot of questions and arguments, I wonder if you read in the newspaper - I don't generally read newspapers, I look at the headlines - that the world every year is spending four hundred billion dollars on armaments. That is four hundred thousand million dollars. I don't know what that sum means but that is what is being spent on trying to kill each other. I wonder, after reading such a statement, what will make human beings change? Yesterday, that gentleman on my left put a question: he said I have listened to you for so many years, listened to your talks, listened to your tapes and so on, and I am exactly where I started when I began. I think it would be important if we could go into that question rather seriously. Perhaps most of us are in that position - perhaps.

What will make a human being change very deeply? This has been a great problem for those people who are concerned with the transformation of man. What makes us change? If you put that question to yourself seriously, and ask with all depth of your being, what will make you change? Will an external event bring about a crisis in your life and that forces you to do some radical thinking and change? A death in the family, an incident or an event, or a happening, that is devastating, psychologically as well as physically - will that bring about deep change? Or must you go through great pain, great sorrow, great agony, brought about by external events, and forces you, forces a human being to alter his course, his drive, his direction, his selfishness, his limited brutal

thinking? We have had several wars and most of us have perhaps lived through two wars, devastating wars, millions have been killed. Think of the misery, the confusion, the enormous sorrow of those people who have had great losses, not only physical losses but their sons destroyed. And apparently superficial events, however great they are, don't seem to bring about a freedom, say, 'This cannot happen again' - do you understand?

So I am asking you, this has been a question which we have considered many, many times - will external events change man? That is one problem. That is, superficial events. And apparently that has not changed man - change in the sense we mean, a real deep transformation of this selfish drive, identified with groups, with nations, with beliefs, dogmas, religion, and all the rest of it. And apparently - please follow this - apparently some superficial event, like the death of one's husband, wife, children, does bring through great pain and sorrow a certain change in oneself. I do not know if you have not noticed it. Does that mean we must depend on external events - death, war, somebody leaving you and so on and so on and so on, external devastating events, will that change you? Which means that you must depend on outward things, which will then put you through great agony and suffering and out of that you come, bringing about perhaps a deep mutation - right?

It seems to us that that is the most appalling thing, even to say, that we must go through suffering to bring a change. That's inconceivable, but yet that is what happens, apparently. It is like a man who is driving a car rather carelessly, kills others and survives, and afterwards he says, 'I am going to be awfully careful how I drive' - he is intelligent after the event. You follow? Is it

possible to be intelligent before the event? You understand my question? Intelligent meaning, not become more clever in this instinctual survival of selfishness, of that drive of desire and so on and so on, but that intelligence that is born out of the perception that superficially events do not fundamentally change man, but that change must come totally inwardly, without any pressure, without any incident, event, to perceive that is part of intelligence. To perceive the truth that if I depend on outward pressure, outward events which puts me through a great deal of sorrow and anxiety, I will either become cynical, bitter or escape into some form of entertainment. So in that there is no deep change. To see that is part of intelligence. The materialists, the communists, the totalitarian people say, change the outward events then man changes. But that has been tried through millenia - right? And apparently man has not changed.

And also there is this statement made by several gurus and teachers in the east, and perhaps in the west, that surrender yourself then all your problems are solved. You again surrender to something outside, or surrender to something which you have created - you follow all this? I wonder if you understand. Please, are we understanding each other? This is very important after the question of that gentleman yesterday. He said, 'I have listened to you for so many years and I have not changed. I am where I started out.' You know to hear such a statement you cry inwardly. You understand? I wonder how many of you cried inwardly. And what will change him, or you, or another? Is it, as we said, an external event, devastating, which brings about sorrow, and then sorrow if it is deep it shatters everything that you have had, and then perhaps

you say, 'I can't live this way anymore' - so you are again depending on an external event? And external events can be vast - wars, earthquakes, and so on, external events. Realizing that these religious - can I use the word exploiters? - these religious exploiters - with your consent I am using that word - say, give yourself over, surrender. You understand the implications of it? Surrender naturally to the guru, to the man who says, 'Surrender', but inwardly do you eliminate this drive, this self-centredness and so on and so on? You understand? Again the same phenomenon, which is outward pressure, now you are exerting inward pressure to submit to somebody else. Have you understood this? Can we go on from there?

Now do you listen to all this - that outward pressure is not going to change, inward giving yourself over to a presence, a reality, to god, to this, or to that, is still the desire which drives you to forget yourself, but the self is still there only covered up. So do you listen to these statements - right? Or it doesn't mean a thing at all? So perhaps the root of the matter lies there: intellectually, verbally you see reasonably, logically, the statements we have made just now, very clear, unless you want to change the words, but the essence of it is that the outward pressure through sorrow, and the inward pressure to escape from yourself - right - which again is another form of pressure. Do you listen to this so that you see the truth of it, that whether it be pressure from outside or from inside there is no change. To see that, to hear that and see that fact, that is intelligence. You understand? So are you, forgive me for asking this question, are you, who have listened to this this morning, clearly exposed, logically, sanely, do you see the actuality of it, the

truth of it and therefore there is intelligence? Therefore that intelligence is the denial of the outer or the inner, and therefore moving from where you are. Do you understand?

Now have you listened this morning, taken in, seriously gone into it, as we did just now, and seen that pressure outward or inward, in different ways, in different forms, will not bring about the radical mutation? To hear that and see it is intelligence. Do you see it? Do you have that intelligence? Therefore that intelligence acts before the event so that man has not to go through sorrow. If you discover that, it is something - you follow - it is a divine gift. Sorry to use the word divine. It is a great, enormous gift because before the event, catastrophic devastating event, that brings sorrow, or any pressure outward or inward will not change man, when he realizes that, sees the truth of that, that intelligence is operating wherever it is - whether in your daily life, whether it is in an office, you follow, all the time that is operating. Right?

Now let us discuss, or let's talk it over, if you want to.

Q: (In French)

K: He says, I am very glad I came here to listen to all this, I am very grateful.

Q: What is loneliness?

K: Any other?

Q: Yesterday we arrived half way to this idea of being free from conditioning. We stopped at the point one is aware that one is conditioned. My question is what happens after you are aware, and why does it seem that one is overtaken by this conditioning process?

K: Shall we go back to that? Are you bored with it?

Q: This question of conditioning, I would like to see if the body itself is conditioned. What is the relationship of the conditioning and identification?

K: What is the relationship between conditioning and identification, with the body, with an event, and so on?

Q: Is the body itself conditioned?

K: Obviously. Right sir? What was the other question that lady asked?

Q: Loneliness.

K: Shall we start with that and work into this question of whether it is possible to understand this question of conditioning, not only the actual fact of being conditioned, what takes place when the mind is not conditioned. That is more difficult.

What is loneliness? Is loneliness separate from solitude? I am not quibbling about words. You understand my question? To be alone is different from being lonely. Alone means all one. I am using the English language. The dictionary says, the word alone means all one. See the significance of that: aloneness, solitude and loneliness. So we are asking, what is loneliness? Have you ever discovered for yourself what is loneliness? Or you have never lived with it long enough to see what it is? Or being frightened of loneliness you move away from it and try to fill that loneliness with amusement, literature, you follow, music and yoga, whatever it is. So there is loneliness, solitude, aloneness. How does this loneliness come about? You asked that question, madam, don't take notes - you won't be able to pay attention while you are taking notes - forgive me for pointing it out.

That is, most of us are unconsciously or consciously lonely -

right? How does this loneliness take place? How does it happen? Aren't we in our actions in daily life, in our relationship with each other, acting for ourselves - no? - for our selfishness. We are all the time acting, living, driving, creating, moving, from a centre - our reactions are from a centre - right? So this constant activity, which is essentially either withdrawal or resistance, must inevitably create the thing called loneliness. You understand? Look: I am married - I am not! - One is married or one has a girl, or a boy, or whatever it is. Are you really related to that person? Or there is always a barrier, a distance, an interval, a space - I am using the space in the sense a withdrawal from the other - right? That is, you are concerned about yourself, your progress, your success, what you are doing, your ambitions, your vanities, your aggressiveness and so on and so on - right? And she is also concerned in a different way about that, so how can there be a relationship between the two when each person is concerned about themselves? It is very simple. That is a fact. Right? Now just a minute, listen carefully. That is a fact, that fact creates conflict - jealousy, dominance, identification with the other, that identification is part of that desire to avoid, run away from oneself, all that. You have listened to it, haven't you. Now you have listened to it. Have you listened to it, or you are translating what is being said in your own terms so that you are actually not listening, therefore you are avoiding - avoiding facing the fact that there is this separateness between you and your wife, girl, boy, and therefore there is this constant tension, constant effort, constant struggle? Right? Do you listen to that. Which means by listening to it very carefully you are beginning to find out for yourself that this loneliness is a movement in which all



relationship with another has ended, with nature, complete isolation. Now do you see that intelligently and therefore the division ceases? I wonder if you do. And therefore there is no loneliness. You have understood this, actually, don't theorize about it, end it.

Then there is the question of solitude - right? Solitude, it's a lovely word, in which is implied when you are walking alone in the woods, not carrying all your troubles, your problems, your anxieties, you are just walking, looking at the trees, the clouds, listening to the birds and the running water, you are absolutely alone, in solitude you are enjoying it. And when you are alone, completely alone, you have left everything behind - you understand? - your girls, your husbands, your wife, your belief, everything 'is down the river'! In that aloneness there is actually, if you have gone very carefully into it, no division. Right? Do you listen to this, or is it romantic - you know, what a lovely thing that is! Or you have seen the enormous danger of loneliness, brought about by our own self-centred reactions? If you have seen that you can go on. Right.

So let's talk about conditioning. As the gentleman pointed out just now, we went to a certain extent and we were rather driven off our course. It was like that gentleman asked, I have listened to you for a number of years and there is nothing. I must tell you a lovely story about this. A pupil goes to a teacher and says, 'Teach me what is truth', and he says, 'All right, stay with me and we'll have a conversation about the universe, about the beauty of the land and so on and so on, and perhaps you will see truth'. So the teacher talks to him everyday and goes into various things. At the end of

fifteen years, he says, 'Master, I have lived with you for fifteen years, watched you, listened to you, seen how you act, do this and do that, but I haven't got truth. So I am leaving you. There is a man a few miles further away where I am going to learn from him the truth.' So the teacher says, 'Certainly'. So he is away for five years and comes back to the original teacher and he says, 'I have found it'. And he says, 'Really, have you found it?' He says, 'Yes, there is that river', they were standing on the banks of a river, 'There is that river and I can walk across it. I have found it'. The teacher then says, 'You have taken five years to learn this and more?' 'Yes'. And the teacher says, 'There is a boat, if you pay a cent you can cross it' - right? Got it? Most of us are like that! We pay enormous efforts to do things where it is so simple.

Now let's start about conditioning. We explained very carefully what is the meaning of that word. Physically we are conditioned, you are a woman, I am a man. You are short, I am tall, or brown, white, pink or whatever it is. That is so, that is part of our conditioning. That is normal, healthy, natural. We are talking about psychological conditioning, which is the mind being conditioned - the mind being our feelings, our sensations, our emotions, imagination, and the intellectual concepts - the fears, the anxieties, the guilt, the hurts and so on and so on. Is all that part of our conditioning psychologically, which may be called consciousness? We are using ordinary words, if you want me to use different sets of words I can use them, but let's stick to the ordinary original meaning. The mind, which includes thought, feeling, imagination, romanticism, and the sensations. So it is limited, that is, limited by the culture in which it lives - the country in which it lives, the

tradition, the superstition, the religion, the economic condition, the social structure - do this, don't do that, this is right, this is wrong, from the family, etc. All that is the content of our mind, the content of our consciousness. That's clear and simple. So a mind that is cultured, that is brought up in a limited sense, which is the conditioning - when you use conditioning it implies limited, conditioned, it is not extensive, it is not universal, global, it is limited, conditioned - right? Now when one's mind is so conditioned, and your mind is so conditioned, there is division. Obviously. I am an Arab and you are a Jew - both Semitic races but divided by language, by race, by prejudice, by beliefs, by dogmas, I believe in the Prophet, and you believe in something else, and I am willing to fight you, kill you and you are willing. That is part of our conditioning.

Now we are asking - please just listen, don't agree or disagree, just find out - I am asking you, or you are asking yourself, do you know you are conditioned? Or somebody is telling you, you are conditioned - you see the difference? I wonder if you see the difference. Do you see the difference? Is it your own discovery, or somebody has discovered this and tells you about it, with which you agree? See the difference? Long before the world war, the second world war, a very famous journalist came to see me, to see the speaker. And we were talking about various things that were happening in the world, he was a very, very intelligent man, very well known, and I brought up this questioning of conditioning. And he said, 'Only the Indian mind can think that'. You understand? We were talking about the conditioning of man, he never applied it to himself but, 'It is the capacity of the Indian mind that goes into

such subtleties'. You follow? So I am asking you whether you are being told about it, and therefore you realize it; or you realize for yourself that you are conditioned? If you are told about it and agree, that has one effect, a superficial effect, a devious effect, a doubtful effect, a sceptical effect, you say, 'Yes, you say so, but so-and-so doesn't say so. I prefer the other.' Or if you yourself realize it, it is so, it is so. It doesn't matter, a million people can say, 'Nonsense', it is so. It's like being hungry, others can say, 'You are not hungry, old boy, you are pretending', but if I am hungry I know it. You see the difference. So let's be very clear that we see the difference. Now if you see the difference that you yourself by looking at the world, at what is happening in the world - the culture, the tradition, the superstition, the religious nonsense and so on and so on - and you realize 'I am that'. Right? Wait, let me finish, a moment, what we are talking about conditioning, you can then argue, or question if you wish.

So let us be very clear that the condition is not imposed on you, persuaded by another, logically, illogically, or rationally, or merely he wants to tell you a story. That is one thing. The other is for oneself to see the danger of being conditioned. You understand? Do you see that for yourself?

Q: Yes, I see this for myself.

K: All right. The gentleman says, yes, you don't have to tell me, I know I am conditioned.

Q: If you see something.

K: Yes, we went into that yesterday.

Q: How can you see the conditioned when you are conditioned?

K: How can you know that you are conditioned if I am

conditioned? You follow the question? He says, how do you know, are aware, that you are conditioned, if you don't observe it as something separate from you then you can say, 'I know'. But if you yourself are conditioned, how can you say, 'I am conditioned'? You see the problem? No? I'll have to explain it. Everything has got to be explained.

You see the difficulty. If I see that the entity that is speaking is conditioned, how do I know that I am conditioned? It is only when I look at it as something outside of myself then I can say, 'I am conditioned'. Am I explaining your question properly, sir? This is not being subtle, it is being simple about it. How do you know that you are in pain? Somebody tells you that you are in pain, or is pain separate from you which says, 'I am in pain'? You follow what I am saying? Somebody puts a pin in your leg and you have pain, pain through nerves and so on to the brain and you say, 'There is pain'. You know pain for itself - right? - caused by a physical accident, or pain or grief and so on and so on. So you know when you have pain. So can't you know equally that this conditioning is there? Either you approach it from the outer - the results of conditioning from the outer, wars, division, conflict, you are a Muslim, I am a Hindu, Catholic, Protestant, from the outer move to the inner, and see logically this sense of separation, which is the conditioning, creates pain, conflict. So then you enquire what are the reasons of this conflict. Then you discover it is because human beings are conditioned - Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Muslim, Arab, Jew and all the rest of it. So there is an awareness that conditioning itself, like pain, is there - right? Have I made myself clear. So let's proceed from there.

Now the next question is - that is nobody is telling you, you know it, as you know pain - then why not leave it alone? Why not leave this conditioning alone? There are some good conditionings, as that gentleman said yesterday, I'll keep those good conditionings and reject those unpleasant conditionings. Please see this. I will reject the unpleasant conditionings and keep the pleasant ones. Right? That is what he said. Now who chooses? You understand my question? This I will keep, this I won't keep. Again the entity who is conditioned. So choice is conditioning. I wonder if you see that. Do you see that, sir? Any form of psychological choice is conditioning: I will keep these and reject those, which is based on choice. The choice is the result of either pleasure, gratifying, or it is painful so I will throw those away. We are talking of the total conditioning, not just the pleasant ones and the unpleasant ones.

From that the next question is: is it possible, having listened to all this very carefully, understood everything in detail that we have described, then you ask, is it possible to be unconditioned, both at the superficial level of consciousness and also at the deeper layers, deeper, the greater depth of consciousness, that is totally? You asked this question not out of idle curiosity but you see what conditioning has done in the world - right? Four hundred billion dollars every year spent on armaments, do you realize what it means? I don't think you do. That is the conditioning - each protecting himself.

Q: Why don't we throw away our conditioning?

K: Throw it away, have you? She says, just throw it away. Is it so easy? As you throw a dirty handkerchief, or a dirty piece of paper, you throw it away. Is it so easy? I wish it were. Do you

mean to say a man who has been a Catholic, or a woman who has been carefully baptized, brought up in Catholicism, practising Catholicism, soaked in it, that is his conditioning, do you say, 'Just drop it, old boy'. Will he do it? Please.

Q: It seems to go beyond that perception. I can perceive the reality of it, yet it recurs.

K: I am going into that, I am going into that. It recurs because one doesn't see the complete danger of it. It never recurs if you throw yourself down a precipice, does it? Once you see the danger of a precipice it is finished. You never say, 'Well, I'll try again'! So the question is, why don't you see totally, completely the danger of conditioning, the entirety of it, not just little bits of it? Because you are still in that position, keeping some which are pleasant, and putting away the others which are not. So you are playing a game with yourself. Right? So can you see for yourself - and the seeing of it is the essence of intelligence - that conditioning is a tremendous danger to man? You have a very good example: human beings are spending four hundred billion dollars every year on armaments. And you can say, 'What can I do about it?' But you elect the politicians. If you felt the tremendous danger of conditioning you act, you don't argue. Right sir? Now the question is: do you see the danger of it, if you don't, why? Look: the danger of ambition, the politician trying to govern the people, politely but tremendously ambitious to come on top of the heap. There was a prime minister who spoke at a Union - a Union of students - saying, don't be ambitious! You understand, the joke of it? Because he is right on top, and says, don't be ambitious. But we don't see the danger of ambition, which is to have power, which is to have

position - right? If you saw the immense danger of it, it is finished, you don't argue, you don't say, 'What happens after if you have no ambition?' You have no ambition because you are intelligent.

Right, sir?

So we are asking why don't you see the immense danger of being held within a small narrow space - which is our conditioning? Why don't you? Is it you must have a disastrous event, then you say, 'By Jove, I will give it up'. That means you are waiting for an external event to take place and shake you, which will give you a great deal of pain and sorrow, and you say, 'Yes, I understand it now'. Which means you are not intelligent; you are waiting for an incident to make you intelligent, but no event can make you intelligent. Got it? You understand it?

So you see, I'll go into it a little further. One realizes, if you are serious, I hope you are all serious, one realizes that one is conditioned. And one realizes the danger of it, logically. Then you say to yourself, how am I to give it up, how am I to break down the narrow walls which I have created, which culture has created, and so on and so on, how is the mind to break down this? Right? I don't know, so I come to you. I say, 'Please, how am I to break this?' Listen carefully. And you begin assuming that you are a great man, or this, or that, and he says, 'I'll tell you what to do'. That is, do this, do this, do this, and you will break it, which means again I am depending on the external person to tell me what to do. So I realize the stupidity of going to another to help me to break down the walls which I have built round myself. So what am I to do? Are you in that position? What am I to do to break down this wall, which I have built, society has built, and society is my relationship



with another, so I have built it, it is my desire, my ambition, my sensations, my will that has built this enormous limited prison. Now what am I to do? I realize whatever positive act I do about it is still the action of a mind, a thought, which is limited. Whatever I do. You understand? I hope you are following this. Is it time, are you getting tired? No, it is not, I have got another ten minutes.

So I realize it is no good depending on another - the other may be a guru, the priest, or the idea that you surrender yourself to all that nonsense. So what am I to do? My conditioning is - please listen to this - my conditioning is to do something about it. I have been to the priest, I have been to the guru, I have been to the professor, the analyst, which is again doing something about it. Or I say it is too troublesome, I'll leave it alone, what the heck does it matter? Right? But if I don't my conditioning is to act, I am positive in that action, at least I feel I am doing something about it, which is part of my conditioning, my culture, my tradition, my education, and here is a man who comes along and tells me, don't do anything. Do you understand? Don't do a thing. Because I realize that positive action is totally inaction, whereas to be with it and not act: I know I am conditioned, I won't act but I will watch. You understand? Watching, alert, aware, and I see every response is from that conditioning, I observe, I don't do anything.

So when there is non-positive action you don't give energy to the conditioning, that dies by itself, when you don't give it a push, or suppress it, or run away, but when you are aware of it and don't act, because you realize non-action is intelligence. Action is unintelligence. Do you follow all this? So if you do this - if this takes place it is all over. That's why we talked about the other day

the positive and action which is what is happening in the world - Russia says, 'I must build up armaments stronger than America', and every country is being supplied by them. Which is to take positive action to keep power, position - I am bigger than you - right? See all this, the stupidity of man, see it and leave it alone, then the leaving it alone is intelligence which will act, which is unconditioning. Have I made this clear sir?

# SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 28TH JULY 1978

K: What shall we talk about this morning? No questions?

Q: What does meditation mean in daily life? Would you explain that please.

K: What does meditation mean in daily life - is that the question, sir?

Q: What is the personality?

K: I really don't know.

Q: (In French)

K: I understand. I think, as far as I can make out, the questioner is asking: as I am walking along something happens in me, and that moves me very much, and gradually that disappears. Again it comes. He is hurt by what he sees around him. He sees there is suffering and he goes through it.

Q: No, he sees contradiction, he says when he saw someone smoking as soon as you leave the tent he feels the contradiction between what has been said and what is actually taken place outside.

K: He is hurt, shocked, suffers, when he sees what actually is going on around him outside, and this contradiction: what is said here, and what is actually going on outside. What is one to do? That's it?

Any other questions?

Q: How can consciousness be conscious of itself totally?

K: How can consciousness be aware of itself? I was going to talk about that a little bit this morning, if you want.

So there are these questions, any more? One, what place has meditation in daily life? One sees the world in such contradiction, what is going on around us, there is so much suffering and so on and it is quite the opposite of what is being said here, what is one to do?

Q: Why is man afraid of truth?

Q: Could you say a few words about the healing energies?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The first part of the question I understood, sir, but the second part I don't quite follow. He has been initiated - please don't laugh at this - he has been initiated into something which Guru Maharajji, that is the boy has initiated him. And though he has lived with it he is not liberated, he is unable to surrender. All right. That's enough.

What is meditation in daily life; why is man frightened of truth; can consciousness be aware of itself; and why is it when we are here together in the tent and when we go out we see such contradiction and that makes one anxious, suffer; and also the last question, which is being initiated by somebody and he is unable to surrender himself to what he thinks he should surrender to - that's what the gentleman says? Now which of these questions would you like to go into?

Q: Can consciousness be aware of itself?

K: Would you like over together the question, which that gentleman raised, can consciousness be aware of itself? Would you like to go into that? That is, can thought - we will begin slowly, go into it slowly - can thought be aware of itself? That is, can thinking be aware of the root of its thought, the movement of thinking, and all the process of thought, can that movement be aware of itself?

That is the question that was raised, not only by that gentleman, it was also raised by somebody over there yesterday morning. The same question: can the mind, with all its content, which is never still, which is always active, moving, can that movement be aware of itself?

Why do you want to know? Why do you want know such a problem? Is it just, I want to find out? When you put that question, why are you putting it? Because if you are serious about the matter it demands a great deal of attention to find out whether thought, the thinking, can be aware of its own movement. Either you have put it out of curiosity, just some question to ask; or you are asking that question to eliminate totally the division between the thinker and the thought. Do you understand my question?

Perhaps we will go into this when we also consider what place has meditation in daily life. And can you surrender yourself to somebody - that is what that gentleman asked.

Can we dispose of that last question. That is somebody with some - you know, all the rest of it, these gurus - they come and say, 'Surrender yourself to me. I know, you don't but give yourself over to me and I will help you. Give away your property, your money, everything, and you won't have any money problem after that' - you follow? This is the actual fact that is going on in the world. We are so terribly gullible. The same pattern has been repeated by the churches all over the world - surrender yourself to God, to Christ, to this, give over everything that you have, we will look after you. And they promise this. And at the end, where are you? No money. Many people have come to the speaker with this problem, given over everything they have - houses, property, money - you

understand - left their homes, and then the man is off, the guru is off in some kind of a lovely house and you are stuck. So the first thing is with regard to that, don't accept any authority - right? There is the authority of a first class surgeon; but in so-called spiritual matters, in matters of the mind and psychology, there is no authority, so nobody can initiate you into something. That is just one of those tricks that human beings play on others.

The next question is: what place has meditation in life, in daily life? Or meditation is something separate from daily life. Or you introduce the idea of meditation into daily life. There are three problems, and more, involved in this. That is, you are introducing the idea of meditation - the idea - and trying to find out what place that idea has in daily life. First of all, is it an idea - that you must meditate, that you must do this, that you must do that - come to a conclusion and introduce that concept into daily life - right sir? You have understood that question? Or try to find out what relationship action has with the total awareness of consciousness? That is, why should one meditate at all? We lead our daily life rather unhappily, shoddily, conflict, misery, suffering, deceived by others and so on. That's our daily life. Why do you want to introduce meditation into that? Or in the understanding of conflict, sorrow, arrogance, pride, and so on, in understanding the meaning, the structure of these things, the reactions, that is part of meditation. Not you meditate and then introduce into action, into daily life, but rather during the daily life, when you go the office, when you are working in the factory, or ploughing a field, or talking to your wife, or husband, girl, or boy you are aware of your reactions, and the comprehension of those reactions, the

understanding not intellectually but why you are jealous, why this state of anxiety exists in you, why you accept authority, why you depend on another, in the investigation of those things that exploration itself is meditation - not the other way round. If you meditate and then introduce what you think is meditation in daily life there is conflict. You think this is so, and you are bringing that into action, into daily life, so there must be contradiction. Whereas if one is envious, as most of us are, what is the nature of envy, why are we envious, not right or wrong, we should not be, or should be, why does this envy arise? In enquiring into that, and freeing through enquiry greed, envy, that is the movement of meditation. In that there is no conflict, you are enquiring constantly - right? This demands your attention, this demands that you must be serious, not just play with words.

So meditation has a place in daily life when there is an enquiry into the whole nature and structure of your being - of your reactions, what is the state of your consciousness, why you believe, don't believe, why you are influenced by institutions and so on, and so on, all that is an actual movement of meditation. Right? If one is actually, not theoretically, actually doing it then you begin to understand the nature of consciousness. You are not imposing something on it, according to Freud, according to some psychologist, some guru, or somebody or other. You are enquiring into your whole being, that being is your consciousness.

So we have answered these questions and we have come to that point. So let's begin very simply and go into it, if you are willing. I wonder if you have ever enquired into the whole movement of thought, the whole activity of thinking, and whether thought,

thinking, can see itself moving. You understand my question? Let's be clear that the question is clear. So please this is rather important if you want to go into it, if you are at all serious in this matter, and it is really very important to comprehend the question first. Which is, I can say, 'I am aware of my consciousness' - through my belief, through my fears, through my pleasures, through my sorrow. So the content of my consciousness I can be aware of by saying, 'Yes, I am afraid, I am greedy, I suffer, I am arrogant, I have pride' and so on, which is the content of consciousness of which I am aware - right? So there is in that 'I am different from my consciousness' - right? Does this interest you? I hope so.

So there is the 'me', the observer observing his consciousness. But the 'me' is greedy, the 'me' is anxious, the 'me' is frightened, the 'me' is full of anxiety, uncertainty, sorrow, which is my consciousness, so I am not different from my consciousness - right? Is that clear? I am not different from what I think. I am not different from the experiences I have had. I am not different or something totally opposite to my anxieties, fears, and all the rest of it. I am all that. I may think I am god, but the very thinking is part of me, which invents god. I hope you see all this.

So then we come to the question: if the observer is the observed, which is the consciousness, then the question arises, can that consciousness be aware of its own movements? To put it very, very simply: is there an awareness of the arising of anger, anger itself, so that there is not me different from anger? Please, you don't mind my going into it a little bit? Are you interested in all this?

Let's go into it: One is angry, at the moment of anger there is no recognition as being angry - right? Have you noticed? At the



second, at the moment of intense anger there is only that state. Later on you call it anger - right? A second later. Which means that you have recognized from the past that which has happened in the past, and which is happening now, and you say, 'Yes that is anger' - right? Are you following? Please follow this. There is anger, at the moment of anger there is no recognition and the naming of that reaction. A second later the naming begins, the naming is from the past, the naming is the recognition from the past, the present reaction. So can you not name the present reaction, but just observe without naming it? The moment you name it you have recognized it and so strengthened the reaction. I wonder if you see this. It is very interesting.

That is, the word is not the thing. The word 'tent', the 'marquee' is not the actual fact, but we are carried away by the word and not by the fact. So to comprehend, to see that the word has become tremendously important, and see the fact, the word is not the thing. So when there is anger, which is a reaction, to observe it without naming it and so that reaction begins to wither away. The moment you name it you have strengthened it, the strengthening is from the past.

So if that is clear we can go the next step. Which is, is it possible for the senses, which is the reaction of the senses, for the senses to be aware of themselves, not you are aware of the senses, but the senses themselves open? I will go into it. If you will kindly not follow what I am saying but kindly observe in yourself the reactions of the senses - right?

Now our senses function separately - seeing, tasting, hearing, smelling and so on. They are all separate. You understand? Now is

there a total movement of all the senses together? You have understood something of what I am saying? You understand, this is really quite fascinating to find out, because then you will see if there is an observation of a person, of the movement of the waters of a sea, of the mountains, the birds, anything, or your friend, or your intimate person, if there is an observation with all the senses then there is no centre from which you are observing. You get it? Please do it, do it, test it out, don't accept anything the speaker is saying. Test it out for yourself. When you smell something lovely, a perfume of an early morning, when the air is clean, washed out by the rain and there is beauty in the land and so on, is one particular sense awake, or you are observing the total delicacy and the beauty of the morning with all your senses? You understand? Yes?

Q: If I see that I am not different from the total content of my consciousness, and the question as to whether I can be conscious of my unconsciousness seems to be rather like, can a camera take a photograph of itself.

K: No, look, I am coming to that point. I am slowly leading up to that. If you don't mind. Because unless you understand the sensory responses, whether the sensory responses are broken up, or is there the response of all the senses together? If there is response of a particular sense, sensation, then what takes place? You understand? When there is only the reaction of a scent, through the nose, then all the other senses are more or less in abeyance - right? Right, sir. Test it, test it out. So I am asking, when you smell a flower, is there total response of all the senses, not only smelling, the whole organism responding with its senses? I wonder if I am

making this clear. No, don't agree.

Q: (In Italian)

K: Yes, he hears the noise of that train going by - that's a very good question. You all heard that train going by - right? Did you respond to that noise completely? You understand sir? So that there is no resistance to the noise, there is no irritation from the noise. You are totally with the noise. Look at those mountains, which you have probably looked at every evening and every morning, not only with your eyes, optically you see it, but is there a perception of that mountain with all your senses? If there is, there is no centre from which you are looking. Test it out. You can't do it now. You can do if you look at the tent, or your friend, or anybody, look as though you are looking with all your being, with your senses. Then you will see that you are looking at something for the first time, not with jaded eyes and memory and so on. We will come to that.

So the question from there arises - not necessarily from there, but as we go along - can thought be aware of itself? I don't think you understand this. Or are we entering into something very, very complex and unnecessary? You are all very silent.

Q: Can we test it now by the hearing, by the total hearing?

K: Yes, but I am asking the next question sir, which is, you are thinking now, aren't you? When I ask you a question the whole movement of thinking arises - right? Obviously. Now I am asking whether that thinking itself sees itself thinking? No, it is not possible, right?

Q: We have always the impression that there is someone who is thinking but thinks it is another one. We have always this impression, here, or in another part of my body.

K: That's why, sir, you haven't probed into this matter very deeply. Forgive me for saying so, but I am just asking. You see I am asking something, which is, can one live a life without having a single conflict, a single effort, without any form of control? Please listen to this. Because we live with effort, we struggle - right? There is always achieving, moving, and so our life is lived in constant struggle, constant battle, constant contradiction - right? I must do this, I must not do that, I must control myself, why should I control myself, that is old fashioned, I will do what I want to do - all that is a movement of violence - right? Right, sir? Now if one is enquiring, is it possible to live without any shadow of control? Which doesn't mean doing everything you want to do, which is too childish, because you can't. The permissiveness - now they are turning the other way round. They see the danger of it so they don't allow permissiveness, control. Now I am asking is it possible to live without any control? Probably you have never asked this question of yourself. Now I am asking you. Where there is control there is conflict. Right? There is a battle going on, which expresses itself in many, many different ways, this battle - violence, suppression, neuroticism, and permissiveness, all that goes on. So I am asking myself and you, whether I can live a daily life without a shadow of control? To live that way I have to find out who is the controller? You understand? Is the controller different from the controlled? And if they are both the same there is no need for control. I wonder if you understand this.

That is, sir, I am jealous because you have got everything and I have got nothing. And from that jealousy arises anger, hatred, envy, a sense of violence to have all that you have, and if I can't get

it I get bitter, angry, all the rest of it follows - right? So can I live without jealousy, which means without comparison? Test it out, sir. Can you live your daily life without comparing at all? Of course there is comparing when I chose this kind of trousers, I am not talking about that. I am talking psychologically not to have any sense of measurement, which is comparison. If you have no measurement at all, will you decay, will you become a vegetable, do nothing? You understand? Stagnate? Or because you are comparing, because you are struggling, you think you are living, but if you don't struggle it may be a totally different form of living.

Q: Let it happen.

K: No, not let it happen, sir, look at it. You meet a very intelligent man, erudite, scholarly, you know, well educated, good brain and all the rest of it, and you say, 'By Jove, I wish I were like him'. All our education is based on that: you must be as good as your brother, if not better - right? Examinations are based on that, and so on and so on. So can you, having been through all that process when you have compared, struggled, violent, all the rest of it, can you say, 'I see the absurdity of living that way, I won't compare'? I won't measure my own dullness, my own state with somebody else. By comparing myself with somebody who is very clever, I see how terribly dull I am - right? You understand? But if I don't compare with the man who is extraordinarily bright and intelligent, am I dull? Answer. Am I dull? On the contrary.

So can you live without comparison, without the example? So you find out that where there is control there must be the controller, who says, 'I must control this reaction', or 'I mustn't do that', but that has become a habit doing that, so I must control.

Which means I have set a standard, the standard is the measurement according to which I have measured and say, 'This is right', and I must live according to that. So measurement implies control. And if you don't measure yourself and call yourself dull compared with somebody else who is bright, you are dull when you compare, but when there is no comparison whatsoever you are something else. Right. So let's move from that.

Q: I think or I feel that the momentum of the thinking process is so strong that I cannot just set myself aside to it and say I won't think anymore.

K: I didn't say that.

Q: I am saying this. Implied in your teaching there is this idea of total transformation, a mutation of the mind. Now this is supposed to be a radical change of consciousness itself. Now I imagine this to take place as a sudden insight, a flash of understanding, a conscious experience of consciousness itself.

K: Sir, may I ask something: what are you trying to tell me?

Q: Well I am trying to tell you that I am actually getting very bored by this constant repetition of these ideas about - look at this beautiful sunset, and..

K: Sir, wait a minute. If you are getting bored, just walk out.

Q: Well I am not really that bored yet! I still have the hope that you might convey something.

K: If you are mildly bored - I don't know what you are talking about.

Q: You don't want to listen.

K: Could you kindly tell me what you want to say in a few words, sir?

Q: Well I am in a way waiting for you to explain the transformation, the insight, to the awareness of consciousness.

K: Yes, you are waiting for me to explain how transformation takes place. It's very simple. Transformation takes place when there is no control, when there is no measurement, when there is no sense of 'me' operating on things, psychologically. That's all! And if that is not clear we will go into it. And if you say, 'I am bored by the repetition of this over and over', I am sorry. If you are bored, walk out. If you are mildly bored tolerate it, and if you really want to understand it, give your attention to it. That's all. If you don't, it's all right.

Q: Is by chance permissiveness the outcome of control?

K: Yes, sir, permissiveness is the reaction to control, obviously. We have been trained from childhood, through certain period in history, Victorian it is called, that control, don't show your feelings, obey, follow, all that. Now in reaction to all that we say, out with all that nonsense, I am going to do what I like. And the parents also feel they shouldn't control, or some psychologists say it is terrible to control your children, they must do what they like. We have been through all that.

So we are saying, control is totally unnecessary, without having the other reaction which is permissiveness, totally unnecessary when you understand the whole business of control. That's all.

Q: Is that right thinking?

K: She wants to know, to live without control, is that right thinking? You follow, this becomes so! Look, sir, please listen to something. I may be wrong, let's find out. Thought is measurement, right? Thought is moving in a certain direction - no? So any

movement involves time - right? From here to there and so on, both psychologically and physically. Time is measurement - right? Which is the whole momentum of thought is measurement.

Q: Can it also be only reaction?

K: No, pleasure just a minute. Now I will have to begin again. So do we understand each other when we say thought in its momentum, in its moving, in its drive, is time - the past, the past going through the present modifying itself and the future, that is the momentum of time. That is the momentum of thought. And that is also the momentum of measurement, psychologically as well as physically. This is simple enough. Right sir? Now I am asking: one lives that way, one is constantly caught in the past, one is the past, and that past modifies itself all the time, and moves forward. The past, modifying itself, going to the future. This whole momentum is time, measurement - right? That's all. So why is it that we live in the past all the time? Why is it that we are not leaving the past, which doesn't mean you forget the past, you understand the whole nature of the past, and find out what it means - I am not saying, experiment with it, test it - what it means to live completely now. Which means the momentum of the past is no longer operating.

That is, put it differently, if you want to go into it more. Which is, people have asked throughout the centuries whether time has a stop - right? Not chronological time, not whether the sun can remain perpetually in one place, but psychologically can time end? Don't you ask this question? Or you don't even observe this momentum? Which is, put it differently: knowledge has become tremendously important - right? Not only technologically, where you must have knowledge, but also knowledge as experience, more



and more and more understanding. Right? So we worship knowledge. I have said this a hundred times, if you are bored by it please tolerate it, have patience, if you can't tolerate it just walk out. The speaker is interested in telling you this. He wants you to find out something different than constant repetition. Unless you do it, what he has said becomes repetitive. It is not repetitive to the speaker. I would get bored much more than that gentleman if I repeated this to myself at every talk, I would walk out. I wouldn't be sitting here. But as you enquire into it you see much more, deeper and deeper, wider. Depth is not measurement. I must be careful there!

If one sees the truth of this, how we live, that we are always functioning from the past, that our life is a momentum of remembrances, a momentum of recording and acting. Like a tape which is recording, our brain records, and from that recording acts, which is all the momentum of time.

So one asks, if you are interested, if I can put it in ten different ways, which I have done, for the last fifty years, is it possible for the brain to record what is absolutely necessary, which is technology, how to drive a car, this, that, the other thing, and psychologically, inwardly not to record a thing? When you are hurt, not physically but psychologically, inwardly, why should it be recorded? You understand my question? What is the necessity of carrying on this hurt for years and years and years, what for, why should you record it? If you can answer that one question and find out whether it is possible not to record the hurt then perhaps the brain will only record that which is absolutely physiologically necessary, nothing psychological, emotional, etc. Right?

Q: Can the question be investigated without seeing the total consciousness can be conscious of itself.

K: Sir, if you don't mind, we will deal with this question of the whole consciousness, whether it can be aware of itself, when we understand this whole cycle of movement of repetition. I can use the word repeat, but the word is not the feeling of repetition.

Q: Can't we record when we have been hurt to avoid the next time to be hurt again?

K: Don't we protect ourselves from other hurts - I have been hurt once, and I don't want to be hurt again so psychologically I build a wall round myself so as not to be hurt anymore - right sir? Is that what you are saying? Which means what? I isolate myself in order not to be hurt. Right? It is obvious. You have hurt me once, and you may hurt me again, therefore I withdraw, I build a wall of resistance, I isolate myself so that I won't be hurt. So from that isolation there is violence, obviously, fear. So why should I carry the first hurt? Is it possible not to be hurt at all? The word 'innocence' means a mind that is not hurt, that has never been hurt - not the symbol of a lamb and all that kind of stuff, but actually a mind that has never been damaged. When it is damaged it is hurt - right? Now is it possible to totally put it away, avoid being hurt? Which doesn't mean you become brutal or resist. Do you want to find out whether it is possible not to be hurt at all without becoming callous, indifferent, snooty and all the rest of it?

Q: Can I be free of the hurts that happened when I was a baby, that happened when I was two or three, that I am unconscious of?

K: Have we time to go into this, do you want to go into this now? Will you give me two minutes so that I can finish this. If you

don't want to listen, don't listen, you are free to go.

One has been hurt in childhood by the parents, by other boys and girls, one is hurt in school, college, university, one is hurt. Right. Now that is, now one is fifty, that is past, the hurt is behind, and you are asking, can that hurt, ancient, old, in the past, can that be totally wiped away. Right, that is the question. Not through analysis - right? Need I go into that? That is, if you here for the first time let me briefly state it. The analyser thinks he is different from the analysed. The analyser is not hurt, but the analysed is hurt. So the analyser who thinks he is not hurt, who thinks he is separate, is going to examine the hurt. But the analyser is the hurt too - right? So analysis has very little meaning in freeing the mind from hurt when one sees the analyser is the analysed. I must go into it. Please.

So there is no analysis. Why am I hurt, why am I keeping the hurts? Why do you keep your hurts? It is part of you - right? Perhaps if you get rid of the hurts you might get rid of yourself. So the question then is: how is that hurt to be totally disarmed, not even a single scratch? Then I have to go into the question what is hurt, who is hurt? Right? The image that I have about myself is hurt - right? I think I am a marvellous man, you come along and tell me, 'Don't be silly', that hurts me because I have an image about myself as being marvellous, clever, intelligent, bright and all the rest of that rubbish, and you come along and say, 'For goodness sake, what an ass you are'. The image which I have created about myself is hurt - right? Whether that hurt is in the past or in the present. Obviously.

Then the question arises: is it possible not to have an image

about oneself at all? Because as long as there is an image about myself somebody is going to tread on it. So I have to find out why the brain, the mind, has created this image about itself. Has it created it because in that image there is security? In that image there is safety? If there is no image, what am I? Therefore I am frightened, I cling to my image. And you are going to tread on it, politely, kindly, tolerantly, you are going to put your foot on it and I get hurt. So I have to find out whether there is a possibility of living without a single image - the image being my conclusions, my opinions, my aggressiveness, etc.etc., the 'me', the image. If I have no image you can't tread on it. If I have no image at all now the past hurt is not. You understand sir? Right?

Q: What about that child of two or three years old, can he be hurt because he has no image of himself?

K: No, I don't know the little children.

Q: Can you repeat the question.

K: The question was as a child one is hurt - right? Why? Your baby, your son, your girl, when she is about four or five, why is she hurt? All right. She loves that teddy bear, must take it to bed with her, loves it, kisses it, hugs it, holds it all day long. You come along and pull it away, some other child pulls it away, she begins to cry. She has taken away something which was mine - there begins the whole cycle.

# SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 29TH JULY 1978

K: What shall we talk about?

Q: Could you please say something about the healing energies, the benediction?

K: Could you talk something about healing, laying on hands.

Q: No, the benediction that you speak about in your book, the healing energy.

K: Not laying on hands but the benediction that I am talking about. Anything else?

Q: Is it enough if I myself change when others around me set the conditions? For example I am a teacher and I want to teach in my way, but it is not possible in the long run. How do I necessarily not come into conflict with the school system?

K: I am a teacher. I would like to change myself fundamentally, and in the long run it has very little effect on the students. Is that it, sir?

Q: No, the school system.

K: Yes, the whole school system, the environment prevents it. Now just a minute. All right, sir.

Q: What do you think of the meditation in the centre of the aisle, hearing music and all that kind of thing?

Q: I have something which I would like to talk over with you personally but it seems rather difficult to talk to you individually.

K: May I say something so that we can finish with that. I used to see lots of people individually, I don't know how many thousands I have seen all my life, but I am afraid I am not doing

that any more because I haven't got time, or after I have talked for an hour and a half all my energy is gone, and I have other things to do. So you if will forgive me I am not seeing individually anyone.

Q: You are not interested?

K: I am sorry, that is not the reason. If I was not interested I wouldn't be speaking here.

Q: Can you talk about physical pain, physical suffering?

Q: (Inaudible) (Repeated by audience: He says in your talks there are two different elements, one is observation, awareness, and the other is the question you ask which you call yourself the impossible question. He asks what is the relationship between the two points.)

K: Between what two points?

Q: Observation and the impossible question - what you call yourself impossible questions.

K: Don't ask impossible questions on a hot day! I don't understand the question, and perhaps we will go into it as we go along with other questions, if we may.

Q: What is doubt? And why are we suffering when we have to choose?

Q: May I put a question too? Can a person who has an innocent mind be at the same time and at the same level with a person who has a damaged brain?

K: How can one meet another human being if one is somewhat sane and the other is not? It seems to me that is our problem! You may all be very sane and I may not! So that is the problem.

So what shall we talk about this morning, apart from several questions about meditation, seeing lights, visions, and all that,

physical help, how to meet people who are perhaps not so neurotic as oneself and so on.

Q: You also like to escape.

K: To escape from what?

Q: From you.

K: May I ask a question, perhaps it will include the other questions. And I am not imposing my question over yours. May I ask a question, may I? I am sure we must have asked ourselves, not in the words I am putting them in, but a very fundamental question, which is, how can one keep a brain that is constantly renewing itself - you understand my question? - that is constantly not deteriorating, not getting old, not getting senile, but that doesn't damage itself, that doesn't allow itself to be damaged, that has a quality of constant youthfulness - the brain, not sexually and all that kind of stuff? Is this an important question for any you, not because I am asking? I am asking if it is important to each one of us. Is it possible as one grows older and older to have a brain that is fresh, young, undamaged, free, so as to have a mind that is quick, not only quick in thought but in action? After all youth means decision and action. It may be a foolish decision and foolish action, but as one grows older there is always the deteriorating factor not only biologically, physiologically, but also in the brain. Would that interest any of you to find out whether it is possible to have a brain, though that brain is very, very old, millenia, thousands of years old, can that brain in spite of its age, in spite of all its experiences, the accumulated burdens of knowledge, can that brain be ever, if I can use the word young, you will understand what I mean - not young in the sense foolish, not in the sense dull, heavy and so on

and so on. Shall we discuss that? Would that interest any of you? Please, I am not asking you to be interested. I am just asking - as you ask the questions of me, I am asking you the question.

Q: In spite of the physical age?

K: In spite of age, of course. Can we go into it? Perhaps in answering that, enquiring into that question we might be able to answer how to meet human beings who are vulgar, cruel, violent, self-centred, and somewhat neurotic - admitting that one is also perhaps neurotic. That is the question I would like to put forward to you, if you are interested in it, we can go into it.

Q: I would not be neurotic if everybody else was not neurotic.

K: How does a mind which is not so completely neurotic meet a mind, or behaviour of a human being who is somewhat more neurotic? That is a question that was asked. Please may I go into it?

What makes the brain, I am talking of the brain which holds thousands of years of memories - right? Because our brain is not young, we have inherited thousands of years of man's endeavour, man's struggle, what he has to face, dangers, pleasures, all the travail of existence for thousands and thousands of years. Our brain has evolved, and through that evolution, time and all the rest of it, it has acquired certain resistances, certain freedom, it has learnt what is danger, how to avoid danger, and how to pursue pleasure, and so on. So our brain, your brain is not just born, it is the result of millions of years. Right? That is obvious. I am not a brain specialist. I have watched myself and watched the whole business. Now can that brain unburden itself from the past, be free from all pressure, from all compulsion, various forms of addiction - right? I am asking that question. That is, what damages the brain? Let's



begin that way. You find out. Let's talk it over together. Perhaps I may be more neurotic than you are, or I may be a biological freak. So we have to talk over together, show to each other, help each other to understand this question. Now what damages the brain?

Q: Psychological hurts.

K: More basic than that, what destroys the brain?

Q: Contradiction.

K: When there is contradiction, that is, feeling one thing, doing something opposite to that, thinking something and saying something entirely different from what you think, or there is this desire to do something, the drive, and there is also the opposing drive. Right? So this is what the gentleman means, if I understood him rightly, by contradiction. Now what takes place when there is contradiction? What takes place in your life - please think it out for yourself - what takes place when there is contradiction, opposition? One desire opposing another desire, what takes place?

Q: Conflict.

K: Conflict. Could we say then that conflict in any form, biological, psychological, or one part opposing another part, and so on, this constant conflict, this constant battle outwardly and inwardly is one of the factors of the brain being damaged? Right? Don't agree with me, please. It is important to find out for oneself whether this brain, which is not your brain, that is just it, please understand it, it is not your brain, it is the brain of all of us because you are the result of millions of years of so-called evolution, progress, accumulation of knowledge, pain, suffering.

Q: You say, referring to what you have said now, that we are all in the same position but I can't understand that the inhabitants are

so different. So when you say is the brain of the whole of humankind, we are all in the same position when we were born. I want to ask you a question: when you were born you were conditioned and you free yourself after this? Or is it work you do after?

K: No, sir, don't go off into detail please, just wait a minute. Would you say your brain, which is the result of thousands of years, is different from my brain which is also thousands and thousands and thousands of years old? Or we both of us have passed through the gate of experience, of pain, of suffering, of agony and so on and so on? That brain may be conditioned in a culture which is different from another culture. It may be educated differently from another culture which has its own education. But the basic quality of the brain is that being thousands of years old it is more or less the same, similar, though outwardly it is different. We will go into that, leave that for the moment.

I am asking myself, and I hope you are asking yourself too, what are the basic elements that bring about damage? Let's forget your brain and my brain are the same - leave all that aside. We said, one of the causes of damage is this constant effort, conflict, struggle, which puts enormous pressure on the brain - right? Oh, don't agree to this. What do you say?

Q: I don't agree. I think the brain has evolved through struggle.

K: Yes, to a certain extent, the gentleman says, this is the common argument, it has evolved through struggle, through conflict, through constant battle outwardly and inwardly. And one questions - I don't say it has not, but one questions it. One doesn't easily accept it has evolved through struggle. I want to find out if

that is the truth. So we are asking ourselves, if struggle is the element of its growth, then if that has damaged the brain through biological strain, the constant pressure, strain, anxiety, if these things have brought about a better brain - I am using the 'better' in quotes - after millions of years what have we achieved, what have we come to? If the brain has evolved, and become extraordinarily beautiful, marvellous after thousands of years of struggle, and what are we at the present time? That is the criteria - right?

Q: Sir, may I ask you a further question related to that. As you say the brain, our brain, has evolved over this long period of time, how long are the brains of other creatures? It seems it is not a question of the superiority of the one brain, the human brain over other brains of other species, but it is remarkable it seems that the human brain has different qualities from the rest. And that it has along with this pain the possibilities of pain and contradiction through its memories, its desire to repeat past experiences.

K: I am sorry, Sir, I can't hear.

Q: I am sorry. I was asking what the difference is between the human brain and the brains which have evolved along with it. The human brain has, it seems, acquired this possibility of suffering through anticipation, the desire to repeat past experiences, and I wonder how you can differentiate what seems to be the peculiarities of the human brain from the other brains.

K: Sir, if I may ask, we must take our brains as they are - as they are. Not say, are we different from the animals, or are we different from the little baby, or different from the extraordinary animal called the whale and so on. We are talking of the brain that we have now, not the brain of the animal, but as we are now. We

are saying that if through struggle, through conflict, through millenia, man has produced this extraordinary brain, what is the actual fact, not theory, not supposition, the actual fact of what it is doing now, how it is operating now. Just a minute. I do not know if you have read in one of the magazines that we have had wars for the last five thousand years. That means historically, that means wars every other year. Right? And we are going on in the same pattern - right? Our way of killing has become much more efficient, much more complicated, you can destroy human beings by the million and keep the buildings intact. Is that the result of our excellent brain? You follow?

So we are saying, does strife, conflict, battle within and without, does that really make the brain young, fresh? There may be another way - you follow? We have accepted the norm, the pattern, that as a tree struggles to reach the sunlight in a forest or in a wood, so we must struggle to have more knowledge, more this and that and the other. So I am saying there may be another way which may bring about a different quality of the brain which is not hurt, which is not under pressure, if one understands the futility of effort.

Q: We don't know if such a state exists.

K: You don't know.

Q: Is it possible that the humankind can go without conflict or not? I don't know.

K: Sir, you are not listening to what I am saying. I said there may be another way. You don't know.

Q: I suppose.

K: I said there may be. That means in English, perhaps, a probability. So don't say, we don't know. We have said that

struggle has not brought about intelligence in our life. It has become very clever to protect itself, but it is not intelligent when you have wars, wars, wars, practically every year all over the world. Obvious, sir. And I am suggesting perhaps - perhaps - there may be another way of living and perhaps making the brain much more alive, young, fresh, if we understand the futility of effort.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The present social structure is based on this question of competition - right? That is, our present social structure with its economy and so on is based essentially on competition, fight to reach, struggle to get something. That is the nature and the structure of our society in which we live. That society is the outcome of us, we have built it. God hasn't built it. Every human being has built the society in which we live because he is aggressive, he wants position, he wants power, he is greedy, and so on and so on. So our society is competitive, our society is essentially immoral - we won't go into what is morality and all the rest of it, we will later on - it is essentially immoral, divided, upper and lower levels of power - right? So our whole education, the way we live, is based on that, and that has been our pattern for the last million years. And that may be one of the factors - I am suggesting, I am not saying it is - it may be one of the factors that damages the brain - this constant strain, this constant struggle, this constant wanting to find something, being driven towards something. Those who are seeking already know what they are seeking - clear? Otherwise you wouldn't seek it.

So we are saying that is one of the basic factors of damage. Can we live - again a probability, I am asking, I want to ask these

questions because otherwise we will just remain where we are - is there a possibility of living without conflict? Otherwise our brains will always function in a very, very narrow, limited pattern. That is simple enough. Right?

Q: We have seen how the brain is so conditioned, and how is right action to come about with such a brain?

K: We are going into it, slowly let's go step by step into it. And if that is the factor why our brains, as we grow older become more and more worn out, more and more repetitive, it won't alter its pattern. It is afraid to break its pattern. If it is malicious, bitter, angry, it keeps to that, and so on. Then is there a way of living which is not this constant strain, battle? To find that out we must understand the nature and the structure of contradiction, comparison, and this drive, pleasant, sometimes unpleasant, aggressive and on other occasions easy, but this constant drive. That is, we say, damaging the brain. Even the specialists are agreeing to this. We happened to talk to one of the so-called brain specialists, he agrees with this - being a specialist you must also agree with him! Right? Because you are all authoritarian bound.

So that is one of the factors. Just a minute. What are the other factors? Come on sirs.

Q: It seems that my thought doesn't want to end itself.

K: He has said something which is important to understand - if I understand the question properly. We are afraid of ending - right? If one is attached with all the sequences and the things involved in attachment, with its pain, with its fear, all the rest of it, the continuity of the same pattern of attachment is one of the factors of deterioration. I wonder if you see this? Because that which is

continuous is habitual, routine, mechanical, so the brain that has become mechanical is one of the factors of deterioration. Right? This is so obvious, no? If I was born in India and continue to be an Indian, thinking around the same way, my superstitions, my gods, my inventions, you follow - routine, routine, routine - it is obviously mechanical, traditional, and therefore it is damaging itself.

Now wait a minute, that is one of the factors: that is, struggle, effort, battle with oneself and a mechanical way of living, following the tradition, it may be two days old or ten thousands years old. That means that which is a continuous movement, in the same direction, is one of the factors of deterioration - no?

Q: Doesn't continuous movement imply struggle, isn't it the same because if I don't struggle I cannot move continuously?

K: I may continue this way, or I may continue that way.

Q: But continuation itself is a struggle.

K: Yes sir, agreed. That's understood. Struggle is what we are accustomed to, which has become a pattern, and never ending anything, which is also our pattern. If I am hurt I carry it all my life - right? I never end my hurt. So the mechanical way of living is one of the factors of deterioration - which doesn't mean that we must be spontaneous. How can a mind which has never been free, which has always worked horizontally or vertically continuously, how can such a mind which follows a pattern, have any form of spontaneity? It is impossible. It may think it is spontaneous.

Right - we have found two factors. So what are the other factors?

Q: Thought itself.

K: Wait. I will come to that towards the end, sir, before you pick thought itself go into another.

Q: To be self-centred.

K: Yes, maybe. And - wait I am coming to that - one of the factors may be this constant desire to identify oneself with something. I am asking you, don't accept it, or deny it, but find out. This constant exertion, drive, impetus, desire, to say, 'I am that' - identify myself with the country, with a belief, with a person, with an idea, with an ideal, or with a piece of furniture - you understand? This constant movement from what I am, to what I should be. And identifying myself with 'what should be', which is again a battle - right? Right, sir?

So what are the other factors: effort, a way of living in a routine, if that is broken you form another routine. Which means a mind, a brain that has been accustomed, it is its habit, to mechanically follow, mechanically accept, mechanically live - I did this yesterday, I must do it tomorrow, I had sexual pleasure yesterday, I must have it tomorrow and so on and on and on. Now there may be another factor, which is, the whole momentum of thought. With this perhaps you will not agree - not agree - we will not be able to communicate with each other. I want to communicate and you may be unwilling to communicate. You may say, use a different set of words. Words are not important when you want to communicate something. There must be the urge to understand each other, then I can use a word in Eskimo, or some language, and language won't matter. The desire to understand is more important than the word. So I am asking, is one of the major, perhaps the only factor, that damages the brain, is this constant movement of thought?



Q: Thought generates fear, and one of the fears is of communicating, really communicating. I am afraid of communicating to you now. I am communicating to you now but I am afraid somehow. It seems thought has generated that fear in me. I am communicating to you now with all these people here.

K: Thought generates fear. That fear is born because thought is afraid to communicate with you. Is that so? Are you afraid to communicate with me? I am not saying you are, I don't know. Unless you are a devotee, unless you say, 'I surrender to whatever you are, I surrender to that' - then you go to sleep. Now are we frightened to communicate with each other?

Q: One doesn't understand quite fully what you are saying.

K: No, sir, one doesn't understand quite fully what you are saying and therefore that might bring about not fear, I don't understand you, please tell me more, put it a different way. But in that there is no fear, unless one is afraid to expose oneself. Right? You may not want to expose yourself to me, and I don't want you to expose yourself to me. But you should expose yourself to yourself. See yourself - perhaps expose yourself is rather a (?) word - but you should see yourself as you are. And the function of a speaker is not important if you use him as a mirror to see yourself as you are.

Now let's proceed: we said one of the major factors, and perhaps the only factor, is this constant movement of thought. While you are awake, while you are asleep, while you are looking out of the window, or keeping still, this constant chatter, not probably put into words but imagination, looking at things and giving them names, this machinery is going on all the time. And

we are saying that may be the real damage to the brain.

Then arises the question: how is it possible not to think at all? Wait a minute. Wait a minute. That is the whole idea of controlling thought so that it won't think about anything except what it is directed to think about. You understand this? That is, one realizes, if you realize, that thought is one of the central factors of the damage of the brain - thought damages the brain then one asks, why is this machinery going on all the time? You understand? What is the motive power of it, what is the petrol, what is the oil, what is the whatever it is that keeps this thing going, going, night and day?

Q: The function of the brain is to think.

K: Is it? Sir, don't posit anything, don't get definite, if I may politely ask you. Let's find out. So if thinking is the nature of the brain, and this thinking is continuously going on, then it is damaging itself. Like a machine, like a car running all the time, add new fresh oil, look after it properly, but keep it running, running, you will wear it out very, very quickly.

So is that one of the major factors of the damage of the brain - you follow? Either you think horizontally, linearly, or vertically. That is, we are used to reading books from left to right, and so our thinking is more or less horizontal; and if you read, as they do in China and Iran, and so on, that way, you are also following along certain lines, left to right, right to left. The same thing. The Arabs and so on. Now our question then is: what is the petrol, the oil, the energy, that keeps this thing going over and over again - right? What is the source of this energy which is now being used for thinking?

Q: It is supplied by the senses.

K: Is it? When you keep your eyes open and look, your senses are looking, but you can keep your eyes closed and keep on thinking. Is thinking only the result of the senses or is thinking based on another, which is memory and so on - one wants to find out what is the energy which is being used in this perpetual motion of thought - you understand sir?

Q: That means that thought is always in the past.

K: Sir, don't say it is. Let's find out. There is energy - right? Energy which is being used through conflict, which has become mechanical, routine, and we said this constant identification, all this energy is used around these lines. We are asking, why is this energy so completely used by thought? You understand what I am saying? No, don't be so quick. Find out. I don't know if I have made myself clear. To make an effort you need energy - to struggle, to battle, outwardly or inwardly, energy is necessary. To identify oneself with somebody else and so on and so on, it requires energy. And when the brain has become mechanical, routine, following a pattern, it is also using energy - right? And I am asking: why has thought become so important and using up most of our energy?

I have just stated madam, I am not clear myself whether I am telling what I am observing, putting into words. If somebody understands what I have said please carry on.

Q: We are trying to control our environment.

K: Any form of control is a wastage of energy.

Q: Perhaps it is only if you continue and follow on thinking it perpetuates permanent damage to the brain.

K: That is what want to get at: why has thought used so much energy that we have no energy anywhere else?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Go into it a little bit, if we understand each other, let's go into it a little bit. You understand what I am saying?

Q: We are always looking for security by comparing everything.

K: Yes, sir, I understand we are seeking security - security in a belief, security in a family, security in a house, security in an ideal, security in identification, all the rest of it. We want security but that is understood. Like a child, a baby, that needs security. So our brain demands security. We have been through that. And that security you may think exists in this constant movement of thought. You understand what I am saying? Discover something! That is, thought, seeking security and establishing what it thinks is secure, remains in that pattern, and thought then is using an enormous amount of energy, night and day. And we say that may be one of the factors of the deterioration of the brain.

Q: Is it thought itself, or is it the point where thought..

K: Is it thought itself or thought in action? That's right. Thought itself or is it thought in action. Right?

Q: Is it not a question of balance?

K: Maybe. You are not listening. We are not thinking together. That doesn't mean that you are accepting but let's think together on the same point, then perhaps we will come to something. Just a minute sir.

Q: I think we are afraid to be empty without thinking.

K: We have said that, yesterday or the day before, that we are

afraid if thought isn't occupied with something, we are afraid to face our loneliness. And fear then is one of the factors of damage, obviously. So please.

Q: Can one say that thought has run wild?

K: You can say it! It has run wild. Technologically it has run wild, babies are being produced in test tubes and so on. Now let's come back. I want to find out a way of living in which the brain is not damaged.

Q: Can there be a way of living so as not to reduce all of the mechanical things, all of the technical things, that are peculiar as products of the human brain. Can we have those things which are the product of thought which relieve our various forms of discomfort, of fear of discomfort, our fear of personal discontinuance.

K: Sir, we went into all that during the last few discussions and talks, but I want to get at this. Please, let's find out. One observes clearly that constant effort does damage the brain, constant struggle, all that. And also this mechanical movement, which implies practice, you know, all that, which purely becomes mechanical, which is called meditation and so on. So we have found two factors. And also we said the major factor may be the whole movement of thought and its action. And we asked: why has thought become so important, using up such tremendous energy, night and day - the images, the ideals, sexual images and so on and so on, which are all the movement of thought all the time - anger, bitterness, aggressiveness, saying, 'You are wrong, I am right', you know, the battle that goes on - why has thought become so enormously important? Which apparently doesn't seem to end at

all. You understand my question. So is there an ending - you follow, sir, to end something is to release energy, not in any direction, to release energy. I want to go on but apparently you don't.

Do we recognize, sir, the one central factor, that thought is in motion, is in movement from the moment you wake up until you sleep, and when you sleep it is there, all the time? And so it may be mechanical. So thought is mechanical, therefore that is a deteriorating factor. So do we recognize, do we see the fact that thought is mechanical?

Q: It seems there is more to it. This constant thinking feeds those forces which motivate the thinking itself, such as vanity, greed.

K: We said that. What is the motive. We said that, sir. We asked, what is the motive of this constant thinking. Motive means movement in a direction, or no direction. Motive means, actually the meaning of the word is a movement. We have been through all this.

I am asking, as long as this brain, our brain, has become mechanical, that may be the major factor of deterioration. That mechanical process is thought, and thought is mechanical. Do we see that? You may invent the most marvellous engines, but it is still the movement of thought. You may sit and close your eyes and think about god, it is still mechanical. Or you may say, 'I will practise, I will sit quietly, I will surrender myself to somebody with a beard, or non beard', that is also mechanical. So any movement of thought is mechanical. And we are saying that is the essence of deterioration. Because that makes us struggle - right? We are competitive, we want to reach, to want to obtain, we want to

become a success, which is all the movement of thought, identification, and so on and so on. So thought is the very essence of deterioration of the brain.

Q: Thought is me.

Q: But is it not possible that there is within the field of thought another area where thought is not organical living?

K: Sir, that means we have to go into the question of what is thought. What is thought? If you had no memory you wouldn't be able to think. Memory is the accumulation of experience as knowledge - right? That is obvious. No? Please, this is, even the most profound scientist says this, so please accept it! - if you want to accept the specialists. But you can observe your own brain in operation.

So if that is so, then what is one to do? You understand? Any movement of thought deteriorates the brain, any movement. Right?

Q: How can we live without thinking?

K: We have been through all this sir, I will tell you. Isn't it time to stop?

Q: What is one to do?

K: Would you listen if I tell you?

Q: Yes. Very attentively, all of us.

K: I have already told you! So you haven't listened.

Q: What is one to do?

K: I have already told you. Either I am an idiot saying I have already told you when I haven't, or a liar, or you haven't listened. So would you kindly listen again.

That means listen to find out, listen with care, with affection, not saying, 'Well, I have heard this before'. If you have heard it

before and I repeat it again, you say, 'I am bored.' But if you have listened, tested, acted, found out, you will never be bored. Every time you test it there is something new taking place. And if you merely say, 'Yes, I understand, you have said so and so, and you are repeating yourself, I am bored, or semi-bored', which means you have not tested it, experimented, looked, gone into it, and if you discover something you want to go into it more and more and more, there is never a moment of boredom. It is like those research people, they are never bored, they are at it from morning until night because they want to discover something new, new, new.

When we are confronted with this enormous complex problem, which is that thought in its very nature and structure is the major factor of the deterioration of the brain, from that you ask, what is one to do? Right? Please listen. Who is asking this question? Thought is asking that question. Right? So as long as you ask the question, which is thought says, 'What am I to do?', then thought says, 'I must find an action which will get rid of my routine, my mechanical processes, how am I to stop thinking? I can't, in life I must think.' Of course you must think otherwise you wouldn't be here and I wouldn't be here. So as long as thought has any form of movement, whatever it does will be the factor of deterioration of the brain. Now if you really understand that, really see the truth of it, you are finished. Then you have placed thought in its right place. Which is, thought being the outcome of knowledge, memory, experience, thought is necessary to drive a car, to take a bus to go home, go to the factory, but if the brain realizes that thought is the factor that is making it deteriorate then it says, 'All right, I have understood this, I have got it', then we can go into



much deeper things. You follow? Now we are all surface.

So the positive action of thought, to which we are all accustomed to, is the factor of deterioration. The non action of thought, which is thought living in its right place, then the brain can never deteriorate.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 30TH JULY 1978

We have had seven talks, and this will be the fifth dialogue, discussion, conversation. I think during these talks and discussions we have touched most of the points of human relationship - our existence, our way of thinking, looking. And if one may ask, one wonders how much or to what extent we have changed; if we are at all familiar with our prejudices, and if we are what do we do about them? Hold on to them, or let them go? Or if you find yourself attached to somebody, to some ideals, to some belief, if you are at all aware and familiar with your attachment, how far one has let them go, knowing all attachment leads to a great deal of sorrow, pain, and all the rest of it, which we went into?

And also if one is aggressive, as most human beings are, some more and some very little, if we have during these talks and discussions, or dialogues and conversations together, if we are free, or if we are aware and know how deeply we are aggressive, and whether we have changed at all. And if we are familiar with our prides, and vanities, and habits, how deeply are we free of them? Or we carry them on for another year, or for many years, and never are aware of our own peculiarities, and idiosyncrasies, our aggressions, our attachments, our prejudices, fears and so on, then we live merely on words. And words are ashes. And if you like to live with ashes, not as monks, but just live with words, then I am afraid one lives very superficially and with very little meaning.

So as this is the last discussion, what shall we talk over together this morning?

Q: What do you mean by bringing order into one's life?

K: Could you kindly talk about order and what you mean by it. Not what I mean by it, what do we mean by it.

Q: As we talked yesterday of the ending of thought, is the free energy the very essence of the image which is the content of thought? Is it that way?

K: Yes sir. What is the question?

Q: The question is, is the energy which gets free if thought is ended, is this energy the very essence of the content, that means the image that thought makes?

K: No, I am afraid we have misunderstood each other. We said yesterday going over the whole movement of thought, what is the origin of thought, the origin being the registration of an event, of an experience, of a pain, of a grief and so on, the registration which takes place in the brain, and from that memory thought arises. That's clear. Then that thought creates the image and all that energy is limited, conditioned, held within a very narrow space. And we said when we understand the whole structure and the nature of thought then thought itself finds its own limitation, and therefore releases that energy which has been canalized along a narrow groove. We explained that very carefully, we went into it.

Q: Yesterday you said the brain is collective, thousands of years old. Whether that statement is true or false I really don't know. But I am deeply concerned with what is going on in the world and I do not see how putting everybody into the same basket is going to bring about love and compassion.

K: No, we are not putting - the questioner says, I do not know how love and compassion can come about if we put every human

being into the same basket. I am afraid we never said that, nor implied. So we'll discuss. What do you want to discuss, talk over?

Q: We don't see humanity. Is humanity the essence, the truth of man, and can we speak about humanity?

K: Can we seek about..

Q: Can we speak about the essence of man, that humanity that we don't see. We see the man but not the essence.

K: We don't see the essence of man but we only see the man. Now which of these shall we discuss? Would it be worthwhile to talk over together this question of order? Could we? Would it be worthwhile to discuss that?

First of all what do we mean by that word order? What does that convey to each one? When you hear that word order, what do we mean by it, what is your feeling, your response, your instinctual answer? Order, according to the totalitarian people, is to obey the few, and conform to a certain pattern they have established. I am putting it in most simplistic terms, but that's good enough to understand what we mean when we are examining the word order. That's what they mean. There will be no dissent, we all think alike, we all work for the State, whatever the State may mean, which is according to Lenin, Marx, and so on and so on. And so anybody who deviates is called dissident and destroyed. That's one kind of order. We are going to question it.

Then there has been Victorian order - if I can use the word Victorian in the sense of about the end of the 19th century, which meant keep everything outside orderly, but inwardly you might have chaos, mess, misery, but outwardly show that you are very orderly. In response to that, in opposition to that, we have

cultivated quite recently permissiveness - do anything you like. Right? To the man, or woman, who is living in the permissive society order is abomination. And to the man or the woman who lives in the Victoria era order is control, don't express your emotions, hold back, restrain; and you have the totalitarian order. Right - these are very simple facts, these are daily facts of life. And inwardly - outwardly we say we must have order - inwardly we are very disorderly. Would you say we are, or we are not? Disorderly means contradiction, confusion, giving importance to one thing in opposition to other things, sex becomes enormously important and perhaps that is the only important thing, and the rest you put it aside, or delegate it to a secondary place. And inwardly there is constant struggle, battle - all that is disorder - right? This is obviously clear surely.

Now what makes for disorder, both outwardly and inwardly? And do we know, or aware, or familiar, or cognizant, that we live in disorder? Outwardly there is disorder when there is war, that is total disorder, that is total terrorism, organized, blessed by the priests and respectable. That is, total terrorism is obviously disorder, but it is respectable disorder, recognized by every human being as something necessary. And there is disorder when there are nationalities and all the rest of it. So outwardly there is disorder and inwardly there is disorder - right? Are we familiar with our disorder inwardly? We know, we are familiar when we read the newspapers and magazines and so on, that there is this monstrous disorder. Now it is much more arduous, or one has not given attention to be acquainted with our disorder - right? Now I am asking myself, and you are asking, what is the root of this disorder,

why do we live this way, for god's sake - if there is god, I am sorry!  
Why do we live like this? Why do we tolerate it? Why do we accept it? There is disorder between man and woman, in their relationship, however intimate, however pleasant, however comforting, however satisfying and so on and so on, there is constant struggle between man and woman, in their relationship, which is disorder - right?

Q: It isn't always so.

K: There may be exceptions, granted. One or two, or half a dozen, or a few people in the world may have a marvellous relationship with each other, but appalling frightening relationship with the world. I said, may be.

So are we first of all familiar with this? We are outwardly and inwardly. Are we inwardly familiar, know, aware, cognizant, see or observe that we live in disorder - exceptions, there may be that lady and a few others. If we are not aware that we live in disorder, who is going to tell you that you are living in disorder? Nobody cares, on the contrary they want you to live in disorder - right? It is profitable for the society, for the business, and all the rest of it, that you live in disorder because the moment you have order in yourself you become a danger.

So please, if you want to discuss this, have a conversation with each other, and go into this matter of order, please find out for yourself whether you are familiar, know, are aware, cognizant with your way of life inwardly, find out whether it is orderly or disorderly. Orderly may mean conforming to a pattern - right? Conforming to a tradition. That is generally called orderly. Conforming to what the religious people have said - the monks, the

gurus, the teachers, the so-called sacred books, if you follow those, and conform to those, you say, 'I am living orderly'. Does conformity bring about order? Or it is the very root of disorder? One conforms when one puts on trousers or shirt in this country, when one goes to India one puts on different clothes. That's not conformity. We are talking of conformity psychologically, inwardly. Do we conform? Does one know, realize that you are conforming?

Q: Do we see that the cause of disorder is the same as the cause of deterioration?

K: Forget what we talked about deterioration. Don't bring it in because you are going back to the same old pattern.

First of all do you know, you are aware for yourself, that you are conforming - to the idea of marriage and not marriage, both the same, you may live with a girl or a boy and say, 'We are not conforming', but those who are married are they also conforming because they sign a paper or something or other? You follow? You have to be cognizant, aware, whether you are conforming.

Q: Any idea, any thought of conformation, because if the thought is repeating, then it conforms.

K: Don't bring in a little more complex - we will go deeper into it. Begin with this: am I or you conforming to a pattern, whether established by a society, or whether I have established it for myself, it is still conforming - you understand? I may reject the outward authority altogether, but inwardly I have the authority of my experience, of my knowledge, and to that I conform. And that is also conformity. So are you aware of this fact for oneself? If you are not then who is going to awaken you? Who is going to put

pressure on you so that you say, 'Yes, I am in disorder, I have found out.' Because through pressure you won't find out, it is the pressure from outside that makes you conform, or not conform. So if one may ask again, if you are asking yourself, are you psychologically in any way conforming? Sirs, this is one of the most subtle and important points if you go into it very deeply. You have to conform to certain laws, you have to drive on the right side in Europe, and in England the left side. If you say, 'Well I am not going to conform' and drive on the right side, the policeman would be after you, the cop will come and tell you, 'Please drive on the left side.'

So I am asking - please ask yourself whether you are conforming to tradition, to your aggressive, violent responses, are you conforming to all that? You see what a tremendous problem this is. And if you are imitating, not outwardly, I not talking of the outward imitation, long hair, short hair, beards and no beards, and all the rest of it, but inwardly, psychologically imitating. Will you take time, one afternoon, or one evening, or some time during the day, to look at yourself? Right? This is what you are doing now: you are, if I may most respectfully point out, you are looking at yourself and discovering for yourself whether you are conforming, imitating, and if you are conforming to a certain pattern, another conforms to another pattern, so there is conflict between the two and so disorder. Right?

Then if you are aware, know, realize, see that you are in disorder, will you remain with it - you understand - not try to change it, not try to say 'I must go beyond it, I must suppress it, I must understand it, I must rationalize it', but just holding it in your



arms, as it were, without any movement? The baby is asleep in your arms, the moment you move it wakes up and cries - you understand sir? I wonder if I am making myself clear, am I?

So that is the point: will one comprehend and bring about order in one's life by rules, by discipline, by control, by suppression; or will you observe in yourself disorder and not run away from it, not translate it into your own idiosyncrasies, temperament, but merely look it, observe it, watch it?

We said, if you have followed, if I may go on with it, we said yesterday, or in one of these discussions or talks, that the word 'art' means to put things in their proper place - right? In their proper place, not giving one or the other importance. If you give importance to technology then other ways of existence are not on the same level, therefore there is disharmony. If you give sex, as most people do, except perhaps there are exceptions, the most important, the highest, all consuming importance, the only thing that matters in life, then again you exaggerate and bring about disharmony. If you put money as all important, again contradiction takes place - or if you say power, domination is all important, again contradiction. Therefore to live harmoniously means to put everything in its proper place - will you do it? Will you do this - not give your body the tremendous importance the west gives, the western world, how they look, how they dress, you follow? This tremendous concern, which doesn't mean you mustn't dress properly, decently and all the rest of it. Will you do all this? If you don't why do you talk about order? There is no point at all. But if one wants to live in order and therefore live in harmony with a sense of great beauty, perhaps also peace, then you must have

order.

Order isn't to go from window to window - window-shopping! You understand the phrase 'window-shopping'? Never buy anything but go from shop to shop, and you think that is an extraordinarily wide mind, go from one book to another, one teacher to another, one guru to another, one priest to another, one philosopher - you follow? Never, never, never staying in one place and finding out. Why do people do that? Have you ever wondered? They go to India, they are fed up with their priest here, so perhaps there is something there and that is romantic, all that nonsense. And this is called gathering knowledge, or this is called an open mind. It isn't really an open mind, it is a big sieve, with large holes, with nothing but holes in it. We are doing this all the time in different ways. So we asking, are you serious enough, committed enough, dedicated enough, to live a life of total order?

Q: It seems easier to live in disorder.

K: It is much easier to live in disorder - is it?

Q: They have not realized at all what is disorder if they like to live in disorder.

K: Please, just for an hour this morning, let's find out for ourselves if we like to live in disorder - apparently most people do - disorder in their room, and so on - if they like it that's one matter, there is nothing to be said about it. But if you say that living in disorder brings about havoc in one's life, misery, confusion, violence and all the rest of it, then obviously one must become aware, cognizant, know, familiar, with one's disorder. Do it at least for an hour, or half an hour that we have left, or three quarters of an hour, while you are sitting here quietly talking over, find out.

Not as a group therapy, which is too silly, but you know, sitting quietly to find out, to become familiar with oneself.

If you find that you live in disorder, discover it for yourself, then what is one to do - right? You understand? Right sir? To find out what to do, or what not to do, one has to go into the question: what is the very root of disorder? What is the very root that produces all this confusion, conflict, misery - you follow? Total disorder in the way we live, what is the root of it? Don't say, 'It's me', or the ego - those are words - or thought. But find out for oneself.

Q: We accept the terror of the majority...

K: Sir, throw out all that, throw out Krishnamurti and all that nonsense and find out for yourself. I am really not interested in myself, I am too old for all that kind of childish stuff.

Q: That we do not care for others, that is the source of disorder.

K: We are talking about disorder, madam. That is what I am asking. What is the reason, the source, the essence of disorder? Just a minute, don't quote anybody, including myself. Because if you do you are just answering, saying something which others have said. So throw out what others have said, including this person. Don't belong to Krishnamurti. That would be fatal. Don't form Krishnamurti groups for god's sake. Just a minute, sir, for god's sake give time to this.

What is the root of disorder? Anything that is limited, anything that functions within a very narrow space must create disorder. If I love you as one human being and hate others it must create disorder - right? If I am attached to you and I don't care for the world at all as long as you and I are perfectly happy in our little

home. So we are discovering something, that is, anything that acts, lives in a very small space, in a very small shell, or the shell being enormous, it is still limited. Anything that moves, functions and acts within a narrow space must create disorder. If I belong to that guru, and not to any other gurus, then I am acting very limitedly - right? Obviously. But if I have no gurus at all, I don't follow anybody at all, then I may act widely.

So I am asking you, is disorder brought about by a limited way of life? My husband and nobody else. I say I must be kind, I must be generous, I must be compassionate, I must love others - but they are just words because my whole centre is round one person, or one thing. That may bring about disorder. So I have found that any action, any action which is limited must create disorder. That is, if I act as a nationalist it is disorder. If I act as a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, all the rest of it, it is disorder.

Now have you looked at yourself, become familiar with yourself, and say, 'No, sorry, that is so, I will drop it, finished'? If you are interested in finding out what is order then everything that creates disorder is dropped away instantly. Like a scientist involved in research, that is the central thing he is concerned about, the rest of the things are secondary, but that is the main thing, he is giving his whole life to it. So can you find out for yourself if you are acting, living in a small circle?

Q: Do you think it is so easy to change oneself, to have an insight - there is disorder and this is the reason?

K: Is it so easy to change oneself - right? That is the central question. Is it so easy to change oneself? I say, yes. Don't believe it because you are not going to change so easily. But if you see the

danger, you understand, real danger, as you see the danger of a precipice, you act. But you don't see the danger of limited action, limited way of living. Which is, I am attached to you, you are mine, and for god's sake let's live together peacefully, don't let's quarrel and let's forget the world, the world is ugly, I have to go out into the world and earn money and all the rest of it, but we two are together. This becomes too childish.

Q: Isn't there actually nothing else but order, and disorder is if I catch something out of this flow of order, so I stop it?

K: No, sir, there is no flow of order. That is just an imagination, that there is supreme order, which is god.

Q: No, no. I mean the order is everything in itself, there is order in the thing itself, if I understand, if there is an understanding of all the things around.

K: When you understand the danger of disorder in life, which is expressed in different ways - conformity, living in a narrow little groove, that groove may be very wide but it is still narrow, if you see all that, not verbally, intellectually but actually the danger of it, it is finished. There is order.

Q: I think it is not so easy to change oneself. I have the insight now, I realize the danger, then I go back to the City, I go back to my friends and I forget it.

K: The City, the business, the wife, the husband, are the most dangerous things because all that involves attachment. You understand? Wait a minute. It doesn't mean you can't be married and have a girl and all the rest of it, but please sir, see the danger of living as we are in a narrow small little circle - right? You know, sir, Saanen, this little village, they speak German, you go two miles

away they speak French, and those French people won't meet each other, they keep themselves into a very small little circle. Now we are doing the same. Do you actually see the danger of that way of living? That's all. If you don't see it, how is one going to make you see it, help you to see it? Wait a minute. I don't see the danger of conformity to a tradition, to a pattern, whether external or inward, I don't see that causes disorder. You have explained to me in ten different ways, I refuse to see it. You understand? Because it is very disturbing, and I am accustomed to live in a disorderly way and your asking me to look at it, it frightens me, I am appalled by it. If you talk to those people who have lived in the totalitarian states, they say, 'Yes, we have got used to it' - right?

Q: They have not got used to it.

K: How do you know madam?

Q: One hears. Look what has happened.

K: One or two have dissented. There are exceptions. There are one or two dissidents who are sent away to camps, to mental hospitals, and all the horror that they do. But the majority of them, apparently I am telling you, I have talked to many of them, they say, 'We have got used to it'. You have got used to disorder, you have got used to wars, you have got used to quarrelling with your wife and husband. So you have got used to living in this chaos. You know, sir, this is very interesting: cosmos means order, the word, cosmos. And the universe is in order, is complete order. And we live in disorder and try to understand cosmos, the universe. I wonder if you are following what I am talking about - no. How can I understand something that is total order, without a break in it, when I myself am living in disorder? I can't, so I am not concerned

with order. I am concerned with disorder and to say, 'Now, I am going to find out how to dissolve that disorder. I am going to find out, I am going to give my life' - you follow, it is important. And I see various causes that bring about disorder, that is enough. Then I say, 'All right, I am so interested, so passionately concerned with order.' So I begin with disorder and find out what are the causes, then it is simple. That is my whole concern is to live in order, as I don't know it I have to go back and find out - you follow? I spend time, energy, enquiring into it.

Don't catch my enthusiasm, or my interest, my passion, don't catch it! Because it isn't yours.

Q: I am weak, I don't have much strength. I tried one time, I found the reason of disorder which I somehow don't want to lose, so I stop there. Or I forget about it.

K: That's right. So in other words, you like to live in disorder. I am not condemning it, I am saying that is what happens.

Q: Order is inherently there, and it's our limitation.

K: Order is inherently there in human beings and it is only thought that brings disorder - you follow? This is an old statement of all the religious people: there is order, god is order, heaven is order, I am born of heaven, that little spark is in me, that will someday blossom and destroy disorder. We have played this game for a million years. You see how our minds works, which is tradition - you follow?

Q: Would you say that there is more order in your schools?

K: You see what is going on? He has gone off to the schools with which I am connected. He is not enquiring if he lives in disorder, he wants to find out if the schools are in disorder. You

see the escape.

Q: It is not an escape, it is just a curiosity.

K: No, sir, it is not. I am not interested - forgive me.

Q: It is a very serious problem. If the people who are associated and working in these schools and they are dependent on your order in order to make the school function. And that's a very serious problem.

K: Oh, no. Nobody is concerned about the schools here for the moment, or the teachers. We are concerned about disorder in each of us.

Q: Perhaps your commitment is part of disorder.

K: This is what happens when you discuss with people who are off onto something else.

Q: Either you are trying to hypnotize us according to your system of getting into your kind of order. If we want to find out order we have to do it according to ourselves. I found it very difficult to accept anything you say and sometimes I doubt very seriously that you are a complete orderly human being. Sometimes you make mistakes and I find it difficult to accept that you are perfect.

K: All right, sir. May I suggest that you hire a hall and talk.

Q: You can't take a question? Isn't this a question?

Q: It doesn't interest us. You look after your own people and let the other people listen.

K: We have talked nearly an hour, almost an hour, where are we?

Q: In disorder.

K: You have a good example of disorder, this lady says. A



person who goes off talking about something else and is not concerned about disorder in himself. I am not saying you are in disorder, or in order, but find out for oneself if you live in disorder, not a la Krishnamurti.

Q: I feel like the disorder is here.

K: Sir, will you give ten minutes to find out for yourself? You are here, perhaps some of you are glad I won't bombard you anymore, but for ten minutes can you find out for yourself whether you live in order or disorder, understanding what disorder is and not introducing order as a means of pursuing a conformity. I have explained all that. Can we spend ten minutes seriously together to find out if you and I live in disorder.

This disorder is prejudice. This disorder is caused by conformity, psychologically, which is to follow tradition - Catholic, the Beatles, and the opposite not to follow, is reaction, which is still conformity, and so on. And what is the root of this disorder? We said the root may be acting, thinking, in a very small enclosed area, psychologically. You may travel all over the world, but inwardly, psychologically one may live in a very, very small space; or extend that space, say, 'I must have an open mind, think, look at everything', and from that hoping to act, and all that. So can you during these ten minutes give your energy to find out if you live in disorder and the cause of it?

Please don't go off into meditation. It is there for you to look. If you find it is so, that you conform, that you are acting in a very, very small narrow circle, then can you look at it, observe it, and not try to do something about it? As we said the other day, when the good scientist, the first-class top people, when they look through a

microscope at a cell, or whatever they are looking at, if they come with a hypothesis, with a prejudice, with a desire to understand it, they are projecting their ideas onto it, so they don't see the thing itself. So they have discovered that if you observe without any 'prejudice', in quotes, the thing itself begins to move, to transform itself - you understand what I am saying? So can you, in the same way, look without any reaction to what you are looking at? That is, observing disorder, the cause of it, looking at it, not you want to transcend it, go beyond it, suppress it, run away, or say, 'This is all right', nothing, just to look. Then if you so look, then the thing at which you are looking begins to transform itself. The transformation of itself is order.

Q: It is a kind of pleasure also for you, maybe.

Q: Can we be quiet now?

K: It is not pleasure for me madam.

Q: I am not so sure.

K: All right, you are not sure. All right. You have understood? Sir will you listen, please, I want to tell you something. Something - just listen, for the fun of it.

When you observe something without the past, without the prejudice, without anything, the very thing at which you are looking is living, changing, and therefore it is never still. Therefore disorder is always still - still in the sense that it is disorder all the time - you follow what I am saying. But if you watch it that disorder in itself is transforming, becoming something else. So are you watching it that way?

Q: Is recognition involved in this watching?

K: It is not recognition. I said if you recognize it, it is a

memory. If you say, 'Yes, that is disorder, I am going to watch it', you have a memory of disorder, an idea of disorder, a concept, a formula and so on of disorder and with those concepts you are looking. Then you are looking at disorder extensively. But if you look without remembrance, without saying, 'That is disorder', but look like a scientist who says, 'I want to see what is happening there. I don't want to bring to it what I think should happen there.' I don't think the scientists do it, but I am saying I hope they do. Then that very thing that you are observing undergoes a tremendous transformation.

Q: Looking without memory isn't there no seeing of movement because..

K: That's it, there is no movement but only observation.

Q: Because the recognition of movement is memory already.

K: Yes. Will you do all this? Test it out, actually in daily life. That is the art of living. Which is, having put everything in its right place, then there is no disorder. But if you put everything in its right place because it is convenient, because you think you will save energy, because you think you will have order, then you are creating disorder. Right? Finished.

# **BOMBAY 1ST PUBLIC TALK 24TH JANUARY 1979**

Sir, may I begin? It appears to me that the art of dialogue is no longer there. Dialogue means conversation between two people; two people who are concerned with their daily, life with all the problems involved in their lives, two friends talking over together not only the world problems of the world outside them, but also the problems that exist within oneself, within the skin as it were. And if one may suggest this evening that we are talking over together not only our intimate problems but to observe objectively, impersonally what is happening in the world. So we are thinking over together. This is not a mere talk by the speaker. He intends that together we explore, investigate the problems, the catastrophe that is going on in the world, the madness, the wars, the utter mismanagement of governments and all the nonsense that is going on in the name of religion and all the gurus with their absurdities and all the so-called spiritual authorities with the extravagance, with their utter lack of understanding the truth.

So we are together, you and the speaker are going to investigate together, not only this evening but in the next three talks that will be here, and if one may suggest these gatherings which are serious, not frivolous, not mere intellectual entertainment or bask in some fantastic, romantic or idealized atmosphere. So please, bear in mind that we are investigating and therefore that demands that you be very serious. It is your responsibility also, as that of the speaker, that you challenge your ways of life, your ways of thinking, the beliefs that you have, the tradition that you accept. One must

challenge the whole way of our living, our daily living, not the theories, the suppositions, the superstitions, the various accepted beliefs and principles, they have absolutely no value at all; they have no meaning. The ideals that you accept are utterly destructive because we are concerned with our daily existence, that existence is relationship: relationship with each other, relationship with man and woman, relationship with your neighbour, relationship with the world and also relationship with nature.

So please bear in mind, if one may repeat that again, and I shall constantly, that we are concerned with the ways of our life, with all its turmoil, with all its fears, with its anxieties, ambitions, greed and so on. That is what we are concerned with because unless we transform our daily way of living mere meditation, trying to seek some form of enlightenment, have utterly no meaning whatsoever, because they lead to illusion.

One wonders why you are here. It will be very interesting for you to find out for yourselves why you listen to the speaker. What is it you intend to receive from him? What is it that you are demanding, questioning, challenging? Why all of you, if I may ask, have come, with what intention, with what motive, with what urge? If you can find that out for yourselves then we can establish a relationship between yourselves and the speaker. If you come, wanting some solace, some comfort, some form of escape from your daily life, some form of theoretical heaven, then I am afraid you will be very disappointed. But if you are concerned, as human beings must be concerned who are serious - the word serious means having weight, having great concern with the world, with their lives, with their reactions, but not merely, intellectually

activated by some kind of speech or talk. So I think it is very important if you could find out for yourselves why you are here. Either you are here out of curiosity and that has a very limited value or you have certain ideals about the speaker, of his reputation, of all that nonsense or you want to be confirmed in your own beliefs, in your own visions, in your own concepts, or, which is more important, which is much more worthwhile, that we, you and the speaker think together, investigate together, go into the problems of fear, of pleasure, of what it is to meditate, what it is to have a religious mind, what it means to have an absolutely quiet mind.

Then, if you come with that intention, with that urge, then we can both of us meet, not only verbally with all its semantic meaning, but also non-verbally which is much more difficult, more arduous, to meet or to communicate with each other non-verbally. It requires that you and the speaker meet at the same level, at the same time with the same intensity, then non-verbal communications becomes possible, but most of us are incapable of that because we waste our energy. We have not sufficient vitality, drive and so we easily accept various forms of comfortable theories, some form of tradition, some form of leadership and follow. So if we are at all serious, and I hope we are because it is only the serious man that lives, not the man who is merely accepting some form of pattern, a way of living, but the man who is profoundly serious, deeply concerned with what is going on with the world outside and also what is going on within himself, deeply committed to find out a way of living that is totally, revolutionary, different.

We are using the word `revolution', not physical revolution because that has been tried and that has led nowhere. We are talking about psychological revolution, the revolution that is the only thing that will bring about a different world, a different human being, a human being that is concerned, that has love, that understands the nature of our minds, and hearts. So please be serious, if you don't mind, at least for an hour.

Having said that let us enquire into our lives because that is the only thing we have; not your theories, not your beliefs, not your visionary acceptance of certain concepts or conclusions, they are utterly meaningless because they do not operate in our daily everyday life. So we are together this evening, if you will, be concerned with our daily existence, with all its complexity, and we are going to investigate together why we live the way we are living: the way of sorrow, conflict, confusion, insecurity, searching for some kind of reality to which the mind can cling.

So first, let us look at our life, at your life. You know to observe you need freedom to look, that is obvious, isn't it? If I am prejudiced, if I am frightened, if I am caught within a narrow groove of my own experience, or if I have some kind of conclusion, a concept, I am incapable of observing exactly what is going on within myself or outwardly. One can observe very clearly what is going on in the world but much more difficult to observe, to perceive, or to realize actually the state of your mind, the state of your heart. Because as one observes, and the speaker has, for the last fifty and more years, seen what is happening in this country, and what is happening in other foreign geographical divisions of Europe, America and so on, if one observes it carefully not from a

personal opinion then one discovers, as you must have also seen, that the world is degenerating. And it is more obvious in this country, that being stripped of all tradition, because your tradition is gone, you are only concerned, not with the search for truth, you are only concerned with money, power, possession and obviously the natural impulse of sex. You can watch yourself, if you have watched at all, how we are contradictory, we live a contradictory life: we say one thing and do another. Please observe what the speaker is saying, do not accept or reject, observe, find out.

I think everybody, at least those who have observed, who have gone into it, who are concerned realize that human beings are degenerating. They are not demanding their excellence, they are not challenging their own way of life, they have lost the energy to recreate their own existence, they have accepted the authority of the ancient books, or the authority of some guru and they have become merely followers. Don't you follow somebody? You see, you daren't acknowledge yourself to yourself. You depend on others. So when one sees what is happening in this country, as well as in other countries, one realizes that man has become what he was thousands and thousands of years ago, completely concerned with himself, he has become extraordinarily selfish, self-centred, thinking about his own problems, his own gain, his own success, his own misery, his own - all the rest of it, you know what you are all doing, I don't have to describe it, it is fairly obvious. And that is the beginning of degeneration; to degenerate, to go back to what we human beings were millions of years ago. We have not psychologically changed at all. We have better means of communication, electricity, better bathrooms, we can fly all over



the world, but essentially we are what we have been with slight modifications what we were a million years ago. Right? We are selfish, we are frightened, we are self-centred, all our actions are based either on greed or fear or demand for success and so on and so on. You know all this, don't you?

First of all it requires a great deal of honesty to observe actually your way of life. And is it possible to change radically, fundamentally, deeply so that a new human being is born? That is, whether you have the energy, the vitality, the urge, the intensity, to discover for yourself, not from another, whether it is possible to change your life so that you are really a human being, unafraid, not depending psychologically, not following somebody, being unattached, free.

So one observes also wherever you go, we human beings are almost alike psychologically, whether they are Americans, Russians, Chinese, or Indians or Muslims or whatever it be. They all suffer, they all bear pain, they all have anxiety, they are all confused, they are unhappy, frightened, and every human being, you, is the representative of all humanity. You understand this? Are we communicating with each other? The speaker is saying that every human being throughout the world goes through great travail, great anxieties, great fears, great insecurities, nothing is certain any more, like you they are - please listen to this-so you are like the rest of humanity. You are not different from anybody else, psychologically, you may have little problems peripherally but deeply, inwardly you are like the rest of all human beings. This is not a theory. This is not a concept but an actuality and so if one human being fundamentally transforms himself, he affects the

whole consciousness of man. One man affects the rest of the world, if he transforms himself. The Hitlers, the Stalins, all the mad people of the world have affected the human consciousness. The Buddha has affected the consciousness of mankind. So if you as a human being radically, fundamentally, bring about a change in your life, you affect the consciousness of mankind. I wonder if you realize it.

I mean by realizing, not intellectually, nor verbally, but feel the immense responsibility that you have as a human being, that you, if you can deeply transform yourself, not into something else, transform, then that transformation affects the rest of the consciousness of man. For most people this is a very difficult thing to accept even intellectually. Because they think each human being is a separate human being, an individual. Are you really individuals? Have you ever asked that question? Please ask it. Demand, find out, if you are individuals. You may have a separate name, you may be tall, dark, fair or have a bank account. Individual means a human being that is not divisible, that is, broken up, individual means a human being that is whole, complete, that is not divided, broken up in himself, fragmented. When one realizes the serious nature of this statement that you are the world and the world is you, then your responsibility becomes enormous. And so we are going to investigate together whether it is possible to bring about a change, change in our habits, change in our ways of thinking, to have a clear mind and to know what love is. So we are going to enquire into all that. First of all to enquire, to investigate, demands that you come to investigate freely. That is, free from your prejudices, from your opinions, from your

conclusions, from your particular experience of what you think is god or whatever it is, otherwise you can't examine. You understand this, it's so obvious isn't it? That if you are going to investigate into your life, into the life of the society, the life of the world, you have to come to it with freedom to find out, mustn't you? Are you free from your prejudice? - that one thing, prejudice. Because to investigate implies a mind that is capable of observation, capable of action, capable of perception, seeing what is true and what is false?

Are we meeting each other? Please do tell me. Are we communicating with each other? You are all so very silent. When you observe your life, your own life, not mine, not your neighbours, not your guru's, you daren't observe the life of your gurus, because his life is pretty ugly too, he is ambition, seeking power, money, position, and all the rest of that nonsense - but when you observe, yourself what is your life? All life is based on relationship. There is no life without relationship. One may live in the Himalayas, but still the hermit is the product of the world and whatever food he eats is the product of the world. Nobody lives in isolation, they cannot possibly. So life is a movement of relationship and action. Right? Is that right sir, can we go on from there? Are we meeting each other?

So we are saying life is the movement of relationship. Now what is our relationship with each other? Have we any relationship at all with another, or is our relationship based on some concept, some imaginary memory, or certain images that we have created about each other, and we look at each other through those images? Right? Why are you all so silent? Sir, this demands your active

capacity to think, not just go to sleep. We have to think together to find out, and if we do not, or if we are incapable of thinking, then we are incapable of observing what is going on. Sir, ladies, let us look what is happening in the world first? Because apparently, to enquire within yourself is most difficult for you. Probably you have never done it. You have never watched yourself as you watch yourself in a mirror to see exactly what is going on, not what you think should happen and apparently most of you have not done it.

So let us next begin by looking at the world first. That is, the world outside you is now a dangerous place to live. There are wars, governments all over the world are incapable of dealing with all the problems. If they solve one problem, the very solution of that problem creates other problems. The world is divided by nationalities, by governments, each government is preparing for war. They are spending, the world is spending four hundred, thousand million dollars a year on armaments which is totally insane and your taxes are supporting this. There are rebellions, terrorists, idealists, who want to create a Utopia and therefore they are willing to kill others. All this is spread out before you in the world and what is your relationship to that? You understand my question? How do you regard that, the terror, the utter confusion of the politicians who are obviously seeking their own position, power and all the rest of it. What is your relationship to all that? You have elected them , you have created them, and we demand that society change, become less corrupt, but society is the relationship of two human beings. If those two human beings are greedy, seeking power, position and all the rest of it, they are responsible for the society in which they live. Again it is all so very

obvious.

So it becomes more and more important, more and more urgent that human beings, you, radically change. I wonder how one can convince you of this, how one can make you feel the importance of this, that we are destroying the world and ourselves. And what is a human being like you to do? What action should you take? Right sir? Enquire, challenge, ask what should you do, what can you do, as a human being living in this chaos, in this corruption, in this great dishonesty, what is your action, what is a human being to do, you, in the midst of this confusion? You understand my question? Are you interested in this question? If you are interested let us go into it. You see sirs and ladies our actions are based on our past knowledge. All our actions very carefully thought out or are based on some ideals or on some motive or on some accumulated knowledge as memory, all action is born out of that. That is obvious. So our action, as our lives, are from the past. We live in the past. The past goes through the present, meets the present, modifies itself and goes on. That is our life. The past with all our experience, with all our knowledge, with all our suffering, with all our anxieties which is our knowledge, that knowledge meets the present, modifies itself and goes on.

So our action is based on this movement: from the past, modifying itself in the present and going on. So our action is based on knowledge. Whether it is technological knowledge, go to the moon, or the knowledge where you live, the knowledge of your wife or husband, knowledge is essentially the past and all our actions spring from that past, therefore our actions are limited, they are never complete, never whole. So our actions have always got

regrets, pain, sorrow, confusion and so on. Do you see this, that knowledge is the motive of our action. Technologically, to speak a language, to go to the office, to do all the work you do in a factory or office or any kind of manual or intellectual work, must have the skill of knowledge. That is essential. So the problem arises, if you are interested, if you want to go very deeply into it, what place has knowledge psychologically in our relationship with each other? You understand sir? As we said, knowledge is essentially the accumulation of experience stored up in the brain and from that brain, from that memory, all response is thinking. So our actions are based on thought and thought naturally then is limited, is fragmented, broken up, thought is never complete. So our actions are always incomplete. Is this clear?

Now, because our actions are incomplete there is anxiety, there is regret, there is pain. So one wants to find out, if you are serious, if there is an action that is not based on knowledge in our relationship. Are we meeting each other? It's up to you sirs, I am not going to ask any more if you understand. I'll go on. Our relationship with each other is based on memory. If you are married, or if you have a girl friend or whatever it is in your relationship, you have an image about her and she has an image about you. Don't you? A picture about her and a picture about him. No? Of course. An image, that is, what she has said to you in the past, what you have said to her in the past. The nagging, the quarrels, all the sex, all that is stored up as knowledge and our relationship is based on that knowledge. So we are asking, if you are serious, is relationship merely a memory? Is relationship, based on memory, love? Is love merely desire, pleasure and

remembrance? Or, is love something entirely different? So we are asking a very serious fundamental question: whether there is an action which is not based on past memories. But you must have knowledge, which is the past, when you walk, when you talk, when you go to the office, technologically and so on and so on. But has knowledge any place in our relationship? Please answer, find out for yourself, because if it is then you will have no love, you may say you love your wife or your husband but if it is merely a memory then it is the love of thought and thought is not love. And in this country one watches what is happening here, the degeneracy begins when there is no love.

So is it possible to bring about a different kind of action. Right, sir? Are you, if I may ask most politely and respectfully, merely listening to what is being said or are you working it out in yourself? Are you observing your life, your daily life of relationship, and the action that is born out of this relationship, whether in the office or in business or whatever you do, are you observing this or merely hearing with the ear and just casually passing it by? Please ask yourself this question and find out. And one asks why there is this degeneration, not only in this country where it is so obvious, but also in other countries. Why? Have you asked this question why man, human beings are becoming degenerate? Why? Not the description of degeneracy, not mere economic reasons or overpopulation or bad government or this or that but what is the root cause of this appalling decay of human beings? What is the source of it? Have you asked? Please, what the speaker is going to point out, don't accept it or reject it, but listen to it. You know what it means to listen? Do you ever listen to your

child, to your son? He wants to tell you a story, he wants to tell you about himself and naturally if you love your son you listen to him. You don't interrupt, you don't say it is good or bad, tell me all about it. Tell me all your story, what you think, what you feel, what you do. So in the same way listen to it. Please listen. You know, with that care, with that attention, with that love, with that affection, willing to find out. Which means you don't accept anything, you don't deny anything but just listen. That is the art of listening. As you would listen to a little boy whom you love, whether it is your son or your daughter, if you ever listen to anybody at all. So in the same way be good enough to listen.

We are asking why human beings throughout the world are going down the hill? Why? They give many, many reasons: economic, social, overpopulation, bad governments and so on, superficial reasons, but there must be a basic reason.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We will discuss it sir. Let me first finish what I have to say if you don't mind. Then you can interrupt, question, challenge, demand anything you like, but please just listen.

The principal, the active cause of this degeneration is - don't accept it or deny it but just listen to a story which your son is telling you, or your girl is telling you - is that the intellect has become so dominant, so powerful, that the intellect with all its capacity to think clearly, to act clearly, with all its activity of thought, that has predominated the world and is predominating the world, that is the basic cause of decay because intellect is only one part of our whole being. The intellect that can argue, has theories, capable of deep enquiry, the intellect, the intellect is not the whole



nature of man, the wholeness of man and because a part has become all important and therefore fragmenting the world, fragmenting your own actions and as the intellect with all its capacity to think reasonably, unreasonably, having its illusions and clarity, that has predominated, and that is the cause of our decay, because we are not acting with all our nature, with all our being. Do you understand? The intellect, that is, we are using the word 'intellect' to mean the capacity to think reasonably, logically and objectively or unreasonably, without clarity, caught in illusions - that is the intellect. And when that rules our life, and the intellect being only a part not a whole, then there are divisions between man and man, country and country, class and class, religion different from other religions. It is the function of thought to divide and that is the function of the intellect, and as that dominates the world that is the basic cause of our degeneration. Don't accept or deny it, but investigate it, look at it, find out if it is false or true, exercise your brain to find out, your brain, not the experts brain who say this cause is this and the other. Find out for yourselves.

Isn't your life dominated by thought? No? And all your actions are dominated by thought. Thought has created all the gods in the world: the rich man's god who says, 'God is good because he is affluent' and the poor man says, 'God is rather terrible'. It is all brought together by thought, the temples and the things that are in the temples, the churches and the things that are in the churches; the rituals, the dogmas, the images, the pictures, all that is the result of thought. You are a Parsi because you have been trained from childhood to accept the belief that you are that or the Hindu, the Muslim and all the rest of it. All that is the activity of thought.

So when thought predominates the world then there must be conflict because thought in its very nature is limited because thought is born out of memory. Memory is the result of experience which is knowledge. Our brain holds knowledge, experience and thought is a material process. There is nothing sacred about thought. Thought can create beauty, thought can create ugliness, thought can create the most marvellous pictures and thought can create devastating wars. Right?

So the problem arises if you are serious: is there a possibility of action, life without this constant battle, without this constant desire for something more and more and more, struggling, struggling, struggling? You know, we think we are advancing, human beings are advancing, making tremendous progress. Are we? Technologically perhaps. But are we as human beings psychologically developing, growing, flowering in goodness? Do you understand my question? Because that is culture, culture means to grow, to develop, to flower, to be excellent. Culture tied to tradition destroys the growth of human beings. So that is the cause of this degeneration that is going on in the world, from that, from the realization not the theory of it, not the verbal concept of it but the feeling, the reality, the truth that as long as one element of our being dominates, there must be decay. So one asks is it possible to act totally as a whole healthy sane human being? You understand my question sir? Is it possible to live a life without a shadow of conflict, without a shadow of fear, without the everlasting pursuit of pleasure which is desire and with all its complexity, with all its struggles and is there a possibility of ending sorrow?

Unless you answer all these questions deeply and find an answer not verbally, but actually ending sorrow, ending fear and understanding the nature of pleasure and the nature of desire, then only is there a possibility of acting as a total, whole, sane human being. This is part of meditation, not merely sitting in a corner and going off into some kind of dream. The actual meditation begins with the understanding of our daily life, to see what is false, and what is true. To see what is illusion and what is not, to see that which is false and to see the truth in the false. You understand what I am saying?

So sirs, which includes ladies naturally, what we are talking about is a very serious affair. It demands you excellent capacity to think, to exercise your brain and not merely live as we live day after day after day in a routine. We have become machines. It is part of the tradition that that has brought this about. So we are asking, is there a way of living a life which is complete, whole, sane, rational, not illogical and putting everything in order in our life and then only we can proceed much further. You know there is a great mystery, not the mystery in temples and all that kind of stuff, that's nonsense, but the mystery that is absolutely impeccable, that thought can never capture and that requires a great freedom. Because only a free mind, a healthy mind, a sane mind can be a religious mind, not all the rituals and all the circus that goes on in the name of religion. That is all a joke, meaningless. But to have a mind that is whole, complete, not broken up, divided into business, sex, money, power, you follow, how one's mind is broken up, which is obviously a destructive mind.

So we are challenging you, not just a verbal acceptance whether

you can live a life and we are going to go into that to see if we can be free completely and utterly of fear. Fear of death, fear of loss, fear of attachment, fear of losing a job in a world that is becoming more and more difficult, whether man, who has carried this fear for millennia after millennia, whether he can be completely totally free of it, whether man can be free of the burden of sorrow, whether he can ever know what it means to love another. To find out all this, to go into all this, your mind must be free to enquire, to look, to challenge. So it is your responsibility, if you come to these talks, that you are thinking, actively demanding, questioning. Then perhaps we can go very, very deeply into something that is not the product of thought.

## **BOMBAY 2ND PUBLIC TALK 27TH JANUARY 1979**

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday, no, on Wednesday. We were saying, if I remember rightly, that the root of the degeneration of mankind at the present time is this living a life on concepts, conclusions, theories, and that is an activity of the intellect, and when intellect predominates all our existence, then it must be, as we pointed out, a lopsided life that is not harmonious, complete, whole. I do not know if any of you followed all this clearly and if we may we will go on further into what we were talking about. First of all I would like, if I may, to point out that this is a serious gathering, not an amusement affair, but people who are serious, deeply concerned with what is happening outside in the world and in their own lives, the lives of conflict, confusion, misery, and before we go into further what we intend to talk about this evening, I think one must learn the art of listening, the art of hearing accurately what the speaker has to say. If you do not give complete attention to that hearing, I am afraid then whatever is said will be confusing, not effective, ineffectual.

So the art of listening implies that one gives attention. You know what you think. You know what your activities are, you know your own opinions, you know your own values, judgements, and concepts. If those interfere with what you are hearing, then you can't possibly hear what the other person has to say. So one has to learn to listen attentively. And probably it becomes very difficult for most people to give complete attention for any length, for an hour, so their minds wander off, they partially hear, they hear what

they want to hear. So as we are going to talk about serious things, please, if I may ask, listen with care as you listen to somebody whom you love, if you love anybody at all. Listen with the intention to understand what the other person is saying, not only listen to the speaker, but in life, to your wife, to your husband, to your children, to listen, not only with the ear to listen, but also listen beyond the word which is much more difficult. Because to listen so intensely implies that we must both be, the speaker as well as you, on the same level with the same intensity, at the same time, otherwise you can't communicate properly and we want to talk about so many things this evening so please learn, if I may respectfully suggest, learn the art of listening. That means putting aside your own opinions, your judgements, your experiences, your wishes, your desires, your motives; just listen happily to somebody who wants to tell you something.

Because one feels that in the very act of listening, the very act of listening brings about a change because it is like a pool that is very still, quiet of an evening and you drop a stone in it and it makes waves. In the same way listen. And also, if I may point out, there is also the art of seeing. We hardly ever see actually anything completely. We have visual impressions casual or deep. But to learn the art of seeing, observing, demands again attention. When you attend to something very deeply you forget about yourselves, you forget about your worries, your problems, because in that attention there is no centre from which you are attending. I do not know if you have ever done all these things, if you have, then please this evening not only listen but observe your own thoughts, your own feelings, your own impressions, your experiences and

see if they have any validity. And also there is the art of learning. Most of us learn by accumulating knowledge, facts, going to school, college, university, if you are so lucky, which is to memorize. But also there is an art of learning which is not memorizing, that comes about by listening and seeing exactly what is false and what is true. To see the truth in the false, to have an insight into that which is absolutely true.

Most of us learn and then act. You accumulate knowledge and use that knowledge skilfully in life. You act and then learn from that action and accumulate knowledge again from that action. That is, you learn first a great deal of information, then from that knowledge you act skilfully or not skilfully. And there is the other which is, you act and from that action learn, which is to accumulate knowledge. So these are both the same, that is, to acquire knowledge and then act, act and acquire knowledge; so both are the same. So we are saying something entirely different and please listen to it, you may not agree or disagree but just listen as some child who wants to tell you a great story about himself, his little experiences. With the same care, affection, listen. There is a different way of acting, not from the accumulation of knowledge but having an insight into something immediately; that is, to see, observe with all your attention that any kind of organization either spiritual or political - please listen to all this carefully - religious organizations, political organizations, social organizations are not going to solve the human problems at all. No organizations will ever solve our human problems. To have an insight into that, into the truth of that, is to act instantly, not acquire knowledge and then act. I wonder if you see this.

That is, you acquire knowledge and from that knowledge act. So there is an interval between knowledge and action and in that interval, which is time, during that interval, during that gap, all other actions come into being. So your action is never complete. Whereas if you see that no organization as an example, no organisation - political, religious organization - as an example - no organization, political, religious, the very latest organization, is not going to solve the problems of man, when you see that, have an insight into it, you act immediately, which implies that don't belong to any organization. That means that you are by your own strength, by your own vitality, by your own energy, you are solving instantly your problems. This is something probably you have not heard about. Probably you have not gone into this question of action, because life is action. Everything that you do implies action, intellectual, physical, emotional and so on. And our actions are based on an ideal, something in the future or on a principle, again something in the future, or on a concept or on some conclusion, which are all the activities of the intellect and so these actions are never whole, complete; in those actions there are regrets, they bring about confusion, uncertainty. Whereas we are saying, to have an insight, to see something instantly and act.

As we were saying the other day when we met here, intellect, that is the capacity to reason logically, sanely, is the movement of thought. Intellect is the instrument of thought and all our life is based on thought. This building is built by thought. The churches are built by thought, and the content of the churches and the temples, the Mass and so on are the result of thought. It is obvious for any persons, who sees sanely, rationally, without any personal



emotions and prejudices, thoughts plays an extraordinary importance in our lives and in our relationship with each other. And thought, as we pointed out the other day, is limited because it is based on memory, on experience, on knowledge. So knowledge is always limited. So thought is limited and fragmented and the more you think about your problems the less you will be able to solve the problem, except technological problems. And we are saying, it is important to understand the nature of thought and its right place which is technological knowledge: how to drive a car, to speak English, or whatever language you speak, to go to the office, to do all the technological functions, activities demand thought but thought has no place whatsoever in the psychological field. When thought takes over the psychological field the trouble begins. This is again, as we have explained carefully, the other time and we do it now.

So we are saying, knowing oneself, what you actually are, what you think, what you feel, knowing yourself is the beginning of freedom. Please understand this because most of us have never looked at ourselves. You may have looked in the mirror when you were shaving or combing your hair, but we have never inwardly looked at ourselves and that is what we are going to do. Knowing oneself implies three things: either you know yourself from the past, from your past experience, from your past incidents, events which have accumulated knowledge, so you say, I am that. I hope you are following all this. Or you observe yourself as you are, that is, what you are actually thinking, what you are actually feeling and what you are doing in the present. In that observation there is no need for the past to interfere. Would you please do it as we are

talking, not memorize it, go home and then try to remember, but as we are talking together because we are thinking together, we are sharing together, we are looking at ourselves together. So you are doing it now, not when you go home, you are then doing it from memory. I hope that is clear.

That is, you look at yourself from your past knowledge, that is simple, you all do that, or you look at yourselves as you are living, as you are thinking, as you observe your reactions now. Or you look at yourself as you might be in the future. The future is the modification of the past, passing through the present and projecting the future. Are you following all this? Because we are going to enquire into something, if you are interested because it is part of our life, which is to find out whether it is possible not to waste our energy. If you act from the past you are wasting your energy, because you are being conditioned by the past, the past tells you what to do or what to say and so there is a wastage of energy because you are not living actually in the present, which is to watch your reactions, your prejudices, your experience actually as you are living now. And you are wasting your energy when you are acting according to a principle, to an ideal which is a concept of the intellect. So to know oneself, the knowing of oneself is to be aware of the wastage of energy and the summation of energy. I am going to go into that slowly.

The self, the you, is knowledge. When you say, I, myself, your selfishness, all that is based on knowledge. If you had no knowledge, there is no self. Please see the truth of it, or the falseness of it, which means you must have the mind that is attentive, that is not prejudiced, that is not caught in its own stupid

experiences, but is willing to listen. The self, the `me', my ego, my personality, is essentially knowledge. Therefore knowledge is the past. So the self is in essence the past. And when you live in the past as most people do you are wasting an enormous amount of your energy, because you need all your energy, which is the essence of religion. A religious mind is not caught in any experience, in any belief, in any concept, which are all the activities of the intellect, which is the thought and thought is memory. I hope you see all this. So we live in the past and the past meets the present, modifies itself and goes on, but it is still rooted in the past.

Now the brain is very ancient. Please, I am going to go into something, give your attention a little bit. If you want me to stop for a little while, so that you can come back from your own wanderings of thought I will stop. I want to talk over with you, the speaker wants to talk over with you something which demands your real attention and if you are tired, if your mind is wandering I will stop and take a breather and we will continue.

Our brain is very, very old, it has evolved through time. It has had a great many experiences from the ancient ape to modern times. It has accumulated enormous impressions, experiences, knowledge, reactions. It has gathered and has lived in tradition. So it is heavily conditioned, which is obvious. And the capacity of the brain is limited by its own conditioning. The conditioning is the result of time and the brain can only function effectively when it is completely secure: secure in its relationship with another - intimate and not intimate - secure in ideas, in illusions, in neuroticism, in beliefs, the brain demands that it be completely secure. It is only

then it can act fully. So the brain seeks security in multiple ways. It has sought security in gods which are the product of thought. All the rituals, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion is the product of thought, and the brain has accepted that illusion and finds in that illusion security. Obviously. And the brain is constantly in action because all the time human beings are thinking, chattering, projecting or involving some political, religious, personal problems. It is everlastingly chattering and in that chattering it also finds security - of course, otherwise it wouldn't chatter. Please understand this - not how to stop chattering but see what the brain is doing - that it demands security and the constant chattering which becomes a habit, and in that habit there is security.

Belonging to a particular group, communist, socialist, this and that, a Hindu, a Muslim, living in that limited concept is security. Now is there security for the brain at all? You enquire, you challenge it, challenge yourself and find out if the brain, the brain is only part of the whole mind, the mind being sensations, the sensual responses, the emotions, the reactions, the intellect, the thought, all that is the mind, the whole mind, and the brain and its activities are part of that mind, and the mind plays an extraordinary part in our lives. So we are asking a question which probably you won't be able to answer, if you ask it really seriously perhaps you will be able to, whether the brain must always live in a conditioned area - being a Hindu, a Muslim, a Catholic or the new gurus or old gurus, whatever it is, must always live in an illusion because in that there is safety. So we are asking, is there a security for the brain which is not based on thought?

If this is too complex, too subtle, I will go on to something else, because you see you have got brains, they have been misused, the business man is only concerned with money and the romantics are only concerned with romance. He has divided life, you understand, as business, the artists, the sentimentalists, the intellectual and all that, he has broken up the activity of the brain into fragments and he is never capable of operating with the whole brain. The brain is only functioning in a very, very small area of itself, and we are saying there is a possibility of the whole brain acting, then that action is something entirely different. Now we are asking, if there is a security which is not illusory, which is not based on belief, which is not based on experience, because that becomes knowledge, then it is a fragment, then it is only part of the brain acting, whether it is possible for thought which is a fragment not to interfere in its movement. I say, I am pointing out it is possible and I will show you how it is possible, not a method, no system, no practice that all becomes mechanical, stupid.

Now take one thing: when you sleep you dream. Most people do, either very, very superficial dreams, which are the dreams of the body reactions or so-called very deep dreams. Now why do you dream at all? We dream, why? We dream because, if you investigate into yourself, which is part of self-knowing, we carry over our problems, our human problems. We carry over from day to day, our jealousies, our hurts, our anxieties, our greed, our envy, our ambitions. So the brain is kept constantly in an artificial movement of thought. Do you understand all this? Do some of you understand? Will you encourage me? I don't want your encouragement.

So one must find out whether it is possible not to dream, and I say it is possible when any problem that arises, human problem, is resolved instantly, not carry it over. You understand my question? The moment you carry over an event, a happening, an insult, a flattery, your jealousy, carrying it over keeps the brain in that movement, in the movement which is limited. Whereas if you end the problem instantly, you release the artificial activity of thought. You understand - some of you. So you dream because you are not attentive during the day, attentive to what people say when they insult you, when they praise you, attentive to your immediate sexual, or other problems, to be attentive, and in that attention there is an ending to the problem. So when you sleep, please listen, the brain has its own rhythm, its own movement, but not the movement - I call it the artificial movement of thoughts with all its problems. So when the brain is allowed to function without the interference of thought it has its own natural rhythm which rejuvenates the brain, the brain that has no pressure, where there is pressure, there is deterioration. So the brain has its own capacity of being secure in itself when it is free from all the impositions of thought.

One of the factors in self-knowing which makes the brain - distorts the brain - is fear. Now we are at home! The brain, please listen to the beauty of the activity of the brain. I am not a brain specialist. No I am not, but I have watched it. The speaker has talked to specialists and so on but they are superficial, they are all informative but they have never gone into themselves very deeply. You know, the brain is an extraordinary instrument; it is so subtle, so quick, so vital, so full of energy, if thought with its

fragmentation doesn't impose itself on it. And one of the great pressures, which is most destructive for the brain, is fear. Most people are afraid - aren't you, if you are honest. If you want to be aware of yourself, if you want to resolve this enormous burden of fear which man has carried for millennia, you have to find out if it is possible to end fear: fear of god, fear of what might happen to you tomorrow, fear of losing a job, fear of somebody running away from you, fear of loneliness, fear of not becoming a great success, fear of so many, many things. Aren't you afraid of so many things - old age? Am I talking to myself? Fear, you know what fear does, don't you? It makes you cringe, it brings darkness, you can't see clearly, all your responses shrink, they withdraw, don't you know all this, when you are afraid both physically as well as psychologically?

So, there is the fear of getting hurt physically, having been hurt physically then - please listen to this - having been hurt, having been to a dentist and the fear of not having that pain again. You have to solve that psychosomatic fear. You know what psychosomatic is - it is the psyche and the body, soma and the psyche. Which is to see the pain, to have the pain and not let it carry over for the next day. You end the pain. You go to the dentist, if you are unfortunate enough to go there, you go to the dentist, he drills you, gives you a great deal of pain, and not register it, not carry it over, end it, as you leave the dentist's chair, finished, which means you are tremendously attentive. While the drill is going on and not shrink, pain is there, but watch it. You understand this? Do it and you'll find out. It is not a theory. Don't memorize. Do it. And the other is psychological pain, the inward

pain of being hurt by people; when you are at school you are hurt by your teacher, at home when you are being compared with somebody who is much more intelligent than you, all that hurts you and you carry that hurt throughout life consciously or unconsciously. All that implies fear. Right?

So we are saying, fear is a great pressure on the brain, it cannot act fully. So is it possible to be completely free of fear? Fear of death, fear of being alone, fear of being lonely, fear of losing, fear of not being attached to something, fear of identifying with something, and not being able to identify with anything, various forms of fear. Do you know your own fear? I am not asking you to tell me but are you aware of your own fear. Perhaps not now but when you go home, when you are quiet, by yourself, if you ever are, then the fear comes into being. So we are asking, is it possible to end fear, not temporarily, relatively, free of fear for a few days, but completely, so that you have no psychological fear at all. That implies tremendous sanity. So many people who are frightened, that shrink, that have become hypocrites, and all the rest of it.

So what is fear? Not the objects of fear. You understand? One may be afraid of the dark, one may be afraid of politicians, one may be afraid of this or that, but the very feeling of it, the reaction of it, that sense of shrinking, what is the root of it? The root of it is time. Just examine it, don't reject it. The root of fear is time both chronologically as well as psychologically: you have had pain yesterday or a week ago, and you might get it again and you hope you don't get it and fear. That has taken time. You see that? Right? You are following this? Or you might be afraid of what might happen, which again is in the future which involves time. You are



afraid of death, again you are living, but death is far away which means time. I won't go into more detail. It is fairly obvious. Time means fear, time means movement, from here to go to your home is a movement of time which covers the distance, time also implies the interval between the living and the ending. Time is this movement by the clock as well as by thought. That is clear.

So thought is time. Have you ever realized thought is never still. It is always moving, chattering, conceiving, imagining, wanting, searching, you follow? Chattering, chattering, chattering. That is a movement. So time is movement and thought is movement. So time is thought. You are following all this? So we are saying the root of fear is thought which is time. Now, please as we said at the beginning of the talk, listen to it. First listen to it. Don't argue about it, that it is, it is not, but just listen and find out for yourself whether it is true or false. Then you will ask, how am I to stop thinking. That is your natural question. If thought is the root of fear, which it is, which is time, how is thought to come to an end so that I shall not be afraid? Right? That is a natural question, isn't it? No? That is a wrong question. No. No, this is not cleverness, it is a wrong question, because you have not seen the truth that time is fear. If you see the truth of it, then thought comes to an end. Truth is that which is - I won't go into all that.

So the brain has been conditioned to act and to waste its energy in fear. And we are saying, when there is an ending to fear you are releasing a tremendous energy into the whole structure of the mind. We will go into the question of death tomorrow or on Wednesday, but first see that how we waste our energy by dividing our life, which brings conflict: the business man entirely concerned with

money, money, money, and the housewife concerned entirely with the kitchen or whatever she does, and the lawyer and the priest and the artist. You know. This division is in essence a total waste of energy. To live that way brings conflict. If you divide, break up your life into departments and each department is active on its own, it must be in conflict with other departments. So where there is a conflict there is a wastage of energy. Come on, sirs, see it.

And as we said, religion, the religious mind, not all the rot that goes on in the name of religion which is absolute nonsense - a religious mind has this enormous capacity because its brain has its own rhythm and it is never under pressure. This we will go into when we talk about meditation and all that. So as we live now, our life is conflict. That is so obvious. Conflict between you, your wife, your husband, with your children, with your society, conflict, struggle, struggle. And the art of living is to find out whether it is possible to live without a single conflict. Which doesn't mean that you become dull, because we think conflict gives us sharpness, we progress and all the rest of that business, but to find out a way of living, which is the art of living, in which there is not the slightest shadow of conflict. Conflict will exist always when thought, which is the movement of fragmentation, which we went into carefully, when thought usurps the whole field of existence, then it breaks up life and therefore there must be conflict, and so the brain realizing the damage of conflict seeks security wherever it can, in illusions, in beliefs, in dogmas, in religions, in rituals, in experience, which is again a divisive process. So there is a way of living, if you go into yourself very, very deeply, there is a way of living in which there is no conflict and therefore the brain has its own rhythm and

therefore it has an extraordinary capacity.

## **BOMBAY 3RD PUBLIC TALK 28TH JANUARY 1979**

If I may, I would like to talk about many things this afternoon. As we were saying yesterday and in the previous talk, it becomes very important if one is at all serious that there should be a radical transformation of our consciousness, because the world is in such chaos, almost insane and few people apparently take notice of it. They are only concerned, it appears, with their own immediate problems, with their own particular desires, with their own little backyard and cultivating that little backyard. It appears rather rare that a group of people who are really concerned as to how to bring about a change psychologically, naturally, in the human mind. I do not know if you are concerned with it, or you are merely listening to a talk and not participating, sharing in what is being said. We are not propagandists. We are not putting out new principles, old ideas, or new ideas, new methods, new systems. But we are concerned with the transformation, mutation of the human mind because the society in which we live is corrupt and no politician, no scientist, no ecologist or economist is going to save man. This is so obvious. Nor any guru, nor your particular meditation, if you do meditate and I hope you don't, because I am sure you don't know what it means.

So if you are at all serious, and I hope you are, is it possible, ask yourself please, we are sharing this thing together, I am not talking to myself or giving a lecture, we are sharing this question, whether it is possible for our mind, for our daily life to be radically changed. One has thought that human beings would change by

bringing about a physical revolution, changing the environment, dictatorship, totalitarianism, but man has remained more or less the same through millennia. His brain, his mind, his heart, the whole nature of the human being is more or less as it was a million years ago. We have made technological progress but not psychological transformation of the human mind and that is what we are concerned with.

We were saying yesterday that we waste our energy and energy is required to have a religious mind because it is only religion that brings about a new culture. Religion in the sense, not what we call religion, all the circus and the nonsense that is going on around us in the name of religion or in the name of god, but religion which is based on deep aesthetic morality, a religion that is not based on belief, on experience, on authority, whether it is the authority of the Gita, Upanishads, the Bible, the Koran or any book - and in matters of the spirit there is no authority. And if one can put aside authority - not the authority of the law and all that, but the authority of the priest, the authority of the guru, the authority of the so-called sacred books, then your mind being free we can investigate together into the nature of what is a religious life in the modern world.

And to so examine we must first look at desire, what place it has in life, what is its importance, whether desire has significance of any kind at all, and what is its right place. So we are going to talk over together - the speaker means together, that you don't listen merely to a talk and not participate, share in what is being said - so we are going to talk over together this evening, not only desire, pleasure, love, whether sorrow can end, and if we have time

we shall go into the question of death, because this is part of our life, our daily monotonous life.

So we will start with desire, why religions throughout the world have said, you must control desire, you must suppress desire or transmute desire, and desire has been associated with the ultimate enlightenment and so on. So please, as we said yesterday, one must learn the art of listening, that you listen with care, putting aside your particular experience, your desire, your own thoughts, and try to find out what the speaker has to say. That is listen and in the very act of listening, share, which doesn't mean you agree or disagree but in listening you will find out for yourself whether what is being said is true or false. If it is false, don't accept it, put it completely aside, but if it is true then test it out. Test it out now as you are sitting here - because we are going to talk over things that need a great deal of attention, perception, insight, care. This has been one of the great problems of our life - desire, and why man has tried to suppress it, to control it, to give it full reign, why has desire become so extraordinarily important. So we are going to go into this question, what is desire, not the objects of desire, whether it be for a woman, for a man, for a car or for god, they are all the same. The moment you have desire, the objects - god, car, woman or a house, whatever it is they are all on the same level, because desire is driving you.

So, we are enquiring into what is desire, the nature of desire. Desire exists when there is want, when there is lack. If you lack food then there is desire, if you lack clothes, there is desire, when there is a want, there is a desire. This is so obvious. And why does man not only psychologically want, but want something which is

immeasurable, which is beyond all measure.

So we are going to first ask, if we may, what is the nature of desire? What is desire and will, because most of our lives are dictated by the action of the will. So will and desire are not separate. We are going to enquire together into the nature and the movement of desire and whether will is part of desire and whether man can exist without will. All this is involved in this. What is desire? How does it arise, and why have religions, Christian, Hindu, Buddhism and so on, said that to serve god, not Buddhism, that to serve god you must give over your desire. So we are asking what is the nature and the movement of desire? Don't wait for me to answer. I am going to go into it. But you must also enquire with the speaker. Otherwise you merely hear words and you have heard a thousands years of words. Would you mind not taking notes because you cannot possibly take notes and pay attention. This is your life, not my life. So please be good enough to pay attention, if you are interested, if you are not then it is all right too.

Desire is sensation, the movement of the senses, which is to touch, taste, smell, see. The sensation - the senses in action. That is, you see, then there is contact, from contact there is sensation and in that sensation there exists also thought which creates the image for the object. Are you following all this? Just see it for yourself. First you see, perceive, then you touch, then in the very touching of it there is sensation, then the object is created by the mind with its image. I will explain this carefully. Please listen. You see a car, a nice low, speedy car - that doesn't exist in India! - and the perception, the touching of it, the sensation and the thought that creates an image, you in the car, driving it, and the enjoyment of

driving it, the power and all that. That is the seeing, the touching, the sensation, then thought creating the image, you in the car, all that is the movement of desire. That is clear. Now the problem arises when thought creates the image. Are you following this? Desire for enlightenment, that is why some of you are all dressed up like this, desire for enlightenment, that is, one lives rather a shoddy life, ugly, conflicting life, and one wants something much greater, and those who have renounced the world by putting on a robe are traditionally respected because they think they are nearer to that thing called enlightenment. It is still part of desire.

So desire for enlightenment, desire for a car, desire for a woman, desire to have an important position, desire to have money are all on the same level, because they are born out of desire. One may call it noble but it is still desire. So our senses are very strong and out of those senses with their movement, with their reaction is born desire. Right? It is clear. Why has man decried desire? You understand my question? Why have you suppressed desire - if you have? It is all right to have desire for money. That is highly respected. If you have desire when you are married, for another woman, that is disagreeable. It is highly regarded and respectable, if your desire urges you towards power, position, prestige. But they are all on the same level. There is no noble desire or ignoble desire. I know this will shock most of you, but look at it, examine it.

And will is energy directed in a particular direction. Will, with which one acts, is the energy operating, driving in one direction, which is the same as desire. You are following all this. When you want to be a politician, and I hope you don't, all your energy is directed in that direction, which is the operation of your senses,



thought seeing that if you achieve a certain political status you will be respected, you will be feared, you will do good to mankind and all that nonsense. So, desire and will go together and when we want happiness or enlightenment or a position, a status, that energy is being driven along a particular direction. So that is the movement of desire.

From that desire arises the acceptance of authority who will tell you what to do, because you feel you can't think so clearly as your guru or your leader or your boss, so you accept that authority because it gives you comfort, it gives you security, it gives you a sense of doing something which you think is right. This is all the nature of desire and the action of will. We are not denying or suggesting that you suppress desire. We are saying that one must understand the nature of desire. When you comprehend something then you will deal with it intelligently, but if you don't understand it, then you battle against it. You understand this naturally. When you understand something you deal with it naturally. But when you don't understand then there is conflict. So we are pointing out the nature of desire, how it comes into being and the nature of will which operates in most of our lives.

We are going to point out whether there is a way of living without the operation of will at all. I wonder if you are interested in all this, because it is very fascinating, it requires your intellectual capacity to find our logically, reasonably, sanely whether it is possible to live without the operation of will, which is energy directed in a particular direction. You understand that? First listen to that. Our life is broken up, as the business man, the artist, the lawyer, as the politician, as the householder, as the monk and so on

and so on. They are broken up, and the will, which is the energy operating in a particular direction, is operating in all these departments. You are seeing this? So, is there an action which is not energy driven in a particular direction but the operation of total energy which is action itself?

I hope you are not tired. This may be something new to you, because you are accustomed to the habit of exercising will, that is your tradition, from time immemorial that is the tradition, exercise your will, control and so on. We are going to enquire if there is a different way of living without the operation of will at all, because will creates resistance. Will or desire breaks up into different categories of desire. And we are asking whether it is possible in life to live without the conflict and the resistance of desire. Please understand my question first.

We are saying that there is a different way, that when the senses are operating as a whole then there is no action of will. Go slowly. I am going to explain. The speaker comes here not having prepared his talk, so he is investigating and so are you. So we must hesitate, take time, look into it. Have you noticed that one particular sense, touch, smell, seeing or tasting, predominates over the others? Have you noticed that? One sense, one sensory response is greater than the other responses. That is so. So, in that there is division and in that there is conflict. When one sense dominates all other senses there must be inevitably resistance. When one sense uses its total energy in a particular direction the other senses are in abeyance also trying to exercise their energy. So there is always a fragmentation in our senses. And so when one sense operates with greater energy than the others, that operation is the action of will.

Right? Clear, at least to some of you.

Now we are saying there is a totally different kind of operation or function or action when all the senses are in harmony, when all the senses move together. That is, when you see the sea, the ocean, when you observe the sea, observe it with all your senses, not with your eyes only, smell it, look at it, taste it, take it completely. Then you will see there is no centre from which you are acting which is the operation of desire as will. You are getting this? This requires a great deal of testing it out. Don't accept a thing the speaker is saying. Test it out. We are saying there is a way of living in which there is no conflict whatsoever - a way of living in which will doesn't operate at all, and therefore no resistance, which doesn't mean you turn the other cheek, but it means you are living with all your senses at their highest level. Therefore no one sense is greater than the other, therefore there is no contradiction, there is no conflict. And when there is no conflict, there is no need for will. You are getting all this? I am investigating with you, now, the speaker is examining it as he is speaking. So you are doing the same, so you are testing it out.

So you find then, that there is a way of living in which there is no - please listen carefully, because what I am going to say is dangerous - a way of living in which there is no control whatsoever. Because for most of us control has become the habit, the tradition, the most respectable thing. Obviously. Your life is always controlled, and when somebody comes along and says, it is possible to live without control you immediately reject it or you say, tell me how to do it, which means you want a method, you want a system, an authority, a guru, which implies that you have

not understood at all the nature of desire and will and when you give importance to one sense there must be conflict. When you understand this whole thing, then you will see for yourself that you can live without the operation of will which is essentially control and therefore conflict.

If you understand this deeply, then we can enquire into the nature of pleasure, because we enquired yesterday into the nature and movement of fear. I do not know whether you have tested out and are free of fear completely, without a shadow of it, that is real freedom, that is real moksha on earth, to be free completely, entirely from the shadow and the destructive nature of fear, then you are a free man. Now, we are going to enquire together into the nature of pleasure, because for most of us pleasure becomes extraordinarily important, either it is sexual pleasure, or the pleasure of having money, or the pleasure of being a sannyasi, or the pleasure of being a politician, having power, position, status. They are all the same. Man has said, to be a sannyasi is the noblest thing, because he has renounced the world, but he hasn't, because he is still burning with desire. He is still full of knowledge of the world, not what is happening outside him, but the knowledge of the world inside.

So we are enquiring into the nature of pleasure. What is pleasure? Think it out - because it is very important, because pleasure and fear go together. When pleasure is denied there is violence which is part of fear. So one must understand the nature of pleasure, not suppress it, control it, deny it, or run away from it, but understand it, logically, sanely, clearly. As we pointed out, when you understand something you can place it - you can put it

aside or accept it - it becomes very simple. But when you do not understand it becomes a problem. Right? What is pleasure? What is the nature of pleasure? What is the nature of joy and enjoyment? Pleasure, enjoyment, joy - you are waiting for me to tell you (laughter). You see, sir, you read a lot of books, you attend talks, lectures, but you never read the book of yourself. If you know how to read the book, which is yourself, you don't have to read a thing in the world. The speaker has not read any book - book in the sense philosophy, the Gita, Upanishads and so on, they are not worth it because everything is inside you, if you know how to look, because you are the result of millions of years, and everything is there, all man's experience, all man's inspirations, desires, purposes, gods, everything is there, the illusions man has created, but you must know how to read it. But we don't want to read it, because to read it one must be free to look, but we want to live a comfortable easy life, a life of routine, so we accept authority, we accept what other people say, we read all about this, but never look at our own book which is the history of man, because you are the history of man, the story of entire manhood in which womanhood is included.

So we are asking what is the nature of pleasure? Please listen, question it. Is pleasure love? Is desire with its will, love? Is the remembrance of pleasure, whether sexual or otherwise, is that love? And where there is desire without understanding it, there is jealousy. Is jealousy love? Can love exist where there is jealousy? You understand all this? And since we have put pleasure as the most important thing in our life, we have lost that thing that we call love. Haven't you? Come on, let's be honest and look at it. Haven't you lost that thing? Do you love your wife, you may remember

sexual pleasure. Is that pleasure love? Love implies no attachment because when there is attachment there is fear of loss.

So one must go into this question very carefully, which is to read yourself, read the book of your own history, of man which is you. You know, joy has nothing to do with pleasure. Have you ever noticed it? It may come unexpectedly when you are with many people, or you are by yourself somewhere, and then thought comes along and says, what a marvellous state, how happy that was. Then that thought becomes pleasure. You are following all this? Look at it for yourself, you are not learning from me, you are learning nothing from the speaker, you are learning by observing yourself in the mirror which the speaker is putting before you. And after looking in the mirror, destroy the mirror, the mirror is not important. So we are asking what is pleasure, which has dominated most of our lives, from childhood till we die. At the moment of pleasure, at the second, moment of pleasure, seeing a beautiful sunset, or a beautiful person or a lovely poem, at that moment, you don't call it pleasure, do you? It is only a second later that thought comes along and says, how marvellous that was and being so marvellous, I want more. The 'more of it' is the pursuit of pleasure. You understand it? Now if you understand it, see the truth of it, then thought doesn't interfere at the moment you see the beautiful sunset. It is finished. There is no recording of it as thought and then demanding more of it. You understand? Don't agree with it, look at it, test it out, because 'the more' is the measure, the measurement is the movement of thought, which is time. I won't go into all that for the moment.

So, to see the nature of pleasure and to observe the movement

of thought as it arises, when you see a lovely mountain and as it says, I must go and look at it tomorrow, to see that the thought itself destroys the beauty of the mountain. You understand? To be aware of all this, then pleasure becomes very, very simple, it doesn't bring any problem.

So from that, that is the understanding of desire, not intellectually, in your heart, in your depth, see the nature of it, the operation of it, the movement of it, the nature of desire, the nature of will and the total movement of all your senses, then you will see that pleasure is a very small affair. There is a much greater thing than pleasure, not in measurement. When I use 'greater', it is a mere means of communication and not as measurement. That is, is desire love? Find out? Work at it. Is desire pleasure? Obviously, when there is fear, there is no love. When you fear your bosses, there is no love, obviously. When you go to your politicians, you know the game, it is not love. So, then what is love, which you have lost? You understand my question? One observes in this country more evidently, obviously, perceptibly, that human beings have lost this extraordinary love, the perfume of it, the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the enormity of it, you have lost it because you don't care, do you? You don't care for your son, and especially your daughter, do you? Specially your daughters. If you have many daughters, what happens? You know what happens? You have to find money to marry them off. So you don't want daughters, you want sons. Love implies care - care for a tree, care for your wife, the respect of your wife, or your husband. Love implies no conflict. Love has this quality of purity, because if you love you can do anything, not promiscuousness, not lust. When there is this

extraordinary sense of the beauty and the greatness of this thing called love - the word is not the thing, you understand? We can describe what love is, or what love is not, but the word, the description is not that. So, don't be carried away by the word. Find out why you haven't this love in your heart. One of the reasons is, why you have lost it, is that you have given your so-called love to your guru, to your principles, to your gods which are all illusory. Watch it sir, look at it for your own self because without it you are savages.

So how can human beings come to this extraordinary flame which is called love? Ask yourself sir. And what relationship has love to sorrow? You understand my question? First understand the question. What relationship has love to sorrow? Because most human beings suffer. I do not know if you suffer, do you? Do you suffer when you see all those poor people in the world? You mean to say you don't know what suffering is? Don't you suffer when you lose somebody whom you think you love, to whom you are attached or you say, that is karma, reincarnation, and pass it by. Have you never cried? Either you have cried out of self pity or out of your immediate reaction to something that you can't get, you have lost, or you want. Haven't you ever - hasn't it been a tremendous shock to lose somebody? So we are asking probably a futile question for those who have never suffered. One cannot imagine a human being who has not suffered - not physically, the invalid, the man that has only one leg, one arm, paralysed, they are suffering, physical suffering. We are talking also of psychological, inward suffering, not only a personal disaster but the suffering of mankind, of the world. Don't you know about all that? Does the



speaker cry for you or what does he do? Man has suffered, perhaps you haven't suffered. If you haven't suffered, you are the most happy, most compassionate human being in the world. But vast numbers of people suffer, consciously or unconsciously, deep down and that has been one of the great problems of humanity - whether sorrow can ever end or must human beings suffer everlastingly. Put this question even intellectually for yourself.

One part of humanity says, we suffer because of our past wrong actions, this life is to test it, but in the next life it will be better and so on and so on. Another group says, the son of god has suffered for us so he will help us and save us and so on and on. We are asking something entirely different: whether a man, you, a human being living in this world, with all the turmoil, with all the agony, with all the anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, misery, which all implies suffering, whether these human beings who are apparently so extraordinarily alive, capable in one direction technologically, whether such a human being who has got such an extraordinary brain, whether he cannot end sorrow. Do you understand my question? Because with the ending of sorrow there is compassion. If you have not known or ended sorrow you cannot have that quality of compassion and without compassion you cannot live, you are dead, you are sterile. And compassion is love.

So one must enquire very, very deeply and most profoundly seriously if sorrow can end. Because desire is part of sorrow. You understand? Pleasure is part of sorrow. Fear is part of sorrow and sorrow is also part of this terrible thing man has accepted as evolution. You understand what I am saying? You have accepted evolution, that is, a continuity, that you will evolve

psychologically, you can't evolve any more biologically, you can't grow a fourth arm, or a third arm. But you have accepted the psychological growth, psychological evolution that you will evolve get better, better, and better, until you ultimately reach extraordinary nonsense, you have accepted that, that is part of sorrow. You have accepted time as a means of change, that is a part of sorrow because you are postponing, as you have accepted attachment because you are attached to your money, to your position, to your memories, to your experiences, to your ideals, you are attached to a person, to an idea, to a belief and that is part of sorrow because in that attachment there is great sorrow, whether you know it or not, because there is fear in it, you might lose. So all this is the movement of sorrow and if you haven't seen this movement, and to put an end to the movement is the transformation of your consciousness.

Is there time now to talk about death? We can do it on Wednesday and go into also on Wednesday, meditation and all that. I think we should stop now because if some of you have understood, not verbally, this movement of sorrow in our life, with all the implications involved, attachment, loneliness, failure, success, fear, pleasure and the anxiety, all that is part of sorrow, and if one doesn't end it, there is no hope for man. You understand sir, it is in our hands, not in some guru's or some fantastic leader, it is in our hands, the book is there for you to read and finish with that book. That requires a great deal of energy, attention, care, love to read your book which is the book of mankind. Then from that, when you end sorrow, then begins wisdom. Wisdom doesn't lie in books nor in your experiences nor with the gurus, they are the least

wise. You know, one of the great tricks of the mind is that it has invented various paths to truth. Have you noticed that? Various paths that will ultimately lead to truth. That is one of the comforting ideas which we have accepted. Truth has no path, yours or mine. When there is a path it means that truth is a fixed thing; truth is a living thing, never the same as it was before and that is the beauty, the greatness, the absoluteness of truth. And you cannot come to it if there is no love in your heart; you can pray, you can stand on your head, you can do all the tricks man invented in order to be religious, but if you have not that compassion, haven't understood the nature of all desire and so on, you will never come upon that glory which is truth.

## **BOMBAY 4TH PUBLIC TALK 31ST JANUARY 1979**

I believe this is the last talk here. We're going to talk about death and meditation. But before we go into that, we ought to consider time, space and what is considered 'evolution'.

I would like, if I may, to remind you, that we are thinking together. Not that you listen to a series of ideas, or words, or concepts, but we are together exploring the problem of death, time and what is the quality of the mind that is meditative. And, may I remind you that the word is not the thing. The word 'tree' is not the actual tree, the word is not the thing; nor is the description the described. One can describe the mountain, paint it, but the painting, the description is not the mountain. In exploring a very complex problem, one must have the capacity not only to use the word, the exact meaning of the word according to a dictionary, but also one must have the capacity and the quality of intensity to go beyond the word.

The other day, we were talking about the whole process of thinking. We live by thought; the things that have been created by thought - the illusions, the beautiful architecture, the lovely paintings and the enormous development of technological knowledge - all the things that are in the churches, temples, mosques are created by thought as well as the beliefs, the expectations, the aspirations, the principles, the ideals are all brought together by thought. And thought, as we have explained in the last few talks here, is limited, because it is the outcome of memory, experience and the accumulation of a great deal of

knowledge. We live by thought; our actions are based on thought. And we pointed out the other day that thought, time is the root of fear. We went into that and we are not going into that again this afternoon. So the whole process of thinking has no opposite. But thought can create its own opposite.

Madam, why do you come here if you are reading a book?

Q: I am not reading a book.

Then please pay attention to what is being said. Look, sirs, ladies, this is a serious thing which we are going to discuss, talk over together. You have to give if you are interested, and if you are not interested I don't know why you are here - if you are interested, be at least serious for an hour. Because this is not an entertainment, either intellectually, imaginary or speculative. We are concerned with our life - the way we live, the way we think, the way we act. So, if one may ask, please be serious, and if you care to, give your attention to what is being said - not only to what the speaker has to say, but also to what you are thinking.

So as we were saying, thought has no opposite but it can create its own opposite; and therefore thought creating its own opposite brings about conflict. But there is only thinking, though that thinking divides itself into multiple forms, both actual, transitory, illusory and what is being perceived. And thought has put together the whole concept, conclusion, ideal. So we must consider thought as a material process. Thought has not created nature - the animals, the forests, the rivers, the mountains. But thought has made the chair out of nature. Thought has created illusion, which is also actual. So thought is reality; the thing it has created is reality - like this, this microphone. But thought cannot possibly understand, or

even conceive what truth is. So bearing this in mind that thought under no circumstances whatsoever, whatever path thought has laid down, which is illusory, to truth is unreal. There are no paths to truth. Truth must come when the mind is in a state of quietness which we are going to examine presently.

First, we must investigate together - please, I mean by this together - what is time. Time is division - before and after; the past, the present and the future; time by the watch, chronological time, and time as psychological beginning and ending. You are following all this? Please, you have to understand this very, very clearly because meditation, when it is consciously done, deliberately done, is no meditation. We'll go into that. That is why it is very important that at the beginning of our talk together that we understand the nature and the whole structure of time.

Time means movement; time means division - division from here to there; not only physical time, but also psychological time. Physical time is necessary - to acquire knowledge, to work skilfully, to drive a car, to do any technological activity, time is necessary. You can't suddenly become a marvellous flyer, pilot, you have to learn quite slowly, take a year or two and so on. And man, that is thought, psychologically has created time, which is called evolution. Psychologically: there is evolution, biological evolution as the baby grows into adulthood, into a man, and dies. There is that physiological biological growth, which is obvious. You plant a little bush, a tree, and it grows into an enormous tree, it takes time. And man, which is the whole movement of thinking, has said there is psychological time; that is when we become something psychologically. If one is angry through time you will

be rid of anger. We're questioning, asking if there is any psychological evolution at all.

Please think it out with me, go with me, we are working together. There is obviously biological, physiological time. To put a watch together takes time, to go from here to Delhi takes time. But psychologically, inwardly, inside the skin as it were, is there time at all? We have said there is time, that is, psychologically one is bad, but eventually one becomes good. The idea of growth. Growth implies a continuity.

Please, this may be a little difficult, go into it with me. I'll explain and go very slowly into this. We're conditioned to accept time as a means of psychological evolution - that you, will one day be a marvellous entity, you will one day reach enlightenment, one day you will have great wisdom; and to have wisdom, enlightenment, needs time, psychologically. And therefore you have systems, methods, paths, all that involves the movement of action and time, a continuity. Is this clear? Now, we are asking if that is so. Or it is a total illusion. We have accepted evolution, psychologically - the afterlife, reincarnation, a continuity of what has been, what is and what will be. A series of movements which are not broken up, but is a continuity.

I am afraid you have to use your brains. You have to think, and see the limitations of thinking. So, we are saying, or challenging, doubting: is there any continuity psychologically? Or thought has said, there is continuity because it is the outcome of memory. Memory is continuous. So psychologically we say, 'Yes, I will be better next week, if I do this and this and this'. And time implies not only the cause and the effect, and the effect becoming the

cause, so this movement of cause and effect which becomes cause again, is the movement of time. If we don't understand the nature of time we will not be able to capture, or fully comprehend, not intellectually, but deeply, the nature of death. Because while we are young we don't think about death, while even middle-aged we are not greatly concerned, but as the body grows older, the mind becomes more heavy, and the eventual death comes, and there is this movement of time - being young, being adolescent, growing old, and dying, that is the whole movement of time, divided up by various experiences, activities and so on. So time is a factor in our life as a movement of avoiding, running away, or suppressing, or transcending. Are you getting all this? Sorry, you have to catch it as I talk, I can't repeat it.

As I said, man has not resolved the problem of death - what is implied in it, what is the nature of it, why man has been so frightened, for a million years, to die. To him, death means the ending. Now we are going to investigate together the whole meaning of death because in that is involved meditation also. Meditation isn't just sitting cross-legged, breathing, keeping your eyes closed and all that business, it involves a very great capacity to investigate, to explore your whole life. If your whole life is in disorder, contradictory, imitative, conforming, and you try to meditate, it has absolutely no meaning. And that's why all of you put on these strange robes, and there is no meaning whatsoever in it. But you won't take off those robes, you will continue.

So we are enquiring into the nature of death. Death is the ending of what we consider living - that is, living which is a continuity, and the ending. The continuity is broken up as time - one is young,



matures and dies. So this continuity is broken up as time: success, failure - all that is involved. So, first before we ask, what is the meaning of death, we must also enquire into what is the meaning of living. If you don't understand the meaning of living, you won't be able to understand the meaning of dying. Are you following all this? So we are going to enquire first, what is the whole nature of our life, which we call living?

Living means, as we know it daily, the continuation of memory: I have been, I am, I will be. And in this movement which is called living, there is a whole complex of innumerable problems: fear with all its ugliness, anxiety, conflict with each other, greed, ambition, comparing, measuring and hoping for something better. This is our life, our daily life - going to the office from morning till night for the rest of your fifty or sixty years. Just think of the horror of it! And the difference in our relationships based on images. We never treat life as a whole. We've divided life - as the artists and so on and so on. That is our living, that's our actual daily living. And this period of time is considered a means to a further end. Right? Do you understand all this? Please don't shake your head. Go into it yourself.

We call this living. We've never questioned this living; but we've always questioned death. We've never asked, 'Why do we live this way - with all the anxiety, misery, lack of certainty, confusion, terrible disorder'. We have never asked why we do it, but we are terribly curious about death and after. Now we are going to question why we live this way first, because if you don't understand life, you won't understand death.

Our life is in disorder, and we are always trying to put order in

our life, obviously. If you are at all aware, intelligent, you try to bring order. So we have to enquire, what is order. Please don't get bored with this, because all this is a movement in meditation. Your mind is now confused; and a confused mind cannot possibly meditate, it has no meaning. So, what is order? Not your order and my order, what is order? Doesn't order mean freedom? Freedom implies that everything in one's life has been put in its right place, and therefore there is freedom. Please, observe your life, look at your life - not the description I am giving, but actually look at your life, your daily life. When you look at it, obviously you will see how disorderly it is: contradictory, wanting this and not wanting that, wishing this, and not wishing that, desiring this and the opposite of desire, changing the objects of desire from time to time, this constant struggle, battle, fear - that is our daily life. Now, how will you bring order in this mess, in this chaos? Do you understand my question? Who is to bring order?

And, seeing the hopelessness of it, we turn to authority, the authority of a guru, a man or a woman, supposed to be spiritual and we conform to what they say in order to live a peaceful, orderly life. 'Tell me what to do, you know better than I do, and I will follow you'. This is the whole authoritarian world of so-called spiritual hierarchy. Because one is confused, one is uncertain, unclear, disorderly, and the guru or the authority says, do this and you will live in order. Probably, and assuredly, the guru is himself in disorder. You can watch them, you don't have to accept my word, you can see them. One year they dance, next year they have other kinds of tricks and so on. So how do you bring order?

Please listen carefully. Thought being limited and fragmented,

and because it is limited and fragmented is in itself disorder. It can't possibly bring order. Thought in itself is disorder, because it is fragmented. A fragment is a thing that is broken up and thought is breaking up all the time, dividing itself - my nation, your nation, my god, your god, your belief, my belief, my guru and your guru and all that nonsense. Thought in itself is divisive, and it is thought that has brought disorder in our life. We live on thought, our whole action is based on thought. If you see that, if you see the truth of that, that thought, though technologically brings about marvellous order - perfect dynamo, the rockets that go to the moon, they must function with perfect precision, that's complete order, but thought inwardly is creating havoc. Because thought in itself is divisive, broken up, so thought cannot bring order: that is a principle, a law. So what will you do? Do you understand my question?

If there is no order in one's life, complete, total order, the mind can never be free. And you must have freedom to observe that which is most sacred - if there is something sacred, if there is something immeasurable, beyond words, the mind must be completely free, and that freedom can only come where there is absolute order. This is logic, this is so.

How will the mind, thought, bring order, because it realizes that it cannot bring order? Are you aware of this? Don't accept what the speaker is saying. Are you aware that thought cannot bring order? Look at the world around you: the wars, the terrors, the class divisions and all the rest of it is the product of thought, and so thought itself is disorder. You won't accept this. So what will bring order?

Order can only come into being when there is pure observation.

When the mind observes its own disorder - is this getting too much for you? Please, I am going to discuss what is meditation and all that, so if you get tired, we will stop for a while and rest.

To observe disorder without any motive. If you have a motive in observation, that very motive brings about disorder. That motive is put together by thought. So that is a factor of distortion because the mind is incapable of observing if there is a motive. That is, I live in disorder, my motive is to bring order, because I hope then I will be free and have moksha and all the rest of it. That motive is the movement of time, of desire, and therefore thought brings this motive into action and therefore there is distortion. Can the mind observe the disorder it lives in, without saying 'I must get out of this disorder, I must suppress it, run away from it'? Just observe. Do it as we are talking. First be aware of your life as disorder, which it is, and observe it without a single motive, without the interference of thought saying, 'I must get beyond this'.

So we are asking, what is observation? What is the nature of looking, observing? To observe without any reaction to that which you are observing. Are you doing this as we are talking? Or are you all meditating? Are you watching yourself and therefore you see your life in disorder? That if there is a motive, it distorts, and therefore creates more conflict. So, can the mind observe very closely, purely, actively? Just to observe. If you so observe, that very observation, which is total attention, and therefore all the energy is applied in that observation. When there is that great attentive observation, this thing that you are observing undergoes a change. That change is order. So the mind must be entirely, completely in order.

And also we must enquire into what is space. Our minds have no space, because we are occupied all the time, talking, chatting, doing things, you know, everlastingly the brain is in movement, so it is occupied, whether it is occupied with sex, with business, with god, with your guru, with all your dancing, shaking and all that business, it is occupied with something or other. And when you are occupied with something you call it noble or ignoble, but it is still occupation. Therefore your mind never has space. What can the mind do to have space? Do you understand how important space is? Space implies - if you will listen carefully I will go into it - space implies emptiness. When there is space, there is emptiness, and therefore in that emptiness there is tremendous energy.

We have explained what desire is, gone into the question of fear, we went into the question of death, pleasure, compassion, sorrow, and now order. That order is not continuity, for the moment there is continuity, that order becomes disorder, because it involves time.

We are now going to enquire into, not only what space is, but also what meditation is. What is meditation, not how to meditate. You've been taught, as part of your education, what to think, but not how to think. In the same way we are asking, what is meditation? Because that word is terribly loaded, every guru, every man who writes about meditation, adds, adds his own commentary, his own explanations, his own feelings, adds and then we are the result of all that. We are secondhand human beings - if you realized that, you wouldn't put on any of the robes.

What is meditation? Why should one meditate? To find that out, stop meditating. To find out what is real meditation, not yours or

mine, your type and my type, or X's type, but what is meditation, to find out you can't hold on to some kind of meditation that you have and then enquire. That is like a donkey tied to a post. So you have to be free to enquire. First one can see very clearly that it is only a very, very quiet mind that can observe accurately. A quiet mind can observe accurately only, not a disturbed mind. So a quiet mind is absolutely necessary just to observe. But if you say, 'Ah, how am I to have such a quiet mind?' Then you are asking for a system, for a method, you are going to somebody whom you think has a quiet mind, and then asking him, 'Please tell me what to do.' And then you are caught in that trap because he will tell you and you will practise - if you are silly enough. But you see the importance of having an absolutely quiet mind. A mind that has no problem. We've gone into the question of problems; as a problem arises, deal with it, finish with it, don't carry on with it the next day. We went into that. So we are saying that a quiet mind implies a mind that has great space; it is not occupied with anything. It is not concerned with experience because the experiencer is the experience. A man who is a light to himself doesn't need experience because he is awake.

So a mind that is absolutely quiet demands a vast sense of space, and it has no attachment to anything. Because the moment you are attached, to your wife, to your family, to your name, to your house, anything, ideals, beliefs, dogmas - they are all the product of thought. So a quiet mind means the ending of this continuity. You understand sir? So we said - before we go into the question of meditation, I forgot about death, we must go into it.

Death means the ending - that is obvious. But the ending of

what? The ending of your attachment - let us take that as an example. Can you end your attachment immediately? Suppose I am attached to - what? I don't know - a house, and I see the consequences of being attached - fear, jealousy, anxiety, antagonism, dominance - all that follows in attachment. Death says, I can't be attached when I die, so it says, 'End it'. Can I, can you, end your attachment now? Go on, sir. Work it out. Not when you are compelled, coerced, persuaded. Death does not persuade you, doesn't coerce you. Can you while you are living, end the things that you hold most important psychologically?

When you end this continuity, something totally new happens. It must, inevitably. When I give up - what do you give up? I don't know - anything, easily, happily, some extra-dimensional thing takes place. It is not my reward, it just takes place. So death is the ending of that which had continuity. It is too complex. I won't go into all that now. Our time is limited.

Man, throughout the ages, historically, has searched endlessly to find out what happens after death. Volumes have been written about it. Reincarnation is one of the happy inventions, comforting. But you've never enquired, what it is that continues? You have accepted reincarnation as a means of improving yourself, becoming nobler, better, eventually reaching godhead, the highest principle, and so on. You have never questioned this continuity. That which continues is mechanical, and that which has an end can begin with something entirely different. So, while living, end the various things that are created - like fear, end it, end your jealousy, your ambition, greed, everything, bring it to a precise end, so that there is no continuity. That is death, isn't it?

So can you, while living, with all your vigour, end the things that death demands? You can test it out. So while you are living, you are also dying? Do you understand? Then there is a totally new thing happening all the time. But if you say, 'Well, I have a future life', or 'I hope there will be', you are lost, you have gone off into something entirely different. I haven't time to go into the question of what it is that continues if we don't end.

From there we can move into what is meditation? Meditation is a state of mind in which all the things that thought has invented - the illusions, the beliefs, the dogmas, the rituals, the habits, sex - all that is no longer entering into the mind that is absolutely quiet. Now is it possible to have such a mind? Do you understand my question? I am going to examine it - we are going to examine it together. We all need a quiet mind, a peaceful mind, an absolutely silent mind without a murmur of thought. Is that possible? Possible means that we don't know. If we know already, that knowledge is the remembrance of something in the past, therefore it is not a quiet mind. So we are saying, is it possible to have a mind that is absolutely without a ripple?

We are going to find out. To discover if it is possible, first you must understand the nature of attention. What is the nature of attention, to attend? And what is the nature of inattention, not attending? And what is the nature of concentration? And what is the nature of distraction? What does one mean by concentration? That is what most people try to do - concentrate. They are taught from childhood to concentrate. In school you say, 'Look at your book, don't look out of the window.' What do we mean by concentration, and who is it that concentrates? Thought has



projected an image, or an idea, a concept, or a picture, and on that you concentrate - that means, exclude all other thought. But the exclusion becomes impossible because thought itself is divisive.

There is no distraction. Thought says, 'Concentrate on that and any movement away from that is distraction.' But the movement away from it is the movement of thought. Thought says, 'Concentrate', and thought also moves away from it. The moving away from it is distraction. Thought itself a distraction because it has moved away. You are following all this? Please don't laugh because it is very, very serious if you want to go into meditation. So there is no distraction because thought itself is a distraction the moment it says, 'I must concentrate'.

And what is attention, and what is not being able to attend? You have been here for over an hour, you are tired at the end of the day, you have been listening to a lot of words, and if you have gone into yourself you become rather tired. And you cannot, when you are tired, attend.

I am going purposely slowly, so you can gradually gather your energy, so we will be able to investigate together. We've seen what is attention and what is inattention. Attention means to attend, to give all your energy to look, to absorb, to hear, to see. You can only do that for a couple of seconds probably, or a minute, and then attention goes down and there is inattention. You are not completely attentive. Attention demands that you give all your energy, with all your senses, with all your mind and heart, completely attentive. But that intense, active attention cannot be sustained by most people, so inattention comes. But when you are aware of the inattention, that you are not attending, that very

perception that you are not attending is attention. Have you got it? What is important is, that there is no conflict in the mind. Never say, 'I was attentive, I know what it means, and I want to capture it again' - that whole movement is, if you are aware of it, is attention. Do you understand some of this?

Meditation implies the emptiness of consciousness, emptiness of the mind, in which there is no ripple - the ripple being thought. That is possible only when you understand the nature of concentration, with all its resistance, its limitation, and when there is concentration there is distraction, which is still a movement of thought. And meditation implies the ending of thought; because thought has realized itself, its own place, but it has no other place: think only when it is necessary, not otherwise. Do you understand? I wonder if you understand this? If you are thinking all the time, there is no space. So you see that it is necessary to have space. If you are living in a city, where everybody lives in a small place, you begin to quarrel, the violence comes from the lack of space. So there must be space, and there cannot be space if at any time there is occupation. If you understand why the mind is occupied, which is, in occupation you feel secure - the housewife occupied with her cooking or whatever she does, is occupied and therefore secure, if she is not occupied, she says, 'What am I to do?'-but if you see the truth that occupation prevents space, then when you see the truth, there is no problem. You have space.

The mind, which is all the senses fully operating, not a particular sense, but all the senses at their highest excellence, but if you have no love in your heart, you cannot meditate. There is no meaning to meditation if you don't love. Love means care, beauty,

a sense of immense compassion, and having space. From that the mind is capable of being absolutely still, without a flutter of thought. If you have gone into it very deeply this can take place by the hour, not for a few minutes, for a few seconds. And in that emptiness which is full of energy there is that which is eternity. Eternity does not mean continuity. It is beyond time, where time has stopped, thought has stopped. And in that absolute quietness there is that which is nameless, timeless, measureless.

You cannot come to it by any path. There is no path to it. Only when you understand the whole nature of yourself, when you have read the story of yourself from the beginning to the ending of the book, and therefore you have total order in your life, only then you have an extraordinary sense of freedom. And then that which is most sacred, with all its blessing, comes into being.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 17TH JUNE 1979 1ST CONVERSATION WITH 5 TEACHERS**

A: Krishnaji, I was wondering if we could talk about the question of the educator, that is, the teacher, both in the classroom and outside, and how he is able to educate having some understanding of what the nature of education is, that is the total responsible for the life of the student and for the life of the community, and for perhaps some understanding of the place of his specific instruction, his specific knowledge in the whole scheme of things, but having only a partial understanding of the depth of things, the reality of things. How is he to proceed to bring about a different kind of understanding in a student, that is an understanding that is not just of the subject but deeper and beyond the subject, a more global understanding?

K: Would you consider the relationship between the student and the educator, what is the relationship?

A: Well so far as the subject is concerned, the teacher knows more about the subject than the student.

K: And so he informs.

A: So he imparts certain information. So that is...

K: ...fairly simple.

A: Yes, that is fairly straightforward.

K: But what is more involved in this relationship? You are the teacher and I happen to be a student. What is our relationship apart from the subject and the information involved in the subject? What is our deeper relationship, if we have any at all?

B: I don't quite understand how you are using the word

'relationship' in this context. Surely one relationship between the teacher is to instruct and is there any relationship beyond that?

K: If that is all the relationship one has, which is generally what happens in ordinary schools, then it is very simple. You inform the students of mathematics, or whatever subject it is, and you go back home, or go back to your room and forget about the whole thing. But we are not talking of such a superficial relationship, we are talking much more of a relationship where we are living in a community of teachers and students.

B: Most teachers would say that they have a concern for the student which goes beyond just instructing them in the subject, they are concerned with their well being, with their...

K: I wonder if that is so? Take an ordinary school in England, or in India, or in America, are they really concerned?

C: I think some of them are concerned but it is very difficult if you have thirty students in your class and you see them three times a week and where else do you see them?

K: That is all, that is what I am saying. If it is an ordinary school there is very, very little relationship.

C: But you might want to have some more relationship.

K: Ah, that is a different matter. If you want it how do you set about it?

A: You probably have to start a school of your own eventually; or join a school that was moving in that direction: one of the two.

B: Are you saying it is not possible in this system, the school system that we have just now to have that kind of relationship?

K: I don't see the possibility there at all. Take even Winchester College, or any of these Public schools, what is the relationship?

B: Well you would have thought that in a residential school where the teachers are living nearby and the student is there all the time, that they would be in a position to...

K: Generally they have rules, you must, must not, and there it is.

C: But surely we have to have rules?

K: Oh yes, of course we have to have rules. I am not saying that. But we are talking of relationship between the educator and the student in an ordinary Public school, or even in a Grammar School, it means very little.

D: But that seems also to be the source of a lot of dissatisfaction with teachers these days who work in ordinary schools. There is some feeling that they would like to reach out more to the people they are working with but they can't, just because of the physical circumstances.

K: Is that what it is? The system prevents it.

D: Or seems to prevent it.

K: Would you say that is so, that is a fact?

B: I don't quite see how the system prevents relationship. Surely it would be possible for a teacher to have a relationship with a student if he wanted to.

K: I wonder if it is possible in ordinary schools, in Public schools, or an ordinary Grammar school, is that possible?

B: Well let's take a teacher in an ordinary school.

K: Yes. What does he do?

B: Where he comes to school in the morning and he may be goes to an Assembly, and then...

K: There is a class subject. And he takes it for forty-five

minutes in the morning, or in the afternoon, or something like that, and he tells them, and there is the housemaster, and he passes them all to him. And there is the headmaster who protects the whole system of fagging and all the rest of it, where is the relationship possible there? Relationship in the sense we are talking about, in the sense feeling responsible for the student, not only academically but morally, socially, his behaviour, his way of thinking, and so on, concerned totally. He doesn't exist.

D: Why not? Why not when they are eating meals, or afterwards?

K: But we are saying sir it is possible but it doesn't exist.

D: It is possible.

K: Anything is possible.

E: I know friends of mine who are teachers in an ordinary school, and they are really trying very, very hard to build up relationships with the students. But to some extent they are succeeding but always they are limited by the school they are in.

K: That's what I am saying. The system prevents it, the modern education is merely concerned with giving information, giving a certain amount of knowledge and helping them to get a career - right? Isn't that so?

A: Well I think ambition comes into it at some stage.

K: Of course. Of course.

A: In many schools, however well meaning the teachers are, eventually they have been there for three or four years, and they want to go on a bit further, they want a better job.

K: Of course, of course.

A: So ambition comes into it.

K: So at what level are we talking about education, about the ordinary education that the average person receives? Or are we talking, having a dialogue about a school where both the educator and the student feel totally responsible?

B: Krishnaji, we seem to be talking about education and we don't really have a very clear idea of what that means.

K: I think we have, don't we? First of all they need academic training, discipline - right?

B: Yes.

K: You all agree to that.

B: The need scales.

K: And also we want, or desire, or wish, that they should have social consciousness, socially be conscious of what is happening in the world morally, in behaviour, the way they talk, that is what I consider education. Totally educating the whole human being.

B: But attention is given to behaviour and to the moral upbringing.

K: It is all discipline, do this and don't do that.

A: I think the question comes in of being on the same level really. About the way what you are saying is conveyed in the sense that you approach it from a position of not being higher or superior to the student but rather you may point something out, but without the implication of a psychological superiority.

K: That's right. And also isn't the question here, the student comes conditioned and the teacher is conditioned, both are conditioned.

A: Both are conditioned.

K: Conditioned according to the culture and so on and so on.



And as far as one observes, one is helping them to conform or fit into the wider or narrower conditioning. Would you say that?

B: Well I am not so sure that I would say that. I would say that, as most teachers would say, they are interested in the moral upbringing in a much wider aspect. Whether they can do it is a different question.

K: The idea and the fact is different. I would like to be something but the fact is I am not.

B: Most teachers would say they are trying.

K: So what are we discussing, that is what I would like to find out? Are we talking over together the average school, either Public, or Grammar schools, or a school like this at Brockwood, where we are concerned with the total cultivation of man, or the student, and so ourselves. I don't know if I am conveying this.

D: We have all decided to come here rather than to teach at an ordinary school. So really we have to talk about this school.

K: So we are talking about this school. Then let's talk about that. Not the average and the people who want to do this but can't and so on. So let's start from here, shall we? Is that it? You all agree?

B: Yes, let's start.

K: What are we trying to do here? If we could talk frankly and openly. What are we trying to do?

A: I would say that we are trying to bring about some learning through understanding, which is not an understanding in a particular area but rather understanding per se, if we could refer to some kind of universal understanding.

K: Would you explain that, I don't understand it. Put it

differently.

A: Generally knowledge is assimilated in fragments, or in parts, mathematical parts, physics, a language, we also do this here, the students learns.

K: My question is: what are we trying to do here as a community, as a teacher and the relationship with the student, and the student with the community and with the teacher, together as a body of people, what is it we are trying to do?

A: Well I am trying to work round to it by saying this. In a school, in any school, it is necessary at some point to point things out to others. That is part of one's responsibility, as I see it anyway. Now the significant thing seems to be that if you are able to point this thing out in such a way that it makes sense to the other person, that he sees the point of it, then that also becomes part of his own learning, and it is also part of your learning as well because you have learnt how to convey it.

K: Have you answered my question?

A: That is what we are doing.

K: No, what is it that we are trying to do? Have you answered my question?

A: I am trying to answer the question. I have got it in myself but I can't bring it out.

B: We might not be able to get at it.

K: We have had the school, you have been here for a number of years, all of us, what is it together we are trying to do?

C: I think part of what we are trying to do is to actually live together rather than separately.

K: Actually you are living together in the same house.

C: Yes but I mean actually we co-operate and work, all that living together involves without necessarily avoiding each other.

K: Is that what you are doing here?

C: It is a part of what we are trying to do.

D: Also when you ask that question what immediately comes to my mind is - I don't know how to express it, except perception, to begin to learn at things because we don't know how to look at ourselves, or to look at anything just clearly. We have thoughts, it seems sort of guide-lines with which we look at things. So to learn how to perceive things.

K: So what is it we are doing here, not only trying, actually doing? Trying becomes rather vague and rather indefinite. What is it actually we are doing?

B: We are looking at the way we live. We are looking at it in relationship and trying to understand how we are, what we are and...

A: I would say we are working for a common understanding, which is not a personal understanding, which is not an understanding of this person or that, but a common understanding.

B: It is very difficult to put into words.

K: You are being rather vague about all this.

D: What would that mean? It sounds nice to work towards that.

K: Sir, are we concerned, if I may ask, are we concerned, not only with the present activities of living, relationship, and academics, informing the students academically, and all the rest of it, or are we also concerned about what is going to happen to them in the future, when they leave here. What is their life, whether they are going to be absorbed into the whole mass of the average?

A: That relates to it.

K: So are we concerned, that is what I am trying to get at. Not only with the now, the now being good relationship, helping them to understand not only mathematics but understand the whole significance of life, and also be concerned with the future of their lives?

C: Surely the now is inextricably related to the future. How you look at life now.

K: That's just it. How do they look at life now? How do we look at life now? How do we help the student or ourselves to understand the now, what is happening now?

E: I was on holiday last month with two students from this school, and there were two or three children who spent some time with us who went to ordinary local schools, and they couldn't understand the relationship which I had with these students. They kept on asking, "Won't he be cross if you don't do the work?" or "Why don't you call him sir?" And so on. They sometimes just stood there watching us. They couldn't understand what was happening.

K: That is what I want to get at. Are we concerned not only with the actualities of present living, our relationship with each others, whether it is personal, or whether it is objective, whether we are cultivating the mind, the brain, the capacity to think, to think objectively, sanely and also the sense of protection, all that. And will that sustain them right through life? You follow what I am saying? Or they will be caught in these traps?

A: They will be caught after being here.

K: I want to prevent that. If I have a son and a daughter and I

send them here. I would say please help him not to be caught in these traps.

A: Well, of course. Some are not caught, but some are also.

K: I want my children not to be caught in the trap, in this rat race that goes on, whether it is in India, here or in America, this perpetual struggle.

C: So surely the only way we can help them is to make sure they develop a real understanding of what this struggle is.

K: Are we doing that? Are we actually doing that? I am just questioning it. I am not saying you are not. Are we actually seeing that they have this quality of intelligence which is not the intelligence of ideas and all that but this intelligence that will help them to ward off danger, ward off, keep away from all the travail of man - you follow? Are we doing that?

E: We are certainly trying but we are not always succeeding.

K: Not with every student. Now let's come back. Are we saying that this is the purpose or the intention of this place?

A: Yes.

K: Then how do we carry it out?

A: I don't think it can be carried out in an unfailing way. That is, in such a way that there will be no casualties, so to speak, that is not possible.

K: Yes. But I am saying, we understand the basis of the school. Now how do we bring it about?

D: I think that is the question we have all been asking ourselves.

K: I am asking you.

D: We are attempting to do that but we don't quite know, we are working it out.

K: I am asking you, what shall we do? I leave my daughter and my son here - I haven't got any but if I leave them here. And I say, please sirs, and ladies, it is your responsibility to see that these two are not thrown to the wolves, are not caught in the social machine, or become mediocre, average, unintelligent citizens. I say it is your responsibility. And what shall we do? We work together as a community, as a community of teachers and so on, what shall we do? That's what I want to get at, you are not answering my question.

B: But we can't help the student if we are mediocre and unintelligent ourselves.

K: Now, so will you wait until you become intelligent, not mediocre and then become the teacher?

B: We can't because...

K: That is impossible. I mean that would be like saying, it is too stupid to say "I will wait until I make myself all right and then come to teach". So our relationship then is, I am not totally stupid, conditioned, and the student is, so we both are on the same level - right?

A: Yes, that's very important.

K: That is really important, except when you are giving information about mathematics or history, or language and so on.

A: Psychologically on the same level.

K: So psychologically we are on the same level. Now how shall we help each other to be free of our mediocrity?

B: Can we stay with this Krishnaji, because this is a tremendous thing you are saying.

K: I know.

B: We should be psychologically on the same level as the student.

K: Absolutely. I feel that.

C: Yes, I think it becomes difficult sometimes because when one is older one feels sometimes you have in a sense more experience.

K: About what?

C: Well one might say...

K: Wait. Just look at it. Sex, drink, smoking, what?

A: There are other things as well.

K: What?

A: For instance, you may...

K: Climbing the mountains?

A: No, you may also have gone through the war, you may also have been a conscious objector, you may have gone to prison.

K: Now that is a different matter. That is a different matter.

A: So you have stuck your neck out in some way probably.

K: That is a different matter. So I am saying, look if we are on the same level with the student, how shall we begin to free ourselves from the results which society and ourselves have imposed upon ourselves? That is the problem, no?

B: I am not quite sure that we see the necessity for being on the same level, that we are on the same level as the student.

K: No, it is a fact. We, as a human being, one is conditioned - would you agree to that? Then the student is conditioned by his father, by his mother, by his friends, by the society he lives in, and so on, books he read, television, he is conditioned by all that. So the teacher is also, not exactly, but they are both conditioned. Now

how are we to help each other to, if I may use the word, uncondition ourselves?

A: Are all conditionings equal?

K: No, no.

A: Is it possible therefore...

K: It is a good question, sir, let's stick to it. Is there a common factor which is the actual conditioning? You follow?

A: Yes.

K: I mean as an Englishman you are conditioned in a certain way. And another as a German, or comes from India, it doesn't matter, time, the climate, the food, the language, the television, all those, religion, the superstitions, all that has made him what he is, and more. What is the common factor in all human beings who are conditioned? You follow what I am saying?

A: You mean more than the fact of conditioning itself? Or different from the factor of conditioning?

K: You are an Englishman and I happen to be born in India, what is the common factor in our conditioning? Language, is it?

A: Well it could be.

K: I want to eliminate. Is it climate? Food, literature, television, the magazines, go on sirs, don't say, no, no, no. And the upbringing, the tradition, being the British and all the pride in that word, and another born in India he has got the same pride, the same religious superstitions, only he is darker, probably not as strong as you are physically, manners and so on and so on. What is the common factor between these two?

A: So you are saying only the form is different.

K: That's all.



B: They might be proud about different things, or they might have different gods.

K: Of course but it is the same movement. So if we agree the educator and the students are both conditioned in their own way, and the central factor is to be free of this, to become human beings, not labels. I don't know if one can put it that way.

A: Yes. So the movement you speak of is a psychological movement, which is common to all. I think we perhaps ought to pause over that for a minute.

K: Obviously. After all what is the common factor to an Englishman, to a German, to a Russian, or Indian, or an American, the common factor is they all have this enormous sense of ambition. The common factor of fear, the common factor of pursuing pleasure, the common factor of suffering, struggle, anxiety, grief, lack of love, and all that is the common factor between all of us.

B: So you are saying now that the educator and the student are...

K: ...in the same boat.

B: ...are exactly the same.

K: Exactly the same.

C: But the expressions might be different.

K: Oh yes. You might express it by going to church, and another might express it by going up to his room crying. That's irrelevant. The factor is we all go through the same phenomena.

Now as an educator and as the student, that is the common factor - right? Or would you disagree there? Don't easily agree. If we both of us that is the common factor then we can do something together.

B: But why is this so important in education, the fact that both of us may be afraid but of different things? Why is that so important?

K: Because fear, whether it is in the educator or in the student, what does it do? It cripples a human being, it dulls the mind, it creates havoc in one's life. No?

E: My daughter is just seven years old and every time I see her again she has picked up things some of which are just making it not easy for her to see straight. So one has to say where do you get this from, and why, is it true, all the time.

K: If we all agree that it is the common factor for all of us, how shall we help each other to be free of all this? That is the function of the educator.

C: Surely one must want to be free of it first.

K: No, see the dangers of it. One is born in India with all the cultural, religious, climatic values, nourishment and so on and so on, and here you have the opposite, marvellous climate! Good food, you know, sanitation and all that. But you, as a human being, and he, as a human being, go through extraordinary miseries, wars, deprivations, tremendous sense of guilt, depression, you know all that. And if you are an educator, that is his function, say let's work this out, and don't let's be caught in all this.

C: But is it possible? I think there is also a feeling that in a certain sense may be it is not possible to be free of this?

K: Then you are admitting something terrible. If you say it is not possible then you are caught in this.

C: But if that is all I know how can I possibly be free of that?

K: If you only know fear don't you want to be free of it?

C: Yes but how can I if I don't know?

K: But aren't you aware that there is fear?

C: Yes

K: So don't you want to be out of it?

C: Yes.

K: So does the student. He is afraid of exams, he is afraid of a dozen things, public opinion, he may not, but fear is common to us. He expresses one way and we express it another way.

B: So now we are saying that we must help the student to be free of his fears, anxieties.

K: Aren't we, that is my responsibility. Our responsibility as good teachers.

A: Or we must understand the nature of fear itself.

K: Yes, that is what I mean.

C: So it is not just the student but both of us.

K: Because both are together, we are both in the same boat.

C: Yes. So the student might help us as much we help the student.

K: That is what I want to get at.

E: My daughter helps me as much as I help her, as well as students.

K: Is that what education is? Or is it merely to help the student to become the average, mediocre, clever, cunning citizen, ambitious, greedy, envious, fighting each other, you know, killing each other, the whole modern society?

B: But now we have to deal with all the pressures of society because we want to understand what fear is and we want to be free both the teacher and the educator wants to be free of all those

things that will make life difficult. There are the pressures of earning a livelihood, of exams.

K: No, here the pressure of earning a livelihood is not for the time being.

A: Well it is in abeyance because very early on the student for instance discovers that examinations are the means to a certificate which is the means to...

K: So can we find a method, or a way of not having exams, or treating exams as though they were nothing? 'A' level and 'O' level, the whole business of it?

C: But if I feel that the only way that I can get a job...

K: No, but we might find out a way of not being afraid of exams, or - you understand what I am saying?

A: Yes.

K: Or during the whole term, or couple of terms, or whatever it is watching the students and say he is good enough, you are all right, so as to remove the fear of these beastly exams. Watch him throughout the year, the student, say look, study a little more, encourage him, all the rest of it, so that when the final horror comes he says it is not a horror at all, he goes through. Can we do that?

A: One does that but seemingly at the last moment so to speak, and the student may feel that it is nevertheless a horror. One has protected him from the horror in a sense, one has protected him from the horror but the horror is still there, the horror is still waiting.

K: Who invented exams? The Italians? The Mandarins? The people who invented this monstrous system.

E: But you obviously do need some exams at some stages, if people are going to build bridges, or be doctors, it has to be clear to themselves and to everybody else.

K: Yes, but is it possible to help the student not to be afraid of exams?

E: If you really have time to do the teaching properly, yes, you can, I think.

K: That is what I am trying to get at.

C: I think it is just a fear. I am not sure it is just a fear of exams actually. I think it goes a lot deeper than that really. It is not just a fear of examinations, it is a fear of the future, and fear of not being secure, of not having your exams.

K: So what does that mean? Fear of not being successful.

C: Yes. I think that is much stronger than any teaching you can do.

K: So we all worship the god of success.

C: That is much stronger.

K: Go into it. Then we go into it with the student and say, look, what is this whole idea of success? Why has it become so important in life?

C: It seems also allied to something to do with self-fulfilment too.

K: All that is involved. I heard the other day, "My ambition is to become prime minister" - no, no, he really meant it, not here. I met somebody and his son was saying that, "I am going to devote my life to becoming the prime minister". You follow sirs? And probably he would.

B: What puts that kind of idea into one's head?

K: Our whole culture is that. A man who is not successful, he is treated with contempt.

B: So now we are saying that we are putting ourselves against the whole of culture and society.

K: Against the whole current of this modern world.

B: We must be careful here because we aren't just talking about revolution in the sense that it is known about, destroying the system, destroying society, getting rid of exams or whatever it is.

K: No, I am not getting rid of exams. We are not getting rid. We are trying to help the student to understand the whole meaning of success, what is implied in it, and whether he is going to give all his life to this idea of becoming something in the world. Look sir, it is not only in the physical mundane world, but also spiritually, the ordinary priest is ambitious to become the bishop. And the bishop wants to become the archbishop, or the cardinal wants to become the pope. It is the same pattern.

E: For the parents just as much as the students.

K: Of course.

E: They may be saying if you don't pass your exams you can't stay on at Brockwood another year.

K: That's right. So can we as educators go into this with the student and say, do we see the danger of it?

B: This wanting to be is so deep rooted, Krishnaji.

K: I know sir, that is our conditioning.

C: I mean the educators have it themselves too.

K: That is what I am saying.

C: So surely we must start looking as well at ourselves, we can't just point it out to the students.

K: No, we have a dialogue about it with the students. In the course of the dialogue I am freeing myself, and I am helping the student to get free of this goddess! I don't know. I have watched it all over the world this extraordinary phenomenon of success. Be somebody in the world.

A: Are we also suggesting that in our discussion we would uncover something which is of greater value?

K: Of course. Aren't you reversing, sir, the whole way of thinking about oneself? Now we think I must be a businessman, I must be an executive when I grow up, even if I fail I must be the foreman of the factory, I must be the shop steward. The whole thing is this.

A: Is it that, or is it also confused because the person wants to be those things, he is ambitious, and yet he feels perhaps in the back of his mind that he would like to be free, he would like to be less bothered, he would like to have a free life but he is caught.

K: He would like to but the fact is he is caught by the throat.

A: Has this dichotomy come about in culture itself?

K: That's what I am saying. I mean you are always comparing 'B' to 'A', which begins the idea of success. So can we as educators discuss this or have a real serious dialogue and point it out to them what is involved in it.

C: I am worried by when you say point it out to them, because...

K: Point it out in the sense I am doing it, I am pointing it out to myself, I am not pointing out to them.

C: Yes.

K: In the course of the dialogue I am aware that I am also pursuing the goddess.

D: It seems to come back to what we were saying earlier, which was what Harsh was suggesting staying with, that the student and the teacher are psychologically at the same level.

K: Of course.

D: But if we both really realize that, that creates a certain atmosphere.

K: Yes. No, that creates a quality of, you know, an intensity. We are both in the same boat. And that gives us a strange sense of responsibility. It is not I row and you sit still. Or you row and I look at the heavens! We would both like to look at the heavens. Can we educate them that way? Is that possible?

C: We have said pointing out but we have not really talked about how we actually work on this.

K: Let's have a dialogue about it now.

C: Because it is all very well saying we worship success but...

K: Wait a minute. I am your student, how will you deal with me? How will you all, five of you, who are educators, teachers, how will you explain, go into this question? Pointing out the consequences, the dangers, how will you show it to them?

C: We would have to find out first what we mean by success and what it is.

K: Very simple. To be somebody, financially, bigger car, bigger house, to be somebody. Money, if you can't have money, all that, you are somebody with an enormous sense of information, scholar. Right? Being somebody implies, you know what it implies, whether you are a doctor, whether you are a surgeon, whether you are a prime minister, or just an ordinary clerk, he wants to be somebody.



C: Perhaps we will have to find out what is behind the wanting to be somebody.

K: That is again, what do you think is behind it? You are teaching me, you are helping me to understand this. We are in the same boat, don't immediately wander off. We are in the same boat, help me to understand this. What is behind all this? Why has man right through the world made this goddess so extraordinarily important?

D: It seems there is a desire within us.

K: Look at it sir, go into it. I am your student, don't just give words. Why has man right through history, it is not just now, right through.

A: It seems in some sense to be connected with survival.

K: That's right. Security.

A: Because he survived at the physical level and then as society gets more sophisticated, more developed, he feels that he needs to survive at the psychological level also.

K: And also each one wants to survive. He is only concerned with his survival. Obviously. So I want to survive at any price and my survival is laid out by my success, money, position, all the rest of it. And your's is also in a different way but both of us desire to survive, individually. Family, the nearer family, and then the nation, and so on and so on. The tribal instinct is very strong in all of us.

C: It is continued, being reinforced by everything that you do, by how you are educated.

K: The British, the British. And when you are in France, 'La France', 'La France', of course.

D: And we also seem to make the assumption since we need a physical security, we understand that, we assume that similarly we need a psychological security. We don't question that at all.

K: We never question psychological security, which may affect our physical security. So...

A: You mean by that endanger our physical security?

K: Yes.

E: Or even if someone is worried to death it works that way.

K: That's right. So can we being on the same level, at the same time, right, can we convey all this to the students and to ourselves, not verbally, just words but in depth?

A: In discussion therefore.

B: Not just in discussion.

A: Not just in discussion, but in discussion, in action, in games, in everything you do. That seems to be implied in what you have said there.

K: Yes.

A: In a variety of ways.

K: It means sir, I am very keen to find out why I worship this goddess, which has so many facets, so many faces. Why? Is it security? Individual? Then the family and so on? Or is there much more to it? There is much more to it, surely, than mere physical survival, as well as psychological survival, there is much more involved in it. Is man nothing but this? You follow? Wanting - the priest wanting to be a bishop, bishop wanting to be pope and so on - you follow? Is this all? That's what we make life into.

A: Generally by implication that is all.

K: That's just it.

B: So far Krishnaji we have said nothing about a whole range of things: about beauty, about love, about affection.

K: I purposefully avoided that because as long as I am worshipping this strange goddess I can't have the other. Obviously. I can't love...

B: ...if I am only concerned with myself.

K: Obviously. I can't see beauty if all the time I am worshipping this goddess.

B: But still I hang on to this question.

K: Sir it is right through. The painter wants to be somebody. The musician always - you follow? It is right through. So it is like a tremendous mountain which you have to climb, but it is not. If you see the truth of this it becomes very simple.

Yesterday morning we had a discussion with the students only and we went into this question of whether this hall should be used for this or that. It took fifty five minutes to disentangle it! And I said, look, let's find out if you want a room where you can be quiet. They all agreed we must have a room where we can be quiet. They said why not in the library and I said somebody is reading there. All the rest ultimately came to the point where we must have a room where we can all be quiet, or I want to come here and be quiet, each one of us. They agreed. I said from that principle work it out. You follow sirs? Not one begin to say we must have it in this room, whatever we like, jazz or whatever we like. I said, don't offer opinions, let's...

So we continue with this don't we? I think we should.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 20TH JUNE 1979 2ND CONVERSATION WITH 5 TEACHERS**

B: Krishnaji, there's a lot of unrest in education these days, and there's a lot of debate, and a lot of people are asking questions about it. But most of these questions seem to be about systems of education and methods of teaching and what subjects to teach. And there seems to be a lot of confusion and none of them seems to get to any point.

K: Don't you think we ought to first enquire, what is education, rather than what subjects, what books, what system, what kind of teachers and so on and so on. Shouldn't we first ask: why are we being educated? The word 'education', we know what it all means, but I mean I would like to know, to ask, if I may, why we are being educated. To fit to a system, into an establishment?

B: A lot of education at present is precisely for that.

K: So is that what is education, does education mean that? To conform to the social demand? To a particular culture, technological or otherwise which says you must fit into this, you must conform, or you must find your career, your life, in this particular system. Is that why you are being educated? To have a good career, to have capacity to earn enough money and all the rest of it, is that why you are being educated? As you say, apparently it is so.

B: Well it would certainly seem to be a necessary part of education to prepare a student to earn his livelihood.

K: Yes. Part of it. But even then I question it. Let's go into it a bit more carefully, if I may. One might educate a boy or a girl to

conform to a particular culture, social demand, technologically, as a career, which is necessary, and so on, but the rest of the whole human complex existence is totally neglected. Would you say that it is so?

B: I think some attempts are made in some ways to try and include that.

D: But it is hard to see exactly where to go, what to do, it is more of a feeling that education should be more but exactly in what direction is not clear.

C: It also often involves some form of rejection that the society to which you are going, you see there is something wrong with it therefore you in some way...

K: What is the meaning of existence? Unless we tackle it on a very large scale I don't see how we are going to solve a particular small problem. What is the meaning of human existence, what is the significance of it? If it is merely to earn a livelihood, merely to get a job, merely, you know, it seems so limited, so extraordinarily narrow.

A: It is narrow, and yet it seems that those very things are becoming in fact more and more difficult, because of the very structure of society itself and its own momentum.

K: Yes. Over population, yes, need we go into all that? Over population, the destruction of real things, you know, the whole ecology and everything. Is that why we have made life so narrow and limited? As a human being, having been to Oxford or Cambridge, or whatever university, when you have got a degree, a job, and for the rest of your life, until almost you die, you are caught in that because you have responsibility for your children,

you wife, you know, all that. So is that all? Apparently that is all. Or if you are slightly inclined to be religious, you go off and pop into a church occasionally and say, "I believe in God" and get on with it. Is that why we are being educated?

E: It is about all that is happening at the moment.

K: I know that's what is happening. And we want to improve what is happening - different system, different methods, different way of teaching, and so on, to do what?

B: It seems that education should be preparation for the whole of life.

K: The whole of life, instead of merely limiting it to earning a livelihood. I should have thought any serious man who is concerned with education is concerned with the whole of existence of man - man not as an Englishman, a Frenchman, or an American, as a human being.

A: You see sir, I think as religion has declined in the West, and generally, universally, often the solutions that are sought among teachers, particularly the younger generation of teachers, are generally speaking political, not necessarily party political, but they are of a political nature. I am suggesting you improve the world by adopting a certain line, or you have a non-authoritarian approach to the actual task of teaching and out of that possibly something better will happen. In other words you try not to frighten the student, or not to dominate him, and in a sense challenge the values of the society you are in, which are consumer values, sometimes going into the army, almost generally having some kind of career.

K: We are saying the same thing.

A: But this seems to be the level at which it functions.

K: In this meeting are we challenging this whole approach to life?

A: I think we are.

B: So we are asking whether it is possible in a school to educate for the whole of existence rather than just...

K: Yes, and is that possible?

B: And is that possible, yes.

D: Because one of the problems is that we haven't been educated ourselves for the whole of existence.

K: I understand that, but as an educator, how do you approach this problem? On the one hand you say you must have a career, a job and all the rest of it, and also you say no authority, and also you say we must be concerned with the whole of life. Who is concerned with the whole of life? Not the politician, obviously. Nor the priests.

A: Not even them.

B: Not the priests.

K: Certainly not the priests. Nor the army, nor the engineer, nobody is concerned with the whole of life.

A: Poets claim to be, but I think that is possibly partial too.

K: And are we exaggerating something which is accepted as an actuality if we are totally concerned with the whole cultivation of man? If we are, what shall we do?

All right sirs. If we have children and we are concerned as parents who are also educators, not just parents and then shove them off into a school, but if the parents are concerned and the professional educators are concerned with the whole development

of man, how shall we set about it?

B: I think the truth is that we, the educators, are not always concerned with the whole.

K: Obviously not!

B: Because we have our immediate responsibilities, our own jobs, our careers to look after, and all the problems that beset us.

K: Are you saying, sir, that there is no such group in the world? There may be, which we don't know. Now with the whole of life I mean not only help the student to have a technological job and all the rest of it, but also concerned psychologically, inwardly, how to face problems, to understand the whole question of relationship, love, death, you know, the whole of life. Who is there concerned like that?

E: It is really very hard to teach if you don't feel like this.

K: It is not only hard, but are there such people? And if we are such people, what shall we do? We have not only to understand it ourselves, perhaps beginning verbally, intellectually, and then making it into an actuality in our lives, but how will you help the student to come to this, to the understanding of the whole of life? Because he comes to you conditioned, he is only concerned with a job, with a career, passing exams. If they don't want to pass exams and jobs, what will they do? You follow sir? What is our responsibility?

A: I think one responsibility is to ask some different questions from the ones that are normally asked.

K: We are asking each other what is our responsibility?

A: For instance one could ask how that society comes about which we see around us, how does it operate.



K: How is society like that? Because human beings have created it.

C: That isn't obvious to a lot of people. Many people would say that society has created the human being.

K: Society has conditioned human beings. Are you trying to say society suddenly existed? God created it? Some fanciful deity living in wherever he is and suddenly says, "There must be society" and bang, there is society? Or man has created it?

C: No, I am trying to say that the conditioning of society could create a human being and many people say that if you changed that society then the human being will change.

K: That has been tried by the communists, by the totalitarian people of different colour: change society, change the environment, either through brutal means or different ways. But they haven't succeeded.

D: But perhaps the response of people who went before just didn't do it well enough. This time we will do it better.

K: You say we will have such a government who will be efficient to change the outer circumstances, society and all that, and hoping thereby to create a different human being. Is that it? I believe every kind of system to change human beings from outside has been tried.

E: I think one has to start from the other end. One has to care for the student.

K: Ah, that is what I want to find out. Whether you want to start from the outside, outside in the sense change environment, change the culture, change the government, change the whole way of looking at life from the outside, through pressure, through cruel

means or pleasant means, and then gradually bring about a different human being. Is that possible? And I believe they have tried every kind of system from the outside: the Greeks, the ancient Hindus, the Romans, historically it is so. And in recent years the communists, in their way, through totalitarianism, have tried to force man to be different. They haven't succeeded. They have suppressed man. They have suppressed human beings to conform to a pattern. But there is always the dissidents - you know the whole history of all that.

So that is what I want to find out. Are we trying to change the human character, the condition of man, from the outside, which is called education in a different way? Right?

B: Yes.

C: Yes.

K: Or if it is not from the outside, is it from inside, inside in the sense inside the skin, psychologically, inwardly?

B: But there has also been a movement of late which have tried all kinds of things, down to gurus, down to psychiatrists.

K: Most of the gurus, are they concerned with the transformation of man?

D: Well people seem to believe they are.

K: Are you sure sir?

B: What do you mean, sir, by the transformation of man? What do you mean when you say, transformation of man?

K: To free him from his conditioning, from his problems, from his tortures, from his anxieties, despairs and depressions and fears, you know, all the suffering. Have gurus tried this? Or have they said, "Follow this, you will achieve something or other"?

B: Well, they have claimed that they can free you from this kind of thing. They say, "Come to me, follow me, do what I say, I can remove all your suffering".

K: Wait. That means accept authority. You reject authority educationally here, and you accept authority there. I don't know if I am explaining myself.

A: That happens. But we ought to try and look at what comes about when you begin from the other way on, which is starting with the person you have in front of you.

K: Can we cultivate the human mind harmoniously?

C: I am not quite sure what you mean when you say, cultivate it harmoniously.

K: What I mean by that is not only jobs and careers and all that, but also his mind, the way he thinks, his attitudes, all that. The two streams go together, the outer as well as the inner. Or must they everlastingly be kept apart? Or is there such a thing as the outer and the inner? I don't know if you see?

A: Yes. Perhaps it is going a bit fast, Krishnaji. If we can see that the outer is the passing exams, and preparing for a career.

K: Career and living a life of constant struggle.

A: What relation does that have to an education based on care, affection, psychological understanding, etc., the things we have mentioned?

K: Can these two go together?

A: Are they, yes.

K: That's what I am asking. Or this division is artificial.

A: Is it?

K: The outer and the inner. Or there is no such thing as division,

but it is a constant moving, outer and inner? I don't know if I am making myself clear.

D: I think a little more. I am not quite sure what you are talking about.

K: We have divided life as the outer and the inner. The inner is more complex, more difficult to understand, and so we have given much more emphasis to the outer. The outer is physical security, physical well being. I am not saying that that shouldn't be. Physical comforts, the whole commercialism, production, you know, all that is going on in the present world, with their terror, with their tortures, with their wars, everything; that's the outer. And the inner is, beliefs, rituals, gods, the saviours, the gurus, the hope that some day there will be some kind of peace in one's life. So we have these two.

B: Is that part of the inner life of a student?

K: The student is only what, when he comes to you? He is conditioned by his parents, by the society, the culture he has lived in, and he comes to you and he is career minded, examinations, job. That's all. It is only very rare that a student says, "Sir, there is something more than this, please tell me what there is." Like the other day the boy asked, "All right, take it for granted you must have a career, but that's not the end of everything".

So are these two divisions artificial, man-made? The one is very complex. Apparently very complex, put it that way. The other is fairly systematized, one wants security, physical security and so that has been the urge right through history, that there must be physical security first. Feed me and we will think about god afterwards! And there are the others who say, "Think of god, be

with him and everything will come right. Believe in the saviour and your life will be made easy." So we have kept these two, you know, almost in water tight compartments. Would you agree to that, would you say it is so?

B: One of them we talk about much more, and the other is...

K: ...rather shy making.

B: Yes.

K: And rather, one doesn't want to expose oneself too much, so you say "Please, let's not go into that, let's concentrate on this".

A: Which is what we have done. We are doing it more and more.

K: Which is what we have done, yes. So I am just asking: is this division emphasized by education, as it is now? Sustained by acquiring superficial knowledge, and keeping the other in a cupboard, occasionally looking at it when an emotional crisis arises and you try to solve it, but that's hidden, secret.

So I am asking are these two streams, one very, very strong, all men are concerned with the one stream and so have given an enormous volume of water to it energy; and the other practically neglected. Even the most religious person is concerned not with the ending of fear, sorrow and all the rest of it, but believing in god, practising certain rituals and hoping thereby to achieve a state of mind, or giving him some kind of peace. You see what is happening? Now I am asking: can these two streams be brought together? Surely that's the purpose of education, not to keep them apart.

B: Why do you see it as necessary to bring these two streams together?

K: That's also my life, the suffering, the agony, the doubt, the guilt, the hurts, you know, all that is part of my life. Why do you give importance only to this?

B: But the two are not really separate because...

K: That's right, the two are not separate but we have made them separate.

A: So doesn't that imply that we need to concentrate on the other one, quite considerably, no?

K: No. One should be educated in both fields.

A: But the other one is already so strong, you see. It tends to dominate the other.

K: So, what will you do? If the educators were concerned and felt tremendous responsibility that the two must be brought together, I doubt if they want it personally, if they do then what shall we do together? As a group of teachers, as a group of educators, what shall we do together? The cultivation of the human mind is not only in the technological world but also in the so-called psychological and if one may use the word, the spiritual world also. And probably the organized religious people say, "That's what we are trying to do".

B: Well, that's what they say but...

K: No, they would say that. Therefore one has to go into the whole question of what is religion. Are beliefs religion, rituals, propagated after two thousand years, religion?

A: Well that is what is understood as religion normally. I think you would have to contrast that concept of religion, or that statement about religion.

K: You have to counter it, you have to find out whether it is

accurate or false, or invented by the priests.

A: So you are introducing another element which is really some kind of psychological enquiry, or...

K: ...revolution.

A: ...or discussion among people as to what is the nature of things.

K: Yes. What is the nature of the psyche? What is the nature of a total human being, as it is now? And whether that total human being can be transformed, can be changed? After all you have a student who comes to you, ignorant in the mathematical system, or whatever it is, and you educate him so that he has a different mind at the end of ten years. He is either a mathematician, an engineer or physicist and so on and so on. He will take enormous trouble to do that, through schools, colleges, universities, that is what we are doing.

B: Then we must take enormous trouble too to do the other.

K: The other, now who will do it? You see, who will feel the responsibility, say, "Look, we must do this too."

B: Well as a teacher I see the responsibility, the necessity for doing that, but I know my subject and I can teach my subject but I don't know the other myself very well.

K: Yes. So what shall we do? If you see the importance of both, how will you enquire into the human existence, as it is, and whether it can be transformed, whether it can be changed? I should have thought that is education, not merely cram the student with a lot of facts about this or that, but also how to live without problems, without suffering, without fear, without the agonies they go through.

E: So you need to start paying attention to your actual life.

K: Yes.

E: One day after the other, as well as going to classes.

K: So as an educator can you do that? If the educator is not living that, is not himself involved in understanding his own life and he gets up and talks about the other, and the students obviously spot you as being rather shady. Question it, why has man denied the other side, or neglected it, or not be concerned about it, why?

D: One problem seems to be that we don't really know how to look at something for ourselves. We have always learnt mathematics, someone has told me how to do this or that, and when I am faced with the situation where I have to look at something, and nobody has told me how to look, I am lost.

K: Is that the question, is that the problem sir? Just a minute. I not quite sure that is the problem.

A: It is also where to look.

K: No, it is not that. Why has he neglected this, the other side of man, the hidden side of man?

C: Earning a living has become tremendously important, it seems the most important thing.

K: That is security. We will call that physical security. And he is asking, "Give me psychological security and I will go after it". Rather, "Educate me to find total security psychologically and then I will accept it". Is that it? He is seeking physical security, all human beings are in one form or another. And if you assure man that there is also security inwardly then he might pay attention to it. So I am asking, is the whole pursuit of man to be completely secure in both areas?



C: I don't like to do something unless I know what is going to happen.

K: Yes, secure. Surety. Give me assurity, a sense of feeling safe, protected, and I will pursue that. They have done that, haven't they? Believe in Jesus, believe in certain forms of religions and you will be safe. If you don't believe you will go to hell. Now, of course, nobody believes that kind of nonsense. So that is what I am asking: is man seeking security in both areas?

B: Not just physical security but also security in relationships.

K: Yes, security in relationships so that I will never be disturbed, security not to be disturbed, not to have fears, completely safe. In this field he is demanding it, in the physical field, in the other also he is demanding it, and so he has created the churches, the gods, the whole religious structure, with their fanciful, romantic mysticism, all that. Is that what man is seeking? And therefore if you, as an educator say, I will give you security there, completely, in your relationships you will be safe, you will have no psychological problems, you will have no fear, no anxiety, no guilt, no sense of being hurt, you will understand death and so on, then he will follow that.

B: Can we really do that for them?

K: Ah, that's what I am asking.

B: Is it possible to have complete security?

K: I think so.

C: Then aren't you offering me the same thing?

K: No. I am not. First of all I question the whole urge, structure of security. Is there security in this field, in the field of technology, in the field of career, in the field of jobs and so on and so on, is

there security there?

B: There is a kind of security but it brings with it its own dangers.

K: Its own problems, its own mess, which is not security. Security means to be perfectly safe. Right? Perfectly protected, not disturbed, say, "I have a job and nothing is going to happen". No wars, because the moment there is war I am lost.

C: Whether nobody is going to take my job from me.

K: But we want it there, and we are not finding it there. Governments change, inflation, every form of dishonesty. So I am asking: when we say we want security, is there such a thing at all? As long as we call ourselves Englishmen, Frenchmen, you know, keep it isolated, keep ourselves isolated as divisions, nations and so on, races, we are not secure. What do you say to that? Because I want to be secure as an Englishman, if I am an Englishman, or an Indian, or a Japanese, or whatever it is, I want to be secure in my job, you know, physically.

A: The solutions that are sought also tend to be bigger but of a similar kind. For instance, like a European parliament, or a European nation.

K: In the meantime, when that comes into being, in the meantime I go through agony, fears, uncertainty. There are millions of unemployed.

A: I would like to get back to the question of the teacher in a school meeting a student who is the product of the society but who is not aware that he is the product of the society.

K: So I have to help him not to be a product of the society.

A: Or show him he is a product of society.

K: He is, obviously.

A: He probably doesn't see that.

K: He doesn't. As an educator it is my responsibility. That he is the result of his father and whole generations past, with their particular form of society handed down through tradition.

A: And also the present society with its own violence etc.

K: So he comes conditioned and the teacher comes conditioned - right?

A: So they are both conditioned.

K: Both conditioned. At present not realizing both are conditioned, it is the blind leading the blind.

A: If one realizes he is conditioned he is only partly blind.

K: Partly. But being partly blind isn't...

A: Isn't much good!

B: What makes us insecure?

K: Division. Division of people into races, classes, nationalities, I am a Jew, you are an Arab. This division.

B: Well we seem to encourage this division. In schools there is competition.

K: Naturally sir, because each person is concerned with his own security. That security is through small groups, large groups, identifying with one country against another, which eventually breeds wars. We never say, "Look, we are one human race, for god's sake let's all work together and create a different world."

E: So trying to find one's own security makes everyone insecure.

K: Obviously. Look at what is happening. The politician wants to be secure in his position.

Sir, we are just asking, as educators, what shall we do, or what is our responsibility when we see how grotesque it has all become. It is like developing a right arm and neglecting the left arm, which is withering, which is ultimately going to be destroyed, the whole human being. So if you see both arms must be developed, strengthened and work together, what shall we do? Would you ask that question: what shall we do if you saw the importance that the inward as well as the outer much move together?

A: I would certainly bring some deliberate attention to bear on it, spend some time with it, talk about it, even understanding it imperfectly myself because of the crucial nature of it.

K: Can you do that, sir? Will you in a class give half of your time? Half an hour for mathematics and half an hour talking over the other? Discussing, having a dialogue, pointing out the importance of both?

B: Or rather than separating them out like that, as you talk about the mathematics you are also looking at your responses to it, how the other is moving at the same time.

K: No, I am saying something more than that. Will you in your class, or whatever you are doing as an educator give time to this?

C: Isn't it rather artificial to divide the class into half for the subject and half for the other?

K: It may be artificial. How will you do it? Will you do it at lunch time?

C: Well surely as Harsh suggested by the very working together at a subject you are also working together with the relationship of the student and you. It is not just working on a subject.

K: That means you have established a relationship with the

student.

C: Yes.

K: Have you a relationship with the student? That means relationship being concerned about his dress, the way he walks, the way he talks, the language he uses, cultivating his taste, manners, politeness, the whole of it. Help him to be free, help him to be free from fear and so on. Are we doing this? Which means the educator must also be enquiring himself. Or is this all so vague and uncertain and doubtful when the educator himself is conditioned to one way of life?

What would you do sirs if you had children of your own? After all the students are your children. What would you do actually?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 23RD JUNE 1979 3RD CONVERSATION WITH 5 TEACHERS**

A: I was wondering if we could consider perhaps the time span in which a student is in a school like Brockwood, say a time span of about four years, beginning at 14 and perhaps leaving at 18, and how this relates to what we were saying the other day about wanting success and some form of achievement related to psychological security, and what the interrelationship is.

K: Are you saying what is the relationship between the student and the educator when they both realize, or the educator points it out to the student that they both are conditioned - conditioned being according to their ecological, cultural, economic, racial, and all that kind of conditioning - what is the relationship between the student and the educator when they both realize that they are conditioned? Is that what you are saying?

A: That's the question.

K: What is the relationship when you and I, I the student, you the teacher, realize that we are both conditioned, and we have a short period, a period of four or five years...

A: ...in which to work it out.

K: ...in which to work it out. Now

B: Is this something that we work out over a period of time, bit by bit?

K: I doubt it. That's what I want to get at. I question whether time has any importance in this investigation.

A: We had better say what we mean about time then, because it is obvious that the student is here for a span of time.

K: A span of time being from fourteen to eighteen. Four years, or five years. Or if you have a longer period from fourteen to twenty and so on. No, I would like to question, or ask, what is the relationship between the educator and the person to be educated - educated in quotes - what is the relationship between the two? Not theoretically but actually. What is your relationship as a teacher to the student, with the student when you and he realize that both are conditioned? What is the quality of relationship? And then we can discuss whether time is necessary, a longer time or a shorter time and so on. I think that is an important thing to find out. What is one's relationship when two people realize that they are conditioned - may be conditioned culturally differently, but essentially, deeply conditioned.

B: These people are also interested in living a life that's...

K: They say, is it possible - no, before I say, is it possible, I want to find out what is the relationship between you and me when we realize that we are conditioned?

C: I am not sure I quite understand the question, when you say: what is the relationship?

K: Before our relationship was, a teacher talking down to the student, informing him, not about himself, about the subject which he is teaching. But here we are asking, apart from that, because we are concerned with the total development of a human being. That's what we began with. And we asked, what is the relationship when two people realize that they are conditioned - realize, not verbally but actually? And this conditioning keeps people apart. You understand my question?

C: If I am conditioned as the teacher then I can't actually help.

K: Not as a teacher but as a human being you are conditioned. And so is the other human being, what is the relationship between you two?

C: We are both the same, surely.

K: Yes, but I said when you realize.

B: From that point onwards you can begin to work together.

K: Yes, not only work together, but before we work together what takes place, emotionally, intellectually and all the rest of it, when you and I realize that we are both conditioned?

B: First I lose my fear of you.

K: Yes. And also - go a little deeper. What takes place between us?

D: It seems somehow or other that our images of each other are broken down.

K: No. We don't react as we did before. Would that be right?

E: You really start listening to the other person a bit.

K: We are beginning to listen to each other. There is...

C: Is that because I don't feel superior to you?

K: No, we both are in the same boat. We both are conditioned. You realize - realize, you understand, not just verbally have understood what the conditioning is intellectually means, but actually realize that you are conditioned, and another also realizes equally, then what takes place? Our reactions don't carry us away.

A: I think that in that particular relationship that is so. But the difficulty arises when one realizes he is conditioned...

K: ...and the other doesn't. But we are helping the student and ourselves to realize that we are conditioned. Let us put it this way: part of our conditioning is to react instantly. Right?



A: To whatever happens.

K: To whatever happens, to your words, to your gesture, to your language. Our conditioning is part of our self-centredness. And when you and I realize we are so terribly self-centred, then what takes place? It is obvious. No?

A: I am not sure it is so obvious. Are you suggesting that there is nothing left to achieve?

K: Look sir, you and I have to live in the same house. And you and I realize that we are self-centred. That is our deep abiding conditioning. You are self-centred and so am I. And we both realize it. Both have to live in the same room, same house. What takes place? What is the difficulty?

E: You have to be very careful because this hardly ever actually happens.

K: That's what I am going to establish with the student. I want him to realize, I want to help him to realize that he is conditioned. And in explaining what conditioning is I realize also that I am conditioned. Obviously. Unless I am dull, or anything, I realize the same thing. So we are both together in this. He is conditioned and his activities are self-centred, so is that of another. Right? So what takes place in this actual realization of two people?

B: What happens then in the relationship is no longer from the conditioning.

K: No, it is conditioned, but go on, sir, investigate.

D: It is a problem.

K: It is a problem which has to be resolved.

A: But surely it is the communication which is now the important thing, not the...

K: Yes, communication. Now how do I communicate to you and how do you communicate to me from our self-centred point of view?

A: Is there any communication?

K: There isn't any. There is superficial communication. Right? So what takes place? If you realize and I realize, what takes place?

A: We, as it were, create the possibility of illuminating this self-centredness.

K: That means what? What is our relationship?

A: Well it is one of equality.

K: What is our relationship actually?

C: Surely we both want to understand and discover together then.

K: A little more than that. Go into it. What is our relationship?

B: Then we can deal with each other with affection.

K: Go on, sir, look at it. You are conditioned, I am conditioned. And we established a relationship of mutual conditioning.

B: So we both know we are that.

K: So what is that relationship, what has taken place in that relationship?

B: We have seen something together.

K: That is, we are removing the barriers between you and me. Right? We are removing the division, this self-centredness. Right? You are helping me, and I am helping you - not helping - we are watching each other in order not to be self-centred. That is part of our conditioning. Can the educator convey this to the student and feel the responsibility of this exchange?

C: But if we said the two are equal, why is it the educator

conveying to the student?

K: No, the student is not so clear as you are.

C: But doesn't that mean...

K: Clarity. I see more clearly than you do. It is not I am superior or inferior. You have more knowledge about mathematics than I have. But if mathematics are used to gain a status, then there is a difference between you and me. No?

A: That is true in that field, and it is quite clear. But the conditioning may also suggest to me that the suggestion of being conditioned is a similar factor to being a mathematics teacher.

K: Let's forget for the moment conditioning. What is the relationship between the teacher and the student? What is the relationship, actual relationship, apart from teaching a particular subject? Have you any relationship with your students?

A: Some of them.

K: What? Apart from the subject. Now what is that relationship when you realize the fact that you and he are both conditioned, both self-centred - forgive me if I use the word 'you', it's not personal - what is the relationship there?

D: Part of it seems to be that we are able to work as mirrors for each other. The student is talking to me and I am able to...

K: Are you doing that now? One has realized that you and I are both self-centred, and do we see our conditioning in our relationship?

A: Taking place in the relationship?

K: Yes. And it is only through the understanding of this conditioning in relationship there is the possibility of real communication. Communication can only exist when there is no

division, when you can both share something together.

C: It seems as though we see this sometimes but now always.

K: No, the question of 'sometimes' and 'not always' is - if I may point out - irrelevant. What is relevant is, what takes place in this relationship with the student and with the teacher when they both realize they are in the same self-centred area, field? You are not answering my question. Probably you haven't thought about this. This is what is happening in Brockwood. So what then is the relationship between you and the students here?

A: One level of it is like this: I can see such and such a person is conditioned in such a way because of his cultural background - Indian. He is conditioned in a certain way, and another is conditioned in another way. I can see the elements of that, and what has brought about that picture. He may have been educated in a special way but nevertheless when he arrives the whole culture is there with him. So I can see that. And I see that...

K: Now wait a minute. When you see the conditioning in him, how the condition has been brought about do you see at the same time how that very same conditioning exists in you?

A: I see another form of conditioning.

K: But it is still conditioning.

A: It is still conditioning.

K: That's all my point.

A: But it works out that seemingly these conditionings have affinities. For instance, although we are an international school here, it is very frequent to find that the Americans go to the Americans, the English go to the English, the Germans go to the Germans, the Indonesians go to Indonesians. So their similarity

draws them together. In that sense their conditioning is not equal.

K: We said conditioning is not merely the superficial manners, colour, but we went much deeper into conditioning, which is self-centredness. The desire for success.

A: And the tribal.

K: And the tribal. We went into that. We haven't tackled this problem.

E: When you are talking about conditioning to somebody, it doesn't seem to be their conditioning or your conditioning, you can look at theirs or yours at the same time.

K: At the same time.

E: It is exactly the same thing.

K: Then when you both see the same thing then what is our relationship? Our relationship has undergone a great change.

A: I am stuck on this point of actually seeing the conditioning as being the same. I can see it as being equal.

K: Yes, all right, equal.

A: But being identical.

K: Wait, sir. The Indian from India, the American, the Russian, the Englishman or French - the western, eastern and far west, their common factor is they all want success. Right? Obviously.

A: Yes.

K: Now the goddess of success has many, many faces. But the central factor is success.

A: Self continuance.

K: You might seek success as a lawyer, and another seeks success in being a carpenter, or a politician, or whatever it is.

A: How do we distinguish that from interest?

K: Interest?

A: Yes. Because that is also one of our objectives in a school like this is to help the student find an interest which will sustain him through life.

K: Is that the central factor of life, interest? He might be interested - he might say, "I am really interested in wanting to be a surgeon, that what I want to devote my life" - is that interest the central factor of life? Or is it something much greater than interest?

A: I am suggesting that the real interest is...

K: I am not suggesting anything.

A: It seems necessary to have this interest also.

K: The interest may be awakened by the social demand. Society says, you must be an engineer because you get more money.

A: But there may be a talent there also.

K: Oh yes, talent. But we are talking of interest. I say, is that the central factor of life, interest? Or ambition to achieve something? I think interest can vary, diminish, sometimes enormous interest, but it is rather feeble.

A: It is partial certainly.

K: We are trying to get at, aren't we, what is the common factor between two people who realize they are caught in the same trap? I want to move away from conditioning.

A: Well they can either...

K: If they realize they are in a trap they help each other to break the trap.

A: But seeing the contour of the trap, to see the nature of the trap is...

K: No, but if you realize you are in a trap, and that causes a

great deal of pain both physically and psychologically, and another realizes it, and you two have to live in the same house, what takes place? We are helping each other to break down the trap. And the intensity of that trap, and the pain of it, is making us very active.

A: Outwardly, you mean?

K: Inwardly also.

A: Would you say this is responsible for the agitation of thought, generally?

K: Probably. So one's relationship with another is, when one realizes, the activity of relationship in which each one is helping the other to break down, to undo the trap.

C: So part of that relationship is trusting another person and not feeling afraid of them.

K: Which means what? How will you trust another if one is afraid of them? How can I trust you if I am afraid of you? If you are competing with me for the same job, or for the same whatever it is, how can I trust you? I can only trust when there is mutual responsibility about certain things.

C: But we both have to see that.

K: That's what I am saying. Do we at Brockwood, it comes down to that, help the student to see that he is conditioned, and the teacher is also conditioned, not climatically, dark brown or black or pale, but also psychologically in the sense we are both conditioned to act from a self-centred interest. If we both see it there is a definite change in our relationship, in the relationship between these two people. I think that is very important in a school of this kind.

C: I still wonder what happens if we don't both see it?

K: Therefore it is my responsibility. If you see it, it is your responsibility for me to see it.

A: Are you saying that this will become the dissolving agent which will do away with the particular conditioning? For instance, an English mentality will tend to be puritanical in some respect, either puritanical or in rebellion against that, so it has that kind of trap, kind of seized up emotionally. Or a Jewish mentality could be legalistic, for instance, and see things in those terms. And this come through in the students, the conditioning shows itself, these different aspects of the mentality. So we are suggesting now that if we meet at this common and deeper level then that will throw light on the particular conditioning rather than starting from the other way round.

K: Through the particular you can find out the whole.

A: Right. We are suggesting, or at least you are suggesting that that's not the best way to proceed but rather the other way round. Is it helpful then to point out to a student the particular conditioning?

K: No. You see, sir, I am not sure whether a collection of details, a collection of particulars is going to help to perceive the whole conditioning, or to understand the nature of conditioning, the structure of conditioning, the climatic, the food, the religion, the prejudices, the family, you follow, the whole cultural and environmental conditioning. That's why personally I would look at the principle of it rather than the details of it.

D: But in point of fact that is how we attempt to do things here, try to see the particulars first.

K: I know.

D: And all the time it makes the person more conditioned.



K: That's why when we were discussing the other day, whether they want a room where they could be quiet, silent, they began to discuss in details. I said, please, if you don't mind, first find out if you want a room like that, a quiet room. If you do that is the principle from which you can work it out. In the same way, can we work this out? That we are, as human beings, wherever we live, we are conditioned by the society, culture, religion of that particular country, or group, or community. And part of that conditioning is ambition, which expresses itself in the desire for success. Success implies security. Right? And so each one is seeking his own personal security. Right? All that is taking place in the world. Or there is the totalitarian concept, the state must be the great success, of which we control it. You know, the whole business of that.

So can we help the student to understand the nature of this conditioning as success. I am only taking that as an example.

B: We are taking that as an example because we are interested not just in that particular conditioning but we want to know what the whole nature of conditioning is.

K: Like looking at one particular conditioning we may discover the whole nature of conditioning. I don't know. Right, sir.

A: One particular conditioning being...

K: Say, success, for instance. Or take anything. We will take success because that is what most human beings want. Which when you succeed you have money, position, status, freedom - that is 'freedom' in quotes, and so on. You are respected. So why has success become so important in man's life. We said, in our previous dialogue, security. Right? It does give security. If I am a first-class fiddler, violist, I am a tremendous success. If I am

mediocre or not so good I become just part of the orchestra. Even in the orchestra there is competition, the left hand man, the violist is more important than the other fellow. So success is part of our life.

B: Does success really bring security? Or do we have the idea that it will bring security?

K: I does in certain ways. Look at all the politicians, they struggle, they campaign, they make all kinds of silly things, all this goes on because they want to be a success, as Prime Minister, or member of Parliament, or whatever it is.

B: But even if you get to the top of whatever you are striving for, it is still shaky, you may fall down any time.

K: The more you strive for success, and the higher you get, nearer to god, in one direction - the popes, the bishops, the archbishops, the whole hierarchical structure of religious people. And on the other side the politicians and the businessman, in every direction it is there. Now what is wrong with success?

B: That's what I am trying to say: it doesn't bring you real security. It may bring you physical security, or you may feel wanted, or above everyone, or something like that, but at the end...

K: There is tremendous pleasure in being successful.

B: Yes.

C: There is, but there is also the fear that that success won't last.

K: It is a tremendous thing to feel, I have succeeded. And you thrive on that.

A: You fulfil your ambitions.

K: That is just it. And you are doing the same, we are all doing the same.

A: So we are fulfilling ourselves through some particular role.

K: And therefore opposed to each other.

A: Do we see that?

K: If you and I are trying to fulfil our ambitions through that particular channel, you are better than me, I begin to be jealous of you, I begin to be nasty about you. You follow. There is division, obviously, conflict between us.

A: One might put that down to market factors. For instance, the government wanted a lot of teachers at one time, so anybody who trained could be a teacher, they weren't so much in competition with one another. But nowadays there are not many jobs.

K: Because of overpopulation, you know, all the rest of it.

A: So we are saying that is a market factor.

K: I understand all that, sir. But we are trying to find out whether that conditioning which in certain ways is so destructive in our human relationship - right, we agree to that? If you and I are married, or husband and wife, and I am ambitious in one way, and you are ambitious in another, there is no relationship between us. This is so obvious, isn't it?

B: Yes.

A: Even if one is ambitious at all.

K: That is just the point.

B: People are willing to put their relationships second to success.

K: That's just it. That means, self-centred activity is more important than relationship.

C: And the whole point about success is that it seems to be at the expense of other people.

K: Of course, naturally. So can we, as educators, convey all this to the student, not verbally, but actually make him realize these things. How dangerous it is.

B: That this is the nature of success, this is what it would lead to.

K: Division, no relationship. If there is a relationship, perpetual wrangle - you don't love me, I love you - all that kind of thing that goes on. And each one pursuing his own self interest. How can you have any kind of relationship, or love in this?

D: And also the added factor that if you do become successful and you have that pursuing pleasure you don't want to lose that.

K: And the wife supports you, and says, "Go on", because she gets reflected glory from you.

B: But we are saying, Krishnaji, that we want to look at success merely as an example of conditioning, because you just don't want to understand success and put only success away.

K: No, but I see the factor, or I realize what brings about division between people.

A: I can observe it in the world also which is quite a fertile field, speaking as a teacher. I can observe it in the world as take the map of history, or take the map of current events.

K: You can see it, sir, you can see it.

A: In newspapers too.

K: It is not only individual success but also it is collective success, national success.

E: It is really quite obvious that if somebody succeeds somebody else fails. So somebody feels good about somebody else's suffering.

K: Of course. So do we as a group of educators see the nature of this: that where there is division there is no relationship. If there is a division between the student and the educator you are educating only about your particular subject. Here you are saying it is different. Here we are actually bringing about a relationship with the student which is not divisive, which has a quality of affection, love and all the rest of it.

D: That is what we are attempting to do, but whether we are actually doing that.

K: We are not doing it - there is no attempt, either you sink or swim. Sorry!

A: You can swim more or less badly. But you are still swimming.

K: Sir, what is our responsibility in all this? The parents send their children here. First of all, if I was a parent and I sent my children here I would want them to live a life that is whole, complete, not partial. Right? And I say to you, as educators, here are my two children, please help them to live that way, not only at Brockwood but right through life.

E: It is quite clear after what we have been talking about. We have to go into the conditioning with them as if it really is the most important thing.

K: It is the most important thing. Therefore I am asking you, how will you deal with my children - if I have children - how will you deal with them, what is your responsibility? They come conditioned, and the teacher is conditioned, how will you help each other to be free of this terrible trap that man has invented for himself? That's our problem. That's why we said at the beginning

of this dialogue, the last two dialogues, what is our actual relationship, is it that of a teacher who is merely concerned with the subject, or he is concerned not only with the subject but the whole way of living, his thinking, his feelings, his sorrows, his ambitions, all that. Are we concerned with all that or not?

B: That's what we set out the school for.

K: I agree. That was why the school existed. So are we doing it? So that is why I am asking, what is our responsibility?

E: It is difficult to say if we are doing it when we are actually in the middle of it. But if you ask whether I would like my child to come here, or to another school, I think I would like her to come here because we are trying to do it more than other schools that I know of. Even if we are not doing it as much as we could.

K: But that is not good enough - more is not good enough.

E: I know, but I am trying to say what I actually feel.

K: I know, a little more is not good enough.

B: Even in answering this question by saying we are trying to do it, aren't we again talking about success?

K: Yes.

B: Are we succeeding?

K: That's why I said, come back to the point: what is our relationship, responsibility in this relationship? If we don't feel responsible in the sense that we are concerned totally with the whole development of the student, not subjects only, then is it possible for both of us to share that responsibility, the student and ourselves, so that we are all working together for the same end. Do you follow?

C: I think why we feel hesitant is perhaps that some people are

trying to do this and others are not, or maybe one person won't listen, and then you feel that you are not doing it.

K: If you are doing it, and you feel great responsibility in the doing of it, what happens to another who is rather weak about it.

B: He is either strengthened, or sometimes he leaves.

K: You burn him out, or burn him in. I don't know.

A: There are also those who slide out, Krishnaji.

K: Sling them out too.

A: Psychologically, I mean.

K: Yes.

A: I was going to say, is the task not something like this, which is: to bring about a different mode of seeing things.

K: Yes, a different way of looking, observing, a way of learning, not merely accumulating knowledge, learning, the activity of learning, the mind that wants to learn.

A: And so therefore this would not be held within the time frame of fourteen to twenty.

K: That's right. I mean, sir, take an example: do the students know what love is? The care of love?

E: I wouldn't just ask whether the students know what love is.

K: As an educator do I know it? Or is it all emotional, romantic, physical, sensuous? Which at present it is. So how am I to convey all this to the student? And I feel terribly responsible. Which means first I must help them to listen to what I have to say.

A: Surely wouldn't that come later in a sense, after you had established a way of seeing together, moving together.

K: But that is only possible if I listen to you. It is only possible that we move together, walk together, on the same road, if I listen

to you first.

A: So that is all involved: seeing, listening.

K: Yes. First I must listen to what you have to say.

E: But you are only going to listen to me if I feel fairly passionately and strongly about what I am trying to convey.

K: Yes.

A: Are you saying that love is in that listening?

K: Yes. If I love you then I listen to you, whether you tell me I am a fool or not, I listen to you.

A: Well what is the relationship of love to silence then?

K: Oh, that we are going off.

A: I am sorry.

C: I think when you say listening, I think we ought to explore a bit more about what listening means. I mean I can listen to someone who I believe in without necessarily involving love.

K: I listen. I want to tell you something: I say, human beings are very self-centred. I want to tell you that. Will you listen? Or you say, yes, I know that. That's nothing new what you are telling me. Which means that you are really actually not listening to what the other fellow is saying.

C: So by listening you are saying it is not judging whether it is right or wrong, just holding it.

K: Just listen. Listening implies, doesn't it, a certain quality of attention. No? And if I want to listen to Tchaikovsky, or someone or other, I must attend.

C: Sir, I think listening has become something that people don't do: like you put the record player on and work and you do something else.



K: No, no. I am only talking about listening. If I can learn the art of listening I would solve a great many problems.

How do you help the student to listen to mathematics? He is not interested in it. He wants to do something else while you are talking, explaining the problem. And how do you see that he really listens to what you are saying?

A: Well I might talk to him about what he is doing instead of listening.

K: Sir, just look at it. If you are passionately involved - not verbally - wholly involved in what you are saying your very passion makes me listen to you.

C: So that shows him the importance.

K: I mean if you are interested in history, and history is the story of man, anyhow, you say, look, man is you, you are the history of mankind, obviously. And you find out, not merely who was the king, this and all the rest of it, wars, but the story of man which is essentially the story of you. And I am interested, I am passionate about it so he listens to me.

A: I think he listens when he gets that point, which is that it is the history of himself.

K: Yes.

A: But when he makes that link then...

K: Yes, that is what I am saying because I am interested in what you are pointing out. History is the story of yourself - the violence, the hatred, the whole thing.

A: That is the inner content of history.

K: Yes, but what I am trying to say is, to help him to listen, that is what I am concerned about.

E: It isn't a matter of how to listen.

K: Listen.

E: It just comes out of the way you are doing things.

K: Yes.

B: To help him to listen you must listen to him carefully.

K: Of course. Naturally. It implies both. Can we do this here? I can't listen - one can't listen if I am prejudiced, if I have a certain point of view I stick to it, I can't listen to you. You may be contradicting the point of view and so I won't listen. But if you say, look let's listen, find out why you hold on to a particular point of view, let's find out. I am interested. I may be holding it, my own opinions may be very strong, I may consciously, or unconsciously be holding on to them. By talking to you I am discovering.

A: Similarly with inattention, and the other things.

K: Of course. It seems to me I have talked all the time.

B: Krishnaji, it seems we keep coming round again and again and we start talking about success and seeing how dangerous it is. We could start talking about nationalism, or many, many things. But is there a central thing?

K: Oh, yes, there is. I don't think we have time to go into that now. Let's stop.

Sir you raised a question, what was it, silence and?

A: Silence and love.

K: Oh, yes.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST CONVERSATION WITH BUDDHIST SCHOLARS 28TH JUNE 1979 'TRUTH'**

N: Mr. Feroz Meta is a scientist and has written a book about a couple of years ago, 'The Heart of Religion', which was very well received. He came here last year once and he also knows Dr Rahula, who was here for last year's discussion.

K: Begin, sir.

R: Why don't you speak one word first?

K: What am I to say? I don't know. We all join in?

R: Sir, I want to ask you one thing today. You see we all talk of truth, absolute truth, ultimate truth; and seeing it and realizing it; always we talk about it. And of course in Buddhism, according to Buddha's teachings, these are very important central points, that is the essence really. And Buddha says there is only one truth, there is no second. It is clearly mentioned. But this is never defined in positive terms. That is, this truth is equated also with Nirvana. It is equated. And sometimes the word 'truth' is used in place of Nirvana, ultimate truth, absolute truth.

And then Nirvana is never defined; except mostly in negative terms. If it is described in positive terms it is mostly metaphorically, as a symbol, symbolic way. And there is a very beautiful Mahayana Sutra; of course when I use the word 'Mahayana' you all understand, I think, there was the original authentic teaching of the Buddha known as 'Theravada', that is the tradition of the elders. Then about the first century B.C., round about that period, Mahayana, which is a later development, began

to grow, free interpretation of the teaching of the Buddha. There is a very beautiful Sutra written, of course it is a late work all students, followers, accept, called (.....) that is the teaching of the Bodhisatva. There is an assembly in this house of the Bodhisatvas, disciples and like this great assembly. There in that assembly the question was put: "What is non-duality?" That is, non-duality is another word for the absolute truth, or Nirvana. It is in Sanskrit called advida.

K: Adwaita, in Sanskrit, yes.

R: No, adwaita is different from advida. In Buddhism, in Buddhist terminology advida means, neither existence nor non-existence, Buddha says: "The world is duality", that means, either is or is not, either exist or does not exist, either right or wrong, that is advita, according to Buddhist teaching. That is Buddha says the world is depending on this... But the Buddha teaches without falling into this... that...

And the question was put, "What is advida?" And there are 32 definitions, why Bodhisatvas, disciples there is a long list, 32. Then... is the leading figure in this story, they said: "Sir, it is not our opinion, but we want to know your opinion." And then Sutra says, it is very interesting,... answered the question with a thundering silence.

K: Quite.

R: If you speak it is not duality. And I was asked in Oxford by a professor when I gave a series of lectures, "Can you formulate this non-duality or truth?" I say the moment you formulate, that is not non-duality; that becomes duality the moment you formulate it.

So, just as they asked..., I ask you today: what is truth, what is

absolute truth, what is ultimate truth and what is that non-duality as you see it? Tell us. It is a challenge.

K: They're all looking at us.

R: Yes. Rather, looking at you.

K: At us, sir. Do you think, sir, there is a difference between reality and truth? And is truth measurable by words? And if we could distinguish between what is reality and what is truth, then perhaps we could penetrate more deeply into this question.

What is reality? The very word *res*, means 'things', thing. What is the thing? Could we say that everything that thought has created is reality - including the illusions, the gods, the various mantras, rituals, the whole movement of thought, what it has brought about in the world, the cathedrals, the temples, the mosques, and their content? That is reality like the microphone - it's made by thought, it is there, actual. But nature is not created by thought. It exists. But we human beings have used nature to produce things, like our houses, chairs, and so on and so on.

R: You mean to say, nature of things. Nature of things.

K: Nature.

R: Nature, yes,

K: The beauty of the earth, the rivers, the waters, the seas, the trees, the heavens, the stars, and the flowing winds, and all that.

R: And why not the beauty of this thing?

K: Oh, there is a beauty in this.

R: That's right.

K: But we were saying, I mean, a beautiful cathedral, a beautiful poem, a lovely picture, are all the result of thought. So could we say then that anything that thought has created, brought

about, put together, is reality?

M: Sir, when you speak of the beauty of the object, are you including their quality of beauty as reality, or the object itself, the beauty may be some other quality.

K: The object itself could be beautiful or one can attribute beauty to the thing which may not be beautiful in itself.

M: So it's the idea of the beauty of that object that you are including in this category.

K: Yes. Both. Yes. So could we do that, sir. That reality, including the illusions it has created, as well as the material things it has created through technological knowledge and so on, so on, all that is reality.

R: Yes. May I add a little to that? That is, reality - I should say, I am explaining to you the Buddhist attitude about this problem - according to Buddhist thought, Buddhas's teaching, there is relative truth or reality.

K: Don't let's use the truth and reality, just...

R: Yes, let us say reality, reality is relative.

K: Of course.

R: And absolute. What you say is fully accepted, that is the reality.

K: That is, everything that thought has created is reality.

R: Reality.

K: The dreams...

R: Reality, even the dreams.

K: ...dreams, all the sensory and sensuous responses.

R: Yes.

K: All the technological world of knowledge, all the things that

thought has put together as literature, poem, painting, illusions, gods, symbols - all that is reality. Would you accept that, sir?

F: Yes, but this word reality has its denotation; its first meaning as well as its connotation.

K: Yes.

F: And through the centuries people have tended to talk of reality more in terms of one of its connotations of ultimate reality.

K: I know, but I would like to separate the two - truth and reality. Otherwise we mix our terms all the time.

F: That is true.

S: Are you also, excuse me, are you also including nature in reality?

K: No.

S: No. Right.

K: No. That tree is not created by thought. But out of that tree man can produce chairs and so on.

S: Yes. Is there then a third category of things, which is neither truth nor reality? Or are you calling nature...

K: Nature is not created by thought.

S: No.

K: The tiger, the elephant, the deer. The gazelle that flies along, that obviously is not created by thought.

R: That means, you don't take the tree as a reality.

K: I take it as a reality, of course it's a reality, but it's not created by thought.

R: That's true. Then do you mean to say, only things created by thought, you include in reality.

K: Yes.

R: Of course that is your own definition.

K: No, I'm trying to be clear that we understand so as not to get involved in these two terms, truth and reality.

R: Yes, I can understand, yes, leave the word truth for another purpose and let us...

K: Not another purpose, let us look at reality - what is reality? The world is reality.

R: Yes.

K: These lamps are reality. You sitting there, this person sitting there, are realities. The illusions that one has are an actual reality.

M: But sir, the people sitting there are not created by thought.

K: No.

M: So could we more or less define another category for living creatures, nature, trees, animals, people?

K: A human being is not created by thought.

M: No.

K: But what he creates...

M: Yes. So the reality category of which you are speaking is man-made, in a sense.

K: Man-made. Like war is a reality. You're a bit hesitant about this.

F: Could we regard all that is apprehended through the senses, and then interpreted by the brain as reality.

K: That's right, sir.

S: At one time we made a distinction, in talking, between reality, which was anything that was created by the mind, and actuality, which is anything that could be captured by the mind, anything which existed in time and space.



K: Yes.

S: And then there was truth. Now, reality was part of actuality.

In other words, the tree was an actuality not a reality.

K: Why do you want to separate...

S: Otherwise it becomes very confusing, because if we say, look, you and I, as people, we are not created by thought, so we're not reality.

K: You want to separate actuality, reality and truth. Is that it?

S: Well I just offer that as a convenient definition of words that we used before.

K: Would we say the actual is what is happening now?

F: Yes, that's a good way of putting it. The point which arises there is that, are we capable of apprehending the totality of what is happening now. We apprehend only a portion of it.

K: Yes, but that's a different point, we can go into that. But what is actually happening, what is happening is actual. That's all. Not whether we understand, comprehend the whole of it or part of it and so on. What is happening is the actual.

F: Yes. That is the fact.

K: That is a fact.

F: Yes.

K: So, what do you say to all this, sirs?

R: I am still hesitating, I'm waiting to see more.

K: So can a mind see the actual, incompletely or completely, that's not the point for the moment. And whether the mind can apprehend or perceive or observe or see that from reality you cannot go to truth.

SS: That's quite a big jump, probably.

K: Sir, could we put it this way too. As you pointed out, sir, that all the sensory responses are the beginning of thought.

F: Yes.

K: And thought, with all its complex movements, is what is happening now when we're talking.

F: Yes.

K: And what is happening is the actual, and the interpretation or the understanding of what is happening depends on thought. All that, including illusions and the whole business of it, is reality.

F: Yes, that is so.

K: Then if we agree or accept that for the moment; then the question arises: can the mind, which is the network of all the senses, actualities and so on, can that apprehend, see, observe what is truth?

F: Provided the mind can be free of all its conditioning.

K: I'll come to that a little later. But that's the problem. To find out what absolute truth is, thought must be understood - the whole movement and the nature of thought must have been gone into, observed. And has its relative place, and so the mind then becomes absolutely still and perhaps out of that, in that stillness, truth is perceived, which is not to be measured by words.

F: Yes, there I'd agree, completely, fully.

R: Yes, I agree with that.

K: Now, this are the two - isn't it. A human being is caught in the movement of thought. And this movement projects what is truth.

F: This is the mistake that man makes.

K: Of course. He projects from this to that, hoping to find what

is truth. Or projects what he thinks is truth. And the truth can be put in different words - God. Brahman it is called in India, or Nirvana, or moksha, you know, all that business. So our question is then, sir, can the mind cease to measure?

F: That is to say, the mind as it functions at present in each one of us as an individual.

K: As human beings.

F: As human beings.

K: Measurement is our whole educational environmental, social conditioning.

F: Yes.

K: Would you agree?

R: Yes.

K: Then what is measurement?

F: Limitation.

K: No. What is measurement, to measure? I measure a piece of cloth, or measure the height of the house, measure the distance from here to a certain place and so on. Measurement means comparison. Right? I'm going on talking, I don't know why you all don't join in.

SS: Well, there's also psychological measurement in all this.

K: Yes, there is physical measurement and psychological measurement. One measures oneself, psychologically against somebody.

F: Yes.

K: And so there is this constant measurement of comparison, both externally and inwardly. Right? I'm giving a lecture - what's the idea?

R: Well, I put the question to you.

K: Yes, sir.

R: As they put the question to..., I put the question to you.

K: What is the question?

R: What is non-duality? What is truth?

K: No.

R: You are explaining.

K: As long as thought is measuring there must be duality.

R: Absolutely, that is a fact. That is so.

K: Now, how has this conditioning come about? You understand, sir? Otherwise we can't move away from this to that. How has this constant measurement, comparison imitation - you know, the whole movement of measurement, why has man been caught in it?

R: The whole measurement is based on self - self, the use of measuring is done...

K: Yes, but how has it come? Why have human beings, wherever they live, why are they conditioned through this measurement. I want, one wants to find out what is the source of this measurement. You follow, sir?

F: Yes, yes.

SS: Part of it seems to be the fruit of observation, because you observe the duality of life in terms of night and day, man, woman, the change of seasons and this kind of thing, which is a certain kind of contrast, there's a certain contrast apparent.

K: You're saying...

SS: So it may seem a natural step to say that there's therefore a kind of contrast or comparison which is applicable in man's own

life.

K: There's darkness, light, thunder and silence.

P: It seems the thought needs a static point to measure, and itself is moving constantly, and in a state of continuous flux or movement, it can't measure, so it creates a static point which is immovable, which is taken as the centre of the self. From there only you can measure.

K: Yes, sir. I mean, the very word 'better', 'greater', in the English language, is measurement.

F: Measurement, yes, certainly, measurement.

K: So the language itself is involved in measurement. Now, one has to find out, shouldn't one, I'm just asking, what is the source of this measurement, why has man employed this, or as a means of living? You follow my question, sir?

F: Yes. Yes.

K: One sees night and day, high mountain, low valleys, the tall man, short man, woman, man, child, old age - physically there are all these states of measurement. There is also psychological measurement, that's what I'm talking about, much more than the mere physical movement of distance and so on. Why has man been held in this measurement?

SS: Probably he thinks it's the way forward, to some extent, because, if you're a farmer and you plant to crop in a certain way, and you get this kind of result, the next year you plant in a different way, and you get that better result.

K: Yes, so it is time.

SS: It's time.

K: Go on, sir, a bit more. Time.

SS: It includes the ability to reflect, to have experience, to reflect on experience, to produce something better out of that experience in terms of probably an established notion of what is, you know what is the good, what is the better thing to have, or what is the right situation of things.

K: That is, of course, but I want to go a little further than that. Which is, why has man used time as a means of progress? I'm talking psychologically, not time which is necessary to learn a language, time is necessary to develop a certain technology and so on.

P: Perhaps the need of security of thought for itself.

K: No, time, which is measurement.

F: Do you think that our tendency is, that starting with the facts, the physical facts of difference, in size, in quantity, and so forth...

K: That's what I want to get at.

F: ...we apply that analogically to the psychological process also.

K: Yes. Or, without measurement there would have been no technology.

F: That's true.

K: Sir, I don't know if you...

N: As in science and mathematics, as it progresses, measurement becomes more and more refined, and each refinement in measurement leads to a further step of progress, computers.

K: We're not saying that, we're not denying that.

N: In one sense, measurement and refinement of measurement, do lead to a certain kind of progress, in science and technology.

K: Of course, we said that.

R: But we are not talking of physical measurement so much as psychological measurement.

K: Yes. Why has man used psychological time as a means of self growth, self aggrandisement, he calls it 'getting better', getting more noble, achieving enlightenment? All that implies time.

N: Is it, as Metah says, carried over from the day to day living of measurement signs, to the psychological field? Is it carried over, or does it exist in the psychological field without reference to this?

K: That's what we're discussing. Whether there is any psychological evolution at all.

S: Could we say that we began to apply measurement to the psychological field, one out of habit, because that's what we've been using for the physical field, but also could we have made that transfer because it's very comfortable to think...

K: Of course, sir.

S: ...that I might be in a mess now but later I'll be fine.

K: Let's be clear on this. At the technological, physical level, we need time. We need time to acquire a language, time to build a house, time to go from here to there, or time as a developing technology, science, we need time there. So let's be clear on that. So I'm asking something else. We're asking something else, which is, do we need time at all psychologically?

SN: What is it that creates time?

K: Thought, thought is time.

SN: Doesn't thought have something to do with it?

K: Which is what we're saying: time is movement, isn't it. So thought is movement, thought is movement, time is movement

from here to there; one is greedy, envious, I need time to be free of it. Physical distance and psychological distance. One is questioning whether that is not an illusion - not the physical distance but the psychological distance. Is there, sir, to put it very succinctly, is there psychologically, tomorrow?

F: Only in terms of anticipation.

K: Ah, in terms, because thought says, "I hope to".

F: And in addition to thought, there is the fact of our physical experience, of day and night, and therefore the words 'tomorrow', 'today'.

K: We said that very clearly. There is yesterday, today and tomorrow; that is a reality, that is a measurement also. But we are asking, is there psychological time at all, or thought has invented time, psychological time, in order to feel that it can achieve or live in some kind of security?

R: What is time?

K: Time, sir, time is movement.

R: Yes. Time is nothing but the unbroken continuity of cause and effect, that is movement.

K: Movement, we said. Cause, effect, effect becomes the cause, and so on, and so on.

R: That is time. We give a word called time for that movement.

K: Yes, which is movement. It's now five minutes past twelve, it's a movement till it reaches one o'clock.

R: Yes, it is a movement.

K: It's a movement.

R: Movement of cause and effect, continuous.

K: Yes, that's one aspect of time. And also the aspect of time



which is from here, physical distance. I have to go to London and it takes time to get there.

R: Yes, that is another conception of time.

K: Another time. We are looking at the various facets of time.

R: Yes, another time.

M: Sir, would you say that thought in itself implies time, because the action...

K: Of course.

M: ...of the mind consulting thought, going through the thought process takes, even if it's a very quick, short amount of time, it is still time.

K: Surely, because thought is response of memory, memory is time.

M: Then one has to...

K: Yes, memory is time. Right sir?

F: Yes.

K: So please don't go back and forth. Let's stick to one thing, which is, is there physical time, yesterday, today and tomorrow. Time as movement.

F: What we call chronological time.

K: Chronological time. Let's call that chronological time. Time also as from distance. Time also to put for the cause, effect - acorn, tree. To climb a mountain, time. So we are saying, time, physically exists.

F: Yes.

K: Right sir? Physically. The baby grows into man and so on. So time is necessary, time exists. That's an actuality, that is a reality. We are questioning whether psychologically there is time at

all. Or thought has invented time as a means of either achieving security, or, it is lazy to completely transform itself.

F: Immediately.

K: Immediately. So it says, "Give me time". Give me time to be strong psychologically.

F: Strong in mind.

K: Strong, psychologically strong. Psychologically give me time so that I get rid of my anger, my jealousy or whatever it is, and I'll be free of it. So he's using time as a means of achieving something psychologically.

M: But then one must ask you about the use of the word 'psychological' in this instance because if a thought process is involved and we just said time is implicit in thought, how can you be without thought psychologically?

K: We are coming to that.

M: Or is the psychological realm in this discussion outside of thought, part of thought, or could be either one?

K: Isn't the whole psyche put together by thought?

SS: There seems to be a question here, whether it is or not.

K: I'm asking sir, go slow. Isn't the whole psyche the 'me'?

SS: Is that the psyche?

K: Isn't it, part of that, the 'me' - what I think, what I want, what I don't want, what I wish, I wish, and so on, the whole movement, self-centred movement of the 'me' is put together by thought.

M: If that is so, then how would it be possible for there not to be time involved in any psychological movement?

K: We're going to go into that. I want first to be clear that our questions are understood.

N: Would you make a distinction, sir, between hope and aspiration, because many people say to aspire is something noble, but hoping is...

K: Aspiring is time.

N: Yes, there is time, but...

K: Hoping is also, yes.

N: But in aspiration there seems to be the idea of something very right.

K: I aspire to become god - it's so silly.

N: In the whole religious world there is aspiration. Would you say that?

R: Of course religious traditions, there is aspiration, always. What we discuss is, I think the point is whether you can see truth without thinking or time, whether seeing truth is now, this moment, or whether you postpone it till you become better.

K: Ah no.

R: That is the question.

K: That is, the moment you introduce the word better...

R: That is what I say.

K: Of course.

R: That is what I say, that is, the other question arises. Now the question is, it is true, you see it now.

K: No, we have't come to truth yet. I am very careful, sir, I don't want to enter the world of truth yet. One wants to be clear that one's thinking, either is logical, sane, rational, or it comes to a conclusion which is illusory. And so one wants to examine this whole nature of time, psychologically. That's all I'm talking about. If there is no tomorrow psychologically our whole action is

different. But psychologically we say, tomorrow is important, tomorrow I will do this, tomorrow I hope to change, psychologically. I'm questioning that, because all our aspirations, hope, everything is based on the future, which is time.

F: Yes.

N: You would say then, any aspiration, however noble it is, is in the field of reality.

K: In the field of thought, yes.

F: Yes, because it is a formulation.

K: Formulation, by thought.

F: Exactly. So would I be right in saying you are concerned with being free of the time factor totally, in psychological terms.

K: Yes, sir. Otherwise I am caught, our mind is living always in a circle.

F: Yes, that is true. We are tied to the past, to that which has become fossilised.

K: Yes, so the past modifying the present and going off. This past modifying itself into the future is time. So when one says, "I will be better", "I will understand" or "I will try", all these are involved in time. So I question that, whether it's merely an invention of thought for its own - whatever reason we can go into, and so it is illusory, and so there is no tomorrow.

F: In psychological terms.

K: Of course, we said that very clearly. So if one is envious, which is a sensory response, and therefore thought has created this envy. Now we say, generally we say, give me time to be free of that envy.

F: Yes, provided we perceive that this is envy.

K: Oh, yes, I'm envious, you've a bigger house, better dressed, you've more money, all the rest of it, everybody perceived this envy, this jealousy, this antagonism. So is it possible, being envious, to be free of it instantly, and not allow time to intervene? That is the whole point.

F: Isn't the envy, the psychical reaction to what is perceived through the senses?

K: Yes, that's right.

F: And are not the sense functionings...

K: ...actual.

F: Yes, they are. Determined by actual physical conditions?

K: Yes, obviously.

F: So psychical reaction follows the sensuous activity. And that involves the pleasure/pain drive within us.

K: Obviously. One sees you driving in a big lovely car. And I'm driving a small car, so there is comparison.

F: Yes. The comparison arises surely, partially through what others have put before us, that this is better than that.

K: Than that.

F: This is more pleasant or this is less pleasant.

K: That begins from childhood.

F: So we get into the psychological habit.

K: That begins in childhood.

F: Yes.

K: You are not as good as your brother, in examinations and the whole education system is based on this comparative evaluation of one's capacities. Now we're going, you see, we're moving away from...

R: Yes.

S: Yes, sir, didn't we just come to the fact that anything that is involved in measurement and thought cannot get rid of measurement and thought.

K: First it must realize the actuality of it. Not say "Yes, I've understood it"

S: Does it realize that with thought?

K: No.

S: So then what is the...

K: Wait, we're coming to that, slowly, wait. Do we see that we've used time psychologically and so that psychological usage of time is an illusion. First I want to see, we must be clear on that point - I will reach heaven. I will become enlightened. I will eventually through various series of lives, or one life, achieve Nirvana, Moksha, all this. All that is psychological time. We are questioning whether that thing is an illusion. If it is an illusion it is part of thought.

S: Right. Now we can't, we don't use thought in order to see all this.

K: No. Wait. Do we understand even verbally...

S: Even with thought?

K: With thought. Communication now is, between us, through words. Those words have been accumulated and so on, and we both of us speak, apparently for the moment we speak both of us in English, we understand the meaning. Now do we see - see not through argument, through explanation, through rationalization, that thought has created this psychological time as a means of achieving something.

M: So we can see that still within the thought process, still within the realm of thought.

K: Now wait.

M: Is that the seeing you're talking about?

K: No, I'm coming to that. I'm coming to that slowly, I want to lead up to it, otherwise it won't be clear. Am I all right, we are following each other, sir, or not?

R: I am following.

K: Is this accurate, sir?

R: That I can't say still. Still I can't tell you. Because I don't know where we are going.

K: I don't know where I'm going either, but this is a fact.

R: Yes, yes. That's right. That is, I am watching.

N: I think there's also some difficulty in apprehending what you're saying, because there is maturity and growth in nature, through time.

K: We've been through that, Narayan. Don't go back to it.

N: I'm not going back to it, but unconsciously you're identified with it. Is there maturity and growth in human beings, through time? There is some kind of maturity through time.

K: We said that.

N: Yes, so one gets stuck to it.

K: One holds on, is attached to this idea of time as self-improvement, not only physically but psychologically.

N: I don't even say 'self-improvement', maturity.

K: No.

N: A kind of natural growth, natural, comparing yourself with nature, as you see all over.

K: Yes, but therefore, wait, what do you mean by maturity? We may have different meanings to that word, to mature. A tree is mature at a certain age, a human being physically is mature at a certain age. And mature cheese!

N: Yes, the whole, the fruit from the bud.

K: Yes, the fruit is matured to be picked. And so on. But is there psychological maturity at all? That's my whole point.

P: Perhaps there is a factor of life, intellectual maturity which is mental level and...

K: Yes, sir, I agreed You're going...

M: Within the illusory world, psychologically there is a certain maturity, but it's still founded on thought and time.

K: Yes, but I'm just asking, Maria, do we understand clearly, even verbally, and so intellectually, that we have used time as a psychological catalyst to bring about change? Right?

R: That is...

K: And I'm questioning that catalyst.

F: May I enquire, sir: what precisely do you mean when you say, "Do we see that psychological time is an illusion", what do you mean by the word 'see'?

K: See, I mean by that word 'see', observe without the interference of thought.

F: That means, to be completely conscious, to be completely aware of time being an illusion as a fact.

K: Yes, to see this is like I see a snake, and I don't mistake it for a rope.

F: No. So you would agree that that involves - would you agree, that that involves a complete transformation of your mode of



awareness, your consciousness? When you're really conscious of something, you don't have to...

K: Now wait a minute. Again, sir, the word 'consciousness' and 'conscious'...

F: Those are difficult words.

K: Those are difficult words. I see this, can I see this and not call it a microphone.

F: Yes.

K: Not call it, but see the shape, just to observe without any reflection.

F: Quite, without naming it.

K: Naming it all the rest of it.

F: Analysing.

K: Analysing it.

F: In other words, to see is a whole seeing...

K: Seeing.

F: ...almost in the sense of your being what you see.

K: No, no. That becomes then a duality, you become that. No.

F: You don't become that in the sense that you are merged into it. But you are awake in terms of a unitary whole.

K: Just a minute, sir. These again are rather difficult words.

R: I don't think that is what he means. No.

K: Sir, to observe implies - first let's look at it as it is generally understood - to observe a tree, I name it.

F: Yes.

K: I like it or don't like it. And so on, so on. But we mean by observation, seeing; is it to listen first and not make an abstraction of it into idea, and then the idea the sees. I wonder if you see?

R: Yes, yes.

K: Say for instance - I said a little earlier that psychologically there is no time, psychological time is the invention of thought, and may be an illusion. Now to listen to that without interpreting it, what do you mean, rationalizing it, or saying, "I don't understand", "I do understand", just to listen to that statement and not make an idea of it, but just to listen. As one listen that way in the same way observe, see. What do you say, sir?

R: I want to ask you what are you trying to tell us?

K: I'm trying to say, sir, that truth cannot possibly be perceived, seen, through time.

R: Right.

K: Wait a minute, you can't agree.

R: Not agree, I see it. That is why I was waiting to ask you what are you trying to say.

K: I'm trying to say that - I'm not trying, I'm saying.

R: Yes, of course. What you want to say.

K: Sorry. I'm saying that man through comparison with the outer world has created a psychological time as a means of achieving a desired rewarding end.

R: I agree.

K: No, do you see that as a fact - fact in the sense it's so.

S: Is the facility of the mind that sees that, the same facility that sees truth?

K: Look, Scott, first you listen, don't you, to that statement.

S: Yes.

K: How do you listen to that statement?

S: Well, at first I just listen.

K: You listen. Do you make an idea of it?

S: Often, later, yes.

K: No. It's a simultaneous process going on. You listen and you get an idea of it and the idea is not the actual observation. That's all I'm saying.

S: But if there is that...

K: No, this is, sir, from Greeks and the Hindus, all our whole structure is based on ideas. And we are saying, idea is not actual happening, which is the actual listening.

F: The idea is just a picture of the actual listening.

K: Yes. Which is an evasion, an avoidance of actual observation.

F: Of the immediate fact.

K: Yes, looking or listening.

SS: Then there may be something which we are evading constantly.

R: Yes.

SS: I would like to suggest that, as we've been talking about thought, and the various things which it has devised in order to create some kind of freedom or liberation or salvation or redemption, that there may be some driving factor which is part of thought, or there may be a driving factor which accounts for this, which may be sorrow.

K: Yes, sir, escape from pain through reward.

SS: It seems to apply to the most sophisticated and the more primitive civilizations, all of them.

K: Obviously. Because all our thinking is based on these two principles, reward and punishment. Our reward is enlightenment,

God, Nirvana or whatever you like to call it, away from anxiety, guilt, all the pain of existence, you know, all the misery of it all.

F: Is it not possible to be free from the idea of reward or punishment?

K: That's what I'm saying. As long as our minds are thinking in terms of reward and punishment, that is time.

F: How is it that our minds think that way?

K: Because we're educated that way.

F: Yes, true.

K: We are conditioned from childhood, from the time of the Greeks in the West, because there measurement was important, otherwise you couldn't have got all this technological knowledge.

F: And would you say that this is due to the fact that we are tied to the idea of a separate 'me', a separate 'I'. Supposing one sees, hears, touches, etc., all in terms of a wholeness, an awareness of wholeness.

K: You can't be aware of the wholeness, unless you have understood - not you, sir - unless one has understood the movement of thought.

F: Thought.

K: Because thought is in itself limited.

F: Yes, of course, which means the intrusion of the self-consciousness as a separate something.

K: Yes.

F: Otherwise it won't be there.

K: Sir, how did this self separative consciousness come into being?

F: Conditioning in the first instance.

K: It's so obvious.

F: I, you, me.

K: Of course, measurement.

F: Measurement, exactly. And that analogically inevitably gets transferred to the realm of the psyche, the realm of the mind...

K: Of course.

F: ...or whatever it is.

K: So we come to this point, you make a statement that psychological time has been used by man as a means of achieving his reward. It's so obvious. And that reward is away from the pain which he's had. So we are saying, this search for reward or the achievement of the reward, is a movement of time. And is there such a thing at all? We have invented it, it may be illusion. And from this illusion I can't go to reality - I mean to truth. So the mind must be totally, completely free of this movement of measurement. Is that possible?

F: As a short answer, I would simply say yes.

K: Yes. Either you say yes as a logical conclusion, or a speculative assertion, or a desire, concept, or it is so.

F: Yes, an 'of-courseness', is there. If there is a sense of 'of-courseness' of course it is so, then there is...

K: Then I assume it is so, but I go on the rest of my life moving in the other direction.

F: If one really sees...

K: Ah, that's what we are saying.

F: ...then one doesn't go in the other direction.

K: So that's what we're saying, do we see it, or is it, we think we see it.

F: Quite.

M: Can we go back for a moment? You said you observe, you hear the statement, you observe it. Actually what does the mind do in that observation?

K: Please, if I can put it this way: please don't accept what one is saying but let's find out. Observation in the sense implies a seeing without naming, without measuring, without a motive, without an end. Obviously that is actually seeing. The word 'idea' from the Greek, the word itself means to observe.

M: But, sir, we would probably all agree with that. And what is acting at that moment? It is a kind of logic, I think, in most people.

K: No.

M: It seems very evident what you've said.

K: Observation implies silence and not forming any conclusion, just to observe silently, without any psychological or sensory response except either visual or inward, insight without the responses of memory.

R: Without any value judgement.

K: Yes.

F: Would you say, sir, that implies without any reaction from the brain or the senses or...

K: Yes, sir, that. Wait, that's dangerous thing to bring in the brain. Because then we have to go into the whole question of, you know, I don't want to go into the question of 'brain' for the moment. It implies that, that means, thought is absolutely quiet in observation.

F: Scientists, for example, who have really new remarkable inspirations, or again great artists when they create wonderful

things, this happens when everything is quiet inside, which allows this new to emerge, the new, the truly new, the pulse of creation.

K: Yes, sir, but that insight is partial. The scientist's insight or perception is partial.

F: Partial, yes. That is to say, the formulation of that insight.

K: Ah, his insight is not only formulation but the very fact of his insight, because insight implies a whole transformation of his daily life, it isn't just, I'm a scientist and I have an insight into mathematics, into matter, into the atom. Insight implies the way the man lives as a whole.

R: That is perfectly so.

F: And any insight is a particular manifestation rooted in the background of the whole.

K: Ah, no, we go off into something. I won't accept, sorry, not I wouldn't accept, it's rather, confusing, that. Sir, let us talk a little bit about insight, or seeing. Insight implies an observation in which there is no remembrance of things past, therefore the mind is alert, free from all the elements and so on, just to observe. Only then you have an insight. But that insight of which we are talking about, implies, his whole life, not as a scientist, as an artist. They have partial insight.

R: That is only a small fragment.

K: Fragment of insight, but that's not what we're talking. So it comes to this.

R: And what we talk of is whole existence.

K: Of course, man's existence.

R: Existence, yes.

F: So in that state of observation which you're talking of, there

is no reaction whatsoever.

K: Of course, obviously. It isn't cause/effect reaction.

F: Quite. It's free of causality.

K: Of course, obviously, otherwise we are back in the old cause being a motive and so on.

R: And that seeing is beyond time. It is beyond time, that seeing is not limited or caught in time.

R: It is not limited, or thought in time.

K: And that insight is not involved in time.

R: That's right. And naturally it is neither cause or effect.

K: Yes. But, wait a minute. Have you, not you, sir, have we got this insight into - wait, just a minute, let me finish - into this psychological invention of time by thought, as achieving some result? Have got insight, do you see it, or it is just at a verbal, ideological level?

R: Or whether it is a fact.

K: No.

R: That psychological time necessary for seeing.

K: No, Sir. We went into this question. Man has invented time, psychologically, to achieve a desired end, purpose, reward. Does one see this as an idea, or it is so? It's so obvious it is so. Then how is man - this is the point - how is man, a human being, to totally move away from that, totally transform this whole concept of idea, of time? I say it's only possible when you have an insight into this whole thing, which doesn't involve effort, which doesn't involve concentration, all that. This is real meditation.

F: In fact, it just happens.

K: It's real meditation.



R: Indeed.

S: Sir, there is a dilemma which I think many people find themselves in when they listen to that, which is that in order to have this insight...

K: Ah, you can't have it.

S: Well, in order for this insight to occur, there must be an insight into thought. And it seems like it's...

K: No.

S: ...somewhat of a closed circle.

K: No. We went into this, sir. Thought, as we said, is response of memory, memory is knowledge, experience, and so from the past, thought is moving.

S: Yes.

K: But always from the past, it is not free from the past ever.

S: And we said that there must be a seeing, an observing...

K: Seeing.

S: ...without...

K: Seeing that.

S: Right. Now we can't see that with thought, we must see...

K: Wait, no, don't say that. I said just now - I've forgotten, sorry.

S: We were saying that there must be a seeing, an observing, which is an insight...

K: ...into thought.

S: ...into thought.

K: Wait, just hold it. Now, thought is the response of memory. Memory, stored up in the brain, through experience, and that has become knowledge.

S: Yes.

K: So knowledge is always the past. And from that thought arises. This is irrefutable, I mean, this is so.

S: Yes.

K: Now is this an idea or an actuality which you yourself have perceived: that you yourself see that ascent of man through knowledge is not so? Man can only ascend perhaps technologically, but psychologically, if he continues with the accumulation of knowledge, he's caught in the trap. Do you see that? Or do you make it into an idea and say, "What do you mean by it?", and so on.

S: But, sir, just to see that, I must be free.

K: No, observe, you first listened.

S: Yes.

K: Listening without analysis, without interpretation, without like or dislike, just listen. And if you so listen you have absorbed it, absorbed the fact that thought is the response of memory. Then you can proceed. Then can thought ever free itself from its mother, from its roots, from its source? Obviously not.

SS: But thought can be aware of its own activity.

K: Of course, we went through all that.

M: Sir, would you say that if insight comes into being at that moment, that then that insight doesn't fall back into the thought mechanism.

K: Oh no, of course not. Say, for instance, you have an insight and you act. Now let's be clear. Insight means action, instantly, not have an insight and later act. That very insight implies action. And you act. And that action is always right, right being accurate,

precise, without any regret, without any effort, without any reward or punishment, it is so.

SS: That action is not necessarily doing anything, though. It may be non-action in terms of doing things externally.

K: You may have to, both externally and inwardly. If I have an insight into attachment, attachment to ideas, attachment to conclusions, attachment to persons, attachment to my - you follow? - knowledge, experience. If I have an insight into that, the whole thing is abandoned.

R: And may I put it, sir, in another way - I don't know whether you agree - to see this illusion, to see this illusion.

K: Yes. But one must be sure that it is an illusion.

R: Whether you call it illusion or whatever name you give to it, to see...

K: 'What is'.

R: 'What is'.

K: That's all.

R: Yes, see 'what is'. Don't give a term.

K: No, to see 'what is'.

R: To see 'what is' is to see the truth.

K: No, no, you see. you're bringing in truth - I'm not yet ready for that.

R: I want to get it, before one o'clock! I don't want to postpone it, but your main thesis is, don't put in time.

K: Yes, I've said, just now, at one o'clock.

R: No, no, not at one, yes. To see 'what is' as it is, is to see the truth. That's what I would like to put, to cut it short.

K: Sir.

R: And truth is not away from...

K: I don't know what it is.

R: That is what I tell you, to see.

K: I don't know what it means to see. You have told me what it means to see, but I may not see. I may think I see.

R: Yes, then you are not seeing.

K: I must be very clear that I am not thinking I'm seeing.

R: No.

K: Sir, my whole life is that - I think I see.

R: It is different from seeing.

K: You say so, but ordinary persons say, I see, yes. Which is, I think I see what you're saying. But I may not see actually 'what is'. I think I see 'what is'.

S: Krishnaji, could I, this might be a simple question but, you say that the ordinary person says, "I see, I see what you're saying," but in fact he doesn't.

K: Yes.

S: It's just mentally that he see something, or intellectually. Could we say, what is going to bring about for the ordinary person this correct seeing, this seeing without thought?

K: I explained, sir, I explained it. First I must listen.

S: Yes.

K: Ah, do we listen or we've all kinds of conclusions, so filled, full of our minds, that it isn't capable of listening. You see me, you say, "He's an Indian, what the heck get rid of him, he knows nothing". Or you say, "Well, he's considered a person," this or that. You don't actually listen.

S: Well, then the question is, I would just change the

terminology, what could bring about that correct listening?

K: It has been said through suffering. It is nonsense. It has been said, make effort. Which is nonsense. You listen when somebody says, "I love you." Don't you? So can you, the same thing, listen to what you think is unpleasant.

So, sir, now come back to this question of truth. Do we have a discussion this afternoon?

M: I believe it was said 3.30, we'd meet.

K: 3.30. All right. Can we then pursue truth?

R: Yes. No. I don't want to wait for truth. (laughter)

K: You want it all in five minutes, sir?

R: Not even five minutes.

K: One minute?

R: One minute. If you can't do it in one minute, you can't do it in five hours.

K: I quite agree. All right, sir, in one second. Truth is not perceivable through time. Truth doesn't exist when the self is there. Truth doesn't come into existence if thought in any direction is moving. Truth, thought, is something that cannot be measured - measured.

R: Truth.

K: I said truth. And without love, without compassion, with its own intelligence, truth cannot be.

R: Yes, now again you have given it in negative terms, in the real, tradition of the Buddha. Yes.

K: You see, you know what you have done, sir, look. You have translated into terms of tradition, therefore - forgive me for pointing out, I'm not being impudent - you've moved away from

the actual listening of this.

R: I listened, I listened very well.

K: Then you've captured the perfume of it.

R: Yes, and I captured the perfume of what you said. And that is why I wanted to have it in one minute.

K: So, sir. What then is the relationship of truth to reality? Be careful. I mean, are these two everlastingly divided?

R: No.

K: No, no.

R: No, I don't hesitate, I am not hesitating like that. They are not divided.

K: How do you know?

R: I know it.

K: No, sir. They are not divided. Now what do you mean by that, sir?

R: That is what I said, to see.

K: No, just a minute, sir. Truth and reality, they are not divided. That means, thought and truth, are always together. No? If they are not divided, if something is not divorced, separated, they are together, a unitary movement. Thought...

R: Not thought.

K: Wait, reality, that's why I went into it, sir. Reality is everything that thought has put together. We are all agreed that is so. We may use the word, terminology, the word 'reality' as something else, I don't care, but for the present we are saying, reality is all the things that thought has put together including illusion and truth, is nothing whatsoever to do with this, it can't. And therefore the two cannot be together.

R: To see, that illusion, or whatever it may be, to see 'what is', is to see the truth. 'What is' is the truth. 'What is' is the truth. There is no truth apart from that. 'What is' is the truth.

K: No, sir.

R: That is, 'what is' is the truth.

K: Sir...

R: What is not is untrue.

K: No, we said reality is the movement of thought. Right, sir? And truth is timeless. Truth is timeless, it's not your truth, my truth, his truth - it is something beyond time. Thought is of time, the two cannot run together, that's what I'm...

R: What I said is, there are no two.

K: Sir.

R: That is again duality, again you are dividing.

K: No, I'm not. I'm pointing out, sir - I may be mistaken but I'm just pointing out, that thought has created such illusion, and so many deceptions it has brought about, and it may deceive itself by saying, "Yes, I've seen the truth." Therefore I must be very clear, there must be clarity that there is no deception whatsoever. And I'm saying that deception exists, will inevitably exist if I don't understand the nature of reality.

We can continue this, sir, after lunch.

R: I would like to take this afternoon another question. Because there will be no end to this question.

K: Yes, sir, what is the question?

R: The other question we wanted to talk about, whether there is pre-existence, continuity, what people call generally rebirth.

K: Rebirth?

R: Yes.

K: Yes. Shall we do that after lunch, sir? Right.

R: I think here we have come to truth. I don't know whether you...

K: I haven't come to truth, I can't go to truth.

R: No, you see the truth.

K: I don't see the truth. There's a tremendous difference: I can't go to truth, I can't see truth. Truth can only exist, can be, or is only when the self is not.

R: That's right.

K: Let's go and eat, shall we. We'll meet here after lunch, at 3.30.



**BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND CONVERSATION  
WITH BUDDHIST SCHOLARS 28TH JUNE 1979  
'DEATH'**

K: Sir, your question was, if there is life after death.

R: May I say a few words about it?

K: Of course, sir.

R: You see, I want to put this question to you because all religions, as far as I know, agree and accept a life after death. Of course Buddhism and Hinduism, they accept not one life but many lives before this birth and after this death. That is Hindu and Buddhist teaching. But as far as I know, Christianity at least accepts one life after death, either in hell or heaven.

K: Yes, sir, Muslims too.

R: Muslims too. I don't know about others very much, but these religions, they accept life after death, I don't know, I think Zoroastrianism accepts it. And of course, except Buddhism, in all those religions there is soul, self, Atman, with this unchanging, everlasting, permanent substance in man which transmigrates or is reincarnated. Buddhism does not accept a self, Atman or soul or ego which is permanent, eternal, everlasting, unchanging. But Buddhism accepts man is composed of five aggregates, physical; and if you put it in brief, as the Buddhist term say, name and form.

K: Name and form.

R: That you use very often. Name and form. That is name means the mental qualities and form is the physical body. But these are all energies according to Buddhism, forces. And according to Buddhism, what you call death is non-functioning of the body.

K: Yes.

R: But that non-functioning of the body does not mean the non-functioning of all other qualities and forces, like desire, will to become, to become more and more and all that. So as long as man is imperfect, that means, if he had not seen the truth. Once one sees the truth, he is perfect and there is no desire for becoming, because there is nothing to become. And when man is imperfect he has always desire, will, as you suggested this morning, time to become more, to become more perfect and things like that.

So rebirth is there for him, because he is not perfect. But whatever it may be according to Buddhism, it is not one unchanging substance that goes on, but it is the cause and effect, just as today Buddha says, every moment we are dead and reborn. And so in Buddhism it is wrong to say reincarnation, because there is nothing to incarnate.

Then transmigration also is not a good term. And we use now rebirth, which is not quite correct. In the Buddhist term it is punarjanman, the Pali, that means, a becoming again, re-becoming, it is called re-becoming, that is, continuity of re-becoming, unbroken continuity, that is the Buddhist attitude. The question is asked, in Buddhism, very often, in the many texts, is it the same person or another one? Answer is, Buddhist traditional and classical answer is, neither he nor another. That is the answer, 'neither he nor another', that is the continuity process, a child is grown up to be a man of fifty, is he the same child or another. It is neither the same child nor another one. In the same way, it is neither he nor another. That is the Buddhist attitude to rebirth.

And now I would like to know what is your attitude and what is

your interpretation?

K: Sir, could we take a journey together a little bit?

R: Yes. You mean, you want me to answer or...

K: No, journey together, investigating this thing.

R: Yes.

K: Would you say that all humanity, whether the human being lives in America, Russia, India or Europe, is caught in sorrow, conflict, strife, guilt, great sense of misery, loneliness, unhappiness, confusion; that is the common lot of all men, throughout the world? That is, the consciousness of man - not super-consciousness or some other kind of consciousness, the ordinary consciousness of man is the content of all this. Would you agree, sir?

R: Yes.

K: That man, human being, I won't say man, because there are a lot of girls here too, but human beings, right throughout the world, have the same psychological phenomenon. Outwardly they might differ, tall, short, dark and so on, but psychologically they are greatly similar. So one can say, you are the world. Would you?

F: Entirely.

K: Would you agree to that, sir? You are the world and the world is you. Right, sir? Let's talk about it.

R: Yes. In a sense.

K: Not in a sense, I want to come to it. It is not partially, it is so. You are born in Ceylon, he was born in India, another born in America or in Europe, or including this island, England. Outwardly one's culture, one's tradition, one's climate, food, all that may vary. But inwardly we have the same sense of guilt; guilt, not about

something but the feeling of guilt, feeling of anxiety. Right?

R: Yes, rather not guilt, anxiety, I would agree. I would agree anxiety, not guilt, feeling of guilt in a certain form of society.

K: I mean, it's guilt, unless you are insensitive, brutal, one feels guilty. But that's a minor point.

R: Yes.

SS: Perhaps more like guilt in the western tradition.

R: Yes.

SS: And something more like shame in the East, perhaps.

K: In the East they translate it differently.

SS: But the feeling is the same.

K: Karma or their lot and so on. All right, I won't take guilt. Anxiety.

R: Yes, anxiety.

K: Loneliness, despair, various forms of depression, sorrow and fear, these are the common lot of man. That's obvious, I mean. So the the consciousness of human beings is its content. Right? The content is all this. So human beings throughout the world are more or less similar, apart from their physical name and form. Would you agree?

R: Yes.

K: So one can say, not as a verbal statement but as a fact, that we human beings are alike. And so deeply you are me.

R: In similarity.

K: That's what I'm saying. And I am you.

R: Yes, similar.

K: Because each person goes through various forms of hell, tragedies, misfortunes. And so the world, the humanity is one.

Right? Would you agree?

F: Humanity is one.

K: If you see that, accept it, then what is death? Who is it that dies? The name, the form, and also the anxiety, the pain, the sorrow, the misery - does that also die? You're following my point, sir? Can we discuss this a little? That is, to me the world is actually the 'me', it's not just words. I am the world, in the sense I may have different physical contours, physical facial differences and so on, height and colour and so on, but we're not concerned with that. Psychologically we go through extraordinary miseries, tragedies and uglinesses, hurts. So that is the common consciousness of man. Right, sir? That is the stream in which man lives, psychologically. Right?

Then what is it to die? If you really accept that or see it as being real, not imagined or idealistic, but it's a fact. If you accept that fact, then what is death, what is it that dies? The body? The form, the name? The form and the name may be different from you, you are a man, woman and all the rest of it. So that is the common stream in which mankind lives, with occasional spurts of happiness, rare moments of great joy, rare moments of sense of great beauty. But that's part of our common life, this vast stream is going on all the time. Right? It's a great river. Right? Let's discuss, you may disagree completely.

M: Sir, are you saying that in that stream the whole notion which most people share of some individual consciousness is a complete illusion?

K: I think so.

M: Why does mankind have that inevitably.

K: Because it's part of our education, part of our culture, both religiously and worldly, that there is you, you are an individual, you, you know, the whole idea of it. And also the word 'individual' is really misapplied, because individual obviously means one who is indivisible. But we're all broken up. So we can hardly call ourselves individuals.

F: We are fragmented.

K: We are fragmented, fragmented, broken up. So if we see that man's consciousness is the consciousness of the world, the world...

F: ...of all humanity.

K: ...of all humanity, in that vast river which has no beginning, which is still going on, and you and another are part of that stream. I and another die. What happens to all my desires, what happens to all my anxieties, fears, longings, aspirations, the enormous burden of sorrow which I have carried for years - what happens to all that?

F: When the body dies?

K: When the body dies.

F: It comes with the world stream.

K: It is part of that stream.

F: Exactly.

M: It never was yours at all.

K: It's not mine, it's part of that stream, which has manifested itself as K., with his form. Sir, don't, this is very drastic what I'm saying compared to all the religions.

R: Now I am with the question. Now in that stream there is K.

K: Wait! There is no K. That's the whole point. There is only that stream - that stream is made up of desire, anxieties, despair, loneliness, all the travail of mankind. That is the river.

F: As well as their opposites. As well as the opposites of pain and so on.

K: It's part of that river.

F: Part of that river.

K: My pleasure, which lasts for a few days, and then I pursue it, and then I cry if I can't get it, and I'm flattered if I'm rewarded, so it's part of that vast river.

F: Would you say, sir, that that which we call the individual is a misnomer.

K: Not only misnomer...

F: Because of our ignorance.

K: It's not only misnomer, I don't think it exists: because you have a separate name and a bank account, but your consciousness is like somebody else, everybody else.

F: But sir, if we say that it doesn't exist at all, then we would have to say that humanity also doesn't exist.

K: No, I'm going to go into it. So if we see that, if we not only see it logically, reasonably, factually, it is so - you're born in India and I was born in Europe, or in America. We go through the same hell, through the same rat race.

M: So, may one, just to be sure so far, that it's clear - there is nothing apart from that in the human...

K: Wait, I'm coming to that. In that stream, man has invented gods, rituals, the saviours, the Virgin Mary, Krishnas, all that - they are all part of that stream. They've invented these.

M: But apart from the invention, the illusions, is there any other something?

K: Yes, is there anything spiritual.

M: Apart, other than that.

K: Yes. I understand. Is there anything that is not of time.

M: Of the stream.

K: Is there in the stream - you're asking, aren't you? - anything which is not man-made, let's call it for the moment. Is that what you're asking?

M: I'm not sure. If what you mean is, is there something that is not of the stream in the human mind, consciousness, whatever you want to call it.

K: Man has invented that there is something.

M: No, non-invention. Something real.

K: Not in that stream. Not in that river.

M: I'm not asking if there's a something else in the river, I'm asking if there's something else in man except the river.

K: Nothing.

M: Because...

K: No Atman, no soul, no God - nothing. Don't accept it, please.

M: There is enormous implication in that.

K: There is tremendous implication.

M: Because if that were so there would be no end to the stream.

K: That's what... but, no. The man who steps out - I don't want to go further, I want to go slowly, step by step.

If that is so, that we all, all human beings, their common consciousness is this, made up of this vast river. Right, sir? You may not accept this.

R: No, I'm not accepting or rejecting, I am thinking about it, meditating. What Mary said was a very important point.

K: Yes.



R: Then...

K: We'll answer that presently.

R: Yes. Is there no escape from...

K: I'm going to answer it presently - not escape.

R: Or whatever it may be.

K: But we are considering death. So that stream is common to all of us, our consciousness is of that stream.

SS: Are you saying, sir, that thought is common to all of us, because all this is a creation and manifestation of thought.

K: Yes, thought, not only creation of thought but creation of thought which has created illusions.

SS: And the operation of those illusions.

K: And the operation of those illusions - Christian, Buddhist, Muslim, Hindu; British, French, Russian; various ideologies, all that is part of this stream.

F: May I ask, sir, is it a case of thought as it is here with us now, and functions as it does, which has created the illusions, or is it that mind as a universal constituent, as a universal factor, in the process of thinking through what we commonly call the particular person releases these ideas.

K: Let's go a little bit slowly. I want this to be clear, that we are part of that stream.

F: Yes, that is so.

K: And when the body dies, the desires, the anxieties, the tragedies and the misery goes on.

F: Part of the...

K: I die.

F: Yes.

K: And that stream, that river is going on.

F: Yes.

K: Right, sir, or do you reject this? I don't see how you can reject it.

R: No rejection, no acceptance.

K: No, just wait - right?

R: Only waiting for the conclusion.

K: Quite right. So that river manifests itself as K.

R: Not the whole river.

K: The river, which is desire, river is that.

F: One of its manifestations is K.

K: The river manifests, not one of the manifestations.

F: Well then how does...

K: No, sorry. I'll make it a bit clear. The river manifests itself as K. That's agreed.

R: Then river also manifests as R.

K: Also? No. River manifests itself as K. K has certain capacities by tradition, by education and so on to paint, to build a marvellous cathedral. But we're talking psychologically. Look, sir, let's go back to it. The river is that, we agree.

R: I don't know.

K: What do you mean, sir, you don't know?

R: I fully agree that whole humanity without exception...

K: ...is one.

R: All these, what you describe as suffering and all that, is common.

K: Yes.

R: To all humanity.

K: That is...

R: In that sense, all are equal, not all one.

K: No equality or anything. We are of that stream.

R: Yes, that's all right.

K: I am the representative of all mankind. Me. Because I'm of that stream.

R: Well, that I don't know.

N: It's a qualitative thing, qualitatively.

K: What do you mean qualitative?

N: When you say, "I am of that stream", all the qualities of the stream are in me.

K: Yes.

N: That's a qualitative thing.

K: Yes, that's right. All the qualities of that stream.

N: Not that I'm the whole river.

R: Yes.

N: But the drop contains all the qualities of the river.

K: But the river is that.

N: Yes.

K: The river is that.

M: Would it be helpful to use the example of a wave: a wave is no different from the rest of the ocean.

K: Yes.

M: But it manifests as a wave which disappears.

K: If you like to put it that way. But this must be clear. Each one of us is the representative of all mankind, because the representative is of that stream and mankind is of that stream, therefore each one of us is the representative of the whole of that

stream.

R: That is better. That's better.

K: Yes, he allows a it. I mean, yes, let's go. That stream manifests itself as K. Or as X, forget K, X. Manifests itself as X. With a form, name, but that stream also has this quality which is, in that stream there is art, there is everything is in there.

R: Not only X, there is Y.

K: Dozens, X, Y, Z.

R: Yes, that's right, that's what I want to make clear.

K: Oh yes, A B C.

R: Yes, begin with the alphabet, that's right.

K: So as long as mankind is in that stream, and one manifestation of that stream leaves the stream, for him he's completely free of that stream.

R: So you are not whole humanity, because if you leave the river, then you leave; whole humanity, then all humanity is away.

K: Just a minute, sir, just a minute. That stream has manifested in X and in that manifestation, if X doesn't free himself completely from this stream, he's back in it.

M: But, sir, this is the moment that the earlier question referred to.

K: I'm coming to that.

M: What is there? You said there was nothing separate from the stream.

K: Wait, wait. I haven't explained it. There is nothing. There is that stream. Right? It manifests itself as A. In that manifestation, with all the education and environmental influences and so on, if that A doesn't step out of that stream, there is no salvation for

mankind.

M: Sir, what is there to step out?

K: Leap, finish with your anxieties, sorrow, all the rest of it.

M: But you said there was nothing except the content of the stream.

K: As long as I remain in the stream.

M: What is the 'I'?

K: I is the thing that has manifested itself as A, and A now calls himself individual, which is not factual, which is illusory. But when A dies, he's part of that stream. That's clear.

M: Yes, but if A is composed of the water of the stream...

K: Yes.

M: ...how can the water of the stream step out of the stream?

K: Oh, yes.

P: So there is some logical error in our...

K: In my explanation.

P: Yes. Once you say this, that you are the representative of mankind, humanity, which is the...

K: Is that so or not.

P: Yes.

K: Don't say yes, sir. Aren't you the representative of whole of mankind, psychologically?

R: Yes, indeed, I think that too general and too vague a statement.

K: No, it's not vague. I have made it very clear. That stream is this content of our consciousness, which is agony, pain, desire, strife, all that.

R: That is common to all. In that sense, all humanity are equal

or...

K: No, I don't want...

R: All humanity is one in other words.

K: I don't want...

R: But I can't accept your attitude, your position, that I am humanity. No.

K: Of course, if I accept that stream, I'm part of that stream, therefore I am like the rest of humanity.

R: Like the rest.

K: I said that, therefore a representative of all of that stream.

R: That also I accept.

K: That's all I'm saying.

R: But you can't say "I am that stream, whole stream".

K: No, I am that stream.

M: But, sir, maybe we're being literal, but there's a concept in this somewhere of a sort of a container which contains the stream.

K: No, not container, not the ships that carry containers and all that. No, don't bring in containers.

M: What is it that can separate itself from the stream if it is only made up of the water of the stream?

K: Part of that stream is this egotistic concept. That's all.

M: No, but what can separate? How can water divide itself from the ocean.

K: You're missing my whole point.

R: Her point is this. Which is it that steps out of the river. That is the question.

K: Wait. If that is the question, I'll answer it presently, I'll answer it. I'm quite good at this. I'm only joking.

R: Yes. We understand. Yes, as a joke. I hope it will not be a joke.

K: No, sir. It's much too serious. You see, all this implies, when you ask that question, what is it that steps out, you're positing an otherness, something which is not of the stream. Right?

R: Or rather you are positing this.

K: I'm not. I haven't posited anything at all, I've only stated what is actually happening. I won't posit anything, I've said, as long as man does not step out of that stream, there is no salvation to mankind. That's all.

F: Sir, may I add a word here. I think the question which the lady asked implies an identifiable permanent entity.

K: There is no permanent entity.

F: No, what I'm suggesting is...

M: A something, I'm not making it more definite than that.

K: I know what you're trying to say.

M: There has to be X or I don't know what to call it.

N: Some aspect of intelligence.

M: Something.

N: Some aspect of intelligence.

K: That's what he's saying.

M: Something that can step out of the stream.

K: Yes, is there some aspect of intelligence in the stream?

N: Yes, which sees the...

K: Which sees the... yes, and therefore steps out.

N: Sees the futility of the stream.

K: Yes.

M: Then you're saying it is part of the stream that quality, it's in

with all the other human things, something is able...

K: Just a minute.

M: ...to separate itself from all the rest of the stream.

K: A is part of that stream. Let's go step by step if you don't mind, then we won't mislead each other. A is part of that stream. That stream has manifested itself as A. So A perceives he's suffering. Obviously. Right? No?

N: Yes.

K: His anxiety, he is living and he says, "Why am I suffering? What is this?" And so he begins to reason, begins to see. Why do you introduce some other factor?

M: Can you then say that some perception that it's still part of the stream...

K: No.

M: Or some molecule, or something.

K: No. No. You are not listening, if you don't mind my pointing out.

R: May I add a word, sir?

K: Yes, sir.

R: According to Buddha's teaching, in that stream there is also wisdom which sees.

K: No. I don't know what...

R: Forget, no, I know, because in that stream, which is called, in other words, in Buddhist philosophy it is very well explained, as Mary puts the question, there is wisdom which sees the whole of thing. It is that.

N: Which sees what?

R: The whole thing. Whole view, whole thing. The reality,



which sees the reality, which sees as it is, as we discussed this morning. And then is that stepping out, that seeing is the stepping out.

M: Are you saying that there is an action of stepping out without an actor?

K: Yes. Go with me. I'll explain it. I'll explain it, but you don't have to accept it. I think it'll be logical, reasonable and fairly sane, unless one is completely besotted, it can be examined. A is of that stream, with a name and a form. And as he lives he realizes what he's going through. Right? In that realization he says, "I'm suffering." Then he begins to enquire into the whole nature of suffering, and ends that suffering. I'm taking one aspect of this stream. Ends that suffering. And he is out of that stream. That entity is really unique, who is out of that stream.

S: So it's something there that wasn't there before then?

K: The moment A realizes that he's suffering, and doesn't escape from that suffering - enquires, explores without any motive and so on into the nature of suffering, and has an insight into the whole structure of suffering, that very insight ends that suffering.

R: That insight also in the stream.

K: You see, a moment - you're positing something I'm not.

R: From where you are bringing insight?

K: No, I brought in insight very carefully. A realizes he's suffering. Suffering is part of that stream.

R: A is also part of the stream.

K: Yes, that stream has manifested itself in A. A living, realizes he's suffering, he doesn't escape from it, because he wants to know the whole nature of it, the nature and the structure and what is

behind suffering. So he examines it, both logically, sanely and also non-verbally. Looks into it. And the very looking into it is the insight. It's not of the stream, the looking into the suffering.

R: That looking in, from where does it come?

K: He's concerned, I said that, he's studying, he's exploring, he's questioning the whole beastly thing, he wants to know.

R: That means it was not a part of the river.

K: No.

S: Krishnaji, because we've been saying that something steps out of the river.

K: Wait. I won't use that word, stepping out.

S: No, and it seems now that what we're saying is that something comes into being which never was part of that river.

K: Yes. I said no. You follow me and see if I'm wrong, then correct me. A is of that stream, A is suffering, A says, "Why?" He's not concerned what the teacher said, he said, "I know all that," he pushes all that aside. Why is there suffering? In the very enquiry of it - the enquiry depends on your capacity to put aside interpretation, not escape and all the rest of it - in the very enquiry into the nature of suffering and the cause of it, and the effect of it and so on, in that very enquiry is insight, comes insight. Insight isn't in the stream.

S: Correct.

R: I say it is in the stream.

K: Why, sir?

R: You see, it has in itself the capacity of producing and ceasing.

K: The stream itself has the capacity?

R: Of continuing and producing and ceasing it. Stopping it. That insight is also part of that stream. Just as all that misery...

K: No, sir, I wouldn't...

R: And where does that insight come from?

K: I'm telling you, sir.

R: You say A is part of the river?

K: Yes.

R: And then A...

K: A is suffering.

R: Suffering.

K: A begins to enquire, A begins to - wait - in his enquiry he realizes enquiry can only exist when there's complete freedom from all escapes, suppression and all the rest of it.

R: Yes.

K: So in that moment of enquiry there is insight, when he doesn't escape, when he doesn't suppress, when he doesn't rationalize or seek the cause of suffering, in that very moment of examining, is insight.

N: You're implying insight is born, it is not of the stream.

K: Don't introduce born, not of the stream.

N: Then...

K: You see, you are misleading, you want it part of that stream.

N: Where does it come from, insight, then?

K: I'm telling you.

N: From enquiry.

K: From the freedom to enquire.

N: Where does that freedom to enquire come from?

K: From his own examination.

R: But he is part of the river.

K: No. You're missing the point.

S: Krishnaji, are we saying this, that A is just a form and a name, normally is nothing more than a name and a form, plus all that there is in the river. With free enquiry...

K: A begins to enquire.

S: Right, A begins to enquire and then A, if he has this insight...

K: No. He has not the insight.

S: He is no longer just a part of that river.

K: Would you just follow, step by step. A is part of that stream, A is the manifestation of that stream, a wave of that stream, or whatever you like to call it. Now A is going through agony. A examines it. And the examination is very important, because if he escapes it is not examination, not exploration. If he suppresses, it's not. So he realizes - please follow this step by step - that as long as he's not free from the blockages that prevents exploration, and therefore he puts them aside, he's free to enquire. And in that freedom is insight.

P: There is a missing link here.

K: There may be ten, sir.

P: It appears that what Narayan was saying, that if the person is part of the stream, a representative of the stream, and when enquiry begins, examination starts, freedom comes...

K: Be careful, sir. No, you see, you are assuming so much.

P: No, but I'm repeating what you're saying.

K: Yes, all right, you're repeating what I said. Right.

P: And the beginning of this, the beginning of enquiry, the beginning of the capacity to explore without any of the things of

the stream, are they also in the stream?

K: No.

P: Where do they come from?

K: That's very simple. What are you all making a fuss about?

P: This beginning of the enquiry is...

K: No. Listen. You are not, forgive me, Doctor, you're not listening. I said, A is the manifestation of that stream. Let's follow it step by step, sir. Part of that stream is suffering. A is suffering, so A says, "Why, why should I suffer?"

P: At this point I will interrupt you.

K: At any point.

P: The number of human beings in the stream, the question as to "Why should I suffer?", this is the beginning of the whole thing.

K: No. Man has asked "Why should I suffer", they have a dozen explanations - the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Christian and so on. The man who is suffering says, "I see all this, the Buddhist, the Hindu, the Christian, the Muslim, I reject all that, because that doesn't leave me the freedom to enquire. I'm accepting tradition and authority, I won't."

F: Sir, perhaps could we put it this way. That the conditioned enquiry...

K: ...is part of the stream.

F: ...is part of the stream.

K: That's the whole point.

F: But the free enquiry...

K: ...is beginning of...

N: ...getting away from the stream.

K: No. Look. Now, leave the stream alone now. For God's sake.

A is a manifestation of the stream. A is suffering. A says, "Why am I suffering?" Studies Buddhism, studies Hinduism, studies Christianity, and says, "For God's sake, that world is out. I'm going to find out for myself." And he begins to enquire. And he realizes he can only explore if he's free to look. Right? Free from fear, free from reward and punishment, free from any kind of motive, otherwise he can't enquire. The moment he's in that state of examination, there is insight. This is very clear.

F: And of course very difficult to do.

K: No, I won't even accept the word difficult.

F: At first, because otherwise we wouldn't be enquiring.

K: No. Because we have not given our energy to this. We don't care, we have put up with so many things.

So leave A alone. But B is part of that stream, and he suffers, he says, "Yes, that's my nature, that's human nature, there is no way out, no Jesus, nobody is going to save me, I'll put up with it." So he is contributing to the stream.

SS: So the stream becomes more intense.

K: Yes, has more volume.

F: More drive also.

K: Of course, more volume is pressure of tremendous water. So we come to the point: what is death?

R: I want to go slowly. Now A is out of the river.

K: No, sir. A is not out of the river.

R: But he has seen, had insight.

K: He has insight.

R: Insight. So if all is one humanity, if A is the humanity then humanity has seen it.

K: No, sir, no sir.

M: So he left humanity.

F: You are looking at it, perhaps, purely logically.

K: No, not even logically.

F: What I mean is, logically but accepting the conditioned states.

K: The moment A is aware of his conditioned state and begins to enquire into it, he has got the energy to put aside.

F: Now the Buddha himself said, "Put aside with the right wisdom" - do you remember that phrase of the Buddha? "Put aside all shape and form, all sensation, all perceptions, all discriminative consciousness itself."

R: That's what I say.

F: Put it aside with right wisdom.

R: That is what I tell you. That is what I said, that he is making so complicated, whole.

F: No.

K: We're all making it complicated, it is very simple.

R: That is what I tell you, that is the statement, that is the idea, but I also...

K: May I interrupt here? Say one doesn't belong to any religion. One doesn't accept any authority. That is to enquire. If I accepted what Christ or X Y Z said, it's no enquiry. So A rejects in his enquiry into sorrow, everything that anybody had said. Will you do that? Because otherwise he's a secondhand human being, examining through secondhand eye-glasses.

R: Or you can hear somebody who has seen it and...

K: I hear what the Buddha has said.

R: Yes, you can hear it.

K: Anybody has said.

R: Said, you also can see independently as he has seen.

K: Yes, but, yes, Buddha said, sorrow is the beginning of, whatever he said.

R: Yes.

K: All right, but what 'he said' is not by me.

R: Absolutely, that is so.

K: No.

R: That is what I am telling you, but you also can see the same thing as he has seen.

K: Yes.

R: And still you know what he has said also.

K: What? Sir, the printed word or the hearsay, to a hungry man has no meaning.

R: That is so.

K: Reading the menu doesn't feed me.

R: That is what I'm telling you, it is not the menu but the food.

K: The food. The food is not cooked by anybody, I have to cook it, eat it.

R: That is not usually so.

K: Wait, I said the man who is examining the whole structure of sorrow.

R: I should say the other way, that you have to eat to get rid of hunger. Just because you have eaten, my hunger will not disappear.

K: No.

R: You have prepared the food, you have eaten and there is food. I also can eat it, and it is my food. Do you deny that?



K: No, of course not, sir. Rthis afternoon, you've eaten lunch, somebody cooked it, and they ate it, we ate it.

R: Yes.

K: But we're not talking at food level. We are saying that, as long as I accept any authority, it doesn't matter who it is, there is no insight.

R: It is not accepting authority. No.

K: Accepting descriptions, accepting conclusions, what Buddha said, what Krishna said, what A said. To me the freedom is from the known. Otherwise I'm everlastingly being in the stream. You see, that's why, sir, either we discuss this factually, and say, "Look, I will drop every authority I have." That means, knowledge, tradition - can you do that? Because that is enquiry, if you, if I am tethered to a tradition, I can't; I'll go round in circles, I must be free of the past and the rope that ties me to the post.

So B accepts suffering. Right, sir? B accepts what he is; conditioned, miserable and unhappy. You know what human being is. So he's all the time contributing to the stream. So there is no soul, no Atman, no ego, no permanent me, that evolves. Then what would the enquiry be, what is the state of the mind of the man, of the human who has had an insight into the whole nature of suffering, and therefore the whole stream? Right? What is the nature of that mind? What is the quality? Right, sir? Would that be speculative? It would.

SS: Sir, what is the position of the person who has some insight or a partial insight? He's still in there, isn't he?

K: Like the scientist, a partial insight. He may be excellent in science, but confused and miserable and unhappy, ambitious, you

know.

F: Don't you think that the very term 'partial insight' means a conditioned insight.

K: Of course.

F: And therefore it's part of that stream and it's true to type generally.

K: I wonder if we see this, sir, or it is an image which we are seeing. Because now we've created the image of the river.

F: Yes, that's the unfortunate thing.

K: Yes.

M: Sir, can one use the word insight in the same sense as intelligence, is there a difference?

K: You see. Now wait a minute. Let's go into that. The stream manifesting itself as B, and in his activities he becomes very cunning, clever. Has not intelligence no relationship with cunning, cleverness, chicanery, all that, but it is essentially part of love and compassion. What do you say, sir? The love in the stream is not love. You know, we are saying things which nobody will accept. If B is in the stream, and he tells his wife or girl friend or boy friend, 'I love you', is that love?

R: As long as there is me there is no love.

K: No, no don't reduce it to the 'me'. B is of that stream. B says to his girl friend or boy friend, "I love you" - now is that love?

R: In which sense?

K: Love.

R: Love has many hundred meanings.

K: So, that's what I'm enquiring. The love of a book, the love of your particular soup, the love of poetry, the love of a beautiful

thing, the love of an ideal, the love of your country, the love of jealousy, in which is included hate, envy, hurt. Is all that - I'm questioning, exploring - is all that love? And B who is the man who says, "Yes, that is love. At least it's part of love." Or he says, "Without jealousy there is no love," I've heard these statements a dozen times before.

R: Not only that, people have asked me, without the idea of self, how can there be love.

K: Yes.

R: There are people who put that question also.

K: You see, sir, are we discussing verbally all this? Or realizing, seeing the stream is you, and say, "Look, examine, end it." And so not being able to end it, we invent time: I will one day step out of that stream. So thought invents psychological evolution.

F: Could we also put it this way: thought invents psychological development through time.

K: Yes, sir, that's what I mean.

F: Instead of what really belongs to the psychological sphere, namely the immediacy.

K: That's right. The immediacy only takes place when there is insight. In that there is no regret, no saying, "I wish I hadn't done it." So our action is always at the time level.

See, sir, what is immortality? What is eternity? What is the immeasurable? All religions more or less touch on this, even the metaphysicists and the logicians and the monks have gone into this. What is immortality? That is, an author writes a good book and it becomes immortal. His name becomes immortal. Or a politician, unfortunately politicians last, endure. We have related

immortality as something beyond death - mortal and the beyond mortality, beyond death. No?

F: That's the usual conception.

K: Of course. Well, sir, what do you say to all this?

R: What happened to our question?

K: Death - rebirth?

R: Yes, what happened there.

K: I've told you. Rebirth is this constant stream, manifesting itself into A, B, C, down the alphabet. I know this is most disappointing, depressing, and I say, "My God, this is too horrible, I won't listen to it."

SS: Are you also suggesting therefore death is part of that stream?

K: Yes, body dies. By usage and wrong way of living, it dies, dies, inevitably.

SS: But I meant more...

K: You see, sir, to find out what death is, one has to be with death. That means, end. End my attachment, end one's attachments and beliefs, end to everything that one has collected. Nobody wants to do that.

M: But that, that definition of death would not be in the stream.

K: What?

M: That action of death would not be part of the stream.

K: No. You see, in the man who is gone, understood this, he doesn't think even in streams, it's something entirely different. It's not a reward for the man in the stream.

M: No, it's the action of the insight, is it not?

K: Yes, the action of insight. Action of insight, you cannot have

insight if there is no love, compassion, intelligence, that's part of all that. And then, it's only then there is a relationship to truth.

SS: You seem to be suggesting in some way that death is a key.

K: Yes, sir. Free investigation, not the scientific investigation - the thinking tank, you know; but investigation into this whole myself, which is me, that stream, myself is that stream. Enquire into that, so that there isn't a shadow of the stream left. We don't do this because we are too learned, we have no time, we are too occupied with our own pleasure, our own worries. So we say, "Please, leave that to the priests; not for me."

So have we answered the question? Is there reincarnation, a continuation of the 'me' in different forms? I say, no!

R: Of course not, of course not. As you say, I also say, there is no. First of all there is no 'me' to be reborn.

K: No, sir, the stream manifests and B says, "I am I", therefore I'm frightened to die.

R: Yes.

K: And therefore he invents various comforting theories, he prays, please save me and all the rest of it. But that stream, as long as B lives in that stream, his consciousness is part of that stream, he's only contributing more and more to the volume of that water. Obviously, sir, if you see that. So there is no 'me' to continue. Sir, nobody will accept this, but it's the truth.

F: You would agree then, that what is necessary is to see in this profound...

K: Yes, seeing is that.

F: Truly see, and that truly seeing is real action, creative action.

K: Is action, the moment I see, I drop anxiety. The moment I

see I'm petty-minded, it's finished.

F: It is a complete transformation of the ordinary psychological process.

K: Yes.

M: Isn't it really the crux in all this and the place where people go wrong, so to speak, that they do not see in the sense you're talking about; they see verbally, intellectually, on various levels, but they don't really see.

K: No, I think mostly they don't mind being sorrowful, they say well why not? They don't see, one doesn't see one's own petty reactions. Say, "Yes, why not?"

M: Or they don't see that they don't see, to put it perhaps childishly. They don't realize that what they think is understanding is not.

K: No, Maria, I mean - not you personally - has one dropped any opinion that one holds? One's prejudice; completely? Or one's experience? Never, they say, "Please" - they won't even listen to you. Do you mean to say a politician will listen to you? Or a priest or anybody who is absolutely caught in his own conclusion. Because there he's completely safe, completely secure. And you come and disturb him, either he worships you or kills you, which is the same.

M: Or he sees that that security is a complete fabrication.

K: Then he drops these prejudices, his conclusions, even his knowledge.

S: Sir, for the man who has stepped out of the stream and is no longer a manifestation of the stream, there is something else which is operating. Could we say something about the nature of that

thing?

K: Which is intelligence.

S: Which is intelligence...

K: Intelligence is love. Intelligence is compassion.

S: And from many things that you have said in the past that seems to have an independent existence.

K: Obviously.

S: Without it manifesting in him.

K: Sir, if A frees himself - not himself - if A, his consciousness is no longer of the stream, his consciousness is entirely different. It is a different dimension altogether.

S: And that consciousness existed before he stepped out of the stream, to to speak?

K: Now you are speculating.

S: Yes, I am.

K: I won't play with you.

SS: Perhaps another way to say it, would be, is there intelligence without the intelligent person?

K: I know what you are saying. That means - let's put it round the other way: wars have created a great deal of misery. Right? And that misery remains in the air. It must. Goodness has been also part of man - try to be good. There is also that enormous reservoir of both. No?

SS: Yes.

K: So what? One doesn't contribute to that goodness but one is always contributing to the other.

M: Are you saying the other exists only in the human psyche, but goodness exists apart from humanity?

K: Let's put it round this way: there is not only A suffering, there is this whole suffering of mankind.

M: Or more than mankind, there is suffering.

K: There is suffering, of course.

SS: Suffering is a universal phenomenon.

K: Sir, would you kindly explain, what is Buddhist meditation.

R: Buddhist meditation, the purest form of Buddhist meditation which has taken many forms, many varieties, the purest form of Buddhist meditation is this insight into 'what is'.

K: You are using my words.

R: No, not your words. You are using those words! Long before you, two thousand five hundred years ago these words were used. I am using them.

K: All right, then we are both two thousand years old.

R: Vipassana is insight vision, to see into the nature of things, that is the real vision.

K: Have they a system?

R: A system is, of course, developed.

K: That's what I want to get at.

R: Yes, when you take the original teaching of the Buddha...

K: ...there is no system.

R: It is called Satyabhatana (?), the best discourse by the Buddha on this insight meditation. There is no system.

K: I am listening, sir.

R: And the key point in that is the awareness. Awareness, smytri in Sanskrit. And to be mindful, aware, of all that happens, you are not expected to run away from life and live in a cave or in a forest, like a statue, all that. It is not that. And in this



Satyabhatana it is - if you translate it as the establishment of mindfulness, but rather it is the presence of awareness, the meaning of that word.

K: Is this awareness...

R: Yes, awareness of every movement, every act, everything.

K: Is this awareness to be cultivated?

R: There is no question of cultivation. There is no question.

K: That is what I am trying to get at.

R: Yes.

K: Because the modern gurus, modern systems of meditation, modern Zen, you know all the rest of it, they are trying to cultivate it.

R: Yes, I'll tell you, sir. I have written an essay, it will be published in Belgium, on The Cycle of Buddhist Meditation. There I said that this teaching of the Buddha is for many centuries misunderstood and wrongly applied as a technique. And they have developed into such a technique that the mind can be instead of liberating it can be...

K: Of course. All meditation...

R: If it is made into a system.

K: Please, sir, I am asking: awareness, is it something to be cultivated in the sense manipulated, watched over, worked at? R: No, no.

K: So how does it come into being?

R: There is no coming into being, you do it.

K: Wait sir, just listen. I want to find out, I am not critical, I just want to find out what Buddhist meditation is. Because now there is Buddhist, there is Tibetan, there are various types of Buddhist

meditation, various types of Tibetan meditation, various types of Hindu meditation, Suffi meditation - for God's sake, you follow, they are like mushrooms all over the place. I am just asking if awareness is something that takes place through concentration?

R: No, not in that sense. For anything we do in this world a certain amount of concentration is necessary. That is understood. In that sense a certain kind of concentration is necessary but don't mix it up with dhyani and samadhi.

K: I don't like any of those words personally.

R: But they are concentration in the principle.

K: I know, I know. Most of the meditations that have been propagated all over the world involves concentration.

R: Zen and various other things, samadhi, dhyana, Hindu, Buddhist, concentraion is the centre.

K: That is nonsense. I don't accept concentration.

R: In the Buddha's teaching, meditation is not that concentration.

K: It is not concentration. Let's put it away. Then what is this awareness, how does it come into being?

R: You see, you live in the action in the present moment.

K: Wait, sir. Yes sir. The moment you say the present moment, you don't live in the present moment.

R: That is what it says, that you don't live in the present moment. And satyabhatan is to live in the present moment.

K: No, you are missing it. How is one to live in the present? What is the mind that lives in the present?

R: The mind that lives in the present is the mind which is free from...

K: Yes, sir, go on sir, I am waiting, I want to find out.

R: ...free from the idea of self. When you have the idea of self either you live in the past or in the future.

K: The now is, as far as I, one sees, not I, one sees generally, the past modifying itself in the present and going on.

R: That is the usual.

K: Wait. That is the present.

R: No.

K: Then what is the present? Free of the past?

R: Yes.

K: That's it. Free of the past, which means free of time. So that is the only state of mind which is now. Now I am just asking, sir, what is awareness? How does it flower, how does it happen? You follow?

R: There is no technique for it.

K: I understand.

R: You were asking how it happens.

K: Quite right. I used the 'how' just to ask a question, not for a method. I'll put it round the other way. In what manner does this awareness come into being? I am not aware - suppose I am not aware. I am just enclosed in my own petty little worries and anxieties, problems, I love you and you don't love me, and all that is going on in my mind. I live in that. And you come along and tell me, "Be aware of all that". And I say, "What do you mean by being aware?"

R: When you ask me that, be aware of that pettiness.

K: Yes. So that means be aware...

R: Of the pettiness.

K: Yes, yes. Be aware of all your pettiness. What do you mean by that?

R: Be aware of that.

K: Yes, sir, I don't know how to be, I don't know what it means.

R: It is not necessary to know what it means.

K: What do you mean it is not necessary?

R: Be aware of it.

K: Yes, sir. You tell me, be aware of it. I am blind. I think that is an elephant, how am I to? You follow? I am blind and I want to see light. And you say, "Be aware of that blindness". I say, "Yes, what does it mean?" It is not concentration. So I say, look, awareness is something in which choice doesn't exist. Wait, sir. Awareness means to be aware of this hall, the curtains, the lights, the people sitting here, the shape of the walls, the windows, to be aware of it. Just a minute. Either I am aware of one part, part by part, or as I enter the room I am aware of the whole thing: the roof, the lamps, the curtains, the shape of the windows, the floor, the mottled roof, everything. Is that what you mean, sir?

R: That also is a kind of awareness.

K: That is awareness. Now what is the difference - I am not categorizing, please I am not being impudent, or inquisitive, or insulting - what is the difference between that sense of awareness and attention?

R: It is wrong to put 'sense' of awareness. Awareness.

K: All right. That awareness and attention. You see we have abolished concentration except when I have to drill a hole in the wall, I hope I am drilling it straight, I concentrate.

R: We have not excluded it. There is concentration but that is

not the main thing.

K: No, that is not awareness.

R: But concentration may be useful or helpful.

K: To drill a hole straight.

R: Yes. In awareness also, it may be helpful but it is not concentration on a simple point.

K: There must be a certain sense of concentration if I have to learn mathematics.

R: For anything, sir.

K: Therefore I am just putting that aside for the moment. What is attention? To attend.

R: How do you explain, for instance, awareness, mindfulness, attention, how do you discriminate these three: awareness, mindfulness and attention?

K: I would say awareness in which there is no choice, just to be aware. The moment when choice enters into awareness there is no awareness.

R: Right.

K: And choice is measurement, division and so on. So awareness is without choice, just to be aware. To say, "I don't like, I like this room", all that has ended.

R: Right.

K: Attention, to attend, in that attention there is no division.

R: Also that means no choice.

K: Leave it for the moment. Attention implies no division, me attending. And so it has no division, therefore no measurement and therefore no border.

R: In attention.

K: In complete attention.

R: In that sense it is equal to awareness.

K: No.

R: Why not?

K: In awareness there may be a centre from which you are being aware.

SS: Even if there is no choice?

R: No, that is not awareness.

K: Wait, I must go back.

N: You are making a distinction between awareness and attention.

K: I want to.

SS: Are you saying attention is a deeper process.

K: Much more, a totally different quality. One can be aware of what kind of dress you have. One may say, "I like it", or "I don't like it", so choice doesn't exist, you are aware of it, that's all. But attention, in that there is no attender, one who attends, and so no division.

R: In awareness also you can say the same thing, there is no one who is aware.

K: Of course, that's right. But it has not the same quality as attention.

R: I don't want to go into these words, but the Buddha's teaching is that in this practise of meditation there is no discrimination, there is no value judgement, there is no like or dislike, but you only see. That's all. And what happens will happen when you see.

K: In that state of attention what takes place?

R: That is another explanation.

K: No, if you totally attend, with your ears, with your eyes, with your body, with your nerves, with all your mind, with your heart in the sense of affection, love, compassion, total attention, what takes place?

R: Of course what takes place is an absolute revolution internal and complete revolution.

K: No, what is the state of such a mind that is completely attentive?

F: It is free of the stream.

K: No, that's finished.

R: The stream is dried now, don't talk about it! It is desert now!

K: I am asking what is the quality of the mind that is so supremely attentive? You see it has no quality, no centre, and having no centre no border. And this is an actuality, you can't just imagine this. That means has one ever given such complete attention.

SS: Is there any object in that attention?

K: Of course not.

R: Object in the sense of.?

K: Subject and object. Obviously not. Because there is no division. You try it, do it, sir.

SS: I mean not merely physical object but any phenomenal object such as sorrow, or all those.

K: Give complete attention, if you can. Say for instance, I tell you meditation is the meditator.

R: That is right. There is no meditator.

K: Wait, wait, wait. I say, meditation is the meditator. Give

your complete attention to that, and see what happens. That's a statement you hear. You don't make an abstraction of it into an idea, but you just hear that statement. It has the quality of truth, it has the quality of great beauty, it has a sense of absoluteness about it. Now give your whole attention to it and see what happens.

R: I think Buddhist meditation is that.

K: I don't know, sir.

R: Yes.

K: I'll accept your word for it, but I don't know.

R: And I think it is not misleading to accept my opinion.

K: No, no. I don't know.

R: Satyabhatana is that. Real satyabhatana is that. Now if you ask people who practise it, there are many meditation centres, I openly say they are misleading. I have openly written it.

K: Yes, sir, that is nonsense.

R: When you ask how it happens, I said that presupposes a method, a technique.

K: No, I am asking, can one give such attention.

R: You are asking whether it is possible?

K: Yes, is it possible and will you give such attention - not you, sir, I am asking the question. Which means do we ever attend.

F: Sir, when you say can one attend...

K: Will you attend.

F: That's it.

K: Not exercising will.

F: Quite.

K: Will you... you know, do it. If that attention is not there truth cannot exist.



R: I don't think that is appropriate. Truth exists but cannot be seen.

K: Ah, I don't know. You say truth exists but I don't know.

R: But that doesn't mean that truth does not exist.

K: I don't know, I said.

R: That is correct.

K: Jesus said, Father in heaven. I don't know the father. It may exist but I don't know, so I don't accept.

R: No, not accepting. I don't think it is correct to say that without that attention truth does not exist.

K: I said without that attention truth cannot come into being.

R: There is no coming into being.

K: No, of course not. Let me put it differently. All right.  
Without that attention the word truth has no meaning.

R: That will be better. That's better.

K: We have talked for an hour and three quarters, sir. I don't know when your bus or train goes. We had better stop.

R: I think on behalf of everybody, I thank all these people, not you.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 25TH AUGUST 1979**

I am sorry the weather is so foul.

I am sure many of you have come with your personal problems, and hope by these talks they will be solved; but they can only be solved if you apply self, choiceless awareness and a quality of religious wholeness. I mean - we mean by 'religion' not beliefs, dogmas, rituals and the vast network of superstition, but religion in the deep sense of that word, which only comes into being when there is this self awareness and meditation. And that is what we are going to talk about during these four talks, and two question and answer meetings, as has been explained.

To go into this matter rather deeply, not only to be aware naturally and easily, with our own particular problems, which are related with the problems of the world, because we human beings are more or less alike throughout the world psychologically, you may have different colour, different culture, different habits and customs but in spite of that all human beings go through a great deal of travail, a great deal of sorrow, great anxieties, loneliness, despairs, depressions, not being able to solve them, they seek salvation through somebody else, through various forms of beliefs, dogmas, and acceptance of authorities.

So when we are discussing, talking over together these problems if we merely confine ourselves to our own particular little problem, then that self-centred activity only makes it more narrow, more limited and therefore it becomes more of a prison. Whereas if we could during these talks and dialogues, question and answers, if

we could relate ourselves to the whole of humankind, to the whole of humanity. We are part of that humanity. Over in the east they suffer just as much as you do, they have their sorrows, their unhappiness, their utter loneliness, a sense of negligence by the society, there is no security, no certainty, they are confused as much as we are here. So we are essentially, deeply psychologically, part of that humanity. I think this must be understood really, not merely verbally or intellectually or through reason but one has to feel this. It is not a sentiment, a romantic idea but an actuality that we are part of this whole of mankind and therefore we have a tremendous responsibility.

And to bring about a unity of all other human beings, it is only religion can do this, bring us all together. Not politics, not science, not some new philosophy or some expansive economy, or various organizations, political, religious, none of them are going to bring us together as a whole. I think this one has to realize very deeply, that no organization - religious, political, economic, or the various forms of United Nations organizations - will bring man together. It is only religion in the deep sense of that word that can bring us all together. Religion - we mean by that word not all that is going on in the world, the various superstitions, the make-belief, the hierarchical set-up, the dogmas, the rituals, the beliefs - religion is far beyond all that, it is a way of living daily. And if we could think over together, think together not about something, but have the capacity to be able to look, hear and think together. Could we during these talks do that? Not that we must agree with each other, or accept each other's opinions or judgements but rather putting aside our own particular point of view, our own experience, our

own conclusions, if we can set those aside, and have the capacity to think together, not about something, which is fairly easy, but to be able to see the same thing together, to hear the same meaning, significance, the depth of a word, to hear the same song, not interpret it according to your like and dislike but to hear it together because I think it is very important to be able to think together, not as a group, having the same thought, the same point of view, the same outlook, but having set aside one's own particular idiosyncrasies, habits of thought, come together in thought. Say for instance we can think together about belief, we can argue for it or against it. We can see how important belief is, to have some kind of psychological security. And being desirous of that security we will believe in anything. This is happening in the world. Belief in the most ridiculous nonsense, both economically, religiously and in every way. So we can think about a belief together, agreeing or disagreeing. But we are trying something else, which is not thinking about something but thinking itself together. I wonder if I am making myself clear.

No two people apparently are capable of thinking together unless there is some catastrophe, unless there is some great sorrow, a crisis, then people come together and think together, about a war and so on. It is always thinking together about something - right? But we are trying something, which is to think together. Which is only possible if we for the moment forget ourselves, our own problems, our own inclinations, our intellectual capacities and so on and so on, and meet each other. That requires a certain sense of attention, a certain sense of awareness, that each one of us are together in the quality of thinking. I do not know how to express it

more clearly. Could we do that about all our problems? We can think together about our problems but to have the capacity to think at the same level, with the same intensity, not about something, but the feeling of thinking together. I wonder if you get it?

If we could do that we can go together into many things. That means a certain quality of freedom, a certain sense of detachment, not forced, compelled, driven but the freedom from our own backyard, and then meet together. Because this becomes very important when you want to create a good society. The philosophers have talked about it, the ancient Greeks, the ancient Hindus and the Chinese have talked about bringing about a good society. That is in the future, some time in the future we will create a good society according to an ideal, a pattern, a certain sense of ideals and so on. And apparently throughout the world a good society has never come into being, there are good people maybe. It is becoming more and more difficult to be good in this world. And we are always looking to the future to bring about this good society - good in the sense where people can live on this earth without wars, peacefully, without slaughtering each other, without competition, in a sense of great freedom and so on. We are not defining what is good for the moment - the definition of the good doesn't make one good.

So can we together think the absolute need of a good society? The society is what we are, society doesn't come into being mysteriously, it is not created by god, man has created this society with all the wars and all that is going on. We don't have to go into all the horrible details of it. And that society is what we are, what each human being is. That is fairly obvious. That is we create

society with all its divisions, with its conflicts, with its terror, with its inequality and so on and so on and so on because in ourselves we are that, which is in our relationship with each other we are that. We may be fairly tolerant, fairly affectionate in private relationships but that is rather doubtful, but with regard to the rest of the human beings we are not. Which is again fairly obvious when you read the newspapers, magazines and actually see what is going on. So good society can only come into being, not in the future but now, when we human beings have established right relationship between ourselves. Is that possible? Not at some future date but actually in the present, in our daily life could we bring about a relationship that is essentially good? Good being without domination, without personal interest, without personal vanity, ambition and so on. So there is a relationship between each other which is based essentially on, if I may use the word and I hope you won't mind, love. Is that possible?

Can we, as human beings, living in this terrible world which we have created, could we bring about a radical change in ourselves? That is the whole point. Some philosophers and others have said human conditioning is impossible radically to change, you can modify it, you can polish it, refine it but the basic quality of conditioning you cannot alter it. There are a great many people who think that - the Existentialists and so on and so on. Why do we accept such conditioning? You are following I hope what we are talking about. Why do we accept our conditioning which has brought about this really mad world, insane world? Where we want peace and we are supplying armaments, where we want peace and we are nationalistically, economically, socially dividing each other,

we want peace and all religions are making us separate, as they are, the organizations. There is such vast contradiction out there as well as in ourselves. I wonder if one is aware of all this, in ourselves, not what is happening out there. Most of us know what is happening out there, you don't have to be very clever to find out, just observe. And that confusion out there is partly responsible for our own conditioning. We are asking: is it possible to bring about in ourselves a radical transformation of this? Because only then can we have a good society, where we won't hurt each other both psychologically as well as physically.

When one asks this question of ourselves, what is our deep response to that question? One is conditioned, not only as an Englishman, or a German or Frenchman, and so on, but also one is conditioned by various forms of desires, beliefs, pleasures and conflict, psychological conflicts; all that contributes to this conditioning and more. We will go into it. We are asking ourselves, thinking together because we are thinking together I hope, can this conditioning, can this human prison with its griefs, loneliness, anxieties, personal assertions, personal demands, fulfilments, and all that, that is our conditioning, that is our consciousness, and our consciousness is its content. And we are asking: can that whole structure be transformed? Otherwise we will never have peace in this world. There will be perhaps little modifications but man will be fighting, quarrelling, perpetually in conflict within himself and outwardly. So that is our question. Can we think together with regard to this?

Then the question arises: what is one to do? One is aware that one is conditioned, knows, conscious. This conditioning has come

into being by one's own desires, self-centred activities, through lack of right relationship with each other, one's own sense of loneliness, one may live among a great many people, have intimate relationships, but there is always this sense of empty whirl within oneself. All that is our conditioning, intellectual, psychological, emotional, and also physical naturally. Now can this totally be transformed? That I feel is the real revolution. In that there is no violence.

Now, can we do it together? Or if you do it, if you understand the condition and resolve that condition, and another is conditioned, will the man who is conditioned listen to another? You understand? Perhaps you are unconditioned, will I listen to you? And what will make me listen? What pressure, what influence, what reward? What will make me listen to you with my heart, with my mind, with my whole being? Because if one can listen so completely perhaps the solution is there. But apparently we don't seem to listen. So we are asking: what will make a human being, knowing his conditioning, most of us do, if you are at all intelligently aware, what will make us change? Please put this question to yourselves, each one of you, find out what will make each one of us bring about a change, a freedom from this conditioning? Not to jump into another conditioning: it is like leaving Catholicism and becoming a Buddhist, it is the same pattern. So what will make one, each one of us, who one is quite sure is desirous of bringing about a good society, what will make him change? Change has been promised through reward - heaven, a new kind of carrot, a new ideology, a new community, new set of groups, new gurus, a reward. Or a punishment - "If you don't do



this you will go to Hell". So our whole thinking is based on this principle of reward and punishment. "I will do this if I can get something out of it". But that kind of attitude, or way of thinking, doesn't bring about radical change. And that change is absolutely necessary. I am sure we are all aware of it. So what shall we do?

Some of you have listened to the speaker for a number of years - I wonder why? And having listened it becomes a new kind of mantram - you know what that word is? It is a Sanskrit word meaning, in its true meaning, is not to be self-centred and ponder over about not becoming. The meaning of that is that - mantram means that. Abolish self-centredness, and ponder, meditate, look at yourself so that you don't become something. That is the real meaning of that word which has been ruined by all the transcendental meditation nonsense.

So some of you have listened for many years and do we listen and therefore bring about a change, or you have got used to the words and just carry on? So we are asking: what will make man, a human being who has lived for so many million years, carrying on the same old pattern, inherited the same instincts, self preservation, fear, security, sense of self concern which brings about great isolation, what will make that man change? A new god? A new form of entertainment? A new religious football? New kind of circus with all that stuff? What will make us change? Sorrow apparently has not changed man, because we have suffered a great deal, not only individually but collectively as a whole mankind has suffered an enormous amount, wars, disease, pain, death. We have suffered enormously, and apparently sorrow has not changed us. Nor fear, that hasn't changed us because our mind is pursuing

constantly, seeking out pleasure and even that pleasure is the same pleasure in different forms, that hasn't changed us. So what will make us change?

We don't seem to be able to do anything voluntarily. We will do things under pressure. If there was no pressure, no sense of reward or punishment, because reward and punishment are too silly to even think about, if there was no sense of future - I don't know if you have gone into that whole question of future, that may be our deception, psychologically. We will go into that presently. If you abandon all those then what is the quality of the mind that faces absolutely the present? Do you understand my question? Are we communicating with each other? Please, say yes or no, I don't know whether we are. I hope I am not talking to myself!

If one realizes that one is in a prison, that prison created by oneself, oneself being the result of the past, parents, grandparents and so on and so on, inherited, acquired, imposed, that is our psychological prison in which we live. And naturally the instinct is to break through that prison. Now does one realize, not as an idea, not as a concept, but as an actuality, psychologically a fact when one faces that fact why is it even then there is no possibility of change? You understand my question?

This has been a problem, a problem for all serious people, for all people who are concerned with this human tragedy, the human misery, and asking themselves why don't we all bring about a sense of clarity in ourselves? A sense of freedom, a sense of being essentially good? I don't know if you have not noticed the intellectuals, the literary people, the writers and the so-called leaders of the world, are not talking about bringing about a good

society, they have given it up. We were talking the other day to some of these people and they said, what nonsense that is, that is old fashioned, throw it out, there is no such thing as a good society any more, it is Victorian, stupid, nonsensical, we have to accept things as they are and live with them. And probably for most of us it is like that. So you and I as two friends, talking over this, what shall we do?

Authority of another doesn't change, doesn't bring about this change - right? If I accept you as my authority because I want to bring about a revolution in myself and so perhaps bring about a good society, the very idea of my following you, instructing me, that ends good society. I wonder if you see that? I am not good because you tell me to be good, or I accept you as the supreme authority over righteousness and I follow you. The very acceptance of authority and obedience is the very destruction of a good society. Isn't that so? I wonder if you see this? May we go further into this matter?

If I have a guru, thank god I haven't got one, if I have a guru and I follow him, what have I done to myself? What I have done in the world? Nothing. He tells me some nonsense, how to meditate, this or that and I will get marvellous experience or levitate and all the rest of that nonsense, and my intention is to bring about a good society, where we can be happy, where there is a sense of affection, a relationship so that there is no barrier, that is my longing. I go to you as my guru and what have I done? I have destroyed the very thing that I wanted, because authority, apart from law and all the rest of that, psychological authority is divisive, is in its very nature separative. You up there and I down

below and so you are always progressing higher and higher, and I am also progressing higher and higher, we never meet! You laugh, I know, but actually this is what we are doing. So can I realize authority with its implication of organization, will never free me? Authority gives one a sense of security. "I don't know, I am confused, you know, or at least I think you know, that is good enough for me, I invest my energy and my demand for security in you, in what you are talking about". And we create an organization around that and that very organization becomes the prison. I don't know if you know all this? That is why one should not belong to any spiritual organization, however promising, however enticing, however romantic. Can we even accept that, see that together? You understand my question? See it together, to be a fact and therefore when we see that together it is finished. Seeing that the very nature of authority with its organization, religious and otherwise, is separative, and obedience, setting up the hierarchical system, which is what is happening in the world and therefore it is part of the destructive nature of the world, seeing the truth of that throw it out. Can we do that? So that none of us - I am sorry - so that none of us belong to any spiritual organization, religious organizations, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, nothing.

By belonging to something we feel secure, obviously. But belonging to something invariably brings about insecurity because in itself it is separative. You have your guru, your authority, you are a Catholic, Protestant, and somebody else is something else. So they never meet, though all organized religions say they are all working together for truth. So can we, listening to each other, to this fact, finish from our thinking all sense of acceptance of

authority, psychological authority, and therefore all the organizations created round it, then what happens? Have I dropped authority because you have said so, and I see the destructive nature of these so-called organizations? And do I see it as fact and therefore with intelligence? Or just vaguely accept it? I don't know if you are following this? If one sees the fact, the very perception of that fact is intelligence, and in that intelligence there is security, not in some superstitious nonsense. I wonder if you see? Are we meeting each other? I am a bit lost. Would you tell me, are we meeting each other?

Audience: Yes.

K: No, not verbally please. That is very easy because we are all speaking English or French or whatever it is. Intellectually, verbally is not meeting together. It is when you see the fact together.

Now can we - we are asking - can we look at the fact of our conditioning? Not the idea of our conditioning. The fact that we are British, German, American, Russian, or Hindu, Eastern or whatever it is, that is one thing. Conditioning brought about through economic reasons, climate, food, clothes and so on, physical. But also there is a great deal of psychological conditioning. Can we look at that as fact? Like fear. Can you look at that? Or if you can't for the moment, can we look at the hurts that we have received, the wounds, the psychological wounds that we have treasured, the wounds that we have received from childhood. Look at it, not analyse it. The psychotherapists, sorry I hope there aren't any here, the psychotherapists go back, investigate into the past. That is, seek the cause of the wounds that

one has received, investigating, analysing the whole movement of the past. That is generally called analysis, psychotherapy. Now discovering the cause, does that help? And you have taken a lot of time, years perhaps, it is a game that we all play because we never want to face the fact but let's investigate how the facts have come into being. I don't know if you are following all this?

So you are expending a great deal of energy and probably a great deal of money, into proficient investigation into the past; or your own investigation, if you are capable of it. And we are saying such forms of analysis is not only separative because the analyser thinks he is different from the thing he is analysing - right? You are following all this? So he maintains this division through analysis, whereas the obvious fact is the analyser is the analysed. The moment one recognizes that, the analyser is the analysed, because when you are angry you are that. You understand that the observer is the observed? When there is that actual reality of that then analysis has no meaning, there is only pure observation of the fact which is happening now. I wonder if you see this? It may be rather difficult because most of us are so conditioned to the analytical process, self examination, introspective investigation, we are so accustomed to that, we are so conditioned by it, that perhaps if something new is said you instinctively reject it or you withdraw. So please investigate, look at it.

We are saying: is it possible to look at the fact as it is happening now, anger, jealousy, violence, pleasure, fear, whatever it is, to look at it, not analyse it, just to look at it and in that very observation is the observer merely observing the fact as something separate from himself, or he is the fact? I wonder if you get this?

Am I making myself clear? You understand the distinction? Most of us are conditioned to the idea that the observer is different from the thing observed. I have been greedy, I have been violent. So at the moment of violence there is no division, it is only later on thought picks it up and separates itself from the fact. So the observer is the past looking at actually what is happening now. I wonder if you get all this? So can you look at the fact, you are angry, misery, loneliness, whatever it is, look at that fact without the observer saying, "I am separate" and looking at it differently. You understand? Or does he recognise the fact is himself, there is no division between the fact and himself? The fact is himself. I wonder if you see. And therefore what takes place when that actuality takes place? You understand what I am saying?

Look, my mind has been conditioned to look at the fact, which is loneliness, let's take that - no, we began with being hurt from childhood. Let's look at it. I have been accustomed, used to thinking that I am different from the hurt - right? And therefore my action towards that hurt is either suppression, avoidance, or building round my hurt a resistance so that I don't get hurt any more. Therefore that hurt is making me more and more isolated, more and more afraid. So this division has taken place because I think I am different from the hurt - right? You are following all this? But the hurt is me. The 'me' is the image that I have created about myself, which is hurt - right? I wonder if you see all this? May I go on? You are following all this?

So I have created an image through education, through my family. through society, though all the religious ideas have sold , individual, all that, I have created an image about myself, and you

tread on that image, I get wounded. Then I say that hurt is not me, I must do something about that hurt. So I maintain the division between the hurt and myself. But the fact is the image is me which has been hurt. Right? So can I look at that fact? Look at the fact that the image is myself and as long as I have the image about myself somebody is going to tread on it. That is a fact. Can the mind be free of that image? Because one realizes as long as that image exists you are going to do something to it, put a pin into it, and therefore I will then be hurt, with the result of isolation, fear, resistance, building a wall round myself - all that takes place when there is the division between the observer and the observed which is the hurt. Right? This is not intellectual, please. This is just ordinary observing oneself. We began by saying self awareness.

So what takes place then when the observer is the observed - you understand? - the actuality of it, not the idea of it, then what takes place? I have been hurt from childhood, through school, through parents, through other boys and girls, you know, I have been hurt, wounded, psychologically. And I carry that hurt throughout my life, hidden, anxious, frightened, and I know the result of all that. And now I face, I see that hurt exists as long as the image which I have created, which has been brought about together, as long as that exists, there will be hurt. That image is me. Can I look at that fact? Not as an idea looking at it, but the actual fact that the image is hurt, the image is me. I wonder if you see? Right? Could we come together on one point at least, think together? Then what takes place? Before I tried, the observer tried to do something about it. Here the observer is absent therefore he can't do anything about it. You get it? You understand what has



taken place? Before the observer exerted himself in suppressing it, controlling it, not to be hurt, isolating himself, resisting and all the rest of it, making a tremendous effort. But whereas when the fact is the observer is the observed, then what takes place? Please do you want me to tell you? Then if I tell you it will have no meaning. But if we have come together that is what I want, think together and come to this point then you will discover for yourself that as long as you make an effort there is the division - right? So in pure observation there is no effort and therefore the thing which has been put together as image begins to dissolve. That is the whole point.

We began by saying self awareness and the meditative quality in that awareness brings about a religious sense of unity. And human beings need this enormous sense of unity, which cannot be found through nationalities, through all the rest of that business. So can we as human beings, after listening for perhaps an hour, see at least one fact together? And seeing that fact together resolve it completely, so that we as human beings are never hurt psychologically. In that thinking together implies that we both of us see the same thing, at the same time, at the same level, which means love. You follow sirs? I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it? We meet again tomorrow morning.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 26TH AUGUST 1979**

If one may remind you, this is not an entertainment. You are not being converted to anything. It is not a meeting of propaganda. We are met for a serious purpose, at least the speaker is, so I hope you are also very serious.

What we were saying yesterday I think should be repeated briefly because there may be new people here this morning. We were saying that self awareness, being conscious of oneself, one's reactions, one's inward thoughts and ambitions, various forms of suffering, pleasure and all the travail of human beings, to be aware of all that. Aware without any choice, just to be aware, without direction, without any kind of pressure, just to be conscious of all the inward and outward activities that are going on, specially the psychological activity of the human mind. That demands certain serious attention, not analysis but pure observation, to observe without any choice, without any direction, without any sense of pressure, that needs quite a deep attention.

And we were also saying that religion is the only factor that might bring all humanity together, east, west, north, south. But as religions are at present in their very nature destructive, disruptive, divisive, based on belief, dogma, ritual, and tradition, hierarchical outlook, all that organized religion is not religion at all - it is a vast sense of superstition, desire playing a tremendous part in it and so leading to a great deal of illusion.

Religion can only come about through meditation, which we shall go into as we go along in these four talks and answering

questions. And we said too that if we could think together. Because for most of us our career demands all our thinking: if you are an architect, engineer, scientist and so on, all our thinking is directed in one particular direction. Our whole life depends on it and so we are conditioned to one strata of thinking, or one form of thinking. And it becomes very difficult for those who are caught in a particular groove of thought to be able to think not about something but the whole movement of thinking itself. That is what we were saying yesterday. And it becomes so extraordinarily important now as one is probably that human beings should come together not based on a belief, on an ideal, or on some authority but have the capacity, the intention, the seriousness to think together. Think not about something which is comparatively easy, but have the affection, care, attention and perhaps love so that we are able to communicate with each other without any barrier so that your thinking and the speaker's thinking are together.

Then we were saying we should be able to bring about a good society. The ancient Greeks and the ancient Hindus and others have talked about bringing about a good society somewhere in the future, based on some ideals, concepts, intellectual conclusions and perhaps rarely upon their own experiences that there must be in the world a number of people who will create a society essentially good so that humanity can live on this earth happily, without conflict, without wars, without slaughtering each other. And that society doesn't exist in spite of two or three or ten million years of human existence. Religions have tried to bring this about but in their very nature, by their very organization, they are separative, they are based on belief, dogma, ritual, authority and all the rest of

that, it becomes really quite meaningless. Though organizations of such kind bring about a certain quality of security, that security itself becomes insecurity and it is based on illusion. I think this is all very clear if one has gone into this matter at all.

And is it possible while we are living on this earth, which is not the British, or the English, or the British or the French or all the rest of it, it is our earth. And can we live there peacefully now? Which implies not some future idealistic society based on goodness but actually in our daily life now bring about such a good society? Which means to have right relationship with each other. A relationship not based on some past images, put together by thought, but a relationship in which that which is actually happening in this relationship of reaction, to be aware of those reactions, and not build out of those reactions various forms of images which prevent actual relationship with others, however intimate or impersonal. Is that possible? Which means can the human mind which has been so conditioned for millenia, can such a conditioned mind be aware of itself, know all the intricacies and the complexities and the reactions of the human mind, based upon the senses, and becoming aware of itself bring about a deep transformation, a mutation in itself? That is the real problem. I hope we are communicating with each other. Or am I going too fast?

Perhaps most of us are not used to this kind of thinking, or this kind of explanation. Explanations are not actualities. You can describe the mountain but to be close to the mountain, see actually the beauty of it, the dignity of it, the majesty of it, is quite different from the description of that mountain. But most of us are satisfied

sitting in our armchairs to be comforted or made to feel romantic about the mountain through explanations, paintings and so on. But we are actually dealing not with the mountains but with actual daily life of our life. Can that life, which is now a travail, a great deal of effort, struggle, competition, brutality, terror, you know all the things that are going on in our daily life, can that be transformed? Not in some future idealistic, when the environment is completely changed to bring this about, which is impossible, the Totalitarians tried this, change the environment and they say then the human mind can become transformed - which has been proved nonsensical. And also there are the others who say human conditioning, the condition of the human mind can never be changed, you must accept it, live with it, modify it, refine it and make it much more pleasant. But what we are saying is quite the contrary of these two: The human mind can be transformed - not to fall into another conditioning, not into another set of beliefs and dogmas and all that nonsense, but actually bring about in itself a religious quality, which is the only factor of bringing about unity among all human beings. All organizations have failed and you never apparently see such organizations can never do this, but yet we are addicted to organizations, like drugs, like whiskey and so on. We think if we could organize everything would be all right.

Perhaps some of you have heard that story which I have often repeated: there were two friends walking along the road and as they were walking along one of them picks up from the pavement and looks at it and his whole face changes, lightens, delighted and he puts it in his pocket. And the other fellow says, "What have you got? Why are you so happy about it?" "Oh," he says, "I have

picked up part of truth, it is so extraordinarily beautiful." And the other fellow says, "Now let's organize it." And we think through organizations, however highly regarded, patronized, plenty of money and so on, blessed by all the Canons of the world, such organizations have never produced unity of human mind because in their very structure and nature they must be divisive, separative, based on some form of idealism or belief, and so they are essentially destructive to bring about this unity of the mind, of the human mind, which requires love, affection, care, attention, responsibility. I hope we are meeting each other, are we? Or am I talking to myself?

Questioner: May I ask you a question?

K: We will do it the day after tomorrow sir. If you are still here, if you are still interested.

So our question is, and has always been: can the human mind, human consciousness, with all its content, the grief, the sorrow, the anxiety, the loneliness, the sense of despair, the desire to fulfil and frustration, the whole of human struggle, is that consciousness with its images of god and you know, all that. Can that consciousness be transformed? Otherwise we will always be separative - please do pay attention a little bit - separative, destructive, self-centred, perpetuating wars and maintaining this everlasting division of nationalities, races, colour and all the rest of it. So if one is serious and deeply concerned with humanity, with man with all his problems - economic, social, religious - all that, can that mind be completely changed?

And the speaker says it can be, it must be. And then the question arises: in what manner can this be brought about? Does it

demand discipline? All right sir? We are communicating with each other, you are following? - not verbally, not intellectually but actually becoming aware of one's own conditioning - the number of beliefs, the experiences, dogmas, you know the whole human existence - becoming aware of it, would you ask whether it is possible to transform this enormous past, with all the knowledge it has acquired, can that be transformed? Where there is knowledge in the past or the present acquiring knowledge, knowledge is always incomplete, there is no knowledge as a whole. So with knowledge goes ignorance. Please understand, this is really quite important for you to understand this. As knowledge can never be complete therefore knowledge always goes with ignorance. Part of knowledge is part of ignorance. And when we rely entirely on knowledge as a means of advance, as a means of ascent of man we are also maintaining ignorance. And so there is always this battle between ignorance and knowledge.

And we are saying as human beings live their lives in the past, their whole life is a movement of the past, if you observe it for yourself you can see how we live in the thousand yesterdays, our memories, our experiences, our hurts, our failures, you know the whole movement of time which is the past. And can that movement come to an end so that the mind is fresh, young, alive, new? Knowledge is necessary at certain levels. If you are a doctor you must have knowledge; a surgeon you must have knowledge; if you are a good carpenter you must have a great deal of knowledge of wood and the implements and so on. But knowledge is the result of experience accumulated through thousands and thousands of people through millenia. That knowledge is stored up in our brain

from childhood, genetics and so on and so on. And that knowledge, based on experience, is memory. This is all very simple, this is not highly intellectual or anything. And thought is the result of that movement of memory, as knowledge is always with ignorance our memory is always limited. And therefore thought is always limited. Thought can imagine that it can perceive or see or experience the limitless, but thought in itself is the outcome of knowledge with its ignorance and therefore it is essentially, basically limited, fragmented and never possibly can conceive the whole. This again becomes very simple and clear if you go into the whole question of thinking: and our whole nature, our whole civilization, all the cathedrals, all the things in the cathedrals, the rituals, the whole circus of all this is based on thought. And so thought can never be sacred, though it can create an image and call it sacred but that thing which it has created is not sacred because thought itself is limited. And we are caught in the images created by thought. So thought - please follow - thought can never bring about a complete transformation of the human mind. Right? Because all the things that thought has put together as consciousness - are you interested in all this?

Audience: Go on, go on.

K: No?

Audience: Go on, go on, please.

K: If you are not sirs don't bother to listen because this is really very, very serious. You have taken the trouble to come here, in rather rotten weather and you want to find out what the other fellow, what the speaker is trying to say, so you have to listen, you have to find out. And in the very finding it out you test it, you don't



accept anything the speaker says. Though he is sitting on a higher platform it doesn't give him any authority. We are investigating into the whole nature of man and whether that can be transformed. Because the way we are living is terrible, destructive, meaningless, going to the office everyday or factory - you know all this. From the moment you pass your school examination, or whatever it is, for the rest of your life, going to the office, struggling, struggling, struggling. And so life becomes utterly meaningless.

So we are saying: thought has created the most beautiful architecture, both in the east and in the west. And the things that have been put in it, in all the various churches, don't get angry please, I am just describing it, it is a fact. Don't resist, just look at it, just listen and if you don't want to listen shut your ears, or if you don't want to be impolite, quietly slip out. Because what we are saying is totally contrary to everything that is going on in the world. We are asking for a psychological revolution, which means the transformation of the human mind with all its miseries, the things that thought has put in there.

So we are saying that thought, do what it will, because in itself it is partial, limited, narrow, based on knowledge, and knowledge goes with ignorance, therefore thought whatever it does, it may write the most beautiful, romantic heaven, theories of god, theories of what society should be and so on, whatever it does it cannot possibly bring about a radical change. But thought has its own place. You cannot go home without knowing, without thinking. If you had total amnesia you would be lost. So thought has its right place, but thought cannot bring this change. If you once see that and grant it, even intellectually, then what is one to do? You

understand my question?

Please understand this very deeply, otherwise you will miss the whole point. Man has tried in the east and in the east, depending on thoughts, the ancient Greeks, and ancient Hindus and the ancient Chinese, depending on thought and saying that will help man to change, to bring about a different culture, a different society, and thought has not brought it about. If one actually, deeply realizes that fact, not a theory, not something you come to through argument, through opposing opinions, but an actual fact, then the next question is: what is the factor that will bring about this change? If thought cannot what will? You follow? If a good carpenter has an instrument which is useless he throws it away. But we don't. We keep it. We hope somehow that it will operate through some miracle. We don't throw it away and therefore have the capacity to look in another direction, because we are frightened that if thought is not the solution for all our problems, including political, religious, economic, if thought is not the solution, and if you say, "All right, I will put thought aside, because thought has its place," then our minds are free of the useless instrument which has its own place, then it has a capacity to look in other directions. I wonder if you are following all this? I hope you are doing all this and not merely listening to a lot of words, and consider it as useless and go away.

So what is there, if thought is not the instrument of right action, then what is the instrument - right? Are we together in all this? What do you say? Our senses partially make up our whole mind, obviously. But we use our senses partially - right? One or two senses highly awakened, highly developed, the others are dormant

- right? And is it possible to observe with all our senses, not with one or two senses, with all the senses highly observant? Do you understand the question? Which means is there an observation which is not the instrument of thought? You are following this? May I go on with it? Not for your entertainment, but you are doing it with the speaker. We are doing it together. Which means we are doing it together with care, with attention, with affection, with love, together. Otherwise it is meaningless. You accept a lot of words and go away, it will just be ashes in your hands.

So is there an observation, not partial, but with all the senses observe? Which means is there an observation without the past? Senses have no past, they are acting. You understand this? This is marvellous. I am discovering something myself. The senses are responding according to every challenge, and the senses when they are functioning completely there is pure observation. Isn't it? I wonder if you see this. And that observation is not induced by thought - right? In that observation there is no centre from which to observe. There is only observation, pure and simple without all the pressure and the volume of the past - right? Which implies that one has to go into this whole question of discipline, because we are used to it. We are used to making an effort, to learn is an effort, a language or anything, one has to make a tremendous effort. And is there a possibility of living - please listen to this - is there a possibility of living without a single shadow of effort? Ask yourself please, find out the answer because we have made effort in every direction, and we have not brought about a good society where people can live happily, without fear, without terror, without uncertainty - you follow - all that is going on in the present world.

And we say through organization, making an effort to create an organization we will solve that.

So we are questioning the whole movement of effort - effort to reach god, if there is a god, effort to be noble, effort to have good responsibility in our relationship. And so effort implies the action of will. You are following? Will is desire, and there are multiple forms of desires. And desire in its activity must create effort. If I want a good suit I must make an effort. If I want to be good, in quotes, I must make an effort to be good. If I want to reach god - we won't discuss god - either I must fast, be a celibate, take vows, burn in myself, struggle, struggle, struggle, great efforts to reach the ideal, the highest principle. We are questioning that effort because we are saying that in pure observation, which I have explained a little bit, there is no effort, there is only observation and action. I wonder if you get all this. I'll go into it presently in more detail.

That is why one has to understand the whole nature of desire because we are driven by desire, whether sexual, whether ambitious - you know, all the rest of it, desire becomes the basis of our existence. So we have to go into this whole question of desire. Various monks throughout the world have said no desire - if you would reach god, the highest principle, desire must be suppressed - you know all this. Look at all the monks throughout the world, they are ordinary human beings, taken a vow to serve god and concentrate all their energy on that which means desire must be held, suppressed or transmuted and so on and so on. So one has to investigate desire. Observe desire, not control, suppress, transform - just to observe desire. You understand? Pure observation of

desire. In that, if you go into it deeply, thought doesn't enter at all, as we explained just now, I hope. Need I go back to it again?

So we are saying as one of the major factors of life is desire, one has to understand what is desire, how does it dominate our lives, why? - whether it is desire for heaven or illumination, whether it is desire for a house, you know, all the rest of it, desire. How does it come into being? What is the relationship - please just follow it slowly, we will go into it carefully - what is the relationship between the senses and desire? You understand my question? The senses - seeing something in the shop window, a dress, a shirt, whatever it is, a nice piece of furniture, or a beautiful car - that is, seeing and desire. You understand my question? What is the relationship between the two? How would you find out? Read a book? Go to a psychologist? A professor? A guru? A man who says it is so? How will you find out? Because we are so dependent on another's explanation - right? We want to be told. The speaker refuses to be told by the books, by the professors, by all the hierarchical beings in knowledge. So how is one to find out? If we discard all that you are left with yourself. How will you find out what is the relationship between the activities of the senses and desire? Or must they all go always together? Do you understand my question? Are you following all this? That interests you, all this? Gosh! Please bear in mind, if you don't mind, that we are not converting you to anything, to new aspects of desire, or this or that, nothing. We are investigating together.

If you observe very closely the movement of desire: you see something in the window, a dress, a shirt, a trouser, whatever it is, the senses are awakened by that perception, by the seeing of that

shirt, of that dress - right? The senses are awakened. Then you touch the material, which is contact and then sensation - right? Please follow this step by step. Seeing, contact, sensation - right? Then, observe it closely you will see it for yourself, then thought comes and makes an image and says how nice it would be for me to have that blue shirt on - right? So when thought makes the image of you having that robe, that dress, and creating the image of you in that dress and how nice you look, then desire begins. You follow this? Do please, it is very interesting if you go into it very deeply. Seeing, contact, sensation, that is perfectly normal, it is so. Then thought comes along and creates the image of you sitting in the car and driving it, and the excitement of the speed and all the rest of it, you have created the image. So thought when it dominates the senses and creates the image, then desire begins.

So the next question is, if that is so, the next question is: why does thought create the image? You understand? It is perfectly right to see a beautiful car, look at it, touch it, the sensation of it. Then thought slips in, you are sitting behind the wheel and driving it. I hope it is a fast car, in spite of the energy trouble! So thought has created this. If one understands this, not verbally, not intellectually but factually, then thought has no relationship with the sensation - you understand? I wonder if you see that. So then there is no question of making an effort to discipline desire, to suppress desire, to transform desire. Because we are accustomed, trained to make an effort, right desire, wrong desire, noble desire, ignoble desire, according to the pattern of each civilization, which civilization is put together by thought - right?

So discipline then has quite a different meaning. Discipline now

means to control - right? To struggle to be what is demanded, either Victorian or Modern, permissive, or not permissive, discipline ourselves to be something, control ourselves - you follow? All that is based on an effort to be, to become, to achieve, psychologically we are talking about. So when you understand the nature of desire, what place has effort? You understand?

Psychological effort. What place has discipline? Discipline actually means to learn, it comes from the word disciple, one who is willing to learn from the teacher - to learn. The actual meaning is to learn. We have learnt. You understand? We have learnt together the nature of desire. So where is the whole movement of a civilization which says discipline? - which means conform, imitate, compare - you follow? All that is implied in discipline and much more naturally.

So is it possible to live a daily life without a single effort? You understand? Without a single sense of control. Please this is very dangerous, especially in a permissive society. we are not advocating permissiveness, or the opposite of it. We are examining the whole structure of the human mind, which has been trained to control and the reaction is, let go, do what you want, do the thing you want. On the contrary we are saying understand, look, observe, be aware of your whole existence, not just one part of it - be permissive when you are twenty. But from the beginning of life to the end, look at it, because all religions, organized religions with their dogmas and so on have always demanded this, discipline, to serve god, discipline, make effort. You can't love with effort - can you? Thought can make an effort and says "I will try to love" - but it is not love, it is still the movement of thought based upon

knowledge with its ignorance, and thought can never have that quality of love which is whole.

So we are saying: the human condition, which is the human consciousness, not only the particular consciousness, that consciousness is part of the whole of consciousness - I wonder if you see this? Your consciousness, living in a town, living in a village, living with a husband, wife or a girl or boy, that little consciousness with all its problems, whether you live in a happy community or not a community, whether you are living happily with your wife, your girl or whatever it is, happily in quotes, that small particular consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind because they are all particular little consciousnesses. I wonder if you see this. So your consciousness is not separate. I know one likes to think it is all special but our consciousness and its content is put there by thought right? Thought has brought about this limited consciousness. Now to observe this consciousness, however limited, to observe its activity without any direction, just to observe, not choosing "I will keep this part and let the other part go" - just to observe the whole content. When you so observe, which means there is no observer who is the past, then that consciousness has no centre. I wonder if you see this? Our consciousness now is self-centred - right? Me and my activities, me and my problems, me and my job, me and my wife, me and my other wife, other girl, me and so on and so on and so on. This consciousness is the movement of thought. Thought has put in this consciousness various activities, belief, dogmas, rituals, on the one hand, you know all that is going on, called religion, and the business activity, the activity of personal relationship, grief,



sorrow, pain, anxiety, guilt - you know, all that - all that is our consciousness. And that consciousness is the consciousness of those people living in Russia or India, China, or America. So if one realizes this, that we are part of the whole of humanity, not English, British, you follow? - all that goes away. Then we become extraordinarily responsible, not to my little family but to all human beings. After all that is love, isn't it? To feel totally responsible for my children who must be educated rightly, not be conditioned to a particular form of British outlook, or French outlook, whether Russian or Totalitarian, or whatever it is, educated so that they become religious human beings. Because in that religion there is unity, which is not to be organized. And right education implies that sense of freedom from fear, from this terrible anxiety to fulfil and so on. It is not the moment to go into right education.

So when one feels that one is representative of all humanity then you become extraordinarily responsible to the whole of mankind, therefore there will be no wars. Oh, you don't see all this. There will be no nationalities. That is actual, you understand, this is not a theory, but when you feel that your consciousness is the rest of mankind, because they suffer in India as well as you do here, in America and so on and so on. So consciousness is the consciousness of mankind and in the freeing of that consciousness of its content we have responsibility to the whole. And that is essentially the nature of love and compassion.

We are going to meet the day after tomorrow. Instead of having dialogues, or discussions, which we have tried all over the world at different times, we thought it would be a good idea to have questions. Whatever question you want to ask, then we will try to

answer each question. That's on Tuesday morning.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 28TH AUGUST 1979**

There are about over one hundred questions! From the most superficial to the most demanding, deeper questions. I wonder why we ask questions, not because we said we would have questions instead of dialogues, but why do we ask questions? And from whom do we expect an answer? If we put the right question perhaps we should also get the right answer. And it becomes very difficult to answer all these hundred, and over, questions, so we chose some of them. Perhaps some of your questions may not be answered because there are too many of them, and don't think we have chosen what specially suits me, what is most convenient for me to answer because one can ask any kind of question that you want to ask, personal, impersonal, serious or flippant. And we have more or less covered that ground in all these hundred questions.

We will try to answer some of these questions this morning but please bear in mind, if I may remind you, that it is very easy to ask a question but to listen to find out for yourself the right answer one must be fairly inquisitive, fairly serious, fairly demanding. And in answering these questions we are not the Oracle, either from Delphi or from India, or from Washington. Or perhaps you would prefer from London! But please bear in mind that we are sharing the question together: that one may answer the question but the very answering of it perhaps will awaken in each one one's own reaction, either you oppose it or you accept it, or you deny it, or you say, "Yes, it might be true". We are investigating the question together. You understand? Together, therefore it is not I am

answering, the speaker is answering and you are just listening. We are together answering the question, though the speaker may put it into words but we are sharing the question, we are sharing, partaking in the answer. I hope that is clear.

On such a lovely morning, which so rarely happens in England, beautiful blue sky, lovely trees on the lawns and the generally clean air, to talk about very serious matters is rather trying. But the first question is:

1st QUESTION: Is it possible ever to be free of self-centred activity? Is there a real self apart from the self created image?

All right. I wonder what we mean by the self. If each one of us was asked to describe in words what is the self, the ego, the personality, the centre, the basis from which we act, from which we think, from which we feel, if each one of us could be clear not only verbally as an idea but actually, what is the self? If you ask somebody what is the self, they would say, "It is all my senses, my feelings, my imagination, my romantic demands, my sense of having a house, a possession, a husband, a wife, my qualities, my struggles, my achievements, my ambitions and so on. Also my aspirations, my unhappiness, my joys, and so on" - all that would be the self. Would we agree to that? You can add more words to it but the essence of it is this centre, the me, my house, my family, my wife, my children, my bank account, what my impulse is, "I want to do this", "I am impelled to go to India to find truth" and so on and so on and so on. Would we agree to that verbal description of what we call the self? Not only the verbal description but the feeling, the me and the you - right? We and they, in which all is included, nationalities, the family tradition, the name, the form,

psychosomatic approach and the intellectual capacities, the desire to have more clarity and so on. The me and the you, we and they - right?

And from this centre all action takes place - right? All our aspirations, all our ambitions, our quarrels, our disagreements, our opinions, judgements, experiences, is centred in this - right? Shall I go on? We are together so far, aren't we?

Not only the conscious self acting outwardly but also the deep inner consciousness which is not open, obvious - right? So all this is the me, the I, the ego, the person, the different levels of consciousness, all that is me - right?

Now the questioner asks: is it possible to be free of this centre - right? Why does one want to be free from this centre? Is it because the centre is the cause of division, me and you, my country and your country, my belief and your belief, my god and your god, and so on and so on. And where there is division there must be conflict - right? Can we go on? That is, when the me is the active element that is operating all the time and in you the same me with a different name, with a different colour, with a different job, with a different position, the hierarchical social structure - you are Lord so-and-so, somebody else is your servant and so on, it is the same me dividing itself into different categories - right? Socially, economically, religiously. I think that is fairly clear.

And one realizes where there is division there must be conflict - the Hindu and the Muslim, the Jew and the Arab, the American and the English, the English and the French, the French and the German, the German and so on and so on and so on. That is physically obvious. And that has brought about in the world

tremendous wars, great agony of people, brutality, violence - right? The self identifying itself with an ideal, noble or ignoble ideals, and fighting for that ideal. But it is still the ego trip - right? It is like those people who go to India - I don't know why but they do - trying to find spirituality and putting on a different fancy dress and saying, "I am going to find spiritual things there". They have only changed the garb, the clothes but they are essentially the me which is operating all the time, struggling, endeavouring, grasping, denying, deeply attached, deeply attached to one's experiences, to one's ideas, to one's opinions, to one's longings. Right? And as one lives, as one observes this centre, this me, is the essence of all trouble, and also all pleasure, all fear, all sorrow. So it says, "How am I to get rid of this centre?" Is that clear. We can expand it more but that is the essence of it. There are too many questions.

So is it possible the questioner asks to be really free, absolutely not relatively, which is fairly simple. One can be a little unselfish, one can be a little concerned with social welfare, with others and so on, but the centre is always there biting hard, brutal. You all know this. So is it possible to be free of that centre.

First of all the more effort is made to be free of the centre, the more - please listen to this - the more one makes an effort to be free of the centre, that very effort strengthens the self - right? Like those people who go off into meditation of various kinds, trying to impose something upon each and that me then captures that, identifies with that and says, "I have achieved" - but he is still the centre - right?

So please first to understand whether it is possible to be free there must be no effort - right? Which doesn't mean doing what one

likes. That is clear, isn't it? No? If one doesn't make an effort then let's do what we like, which is still the movement of the self.

Whether you put on a yellow robe or a purple robe or join a monastery it is the self still, identified with an ideal, and pursuing that ideal through great effort. But the movement is from the centre. I wonder if that is clear, isn't it?

So what is one to do? If you are not to make an effort because you see the truth of it, that the more you make an effort the greater the travail of the self. It is the self that is making an effort to be free of itself, and therefore it is still involved in it, imagining that it will be free, imagining that it will be etc. etc. But it is still the activities of the centre, me. Then what is one to do?

Before we go into that, is there a real self apart from the self created by thought with its images? - the questioner says. Is there a real self? Many people feel that. The Hindus have said there is the highest principle which is the self. And we have imagined also that there is a real self apart from the me. You all, I am sure, feel this. There is something else beyond this me, which is called the higher self, or the sublime self, or the supreme self. The moment we use the word 'self' or use any word to describe that which is beyond the self, the me, it is still the self. The first thing to realize is: is it possible to be free of the self? - without becoming a vegetable, without becoming absent minded, somewhat lunatic, and so on and so on, is it possible? Which means what? Is it possible to be totally free from attachment? That is one of the attributes, one of the qualities of the self - right sirs? I am attached to my reputation. I am attached to my name. I am attached to my experience. I am attached to what I have said and so on. So is it possible to be free

from all attachments? Work it out sirs. If you really want to be free of the self, no attachment. Which doesn't mean you become detached, indifferent, callous, shut yourself away, which is another form of the self - you understand? Before it was attached, now it says, "I won't be attached". It is still the movement of the self.

So if a person is serious, really concerned because the world is divided, is this - the me and the you, we and they. We British and they French - or rather the Irish! The black and the white and the brown. So is it possible, without effort, to be free of attachment, to your wife, to your children, to your name - you can't very well be detached from your bank account if you have one, then the bank profits from it, but to be detached - you know what it means? - not to be identified with anything, with your country, with your god, with your - nothing. And therefore when you are really deeply basically not attached then from that deep sense of no attachment comes responsibility. Not responsibility to my wife, to my children, to my nephew, niece, the sense of responsibility - right. Will you do it? That is the question. We can talk everlastingly, put it into different words but when it comes to testing it, acting, we don't seem to want to do it. And so we prefer to go on as we are, status quo, slightly modified but carry on, with our quarrels, you know all the things that are happening in the world. And to be free from your own experience, from your own knowledge, from your own accumulated perception - you understand all this?

So it is possible if you go at it. And it doesn't take time. That is one of our excuses that we must have time to be free. When you see one of the major factors of the self is attachment and you see what it does in the world, and what it does in your relationship with



another, separation and all the rest, ultimately quarrels, divorce, all the ugliness of relationship, if you see the truth of attachment, then that very truth is so, it is actual. Then you are free from it. Your own perception sets you free - right? Will you do it?

2nd QUESTION: Will the practice of Yoga as it is being done in Europe and America help to bring about a spiritual awakening? Is it true that Yoga will awaken deeper energy, which is called Kundalini?

From the sublime to the ridiculous! The so-called Yoga which the west and part of the east in India, was invented about the seventeenth and eighteenth century, the exercises, in order not only to have a very good body, healthy body, through force, you understand, through discipline, control, in order to awaken so-called higher energies - seventeenth, eighteenth century. The real Yoga, which is called Raja Yoga, King of Yogas, is to lead a highly moral life - not morality according to circumstances, according to culture, but true ethical activity in life - not to hurt, not to drink, not to drug yourself, right amount of sleep, right amount of food, clear thinking, and acting morally, doing the right thing. I won't go into all that, what is right and wrong. They never mentioned, as far as I understand after talking with a great many scholars, they never mentioned about exercise. They say exercise normally, walk, swim, all that, but their emphasis was a very moral life, a mind which is active.

And modern yoga - the meaning of the word you all know, you probably know, I have talked to the scholars too and they say it doesn't quite mean that, which is to join. The meaning of the word, Yoga, is to join, join the higher with the lower, or the lower with

the higher. You understand? And modern Yoga - I don't know why I am talking about all this nonsense! - I don't know why they call it yoga, it should be called just exercise but that wouldn't appeal to you! You have to pay money to learn yoga, to breathe properly and all that. You can practise yoga, the exercises of different kinds, the speaker has done some of it for years, taught by the experts, fortunately they didn't charge! Because they also thought I was an expert!! Sorry. (Laughter) I am not an expert and so they soon deserted me! I deserted them.

Sirs, you can do this kind of yoga exercise for the rest of your life, you won't awaken spiritual insight, nor will the awakening of a higher energy come into being. You know in the east they have a word for this called Kundalini, some of you probably have read or been caught in that word. But most of the people, as far as I have discussed with them, who have gone into this matter very deeply, they are always quoting somebody else, back to the original mischief-maker - sorry. (Laughter). And none of them, please believe me, none of them have awakened this thing. They talk about it. They feel certain experience, which they call by this name. I have discussed with them very seriously and what they are talking about is a certain form of increasing energy to do more mischief. I mean that. By eating the right food, by control, by breathing properly, etc. etc. etc., you have more energy, naturally. And that gives you a sense of superiority, and you are enlightened and so on.

But there is a different form of - I won't go into it because you are all eager, I am not touching it! - that can only happen when the self is not. Then there is a totally different kind of energy to keep

the mind fresh, young, alive and that can only come when there is absolutely no sense of the self - right? Obviously. Because the self, the me, the centre, is in constant conflict - right? Wanting, not wanting, creating dualities, opposing desires, this constant struggle that is going on. As long as that struggle is going on there is a wastage of energy obviously. When that struggle is not, there is a totally different kind of energy taking place - right?

There is the story of a man, a philosopher, or a patriarch, who was a well-known teacher. And a disciple came to him and said, "Master teach me to meditate". So he sat up in the right position, you know, and closed his eyes and began to breathe very deeply, trying to capture the higher webs and vibrations and all the rest of it. So the Master picks up two pieces of stone and rubs them, keeps on rubbing them. And the disciple opens his eyes and says, "Master, what are you doing?" He said, "I am trying to make out of these stones a mirror so that I can look at myself" and the disciple says, "Master you can never do that". He says, "In the same way, my friend, you can sit like that and breathe like that for ever but you will never..." - got it?

3rd QUESTION: Can there be absolute security for man in this life?

This is a very serious question because we all want security, both physical and principally psychological. If you are psychologically secure, certain, then we might not be so concerned with physical security.

The search for psychological security - please follow this - the search for psychological security is preventing physical security. We will go into this. The questioner says: is there absolute security

for us, for human beings? We will answer that at the end but follow it step by step.

We must have security - right? Like a child hanging on to its mother, the child must feel secure otherwise something goes wrong. They have found this. If the mother and the father don't pay enough attention to the baby, give it all affection, etc. etc., it affects the brain, the nerves of the baby and the child. So it must have security, physical security.

And why do we demand psychological security? Do you understand the difference between the two? There is the psyche demanding security and the physical demanding security - right? This is obvious. Now is there psychological security at all? We want it, we want security in our relationship - right? My wife, my children, a sense of family unit. That unit is now breaking up. In that there is a certain security, psychological - right? So one is attached to the wife, or to the girl - right? So in that attachment there is security, at least we think there is security. And when there is no security in that person we soon break away from it and find it in another - right? This is happening. And we try to find security in a group, in the tribe - that glorified tribe is the nation - right? No? I am glad. And the nation against another nation - you follow? So thinking security psychologically is in a person, in a country, in a belief, in your own experience, all these are forms of wanting, demanding security, as one demands physical security - right?

Please we are sharing this together, you are not just listening to me. We are together examining if there is security for us human beings. And demanding the psychological security we have divided ourselves - right? The Hindu, the Muslim, the Jew, the Arab, the

Christian, the non Christian, believer in Jesus, the believer in something else - in all this there is the demand for security. And this security has been found in illusions - right? Do you accept that? Right? Being secure in Catholicism, hold yourself tight. In Buddhism, in Hinduism, in Judaism, Islam and so on - you follow? That has created an illusory security because they are fighting each other. I wonder if you see this? Do you? The moment you see it you don't belong to anything.

So wait a minute. So the demand is for security. It may be an illusion in superstition, in a ritual, in a dogma, in a nation, in an economic system, in Totalitarianism, in being safe, secure, economically, like in America, completely safe, at least they think they are. So the desire for security not only creates illusion, because it is an illusion, isn't it, to belong to a tribe, or belonging to some church, so one finds security in illusions, in actualities, in a furniture, in a house, in a person. None of these, as you observe, give man security, because you have had two terrible wars - you haven't had - you follow? You want security but you create wars, which destroys your own security.

So when you see the truth that the mind, or thought has sought out security in illusions - right? - the very perception that you are seeking security in illusion, that very perception of that brings you intelligence - right? Are you following this? Are you following this? Please don't, unless I make it perfectly clear, don't agree with me.

I sought security in my belief as being a Hindu with all the nonsensical superstitions and gods and rituals and all the nonsense that goes on. I sought security in that - I haven't but suppose one

does. That opposes another group of people who have different ideas, different gods, different rituals - Catholic and all the rest of it. So these are the two opposing elements, tolerated but they are antagonistic essentially. So there is conflict between the two, in which I have sought security in one or the other - right? And I realize, by Jove, they are both illusions, in which I have tried to find security - right? And to see that they are illusions is intelligence. It is like seeing danger. A man who is blind to danger is an idiot, is something neurotic, there is something wrong with him. But we don't see the danger of this - right? And the man who sees the danger, intelligence is in operation. In that intelligence there is absolute security. You get it? Do you understand this?

That is, the mind, thought has created various forms of illusions, nationalities, class, me and you, different gods, different beliefs, different dogmas, different rituals, the extraordinary religious superstitions that pervade the world, in all that one has sought security. And one doesn't see the danger of this security, of this illusion. When one sees the danger, not as an idea but an actual fact, that intelligence is the supreme form of absolute security. Right? Are we together? Are you intelligent? (Laughter) Otherwise we miss it. You may say, "I don't believe in any religions, I have no beliefs, I have no this, I have no that" - but the me is in operation, which has created all this and you are opposing all that by another word, another belief, another idea.

So there is absolute security, which means to see the truth in the false - got it? I wonder if you see this?

4th QUESTION: Emotions are strong. Our attachments are strong. How does looking and seeing reduce the strength and

power of these emotions?

Right? Can we go on with that question? Trying to control, suppress, sublimate emotions and attachments in no way reduces the conflict, does it? Clear? Are we generally aware of our emotions? Are we aware of our attachments, which say emotions are very strong, attachments are very strong, are we aware of that? Do you know that you are attached? Go on sirs, find out. Are you attached strongly? And are your emotions so extraordinarily strong that they act? So first one has to be conscious, aware, know, recognize, see that your emotions are strong. And know also, be aware, recognize that you are attached. If that is so, when you are so conscious, what takes place? Do you understand my question?

I am conscious of my attachment, or my strong emotions of hate, jealousy, antagonism, like and dislike, I am conscious of it - right? Are you? Please we are sharing this together. Now do they, being so strong, overshadow, control my action? I am examining, looking, observing, the emotions and attachments which are apparently very strong, and they act as barriers to clear thinking, to clear action, to unconfused thinking. So am I aware of them? Or we take it for granted? You follow my question? Say, "Yes, I have very strong emotions, I am terribly attached, but it doesn't matter. It is part of life. I don't mind struggling. I don't mind having quarrels with everybody". There is a lovely joke but I won't go into it!

(Laughter)

So are we aware of them? Now if you are aware what takes place? Please examine it yourself. You are attached. Are you aware that you are attached? Just aware. You know that you are attached to that person, or to that piece of furniture, or to a belief, to a

dogma, you know all the rest of it, attached to something. Now when you say you are aware, what do you mean by that? Know, recognize. Is thought recognizing the attachment? You follow? You say, "Yes, I am attached" - is it the activity of thought that says, "I am attached"? - you follow? Go into this please with me. Take a few minutes. Pay attention. Please sir quiet.

When you say, "I am attached", is it an idea? Or is it a fact? The fact is not the idea. This microphone, I can create an idea of it but that is a fact. I can touch, see - right? So is my attachment a concept? A conclusion? Or is it a fact that I am attached? You see the difference? Do you? Please. So when you are observing the fact, not the idea, not the conclusion about the fact, but the fact and you are aware of it, is the fact different from you who are observing the fact? You are following all this? I hope your minds are all active. It is clear, isn't it? Am I observing the fact through an idea, or through a conclusion? Or I have heard somebody say that - you follow? - therefore I look, which means I am looking through a screen of ideas. So I am not looking at the fact.

So I am looking now at the fact. I am not verbalizing the fact and looking at it. How do I look at it? As something separate from me - you understand? Attachment, something different from me? Or that is part of me? Do you understand? Don't go to sleep please. If you want to sleep, sleep but if you are serious for a few minutes, see this fact. That is, am I looking as though it was something apart from me? The microphone is apart from me, but attachment, emotions are part of me. Attachment is the me. If I have no attachment there is no me. So awareness of your emotions and attachments are part of your nature, part of your structure. So you



are looking at yourself, so there is no division, there is no duality, me and attachment. There is only attachment, not the word but the fact, the feeling, the emotions, the possessions, the possessiveness in attachment. That is a fact. So that is me.

So what am I to do with the me? You understand? Now please follow this step by step. If you get tired, or if you are distracted, be distracted but come back. So when there was division between me and attachment I could do something about it - right? Do you follow this? I could control it, I could say, "No, I mustn't be", or suppress it, or do something about it all the time - right? Which we do. But if it is me, what can I do? Wait, wait. Follow it closely. If it is me, what can I do? I can't do anything, can I? I can only observe. Do you see the difference? Before I acted upon it. Now I can't act upon it because it is me, it is my arm, it is part of me. So all that I can do is to observe - right? So observation becomes all important, not what you do about it. You see the difference?

So there is observation, not I am observing. There is only observation. In that observation, if I begin to choose and say "I mustn't be attached" - I have already moved away in saying that is not me. You understand all this? So in observation there is no choice, there is no direction, just pure absolute clear observation. Then the thing that is being observed dissolves. Before you resisted it, you controlled it, you suppressed it, you acted upon it. Now in that observation all energy is centred. It is only when there is the lack of energy there is attachment. I wonder if you see this? Do you see this?

That is, when there is complete observation without any interference of thought, because you are observing. Why should

thought come in? You understand the point? You are just observing the fly the thing that you call the fly, just observe. In the same way to observe so completely your emotions, attachments, then there is a gathering of all energy in that observation. Therefore there is no attachment. I explained very carefully, it is only the unintelligent that are attached. It is only the people who do not see the full implications of attachment that are attached. And they pervade the world, they are the stronger element in the world and we are caught in that. But when you begin to examine this closely, look at it, then you are no longer caught in that, so you are no longer dissipating energy in something which has no meaning, naturally. So your energy is now centred completely in observation, therefore there is total dissipation of attachment. Test it, do it and you will find out. But you have to go step by step, don't jump into something or other, you have to examine the thing very, very closely so that your mind is absolutely clear in the observation - right? It is only the unaware that jump over the cliff. The moment you are aware of danger, move. Attachment is a danger because it breeds fear, anxiety, hate, jealousy, being possessed and being not possessed - the whole of that, that is a tremendous danger. And when you see danger you act - not you act, there is action.

5th QUESTION: Why does the mind so readily accept trivial answers to such deeply felt problems?

The questioner says, why do I accept trivial explanation when a deep problem is concerned? You understand? Why do I live in words? That is the real problem. You understand? Why have words become so colossally important? No? I suffer, go through great agonies. And you come along and give me explanations and in that

explanation I seek comfort. There is god, there is reincarnation, there is this, there is that, there is something else. So I accept the word because it gives me comfort. The explanation gives me comfort, the belief gives me comfort, when I am in agony, in anxiety. So explanations by philosophers, by analysts, by psychologists, by the priests, by the yoga teachers - explanations - it is on that we live, which means we live secondhand. We are secondhand people and we are satisfied with that. You use the word 'god' to a Catholic or to a man who believes in Jesus - you follow? - the word, the image, which word is a symbol, the image is a symbol. So symbols become extraordinarily important, like the flag. Oh sirs, you don't face all this.

Why does the mind do this? Is it because we read a great deal of what other people have said, we listen to what other people have said, we see in the cinema what is taking place - others? Always somebody else out there telling me what to do. So my mind is crippled by this. So I am always living secondhand. Goodness. You understand sirs?

And we have never asked: can I be a light to myself? You understand? Not the light of someone else, including Jesus or the Buddha or somebody else. Can I be a light to myself? Which means no shadow. You understand? Because to be a light to oneself means it is never put out by any artificial means, by circumstances, by sorrow, by accident and incidents - a light. Can one be that to oneself? One can only be that to oneself when your mind has no challenge because it is so fully awake. But most of us need challenges because most of us are asleep. We are asleep because we have been put to sleep by all the philosophers, by all

the saints, by all the gods and priests and politicians - right? We have been put to sleep. And we don't know we are asleep, we think this is normal. So a man who wants to be a light to himself has to be free of all this. And the light to oneself can only take place when there is no self. Then that light is the eternal, everlasting, immeasurable light - right sirs.

Could we go on with these questions instead of dialogues, discussions?

Audience: Yes.

K: I thought so! I do all the talking and you - I hope not.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER MEETING 30TH AUGUST 1979**

We have so far one hundred and fifty questions! I don't think it will be possible to answer all of them this morning. Probably one needs a month to answer them, and you won't be here and I won't be here.

I think before we answer these questions, please remember that we are sharing the question as well as the answer. Your particular question may not be answered because there are too many of them to go into each one, but I think we have more or less chosen, or gathered together representative questions out of that hundred and fifty. So I hope you will not mind if your particular question is not answered. Most of us I am afraid ask questions and try to find an answer from others. When we do put a question one must find out why we put them. Is it a genuine, serious applicable question? Or just a fanciful question and therefore no answer that can be properly correct and true? But as we said, we are going to share together the question and the answers. And I hope that we can do that this morning. I hope you are not too hot.

1st QUESTION: The speaker has said that going to an office everyday from nine to five is an intolerable imprisonment. But in any society all kinds of jobs have to be done. Is K's teaching therefore only for the few?

You have understood? Shall I read it again? The speaker has said that human society is so constructed throughout the world that most people are occupied with jobs, pleasant or unpleasant, from nine to five everyday of their life. And he said also that it is an intolerable imprisonment. I don't know how you feel about it.

Probably you like being in prison, probably you like your jobs from nine o'clock to five o'clock, rushing, rushing back and all the rest of it. What shall we do? To the speaker he wouldn't tolerate it for a single minute - for the speaker. I would rather do something which would be pleasant, helpful and necessary to earn enough money and so on. But most of us accept this prison, this routine - right? We accept it. So what shall we do? Nobody, as far as one is capable of sufficient observation, nobody has questioned this. We say it is normal, it is the way of society, it is the way of our life, it is the way we must live. But if we all see together that such an imprisonment, which it is actually, that we all feel it is intolerable, not just verbally but actually do something about it we will create a new society - right? We will if all of us say we will not tolerate for a single day this routine, this monstrous activity of nine to five, however necessary, however good and pleasant, then we will bring about not only psychological revolution but also outwardly. Right? We may agree about this but will we do it? You might say, "No, I can't do it because I have responsibility, I have children, I have a house and mortgage, insurance" - thank god I haven't got any of those! And so you might say, "It is easy for you to talk about all this." But it is easy for the speaker to talk about it because he refuses to go in that pattern. From boyhood he refused it.

Now if we all consider that such a psychological as well as physical revolution of this kind is necessary, not bloody and all the rest of it, then we will create the society - won't we? You want others to create the society and you can then slip into it. That is what we are all waiting for. A few struggle, work, create, and refuse to enter into this rat race and the others say, "Yes, after you

have constructed what you think is right society, then we all join you" - but we don't do it together. That is the whole problem.

Right? If we all had this, not idea but the fact, that to spend our life from nine o'clock to five o'clock probably before that, every day of our life for sixty years and more, we would do something about it.

As if you refuse to have wars - you understand - wars, killing other people in the name of your country, your god, whatever the ideal is, if you all refused to kill another there would be no wars - right?

But we have constructed a society, built a society, based on violence, armaments, each nation protecting itself against other nations, and so we are perpetuating wars, killing your sons, your daughters, everything. And we support it. In the same way we support, maintain this imprisonment. It may be pleasant for those who have an agreeable job but those who refuse to enter this game they will act, they will do something.

So the problem is, do we see the importance, or the necessity of this change? After all the human mind is not merely occupied with a particular job, pleasant or unpleasant. The human mind has the quality of other things which we disregard. We are concerned with the whole of life, not just a career, nine to five, how we live, what we do, what our thinking is, whether there is affection, care, love, compassion. All that is part of life. But we are so conditioned to this idea that we must work and create a structure of a society that demands that you work from morning until night. The speaker refuses to pay into that rat race. It isn't that he has got certain gifts or that somebody will look after him, but he refuses to enter that. I wouldn't go for a single day from nine to five for anybody, for anything. I might die but I wouldn't do that. In the same way I

wouldn't kill another human being whatever the circumstances. I know what you are going to say - 'What if your sister is attacked?' - you know all that game. Because violence produces more violence. You are seeing that in Ireland. But we are all so timid, we are all so nervous, frightened, anxious, we want security which we think we have, which we haven't got.

So will you go into this and find out if you can free yourself from that rat race and to find out one must exercise capacity, intelligence, not say, "I won't do it". You don't do it because you are intelligent, not because you are told, or you have read in some book, or some philosopher. I think it is very clear.

And also the questioner asks: are K's teachings therefore only for the few? This is one of the questions that is asked over and over again. What do you think? If it is for the few it is not worth it. Wait a minute, just go slowly. The speaker says it is for everyone. But everyone is not serious, has not got the energy because he is dissipating it in various ways. And so gradually there are very few - you follow? So observing it, say it is only for the few. Whereas actually if you apply, go into it seriously with the spirit of investigation and wanting to live a different kind of life, it is for everyone. There is nothing secret about it. But there is great mystery if you go beyond the limitation of thought. But we don't do any of these things, we don't test it out, we don't apply, we don't eat the food that is put before us. And the few that eat it say, "We are the elite". They actually are not the elite, they are only the serious people that have applied, thought about it, gone into it, seeing that it affects their daily life. It is only then one can create a different kind of society.



2nd QUESTION: Isn't insight intuition? (You have heard these two words, I am sure.) Would you discuss this sudden clarity some of us have. What do you mean by insight and is it a momentary thing or can it be continuous?

In the various talks the speaker has given he has used the word 'insight'. That is, to see into things, into the whole movement of thought, into the whole movement, for example, of jealousy. To perceive the nature of greed, to see the whole content of sorrow. Not analysis, not exercise of intellectual capacity, nor is it the result of knowledge, knowledge being that which has been accumulated through the past as experience, stored up in the brain, therefore knowledge always goes with ignorance. There is no complete knowledge, therefore there is always knowledge and ignorance, like two horses tethered.

So then what is insight? You understand my question? You are following this? Please it is a hot morning but it doesn't matter a little bit. If the observation is not based on knowledge, or on intellectual capacity of reasoning, exploring, analysing, then what is it? That is the whole question.

And the questioner asks also: is it intuition? That word 'intuition' is rather a tricky word because many of us use that word. The actuality of intuition may be the result of desire. One may desire something and then a few days later you have an intuition about it. And you think that intuition is most extraordinarily important. But if you go into it rather deeply you may find that it is based on desire, on fear, on various forms of pleasure. So one is rather doubtful about that word, specially used by those people who are rather romantic, who are rather imaginative, sentimental

and wanting something. And they would certainly have intuitions but it may be based on some obvious self-deceptive desire. So for the moment we can put aside intuition, that word. I hope I am not hurting anybody who is caught in intuitions.

And if that is not so, then what is insight? That is, to perceive something instantly which must be true, logical, sane, rational. You understand? And that insight must act instantly. It isn't that I have an insight and do nothing about it. If I have an insight, if one has an insight into the whole nature of thinking - you understand? - that is, I will explain a little bit about thinking. Thinking is the response of memory. Memory is the result of experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain. And the memory responds. Where do you live? You answer. What is your name? There is immediate response. And so on. Thought is the result or the response of the accumulated experience, knowledge as memory. That is simple. So that thought based upon, or the outcome of knowledge, that thought is limited because knowledge is limited. So thought can never be all inclusive. It must always be partial, limited, based on knowledge and ignorance. Therefore it is everlastingly confined, limited, narrow - right? Now to have an insight into that, which means, is there an action which is not merely the repetition of thought - you are following all this? - to have an insight into say organizations, let's take that. Right? To have an insight into it, which means that you are observing without memory, remembrances, without argumentation, pro and con, just to see the whole movement and the demand for organization. Then you have an insight into it, and from that insight you act. And that action is logical, is sane, healthy. It is not you have an insight and then you act the opposite,

then it is not insight. I wonder if you are getting all this? Sorry to be so emphatic. That is my way of doing it.

To have an insight, for example, into the wounds, hurts that one has received from childhood. You understand my question? We are all people who are hurt for various reasons, from childhood until we die there is this wound in us, psychologically. Now to have an insight into the whole nature and structure of that hurt. Do you understand? Are you following all this? You are hurt, aren't you sirs? - wounded psychologically? Play the game with me. The ball is in your court. You are hurt obviously. You may go to a psychologist, analyst, psychotherapist, and they trace why you are hurt, from childhood, your mother was this and your father was that, or you are put in the wrong part or the right part and so on and so on. (Laughter) Don't please. Go into it. And by merely looking, or seeking out the cause the hurt is not going to be resolved. It is there. And the consequences of that hurt is isolation, fear, resistance, and not to be hurt more, therefore self-enclosure. You know all this. That's the whole movement of being hurt. The hurt is the image that you have created for yourself about yourself. right? So as long as that image remains you will be hurt, obviously. Now to have an insight into all that, without analysis, to see it instantly and the very perception of that insight, which demands all your attention and energy, the hurt is dissolved. And therefore when it is dissolved there is no further hurt. I wonder if you get all this?

If one may ask most politely, you have heard this, have you got that insight that will dissolve your hurt completely, leaving no mark, and therefore no more hurt, nobody can hurt you. You understand? Because the image that you have created about

yourself is non-existent. Are you following all this? Are you doing it? Or are you just merely verbally paying attention to the words?

Questioner: I don't really understand what you mean when you say we have created this hurt.

K: First of all, who is hurt? What do you mean by being hurt? Sir, what do you mean by being hurt? You say, "I am hurt" - consciously you are aware of it or not. One is hurt. Now what is that which is being hurt? Do you understand my question? Do you understand sir? What is that which is hurt? You say, "It is me". What is that 'me'? It is the image you have about yourself. If I have an image about myself, I am marvellous, spiritual, blah, blah - eh? - and you come along and say, "No, you are a silly ass" - I get hurt. (Laughter) That is, thought - please follow this - thought has created an image about oneself and that image is always comparing: my image is better than your image, and so on and so on and so on. So as long as one has this image about oneself it is going to be trodden on by somebody. And that is called hurt, wounds, psychologically.

To have an insight into that means to see the whole movement, the cause and the image and therefore the very perception ends the image. Do you understand this? No?

3rd QUESTION: You say that organizations will not help man to find what we Christians call salvation. So why do you have your own organization?

In 1925 - perhaps some of you weren't born even - in 1925 the speaker was the head of a very big vast organization. He was the head of it and they looked up to him with devotion - you know, all that stuff, candles and all that! (Laughter) Please don't laugh, we

are just stating facts. And it was considered a spiritual organization, a religious organization. And in 1925 - or was it 28 or 29, I have forgotten, it is not important - that organization called 'The Order of the Star' was dissolved by the speaker, because he said that any spiritual organization of any kind is not spiritual. And he dissolved that organization, returned the properties, the whole works of it.

Now he has - not, he has - there are several Foundations, one in India, one in this country, America and Canada. In India there are five schools, in different parts of that country, with a great deal of land. And they are schools, they are operated under the K. Foundation, which is responsible for the land, to see that the schools are more or less in the right direction - less perhaps than more! And here also there is a Foundation with a school and we are hoping the school will keep in the right direction. And the Foundation is responsible to gather all these talks, tapes, publish and so on and so on. And it is the same in America and in Canada. There is nothing spiritual about it. Right? They merely act as function. They are necessary, the law demands it. And to publish the books - you know, all the rest of it. And to see that the teachings are kept fairly pure. That is the only function of these Foundations - right? It has no other function. They are not spiritual bodies which you can join and attain Nirvana, or Heaven or whatever. It is very simple, very clear. Is that all right? So don't please next time ask about why do you have organizations. It is very simple: there are schools, they publish, tapes, arrange talks wherever I go and some of them look after the speaker physically, because the speaker has no money. When the speaker is in India

they look after him, here they look after him, when the speaker is in America they do the same. Full stop. That is finished, isn't it? Shall we go on to the next question?

4th QUESTION: Is sex incompatible with a religious life? What place has human relationship in spiritual endeavour?

First of all why have human beings, right throughout the world, made sex so important in their life? Do you understand my question? Why? Now in the west it is permissive, boys or girls of twelve, thirteen, have already sex. And one asks why have human beings throughout their activities, throughout their lives made this thing of such colossal importance? Go on sirs, answer it. Put the question. We are sharing the question together - right? You are not just listening to a Delphic Oracle, but together we are investigating. It is your life. We are looking at it.

There are those gurus, and there is a whole philosophy called Tantra - part of it - is based on sex. That through sex you can reach god - whatever that god be. And that is very popular. And there are those, like the monks, the Indian Sannyasis, and the Buddhist priests, have denied sex because they have all maintained that it is a waste of energy, and to serve god you must come with all your energy. Therefore deny, suppress, burn inside yourself with all the demands but suppress it, control it. So you have the permissive, and the so-called religious suppression. And those in between who enjoy everything, both sides, they have one foot in this and one foot in the other! Then they can talk about both things and see if they cannot harmonize the two together and find god - or whatever you want to find. Probably you will find at the end of it a lot of nonsense!

So we are asking: why has man, woman, made this sex business so important? Right? Why don't you give the same importance to love - do you understand? To compassion? Not to kill? Why do you give only such immense value to sex? You are following what I am saying? Your wars, terrors, national divisions, the whole immoral society in which we live, why don't you give an equal importance to all that and not only to this? You are following my question? Why? Is it because sex is your greatest pleasure in life? The rest of your life is a bore, a travail, a struggle, a conflict, meaningless existence? And this at least gives you a certain sense of great pleasure, a sense of well being, a sense of - you know - what you call relationship, and what you also call love - right? Is that the reason why we are so sexually crazy? Go on sirs, answer yourselves. Because we are not free in any other direction. We have to go to the office from nine to five, where you are bullied, where your boss is over you - you know all that happens in an office, or in a factory, or in another job where there is somebody dominating you. And our minds have become mechanical - are you following all this? - we repeat, repeat, repeat, we fall into a tradition, into a groove, into a rut. Our thinking is that: I am a Christian, I am a Buddhist, I am a Hindu, I am a Catholic, I worship the Pope - you know, the whole thing is clearly marked and you follow that. Or you reject all that and form your own routine.

So our minds have become slaves to various patterns of existence - right? So it has become mechanical. And sex may be pleasurable and gradually that too becomes mechanical. So one asks, if you want to go very deeply into it, one asks: is love sex?

Go on, ask it. Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love a remembrance of an incidence, which you call sex, with all the imagination, the pictures, the thinking about it, is that love? Oh, for god's sake! Is love a remembrance?

And the questioner asks: (Oh, lord, I have forgotten where is it? Here it is.) what place has human relationship in spiritual endeavour? You see what it is reduced to? Human relationship is pleasure, sex, conflict, quarrels, divisions, you go your way, I'll go my way - you follow? That is our relationship, actual relationship in our daily life. And what place has human relationship in spiritual endeavour? Obviously the present relationship has no place whatsoever, obviously. We are jealous of each other, we want to possess each other, we want to dominate each other and so there is antagonism between each other, one is sexually unsatisfied therefore you go to somebody else, and in that sexual relationship there is loneliness - right? All this sir. And always seeking your own pleasure. Is that all love?

So you disregard, put aside that thing called love, perhaps that is the most wonderful thing if one has it, and are so caught up in this vortex or one's own desire, of one's own pleasure - right? So we are always wanting not only sexual satisfaction but gratification in every direction, which is based on pleasure. And that we call love. From that we kill each other - right? Love of the country.

So when at the end of this you say why has man, woman, given this one thing such extraordinary importance? All the magazines, you know all that is happening. Is it man, woman, have lost their creative capacity? - not sexual capacity - you understand? - creative capacity. To be able to see, to be a light to themselves, not



to follow anybody, not to worship any image, illusion, belief. When you put aside all that and you have understood your own petty little desires, which is your own sexual demands, gratifications, then when you see all that, have an insight into all that, then out of that comes creation. It doesn't mean painting a picture, or writing a poem. That sense of ever freshness - you understand? Having a mind that is fresh, young, innocent all the time, not clouded, burdened with all kinds of memories, dissatisfactions, fears and anxieties, you know, when you have lost all that there is a totally different kind of mind. Then sex has its own place. But when sex becomes a means of religious endeavour - you understand what I am saying? - then we get completely bogged down.

Apparently we don't have that quality of scepticism - you understand? To be sceptical about one's own demands, to question, doubt these innumerable gurus. And doubt also becomes rather dangerous because if you don't hold it then you doubt everything and then there is no end. It is like having a dog on a leash, you must let it go occasionally, or often so that the dog enjoys himself, runs about. In the same way doubt must be kept on a leash and also allowed, take away the leash, so the mind is - you know, the mind being your heart, your brain, your emotions, everything active, not just directed in one direction which is sex, sex, sex.

5th QUESTION: Can thought be aware of itself as it is taking place? Or does the awareness come after the thought? Can consciousness be aware of its whole content?

Most of us are aware after the happening - right? - after the incident, after an action. Then we say, "I should have done", "I

shouldn't have done". The questioner asks: can thought be aware of itself as it arises? - not after, which is fairly simple, which is what most of us do. But the question is: can there be awareness of thought as it arises? Do you understand the question? You understand the question at least? Can you be aware - please listen - of your thought? That is, can thought be aware of itself, as it arises? You understand the question? That is, one's whole life is based on thought, thought recognizing the emotion, the sentiment, the romantic feelings, the imagination and so on, thought is recognizing all this - right? "Oh, I am very emotional" and so on. Now thought is our instrument of all action - right? Therefore there is no spontaneity. If you look into yourself seriously spontaneity can only exist when there is complete, total freedom, psychologically.

So can your mind be aware of itself as thought arises? That is, is there an awareness when you begin to be angry? You follow all this? Can there be an awareness as jealousy arises? Can there be an awareness as greed comes - be aware of that? Can there be? Or you are aware that you have been jealous, or that you have been greedy or that you have been angry? That is fairly simple, most of us do that. But to be aware so attentively you can see for yourself the anger coming in, the adrenaline and all the processes, the whole movement of anger. You can see greed come into being: you see something you want and - you follow? - reaction. To be aware of that. Of course one can as it arises.

Now the question is a little more difficult, more deep. Can thought - please listen to this - which is, you can be aware as anger arises, that is fairly simple, but is there an awareness of thought

itself? You understand what I am saying? You are thinking now, aren't you? Or are you all absent minded? You are thinking now, aren't you? Now as you are thinking find out if that thinking can be aware of itself. Not you aware of thinking - do you understand the problem? I wonder if you see this. This is really great fun if you go into it. Not only fun, it is very, very serious because we can go very, very deeply into all this. That is, you are thinking about something, about your dress, how you look, what people have said, what you are going to meet, and this and that - thinking is there. Now take one thought and see if that thought can know itself. Ah, yes sir, this requires tremendous attention which you are not used to. You are thinking about the dress you have had, or you are going to buy. The thought that arises, can that thought say, "Yes, I am awake" - you understand? I see myself, itself, not you observe the thought because you are also thought. Do you understand? So you are not aware as thought arises but thought itself is aware as it comes into being. I wonder if you see this. No. Right? That is one question.

The other is: can consciousness be aware of its whole content? Do you understand? Consciousness, to put it very quickly and briefly, is its content, isn't it? Your belief, your name, your nationality, your prejudices, your opinions, your conclusions, your hopes, your despairs, your depression, your concern about yourself, you believe and you don't believe, you believe in being a British - you follow - god or no god. All that - your anxieties, your fears, all that is the content of you - right? Your sexual demands, your urges, your pleasures - all that is your consciousness, and can that consciousness - please listen to it - be aware of its own content, as

a whole, not just a part? You get the point? No.

This is real meditation, you understand? Not all the nonsense that goes on. Because to see the whole of your being, not just your sexual demands because sex isn't your only life, there are fears, death, anxiety, guilt, despair, depression - you follow? - sorrow, all that is part of your life. So all that is your consciousness. Now the questioner asks: can your consciousness be aware of its whole content? That means can you observe - not you observe - is there an observation of the whole thing? One has to go very deeply into this. We haven't time but we will go briefly into it.

That consciousness is put together by time, through time, through what we call evolution. You have had incidents, accidents, remembrances, racial, national and so on, family, all that is a movement contained in consciousness - right? And is it ever possible to be completely free of that content. Do you understand? No, you are not interested in all this. This is really very important because otherwise we are always acting in the field of the known, the known being the unknown also, the ignorance. There is never freedom. That is, a man always living in the past, as you do. You may project that past into the future as an ideal, as a hope and so on, but it is still the movement of the past, modified through the present - right? So a man who is more or less living in the past, what is his mind - you understand? He may have new techniques, new opportunities to learn other forms of skills but it is essentially, in himself, his consciousness is the movement of the past. Right? So a man who is living in the past - or a woman - what happens to his brain, mind? It can never be free.

So a man who enquires into this very seriously has to find out

whether this whole consciousness with its content can be seen at once, which is to have total insight into this. I don't know if you have ever considered looking at anything wholly: to look at your wife, or your girl, or your husband, whatever it is, wholly, not just her face, her this or that, but the whole quality of another human being. And you can only do that when the you is not - do you understand? When you are not centred here, me. The 'me' is very small, very petty, because the 'me' is the accumulation of all this.

So when you begin to enquire into this, whether it is possible to see the whole content, the movement of consciousness, which means the whole structure of the 'me'. That requires pure observation - do you understand? Not your direction, prejudice, like and dislike and all the rest of it, but just purely to observe the vast structure, very complex. Because of its very complexity you must come to it very simply. Right?

Shall I go on with one more question?

6th QUESTION: I have tried all kinds of meditation, fasting and a voluntary solitary life, but it has come to nothing. Is there one thing, or one quality that will end my seeking and my confusion, and if there is what am I to do?

You understand this question? Are you in that position? You understand the question? That is, one goes to Japan, Zen Buddhism, Zen meditation, the various forms of Tibetan, Hindu, the Christian, and all the innumerable meditations man has invented. And the questioner says, "I have been through all that. I have done yoga of various kinds, fasted, led a solitary life trying to find out what is truth. And at the end of it all I have found nothing". Do you understand this? Many people don't understand.

Which isn't a tragedy to you, is it?

Is there one thing, one quality that will end my seeking and my confusion? If there is, tell me what to do? You understand the full meaning of this question?

I met a man once, he was a very old man, I was quite young, grey hair, almost dying. And he heard one of the talks and came to see me afterwards and he said, "I have spent twenty five years of my life in solitude, in meditation. I have been married and so on, but I left all that, and for twenty five years I have meditated. And I see now that I have heard you that I have lived in an illusion." - you understand? Twenty five years - you people don't know a thing. And to say to oneself, "I have lived an illusion, I have deceived myself." - you understand? At the end of twenty five years to say that. Which means a wasted life, which you are doing anyhow, without meditating for twenty five years.

And he asks what is the one thing, one action, one step that will dissolve my confusion, the end to my search. You understand the question? Are you in that position, any of you? Except the questioner? You understand, you have come to the end of your tether. You have read, you have walked, you have heard, you have cried, you have meditated, you have longed, you have sacrificed - you understand? Probably you haven't done any of those things. And if you have, then what is the one thing that will resolve all this?

First of all don't seek? Do you understand what it means? Because if you seek you will find, what you find you have already sought. I wonder if you see all this? What you will find in your search is what you have projected - you being your priests, your

gods, your professor, your guru, your philosophy, your experience. That, projected in the future, you will find, therefore a wise man doesn't seek. And the questioner says, what is the one thing? For that one thing there must be total freedom from all attachment, to your body, to your exercises, to your yoga, to your own opinion, judgements, and persons, and beliefs, complete freedom from all attachment - right? Don't make it a sorrowful thing, it isn't. There must be no fear - wait, this is not one thing, absolutely no psychological fear, and therefore when there is physical fear you deal with it - you understand what I am saying? When somebody is attacking you, you deal with it, but psychologically there is no fear, that means no time as tomorrow. Oh, you don't see this.

And the mind having understood the nature of sorrow and therefore freedom from sorrow, which doesn't mean that you are indifferent and all the rest of it - freedom from sorrow. Right? These are only indications, not the final thing. If these don't exist the other final thing cannot be. You understand the point? I don't think you do. Look sir, a man or a woman, a man has spent years and years searching, seeking, asking, demanding, so-called sacrifices, taking vows of celibacy - you follow? - and at the end of it all he says, "My god, I have nothing. I have ashes in my hand". Even though they think they have in their hands Christ or Jesus or the Buddha, it is still ashes. I wonder if you see all this? And such a man asks: what is the right action in my life, the right action which will be right under all circumstances? It doesn't vary from time to time according to culture, according to nations, according to education - right, precise, actual.

When all this is clear, that your mind is totally unattached to

itself - do you understand? - to its own body and no fear, and the ending of sorrow, then if that is clear the one thing is compassion. You understand? Out of all this comes compassion, then compassion is not ashes in your hand, which isn't the compassion that does social reforms, social work, the saints, it isn't the compassion of the saints, compassion of the people who go out in the war and heal people, doctors and so on and so on. It is not that at all. It is the one answer that is true under all circumstances and therefore out of that right action because compassion goes with intelligence. If there is no intelligence which is born out of compassion - you understand? - then you get lost in some trivialities. And the world then accepts those trivialities as being extraordinary acts of compassion. They become saints, they become heroes, they become all kinds of idiotic recognitions of silly people. So there is one act, one quality that is supreme and that is compassion with its intelligence. And out of that intelligence there is right action under all circumstances.



# **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1979**

May we continue with what we were talking about last Sunday and go on further into it?

We were saying, weren't we, that the human mind and our way of living is so fragmented, broken up and because human beings make the world into what it is - a chaotic, cruel, confused, frightened world. And we were also saying that self awareness, that is, to know all about oneself, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the deep down and the open mind, so that in knowing oneself completely, and it is possible to know oneself completely, then we can approach the world and ourselves as a whole. Our life, as it is now lived, of which we know very little about ourselves, and perhaps the psychologists, the therapists and the psychoanalysts tell us what we are, but to find out what we are we can't listen to them because they are like us, equally confused, equally uncertain, equally frightened in various different ways. So one has to rely completely on oneself, and not look to another to tell us what to do, including the speaker, naturally.

Can we know ourselves so completely? The wounds, the fears, the anxieties, the uncertainties, the very complex network of pleasures, death, love and if there is a continuity after we die. And also we should be aware and know and understand what is meditation. All that is our life, our education, our jobs, our way of thinking, our beliefs, our experiences, deep strong opinions and so on. All that is our life, with all its struggles, with all its escapes, miseries and so on. Can we know ourselves completely - all that?

Then perhaps it would be possible to approach all our life as a whole, not as fragmented human beings.

So we are going to talk over together this morning whether it is possible, without any guidance from outside, because they have all led us up the garden path, they have all led us to this present state of the world, the politician, the economist, the religious people and the gurus and all the rest of the gang. And it becomes more and more imperative and necessary to find out for ourselves what is right action, irrespective of circumstances? - such action which will not bring about further confusion, regrets, sorrow, more misery and so on.

So can one, each one, know ourselves so completely? Or must we be guided, be prepared to investigate, explore with the help of others? The others however erudite, however knowledgeable, experienced are just like us, psychologically - they have more skill, greater capacity to express themselves and so on. But we are each one, as we pointed out the other day, like the rest of the world, with their sorrows, miseries, confusions, insecurities, intolerable fear and so on. Can one know oneself so completely so that there is not a spot which is not being explored, understood, gone beyond? That is what we are going to talk about together this morning.

Which is: to know oneself, all the movements of thought, the fears, hidden and open, all the pursuits of pleasure, sexual and otherwise. And find out for ourselves what love is. And understand the full significance of not only personal sorrow but also the sorrow of mankind. And also is it possible to understand the final event of our life which is death. All that is our living. And if we are not clear in ourselves whatever we do will bring about further

confusion. So it behoves us, it seems to us so absolutely necessary to find out if we can know ourselves - right? We are going to begin.

Which is: the speaker is not going to investigate and you just merely listen, accepting or denying, but together. Together, think together, if it is possible, because no two people apparently seem to think together. And without pressure, without any form of compulsion, together go into this matter. That demands first of all certain attention, not concentration but a certain quality of deep interest, a mind that is committed to find out, therefore care, freedom to observe - right? That is absolutely obviously necessary. If one has certain prejudices, experiences which one clings to, then we cannot possibly think together, investigate together, or find out. So one must be somewhat free, at least for this morning, so that you begin - one begins to explore - right? We are going first to explore as we did the other day the psychological wounds that one has received from childhood. We went into that the other day.

And this morning we will first begin with fear. The fears that are deeply hidden, of which you are not conscious, know or aware, and those obvious both psychological and physical fears - right? We are following each other? Please we are together, working together. The speaker is not working by himself, talking to himself. Together we are going along the road which might help us if you are interested, if you are serious, if you want to go to the very end of it, investigate this enormous problem of fear.

There is both fear of insecurity, physically, not having jobs, or having jobs, frightened to lose them, the various forms of strikes that are going on in this country and so on and so on. So most of us

are rather nervous, frightened of not being physically completely secure. Obviously. Why? Is it because we are always isolating ourselves as a nation, as a family, as a group and so this slow process of isolation, the French isolating themselves, the Germans and so on and so on and so on, is gradually bringing about insecurity for all of us, which is obvious. So can we observe this, not only outwardly because by observing what is happening outwardly, knowing what exactly is going on, then from there we can begin to investigate in ourselves, otherwise you have no criteria, otherwise one deceives oneself. So we must begin from the outer and work towards the inner - right? It is like a tide that is going out and coming in. It is not a fixed tide, it is moving out and in all the time. I hope you are all following this.

And this isolation which has been the tribal expression of every human being, is bringing about this physical lack of security - right? If one sees the truth of it, not the verbal explanation or the intellectual acceptance of an idea, but if one actually sees this as a fact then one doesn't belong to any group, to any nation, to any culture, to any organized religion because they are all so separative, the Catholic, Protestant, the Hindu and so on and so on. Will you do that, as we are discussing, walking together, drop the things which are false, which are not factual, which have no value whatsoever? Though we think they have value, actually when you observe, nationality breeds wars and all the rest of it. So can we drop that so that physically we can bring about a unity of man? You understand sirs? And this unity of man can only come about through religion, not the phoney religions that we have - sorry, I hope I am not offending anybody. Either the Catholic, the

Protestant, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Arab - you know, all those religions are based on thought, put together by thought, and that which thought has created is not sacred, it is just thought, it is just an idea. And you project an idea, symbolize it, then worship it, and in that symbol, or in that image, or in that ritual there is absolutely nothing sacred. And if one actually observes this then one is free from all that to find out what is true religion, because that may bring us together.

So if we can go into much deeper levels of fear, which is: psychological fears - right? Psychological fears in relationship, one with the other, psychological fears with regard to the future, fears of the past, that is fears of time - right? You are following this, please? We have got a lot to cover this morning. Please, I am not a professor, a scholar delivering a sermon and going back to his rotten life. But this is something which is very, very serious, which affects all our lives, so please give your attention and care. So there are fears in relationship, fears of uncertainty, fears of the past and the future, fears of not knowing, fears of death, fear of loneliness - right? Look at yourselves please, not at the speaker and the words. The agonizing sense of solitude, you may be related to others, you may have a great many friends, you may be married, children, but there is this sense of deep isolation, sense of loneliness. That is one of the factors of fear.

There is also the fear of not being able to fulfil. I don't know whatever that may mean. And the desire to fulfil brings with it the sense of frustration, and in that there is fear. There is fear of not being able to be absolutely clear about everything - right? So there are many, many forms of fear. You can observe your own

particular fear, if you are interested, if you are serious. Because a mind that is frightened, knowingly or unknowingly, can try to meditate - right? - and that meditation only leads to further misery, further corruption, because a mind that is frightened can never see what is truth. Right? So we are going to find out together if it is possible to be totally completely free of fear in all its depth - right?

You know we are undertaking a job which demands a very careful observation: to observe one's own fear. And how you observe that fear is all important - right? Can we go on? How do you observe the fear? Is it a fear that you have remembered and so recall it and then look at it? Or is it a fear that you have had no time to observe and therefore it is still there? Or the mind is unwilling to look at fear? You are following? I wonder if you do. So which is it that is actually happening? Unwilling to look? Unwilling to observe one's own fears because most of us do not know how to resolve them. Either we escape, run away or - you know all the things - analyse, thinking thereby we will get rid of it, but the fear is still there. So it is important to find out how you look at that fear - right? How do you observe fear?

How do you observe fear? This is not a silly question because either you observe it after it has happened, or you observe it as it is happening. Right? For most of us the observation takes place after it has happened - right? Now we are asking whether it is possible to observe fear as it arises - right? That is, you are threatened by another belief, a belief that you hold very strongly, you are frightened about it, there is fear in that - right? Now I am challenging you now. You have certain beliefs, certain experiences, certain opinions, judgements, evaluations and so on,

when one is challenging them there is either resistance, building a wall against it, or you are doubtful whether you are going to be attacked and so fear arises. Now can you observe that fear as it arises - right? Come on sirs. Right? You are following? Are you doing it? Now how do you observe that fear? The word, the recognition of the response which you call fear, because you had that fear previously, the memory of it is stored up, and when the fear arises you recognise it - right? So you are not observing but recognising. I wonder if you see this?

So recognition doesn't free the mind from fear. It only strengthens the fear. Whereas if you are able to observe as it arises then there are two factors taking place in it. One, that you are different from that fear - right? And so you can operate on that fear, control it, chase it away, rationalize it and so on. That is you doing something about that fear - right? That is the way we generally observe. In that there is a division: the me and the fear, so there is conflict in that division. Right? Whereas if you observe that fear is you. You are not different from that fear. I wonder if you get this. If you once grasp the principle of this that the observer is the observed, that the person who says, "I am observing", is separating himself from that which he is observing, whereas the fact is the observer is that fear. Therefore there is no division between the observer and the fear - right? That is a fact.

Then what takes place? Let's first hold it for a minute. Are you all following all this? As we said, are we observing fear through the process of memory, which is recognition, the naming, from that the tradition says, control it, the tradition says, run away from it, the tradition says, do something about it so that you are not

frightened. So the tradition has educated us to say that we, the me, is different from fear - right? So can you be free of that tradition and observe that fear? That is, observe without the thought that has remembered that reaction which has been called fear in the past. It requires great attention - you understand? It requires skill in observation. That is also part of yoga - you understand? It is not merely doing exercises, which is not yoga at all, but the skill in observation. That is, in observing there is only pure perception, not the interpretation of that perception by thought - you understand? Please do it as we are talking about it. Then what is fear? You understand? Now I have observed someone threatening the belief that I hold, the experience that I cling to, the saying "I have achieved" and someone threatens it, and therefore the fear arises. In observing that fear, we have explained it, we have come to the point when you observe without the division - right?

Now, the next question is: what is fear? You are following this? What is fear? Fear of the dark, fear of husband, wife, girl, or whatever it is, fear, artificial and actual and so on, what is fear, apart from the word? The word is not the thing - right? Please, one must recognise this very deeply, the word is not the thing - right? May we go on?

So what is that which we call fear without the word? Or, the word creates the fear. Are you interested in all this? Because if the word creates the fear, the word being the recognition of something that has happened before, which means a word has been given to something that has happened before which we have called fear, so the word becomes important - right? Like the Englishman, the Frenchman, the Russian, the word is tremendously important for



most of us. But the word is not the thing - right? So what is fear? Apart from the various expressions of fear, the root of it? Because then if we can find the root of it then unconscious and conscious fears can be understood. The root, the moment you have a perception of the root, the conscious mind and the unconscious mind have no importance, there is the perception of it - right? What is the root of fear? Fear of yesterday, of a thousand yesterdays, fear of tomorrow - right? Tomorrow death - not for you. Or the fear of something that has happened in the past. There is no actual fear now. Please understand this carefully. If suddenly death strikes one, it is finished. It is over. You have a heart attack and it is finished. But the idea that a heart attack might happen in the future - right? So is fear - please follow this carefully - is fear, the root of it, time? You understand? Time. Time being a movement of the past, modified in the present and going on in the future. This whole movement, is that the cause of fear, the root of it?

We are asking: is thought, which is time, the root of fear? Thought is movement - right? Any movement is time. So I was asking: is the root of fear time? Thought? And if we can understand the whole movement of time - right? - the time psychologically as well as physically, the time that it takes for you to go from here back home, physical time to cover the distance, and the psychological time, which is the tomorrow - right? So is tomorrow the root of fear? Right? Which means can one live - please we are talking about daily living not just theories - can one live without tomorrow? You are following this? Do it. That is, if you have had a pain yesterday, physical pain, to finish with that pain yesterday, not carry it over to today and into tomorrow. You

understand the question? It is the carrying over which is the time that brings fear. I wonder if you can do all this?

So it is totally possible, and absolutely possible that fear, psychological fear can end if you apply what is being said. The cook can make a marvellous dish but if you are not hungry, if you don't eat it, then it remains merely on the menu and of no value. But whereas if you eat it, apply it, go into it for yourself, you will see that fear can absolutely psychologically can come to an end, so the mind is free from this terrible burden man has carried - right?

Then the next question is, which is part of our life, which is pleasure. Right? Are you afraid to tackle it? Because for most of us pleasure is an extraordinarily important thing. Pleasure of possession, pleasure of achievement, pleasure of fame, pleasure of doing something skilfully and so on - pleasure. Sexual, sensory and intellectual. A man who has a great deal of knowledge, he delights in that knowledge. But as we pointed out, with that knowledge also goes ignorance, because knowledge is never complete but he forgets that part and only remembers the knowledge which he has acquired. And in that there is great pleasure - sensory, sexual, romantic, sentimental, intellectual, having experiences, which are sensory. So this whole combination of various elements bring this extraordinary feeling of pleasure - right? Why shouldn't we have pleasure? You understand? Religions throughout the world have said "Don't, only have the pleasure to serve god" - you understand? All your senses, sexual, all that must be dissipated, put away. This is what the organized religions throughout the world have said. We are not saying that. We are saying investigate it, why man, human beings, demand, pursue pleasure - why? Go on sirs. There is the

pleasure, physical pleasure, sexual. Seeing a lovely sunset, seeing the beauty of a mountain, the calm waters of a lovely lake, if you observe it. But having observed it, having seen it and enjoyed it, the mind has a remembrance of that enjoyment and pursues that enjoyment - right? That is the continuation of pleasure: having seen the sunset, taken delight in it, not end it but remember it, and the demand of the previous pleasure to be continued.

So thought - right, you are following this? - thought interferes with that moment of perception, then remembers it, then wants more of it. You have seen all this, sex, you know all about it. The remembrance of it, the picture, the excitement, the whole mechanism of thought operating and pursuing that - right? Why does thought do this? You are following my question? Why does thought take over an incident that is over, remember it and pursue it? The pursuit is the pleasure. You are following this? Why? Why does thought do this? Is it part of our education, part of our tradition, part of our habit, every man does this - better include the woman too because otherwise! Every human being does this, why? Go into it sirs, don't look at me. Why do you pursue pleasure? Is it that that creates isolation? You are following this? Is that what makes for the so-called individual? My pleasure and it is private. All pleasure is private, unless you go to football and all that kind of stuff. Pleasure is private, is that one of the reasons why human beings secretly pursue this pleasure? Because it gives them importance to themselves? You are following all this? Therefore pleasure may be the cause of this tremendous isolation - as a group, as a family, as a tribe, as a nation. I wonder if you see all this?

So when one sees the truth of this, the truth, not the words, not

the intellectual concept, then will thought take over and make it a remembrance? You understand? Or just see the sunset - finish.

Experiment with this and you will see for yourself, if you do it, that thought, as in the case of fear, is the origin, the beginning of this conflict, both of fear and the pursuit of pleasure - right?

Then there is the question - we are dealing with the whole of our life - then there is the question why human beings throughout the world suffer. We are not talking about the physical suffering, that can be dealt with also if the mind is not continually attached, always concerned with itself - you understand? You have had a pain, disease, infirmity of some kind or other. Thought then becomes so concerned - right? And so it identifies itself with that and so the mind itself becomes crippled - right? So can the mind, thought see the infirmity, the disease, the pain - 'Yes' - you follow? Try it, do it, you will find out. When you are sitting in the dentist's chair - the speaker has done for four hours - when you sit down on the dentist's chair and the drill is going on, observe it. You will see, find out. Or look out of the window and see the beauty of the trees so that the mind is capable of observing itself with a detachment - you understand? Oh, you can't do all this.

So we are asking: why do human beings throughout the world suffer, accept suffering and live with it? There have been two wars, terrible, think of the tears that human beings have shed. And their children, their grandchildren support war. So sorrow doesn't teach man apparently - right? We worship sorrow - the Christians do. The Hindus have different explanations for sorrow, for what you have done in the past, past life and so on. I won't go into all that.

So we are asking: what is sorrow? And why man lives with

sorrow? You understand? Find out sirs, give your minds to this. As you give your minds to sex, to jobs, to this or that, give your mind and heart to find out whether man can ever be free from sorrow. Is sorrow part of the egotistic attitude towards life? That is, my son is dead, or my wife has run away, or something or other, to which I am greatly attached, and he is taken away for various reasons, and I suffer. There is grief, there are tears, there is antagonism, there is bitterness, cynicism - why? You understand? Is it I am so caught up in my own problems, I am so self-centred, my son is me - right? Or my daughter is me. I am attached. I hold on. And when that is gone there is a great sense of emptiness, great sense of loneliness, great sense of lack of relationship - right? Is that the reason that one suffers? That is, the son being taken away, death or whatever it is, has revealed to me what I am, my loneliness, my isolation, my lack of real relationship. I thought I was related but it is my son - you follow? So the taking away of the son reveals my condition. Go carefully into this. And I suddenly realize my loneliness, my sense of loss, deprivation of something to which I am greatly attached. The death of the son has revealed to me - right? But that revelation, an awareness of the self, of the me, has revealed before the incident. I wonder if you see this? Right? You are seeing this?

As we said at the beginning of the talk, self awareness. Self awareness is to know one's self, one's attachments, one's loneliness, one's sense of isolation and all that, to know the totality of oneself. The incident of the son reveals that - right? That is, reveals after the incident. But if there is self awareness from the very beginning, taking away the son, the son dying, is what? - Is no longer the sorrow which is brought about through attachment. Right, you

have understood? My mind now accepts it. It is no longer caught in self pity, in the struggle to be free from isolation, taking comfort in a belief, or in this, or that - right? So one sees sorrow exists so long as the self is there. I wonder if you see this? So the total abandonment of the self is the ending of sorrow. Are you following all this? Will you abandon yourselves? No, sirs. Therefore we worship sorrow, or run away from it.

And also we should go together and investigate this whole question of death. Not just for the old people like us, but also for everyone in the world, young, old or middle aged, death is one of the most extraordinary things that happens in life - right? What do you think of it? What is your instinctual response to the word and to the fact? What is death? Death is an ending - right? Please follow this carefully. Ending. Ending voluntarily, you can't argue with death, you can't say, "Please give me another week", you can't discuss, it is there, finished. So can you voluntarily end your attachment, which is death? You understand? Ending is something like death. The ending of a particular habit, not struggle, fight, anguish, end it. If you smoke, if you take drugs, if you drink - that is what is going to happen when you pop off! (Laughter)

So can we voluntarily end - do you understand? - your experiences, your opinions, your attitudes, your beliefs, your gods, end. We are afraid to end - right? To end anything voluntarily. Then you say, "What is there if I end?" That is then you are looking for a reward. You consider then ending as a punishment. So the ending being considered as pain, then you will naturally demand a reward. If I give up that then what? You don't ask that of death.

So can you end and see in that very ending there is the beginning of something new? You understand? That is, one ends attachment - attachment to furniture, people, ideas, beliefs, gods, the whole thing, end. And you end it voluntarily because it is intelligent to end - right? So in that ending a new - this isn't a promise, you understand - a new thing takes place. Try it sirs. That is, while living inviting death which is the ending. You understand? Ending to one's incredible complex way of living. So that the mind because it has ended everything, you understand, do it and you will discover it for yourself, therefore it is always new. New in the sense fresh. You know when you climb a mountain you have to leave all your furniture behind, all your problems, because you can't carry all the furniture that you have collected up the hill. So you let go and you discover for yourself that there is a quality of mind, that being absolutely free, is able to perceive that which is eternal. The word eternal is not an idea, you follow? Eternal means out of time. Death is time. I wonder if you see this?

So the mind that understands this extraordinary mystery - it is a mystery because what we are clinging to is our problems, our furniture, our ideas, all that, we are clinging to that, which is put together by time, and with the ending of that there is something totally... a new dimension. It is up to you. Right. Right sirs.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 2ND SEPTEMBER 1979**

I don't quite know what to talk about. It is a good beginning! I think if we are really serious we will take life as a whole, not just what suits us, what is most convenient, what is most profitable or pleasant, but life is such a complex affair, with all the travail, all the struggle, conflict and a great many pressures and demands on one's life. And we seem to take one particular point of view, or choose what is most satisfactory and pursue that. We never apparently seem to take life as a whole thing - our education, our jobs, our way of living, our relationships, love - whatever that word may mean - perhaps we might go into it this morning - and the possibility of living a very good life.

And religion throughout the ages has played an extraordinarily important part in our life. One may discard it, one may say that is all nonsense, superstition, but man, human beings throughout the world have searched, or enquired if there is something far beyond all this sensory excitement, sensory pleasures, sex and the ordinary routine of life. We have always asked about this. The more one is serious, the more one is delving deeply into one's life, one invariably asks if there is something far greater beyond this existence with its complexities, with its boredom, with its loneliness. And I hope we are serious enough this morning at least that we can go into this.

And if I may ask and point out don't make this place into a resort; something you come here for ten days and make a - you know, all the rest of it. Please don't do it. It is not worth it. There



are other places where you can have a much better time. And if you take drugs and all that, don't come here, it is not worth it.

So how shall we, as human beings, set about this? You understand? How shall we begin to enquire if there is something far greater, something that is really enduring, something that is very, very immovable, something that can't be transient, changing according to circumstances, according to cultures and so on? How does one begin to enquire into this demand which man, human beings throughout the world from time immemorial have sought? - right? Can we go into this together?

If we can, the first thing is to find out how we listen, not only to what others say but to listen to oneself, listen to all the thoughts, all the emotions and the problems and the anxieties, to listen to it, without any kind of distortion, without any kind of direction. Just to listen as you would listen to a beautiful concert. So that one begins to discover as one listens the distortions that mind or thought, in its activity, twists what is actual. You understand? Because thought is always seeking more, so it moves away from the actual.

So could we this morning - as I said I didn't know quite what I was going to talk about - but since we have started on this, could we this morning so listen, not only to the speaker, which is not very important really, but the speaker is only acting as a mirror in which one sees oneself. And when you observe yourself the mirror is not important, then you can break it, throw it away, bury it, whatever you like. So could we, this morning, together investigate into this enormous complex problem of what is the meaning of life and if there is something beyond time, beyond the tomorrow,

beyond the enormous burden of memory? If there is something far greater than mere superficial sensory existence. And to enquire into that we must have a certain quality of freedom; not attached to any particular experience, nor longing or asking something more.

Because then you are already moving away from the actual observation - right? Could we please do this, this morning?

That is, we are enquiring into what is called religion. We have enquired into what is fear, pleasure, suffering and somewhat into the whole question of death. And I think we should also enquire very deeply into this question of what is religion. Because man has lived by that. Man has said, in his search to find out something away from the normal, which is not abnormal, which is not neurotic, something beyond the actual - the actual happening, the actual pain, the actual grief, the actual anxiety, the actual sensory sexual demands and their experiences, if there is something far more. Right? That has been the enquiry of man and that he has called the search for god, search for truth, search for various forms in Asia, which is called Nirvana, Moksha, Liberation and so on and so on - Enlightenment. This has been the constant deep demand of serious people. And in its search he gets caught. He joins one religion, abandons it, then goes to another, abandons that, so he is caught in various traps in his search. By the end of his search when he is about to die he says, "I have found nothing" - you follow? I have been to this guru, that guru, this temple, that church, followed the various cantankerous superstitious priests and so on and so on. At the end of it all as he is about to die he realizes there is nothing, there is nothing but ashes.

So could we in our enquiry, if you are serious, leave all that?

Because all the religions which man has organized or put together by thought, and thought as we went into it the other day, is limited because it is based on knowledge and knowledge is always with ignorance, there is no complete knowledge - right? - therefore there is in it the quality of ignorance and therefore knowledge - thought is born from knowledge, experiences and therefore everlastingly limited. And all the things that thought has created, the churches, the technological advancements, science, literature, painting and the things in the churches, in the temples, in the mosques, are all put there by thought, there is no question about it. You may say the saviour put it there but it is still the movement of thought. And so on. Could we see that very clearly, not verbally, intellectually, or being persuaded, see this fact that all the things that thought has created though illusory is a reality. Wait a bit, I am going to go into this. I am using the word 'reality' in the same sense 'this is real'. The microphone in front of this person is actual, real, you can touch it. And the things that thought has created which he has called religion, and organized that which he calls religion, is an actuality, the ritual is an actuality, the various fanciful robes they put on are actual, so it is real. And the symbols, the ideas, are actual - aren't they? - as well as illusions, because thought has created illusions. You are following all this?

So illusions, fanciful ideas, all the rituals, everything that thought has put together is actual. The guns, the submarines, going to the moon, and so on and so on are all actual realities. But that reality is created by thought - right? Thought has not created nature. So nature is actual, real but it is not the product of thought, but thought can use the nature, making a chair, which becomes a

reality.

So in going into this matter of what is religion, if there is something beyond, one must distinguish between the actual, the reality, in that is included illusions - right, you are following all this? - and nature. Those are all realities but thought has not created nature. So if one is very clear on that matter then we can proceed to find out: this human search for something infinite, beyond time, is that man-made, thought-made, or is there something which is not the product of thought? You are following all this? Please, we are investigating together. Please bear in mind this central fact all the time, that we are examining together. You are not accepting what the speaker is saying. He has no authority whatsoever. Therefore we are both of us seriously committed to this enquiry. You may drop off in the middle of it. That is equally right. But when once you start enquiring, go as far as you can. Probably one's own minds are not strong enough, clear enough. That is why I said at the beginning one has to listen to oneself, where one is blocked, where one is attached to an experience, to a desire and so on. So one must put aside those if you are enquiring. And in that enquiry there must be freedom to observe. You can't say, "Well, I believe in god or Jesus, or Krishna" - or whatever it is, in enquiry you can't. That is playing tricks. You can play tricks upon yourself but when you are enquiring seriously you must play the game.

So is there something that is not produced by thought - right? Which means: is there something which is beyond time? Please go slowly, we are going to enquire. We are accustomed to the idea of evolution, physical evolution first of all. That is, the seed, the acorn

producing the oak, it takes infinite time, a great many years. And that same concept or actuality is taken over psychologically. That is, psychologically one must have time to learn, to understand - right? - to capture that which is much more advanced. So we are used to the idea of evolution, time - right? So we must be very clear if there is psychological time at all. There is physical time. Please you must give attention to this a little bit if you are interested in the enquiry. There is physical time from here to go to that house it takes exactly three minutes. So time is necessary physically to cover from a certain point to another certain point. That is time to cover the distance.

Now we have taken over that concept, that conclusion psychologically. I am ignorant, one is ignorant, one doesn't know, I don't know myself, I need time. Now time is psychologically put there by thought. Do you actually need time to be free say, for example, of greed? I am taking that as an example. Do you actually need time? That is, several days, time being the future. Do you need the future, time, to be free of jealousy, whatever it is, anxiety, greed, envy? Do you need time actually? No, no, don't shake your head. But we are used to that. When I say, "I will get over it" - the will is time. You understand? I wonder if you do. Don't be so dazed.

So it is our habit, our tradition, our way of living to say, "I will get over my anger, my jealousy, my sense of inadequacy" and so on and so on. So the mind has become accustomed psychologically to the idea of time, that is tomorrow, or many tomorrows. Now we are questioning that. You understand? We are saying that is not necessary. Time is not necessary to be free of greed - right? That

is, if you are free of time and you are greedy there is no tomorrow. You attack it. You act, you do something immediately. I don't know if you are following all this? So psychologically thought has invented time as a means of avoiding, as a means of postponing, as a means of indulging in that which it already has. I don't know if you are following all this - right? So thought psychologically has invented time out of laziness and so on and so on.

Now, can you be free of the idea of tomorrow, psychologically? Please do go into it, look at it. Take your own anxiety, or whatever it is, your sexual indulgence, if you want that, or if you think through certain sensory activity you will reach whatever you want to reach, which is, the reaching is the movement of time. Can you see the truth of it and the very perception of that ends it? I wonder if you have got this? Right? Are you doing it as we are talking? Or is it just an idea?

So the mind has enquired into time, which is very complicated, we are making it very brief, that the concept that tomorrow is a means to an end psychologically is illusory. Therefore there is only perception and action without the interval of time. I wonder if you get this? I - one sees the danger of nationalism, the danger, because of wars and so on, the very perception is the action and the ending of the feeling of being attached to a particular group. Right? Are you doing it? When every evening the television says, 'British, British, British' or the French and French and French, whenever one is in France, and so on. To see that this division brings disaster and then "Give me time to be free from the conditioning which I have had from childhood, that I am British" - or this, or that - to see that without the idea of time and therefore action. You are

following this? I wish you would do this. Therefore that ends conflict - you understand? The struggle that I must be free. We are together in this somewhat? I see you are not because this demands really a very serious mind, a mind that says, "I want to find out".

So meditation is the ending of time - you understand? Because that is what we have done just now, we have meditated, we have meditated to find out the nature of time. Time is actual, necessary to go from here to there, but psychologically time doesn't exist. To discover that is a tremendous truth, tremendous fact, because we have broken away from all the traditions - you understand? Tradition says take time, wait, you will reach god if you do this, this, that. And also it means hope, the ending of hope. You understand? I wonder if you understand this? According to Dante's Inferno, it means the ending of hope - you understand? Whereas we are saying hope implies the future. That is, one is depressed, anxious, hopeless sense of inadequacy, give me hope to advance, to learn, to be free. So when you see that there is psychologically no future, then you are dealing with facts, not with hopes. I wonder if you see this? Because hope is time - right?

So what we have done in the enquiry into time is the beginning of meditation. It is part of meditation. And to find out if there is something beyond time - beyond time, one mustn't carry any problems with us - right? - because we are burdened with problems - right? Aren't we? Personal problems, collective problems, international problems, and so on. Why do we have problems? Please ask yourself: why do you have problems? - sexual, imaginary, problems of not having jobs and so on, problems of inadequacy, problems of saying "I want to reach heaven and I

can't", and all the rest of it - you know, problems. Why do you have them? Is it possible - please listen - is it possible to live a life without a single problem? You understand what that means? As each issue arises to dissolve it instantly, not carry it over. The carrying it over, which is the movement of time, creates the problem. I wonder if you see this? Right? If I have a problem - if one has a problem, first of all why has one a problem? What is a problem? A problem is something which you have not understood, resolved, finished with, but which you worry over, you are concerned, you cannot understand it and you struggle and struggle day after day, day after day, day after day. So the mind is crippled by this process - do you understand? So if there is no time - do you understand - there is no problem. I wonder if you see this? Do you really see this, actually in your heart, not up here in your mind, but in your heart, do you see that the man or the woman who has problems is caught in time? But as an issue arises if the mind is free of time it deals with it instantly, finished. I wonder if you see this. The moment you have the idea of time say, "I will resolve it", "I will take time". The movement away from the fact is the problem. Are you all asleep?

So if we are to enquire into this there must be no problem whatsoever, which is, the mind must be free to look. Right?

A problem arises when our relationships are not understood - right? Whether it is intimate, or impersonal. Why have we not understood relationship and seen the depth of it and the futility of it and go on with it. But apparently we have never resolved this problem of relationship - right? You know all about it, don't you? Why? Is it you love and you are not loved? Is that a problem?



Come on sirs. It is, it is a problem. Or you love and the other doesn't love - right? Or in your relationship with another you are possessive, you are dominant, you know, dependent, you want something from her or from him, sex, pleasure, comfort.

Somebody said to me the other day, to the speaker the other day, "If I leave who will wash my clothes?" Do you understand? I wonder if you understand all this?

So what is relationship, out of which we have made such a tremendous problem? It is to be related to another - relationship means related to another. To one or to many, or to the whole of mankind - right? To the one, or many or to the whole of mankind - you understand? Oh, you don't! Why is there not in this relationship peace? A depth of understanding of each other which brings about love - do you understand? Why isn't there? The relationship between two people, man, woman, with their sex is called love - right? Right? Oh, for god's sake don't let us be hypocrites, let's face these things. It is called love and is it love? Or is it the demand of sensory satisfaction, the demand of companionship, the demand which is born out of loneliness, the demand that says "I cannot be alone. I cannot stand this immense solitude in myself, therefore I must have somebody on whom I can depend" - psychologically only. You need the postman, the porter and all the rest of it, but psychologically in relationship between man and woman why is there this tremendous division - you understand? And is one aware of this? Aware of this great division between you and another, whom you say you love. Do we have to go into that, is it necessary? Apparently it is, all right.

Have you noticed between two people their thinking, their

feeling are never the same - right? One is ambitious, the other is not, one is aggressive, the other is not, one is possessive, the other is not, one is dominant and the other is docile, which means what? Each one is self-centred in his activity - right? Are you following? Observe yourself. Self-centred in yourself and the other too is self-centred so there is division. Where there is division there must be quarrels, there must be antagonism, there must be all kinds of things going on between nationality, when there is division there is chaos - right? And this division we call love - right? You don't face it.

So in enquiring into something beyond time there must be complete sense of relationship, which can only come about when there is love - right? Love is not pleasure, obviously. You cheapen it - right? Love is not desire, love is not the fulfilment of your own sensory demands. Are you following all this?

So without love, do what you will, stand on your head and sit in meditation for the rest of your life cross-legged, put on fancy robes, do anything you like, without that quality there is nothing. So if the person wants to find something beyond time there must be right relationship completely so that no problems exist. And this quality of great affection, love, which is not the result of thought - right? - that must exist.

Then we can proceed to find out. See how difficult it is. Because most of us are so indulgent with ourselves, most of us are so petty - right? - so small in our outlook. So your mind must be free from all this self-centred anxious movements - right? Because that creates the problem, and when the mind has problems it cannot possibly see clearly. The mind that is everlastingly chattering, such

a mind is not a quiet mind - right?

Then the problem arises: how am I to stop chattering - you understand? Listen to that very carefully. You realize your mind is chattering, then you say, "How am I to stop it?" The moment you have put the question you are already entered into the time element. I wonder if you see that. Yes? So the 'how' means time, and because you ask the 'how' the other fellow invents the system, invents the method, the practice, put on the yellow robe, blue robe, or whatever it is. So see the mind chattering and you are not different from that chattering. Your mind is chattering and your mind is you. So when you have that principle, that actual truth that you and the problem are one, you and the chattering are one, then all your effort to change it comes to an end. Then you are facing the fact that your mind is chattering, that you are chattering. So when you so observe what takes place? In that observation you have brought all your energy to observe. That energy has been dissipated by saying, "How am I to stop it?" You understand this? I wonder if you understand this? Can we go on?

So the problem is: can the mind, that is, the mind being the senses, the feelings, the reactions, the emotions, the intellect, all that is the mind - right? Can that mind, including the brain, can that mind be absolutely quiet? You understand my question? Because that is part of meditation, to bring about, as people try to do, to bring about through various systems, methods, controls and so on, so the mind is absolutely quiet because it is only when the mind is quiet completely that you can hear, that you can see. So there are various forms of meditation - the Tibetan, Hindu, the nonsensical T. M. meditation - you know, Transcendental Meditation, a nice word

spoilt, isn't it? Transcendental is ruined by this cheap nonsense. All these various forms of meditation have tried, through control, through relaxation, through self-hypnosis, by repetition, repetition, to bring about a quiet mind, which means - listen to it - which means allowing time to bring this. You understand? One's mind is not quiet now but I will practise, I will control, I will be aware and through time it will come about - right? But when there is the understanding of the truth that time is illusory, you can't change it, time will not change - you understand - then you are faced with the fact that your mind is chattering.

When you are observing a fact completely with all your energy the fact changes. You will see, if you do it you will see it. Because you have brought your energy into the observation, and that energy has been dissipated when you are trying to change 'what is'. Look, I will show you! Human beings are violent - right? - for various reasons, we won't go into it for the moment. And human beings have invented non-violence - right? The non-violence is a non-fact - are you following this? The fact is violence but when you try to pursue non-violence you are pursuing a non-fact and also pursuing, allowing time. And when you realize time does not change, bring about change, then you are faced with the fact, which is violence. Not how to change it. There is this fact of violence. Now can the mind observe this fact of violence without any direction, without any pressure, just to observe it? You understand? Observe it. In that observation the mind has pulled together all its energy - right? So that energy is like light, focused on the thing called violence and that violence dissipates. Don't go to sleep please.

In meditation, which is to bring about a mind that is absolutely

quiet, any form of effort is futile - right? I wonder if you understand this? To make an effort to meditate which means time, which means struggle, which means achieving something which you have projected. So can there be an observation without effort? Without control? Please listen carefully. I am using the word 'control' with a great deal of hesitation because we live in a permissive society - right? And one does what one likes, the more idiotic the better, drugs, sex, putting on clothes that are so meaningless - you follow? The sloppiness of it all. And the speaker is using the word 'control' in the sense when there is pure observation there is no need to control. Don't deceive yourself by saying, "I am observing purely therefore I have no control" and indulge yourself, which becomes nonsensical. Unless you hear carefully that a mind that is under control, that control brought about by thought, that thought being limited and out of its limitation it is desiring something, and therefore it says, "I must control", such a mind has become a slave to an idea - you understand? - not to a fact, to a concept, to a conclusion. Like those religious people who believe very strongly about something or rather, they are incapable of talking about anything else, thinking freely. The speaker was once travelling in India, in a train, and there was a European, an Englishman in fact, and a very learned Indian was in the same compartment. The Englishman was telling the Indian that their religion was all nonsense, stupid - you know, went on at him, for some time. And the Indian said, politely, "But you also have your beliefs, don't you? You believe in Christ and in the Virgin Mary". "Oh," he said, "that is a fact" - (Laughter). That is the end of the conversation. And most of us are that way.

So we are saying: a mind that is in conflict, either brought about through control, through will, which is desire, a mind that has problems, a mind that has not resolved relationship and therefore no love, such a mind is incapable of going beyond. You understand? It can only go to what it thinks is beyond within its own circle. And it might invent that it is going beyond, but it is not. Right? So if we are serious, if we have come to this point, that the mind, all the senses, the brain and all the things that man has been caught in are put aside because there is this tremendous sense of love with its intelligence, then we can proceed to find out - right?

That means a mind that is quiet, not only physically quiet but the quietness is not necessarily sitting in a certain position, you can lie down, do what you like but the body must be absolutely quiet - right? Uncontrolled because then you impose and there is conflict. And the mind being free and therefore absolutely quiet can observe. It is not "I am observing" - you understand? Then if there is 'I observing' there is duality, there is separation but there is only observation without the 'I'. I wonder if you see all this? The 'I' is made up of many things, past remembrances, past experiences, past problems, present problems, anxiety, the 'I', that is me, that is you. If we have gone that far the 'I' is now absent - you understand? It is not 'I' who is observing but there is only observation.

Then what takes place? You understand sirs, this is real meditation now, what we have done. The sense of enquiry into your self, self awareness, knowing all its problems, knowing all the desires, pressures, conflicts, sorrow, pain, all that, be aware of all that. And that awareness can only come into existence when you are observing your reactions in relationship - right? You can't

observe yourself by just going off and sitting under a tree. You can somewhat observe it but it is only in relationship all your reactions arise. So the mind is now in a state where there is no problem, no effort, no control, and essentially no will, because will is the essence of desire. I don't know if you have got it? Right? I will, I want, I must. That is, desire demanding something which is in time - right? And to achieve that I must exercise will to gain it. So the mind is free of all that.

If you have gone that far then what is there? Man has sought something sacred - right? Something holy, something imperishable, incorruptible, timeless - it doesn't matter what. And he says, "I have worked, I have taken my life, I have understood my life completely, now what is there?" You understand? What more, what is there beyond? Because all search must end too - you understand? Because the moment you are seeking how do you know what you find? You understand what I am asking? You are seeking - god, truth, or whatever it is you are seeking - it may be your own pleasure, it may be your own sexual urges, it may be your own ending to certain problems and so on, you are seeking. In that search is implied several things. First of all when you find it you must recognise it - right? In that search it must be satisfactory, if not you will throw it out. It must answer all your problems, and it won't because the problems are created by yourself. So the person who says, "I am seeking" is really quite unbalanced, because he is playing tricks upon himself. So all that now is totally in abeyance, finished. Then the mind is absolutely quiet in pure observation. Now anything beyond that is merely a description - you understand? Is merely putting together words to convey something

which is incommunicable - you understand?

So all that one can do is not to describe that but to meet another with the same capacity, with the same intensity, at the same level - you understand what I am talking about? What is love? It is to meet another with the same intensity, at the same level, at the same time. You understand? Isn't it? That is love. I am not talking of physical love, I am talking of love, which is not desire, it is not pleasure, to meet somebody with the same intensity - right? - with the same sense of time and with the same passion. That is love.

Now if there is that love in another and you have this quality of mind which is silent there is communication - right? - without words. That is a communication which is really communion, complete sharing of something which is not capable of being put into words. The moment you put it into words it is gone because the word is not the thing.

So at the end of these talks, four talks and two question and answers, where are we? Where is each one of us with regard to what you have heard, what you have learned, what you have seen for yourself? Are they just mere words for your to carry? Or is there a deep fundamental change so that you are free of all your problems, free of fear and there is that perfume which can never die, which is love. And out of that action, from that comes intelligence and action - do you understand? Right sirs.



# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST SEMINAR MEETING 13TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: I'm a bit nervous. I think we all know each other, don't we? At least you know me. And perhaps we'll meet each other after the meeting here.

We chose a subject to discuss or to talk over together during this Seminar. And I hope everyone will talk, not just two or three of us but everyone of us will partake in our discussions or talks or dialogues. The subject is: we live in a world of increasing violence, and disorder, what can I, as a human being, do to change this? Does it interest all of you, this question? We chose this question because it affects not only the people here but also we were thinking about India and all the people concerned there, Europe, and America. This would be a question that would apply to all people.

So shall I read it once more or you have already read it all?

QUESTIONER: I think we've read it.

K: All right. So how shall we begin. There is the subject: what shall I do as a human being in a world that is steadily deteriorating, declining, in violence, terror and a great deal of confusion, in all the fields of life. What shall we do? What shall I, as a human being, concerned with the world, and naturally with myself, what is my action, not a rare action but a continuous daily action, what shall I do?

How do we approach this question? What is your manner of approach to a question of this kind? Do I approach it, 'I' means each one of us, do I approach it with an already formed opinion or

conclusion or point of view? Or have I my own problems, my own difficulties that I cannot possibly be concerned with the world. You understand my question?

I may be having difficulties with my family, my wife, keeping a job, earning a livelihood, you know, my son and daughter are becoming so neurotic, drug ridden, and I quarrel with my husband, wife and so on, so I'm only concerned with that, with my problem, and I'm not really greatly concerned with what is happening in the world. The world doesn't interest me so much. Or the world is so imminent, so pressing, I am only concerned with the world and not with myself. You understand? How do we approach this question?

Q: Sir, the problem is so enormous that one's left paralysed.

K: I know, the problem is enormous and leaves one paralysed. So what shall I, all the same, if one is paralysed, one is finished, there's no more answer to it. One has the enormous problem, enormous crisis, and how do I approach it - first let's come to that, take that question and go into it. How does one, or you or I, approach this question? Because however I approach it may decide the quality of my attention, the quality of my enquiry, investigation and so on.

So I think it's important before we start discussing this question, how do I or you approach this problem.

Q: It must be from compassion.

K: Not must be - how do you approach it. If you say 'must', that becomes an idea, a future thing. I'm not trying to push you down, sir, but if I say 'I must, it should be' or 'if it were' it's a conditional approach, and therefore your approach will dictate your investigation.

So I'm just asking, how do we, each one of us, approach this question. Perhaps in the approach may be the real quality of investigation. I think one should be very clear before we start discussing this question.

Q: I have to look at the environment in my own daily life.

K: So you are not concerned with the world.

Q: By looking at that...

K: No. I don't know if I'm making my question clear or not.

How do I approach a problem, any problem?

Q: Isn't it important to question the presupposition, the assumptions that seem to be implicit in the way the question was phrased, because the question seems to imply that the violence is in the world external to us. That seems to require some questioning, where the violence is.

K: Is that your approach sir? Now what's your approach, Peter?

How do you approach the question?

Q: I feel rather hopeless.

K: You see, you've already, when you say, "I feel hopeless," you've already - it's no problem, it's hopeless, finish.

Q: Well, that's the way I'm feeling...

K: Is that your approach?

Q: I felt that until now I will not fight, I will not go into a war for that or for some idea, and just escaping...

K: So your approach is to escape.

Q: Yes.

K: Will that solve the problem? We are discussing this, it's not just that I'm opposing you. Will that solve the problem? If I escape from the world into some monastery, into some Utopian concepts

and you know, all the rest of it, run after some guru and all that, will that solve the problem?

Q: I ask myself what is the relevance between the proposition that violence in the world, when there is a violence that I find in myself, what is the relevance, where do these two meet, do I see it? Intellectually one may see this, but does one really see it from the inside instead of just a proposition.

K: Sir, is there a problem at all, for each one of us?

Q: Am I really concerned about it?

K: Yes, is it a problem, is it something I've got to resolve?

Q: Yes, it is.

K: Or is it something I can't resolve therefore I lose all hope and I don't care. As long as I have a little money, I just wither away.

Q: We've got to do something.

K: No. Is it a problem, as hunger, a lack of money, as sex, it doesn't matter, a problem which has got to be resolved?

Q: Can we look at how all that has come into being?

K: That we can enquire, how all this mess has come about, after you are really serious, if you really want to solve it. I don't know if I'm making myself clear. That's why I'm asking - sir, sitting a little higher doesn't mean the chairmanship or anything in authority, I'm sitting a little higher because it's a little more convenient for everybody to see the speaker, I'm not the Pope.

Q: Can I just ask, I think it's not so much that I approach the thing with passion so much as with a great drive, some kind of energy, and I feel a little bit as though I've got myself into some very deep water.

K: Yes, sir. I have energy, if it is something that I've got to do.

Q: Well, it's not so much that it's something that one has got to do, I mean, I don't know how one can tell what's a violent action and what's not.

K: We're coming to that.

Q: It seems to me there's so much total disorder in the whole sphere.

K: I know, but we'll come to the understanding and the resolution of it if I say it is to me an intense, demanding, immediate problem. You follow what I mean? That may drive me.

Q: Sir, I was talking outside with Brian just now, I said this is not a problem to me, really.

K: Why? Why isn't it a problem?

Q: Sir, I think that that urgency comes second, you know - the first time that question is posed, I think we would have to see the nature of that problem, we would have to see, is it just the violence that is in Cambodia, ten thousand miles away or we have to see the nature of that violence and our relationship to it before we can muster any passion to look at it.

K: Are you saying, sir, we must examine in detail what is happening in the world, the violence or the cause of that violence?

Q: No, I'm suggesting that we would have to take a look at the nature of the violence in the world, we would have to see how we are related to it, before we could add any passion to...

K: I'm not even asking for passion - is this a problem? Peter says it is not a problem.

Q: If someone doesn't feel that it's related to them, it is not a problem to them.

K: Why?

Q: Because they might not see that it is related to them. But if that violence is part of their daily life...

K: No. he says, it's not a problem. And I'm saying, "Why?" Are you blind? You know - sorry - I'm not being personal. Are you blind, are you insensitive or don't you know, even read a paper headlines - everything indicates it. And I say to somebody who says, "I'm really not, it doesn't concern me", what's happened to you?

Q: Peter has come from Brazil and he has said that the violence there disturbs him greatly, he's come here to try to find out what is the cause of it, how he can respond, do anything about it. So I think he's under-estimating or not saying correctly what he's thinking.

K: In Brazil, appalling things are happening there.

Q: That is what he says.

K: They are murdering poor Indians and all kinds of things are going on there.

Q: But when the problem manifests itself as being so vast, don't we tend to want to push it away and pretend that it's maybe not there, so we say I don't care about it, when in actual fact we just don't know how to maybe deal with it.

K: Is this a problem for any of us?

Q: Yes It is.

K: Or is it a problem which is insolvable, so we give up? Or retreat into some kind of nice, comfortable corner and forget the rest? Am I, are you, concerned with this problem, first, that's all - and if it is a problem to each one of us, except perhaps one or two here, then how do I approach the problem?

Q: To me it seems the only thing I do want is really to quarrel

when I'm angry, have a continuous quarrel, you know, like strike. And whatever makes it strike I let go.

K: But whatever disturbs you, you let go.

Q: Whatever is creeping across it.

K: But you're not answering my question, sir. Why as a human being, living in this world, whether in Brazil or Chile or Russia or here, there is violence, tremendous disorder. And we say I'm not concerned. Then I say, "Why? Why as a human being I'm not concerned with the things that are happening around us."

Q: Isn't it, sir, because we don't see the nature of that violence and how it touches, and how we are related to it, how it affects us, how we participate in it?

K: All right then let's discuss what is our relationship to the world. Right?

Q: And to that violence.

K: Yes, to the world, to the world that is in disorder, deteriorating, violence, terror, kidnapping and all the rest of it.

Q: Aren't they the products of something that is more the confusion that creates that, isn't that when it's the final thing, the violence, and something comes first, confusion within ourselves in our living.

K: No, as Scott pointed out, what is my relationship to the world. If the world is that, what's my relationship with it.

Q: Dorothy has used, confusion, because physical violence if we separate it out from mental violence, physical violence is the result of confusion. And confusion arises out of intellectual idiocy in some cases, believing things which are not necessarily truths. And any problem, whether it is the problem we are addressing

ourselves to at this particular time or any other problem, is summed up in what happens in each skull, so that we are all... and it resolves around this central thing, confusion, which we all do, holding on to things which perhaps we should let go and therein lies the seeds of violence, not holding onto, but being prepared to let go in order to find something else.

K: Yes, sir, but have you, have we answered that question of Mr. Scott's, saying, what is my relationship to the world?

Q: Then we are all in a state of confusion.

K: Yes, but what is my relationship to all that is happening? In the Arab world, what's my relationship to all this?

Q: I think if one is paying attention one sees in a thousand ways in the course of the day how circumscribed one is.

K: No, you're not answering - are we answering the question, sir? I may misunderstand. Have I? Have we established for ourselves what is our relationship to the world?

Q: I think our relationships are also violent, it is of the same nature.

Q: Is it the same question, Krishnaji, to ask how do we participate in the world?

K: If you like to put it that way. Who has created this awful mess?

Q: We have to accept responsibility.

K: No, wait, sir - who has created it?

Q: We have.

K: Human beings have created it. Right? Whether they live in India or Russia or America or here, we human beings have created this mess. And what's my relationship to that?



Q: I am that. I'm part of it.

Q: We don't normally see that, we always attribute it to somebody else outside.

K: Are you answering my question? Sir - you may be but I may be deaf or not - are you answering my question?

Q: Are we really in relation, sir, or do we feel different from the world.

K: That's all I'm asking. Is the world, that's happened there, different from me?

Q: In our attitude it is. In our present attitude, it is.

K: In our present attitude it is. So let's examine that, shall we? Is that your attitude? That the world is totally different from me?

Q: I don't feel it so keenly. What is out there and what is happening close...

K: No, we're asking the question, sir - is the world different from me? The world, the scientific world, the world of misery, confusion, all that's going on, sir, in the world - is it different from me, something out there which I have nothing to do with?

Q: I think we do from time to time only realize when there is something very serious happening.

K: We are serious here.

Q: Then we realize, it touches us, we start crying to see all this misery. But then we lose sight of it, our daily life makes us lose sight of it.

K: We lost sight of this and we say, "I am different from the world." is that it?

Q: No, I don't think so.

K: Sir, let's just look at it.

Q: We do everything we can to protect ourselves.

K: So you are saying, we are different from the world.

Q: But we don't see it.

K: All right. We seem to think we are different from the world.

And very rarely we think we are the world. Is that it? Sometimes we think we are the world, and sometimes the world is totally different from us. Right?

Q: That's the truth.

K: Is that your approach? Is that your approach?

Q: No sir, we are part of the world, we are in it.

K: Yes, but is that a fact?

Q: It is.

K: A burning reality, which says, "I am the world."

Q: We are deluding ourselves that we are separate. We are always part of it, whether we like it or not.

K: So why do we lose the sight or the understanding, or the reality that we are the world, why do we lose sight of that?

Q: But what does it mean when you say, "You are the world."

K: What, sir?

Q: When you say you are the world, I mean, it means you are full of all that rubbish that's out there and violence, as well as all...

K: Wait - aren't we? You see, that's...

Q: In one sense, I like to be important, I am caught in sexual things, I'm afraid of losing my security, in that sense I feel like everybody else. But then I say I'm not joining the Army, I'm not shooting around, I would rather be shot than do that, in that sense then I stop feeling I am different, although you see its confused.

K: The Army is created by us, because we are nationalistic.

We'll answer all those questions, sir, but first, if one may be clear, what are we talking about? We're asking, how do you approach this question - the question is, in the world there is disorder, disintegration, decay going on, confusion, all the rest of it, and what am I to do? That's the question.

Q: I have to approach the question with my present attitude of mind. Unless I am clear about this.

K: All right, sir, what is your present attitude, sitting in this room, what is your present attitude?

Q: Sometimes one feels closer in relating to the things that are happening, the things that one does understand when one has suffered violence in one form or another, oneself, but then preoccupation of our usual daily demands comes in and we no longer feel with the depth of being actually related with the world. This is the fact, not what should be.

K: So you are saying, in this room, at the present time, I really don't feel so completely identified or realize that the world is me.

Q: Right.

K: That's all, otherwise we will go off. Is that what you all feel?

Q: No, it is not what we all feel, I don't think.

Q: Then what do you feel, sir?

Q: I feel vastly involved, tremendously involved in the world, and part of that confusion manifests itself in me. I am that confusion.

K: So the world, being confused, that confusion is manifested in you.

Q: Yes.

K: Just a minute. That violence, that disorder is showing that in

yourself. Right? So you are different from the world.

Q: No, I'm caught in it.

K: No, sir, just a minute. If that can be manifested in you, then you are clean, healthy, and that manifests. Or is it the other way round?

Q: The feeling that you can do something about it, which is also different from...

K: Yes, sir, the moment when you say, "I can do something about it", you are different from that.

Q: Right

K: You see, that's why I think we ought to be very clear in our discussion, whether the world, with all the things that are going on, is different from you, and you, being different, by some curious process that world manifests itself in you.

Q: Why am I so gullible?

K: One might say for various reasons. Indifference, education, your own particular job which occupies all your time and energy. And you have very little time to consider what is happening in the world, so you are gradually enclosed. So you say, I can't, I don't care what happens. One must come back over and over again. All right. What shall I do in front of this?

Q: Well, if I do find it difficult to accept the fact that I am part of the world...

K: I'm not - what shall I do?

Q: ...I have to examine my relationship to it. What are my contributions to that confusion.

Q: Sir, the problem is not the world but the problem. You see what I mean, it isn't the world that arises out of the non-resolution

of the problem. In a sense, all the conflict that is taking place in the world, the battling and destruction etc. arises out of problems not being resolved, that is, not being considered accurately, in the first place.

Q: Do we have to approach it that way? Can we approach it, what we should not do.

K: What, sir?

Q: What we should not do about it, just see this disorder, this world, we cannot approach it directly.

K: I can't hear.

Q: We should be concerned with what we should not do.

K: No, before what we should do or should not do, is it a problem? Sorry.

Q: We seem to be implying if it's not a problem it's because we think we are different from the world, so we have some mistaken idea about who we are, so it seems we should begin by straightening out that problem.

K: Scott, is it as much a problem to you, to us, as when you have a toothache, and you have got to go to the dentist. The pain drives you, the pain makes you act. And you put up with extra pain because of more pain. Now is this problem as acute as that for each one of us, or is it something casual, to be casually discussed without, you know, putting some vitality and energy into it. That's all my first question.

Q: I would say no, it's not the same.

K: So if it is not, why?

Q: Could it not be because we have some mistaken idea about who we are, that we are separate, that we are individuals.

K: Is that it?

Q: Sir, if somebody threatens you with violence, then it's a real problem, to you at that time. If somebody is threatening somebody else with violence, it's not a problem, unless they are your close friend.

K: So it becomes a problem if you are personally involved. Otherwise it's no problem. Right? It would be a problem if you lived in the Middle East, if you were a P.L.O. or the other, then it would be a problem. Is that what we're saying. As long as it doesn't touch you personally it's no problem.

Q: If it does touch one personally, the mind tends to particularize it.

Q: So what do you mean by touching personally - do you mean going through your mind?

K: No, touch you, somebody comes and hits you, somebody comes and tears down your house.

Q: But that is a different problem. To me it's a fact that we are profoundly connected to what is happening in the world, whether we see it or not. Somebody hits me on the head and that's a problem, another one, but that we are profoundly connected to everything that's happening is a fact and not a question of...

K: So is it a personal problem to you, this?

Q: It must be.

K: Not must be - is it a problem to me?

Q: What is a problem, sir? Why is it so important to say it is a problem, or is it not a problem?

K: Goodness!

Q: We somehow isolate or insulate ourselves from things that

really do affect us because we're part of the world but we put our heads in the sand and say, no, it is not very close to me individually.

Q: I think our education, upbringing is doing that, that is the problem. We're taught to think only personally and that creates the problems.

K: Apparently to that gentleman it's not a problem.

Q: I think it is, I think that's what he is saying.

K: You think it is but he doesn't think so.

Q: I feel that the turmoil in me is the turmoil outside. Now if you call that a problem or - I don't know what you mean by the word 'problem'.

K: Sir, I don't know if you heard the question, the first question. The questioner says, not the questioner, we worked it out, the question is, "What am I to do, living in this chaotic, destructive decaying world, what is my responsibility, what am I to do?"

Q: Survival, it seems to me, is the only thing that one can go for.

K: What?

Q: Survival.

K: Is that what you're just concerned with, just survival?

Q: Sir, you said to begin with austerity.

Q: I think the problem is that we don't know what to do, that we are utterly unable to do anything. I think we all feel concerned but then we don't know what to do.

K: Are you saying that it is such a colossal, complex problem that I can't do anything about it?

Q: I feel unable to do anything.

K: Unable. I'm not sure, let's find out. Don't say it is hopeless, and give it up.

Q: No, but there is a barrier, I can't do anything.

K: Let's find out, if we can't remove that barrier.

Q: Isn't our guilt one of those barriers, because we participate with that violence via the television, constant television, so we are sort of precluded from doing something because we are guilty.

Q: Sir, if someone threatens to beat me up, then it's a real problem and I have to do something. If somebody threatens to beat somebody else up, then it's not a real problem to me, I can be intellectually concerned about the problem.

K: Yes, sir, I understand that.

Q: And I find it is not the same.

K: So you're saying, this thing is something happening to somebody else, not to me.

Q: Of course.

K: Wait, sir, let's pursue that one thing - it is happening out there, it doesn't concern me, but if it concerns me, personally, then I'll do something about it. Is that what you're saying? Which means, as long as you leave me alone, as long as I've a little corner safe and comfortable, I don't mind, I've nothing to do with that. But the moment my comfort, my security is touched, I will do something. Is that what you're all saying?

Q: I think that's the problem, yes.

Q: Sir, taking this gentleman's example, if somebody else is doing violence to somebody else, and I am watching, one can see that violence leads to violence, it can't just stop, it's a very rare occasion when violence stops.



K: I understand, sir.

Q: It will inevitably be part of me.

K: So all that you have said so far, if I have understand right, as long as it doesn't touch me, it's no problem.

Q: It's...

K: Wait.

Q: It's an intellectual problem - I can explain, I understand the reasons for the violence in the world, it's a problem, intellectually, but it's not the same quality when somebody is threatening me.

K: That's right. And that's what I'm saying the same thing - as long as it doesn't touch me, then what is happening there and being concerned with that becomes an intellectual problem. That's what you're saying. Is that so for all of us?

Q: Sir, that question of yours is so profound, one of the troubles that is going on in Ireland, if I may mention that, is that the violent people of Ireland feel that the British people will not concern themselves about the problems over there. And that really is the question which is going on here. We're really not concerned with the violence that is in the world.

K: So you are really not concerned with the world at all, what is happening, you're only concerned with yourself. Is that it? Let's come to the point.

Q: For most people, perhaps, it is aggravated by others who feel it, just as a stone at the bottom of a pool is affected by another stone being thrown in. The ripples spread, the impact of the new arrival is there. There are people who feel things like this and for them the world is them, they are the world. But the trouble is that we are caught in a trap of words, where words in one's head create

associations and ideas which may be exchanged in one situation, suggesting one thing. In another situation they are subtly changed again. But the problem seems to revolve around words and what we do with them inside our own skull.

Q: I don't find it a problem, an intellectual problem, to me it's a real problem, that I am directly in touch with people, mentally in some way they are there, I don't care whether they are a thousand miles away or they are there, and it's a problem I've got, you know, I just don't know how to relate to it. I find I have no privacy, or whatever it is.

K: You're asking, I am directly in relation with the world.

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, and you say, "What am I to do about it?" That's the question, that is the real question.

Q: Yes.

K: Now here there are varieties of opinions, we'll never come together about anything, you say one thing and that gentleman says another, and somebody else says something else. So can we think together about this, first. You follow what I mean? So there is a common denominator with all of us concerned about this.

Q: Sir, I don't understand how some people here can talk about violence in other parts of the world and how it doesn't affect them. I mean surely anyone who has got open eyes can see the direct effect of violence...

K: Of course, sir.

Q: ...on themselves, quite directly.

Q: It's not just a question of affecting oneself, it's that we don't care about others, I think that's why we don't see the urgency of

this, because we only care about ourselves and not others.

Q: And then perhaps we don't see the violence in ourselves.

K: Could we begin by finding out if we could all think together about this?

Q: Sir, what do you mean by 'think together'?

K: I'm coming to that, sir. Could you and I think together about something?

Q: I think it would be very difficult.

K: That's all. It wouldn't be difficult if we both of us wanted to build a house. You may disagree about the architect, the shape of the house, amount of room, but we could talk over it together, if we are agreeable we say, let's both of us choose the architect, we'll do that, we'll agree. Right?

Q: Is thinking together agreement then?

K: Yes, sir, I'm saying that. We are saying the same thing. That is, sir, think together, that means, could we both of us put aside our prejudice about this architect or that architect and say who is the best architect together. We can do that, can't we?

Q: I've never done it, sir. You probably can but I've never been able to do that sort of thing.

Q: Where there is an interest and enthusiasm in the subject, that dispels the prejudices and preferences that usually bung up a situation. In other words, you have a common interest in exploring the situation.

K: Is there a common interest here?

Q: Yes.

K: Or we have no common interest, we're all thinking about different things all the time. I want to find out for myself, what am

I to do with the world, with all the catastrophe etc., etc., what am I to do about all that? That's all my problem.

Q: Surely one can only look at oneself first.

K: Pardon?

Q: See how violence arises in oneself. I don't see how you can start...

K: Are you saying, whatever is happening there is affecting me, I have contributed to it, therefore I must see that in myself I don't give or contribute to all that. Is that what you're saying? You see we don't seem to be able to think together.

Q: But that affects only the immediate environment.

K: It's not only the immediate environment but - look, could you and I think about this subject together, look out of the same window, which doesn't mean that you and I agree, we both agree to look out of that window, we both see it's important to look out through there. Will we do that?

Q: We can only do it if we see that it's important.

K: So what am I to do, sirs?

Q: Sir, can we come back to this, the question where, we all pretty much agree that we do not feel that we are the world, and we all, from what we said, pretty much feel that that is incorrect.

K: I cannot understand - forgive me - a simple fact that the world is that because I have created it, by my arrogance, by my selfishness, by my silly activities of self-centred interests - I've created that thing. It's very clear to me.

Q: It's also clear that we don't seem to be prepared to accept that responsibility.

K: I do.

Q: Yes. I do too, sir.

Q: Isn't that the first thing we've got to look at, our self-centred activity?

K: That's very clear. Are we of the same outlook?

Q: Yes.

K: You and I may be but the others may not. Sorry. The others may say Marx has created it, or the Pope has created it, not me. Or these silly politicians have done this. It's not me.

Q: It seems the only thing we can actually agree about together...

K: We don't seem to agree.

Q: ...we can agree about the fact that there's confusion.

K: Let's agree on that. Do we all see the fact, not agree - could we all see the fact that there is terror, violence, disintegration, do we all see that?

Q: Yes.

K: Could we? Are you doubtful?

Q: Sorry to keep saying the same thing, but obviously we all can see the fact of violence and so on. We can all see that intellectually, emotionally and so on, but it's not the same as when the violence is threatening us.

K: I'm going to go step by step, sir, let's go step by step into this. If we all see the fact. Right? Wait, the fact that is happening there. Now first of all, how do you see it? As something happening out there which has nothing to do with me, or you see it because you read the newspapers, television, and that becomes an idea, a concept, something away there, nothing to do with me. So I'm asking, how do you see the fact?

Q: The fact manifests itself as...

K: How do you see the fact?

Q: ...as violence, as confusion, that manifests itself in my life.

K: No, sir, it's not - you see, sir, we're not again keeping together. How do you see the fact, is it an intellectual concept, an idea?

Q: You see it by looking, sir.

K: No, you've read the newspapers, sir, or you've been in a street fight, or in the demonstration that has taken place there is violence, you see it, you are there. Or do you see it as something happening which has nothing to do with you? How do you see it?

Q: Gut reaction.

Q: Don't many of us see it as a menace?

K: No, not as a menace, just how do you see it.

Q: That's how we perceive it often, don't we?

K: But when you say as a menace, you've already looked at it with fear.

Q: Yes.

K: Therefore you're not looking at it.

Q: I personally have never been in a war but I did go to one demonstration and I was amazed at the level, because there was so much awareness amongst people, admittedly violence was going on, you know, policemen were knocked over and things, but there were many people and there was a great deal of affection and all sorts of things going on.

Q: Except to the other side.

Q: It wasn't, I mean, something about people being in the streets, just consciousness which you don't normally see, one's

normally used to television.

K: What shall we do? Could we see the same fact together.

Q: Sir, it seems that first there is a world 'out there' which I read about and somehow I separate it from the world in here at Brockwood, I feel rather safe here, it's a nice place to be, people try at least to respect each other as much as they can, at least that's how I feel. But as far as I am talking, I don't have any real concern for anybody, maybe one person or two that I like, where I help in the work but concern about the person, I don't have it. You see, I'm really indifferent whether this person dies or not.

K: All right, sir.

Q: You know it's kind of callousness.

K: You're only concerned about yourself.

Q: Or one or other person that gives you pleasure.

K: Yes, but it's still...

Q: My father, or...

K: Yes, but it's still, you're concerned about yourself - that's clear. And you don't care a hoot what happens out there, as long as you're safe at Brockwood.

Q: To be honest, that's it.

K: That's it. Keep to it, sir, keep to it, don't... Are we, do we think like that too?

Q: Yes.

K: As long as it doesn't touch me, I don't care what is happening out there.

Q: Yes, but it touches us, when I leave Brockwood and I go somewhere, then it touches me, and then it becomes a problem.

K: I don't know - to him it's not.

Q: Yes, but you are saying so when it doesn't touch him.

K: All right, you are reducing it to a personal problem. As long as it doesn't touch me, please, I'm not concerned about the world. Do you all think like that?

Q: No, no, I don't.

K: Why?

Q: When we use this self we can't live together, can we.

K: Apparently we don't come together about anything. That's one fact, at last.

Q: That's confusion, isn't it.

K: We don't seem to come to the same point together. Right? Why? The question, the subject of this Seminar is that the world is in a terrible state, what am I to do? Apparently each one has a different point of view about that. One says, as long as I'm quite safe at Brockwood or anywhere else, it doesn't touch me, therefore I don't care what is happening out there. There are others who are saying, I am part of that world, it affects me, I have contributed to it, therefore I must change, that's another point.

Others say, well, occasionally I am part of the world, and the rest of the time I'm only concerned with myself. Right? At other times it becomes an acute problem when somebody hits me. So we are all of that. Now can we all come together and see one fact together.

Q: Surely one fact that we can all see together is that we all think differently.

K: I know, we've said that, sir.

Q: Is it possible to find out the root of that confusion? If we can all agree absolutely together that...



K: No, before you start - could we all of us look at this one fact, that we are all offering different opinions. Right? Different points of view, personal, impersonal, idealistic, etc. Now do we realize this? This may be one of the major factors of the confusion in the world, because each one holds onto his personal opinion.

Q: Maybe when we say we have different opinions we again tend to confirm the division between us.

K: No, sir. Do I realize, or do you realize that we are creating terrible confusion in this room, because each one of us is saying, "I think this", "I don't care what you think".

Q: But if one does care, one expresses one's own viewpoint, one does care that others...

K: Not if - you're saying if one cares, then you're out. The fact is, here we are, sir, look what we have done for 45 minutes or 50 minutes, we haven't come to answer the question at all, each is offering a different opinion.

Q: See the confusion now.

K: In asking this question we have awakened tremendous confusion all round us.

Q: Yes. Is it possible for us just to look without knowing?

K: We are trying, we are trying to do that. Can Peter, who says, "I'm really not concerned about the world, I'm really concerned about myself as long as I'm safe, leave me alone." The world won't let him alone, it doesn't matter, he wants it, he hopes for it. So that is his opinion and he's stuck to it.

Now I say please let us drop our opinions, our conclusions, our ideas, let's consider the common factor, which is, as there is confusion between ourselves, who are supposed to be serious, we

are met to discuss this thing, even here we can't clear that up. And we want to clear up, do something out there. Right? So can we clear up this confusion among ourselves first.

Q: Maybe there's a way forward. Instead of seeing it as a confusion between different...

K: No, wait, sir - can I clear up this, can I say, "All right, I'll forget myself for the moment, my opinion - let's look." Will you do that? Do it actually not just spin words and then play tricks with me, and say, "Yes, I can put aside my prejudice, my conclusion, only me that matters and hell everything else."

Come on! Can you drop that? And join me, who says, "Look, I'm not only concerned about myself, but I'm also concerned with the world." Right? Could you do that? No, not verbally - actually. I'll drop my point of view and say, "Yes, I am really concerned about my own security, my own this and that, and also I'm concerned with the world." Could we do that?

Q: Let us see.

K: Not let us see.

Q: We can't do it.

K: Can I do that? I am concerned about myself and equally concerned about the world, with the same pain, with the same anxiety, with the same intensity about the world.

Q: I just don't know. You say can we have the same intensity.

K: No. You may not know, but will you do it?

Q: All I can say is, I have to see.

K: No, do it now, not you have to see - now.

Q: That is what I mean. If we investigate now...

K: We are doing it now, sir, I am doing it. I am concerned with

myself - I know that. I am fully aware of it. And also I'm concerned with the world.

Q: It feels like taking a vow, Krishnaji.

K: No, there is no vow.

Q: Krishnaji, that's the feeling I get when you put that out, because it feels like something, are we all going to do that now, can we all feel this way.

K: No, nothing of the kind.

Q: It seems like we don't have any choice. I mean, one observes that there is confusion in this room presently, externally and internally, and the one says, one is concerned about the world - does one have any choice but to jettison all of one's opinions and ideas and explore this thing, go into it, find out, see if it's possible together, to find out the root of confusion, the root of violence. Surely we have at least to give it a go.

K: But, sir, she says, "That is forcing me," forcing her into a corner and making her do something which she is not willing to do.

Q: It feels different from, say, look at it, and to say, are you concerned, be concerned.

K: No, please, you didn't listen then. I said let us - obviously looks like it - I am concerned with myself, and perhaps I'm also maybe concerned with the world. That's all. There is no violence, there is no compulsion, there is nothing.

Q: Sir, nobody is disputing that the world is falling apart. Now you have said it's a fact, the world is falling apart. You have said, shall we now look at it together.

K: That's all.

Q: Good God, can't we do it?

Q: Sir...

K: You understand that question?

Q: Yes I understand but it seems it's very easy to say, it's too easy to say, it's too easy to feel concerned about the world, but it's somehow removed from myself, it doesn't have that quality of urgency. It's easy to deceive yourself that you are concerned and so on.

Q: If you see that this group here now is a microcosm of the world...

Q: I see that as intellectualism.

Q: No, actually what is going on in the room.

Q: It's too easy to say that.

K: Sir, we said this, sir. Look, I am concerned with myself. Right? Now wait. Seeing what is happening in the world, which is a fact, it's a fact, they are killing each other.

Q: I agree but...

K: Wait - can I also be concerned with that? Or only myself and nothing else?

Q: Could we ask where this genuine concern for the world comes from?

Q: It comes surely in part in pure self-interest, because where are people going to find these little spots to be safe in the world the way it's going. You, and Brockwood aren't going to stand up against the world. I don't understand this isolation between the self and the world out there. We're part of it.

K: Dr. Wilkins pointed out a few minutes ago, this, but nobody listens.

Q: What is it in people, some of us, each one of us perhaps that

thinks that we're safe, that we're separate, that the world is not going to affect us personally.

K: Maria, in microcosm, this is exactly what is happening in the world. Here we can't agree about anything, look at any fact together. If all the politicians dropped their opinions and said, "Look, what is best for the world," came together, they could solve all these problems. They won't, because they are Conservatives, Liberal and blah, blah, blah. And we are doing exactly the same thing here.

Q: Can we distinguish facts from opinions?

K: Yes, sir, very simple. Fact is which is actually happening. And the opinion is what I think about what is happening.

Q: When we say is it a fact or an opinion that everybody in this room is threatened by what is happening in the world - is that a fact or an opinion?

K: It's a fact.

Q: It's a fact.

Q: But do we all see it as a fact, or is it for many just an opinion?

K: That's just it. Peter, would you see this fact, that what is happening is a fact.

Q: What I see...

K: Wait - that is what is happening, sir.

Q: Yes, but in here, which is the world...

K: What has happened this morning, they announce Lufthanza, whatever it is, kidnapped - what is it?

Q: Highjacked.

K: Highjacked. That's a fact. But I can have an opinion, say

Lufthanza deserves it. That is an opinion. So could we not offer an opinion, any opinions, any judgements, but only look at the facts.

Q: It's a fact that we're divided.

K: Wait, sir. Could we look at the fact. The fact is that we are separate and the world is separate.

Q: Each person here is also separate.

K: Yes, yes. Each one thinks, the fact is each one is concerned about himself and the world second. Right? Me first, the world second. Is that so? Is that a fact for all of us, me first and the world second.

Q: To me it is.

K: All right, I'm just asking. Could we all honestly say, "Yes that is a fact. Me first."

Q: I think it's about 50/50.

K: It's a reality, therefore let's stick to that. Now could we look at that, me first. And really the world comes second. Could we look at that fact. So we all say, "Yes, that is so." At least we are all altogether on that one point.

Q: Somebody may ask a question, why shouldn't I be concerned first?

K: We'll come to that, we'll come to that. Me first and the world second. I think that we all agree to that at last.

Now why am I so 'me first.' What is this thing, I'm so concerned, me first and you the second, the world. You are the world, you're the second, me first. Why do I lay such tremendous emphasis on myself first. Go on, sir, answer this.

Q: Well, I'm far more important, by my attitude I'm far more important, because I'm the thing that is right here.

K: Wait. You feel that's much more important - is that a fact, for all of us.

Q: Now that's our years and years of conditioning. That's us. That's what we've been conditioned to, that's what we've been brought up as.

Q: Whether we were brought up as that or whether we naturally evolved into that, we are that, it doesn't make any difference.

Q: Oh yes, we are that.

Q: We are that, so whether I feel I'm the world or I don't, I'm the centre.

Q: But can we question that? Can we say that is why the world is so wrong in the way that it is?

K: Sir, me first and the world second, that's what everybody says.

Q: Yes.

K: That's a fact. Right? The politicians, the priests, the economists, everybody says, "Me, you second." Right?

Q: What is good for me is good, what is bad for me is bad.

K: Of course, me first - all that's implied.

Q: And of course us and them.

K: Of course. Now why do I give such tremendous importance to me?

Q: Other people give importance to you.

K: No. People also, I sit on a platform, you give me importance. I'm not talking about that. Why do I give importance to myself, what is the cause of all this? Is it my education, is it my culture, is it the society I live in, is it...

Q: It is...

K: Wait a minute, I'm going slow, step by step. Is it the religion that says, salvation to you first, the trumpet, Gabriel! So society, religion, culture, everything says to me, "You first." Right?

Q: Also the survival instinct says that.

K: Yes, me first, survival, position, prestige, reputation, money, big house - me. All that's included. And you, the world, second.

Q: If nobody cares about my problems, I must do something about them.

K: Yes, yes, all that's involved. Nobody is going to solve my problem except myself.

Q: Exactly.

K: So I'm only concerned with myself.

Q: I think it's also, I find myself that I have a problem, having read some of your books, I now have the conditioning which seems more in my mind than what you say, such as choiceless awareness.

K: Scrap books and conditions, let's start freely. So I say to myself, Why? Is this the result of all this? Environment, culture, education, religion, the economic social structure which makes me consider myself first, my union...

Q: My country.

K: So - wait, wait, look at it, that's a fact, isn't it? Now who has created that? This society, this religion, this culture etc., who has created it?

Q: Well, it certainly wasn't me.

K: My grandmother, my grandfather, great-grandfather?

Q: Yes they all did it.

K: Which means what? I am the result of all that.

Q: And I'm going to create the same situation for my children.



I'm going to perpetuate this.

K: Children - same thing, education.

Q: Sir, is this self-centredness entirely the result of our conditioning?

K: I'm coming to that, first we're examining that fact, is this the result of my society, my culture, my religion, my superstition, the thing around me, has forced me to be self-centred.

Q: It's certainly also that, but is that all?

K: That's good enough, I'll begin with that.

Q: There is already a sense of self-centredness when we say...

K: Sir, the moment the child, baby says, it's my toy, it's already there. So let's begin. Do we all see that same thing, that the world, culture, society, my grandmother, grandfathers, my father, my friends, my neighbours, society, everything has said, you first. Right? Do we all agree to that?

Q: Yes. Is it just a question...

K: Do we all see the same point - just a minute, sir, go slowly. At least we can all come together on this. That's all I'm trying to say. Right? Do we all see this thing?

Now the next question is, who has created this?

Q: Me.

K: Don't go so quickly, that's an idea then.

Q: But doesn't...

K: My grandfather, my grandmother, my great - down to me, have established a society based on me, and I'm caught in that trap.

Q: But does the baby naturally of its own accord say, 'Mine' or does the mama and papa...

K: So do we all see that fact, fact, not an opinion. It's not the

result, I'm not taking a vow. It's a fact. Right?

Q: Could we examine who or what is seeing that fact?

K: Fact. The roof is a fact and all that. It's a fact. How do you see it? Just look at it or say I don't like it or like it - just look. Mere observation without prejudice, that observation is seeing the fact, like a good scientist, he observes the fact, not his opinion.

Now do we all see this fact? Are you quite sure, that the society with all the culture, superstitions, the religions, the popes, the Protestants and all that, has made me into a self-centred human being. My education...

Q: My biological needs, I have to...

K: Yes, my biological needs, I said that sir - needs, sexual, everything around me, society has made me this. Do we agree, do we see this, simple and clear?

Q: Yes.

K: Right, sir? Right? Then if that is so, I am that. Right? Now comes the difficulty. That is not separate from me, that has created me, and me is that.

Q: And I'm now responsible for perpetuating it.

K: Don't go off further. That has created me, and me is that.

Q: But, Krishnaji, what this society has screwed into me...

K: Yes, yes...

Q: ...is a sense of my own self.

K: Don't enlarge, introduce new words, new screwing, but the fact is that the world, society has created me, conditioned me, made me what I am. And me is that. There is no question about it. Now do we all see that fact together. Do you?

Q: Yes.

K: Don't agree with me. Do you see this fact or it's still a vow?

Q: It may be an idea, sir.

K; That's just what I want to know, is this an idea or a fact?

Q: One can see that logically it must be so.

K: No, no - this is a fact. The microphone in front of me is a fact. I don't have an opinion about it. But if we say, let's all agree it's a giraffe, it's already a giraffe. Do we see this clearly? Do you?

Q: I have to say what she says, it's a good, logical sequence, Krishnaji.

K: What?

Q: It's logical.

K: No, it's not logical, it's a fact. Why do you make it logical?

Q: It's a fact that it's also logical, that's the problem.

Q: So there is a conflict between the feeling of separateness which one still has and...

K: Sir, either you want to look at the fact or you want to keep it to yourself. That's all right and I'm not preventing.

Q: Maybe this fact is too unpleasant.

K: It is not pleasant or unpleasant, it is so. I've got toothache, I've got cancer, it's a fact. Then I say I don't like it, I'm frightened, I don't want to be operated on, but the fact is the surgeon says, "You've got cancer." It's a fact. After X-rays, biopsy, all the rest of it, he says, "My dear chap, you've got cancer." I accept the fact. Then I say, "By Jove, I'm frightened, I might die, I'll be lonely." All the rest of it. But are we accepting the fact? It's not a logical conclusion.

Goodness. Right? Do we start from there?

Q: Krishnaji, it is easy to see that I am that, part of that, it's not

so easy to see that I am that full stop.

K: Sir, you've got a different tendency from me. Right?

Different characteristics, different idiosyncrasies, right? Those are all the result of your environment, your reaction to the environment. You don't see.

But do we together see this fact, that the world has created me, what I am, the stand I take, the position I assume, my conceit, my vanity, and that world is me and I am the world full stop.

Q: The fact that you can see that, isn't full stop, it's an action in seeing.

K: Yes, I'm coming to that. Do I see that first, or is it just an idea, as she says, a logical conclusion, it has no reality. I'm not trying to put you into a corner.

Q: Krishnaji, it's like I'm talking about astrology and the stars, I can understand that they are out there, I can understand what you are saying about it, but when I leave this room and I come back to my actions are here.

K: We are saying that.

Q: And it's not in understanding about my connection with the whole, it's much lower.

K: Yes, we are saying that, we are saying, you are the result of all that, so you have to do something about yourself, because you are that.

Q: So why is it so difficult to understand so simple a fact?

K: I don't know, apparently it's very, very difficult to see a simple fact.

Q: Why should we investigate together?

K: Ask her to explain to you, why she finds it so extraordinarily

difficult to see a fact, about herself, not about the stars.

Q: Sir,...

K: The fact is you were born in California - forgive me, or in England, wherever, the culture, the society, the parents, the grandparents, the education, has made her what she is.

Q: Part of that education is I am an original, separate being.

K: We've explained all that.

Q: I can see that part of it, what I can't see, it seems that there is a subtle implication in the fact that one should act in some other way.

K: No, we'll come to that.

Q: As though that is wrong.

K: First I must see that there is actually no division between me and the world.

Q: I think the difficulty is that we see the fact.

K: That...

Q: That to see the fact, we still think we are different.

K: Do you see that fact, sir, not your opinion of the fact, that I, born in India, with all the nonsense that goes on and brought to England, with all the nonsense that goes on here and so on, I am the result of all that. What's the difficulty in seeing this?

Q: How about also the part that says "I'm different and I'm important".

K: That's what the world made you.

Q: That's why the world has created us.

K: What's the matter?

Q: I told you that constantly.

K: You are the world and the world has made you think that you

are the most important person. Religions have done it, haven't they, salvation. You are so, and your education says you're better than me. So all the way from the moment we are born till we die, everything around us says, "You are the first." Right? That's a fact.

Q: Right.

K: That's all.

Q: O.K.

K: My god!

Q: You have worked, sir.

K: Why has it taken nearly an hour to see a simple fact like this.

Please answer me, why?

Q: Me is too strong.

Q: Because the thing that has been pushed into shade is wiggling.

K: You see it has taken an hour, because we are fairly friendly, we are not antagonistic to each other, we said we have come together to discuss so we are fairly amicable, but even this amicability has taken us an hour to clear up some very simple points. You understand?

Q: It's remarkable it's taken only an hour. (Laughter)

Q: We relate more readily to opinion than we do to facts.

K: I have no opinion, we just see the fact that I am that. I may not like it, I may say it's most unpleasant, but it is a fact. Then my next step is, what am I to do? Knowing I am that, what am I to do, what is my action, what is my responsibility? And at what level, at what depth is my responsibility, and is my action superficial or is it out of a deep understanding of this thing?

I think we'd better stop, don't you? It's five minutes to one.

We'll continue tomorrow where we left off, can we? Right?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND SEMINAR MEETING 14TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: Shall we go on where we left off? We were saying, weren't we, that this division between the world and me is really very artificial. The society that man has created is the society that we have created. And we are caught in it. And the question, the subject is: in a deteriorating world, what is one to do, what is the correct action?

We said the world is me, and 'me' is the world. I hope we all see the same fact. Do we? The Communists and the Marxists have more or less said the same thing, so they try to control the environment, manoeuvre man to their particular ideals and ideologies and so on. But we have come to a point which is perhaps totally different from theirs, which is, that you cannot possibly control man through change of environment. The environment is what we have created. Right? And unless man himself changes, environment cannot possibly change him. So that's where we are. Do we all see the same fact? Or is there still some doubt about it.

Go on, sirs.

QUESTIONER: When you say the world is deteriorating, you seem to say that's a fact, that the world is deteriorating, and yet that is the environment.

K: What sir? I can't hear.

Q: You're saying that one can't change the environment, it's ourselves that we have to change. And yet at the same time you were saying that the world is deteriorating.



K: That's right.

Q: Which sounds like the environment.

K: No, we were saying the environment can only be, environment in the sense society, the culture, the religion and all that, can only be, radically changed if man himself changes. That's the whole point.

Q: Why do you say it's deteriorating, Krishnaji, when it's really been like that since the beginning of time.

K: It has been like that from the beginning of time. So do we accept it? It has been like that through all the civilizations, through all the empires, throughout history. Me first and you second. In our relationships, in our activity, in everything that we do, it is me and you, two separate divisions, the world and me, as though they were separate. It has been like that for millenia.

And are we saying that it is impossible to change human nature, because it's been like that for so many million years. Is that what you're saying?

Q: Perhaps the important question is, how significant is the factor of the deterioration?

K: What do we mean by deterioration? Right? Go on, sir, let's talk about it.

Q: As we've defined it so far, it seems to be to go from bad to worse.

K: Not only that, sir. Our minds are becoming more mechanical, more caught in the trap, our education is - you know all about that. So what do we mean by deterioration, degeneration, decline - from what?

Q: In a way that's all we've ever really known, that state.

K: When we use the word 'decline', decline from what?

Degenerating from what?

Q: From wholeness.

Q: But there's never been a wholeness in civilization, that's only nostalgic remembrances.

K: Sir, let's all talk, please not a few of us or me.

Q: Sir, to me you touched the fundamental question when you talked of human nature. Having been an ex-Marxist for 16 years on puppet platforms and so forth, for years I saw the way as the Marxists see it that what we must do, human nature to the Marxist was determined by the material conditions.

K: Conditions, yes.

Q: Change the environment and we'll change the nature.

Fundamentally they got it wrong. Now I'm along with you, yes, it's human nature, but where do we go from there? We are human nature - what are we going to do with ourselves? Because that's what we've got to face. Do we want to face that human nature, we are that human nature.

K: Yes, but before we come to that the question was raised, what do you mean by degeneration, decay, like the Russians call the western civilization degenerate. What do we mean by that word?

Q: Separation, seeing things separately.

K: Is that what we mean by that?

Q: It sounds as though it usually means falling out of a creative state.

Q: The original question that we were supposed to consider was the world is becoming increasingly violent and disorderly. Do we

want to go into a definition of whether the world is a little bit worse or not so bad, it's always been that way. Or can we accept the fact that it's rather a mess and concentrate on how we respond to that.

K: That's what I want to get at. You raised the question, what do you mean by degenerate?

Q: Do we want to go on discussing that today? Isn't that holding up the point of this discussion.

K: Up to you sirs.

Q: Why not tell them about Cambodia, which has just been published. Don't they call that degenerate?

K: What sir?

Q: What's been going on in Cambodia, isn't that degenerate? Which has just taken place and just been revealed - do they need to go any further? Or is it a wonderful world we're all living in.

Q: Sir the fact is not whether it's a wonderful world - it's perfectly obvious that it's not a wonderful world, but it seems to me that the factor of deterioration is quite significant, and it's not separate from the response that is required because if it is a fact that this deterioration is taking place, then the response is made very much more urgent. In other words, it's not a historical reflection of the condition of the world, but it's as things are happening now. For instance, many people say in so-called spiritual work that there is a break up of civilization in order that a new birth may take place. This is a very common idea.

K: All right.

Q: Doesn't the word deterioration imply that there is another state.

K: That's what I asked, deterioration from what?

Q: We can either look at deterioration as history, over a period of thousands of years or we're talking about a single life, a baby being born whole, sane and healthy, innocent, and then gradually becoming involved in this.

K: Would you say, sir, the constant violence which is spreading right throughout the world, the nationalistic divisions, wars, terror, the disorder, the confusion, all the literature, you follow, all that, would you consider all that in very good order?

Q: Not at all.

K: Can't we accept this fact, that there is disorder, violence, terror, confusion, misery. That is a fact, throughout the world. Can't we start from that, instead of defining the words, degeneration and so on. Could we start from that?

Q: Yes.

K: Could we, sir, please. All right. Then what am I to do as a human being, living in this disordered, violent society, what is my action? That is the real problem. What am I to do, knowing that I am not different from society, that I am the world and the world is me? That's a fact, to me at least, that's an absolute irrevocable fact. Then what am I to do? That is the whole issue. Can we start from there? Do we all think together on this point?

Q: Yes.

K: No, please don't casually say yes. Is it a fact to all of us? If it is a fact, then how do we deal with that fact? I am a part of that world, and the world is me, and what am I to do with my life, given 20 years or 30 years or 50 years, what am I to do? What is my action in relation to what? And what is my responsibility, to what?

You understand, sirs?

Q: Sir, our responsibility in our actions must be to everything because everything is the world. It can't just be directed to one thing.

K: Is there a holistic, an action that is whole. Or all my actions must be inevitably fragmented, broken up. That's one of the questions. So first, could we be clear on the word 'action'. Right? Could we discuss a little bit what we mean by action. Come on, sir, please.

Q: Can I ask in connection with action, it suggests to me doing something. And when one thinks of the word, I'm thinking in terms of the many and the one. Some idea of wholeness being equated with perhaps a non-existent one, because it seems to me that wherever I go, the problem that I'm confronted with is that there is the many, and it's all different from all the rest of it.

K: Yes, but what do I mean by action, action with regard to what?

Q: Couldn't we say that it's a following through of a thought.

K: No. To act, sir, to do.

Q: To do. But there has to be something that prompts the doing.

K: No, we'll come to that. First we are trying to find out what that word means to all of us. It may mean something to you, it may mean something to me. So we'll be always different. So let us find out, if we all agree about that word 'action', what is implied, what is its significance, and whether it is partial, whole, and so on. So let us go into that. May we?

Q: Yes.

K: Please sir.

Q: Action to change what? We know what the Marxist action want to change, he wants to change the environment. You say human nature. I go along with you. Now how are we going to change human nature?

K: We'll come to that, sir. First I must find out as the subject of this Seminar is, what am I to do, first, with regard to what, whether I can change myself and so change the world. But before we enter into that, mustn't we enquire into what do we mean by action. I may think I'm doing right - right in quotes. And I may be acting from an illusion, from a very prejudiced point of view, or from some conclusion which I have derived or gathered or learnt.

Or I must act according to some idealistic formula. Right? I might be a Catholic and I think this is action; a Protestant and say this is action, the Marxists would say this is action. So I think we ought to be clear about that word. What do you consider action? Come on, sirs.

Q: I consider it motion, sir.

K: Is your action motivated by an emotion, by a reward, by a punishment? You see we have to go into this.

Q: Most action is motivated in some way, generally speaking.

K: So your motive is different from mine, and hers. So our action can never to together. Right? So is it possible, is there an action which is not separative? You follow, sir? Which is not yours, mine and his. So we ought to go into that word, or the whole meaning of that word 'action,' to do. That's the question which says, "What am I to do? How am I to act?" Not only to think but to act.

Then from that we can go onto what is thinking and all the rest,

but I feel we must be together in this word. Could we?

Q: Sir, are we distinguishing two types of action, a selfish action which comes from motive and a non-selfish action, or whole action?

K: How do I know what is non-selfish action? I might think I am acting non-selfishly but it might be the most selfish action.

Q: So that's one thing we know for sure, that action is not apart from self.

K: So what do you mean by action?

Q: The implications of this are that action is an unbiased movement. Our usual movements are, as you were pointing out, orientated to self-interest and identifications. So for the self, for us to imagine, or for us to move without bias - this is the problem, isn't it?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It seems as if action is something from ourselves, that we have to do something or other, so it is always from a centre.

Q: But in order to act I have to see what I think is required.

Q: Action is to respond.

K: I mean, you're a doctor, and you say my action is to attend to the patient. Or a professor says, I must act. I want to find out, if I may ask you, I am asking myself too, what is action which is not separative, you understand?

Q: Sir, would we not have to consider what it is that is doing the acting. If we are the product of our conditioning and its only our conditioning which acts, then that seems always that it will be separative.

K: So you're saying, are you saying, sir, as long as the mind is

conditioned in a particular way...

Q: As long as the conditioning is there.

K: ...it is bound to be separative, it is bound to be divisive, bound to act in contradiction with others and so on. Is that it?

Q: Yes.

K: So we then have to go into the question, why are we conditioned, are we aware of our conditioning?

Q: And also there's the question, is there something else besides our conditioning which can act?

K: That comes much later, very much later.

Q: So the action must be spontaneous.

K: No, sir - how can I be spontaneous when all my background is not spontaneous, it has been cultivated, forced, pressurized, you know, brainwashed. How can it ever be spontaneous?

Q: If action is going to be of that nature, it's not possible to act at all, unless one makes judgements, which obviously could be false. And so it seems to me that one has got to be in some kind of relationship with what other people are doing, be sensitive to it in some way. And somehow know that one is in relationship, have confirmation of that.

Q: It seems to me that usually I don't see a situation clearly and I think of an idea what I should do. And the other person picks another idea and we never agree. Occasionally I may agree with one person, but on the whole I can't go beyond that.

K: Are you saying, sir, we act according to different ideas?

Q: Or from some concept - not always but for most of the time.

Q: Until we see our confusion, can there be action?

Q: There's action all the time, we're acting constantly, whether



we're in the kitchen or whatnot, it's obviously action is coming from thinking and we can't separate the two, and so we have to talk about thinking, because if you're not thinking, how can there be any action. Or can there be one?

Q: Thinking is action, too.

K: Thinking is action. So what is action then, thinking, self-centred, conditioned, partial, contradictory, idealistic, acting according to a certain pattern, Utopia, Marxist, Maoist.

Q: In action, there is simply an actor, and that actor implies will, the desire to change something, so we come back almost full circle to the predicament of being separate and yet wanting to identify the whole, so we always seem to come back to will. Is this correct?

K: Yes, sir but have we - I don't know how to approach this question, because here we are, each one has a different idea what action is. Right? Right, sir? Now is there an action which we can all, not accept, but see. Let me put it differently: is there an action which is not divisive, which is not self-centred, which is not idealistic, and so on? Or must all action be the result of our conditioning, of our ideology, of our self-centred activity?

Q: Wouldn't an action of common enquiry be non-divisive?

K: We are trying to do that now, aren't we? We are trying to enquire into what is action, which is common to all of us. Right? Not similar, not conforming, imitative. Is there an action which we can all accept, which we all see, and act according to that, not according - you understand what I'm saying - I wonder if I am conveying, I'm not quite sure I'm conveying it properly.

Q: If we are all really curious and concerned, this is an action.

K: Is there an action that is accurate, precise, and not self-

centred?

Q: That must come from intelligence.

K: Wait, I'm just asking that, sir. A right action, right being precise, accurate, seeing the fact and acting, not see the fact according to my prejudice, my experience and opinion and act from that. But perceiving the fact and acting to the demands of that fact. I wonder if I am making myself clear?

Q: Yes. Yes, there is such a thing.

K: We are enquiring.

Q: If we see that acting on an idea doesn't take us anywhere, isn't that an action?

K: Is an idea a fact? Idea, from what the dictionary says, began from the Greek word which means 'observation, to observe'. Now we're coming closer. May we go on with this a little bit? That is, to observe, not draw a conclusion from that and act, but the very observation is the action.

Q: That means you have to relate. Relating to a fact can then bring an action.

K: I'm just beginning to enquire into it, sir. That is, I observe. Let's begin - I am the world and the world is me, that is, we can't go back on that, can we? We can't go back on that. Right? I observe I am violent. Right? Which is, the world is me. The me is violent, which is the expression of the world. Right?

So I observe it. Now is my observation clear, pure, or is it diluted, twisted, according to my desire, my desire to escape from it, run away from it, to suppress it - you follow? Can I observe violence without any distortion? And that very observation is the action. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

Q: That is, from the clarity of an observation.

K: That's all.

Q: Yes.

K: Now can we all do this?

Q: Is there any more to do after that?

Q: That's it.

Q: That observation is the action. Do you mean that that observation brings the action, observation is part of it, but it also...

K: I say, observation is action.

Q: ...yes, but must it be followed by a continuation of that action?

K: Of course, first have we understood this? Am I talking nonsense?

Q: Krishnaji, if I am self-centred, full of ideas and prejudices and so on, how am I to come upon this action?

K: So you can't, you can't.

Q: That's right.

K: So you have to see the fact that you're self-centred, therefore you cannot observe, and the very observation of the fact that you're self-centred, to observe it. I don't know if I'm making this clear.

Q: Yes, very.

K: Now can we together, is it possible for all of us, to observe this fact, violence? Don't let's define the word 'violence', for the moment - anger is violence, jealousy is violence, conformity is violence. Right? Imitation is violence. Competition is violence. Being attached to a particular formula or an idea, and you the opposite, which is a sort of violence, the national divisions are violence and so on. Now do we see that all this is being covered by

that word. I don't know if I'm making it clear.

Q: But is it possible for a violent mind to see its own violence?

K: To see it is violent, that's all - why not? Is it possible for you to be aware - not you, sir - but aware of one's jealousy.

Q: Does that mean jealousy being aware of itself?

K: Yes, as it arises, you can see jealousy. So we are asking, is our observation clear, pure, not twisted. That's the first thing, before I can act. Can I observe myself, myself, which is the society, and therefore can I observe myself very clearly, without any distortion, without any illusion? See myself in a mirror that is reflecting exactly what is? Come on, sirs. Could we all do this?

Q: Sir, what do you mean by a mirror, exactly what is?

K: I mean by mirror, a reaction, to see that you are violent, prejudiced, conditioned by society, by education to function along a particular line, you know, all that. Just to see what you are. Which is the world. Can we do that? And not say, "Oh, what I see I don't like or it's so lovely, I'm going to keep one part of it and discard the other part." Can I read the whole history of myself. I don't know - go on, sirs. Is that possible?

Q: I don't want to seem to quibble with words, but sometimes you can see violence but not recognise it. There seems to be a difference between our ability to see it and actually recognise it as such.

K: No, sir, look. Anger is violence, isn't it? Can you observe anger arising in you? Not in you, generally. I'll say, 'Can I observe anger as it arises, is there an awareness of this movement of anger welling up? And can I observe that anger without explanation, without saying, it's justified - just to observe it?'

Q: Sir, I think there's a difference, one can be aware of one's jealousy, for instance, but there is a difference between being able to observe it with action, which you were saying just now. The action which is the observation. It's a difference between just being aware of it, maybe partially, which means perhaps all of us, but...

K: That's the question, sir, that's what we're asking. Can I be aware of this movement of violence in me, not just one by one, anger or jealousy but the whole structure of violence.

Q: What is going to make mankind act in the way you have put forward, that there's going to be this clarity, this observation, that I see that my jealousy, my violence and I see what it's doing to the world. What is going to make man act or think or to bring about that clarity? That's the problem, as I see it.

K: I'm saying, we are saying, sir, that very observation is action.

Q: Yes.

K: Not what will I do. If I see the whole nature of violence in myself, without any distortion - that is important, because if I distort I can act from that distortion. So my question is, can I observe the whole nature of violence in me?

Q: Can I put it the other way round? What will make man put down his prejudices so he can observe that?

K: What will make man put aside his prejudices.

Q: Mankind. Yes.

K: Crisis?

Q: We have plenty of those.

K: Crisis, a challenge which you have to answer. A relationship that brings about a sense of responsibility. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: What will make man, a human, what will make me drop my prejudices?

Q: That's it.

K: Go on, sir, enquire - you're all in it, not me only. What will make us, each one of us, drop our prejudices?

Q: It seems to me that it is realizing that the prejudice is not something outside on the other person, but it's my very cherished beliefs.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: But what I really stick to is that the other person is doing the same thing and think they're good and therefore we clash.

K: I'm asking, will you drop your prejudices? What will make you?

Q: Seeing that...

K: See, sir, we are prejudiced, aren't we? No? You have your own prejudices, your own opinions, your own experiences, which are part of the whole business. Can you drop them?

Q: But the prejudices are a challenge to me.

K: Wait, look at it, I'm asking you, don't enlarge it more. I am prejudiced because I think I'm a Hindu, much better than all the rest of the human beings. Prejudiced. I think I've got a better brain than anybody else. That's prejudice. And so on. Can I drop all that? What will make me drop my prejudices? That is the question.

Q: Danger. Immediate.

K: Yes, danger. We have no danger, sitting in this room, immediately.

Q: Sir, I don't want to try to give a whole answer but aren't you missing out your catalytic action? Isn't that why we are here just

now.

K: You're saying, listen to me, action is a catalyst. Maybe. Or may not be. My prejudice may be so terribly strong. Right? Just a minute, so what will make me drop my prejudices?

Q: Seeing that it prevents you from relationship, from real relationship.

K: No. Will you drop yours? Will I drop my prejudice because I see the importance of having a good relationship. Will that make me do it? You see, in all that is implied reward, a sense of if you don't do this you will be punished. That again is acting according to a desire of not wanting to be punished or be wanting a reward.

So can I drop this prejudice? Can I drop my being a Hindu so completely that I've not a particle of that idiotic idea? Sorry.

Q: If I say I am not impressed with these ideas such as if I drop the idea of myself as an Englishman...

K: I'm asking you, sir.

Q: Yes.

K: Can you drop being British, French, you know, all the things that go with it?

Q: Sir, doesn't one have to see the danger and the destructiveness of these categories because otherwise why would we look at them. The question is that the world is violent and disordered and what can we do about it. If the disorder and violence were simply lovely, we wouldn't be asking the question, would we?

K: Yes.

Q: We wouldn't be, would we?

K: Of course not.

Q: Therefore there is a certain impetus in the...

K: ...the very...

Q: ...the unpleasantness, to put it mildly.

K: He raised a point, which is, I am here to listen to what is happening, to all of you and to you, I want to listen. That may act as a catalyst. That's his point. Now can I listen to what you are saying, which is, drop your prejudice. You understand? You have said that to me. Can I listen so completely that the very listening is the emptying of my prejudice? You understand?

Q: Yes.

K: Are you doing it?

Q: There's the rub - what is going to make us do it? And I say it must be a feeling that man wants to end his inhumanity to his fellow man.

K: Yes, sir, but again that's a motive. Be careful. Sir, the point is this, if I may. You have told me, drop your prejudices. That the very putting aside your prejudices, your mind will be different. That you're telling me. And I listen to you. You follow, sir? Because I'm tremendously interested in the feeling that I might, whether I can be free of prejudice. Because I've lived with it, my fathers, my grandfathers the whole past, thousand years of Brahmanical outlook has prejudiced my mind. And I listen to you. And the very listening may be the act of purgation. I don't know if I'm...

Q: Sir, don't we have to watch each prejudice as it comes?

K: No. No.

Q: Give complete attention to it.

Q: It's clearly something you can't will.



K: No, I want to listen to you. I've listened to you to find out if I, part of society, if I can drop my prejudices.

Q: But sir, why do you listen, why do you wish to examine whether you can drop your prejudices? Why?

K: Why?

Q: Why?

K: Because, a very simple reason, I see as long as I have my prejudices, we can never meet.

Q: So is that not a valid motive?

K: No. All right, it's a valid motive. (Laughter) But it doesn't lead me any further.

Q: But it does lead you to ask, it leads you to look.

K: So there are valid reasons and not valid reasons. Then we go off into that.

Q: No, but to ask the question what will make us look.

K: What will make me drop my prejudices?

Q: If you see something stupid you drop it.

K: Go on - what will make you drop your prejudices?

Q: I must die fast. Literally.

K: I don't want time. Time is a prejudice.

Q: No, sir - I must die now.

K: I'm doing that, sir - I want to know what am I to do? I want to know if it is possible to drop my prejudices.

Q: Is there anything to do?

K: I'm going to find out, sir.

Q: I don't know. Because it would have to be an action so totally different from any action we're used to.

K: Probably.

Q: Something that I don't know.

Q: First of all I have to see I have these prejudices at all, not just because somebody has told me.

K: I've seen my prejudices, I'm not a child any more, I can't keep on repeating I must see it - I've seen it.

Q: Of course.

Q: I'm not sure I see all of mine, like for instance, I don't feel identified with the country or with the religion.

K: All right, but your experiences are prejudices. Go on, sir. You've had certain experiences.

Q: My experience is better than your experience.

K: Wait, Peter - you've had certain experiences going to India, all the rest of that business.

Q: Yes.

K: And you're entrenched in that.

Q: Yes, it makes me feel I'm a beautiful human being, but next moment I feel I'm a terrible human being - you know.

K: Do please let's finish. You're entrenched in that, in those experiences which have become part of you. And can you drop those experiences and say, "Look, I must look at life differently," perhaps or see things which may be more accurate.

Q: Prejudices create conflict because one is part of something greater than yourself, the very carrying around and acting upon that prejudice leads to conflict inevitably, and the conflict is the result of conclusion.

K: Yes, sir, but...

Q: Confusion.

K: Yes, but have I got different points of view, have I got a

certain view to which I am attached, a certain concept which to me is so deeply rooted?

Q: You may have.

K: Sir, go to a Catholic, and he'll say, "What nonsense are you talking about?" Right? Because it's part of me, I accept it. You're not meeting my point.

Q: If conflict is there, then there is the inevitable recognition of becoming an observer.

K: Wait, sir. Are you aware of your prejudices?

Q: Unfortunately, yes.

K: Wait, yes, you are aware of your prejudices, can you drop them? What will make you let go?

Q: That's the question. When I become an observer which is not to often.

K: Not when you become - become, be.

Q: Exactly, but this does not happen frequently enough, but one can do it and it is fear frequently that stops it.

K: Sir, when you say 'when', that means some time later, but I'm saying now, sitting in this room, at this time, can I be aware of my prejudices and let them go?

Q: Then I have to live fully in the present.

K: I don't know what is implied, sir, but can I do it now.

Q: I don't understand your usage of the word 'to do.' I don't know if I can do it now. Doing, doing - I don't know.

K: Why not?

Q: What's involved in that specific kind of doing?

K: No, I'm not saying 'doing'. I say are you aware of your prejudice. And realize its consequences at the same time, the whole

movement, not just bit by bit by bit. The whole of it, the prejudice, the consequences of it and the motive why you want to get rid of prejudice, the whole movement of this prejudice. Can you be aware of it and say, "Look, how silly it is. I'm only..." - finish?

Q: But surely, the answer most people would give would be that they don't know but they hope that it is possible, that is as far as they can get.

K: Of course, sir. I know that. But are we like that? Are we in this room saying, "I hope to eventually get rid of them, when I'm 90 and just about one foot in the grave, then I'm ready to give it up."

Q: To me it's so fundamental that we can stay with this, how is mankind going to drop these prejudices?

K: You are mankind.

Q: Yes, now to me I see it compassionately, I see it as...

K: No - you are mankind. Have you dropped your prejudices?

Q: Sir, before you seemed to be talking about the essential root of all prejudices, the structure of each of them, rather than each one in turn. Is that correct? You want us to see the whole structure, not each particular prejudice.

Q: Can I see all my prejudices alone? Many I only see in relationship with other people.

Q: Can I drop my prejudices? Is that not a wrong question to ask, one is looking at...

K: I have prejudices, of various kinds, prejudices, opinions, judgments, experiences to which my mind in memory is attached. What I think I am, what I must be - all that, and more, is the whole bag of my prejudice. Right? Now I'm asking, can I open

that bag and let it go. You don't answer my question, you're all dissipating my question. As Professor Wilkins pointed out, I hope to get rid of it. Is that what we're doing? You understand, sir? If I go to a politician, in the present government, and say, "Drop your prejudices." They would throw me out. Go to Russia and say, "Please." Now we are not in that position here, you're not going to throw me out, I'm not going to throw you out. So we are amicably examining this thing.

And we're saying, "Can you and I, in the process of thinking, watching, observing, talking over together, feel the absolute necessity of dropping prejudices?"

Q: Does the word 'prejudice' mean to prejudge, it means to prejudge something before I've actually seen it.

K: Yes, Madam, don't pick on one word. Prejudices, I've said, the whole of it. The way I think, I've been trained to think along Marxist lines or Mao, or Krishnamurti - I've been trained, read conditioned. I said, "For God's sake, can I be free of it."

Q: Let me put it this way. I have dropped my prejudices, you are my friend, and I see that you haven't dropped yours. And you're a good guy etc. etc. And I want you to drop them. What am I to do?

K: All right. I'll tell you. What am I to do? Will you first listen? You understand, sir? Listen. Or are you listening partially, because those prejudices are very pleasant, very profitable, and those prejudices are profitable, pleasant, rewarding, you say, "I will prevent you from listening". Right?

So can you listen in spite of all that? Because no amount of argument is going to get at my prejudices, no amount of rewarding

or punishment or anything is going to get rid of it. We have tried all those.

So sitting together in this room, talking over together amicably, because we're interested in, rather, we are concerned with regard to action in a mad world. And one of you says, "Unless you, as a human being, part of this society, drop your prejudices, your action will always be limited, it will always bring about conflict." And so on. That interests me. Because I see what the world is and instinctively I don't want to live like that.

So can I drop my prejudices, realizing all the consequences of it? Go on, Peter. As I listen to you, can I drop them, not sometime later, here in this room finish with them?

Q: But I see that you've got to instinctively feel like that.

K: What, sir?

Q: In order for me to get you to drop your prejudices, you've got to instinctively feel like you've described. That's important.

K: Whatever it is, will you drop them?

Q: I can't see how my experience, say my trip to India, is prejudice. Is it because I give it a value different to other things?

K: Look, we said, prejudice is to prejudge, opinion, have different points of view, a particular way of thinking, certain concepts which you hold dear, certain experiences which seem to you very important to yourself, and so on, various forms of illusions. All that and more can be summed up in one word, prejudice, for the moment. We might change the word 'prejudice' into something else, but for the moment, let's call all that bundle 'prejudice.'

Now can one drop that bundle, that's what I'm asking. Because,

my mind, one's mind isn't free. One can't observe clearly. If I, if you have prejudice against brown skin, you won't even look at me.

Q: But if all I am is prejudice, if all my vision is prejudice, how can that see itself?

K: Wait, sir.

Q: If it can is it the prejudice vision that sees the prejudice or is it...

K: I'm going to show you.

Q: ...or does there have to be something else that comes.

K: We'll go into that, sir, in a minute, just see.

Q: It seems mutually exclusive.

K: You see, my prejudice is me.

Q: Right.

K: I am a bundle of prejudices. Now is that bundle different from me? Don't - go into it very carefully. Is that bundle, which we have described, various aspects of it, me? I am observing that bundle. Is the observer different from the bundle? Go on, sir. Our tradition says the observer is different from the bundle. Right? Our whole education, our culture, says you are different from that. So it's very difficult for me to accept that I am that bundle, how terrible. I reject that instantly, because my whole upbringing says I am different. Because it says you can then control the bundle, you can get rid of it, or keep parts of it and so on. You can act upon it. But when I really see the fact that the bundle is me, there is no observer. That's the whole point.

Q: But it's obvious that I...

K: Have you listened to this, sir?

Q: In other words, one must not interfere with that observation.

K: This is a fact, sir, look. Would you please listen, not go on with your own - we'll come to that later, which is, the bundle is me. But I reject the idea that me is the bundle, because my whole background, my upbringing, my culture, my religion says, "You must control it." Right? "You must change it, you must go beyond it."

But when you come along and say, "You are the bundle," it is a fact. So what happens, when I realize, when there is the realization, the bundle is me?

Q: What realizes that, if the bundle is prejudice, how can that prejudice...

K: Ah, you haven't listened. Forgive me, sir, I'm not criticizing, it's your business, but we don't listen. The bundle is me. So the observer is not separate from the bundle. This is important to understand, because the observer who says, "I must get rid of the bundle," thinks himself he's separate from the bundle. So he thinks he can act upon the bundle. We have removed altogether this separative action when I realize that I am the bundle. Can I observe, is there an observation of that bundle without the observer?

Q: Sir, it's obvious that my effort is...

K: There's no effort.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, I'm not making an effort.

Q: Yes, but...

K: I abhor every form of effort.

Q: It seems that something is coming up preventing this observation from taking place, so one finds oneself trying to see,



which is obviously nonsense, but this is a real thing happening.

K: Sir, I've listened to you, explaining logically step by step, though I may object to logic, conclusions, your logic has forced me into a corner, naturally. I am not resisting it because I want to understand. I'm not obstinate, I want to find out. So I listen to you. You have explained very carefully what this whole nature of prejudice is, various aspects of it, and we've come to the point when we call that whole prejudice a bundle.

Now you say to me, observe that bundle. Yes, I say, I'm observing it. Which is, I am observing it as though it were something separate from me, because that's what I've been used to, that's what my education, my religion, my culture has said, "You are different from that." And so that culture, that tradition says, "Act upon it." Change it, break it down, or run away from it, suppress it. But you come along and say, "Look, you're living in an illusion, the bundle is you." Right? Which means what? There is no observer who says, "I am the bundle." I wonder if you see?

Dr. Bohm, please join us, what do you say? Give me a rest!

Q: I think that the mind has a tendency to try to prepare the ground first by saying that there is something different, that I'm not only the bundle but something more.

K: I don't know.

Q: And that's almost universal.

K: That's another trick.

Q: And therefore we prepare to bargain where there's something more, in which the observer could retreat. So I think that the attempt of logic to make sure of the ground beforehand is interfering with the thing.

K: Would you agree or see the logic of the sequence of this?

Q: I think it's a peculiar kind of logic that we are not used to, this is why it's so difficult. Ordinary logic, we think, we try to see, to form a concept of the totality...

K: Of course, of course.

Q: ...before we act. Now if you say who is going to observe or what is it going to observe, it's going to have a concept of the totality before you act and then act. Which means, you put back the observer in the place of the, whatever it is that is beyond the bundle of prejudice. So it's a peculiar kind of logic which is correct but it is not common. You don't do that, but actually just work from the statement of the fact as you have given it. I don't know if I've made myself clear.

K: Yes, sir, it's clear to me, I don't know about the others.

Q: We are not accustomed to this kind of logic because it's something in which the logic itself will change the totality...

K: No, no.

Q: ...when you observe. But by staying with the way you have put it, rather than going on to ask for what is it that will observe, then that observation can take place which will change the structure, in that very moment of observation.

Q: Don't we get confused by the original question, which was something like, "Can I be free from my prejudices?"

Q: That's the same question. Whenever you say, "Can I do this?" and they are assuming that I will continue...

K: Of course.

Q: ...through this whole process and therefore that defeats the whole thing. It seems to me that in some way - we were listening to

a tape of your discussion with the buddhists, where you say that you die to that prejudice and therefore you are not the same person any more.

K: Right, sir. Sir, so what do you say to all this?

Q: I was going to say what does the bundle require so as to observe itself?

K: No.

Q: But I don't think that goes as far as what David Bohm says.

K: Yes. But I'm not saying the bundle can observe itself. It can't. But what we are saying is, you have removed the observer.

Q: Do you mean, sir, rather that the bundle discloses itself?

K: No, sir, it has been disclosed.

Q: Yes, but...

K: By words - you've explained it to me very, very carefully.

Q: ...but you're saying whereas previously by acting on it...

K: You thought you could do something.

Q: ...I thought I was changing everything.

K: Yes.

Q: Actually it remains the same.

K: Same, yes.

Q: Now by removing the observer, the bundle itself discloses it's own features.

K: No, something else takes place. That's what I want to get at.

Q: Is that always silent?

K: No, no. Have we come to this point together, at least that the bundle is me? I am not separate from the bundle, full stop. Could we come to that, all of us together.

Q: Which means there is no part of me that is free from

prejudice.

K: Quite right.

Q: Whatever I say, as long as...

K: Of course, obviously.

Q: ...I don't see I am prejudice...

K: I said that whole bundle is you, your consciousness is made up of that bundle. But if you see that, that is, only the bundle, nothing else.

Q: So the observer has no escape.

K: Of course, all that's gone, sir - escape and suppression and trying to do something about it - it's all finished.

Q: Aren't we attempting to do the same thing again, which is instead of having two things, an observer and a bundle, we now think we have only got one thing which is a bundle, but we are still stuck with the idea that the entity, the bundle, will act...

K: We're going to find out.

Q: ...instead of...

K: No, something else, I want to find out if I've reached that point, what happens. We haven't reached it, but we're speculating about it. Is there an observation of this bundle without the observer? The observer is the prejudice, so when he observes with prejudice, he still remains with the prejudice

So I'm asking, do we all of us together here in this room now, at quarter to one, before lunch, see this simple point together - the bundle is me. The moment that is a fact, there is already transformation in the observing.

Q: Could you use the word 'awareness' instead of observer?

K: Same thing, sir.

Q: But I think it's misleading as observing implies some action, whereas awareness implies the state of mind which is not moving.

K: Sir, when you are observing through a telescope, you are observing the thing which is happening under the telescope.

Q: Right, but I'm observing, there isn't...

K: No.

Q: I am observing.

K: You are using the eye to observe but there is no observer who comes to it with lots of prejudices and says, 'I'm observing.' That's a top scientist - I mean, sorry, sir.

Q: You would have to become unconscious...

K: No, sir, nothing - you see, nothing of that kind. It is a simple fact that I am the observer, that I am the bundle and nothing else.

Q: But if the bundle observes itself, then the bundle disappears, surely.

K: That's what I want to come to. When there is no observer, what takes place? You don't come to that point.

Q: If there is no observer there is only observation.

K: No, that's just an idea - don't play with words, for God's sake - come to the point. Have you come to the point that you are the bundle, not that you are observing the bundle? In that observation you have dissipated energy. Right? I don't know if you follow this. Right? Can we go round with this for a few minutes? That when there is division between the observer and the observed, there is a wastage of energy, which is, he says, "I'm acting upon it, I must do something about it, I must change it and do something else." And so on, which is an indication of wasting energy.

Q: Doesn't it also make the bundle heavier?

K: No - don't - but when there is no dissipation of energy, which means the bundle is you. Right? Have you come to that point? Otherwise we can't talk any further.

Q: This whole bundle is theoretical for me - I can't grasp this bundle, it looks theoretical, I can't see it, touch it.

K: You want to grasp it, why can't you see the meaning of the word? The significance of prejudice, the consequence of prejudice, can't you see it instantly?

Q: Is it the sum of my total likes and dislikes and that's all, or is there something else?

K: You're made up of that, aren't you? Like and dislike.

Q: Like and dislike. Finished.

K: Yes, so that's part of your prejudice. I like this, I don't like that. I like you, I don't like the black people, or the white people, or the purple people.

Q: Is there anything beside this, this bundle, besides this liking and disliking?

K: I said, sir, that's the whole bundle, whole of it, my experience, my judgement, my opinions, my desires, my longing for something better - all that is part of me, it's me.

Q: What about the enquirer who is trying to find out?

K: We've enquired, we've come to this point through enquiry.

Q: Is that part of the bundle?

K: No, I'm looking, searching. And I discover I've got tons of bundles, prejudices.

Q: But it can't be a prejudice seeing that, because if it were prejudice realizing that you were full of bundles, it would still be a prejudice and you wouldn't see that as clarity.

K: No, you're missing the point, sir.

Q: There has to be something else.

K: No, you're not to do anything else but listen. Listen to somebody else, not to me only, listen to somebody who says, "How am I to get rid of my prejudices, so deeply rooted?" He's bothered with it, he's concerned. And I say, "Look, there's a way, if you listen very carefully I'll show it to you." You might say, "Go to hell." That's all right. Since we have gathered in this room for this purpose, we say, "Look, will you kindly listen to what the other fellow is saying." He says the bundle is no different from you. That's a fact.

Q: I think that people are puzzled by your saying that and at the same time saying that when you see this is prejudice you're not a bundle you see. This doesn't seem to be clear.

K: Of course.

Q: One becomes the problem.

Q: Is it that we are still hiding the subject of the verb, the 'I' now in the bundle, instead of having it separate from the bundle, we've now stuffed it into the bundle?.

K: I am the bundle.

Q: That's right, but is that correct?

K: Oh yes. Absolutely.

Q: The one is correct but in the seeing of that, it doesn't...

K: Not only in the seeing, the feeling of it, in my blood, in my guts I feel it.

Q: Yes, sir

Q: There is an 'I' tucked into the bundle - you haven't changed anything, have you? The perception of that changes the whole

thing.

K: I have changed completely because I see the truth, the observer is the bundle.

Q: But can one say that it isn't that 'I' perceive that but...

K: No.

Q: ...it has occurred, thereby undoing the duality.

K: I am not perceiving the bundle, the bundle is me.

Q: So there's no longer a perceiver or the thing perceived.

K: I've made that clear.

Q: Finished.

Q: So there is perception and not who sees it or who...

K: I said that, I said there is only the realization, the fact that I am the bundle.

Q: But is not the root of the matter that if we perceive the bundle and then we disappear, we don't want to disappear.

K: Yes, of course, that's the...

Q: I don't want to disappear. (Laughter) I'm sorry to have to admit it.

Q: What has become of the problem itself, and if one has a sense of awareness, as something which seems to be separate, you know, a manifestation of, then that manifestation of whatever it is we feel, that sense of awareness is the problem, so one hasn't disappeared, they have just become something which is more involved with, in the thing itself. There is no separation.

K: Sir, look, Professor Wilkins said, I don't want to disappear. That's probably what most of us do. But the 'I' is the very centre of violence. If you are like that, asking the Prime Minister, say, "Give up your prejudices", he says, "Sorry, 10 Downing street is very



profitable, nice."

No, I want to find out as a human being whether it is possible to live without violence. And I see for myself, I mean I'm not asking you to see it, I'm not persuading you or pressurizing, putting you in a corner, or brainwashing you - I say, for me the fact is I am that. When there is that absolute realization, the truth of it, something totally different takes place. If you are interested we can pursue it. We can only pursue it if you have come to the point.

Q: Sir, I am part of the society, whether in the politics, economics, so for more than 20 years I am trained up to see myself different from that bundle of incidents.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: So I listen attentively and I also see the consequence that despite prejudice, it is also the cause of sorrow and it is fortunately for me. So for more than 20 years I always try to change it, to modify it. I always try to do something because I see also it causes something that is not good for me or for others, so I always try to change it. And now I see that it is not different from me, so surely there is an action.

K: So what is the action?

Q: Because I am not different from that bundle and I am that bundle, surely I am not going to do anything any more.

K: No, no. Something else takes place, you see, that's another, that means you are now come to a state, according to you, sir, that you don't act at all. There is no action.

Q: I mean that I am not trying to change anything.

K: No, we've been through all that. I said, when you come to that point and you realize the bundle is you, there is a totally

different action takes place. It's not my action or your action, it's action which will be common to all of us.

I think we'd better stop, it's one o'clock. We'll go on tomorrow.  
Is that all right?

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD SEMINAR MEETING 15TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: Where did we leave off yesterday?

QUESTIONER: The observer and the observed.

Q: I think we left off where somebody said he didn't want to disappear, in other words, the 'me', the 'self' doesn't want to disappear. And if we really fully go on with all of this it could well mean that 'me', the self, disappears, that's the end of it. We don't want that.

K: I don't quite remember, do you?

Q: We talked about the observer and what we called a bundle.

K: Yes, oh yes.

Q: And the notion was raised that perhaps one was just placing the self into the bundle.

K: We must bear in mind the subject we started out with, which was, what is one to do in a world that is steadily declining, deteriorating, violence and all that. What can a human being do about all that? That's what we started out with.

Yesterday and the previous day, we made it quite clear that the world outside of us, we human beings have created this. And after having created it, we are caught in that trap. And we think we are different from the activities that are going on outside of us. We pointed out too, that the world with all its violence and terror and greed and competition and violence, is made by man. And we, as human beings, are responsible for that. That is, the world is me, and me is the world. I think that we made quite clear.

All the accumulated despairs, anxieties, grief, sorrow and

violence, all this bundle is me, my consciousness is that. And that consciousness is part of the world. So that consciousness is the world. Right? We are clear on that point I hope. Can we go on from there?

And do we observe that bundle with all the content of this consciousness, do we observe it as though I was different from that consciousness, and can operate on that consciousness, try to modify it, change it, control it, suppress it, or run away from it. Or that consciousness, which is also the expression of the world, is me, and therefore there is no observer separate from that bundle which is the 'me'. Right? That's where we left off yesterday.

I don't know how far we have really grasped the significance of it. Could we discuss it a bit more? "When I realize", the questioner says, "When I realize that I am the world and all the happenings in the world, psychologically, have been created by my ancestors and by me, I am part of that. I am not separate from that, I am the total quantity of all that."

And there is the suspicion, probably in most of us, there is something beyond all this. Right? There is something superior or which is not contaminated. Is that so? We ought to discuss this rather carefully. I don't know if it interests you. We are following each other?

The Hindus have said that there is a superior entity, the Atman and so on, I won't go into all that, that is not contaminated, that exists in you. And that is operating, that is the witness, he is the witness, watching. Right? I don't know if any of you know anything of the Hindu mythology or Hindu superstition, but it's part of that. That is, that there is a watcher who is not touched by

society, by thought. And that is trying all the time to push away the things that man has created round it. I'm putting it rather crudely and briefly. That's one idea.

And also, probably in the Christian world too, and perhaps in the eastern world, there is the soul, something that is not part of this society. Right? I don't know if you have gone into it, thought about it. So we ought to consider that too, if there is something in us, in me, in you as human beings that is not touched by the corruption of society, corruption of thought, corruption of time. Right?

Q: I've got a problem here, you seem to be implying that there is some kind of individual, indivisible sort of state of peace.

K: No.

Q: You are saying that we are the world, and it seems to me that if we are the world there's no place for a sort of private, personal, sort of subjective state.

K: I think so. I agree with you, there is no private me apart from the public me. I can deceive myself.

Q: Then if there isn't, why are you talking about the soul...

K: No, because...

Q: ...that sort of stuff, which is nonsense. I see that as being...

K: I'm talking about it because this is a prevalent idea.

Q: I don't think one can seriously think so.

K: Perhaps you have not that idea. So we can drop it. Right? No, you're too quick to drop everything.

Q: Sir, I think we might say that we don't believe in it but it's buried deep in many of our premises and the way we think.

K: No, I think, sir - look at it differently, if I may point out. Is

the whole of me, my consciousness, corrupt, in the sense, there is nothing more in me, there is no spot of clarity? You understand what I'm saying?

Q: We might as well all go home if that's the case.

K: Am I the whole bundle of this and nothing else? I'm putting the question differently. I wonder if you are meeting my point. Could we discuss this? Is there in my consciousness of which I'm not aware, of which I'm not cognizant, is there in me a field, an area that is not put together by thought. You understand? I wonder?

Q: Is that the question you are putting forth to us?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Well, would it seem difficult when you ask if there is such a thing, it does exist, beyond our cognisance, how would we know that, I mean, how could we even answer that question?

K: There is an idea, sir, that I'm not, I as a human, all that - I am not all this corruption, this time element, all the greed, envy, there is something in me which is not that also. This is the religious attitude. You understand? I don't know if you...

Q: This has been said throughout the ages.

K: Yes.

Q: It must be today the only hope of mankind, if I can dare use that word hope.

K: So if there is such a thing which is not touched by time, that given the opportunity may wipe out all this.

Q: Exactly.

K: You understand? No, you're missing it.

Q: And yet on the other hand, it might just be a wishful thought.

K: That's just it. So what do you consider? This is a discussion,

you understand, we're trying to find out.

Q: You have been speaking about the objects of consciousness, I mean, is it possible if one is seriously interested to consider consciousness itself. In other words, I'm not concerned with the content. Consciousness without any content as we know it, thinking process and so forth.

K: Do we know...

Q: Is it worth looking at that area?

K: Do we know consciousness, first of all, with all its content, or only part of it, not the whole content? You understand my question? That is, my consciousness is made up of all the traditions, superstitions, belief, illusions, suspicion, anxiety, and so on, all my consciousness is that. Put there by thought. Right? Would you agree to this? Not agree, see it.

Q: I don't think I do agree with that, because I think for some time now I think I've had some kind of change, and I now see that there is no difference between what is going on inside me and the content of consciousness outside.

K: No, all right. I'm saying, the world consciousness is my consciousness.

Q: Yes, but that means you have an immediate problem like a doctor has a problem, they say there's no time for prophylactic medicine, looking into this, is there an area which is...

K: I don't quite...

Q: ...but that the situation is such that you keep saying it's so urgent that one has to deal with this, with this problem.

K: We are dealing with problems.

Q: It's so violent that even the Church, they haven't got the time

to sit there, they are all worrying about being humble and all this nonsense.

K: Then I'm not following your point. Perhaps others are following it.

Q: We seem to have jumped, because you said, you asked a question and said, is there consciousness apart from thought, I think.

K: No, I didn't say that.

Q: Or not made up, part made up.

K: No, I only said, my consciousness is made up of all the things that thought has put together there. The nationalities, the racial prejudices, the beliefs, the ideals, anxieties, all that is the movement of thought, which includes emotional and all that, all that is the content of my consciousness.

Q: It's the content?

K: Wait, wait. Am I aware of that or only part of it, depending on circumstances, incidents, happenings, pressures, only part of it. Or am I aware of the whole content? And if I am aware, is there in that consciousness, something which is not put there by thought? How do I find out, because this is a question that has been put, been talked over, gone into by all the religious people, that there is God in you, in different forms, it doesn't matter. The whole Asiatic world believes that, practically, except part of the Buddhist and so on. I won't go into all that.

So I'm asking myself, therefore you're asking yourself, is there in my consciousness an area which is not put there by thought? You understand my question?

Q: We are asking, it would seem, I have a time-based mind and



I'm asking now with this time-based mind, what is it like to be...

K: I don't know.

Q: ...without time.

K: I don't know what it's like, all that I know, I'm asking, because this has been one of the questions which mankind has gone into and asserted and denied, that there is something which is not put there by thought. Please, you must see this, this is not my opinion, this is what the world is thinking about.

Q: But surely this seems to implying, if you say that there is something inside, you're suggesting that there is a soul, some sort of personal subjective experience, some private space.

K: No, they don't call it private, individual, they call it something, highest principle, eternal something or other.

Q: Isn't that the same thing?

K: So we can wipe that out if you agree, sirs, we can put that aside.

Q: I don't think it is quite right to put it aside, personally, forgive me, because I haven't been here for the past few days.

K: I know, sir.

Q: If one's putting away aside the content of consciousness that's one thing, but the very immediacy of consciousness, which we cannot dismiss, which is our very being, is rather a different area. And are you suggesting that we should dismiss that as an area of investigation?

K: I'm sorry I brought this thing up, because you haven't gone into it, let's drop it.

Q: I think this gentleman is asking, sir, if there is anything in consciousness other than the content.

Q: Not in consciousness, as long as you're looking at things in consciousness, you're forever looking at things that are away from oneself and not in one's immediacy of being, it seems to me that this area that we are discussing is a sort of peripheral area whereas there is another mode, which is a mode of...

K: Sir, I'm asking, sir - all right, I won't ask. My consciousness is its content. Right?

Q: No, I don't see it that way, sir. It seems to me that it is possible for consciousness to be, for awareness to be, for me to be without thoughts, without thought processes.

K: Ah, I see.

Q: And I think there's a danger in dismissing consciousness or the objects of consciousness, dismissing one's own immediacy of being.

K: Sir, our subject was, what am I to do, act, do, in life in a world that is violent, disorderly, disintegrating, what is my action towards that? And we have been talking over it for the last two days and come to a certain point, which was, that what is happening out there is not different from what is happening from here. We all agreed to that, agreed, no - I won't even use the word 'agreed'. We said we all saw that.

Q: We saw that.

K: Just a minute, sir, let me finish. And so the world is me, and I am not different from the world. Just a minute. We saw very clearly. It took two days to come to that point of view, sir.

Q: Forgive me.

K: And we said, that being aware that I am the world, and that there is no observer different from the bundle which I am, right? -

then what actually takes place? That's the whole point. You understand my point? Perhaps you haven't followed clearly, I've not explained probably clearly, much too briefly, probably.

Q: Yes, I do feel you have said the possibility of though we are the world, there are gaps in the thought process, there are gaps between the words, and if there is care so that there isn't a complete continuity of the world within us.

K: We haven't gone into the continuity of that, sir. All that we have said so far is that the world is not different from me. The me is the bundle of all my desires, depressions, anxieties, sorrow and so on. That is the bundle. Now am I observing that bundle as though the bundle is not me? You follow? Am I observing the bundle as though I was outside of it, and therefore looking at it? Then if I do that - we went into that, then there is the urge to act upon it, to control it, to shape it, to run away from it or suppress it.

But the fact is that bundle is me, there is no observer. That's where we came to yesterday. Right, sir?

Q: And what is action from there?

K: Yes, that's it. That's it. That's why I began by asking, our subject was, what am I to do, living in this world which is so destructive, disorderly and so on, what am I to do? To find out that action we have discussed the last two days and come to this point: that is, there is only the bundle and not the observer. I don't know if you have gone as far as that. Right?

It was a logical conclusion. Right? I'm using the word 'logical' in the sense, as a river flows naturally, and in the same way we have observed this whole process flowing, which is not a logical step my step conclusion. I wonder if you see. Like a stream or a

river that's flowing constantly, it has its own logic. And what we have done is to follow that logic naturally. So there has been no effort. Right? There has been no definite opinion or conclusion - it's a fact. Right? We are observing the fact.

So have we really come to that point? That's my question, which is, are we looking at this bundle of consciousness with all its content as an observer looking in, or there is no observer but only this bundle? Have we come to that point, not as an idea, a conclusion, but as an actuality, as a thing that is happening. Now could we go on from there.

Q: Sir we have seen that, now what are we going to do, if we have seen that?

Q: I don't know if we have seen that.

K: No, that's why we may have seen it as an idea, as a conclusion, which is different from the actual - I dislike to use the word 'experience', it's a silly word - as an actual fact, you understand sir? - an actual reality.

Q: Perhaps we could try to go on to the difference between the seeing it as an idea and actually seeing it as a fact, or as an experience.

K: Yes. We ought to talk over that a bit.

Q: Yes.

K: That is, do I observe it, is there an observation, and from that observation a conclusion which is an idea, or without idea observe, and not come to a conclusion? Sir, I see you sitting there. That's a fact, you're there. I may draw a conclusion from it. I may say I don't like you, it becomes an idea.

So when we say the bundle is me, is it an idea, or the real, the

actual realization that it is so? So we ought to talk over that a bit.

Q: Sir, the difficulty seems to be the way that we are looking. It seems that looking is struggling, because if that is so, if looking is struggling, then the answer to the question "What can I do in the world that is violent" the answer is nothing, there is nothing I can do, if looking is struggling.

K: Yes, sir. First of all, we have discussed so far, is it an idea or is it an actual fact of which there is observation. You understand?

Q: Sir, it seems that the words we have to use, which are not the thing, can be an obstacle if we think with the image of the words. It seems we have to put aside the image of the words.

K: Sir, I'm asking you a question, please find out - I may be wrong or perhaps you're already answered it. When you observe a fact, or rather when there is an observation of fact, does that observation bring about an idea, a conclusion, a concept, or merely observe the fact? Which is it that we are doing?

You see, all this comes to, is there an action without the actor? I don't know if I'm jumping.

Q: Yes, I think it's a little too fast.

K: I'm going too fast. Right.

Q: Are you saying that acting is quite different from an action, it sounds like an abstract nonsense.

K: An action, action, don't say...

Q: Acting.

K: Acting. Is there an - as Dr. Bohm says, you have jumped too far ahead so I withdraw that.

Q: I would like to ask the question, what is it we are in contact with this actual fact of the bundle, you know, if we see it we must

have a contact with it, if it's an actual fact.

K: That's it.

Q: This contact.

K: Yes, that's it, put it that way. Is there an actual contact with the fact?

Q: Yes, as we can contact with an object.

K: Put it that way.

Q: - a real object.

K: Let's put it that way, instead of using experience and all that, is there an actual contact with the fact that I am the world and the world is me, and this bundle is me without the observer? Is that an actual contact.

Q: That contact is the way we live.

K: No, no.

Q: What we seem to do is wrestle with the idea, not make contact with the fact. You wrestle with the idea, and that seems to cause the conflict.

K: Sir, bear in mind, sir, all the time, we're asking what am I to do. Right? And we've come to the point when we say, "Are we actually in contact with the fact that I am the bundle?" You understand - contact.

Q: When I'm relating to you or to a person, when I'm relating, talking to a person, I see that actually there is no real relationship, there is a mess.

K: But we're not talking...

Q: Just, please - but when I go away from people, then I'm alone, somehow I still think that I know what is good, what is beautiful, what is holy, except that it's not coming through, but in

the back of the mind this belief persists.

K: So what, what are you saying, sir?

Q: This, at some moments one sees that one is the bundle, when you're there but when...

K: No, when you're in touch with that, you can't say occasionally I'm in touch.

Q: We must pull out this contact. We must pull it out somehow or another. Yourself or Professor Bohm, we must pull out this question of content.

Q: Look into it.

Q: Looking into it, to me it is the way I look.

K: All right, are you directly in relationship with it?

Q: If I act.

K: No, I'm not talking of action. I'll come to that a little later, sir. I said, let's bear in mind all the time, or in the background, put it there, that the question is, "What am I to do in this world"? And we are trying to find out what is the right action in this.

And we are saying there is a right action when there is no observer. Right? That is, the observer has separated himself from the bundle. But the observer is put there by education - we went through all that yesterday, I won't go into it again. So as long as there is this division between the bundle and observer, there must be conflict, and all that.

But when there is the realization, the actual fact that I am the bundle and there is no observer - you follow, sir? - then what takes place? That is, when there is direct relationship with the fact, actual contact with the fact - I am using different words - actual embracing the fact, the fact is me. I am in complete contact with

that fact. There is no part of me which says I'm different. So the fact is entirely me. I don't know how to...

Q: Then there's no interference when the fact affects whatever takes place, it must spring from the fact, because there's nothing to interfere with that relationship that you are talking about.

K: We are not quite meeting each other, I'm afraid.

Q: It seems that instead of really trying to get at that, we're already trying to project what it will be like when we have it.

K: That's what I'm...

Q: Then we have something to move towards.

K: Yes.

Q: And that seems to be part of the difficulty.

K: I've not moved from this one thing, which is, I want to act in this world, and I see whatever I do either creates more mischief, more misery more confusion, so I say to myself, "What am I to do?" I don't think you feel this.

Q: It's a shock when one sees it.

K: What am I to do? Wait a minute, sir. So in examining that I have found out for myself, the world is me, I am the world, there in no other - that's a fact. I have embraced it, I have kissed it, I have hugged it, I am in contact with it, there is no difference between that and this.

And that violence and deterioration is part of me, so this bundle is me. That's a fact. So I am entirely in contact with it, wholly, there is no part of me that is not touching it entirely. I can't put it ten different ways.

Q: Got it now.

K: Right. Then what takes place? Wait - from there there is



action. My mind has reached that point, you understand? - where it is entirely in contact with that fact, then what takes place? I can tell you what takes place but I don't want to.

Then from that there is an action which is complete, for me. Therefore don't accept what I am saying. Up to now we have logically, verbally, clearly explained this fact. Now I'm asking, after two days of discussion and verbal exchange, are we in contact with it completely, so that there is no hiatus, gap, saying, sorry, part of me which is not that.

Q: But, sir, if all that goes on day and night, goes on here, what else can it be but me?

K: Have you answered my question, Madam?

Q: Sir, could we say that we have a certain contact with that fact and it's incomplete, and then look at what we can do to bring about more complete contact with that.

K: I can't do anything more. Either you see it or you don't see it.

Q: Sir, can we discuss the state of mind? It seems the only question we can talk about now is the state of mind in which this perception can take place, otherwise there's no point, I mean, it just seems that we're not getting it. Or I can only speak, maybe I should only speak for myself. It seems that maybe there is a state of mind, a perception, which is not a struggle, which is not an effort, but personally it seems extraordinarily difficult to be in that state, in that position, in that place.

K: Sir, are you answering my question? I'm sorry to stick to that.

Q: Look, sir, I see that this violence, this world which is going on throughout the world is me.

K: Now, wait, just a minute. Is that an idea or a fact to you, your breath?

Q: It's a fact, sir, I can see it.

K: Wait, wait - I want to know. Not you can see it - it is so.

Q: Feel it.

Q: Yes, I feel it and I want to do something.

K: Wait, no, then if you want to do something, you've already separated the fact from the fact. You understand? I say action will come into being when there is the realization and complete contact with the fact. From that there is a different kind of action. This is logical, please, sir, - I'm using the word 'logical' in the sense that the river that flows, it's not clear-cut, put there by thought, logically step by step, it's like a river that's flowing, flowing, flowing. It has its own logic, its own beauty, its own movement.

Q: There is shock and despair at seeing this, when you say this is me and there is nothing, with what you've got that I can do.

K: Now wait a minute.

Q: I have tried all those things.

K: You're still acting, you're still concerned with the doing, I'm not. I started with the question - what to do? - but I say I must find out if there is an action which is absolutely without regret, without - you know, all the rest of it. I want to find out. So I say, is the world different, I come to all that, I say I am the world.

Now what am I to do? To answer that question, I say to myself, "Am I absolutely in touch with the fact, or I'm imagining it, or is it an idea, or is it some hope, because I want to act properly." You follow, sir? So I'm not concerned for the moment with action.

Q: Krishnaji, we are very concerned with the action, that's part

of the difficulty, we already want to act rightly before going through all the...

K: No I don't know what right action is, I said that.

Q: Yes, but I think that we assume there is a right action.

K: I don't know.

Q: And move towards it.

K: You assume but I don't know.

Q: There is a big, continual cloud of thoughts which are making assumptions about what the situation is and what to do.

K: Yes. You're not meeting this.

Q: There's really only the seeing, isn't there?

K: You can see visually, optically, but it may be not whole, not complete.

Q: I think the point where we're at is that we're not in complete contact with this fact.

K: That's all. Then if you're not completely in contact with the fact, then what will you do to be completely with it?

Q: If you state as an idea one would say, I am aware of the bundle as I, if you state as a fact, one would say the bundle is aware of itself.

K: No, sir.

Q: I think the simple fact is that I'm not at all sure that I grasp this fact of the bundle. If you could put it differently.

K: I am all that, sir. Right? I won't even call it a bundle. I am greed, I am envy, anger, I suffer, all that is me. Right? And I won't enlarge it. All that's me.

Q: But it's also a fact that anyone that I have relationship with insists that there is a me too. And I have to relate to that fact. What

is the response to that? Intelligence?

K: To what?

Q: Somebody relates to me. Let's just suppose for a moment that I haven't got a 'me'...

K: I don't...

Q: ...and somebody insists there is a 'me', there is a self, you know the physical entity with a relationship.

K: Sir, what do you mean something relates to me?

Q: Oh, the rest of the world. All the people which you're talking about, that are causing all the violence, including myself.

K: Sir, the world, with all the people in it, with all their mischief, with all their conceit, with all their vanity, with their etc. is part of me. I am not in contact with...

Q: We are talking about a microphone, it's no use your telling me that you're part of me.

K: What?

Q: I mean, I know you're a different human being.

K: I have got a brown skin.

Q: Yes, but...

K: ...taller...

Q: ...you are a different entity - you know, entity.

K: You see, I am only, sir, you are missing my point, or I'm not explaining. Psychologically all human beings are similar. Right? Do you accept that?

Q: No. (Laughter)

K: Human beings, whether they live - we've been through all this - whether they live in Russia, or this, suffer, they're uncertain, they're unhappy, they're insecure, they are violent, greedy, envious,

competitive and so on. They are similar, psychologically, inwardly. Modified perhaps by their culture, by environment, by the climate, but the core of it is similar.

Q: Yes, but why is it similar? Why is it similar? That's the question.

K: Why? That's been gone into too, sir. Why is it similar? Because we human beings, who have lived for a million years, have not resolved this problem.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is that the reason?

Q: Well, I think the fact that there is the problem that hasn't been solved...

K: We are trying to solve it. We are first stating - we have to go back over and over again - we are stating that the psychological similarity of all human beings, therefore the world which they have created is me. Psychologically I'm not different from you.

Q: No, but there are all these questions like Aristotle's business of substance, you know, this deprivation of being, all this that has to be related to. I mean, you know, I feel empty, we were talking about the emptiness inside oneself and all this stuff.

K: That's part of me.

Q: Someone else is feeling my empty.

K: Sir, that's part of me. I'm also empty, as a human being. I also feel terribly lonely - I don't personally - I'm saying as a human being concerned with the question which has been the subject of all of our discussions over the last two days, is what am I to do?

Q: Could I try to put it in slightly different words?

K: Yes, sir, delighted.

Q: What you are saying is that what is required is an intense realization that it is a fact that each individual is an integral part of the whole human consciousness.

K: Right.

Q: The whole human condition.

K: Right, sir.

Q: And that the differences which appear significant to us, are...

K: ...superficial, trivial. Now have you understood that, sir?

Q: Krishnaji, I feel this is the point where we always jump and you are always ahead of us and we get lost, so can I ask a question...

K: Delighted.

Q: ...and say that I feel that we come to the point when we see the bundle of memory, of violence, greed and all the limitations, but it seems here that nothing really then is fully clarified. Is there a way of exploring that more totally than we do, and is it that there is something that we don't look at that is nearer even than the content of consciousness. Is there some part of consciousness that slips through our exploration, when we try to see this?

K: I wonder, Mrs. Cadogan, if you heard what Professor Wilkins said. He said we are integral part of all humanity, though we think we are separate, we are really essentially...

Q: No, I don't think we are separate...

Q: I don't think anybody here thinks that we are separate.

Q: Sorry, could I say, once you see that we are not separate, one sees that we are not separate, then one looks at this process of consciousness, to see - not to see - but just to understand.

K: I don't quite follow - sorry. What are you trying to tell me?

Q: Well, I feel we looked at this bundle so many times.

K: No, I will drop the word 'bundle'. Take another.

Q: You look at, you see the bundle, the bundle was the fear, the greed, the doubt, the fear, the pain. But that seems almost like the symptom rather than the deep fact, somehow. There seems to be a movement of consciousness which comes before that which somehow we don't quite get to grips with, which is still causing the separation. Can we go into that any more with you? Will you help us?

Q: Sir, it seems that everybody seems to be looking about but it is not answered by it.

K: No, I don't quite follow what Mrs. Cadogan is saying.

Q: Could it be...

K: Would you explain, sir? If you have understood.

Q: Well, I think what it may be is that there is a kind of in each person as they're born, in each child there is a search for meaning begins. In each child the search for meaning begins, in each person the search for meaning begins. What does it mean?

Q: No, it's not that.

Q: No?

K: I don't think she meant that.

Q: There is no self, there is only a state of being, and what seems to be happening just now is that nobody is paying any attention to the fact that this bundle has as much capacity for good as it has for the other. And it is the awareness of this factor which to my mind suggests that there is no necessary will or desire. When one becomes aware of the fact, then the condition of being a part of also creates within its own self the ability to be one thing or the

other which we are all - but the turning over within ourselves towards right action or wilful action is something which is the bundle itself.

K: Sir, are you answering Mrs. Cadogan? Are you explaining what she meant because some of us have not understood what she meant.

Q: I do not know if I am explaining that.

K: That's all I asked, sir. You're saying something different from her.

Q: I'm still...

K: First we haven't understood what she has to say.

Q: I think what she was trying to say is that, we get always stuck at this one point but there is this bundle which is made up of suffering, pain, effort - is there a step which we are missing before that?

K: Is that it?

Q: Not quite. I feel that we're not in a content of consciousness rather than the structure of consciousness. There seems to be something more vital that's not understood by us. But it's more vital than the pain or the symptoms which...

K: All right, is there something more vital than all this.

Q: That slips through, it slips through, it moves without us seeing what happens.

K: Yes, I understand.

Q: We are not aware of it.

K: I think I understand what you're trying to say. Is there something more vital behind all these symptoms. Is that it?

Q: Yes.



K: Behind all the sorrows, misery, blah, blah, blah. Is there something much more active than this?

Q: Yes, that escapes our awareness.

K: Yes, that escapes - at last we've got it. Some of you answer it, sirs.

Q: I think Mrs. Cadogan is where I am. When you were a few minutes ago and I've been looking at this in these last few minutes - is it a fact that I feel that all this which is going on in the world is me, is it a fact or is it an idea? And to me Mrs. Cadogan is saying, now wait a moment, it is a fact, but really I feel she feels that it's an idea, and she wants something in between which is going to bridge the gap between idea and fact.

K: No, not quite that. Sorry to contradict you, which is not, as far as I understood what she meant was, apart from all the symptoms, greed, envy and so on, is there something much more vital, active that we are missing?

Q: In our own process.

K: Yes, in the process of examination and investigation, are we missing something which is much more, which is deep, which has great vitality, which will wipe away all this. More or less. Right? Have I got it?

Q: Yes, yes, I mean something is not clear, you see, and one feels it so immediate, so vital each time, and its - yes, you go on Krishnaji, you explore that area.

Q: Sir, doesn't this imply that there is a division in consciousness, in what Mary is saying?

K: No, no. Sir, may I put it differently. Is there a cause, root...

Q: Root, root.

K: ...which is producing all this. Just a minute, just a minute, just a minute. Let's understand the question properly. The branches are all this, anger, jealousy, blah and so on, the root is there, if one can touch the root, then the symptoms may disappear. Is that it?

Q: It's the roots.

K: Yes, that's what I'm trying to get at. Is there...

Q: Can I ask another question? Is this really a collective thing, I mean, are we talking about the structured form of the human being, human species, I mean something, you know, some sort of, like... kind of thing, is that the kind of thing in terms of consciousness, is that what you are talking about?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes, that's why, I've made the question clear for myself, I don't know if the others understand it. If instead of always talking about pruning the branches and cutting the flowers and leaves and so on, if we could go to the very root of it, the tree would wither away. Right?

Q: Are we suggesting that this root is not...

K: I am only trying to understand what Mrs. Cadogan was saying.

Q: I thought she was implying that there was something other than content that was part of this root.

K: No - the content, sir, no, the content are the leaves of the tree. Right? Put it like that - the branches, the flowers, the fruit and all that, but the root, if we can touch the root and understand that, the symptoms and all that will disappear. That's what, if I understand rightly, that's what she's trying to convey. Is that right?

Q: The root is what seems to elude out observation.

K: Yes, is that understood? Have you understood?

Q: Yes.

K: My god!

Q: Would it be helpful to state that then if I give up the desire to see this as a fact, and if I give up the fear of not seeing it as a fact, that would help?

K: No, there is no giving up. There is no sacrifice, there is no taking of vows, but only investigating and understanding. Right? As far I'm concerned.

So Mrs. Cadogan's question is, instead of always talking about the branches and the leaves and the fruit thereof, go to the root of it. Right?

Q: Can we go to the root of it?

K: Go to the root of it.

Q: Is there a root at all?

K: Of course, must be. Answer that question, sir. You're all ready to answer - go ahead.

Q: Sir...

K: Wait - piano!

Q: I think that, you see, as long as I say to you, you know, I'm this bundle, but I keep on believing that some part of me is not that, and I keep on doing that, which is a fact. You know, I'm stuck there.

K: Yes, sir, that's your whole illusion.

Q: And that's where I stay.

K: Yes, yes.

Q: Part of me is not the bundle, part of me is good.

K: Yes, I understand that's what I tried to explain when I said at

the beginning of the talk, some of us, some parts of the world believes there is something which is not this.

Q: Perhaps if we could answer Mrs. Cadogan's question, we could...

K: I'm coming back, sir - he's pursuing his own idea, he hasn't moved away from it.

Q: Yes.

K: Sorry.

Q: Could I suggest that possibly, this is only a suggestion, that what underlies the various symptoms is some sense of grief, some sense of frustration that life is an uncomprehended reality.

K: You see, Mrs. Cadogan has asked that question. He says I'm really not interested in that question but the part of me that says I am different, there is something I'm not all that. And he's repeated this three days. And he'll go on repeating it, because to him that is an experience which he won't let go. And we said that to investigate one must be free of all experiences, prejudices, knowledge and so on - to investigate. Right? If I'm a Marxist I can't investigate. If I am attached to my experience I can't investigate.

So he's playing with us. Sorry. After three days you're sticking to it. We have explained very carefully, I'm not being rude, we explained very carefully, that's also part of our illusion. And you say, why do you consider that illusion, because it's still thought says, "There must be something." The whole movement of thought we have investigated.

So to come back to Mrs. Cadogan's question, which is, if we can cut the cause, everything is simple. The symptoms will disappear.

Q: I'm not saying that, I am questioning.

K: Wait - I'm saying that.

Q: Yes.

K: So is there a cause for all this?

Q: Are you suggesting in saying is there a cause for this, I mean, it seems to me rather like saying that the bundle...

K: Cut out the bundle, sir.

Q: No, hang on!... that I will look for a result beyond it. Aren't we also assuming that there is an individual - are we talking about an individual separate, or are we talking about something deeper, which I hope is what we're talking about.

K: The individual is only superficial movement. There is no 'me' but the world.

Q: There are distinct bodies, aren't they, I mean your body is different from mine.

K: Of course, sir, don't. I mean obviously, you're short, I'm tall, brown, black, but psychologically we are all similar.

Q: We are talking about consciousness.

K: We are an integral part of humanity, I am not an individual. I like to think I'm an individual. It gives me great sense of vanity, separateness. But actually, psychologically, I'm an integral part of this world which is so terrible. Right? To me that's not an idea, not a belief, a conclusion - it's so, in my blood it is so.

So Mrs. Cadogan's question is, is there a cause which in our investigation we are missing? If we could go into that, then perhaps the symptoms may disappear - may, I don't say it does, or it will.

Q: Sir, earlier on we said that human consciousness is all the little bits that thought has put together.

K: Sir, are you answering her question?

Q: That's what I'm doing.

K: What is that?

Q: I'm saying that the branches of this tree are all the things that thought has put together. And so lower down must be the mechanics of thought.

K: Sir, what do you think is the cause of all this? Cause, not idea, not a conclusion, the root of it.

Q: I think it's the thinking process that has created all this.

K: Would you accept that?

Q: I don't really feel that, that's what I'm trying to get to.

K: What he's saying is, the root cause of all this is the whole process of thinking. Thought is the root of it. Thought being born of knowledge, and knowledge implies ignorance. Ignorance. Knowledge and ignorance go together. There is no complete knowledge.

Q: I feel this is concerned with the same thing, which is the structure of our consciousness.

K: No, no, he's saying something else. It's not the structure. The structure is the result of thinking.

Q: Which also implies time.

K: All that. He's read what I've said, a dozen times! (Laughter)

Q: I feel that we're moving away from what I was looking at.

K: No.

Q: Can I try to clarify Mary's question, I'm not quite clear - are you talking about the roots of violence, or the roots of our being?

Q: I was trying to talk about the part that slips through our awareness, almost a movement that comes. We can see our greed, our nationalism, that's easy. And we're not necessarily trapped

obviously in that, but there is still something which moves too fast or too something for our awareness. So that we are still restricted in this way.

Q: That isn't necessarily the root of violence, is it?

Q: Well it may do.

Q: Yes, but I mean you are saying there is something that is escaping us, that is so immediate.

Q: Yes.

Q: But that isn't necessarily a thing of violence, the root of violence.

Q: But I wondered if Krishnaji could somehow...

K: Let's do it slowly. Are you saying, we've always talked about the symptoms, the branches, and never the root?

Q: I don't say never but at this moment...

K: Wait - never - doesn't matter. In our investigation we have always looked at the tree, at the branches, at the fruits and so on, but we have never gone down deeply, to see what is the origin of all this.

Q: Or the thing that moves so fast.

K: Yes.

Q: May I ask if the root in the question could be considered the root of thinking - is thinking a branch of this root or is it some other factor that somehow weaves its way through thought?

Q: Thinking could be a part or a branch of the tree.

K: What is that?

Q: It could be.

Q: We're looking for something deeper then, as a cause of all this human trouble, deeper than thinking, is that it?

Q: Almost more immediate than thinking.

Q: Now here we're back to the thinking.

K: What did you say?

Q: Well, I was trying to find out if in this analogy if thinking is a branch of something deeper, which we're looking for, or is thinking actually down there in the roots.

K: The cause. Yes.

Q: Is there some primal cause before thinking?

K: Yes. Right?

Q: I get the feeling that the way the discussion's going that we always get trapped in the new words, we use some words which seem to be helpful up to a point, a metaphor, I mean we had the metaphor of contacting the thing itself, and we could get into that in a way. And then we seem to come up against a block and we feel that there must be something else beyond that, we are not getting through to the thing itself. And so we come up with a new image, with a new word which seems helpful.

Q: But this is not an image to me.

Q: No, I know.

Q: To me this is something which has been there a long time in my life. It has not been...

K: But Mrs. Cadogan, what is right action? Confronted with this world, what am I to do - that's how we started.

Q: And my right action...

K: What is correct action? Which will be correct always. Not depend on circumstances and so on. And that is the question which we propose. Will the answer what to do cover this question, your question?



Q: You said, what is right action, what is right action - for me the only right action seems to be to explore this unresolved part of my consciousness, obviously there is still something which I have not understood, which is the key to going into all the things we are going into.

K: Yes, now, unexplored part of your consciousness. Right?

Q: All right, yes. Not mine, I don't think it's mine particularly, I question consciousness: -

K: Is there any part of your consciousness that cannot be explored? How do you explore the deep, hidden consciousness? You follow? I'm pursuing the deep, hidden consciousness may be the root. You understand? How am I with my conscious mind to explore that which is hidden? You're answering my question? I can't.

Q: I agree.

K: No, sir, don't agree or disagree.

Q: Well, that's how I see it.

K: No, no. It's not a question of agreement or disagreement. There are hidden parts of me and my conscious mind says I must investigate that, which may be the root of it. Right? The root of all these symptoms. Right?

Now how am I, how is the conscious mind, the mind that thinks, the mind that has knowledge, the mind that is caught in various illusions, going to investigate something which is totally hidden?

The analysts have said analyse. Right? We won't go into that. Or it will reveal through dreams, through sleep. Or it will reveal itself through meditation. I'm proposing various systems which man has put together to find the deep hidden cause. Right? Now,

we deny analysis, obviously. The other is dreams. There too there must be an interpreter or the interpreter goes on while you're dreaming - it does happen, I know this - you have a dream and the interpretation is going on at the same time. And you wake up, it may not be true. Right?

So we're thrown back to one thing, meditation. Now that covers a large field, which means - wait - I'll explain briefly, which means conscious mind being absolutely quiet. Then in that quietude things may be revealed. Right? Thing being the root. Go on. You're all... right? So how shall we do this. Will you meditate - I mean this seriously - to see that your conscious mind, the thinking mind, stops completely. Then there is a possibility of the deep, hidden activity surfacing itself. Right? Possibility, I don't say there is.

Now instead of going through all these methods, systems and so on, is it possible - just a minute - to see the whole thing instantly? You follow? The cause, the symptoms, the activities of the symptoms, the totality of the thing, seeing it immediately.

Q: The whole.

K: The whole works. I say it is possible only when all the symptoms have disappeared.

Q: You're saying that?

K: I'm saying that. When all the symptoms have subsided.

Q: Sir, for me that's...

K: Nonsense?

Q: Too fast.

K: I know, I'm answering her question quickly.

Q: Because the way I hear that, we are saying that if we see the entire root...

K: No, not the entire root - the whole thing.

Q: The whole thing, the root and all the branches and all of it...

K: Is that possible, first.

Q: But Mary was saying that it is not possible because that root exists.

K: No.

Q: That's what blocks the perception of the whole thing.

K: That's what she means, too - she means that. Says, it is possible. Unless you want to go into that, that it is possible to see the totality of this whole movement.

Q: The whole consciousness.

K: The whole of it.

Q: The whole, the structure, the content...

K: Whole of it. I mean the whole.

Q: On the instant.

K: I mean the whole, the root, the branches, the whole of it, to see it. It's not a miracle, it's not - that leads us off somewhere else, for the time being.

I am left at the end of this discussion, after three days, I don't know what to do. Right? But let's be clear, when I, when there is the realization that I'm the integral part of the whole of humanity - you understand, sir, what it does? You don't. When I am the integral part of all humanity, what has taken place when there is the realization of this fact, enormous fact, you understand, it's not just words. What takes place?

Q: Could it be said that action then loses its aspects of activity, doing, and becomes the aspect of actuality?

K: Sir, I am concerned with what takes place, you follow? -

before action, before anything. When I so completely realize, the mind realizes that it is part of all humanity.

Q: There is no more self-centredness.

K: No, no. What takes place?

Q: It must be compassion.

K: Look, why haven't you come to that point, that's what I'm asking. We have logically like a river, explained why haven't you come to that point, say yes, I know what it means, there is...

Q: Because the sense of separation is still operating in us.

K: So all these three mornings are wasted.

Q: Not unless I see this.

K: Because we're still living at the verbal level.

Q: Yes.

K: So I say, are you observing all this as an idea or conclude from the observation a series of ideas, or are you really in contact with reality, with that truth that you are the integral part of this whole, vast, decaying humanity?

I say if you realize that, there comes quite a different state, from that there is action.

Sir, what is love? Just a word? Doesn't this happen when you're really in contact with that fact that you are integral, that you are humanity? Gosh, something happens to you, doesn't it?

We'd better stop - lunch. Sir, I meant to ask - do we meet tomorrow or do you want a rest?

Q: No, let's meet tomorrow.

Q: Krishnaji may want a rest.

K: No, just a minute, don't - you're not giving me a rest, don't think about that. You've had three days of verbal exchange. Right?

Your minds have been drilled, pushing back and forth.

Q: You need one, sir.

K: Do you want a rest tomorrow?

Q: You need that, sir.

Q: Can we give you a rest with all of us.

K: Don't bother about me. You decide.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH SEMINAR MEETING 16TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder where we are. We've had three talks. We are still concerned, aren't we, with what is one to do in a world that has become so appallingly disorderly, violent and so on. What is one to do? That is the central issue.

So we're not just indulging in lots of words or theories or holding on to one's own experiences and points of view, but those of us who are here, and I hope we are serious and not playing around with all this, that our principle question is, what is one to do?

And I think we ought also to consider what is the individual action which we think is separate from the integral part of the whole. Right? Have I made my question clear? We may think we are separate individuals and act from that self-centred intention, or from that self-centred movement, because we think we are individuals. And I wonder if we are individuals, though we have accepted that for millenia, that we are separate individuals, with its own consciousness, with its own sorrow, different from all humanity. Right?

And we have found for ourselves through all these talks that we are the whole, we are the part of the world. And our actions are like the rest of the world. Right? What we do the world is doing. So psychologically, as well as in action, we are the rest of the world - we are the world. And when we have reached that point, is there any individuality at all. You understand? We have accepted that we are individuals, separate, something unique which in its whole life

has to fulfil in various forms.

And when we discover the truth that we are integral part of this enormous humanity, what place has any individual, individuality. Or there is no individuality at all. It's up to you to discuss.

QUESTIONER: The world is us and we are the world. That is no longer an idea, it is a fact. The world being us and the world is us, the action from seeing that, the full realization of that as a fact, is a different action.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Now I don't know what that action is.

K: We're going - we're coming to it.

Q: It means no further contributing to the disorder and the violence that is going on in society. Now whether the individual comes in there or not, I don't know.

K: Sir, first, that's why I want to go into the question of individuality, if there is such a thing at all. I know it's rather, maybe you may not like to go into the question, because you may think individuality is very important, or one who is bound to that tradition, and so it's very difficult to break through that wall of individuality. But I, we are questioning whether the individual exists at all. If and when we see the truth or the fact that we are the whole of humanity - go into it, sirs.

If, no, when we see the fact that I am part of the world, I am the rest of mankind, what is the quality of my mind that has seen this fact, seen in the sense, be absolutely in contact with it, wholly, realize completely, that is integral part of that vast mankind? What happens to the mind? Could we discuss this? Or is it too...

Q: The family is one, there is love. It is your family.

K: No, no. What is the quality of your mind, sir, before we say it is the family or it is this - what has taken place in your mind, mind in the sense your emotions, your sensitivity, your quality of your senses, feelings, affection, the capacity to think clearly, all that. What has happened to that - you understand my question?

Q: Yes.

K: What has taken place in the mind that has seen that it is part of the whole, it is not separate.

Q: It has become fairly quiet then, sir.

K: No, no. Find out, let's talk about it a little bit.

Q: Sir, if the mind realizes that it is part of the whole of humanity, that it is humanity, human beings..

K: Does the mind realize it, or does thought realize it? You understand?

Q: If it is watching...

K: Wait, sir. You understand my question? Is it thought that realizes "I'm the whole, part of the whole" or the whole consciousness, which is the mind, the whole of your consciousness realizes, sees, in contact, it completely comes to the truth that it is the rest of the world. I'm asking, what is the quality of the mind?

Q: What was outside before has now become intimate. One feels from the inside, rather than just as an objective series of events one has some sort of loose connection with.

K: Are you answering my question, sir? What is the quality of your mind, your consciousness when you realize, or when there is the realization that you are part, integral part of the whole, whole of humanity? What has taken place when there is perception of that?



Q: Sir, we might not be able to answer that question, because that action, that perception is something that is unfamiliar to us.

K: That means we have to go back and go over all the...

Q: Not necessarily go over all of it, but that last activity that, because we seem to be able to go most of the way, but that last action, that last activity that sees everything, that sees the whole is something that is new to us, is something that...

K: I'm not saying that sees the whole. That has realized that it is not separate from the rest of mankind.

Q: Could I ask a question?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: Because I feel there is a difference between someone who has never experienced, who has never actually been through that and say someone who has listened to what you've said, and has already had an experience of that, of not being separate from the world and therefore has found himself...

K: Sir, may I add a word there, the word 'experience' is rather difficult.

Q: Well, I don't want to get into the semantic thing, I have got to use language.

K: So, what is the question, sir?

Q: What I'm saying, what I'm interested in is the fact that you were mentioning about two things. I have a problem here. We never seem to be able to get to it because no one will get beyond the idea that it seems that there's a kind of, "What is it like to be the world."?

K: No, sir.

Q: Or that you are the world, you are not separate from it or

something of the sort.

K: Not something - we made it all very clear, up to now, that...

Q: It's not clear, that's the problem.

K: Oh glory!

Q: Sir, yesterday you were talking about, we were talking about how just before one could see the root of the separateness of the problem, there had to be some sort of subsiding of the problem or the bundle.

K: Sir, he's asking a question, that gentleman. He says, what you have been saying is not clear to me. So we have to clear it up with him. Right? What is not clear, sir?

Q: You seem to be asking what am I doing at this moment, what is my response at this moment, and yet I feel as though, I mean, if you have toothache - if I may use that metaphor - if you had toothache yesterday and you haven't been to the dentist, you've still got toothache today. And I feel as though I've got toothache, if you like...

K: You must have a bad dentist!

Q: But what am I doing about it now. I'm saying that I can't discuss that because you're talking about the first principles.

K: No, sir - look, what we have said so far is fairly simple and clear. We think we are separate, right?

Q: But I don't. I mean, for me there are problems of privacy, what happens if you are conditioned into having a private space, say mentally, I mean, how is one not to respond neurotically - included in what you are saying, if one is not an individual, is that one has no privacy, for instance, now.

K: I don't catch your meaning, sir. Sorry.

Q: He's saying, I think, that there's a physical correspondence to seeing that your consciousness is the same as the consciousness of mankind, that somehow hasn't had the physical correspondence in that you don't have a private space, or you don't have a private life. He seems to have made a logical jump there.

K: Is that it?

Q: Well, that's not only it, I mean, then - I think that the number of people who've actually done what you're saying is very few. I'm not saying that...

K: Don't bother about the few or the many, sir, but what is the quality of your mind, your mind, after examining all this? That is, psychologically we are the rest of mankind. Right? That's obvious, isn't it? What you suffer, people suffer similarly in India, in America, in Russia. What you go through, your sorrows, your pleasures, your anxieties, the rest of the world goes through that. You may be physically different, you may be taller, whiter, blacker, purple, whatever, brown, and so that is superficial. Basically, psychologically, we are the rest of mankind. Have you accepted that?

Q: Yes, I accept that.

K: Wait. Now is that an idea or an actual living fact? Stick to that one thing, sir. Is it an actual living fact or just a concept which you have gathered from the rest of us?

Q: How is one to tell the difference?

K: Oh yes, that's fairly simple - either it is an idea which you have accepted, or it is a living thing. Like breathing, like your whole being says it is so.

Q: But I don't know if at the same time it is a living thing.

K: What?

Q: I mean I don't know the relationship with what's in the mind.

K: I explained what the mind - all right, don't use the mind. Is there seeing that fact with all your being?

Q: I can be consecrated to the idea, over the fact, my action would be an act of consecration, a passion, if you like.

K: I don't quite follow that.

Q: Someone can be devoted, he can be devoted say to say the Nazis, or some of them were devoted to Nazism.

K: No, this is not, you're still devoted to something.

Q: Quite, that's what he's saying.

K: No, but...

Q: And it has an immense effect on one's life, it's still an illusion, but that illusion is also a reality.

K: Illusion is also a reality. Oh yes, we've been through that. I can accept an illusion and see, think that it is a reality.

Q: But he's saying he doesn't know how to tell the difference between the two.

K: What? Between what? The illusion and...

Q: The fact.

K: The fact?

Q: Yes.

K: Is that it, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Between illusion and fact. All right. Help me out, please - it isn't a battle between him...

Q: It's not like that for me. I have to say, the realization of the world is me and I am the world, to me it was an idea, it's a fact, and

I know that there will be a different action - what that action will be I don't know.

K: No, just a minute, sir. He says, how do you distinguish, how do you know what is an illusion and what is a fact?

Q: I'll tell you...

K: Tell him, sir.

Q: Yes, I'll tell him. Things are not going to be the same again. My own urgency about my self-centred activity, about my business, and all the personal problems have fallen away, because the world is me and I am the world.

K: You're not answering him.

Q: There is a different approach.

Q: Yes, but how do you know that the different approach is the right approach, or the correct one, or an intelligent one, or a sensible one, or one that is not violent, one that doesn't further violence or lead to more violence?

Q: Because I am no longer going to contribute to those problems, the violence of the world.

Q: But you are those problems.

Q: Exactly, I see that I am that. And it was an idea that the world is me and I am the world. It is no longer an idea. And if it is no longer an idea with me, then I will not be acting from what I was acting from, which was self-centred activity. Now there'll be an action from something else.

K: He's asking, sir, if I understand him, how do you separate illusion and fact.

Q: Sir, could we talk about the nature of that total perception.

K: No, we haven't answered that question.

Q: That would answer it, because if we saw the nature of that and we saw the nature of illusion we would see the difference.

Q: The difference between feeling and being.

K: Then, feeling and being both may be illusion. How do you separate the two?

Q: Is illusion created by thought only?

K: Yes, illusion is created by thought, by desire and so on.

Q: If there were somehow a way to test it out, then you could tell, because a fact, I mean, if that microphone is actually there I can touch it, but if it's only an idea...

K: You can't touch it.

Q: Right.

K: But can you touch, as you can touch the microphone, the fact - that's what he wants to know, as far as I understood.

Q: But you can test it, if one thought one saw that one was the world, then you saw that...

K: No, forget the world, forget me and... He's asking a question, how do you distinguish, discriminate or find out which is illusion and which is fact? Fact is something that is actually happening. Right? Right? Right, sir? Yes? You are doubtful about it. And illusion, what I conceive or have an opinion of what is happening. I am suffering. That's a fact. And being a Christian I say, Jesus is the embodiment of suffering, I'll give it to Him, he'll save me. That is an illusion, the actual fact is I am suffering. Right? So we don't have to go back to that.

We can distinguish, or separate the two, what is actually doing, happening. I am unhappy, I am greedy, I am anxious, I am frightened - that is the actual fact. Right? And I can say that

somebody will save me from this is an illusion. Right? Wait - just let's get this clear. Is this clear, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Now wait a minute, from there we move. Which is, the world outside is put together by me, by my parents, by generations past. Right? That's a fact.

Q: It's easy to see that one has suffering, pain, these things oneself. It's not so easy.

K: Your neighbour is not suffering? That your wife doesn't go through hell?

Q: I haven't got a wife.

K: Sir, I have no wife but I can see. Good God, you don't have to...

Q: But it does look to me as though some people are happy.

Q: Is it a question of degree, is part of our difficulty the fact that some of us feel as though we have lost some of our religions, that we might have seen through religious dogma, we might have seen that physical violence is rather useless, not a good way of going about it. I feel it is a question of degree. And that the illusion is that possibly we might have lost something that they've still got.

K: To a Catholic who believes very strongly in all that business, to him it's a fact. But when you examine it closely it is illusion. So is this clear, sir? Now wait a minute. The world, which is violent, which is all that, I am also like that. Right? So I am the world, that's a fact.

Q: No, it's not - you've jumped.

K: No - all right - wait. The world...

Q: You have. There is disorder outside, there is disorder inside,

but it doesn't mean that the disorder inside is anything to do with the disorder outside.

K: Sir, your neighbour is like you, psychologically. He may have a different business, different job, he may be a carpenter, he may be a professor, he may be a doctor. But psychologically, inwardly, he's like you. He suffers, you suffer. He's anxious, you are also. We've been through all this. So you are your neighbour.

Q: Sir, it's one thing to say that you are like your neighbour, because he suffers and you suffer. But isn't the difficulty that you were saying, you are your neighbour, because obviously one is not - we share certain things, we share one head and two arms and so forth, and we share things psychologically, but to say that you are that I think may be...

K: Psychologically I am my neighbour. There is no...

Q: I am like my neighbour, I share all kinds of things with my neighbour.

K: All right, I share, I share the same thing. You see, use different words but the fact is that.

Q: I think that one may feel that, it's true I share some things with my neighbour, but there may be some other things I don't share that may seem more important. For example, if one believes in individuality, one would feel, it's true I suffer but my individuality, which is more important, is not shared with my neighbour.

K: Of course, that's just it. You see, I don't...

Q: Sir, have you an objective in being here this morning?

K: Have I an objective?

Q: Being here this morning - that's what he said. A motive.



K: A motive? Have you a motive being here?

Q: I think so, yes.

K: Then why do you ask me?

Q: Because you have not...

K: I don't know, how do you know?

Q: It seems to me from your reactions that...

K: Sir, why do you bring that up, when that poor gentleman says I don't know what you're talking about.

Q: Because the turmoil in this room is affecting me, and I think to some extent you're perpetuating it.

K: What?

Q: He said, the turmoil in this room is affecting him and you are in some way perpetuating that turmoil.

K: I'm answering his question, I'm not perpetuating the turmoil.

Q: If you're not, sir, how can you ask a question?

K: He asked a question, sir. What are we all talking about?

Q: But I mean, you are stirring up turmoil, because you're trying to bring to our attention the nature of the turmoil. It seems to me a perfectly legitimate, desirable thing.

K: Yes, sir. That doesn't mean I'm in turmoil.

Q: If we examine it carefully, isn't that the difficulty, I mean, to accept something is one thing, that microphone is a microphone, it might be made out of chocolate, but in order to examine it carefully I have to see that that microphone couldn't possibly be made out of chocolate. We are very serious here.

K: Sir, would you kindly explain to that gentleman the fact and the illusion, if you have understood it. And the world is me and I am the world, that's the simple fact.

Q: But in order to see it as a fact...

K: He asks, explain to him, not to me.

Q: But I'm just saying, in order to see it as a fact, I have to go into it very carefully.

K: We have been - three mornings we've been into it, very, very carefully.

Q: Yes, but each individual has to go into it very carefully.

K: I thought we were doing it, each one of us, as we went along, step by step.

Q: But it seems that isn't the case.

K: Then what am I to do? Go all over again - I don't mind. Is that what you want, sir?

Q: Couldn't one look from another view? If one has the idea, the illusion that you are seeing, for instance, a stream, water flowing, and you really think this is water flowing and you can't tell if this is water flowing or not. But if you go out and put your fingers down into the stream you will know, this is water. Then you can tell the difference, but not while you are sitting there.

Q: It's only a fact if you test it in your life.

Q: As I feel it, the mind may fall into an illusion despite facts which should be nothing factual, to be something simply of the mind. So an illusion can always be challenged by facts, but a fact can never be challenged by an illusion and be seen to be anything but of the mind. The fact exists, the illusions are something which the mind grasps, holds onto, in many cases as a denial of the facts, as a retreat from facts. This is how it is for me. I don't know if this helps the discussion.

Q: Returning to his point about distinguishing between an

illusion and a fact, all illusion is created by thought, then it is clear that the only way to distinguish between illusion and fact is to go beyond thought to some other form of apprehension which does not involve thought.

K: Is that clear, so far? He's saying, Professor Wilkins is saying that any form, any movement of thought, anything that thought has created as an idea, as a concept, a conclusion, must be illusion. Only that which is happening without the interference of thought and the observation of it, is fact.

Q: You don't mean that thought always creates illusion.

K: No, of course I don't, of course.

Q: But all illusion is created by thought.

K: I mean, I took an example that I suffer as a Christian and I as a great believer always accept Jesus or Christ as the Saviour, I leave all my suffering to Him. Somehow He will help me, save me from suffering. That is an illusion. The fact is I'm suffering, that's all I'm saying.

Now have we come to the point that we have found an answer to what is one to do in a world that is insane. Have we found the answer, what is one to do? This is the fourth morning. Right? We've got two more mornings, and I'm asking myself if we have understood the question, we have investigated the whole three mornings and this is the fourth morning, and we are asking, have we found an answer to the question, "What am I to do, what is the right action in this world?"

What am I to do? To find an answer to that, is individual action right action? Right, sir? Just a minute, I want to explore that. We have so far acted as individuals, and whatever we do or modify,

somehow we say that is right action, not all the things we do, but as an individual we are trying to find what is right action. And the speaker says you can never do that, because the individual is a fragment of the whole. And when a fragment acts independently, whatever his actions be, they'll be fragmented, incomplete. That's all we've said.

Q: Man cannot do this.

K: Wait - as an individual, whatever action I do must be either destructive, pleasurable, violent and so on. It is a fragment that's acting.

Q: Yes.

K: And therefore it must create division, conflict and so on. So I say to myself, that is not right action, as self-centred human being, that's not right action. Therefore I say to myself, what is right action? Let me follow this, sir, a little bit. What is right action? I don't know. But I know this is wrong, wrong, right, please understand, quickly. So I say, am I different from the rest of the world? Psychologically, not peripheral differences, not colour differences and so on, but basically, at the root, am I different from the rest of mankind? I find I'm not, psychologically.

So then what place has individuality? You follow? If I have discarded individuality as being not capable of bringing about right action, then when I realize that psychologically I am the rest of mankind, then my individuality has disappeared. That's what I want to find out.

Q: Sir, isn't it that an illusion?

K: Wait, let me...

Q: Isn't that the illusion of individuality?

K: Yes, sir, I said that, we've said that's gone.

Q: So it's possible, I mean isn't it possible...

K: Is that so with you?

Q: Yes.

K: Or am I just talking to myself?

Q: I think you are talking to yourself.

K: Am I talking to myself - he says I am. Sir, the individual action - right? - which the world is doing, acting, each one acting for himself. Right? His own security, his own pleasure, pursuing his own experiences, his own little family, you follow? - all that, every human being is doing that. That's a fact. And that has produced chaos in the world.

Q: Exactly.

K: Right? Division, and where there is division there must be conflict. Right?

Q: The logic...

K: Follow it, sir, follow it. So any action as an individual I do is not productive, is not productive of peace, of real security for mankind. Right? So I discard, not as an idea but as a fact, I am not an individual.

Q: This is where the difficulty is, it doesn't follow logically from the fact that working as an individual has a destructive result, it does not follow that I have power to discard my individuality. This is where the question is.

K: I have not the power of discarding?

Q: Individuality, if I believe I am one.

K: No, because I perceive the truth that I am part of the whole, integral part of the whole, I see that as a fact, not as an idea.

Q: That's the step, you see to see as a fact that I am not an individual.

K: What?

Q: To see it as a fact that I am really not an individual.

Q: I can see how you can identify but I can't see how you can see it as a fact.

Q: It's a delusion to see that you are an individual, that's what you are saying.

K: Yes, that's what I'm saying.

Q: And if you see that it is a fact.

Q: I'm saying it's an illusion to identify with my mind, that I am the world, because that leads to all sorts of tortuous things and sends me to mental hospital and God knows what, as a result of making a mistake. The thing is, I don't want to make a mistake.

K: Sir, look at it the other way. You are an individual, aren't you. You think you're an individual and you are acting as an individual. Right? Each human being is acting separately. Right?

Q: Well in my present situation I find that I can't act as an individual because there's so much violence in the world, it's not possible to function hardly.

K: But the world - you're doing it, sir.

Q: Not effectively.

K: This is incredible!

Q: But you have the sense of your own individuality.

Q: Well, sometimes.

Q: Sir, isn't there some confusion which maybe we could sort out, that, I think we can all see what you're talking about, of the illusion, and being individual. I think we've followed that.

K: The word 'individual' means indivisible, obviously. But we are divided, we are broken up, we are contradictory, in ourselves. We are not individuals in the ordinary dictionary meaning. We think we are individuals. And I am saying that the very thinking that you are individual, acting separately etc., etc. is an illusion.

Q: Exactly.

K: I know this is very difficult to realize, because we are so stuck in this individuality.

Q: Isn't one of the blocks the every day sort of common sense that, the feeling that we have separate bodies, that, I mean, what you're saying is, surely you're not saying that if this illusion goes, and we no longer...

K: I don't, sir, that is an illusion, therefore it has no reality, no - so I discard it personally, I said, nonsense.

Q: But there is still a response from one human being...

K: Wait, sir, wait. I don't - you're all so - you won't step afar ahead. First - sorry.

Q: The other day Professor Wilkins said that we don't want to disappear.

K: That's right.

Q: I think that's the point.

K: We like the idea of individuality which is an illusion, but I'll hold onto it. It is part of my blood, I've accepted for generations, the world around me says, "You're an individual, you must be ambitious, you must fulfil."

Q: That's right.

K: You are separate.

Q: Because it's like dying, it's so important.

K: Yes, sir, that's why...

Q: Even if I die...

K: I am saying that. It has become part of our whole structure of thinking, part of our nature to say, "I am an individual." And somebody comes along and says, "Look at it, you are an illusion." I say, "Nonsense." So he says, "Just, before you call it nonsense, examine it, look at it." But I'm unwilling to look. Therefore there is no communication.

Q: I'm trying to look.

K: Wait, therefore you are willing, you as a human, as another person, willing to listen to. You're willing to listen. Therefore we're beginning to establish a communication between you and me. And the speaker, I say to you, since individual action throughout the world has produced such chaos in the world - right? that's obvious, is there an action which is not individualistic? That's all.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is there an action which is not born out of the idea of the individual?

Q: Well obviously there is.

K: Obviously no.

Q: There is, there's no question. Are you suggesting that there is some kind of intelligence which means that one is in touch with...

K: We're going to find out.

Q: ...with other people, and therefore not selfish, or self-centred.

K: I can only find out if I am not living in an illusion. If I am living an illusion, any amount of your telling me there is something greater or wider, I reject, because my illusion is stronger than the fact.



So have I, have you, gone into this sufficiently and say, "Yes, I see for myself very clearly that the individual is an illusion." My God, to accept that, sir, when all the world round you is saying you're an individual, that means you're going against the current of the world, and nobody wants to listen, stand against the current - right?

So if you want to find out what is right action, I say the individual illusion must come to an end. That's the first thing, because you are the world.

Q: I think it's not merely the pressure of outside circumstances but also there seems to be the direct feeling of the reality that you are an individual. It seems that is your experience of individuality...

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It's no good if other people tell you about it.

K: Yes.

Q: And how will you see that this experience is an illusion?

K: How do you convince me or show me that I am not an individual? How will you show me, how will you help me, when all my education, all my conditioning is I am an individual. And I won't let that go.

Q: I can see that this feeling of being an individual is coming from a thought. Then it will begin to loosen. Right?

K: Yes, sir, I agree.

Q: If I don't see it coming from a thought, I don't know.

K: I agree logically to everything that you're saying. But inwardly this thing is so strong that I won't let go.

Q: But I'm also convinced that it's real, you see - that's one reason that I don't want to let go.

K: For the majority of people here, that's our position. I've lived 40, 50, 80 or 20 years as an individual, my pleasure, my fears, my possession, my etc., it is so embedded in me that I refuse to listen to you. Or I listen to you and say, "Please, I don't understand what you're talking about."

Q: I suppose one might say that something which is real is essentially non-contradictory and makes sense, and if one can draw people's attention to the fact that regarding oneself as an individual is filled with contradictions...

K: Yes, sir, we've said that. Umpteen times. But nobody wants to listen to it, because the individual is so tremendously important. You see, the painters, Picasso is an individual, you see you know, all the rest of it - I don't have to explain.

So my question then is, if one has gone so far, "What am I to do?" Is there an action which is not born out of the idea or the illusion that I am an individual? That is really the question. If we want to face it.

Q: From what you've said about people in this room, working together and turning these questions over, of communal enquiry...

K: Yes.

Q: ...then presumably this goes beyond the action of the individual.

K: Yes, sir. You see, we're not all together in this, are we? We're not thinking together are we, about this?

Q: As you've pointed out, no action, real action that will operate directly is possible while we retain the sense of separateness. It's self-defeating in this way, so there is, so far as we are concerned, there's a question, is there an action that can take place, implicit in

this, is there the possibility of an action that can take place, when a sense of separateness is not operating, here? Now, this process of enquiry has been into the nature of what we regard as separateness.

K: Sir, we've come to the crossroads. Either you accept individuality and go on.

Q: That's it.

K: Or you say, "Let us look in another direction."

Q: Yes.

K: And to look in another direction you must kind of put that aside for the time being.

Q: I see that, yes.

K: All right. Are we at that point together?

Q: We have got to be serious enough.

K: Together, together, I may be or you may be or some, but together - are we at that point?

Q: Sir, can I ask you, is there any factuality at all to the individual differences - obviously there are different bodies and so on. There might be some confusion there about those obvious differences.

K: Sir, you see, you go back something, sir, forgive me. I said we've come to a cross-road, either you see that individuality brings about conflict, all that, and therefore you say, "Look, I turn my back on it and let's look in another direction." That's all I'm asking. Are we looking in another direction? If we are, then I'm saying, we have to go into the whole question of our consciousness. You follow? Our mind, which is, the world is me and all that. So is my consciousness, has my consciousness lost its sense of separateness? Because separateness brings conflict, inevitably. Britain, France,

Germany you follow, sir? The Arab, the Jew and all that, the Hindus, is invariably bringing conflict.

Q: Every Peace Conference is separate - my country against your country, and they will not look in another direction.

K: I know, the politicians won't, general public won't, but we are here to find out if we can look in another direction.

So when we look in another direction it means, have I really realized that I am the world? That comes to the point. am I really in contact with that absolute fact? If I am, then what is the quality of my mind, from which action invariably comes? I don't know if I am making it clear.

Q: Yes.

K: If I am not clear, if there is not clarity in my mind, all my action will be unclear. Right?

So I'm asking myself and therefore asking you, if I may, what is the quality of your mind when you see that individuality brings conflict, all that? Therefore it's no longer holding onto that. And realizes it's a part, or integral part of the whole of mankind. So from that realization of that fact, what is taking place in the mind. You understand? That is my question.

Q: Krishnaji, the question is, what happens when I'm really in contact with the fact that I am the world and the world is I. And your question is, what happens when it is fact, and if it is a fact, then surely something will happen that is also...

K: We're going to find out, sir, we're going to find out. You see, you're all so quick. We want to find out what happens and that's why I'm asking after talking for four days, what has happened to your mind?

Q: Krishnaji, it seems that fear seems to dissolve.

K: If there is no fear - wait - then what is the nature of your mind?

Q: Peace.

K: No, go into it a little more slowly, Madam.

Q: Less problems, certainly, because no separation.

K: Surely there's something else going on. You're not - examine it a little more closely. That is, individuality has lost its meaning to me, personally. And I realize that I am part of this whole of mankind, I realize it, it means something tremendous, not just words, something enormous has taken place.

And have I lost the memory - please listen to it - the memory of individuality? I don't know if...

Q: Yes.

K: No, please, sir, this is very, very serious, don't let's play around with this. Have I lost the memory of my individuality with its experiences, with its sorrows, with etc. etc?

Q: What do you mean by losing the memory of it?

K: Oh, Maria!

Q: It's past, it's gone.

K: Memory, my remembrance of my sorrow.

Q: You mean that it's no longer active.

K: No, no remembrance.

Q: Finished.

Q: How can you have no remembrance?

K: I'm going to show you. Go slowly, Maria. First find out what I am saying first, before you say. That is, I have collected during my 80 years of life, 84 years of my life, as an individual, lots of

memories. Right? Lots of experiences. The memory of sorrow, the memory of happiness, as an individual. It is there, in my consciousness.

Now when there is the realization of the truth - I'm using the word 'truth' in its right sense - absolute truth, that individuality is an illusion, with that realization, is there a loss of all the memories which I have collected during the 80 years?

Q: Sir is...

K: Just go slowly, sir. I may be crazy in saying this.

Q: Is it that there is a new mind that does not have that memory?

K: Scott, have you listened to what I've said?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Which is, have you, who have understood or seen the truth that you are an individual and therefore no longer - are you still carrying the memories, the structure, the nature of your remembrance, your past, all that, in your mind? Yes, sir, this is a real question, don't...

Q: I may be but it doesn't touch me any more.

K: No, no. That is again, maybe it doesn't touch me - what do you mean, it doesn't touch me?

Q: I mean...

K: Me is part of that.

Q: The memory may be there, you can't turn off all memory, but it doesn't affect me.

K: No, sir, no, sir - see how...

Q: Wiped out.

K: How we have translates it immediately? That is, I have

memories of my sorrow, but it no longer interferes with my action.

Right? Is that so?

Q: That's how I see it. I may be wrong.

K: I have memory of being hurt as an individual...

Q: There's no more me.

K: Wait, wait, listen, sir - memory of it, remembrance of it, it's in my brain, in the cells. And when I say individuality is nonsense, have I lost the memory of the hurt?

Q: How can you lose the memory if it's in the brain cells, it may not be operating, it may not be...

K: No, I say...

Q: It is like amnesia?

Q: I think that if there is an illusion, you see, what one remembers is an illusion, when the illusion is dispelled, the memory must go. We can't remember an illusion, because it is nothing.

Q: Something is in the brain cells, is that an illusion or an actual...

Q: What has been in the brain cells can change from illusion to non-illusion, the brain cell itself must have changed, it's like waking from a dream, you're not, you know, the thing is dispelled.

Q: But you may remember the dream.

Q: In fact if you do, then you're not free of the dream, you see, that if you remember the experiencing, the experience of pain, in the illusion, then it's still the illusion.

Q: It's of the past, it's not the present. The present has nothing to do with memory, remembering...

Q: The imprint on the brain cells of certain experiences, are

they...

Q: But the imprint was an illusion and when the illusion is dispelled, the imprint must go.

Q: Why?

Q: Otherwise we still have the illusion.

K: Maria, may I say something - have you heard my question? Have you investigated the question?

Q: Yes.

K: Are you reacting to the question? Wait, slowly, go slow. Have you investigated the question which I have put, or are you reacting to the question and asking out of that reaction. Go slowly, Maria, find out first. Piano, piano. I put the question to myself, perhaps you will see it. As an individual, which is an illusion, for the moment, as an individual, I remember certain incidents which have caused pain. The remembrance of it, the memory of it, the room in which the thing happened which gave pain. And all the circumstances involved in that incident.

And that has, as an individual, it has been, it is there, circulating. Right? You've followed up to now? Are you following up to now?

Q: Yes.

K: And if I drop my individuality as an illusion, will the memory still remain, I'm asking a question.

Q: You used the word 'circulate.' If...

K: My god, you're all...

Q: ...there are memories that are factually in the brain...

K: I'm going to find out, Maria, you're all too quick in your answers. I remember where it happened, the house, I can go back



to the house and see it happened there. I lived in Ojai, ten years or whatever time, I can see the whole thing, but the memory of pain, that's what I'm talking about, the memory of pain - I won't listen, I won't answer you - the memory of the pain has gone. Have you listened to what I've said?

Q: May I ask a question? The memory of the pain, you say, is gone, but you've just referred to the fact that there was pain at a certain point, therefore...

K: That's only a description - please, Maria, careful, that's why you are...

Q: There is some record in the brain.

K: You see what it is...

Q: But Krishnaji, I think some of us are trying to see. One is to relieve the pain, the pain is active, the pain is there...

K: You're missing the point.

Q: It has a certain action. The other is a simple factual memory, that there was once a pain, it isn't doing anything or affecting one today.

Q: The hurt has gone.

K: No, sir, be careful, this is very, very serious, you can't...

Q: Is the pain different from the memory?

K: Oh, Lordy, don't sir, this is...

Q: Sir, could you use the word imprint when talking about pain?

K: Imprint. Answer Mrs. Zimbalist, Sir.

Q: It's possible, I think, that if this is so, then one would remember the circumstances and perhaps remember the figures, in the sense that perhaps if they were in a play, something like that, but there would be no imprint inside.

Q: To me there is a distinction between an absolute memory of one that is affecting my reactions, my life, my, whatever I am. The other is something that happened that has no meaning for me any more but I can remember it as a fact. I'm trying to find out, when you say, be without memory...

K: Wait a minute - could you put it this way, just - you're attached to somebody. I'm not asking, saying this personally. You're attached to somebody. And you see the whole business of attachment, what is involved, the whole structure, nature of it, the consequences of it. And you end it. Right?

Q: Yes.

K: Then what happens? Wait - go slowly. What happens? The person is there, the furniture is there or whatever you are attached to. What has happened?

Q: There is no longer any attachment.

K: That's all. What has taken place in the mind which is no longer attached to?

Q: I don't understand.

Q: Sir, are you saying that there is a new mind? Which is different from forgetting.

K: Sir, I don't want to suggest a new mind. I just want to see, if you have been attached to something, to a belief, to a person, to a piece of furniture, and you are no longer attached, completely, what has happened?

Q: Sort of sense of falling away.

K: She began.

Q: Well, this is...

K: What has happened?

Q: ...in your example because in the instance you have raised, the attachment is no longer there, there is no...

K: So what has happened - you're not answering.

Q: There's been a change...

K: Which means what? Have you lost the memory - quiet - please listen - have you lost the memory of having been attached? I'm not going to - please I'm going to prevent you from answering. Have you lost the memory? All the consequence, all that, when you drop completely attachment? Go ahead,

Q: You use the word memory where...

K: Use some other word. Contact.

Q: Could you say it is like a wound healing without a scar?

K: I'm using the word memory, purposely, because that is what is keeping me attached.

Q: But if it is wiped out that's the finish.

K: This is important, because if one has done this, what takes place? That's all I'm asking you.

Q: Sir, can you go back a couple of steps about the individuality and just pick up what you were saying because I've lost the thread of the argument.

K: Oh my lordy.

Q: Sir, aren't you saying that if there is a recording of the event you remember it, you have a picture of the event.

K: No, sir, I'm asking something else. I have recorded when I am attached.

Q: It's an emotional...

K: Just follow it, sir, please. Two minutes - forgive me, I'm not suppressing anybody from asking questions. When I was attached

the whole mechanics of registration was taking place. Right? Now when I am not attached, absolutely, the mechanism of registration has stopped. If it has not, the attachment is still going on, in a different form.

Q: It is emotional, we're talking about emotion, emotional registration, we're not talking about recording in the same way that...

K: No, sir, of course not, memory, all the recording is memory.

Q: Yes, we're talking about emotional memory.

K: No, not only - recording. I record, you've said something and my mind records.

Q: I remember the fact that the person was standing there, I mean, obviously.

K: Yes, sir, that - have I. when the mind is free from that attachment, has the recording then been wiped out? That's my point.

Q: Of what? What recording?

K: All the memories. All the incidents.

Q: Well just now you said...

K: Maria.

Q: You've just said you remember, say, it's a person, or a place, the circumstances, but you're no longer in that, you're not, none of that is operating in you.

K: But I am not attached to you.

Q: No.

K: Just a minute - I'm being personal, I'm sorry. I'm not attached to anybody - forgive me. I'm not attached to you. I know you, you are there, you do all kinds of things. The mechanism of the whole

process of attachment has completely come to an end. But you are there.

Q: That's right. But what I'm talking - I think, OK, that I do understand, that attachment is not going on, but if you say, is the memory of the attachment in the past, it's not going on, it's not active, it's not in one, in me...

K: It is not there.

Q: ...once it was and I remember the fact that...

K: For God's sake, somebody explain to her, or something.

Q: It's a kind of burden.

Q: It's gone, there's no burden, there's no attachment, there's none of that.

K: There is no memory, I'm telling you.

Q: Sir, is that the same thing...

K: There is no memory.

Q: Is it the same thing as forgetting?

K: No, I give up.

Q: Right, then...

Q: What is the difficulty in understanding this?

K: No, sir, don't say that, this is one of the most difficult - you don't know - if you say, what is the difficulty, it's simple - it's not.

Q: I think it is in this case, I think the difficulty is with me. You say the memory is different from forgetting.

K: What?

Q: Having no memory, is that different from forgetting?

K: No.

Q: It's not?

K: Forgetting is something else and having no memory is

something else.

Q: All right.

K: This is enough.

Q: Isn't Mrs. Zimbalist saying, my son dies, I wipe it all out, I don't even remember that there was a son.

K: No, sir, it is not like that. Don't...

Q: Isn't it like, I remember that yesterday you called me stupid but I don't remember...

K: I didn't call you stupid.

Q: No, somebody did. (Laughter) Somebody called me stupid yesterday but I don't remember the feeling that arose or hurt any more, it's gone.

K: Good.

Q: Is that what you're saying?

K: Something like that.

Q: He remembers that he was hurt but he can't remember the hurt itself as the feeling is gone.

Q: The words, the questioner said, these words, "You are stupid." But the feeling that arose is gone, cannot be recalled.

Q: So there is no real memory of the feeling you had. So the emotional contents are gone.

K: That's right, that's right, sir. Sir, could we take another example. Suppose I've been hurt. The memory of that hurt, the feeling of that hurt is there. Now if I wipe out that hurt completely, therefore in that wiping away, cleansing, there is no feeling of ever being hurt. I know, this is difficult for people - there is no feeling ever of being hurt.

Q: I think the difficulty is that people are so used to

remembering factual things, that the idea that you cannot recollect the actual hurting, the nature of the hurt...

K: All right, you cannot recollect, if you want to put it, you cannot remember, recollect what was the state of the mind or feeling, when it was hurt. Is that explained somewhat?

Now, come back. As an individual, I remember certain incidents which have caused pain or pleasure, or whatever it was. And with the cessation of the individual as an illusion, absolutely, then what is the quality of the mind which has remembered, recollected? I say it has gone. That's all.

Now what is my action, what am I to do in this world - I've lost my individuality, I mean it, I'm talking about myself, I've lost my individuality, I'm no longer separate, fighting for myself, struggling, conflict, all that. Then what is the nature of my mind which sees that I am part of the whole? The realization that I am the entire mankind.

Q: One feels a total responsibility.

K: Responsibility. One may not - Madam, do you feel that, or it's just a lot of words.

Q: No, I feel that.

K: How do you act from that responsibility?

Q: I don't know.

K: So I'm asking what is action?

Q: An action of great care, great attention.

Q: Sir, I think that any attempt to answer your question is rather speculative on our part.

K: Yes. So what will you do, how will you meet this question, how will you meet this challenge? The challenge is, what are you

to do in this world, if you have lost, if you put away your ugly little individuality which means nothing.

Q: At this moment we have no basis from which to act, there is nothing of the same order from which we've acted in the past.

K: Sir, you can only answer my question, have you really put aside your individuality? Or is it just, say, "Yes, convenient today in this meeting but for the rest of the time I'll carry on."

Q: You are stopping us from answering, because how can I say I'm sure that I've lost...

K: I don't know, I'm asking, I'm just asking, I'm not asking to be sure.

Q: I think that the only thing you can be after your question is silent.

K: No, sir. After four days...

Q: Why are you stopping us answering it?

K: After four days, you're just silent at the end of it?

Q: Exactly, I am, completely.

Q: I'm not, because if we are silent nothing will change the world and we can sit here and go out, nothing has changed. But I feel, if I may, is that if you have a big feeling in yourself that you are not separate from all people, that you really want to share with other people, really want to listen to other people...

K: No, no sharing - you see, you've gone off to living with other people, sharing.

Q: Well, that's the wrong word. Could one say that before I was acting for my individual, then after this change occurs, my individual being the whole, I act for the whole.

K: What is the action that is born out of that?



Q: Love?

Q: Perhaps the realization which we actually cannot do anything ourselves, from a me.

Q: How can we say that it hasn't happened? We can't say anything, I mean this passionately but I don't think we can say anything.

Q: You see, this happens in the moment, and each moment new, free from the past, because there is no illusion of memory, there are no more illusions, there is only the reality of the moment, and that is the responsive action, the thing from which you cannot divorce yourself. So there has to be some response. It is the moment, and each moment, that is the moment, at least this is how I feel now.

K: Sir, could I put...

Q: I feel so hesitant in making any statement at all.

K: Could I put the question differently.

Q: I seem to be looking to see is this true or not.

K: Is my individuality dead? It cannot be resurrected, it cannot be called back, it is dead. Then what is my action? The mind is not recollecting, remembering the individual, feeling separate.

Therefore what is its action when it is dead to separateness?

Q: Somebody said 'love' and you said, no - I didn't understand.

K: I said no because it comes out, love is one of the easiest words that we all use.

Q: But he's right.

K: He's perfectly right, but I just wondered if it is a reality or just a word.

Q: If one has lost one's individuality, sense of separateness, one is a whole being.

Q: But am I whole when I see it?

K: You understand, sir, if you feel you are the rest of mankind - you understand, sir, it's tremendous realization.

Q: Participation.

Q: There's a tremendous different feeling.

K: From that there is action. Perhaps we'll go into it tomorrow, from that point, if we may, It's now one o'clock - sorry.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 5TH SEMINAR MEETING 17TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: We will go on with what we were talking about yesterday. I wonder if it is fairly clear, not only verbally, but perhaps even intellectually, that individual action, as we have been indulging in, has not brought about peace to mankind, has brought about innumerable problems, conflicts, divisions, the 'me' and the 'you' and 'we' and 'they', ideological differences, with all their struggles and wars and so on. If one sees that the individual is an illusion, actually faces it as a fact, then what is the quality of a mind that has lost completely all its individuality. That's where we left off yesterday, if I remember rightly. Is that so?

Have we gone into this at all? Or does it remain merely verbal, an intellectual concept and therefore rather shallow, superficial? And without any shadow of conflict, an action which does not bring about any kind of conflict. That's what we're investigating.

And we said, too, yesterday, when the whole concept of the individual comes to an end, the memory of all the incidents of individuality also come to an end. This is rather difficult to accept or even to understand, or to be aware of its whole significance. I wonder if we need to discuss more of it. Do we have to talk more about it? Is it possible, say for example, the individual gets hurt, which we all know, and when that individuality comes to an end, is there even a memory, a scar of that hurt?

Come on, sir, please. Or if there is an attachment as an individual for another individual, for an object, for an idea, and there is the ending of that attachment - is there any recollection,

remembrance, recording of that attachment? Because I think it is important to find this out, for it may lead us to some other quality of a mind that is whole, not fragmented. Won't you join me? Or am I talking to myself?

Because is love individual, or rather, can individuality love? Come on, sir, if we say, "No"...

QUESTIONER: How can we even answer that? I mean those who say 'no', I feel, even if I say "No" I'm under the illusion that I can't love and yet I'll leave this room and I'll tell someone, "Yes, I love you." I mean is it that something we can know?

K: We're going to go into that question, sir. I'm asking, one is asking, can the individual, the separate, the thought that has created this individuality, can that individuality love? Because by its very nature and structure, it is separate, at least it thinks it is separate, and it wants to be separate. And when that exclusive division exists, can that individual ever know what love is? Sir, this is a very serious question, not just to be argued intellectually or bandied about, but one has to find this out, one has to come to this.

Q: The individual and love - to this person it seems a contradiction in terms, because I seem to know everything else but the state of which you talk.

K: But we say to each other, "I love you." We say, I love the country, I love my God, I love my nation, my family, with all the responsibility involved in that so-called love. Can there be love when there is the essence of separateness involved in it.

Q: Isn't it that the separate prevents real understanding...

K: Yes.

Q: ...of the other?

K: No, I'm not talking about the other, the other is like me - right? In essence. He may be a little more or a little less greedy, little more jealous, little more ambitious, but in essence, deep down, he is like me, like another. Right? We have seen that, I hope, after five days discussion, that's clear.

And we're asking, when there is the reality that I am the world and the world is me, with that comprehension, with that realization, in all its depth, individuality has come to an end. Is that so, or is it just a lot of words which we have bandied about?

Q: I don't know if I have the critical or the mental apparatus to understand that, if that is so.

K: Understand what, sir?

Q: Understand if what you were asking is possible or true, whether one can die to the individual.

K: Yes - have you?

Q: I doubt it.

K: You doubt it. So it means what? That you haven't really investigated your relationship to the world and the world's relationship to you. You haven't really gone into it.

Q: Or at least if I have tried to go into it, there's been some kind of block, or something that has prevented me from...

K: All right - what is the block? Is it unwillingness, is it fear, is it the sense of loss, a sense of deprivation, solitude, a sense of isolating yourself and so are all those blocks? I don't know - which is the block? All of them or one?

Q: Perhaps all, yes.

K: No, sir, - all of them, let's examine all of them.

Q: But even so, if I can raise this question, even if we examine

all of them, we're back in the immediate blocks. Will that free the mind of blocks?

K: Yes, the blocks will disappear. Because if you look at them very carefully - is it fear, fear of what? Go on, sir, investigate it with me - many of you may be feeling that. That is, if I lose my individuality, what am I? Except my profession, my career, my particular idiosyncrasy and so on, otherwise what am I? So I am afraid of being nothing, of being empty in the sense, individuality has filled itself with a lot of things, possessions, attachments, so many things. And when that individuality comes to an end, you lose all that, and so there is fear, fear of what might happen if you lose.

Now, have you come to that point? Or it's just playing with it?

Q: No, I haven't come to that point.

K: Then what am I to do, sir.

Q: I don't think you can do anything.

K: No, you see, then communication between us ceases.

Q: Apparently it does at a certain point.

K: No if it is a block, fear is a block. Why can't we remove that block?

Q: That is the question.

K: I'm doing it, sir. Is it I'm afraid that if I lose my individuality I face a feeling of nothingness, of not being. Is that it?

Q: Krishnaji, it seems to me that we are trying to look at something new and unknown with the old tools, the thought process, and that's why we keep coming to this point. How with the thought process can I see this? You've asked, what is...

K: But we are understanding fear, you understand?

Q: But how can you understand fear with all the continuation of the thought process? How can you understand it?

K: Then can - all right, then attack it differently.

Q: What I'm trying to ask is, you asked us yesterday and again this morning, what is the state of the mind that has seen as a fact the ending of individuality. What I want to know is, what is the state of the mind that can perceive this fact. We haven't come to that.

K: What is the state of the mind that can perceive the fact that individuality is an illusion?

Q: Yes.

K: Now just a minute, let's hold onto that. What is the state of the mind that perceives or that realizes the individuality is an illusion. Go on, sirs. I've got it.

Q: I can see clearly what it is not, but I can't just see what it could possibly be, something totally unknown.

K: First of all, we have seen the activities of individuality, where it has led us, humanity, human beings, individual as well as collective - we have explained that verbally, like a river flowing logically. And you have followed that. That is verbal communication, explanation through words, which we both understand, and in the process of explanation your mind is following the consequences very carefully, without any effort, like water flowing. So when you are doing that, what is taking place in the mind? You understand what I'm asking?

You are explaining to me something. I follow it verbally and also I feel what you're saying to be more or less true, and I'm following it without any effort, like a river flowing, I'm following

it. Now what is the quality of my mind when you have shown me the picture, the map, very clearly, and I've been watching it? What has happened to my mind?

Q: I can't refer back to anything I know.

K: Right. What has happened?

Q: It's very passive. Watchful. It's very passive, it's watchful. it has...

K: All right. Watchful. You have watched, you have worked, you have listened, verbally you have understood, you have seen the consequences, it's all an even flow. Right? Without any effort. Now wait. Without any effort. Go slowly - understand this. Before you have made effort, struggle, find out, analyse, you follow? - you made great effort. Here you are not making an effort, any effort at all. Right? So what has taken place in the mind?

Q: I would say that the two minds in a sense become one, if you are tuned in on the same wavelength.

K: Yes. And also, what has happened? Before you made an effort, now you're not making an effort. Right? So what has happened?

Q: Do you mean conflict has gone away?

K: Conflict you have put aside, because there is no conflict in this, I am not persuading you, I am not pushing you, I am - we are in communication, flowing with it. Right? So what has happened? It's very simple if you look at it. Before conflict, now no conflict.

Q: So there is no...

K: Wait, wait. Isn't it? That's all. So the mind has become, is in a state of not having any conflict. Right? In this communication - that's all, you may have - we'll go into that. So what has happened?



A mind that has made conflict, and a mind that says, "I have no conflict." Because it has seen and therefore it is intelligent. The other is not intelligent, this is intelligence. I wonder - that's all. Right?

Wait a minute. So we are seeing a block. One may have a block of fear. Now examine it with the same way, you follow? That is, without effort watch the whole movement of fear, watch it, without struggle, without saying, "I must be free of it, I must go beyond it, I must suppress it," which are all efforts. Now just watch, look at that fear, the consequences - right? Now as you watch it, what is operating? The intelligence that was not functioning when you were making conflict, now that intelligence is functioning. Right? So the fear is no longer there. I wonder if you get all this.

Q: Observation without the observer.

K: No - yes - but I'm just saying, see the difference of a mind that has made an effort and a mind that is observing the flowing of the water without effort. Right? Then the block has gone.

Q: I see that very clearly but the block is coming back.

K: No it won't, it won't. It will not if you... all right, let it come back. Go slowly, let it come back and again watch it, without making an effort. You get it?

Q: I see what you're saying, we're struggling against this, trying to get to the other side.

K: Other side.

Q: So that's what is needed before one can reach the threshold of making that other step?

K: No. there is no other step. Sir, I have made an effort, my mind has made effort to get rid of this block, which is fear. And it

has struggled, it has analysed, it has been to a psychotherapist and so on. It has made tremendous effort. Now somebody comes along, you come along and say, "Don't do that, just watch it." Right? And you're watching it. So there is a vast difference between the mind that made an effort and the mind not making an effort. Right? Before you were seeking a result, here you're not seeking a result. I wonder - right? A total change has taken place.

So if a block recurs, you want to find out why. Either you're so eager to reach the other end right? Can we proceed?

Q: Yes.

K: So I'm asking, we're asking each other, what is the quality of a mind that is no longer separative, that has understood the whole nature of individuality - right? - the root of it, the separateness of it, the conflict involved wherever there is separation, two nations, two people, two ideas, two opinions, you follow? - wherever there is separation, there must be the expression of individuality. The individuality as the collective, as the nation, as the Catholic, you follow? - it's all the same, in the same direction. I don't know - right?

Now if the individuality has gone, that is separative effort, then I am the world and the world is me, essentially. I may be a little more greedy than the other fellow, but he'll be a little less jealous than me, but jealousy is the same, greed. We're not talking about relative greed but greed. Right?

So, shall we proceed from there? No, don't, please, carefully - either it is an actual fact that you're facing, or you're just verbally playing with it. And don't play verbally with me, please, it's no fun.

Q: Can I make a point here, to avoid this, just words and

thoughts, presumably what you've done is you've directed attention to what you might call a living situation of communication between yourself and a member of the audience.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: And then by paying attention to this, people can without having a block, can see the nature of this process.

K: Quite. You've understood that, of course. We are walking down the same path watching the river flowing. Right? The water is flowing. So we're both walking along the river, both of us, as Professor Wilkins has pointed out. Now we've come to the point, we must go on, otherwise we - not that I'm impatient or anything. So, what has happened to the mind when this individuality has come to an end? The ending implies the recollections, the remembrances of the individual activities. If that remembrance, recollections remain individuality still exists - that is the whole point. And I raise the question, can individuality love, can this entity that thinks it is separate, which is essentially an illusion, can that entity which thinks it is separate, love?

You understand, we are going against the whole current of civilizations, cultures. So is love personal and impersonal? I love my wife and I really don't care about what is happening about something. You follow? I don't care what happens. My love is limited to that one person. Please, sir, this is very serious, you understand? Is that love? Or love, not being separate is both personal and impersonal - it is love, not my love and your love, it's just love. Do we meet this?

Q: That implies no discrimination at all.

K: No, don't, moment you use the word 'discrimination' you've

already separated it. I don't know if I'm making myself clear. We said, love, which is, as an individual I say, "I love you," and I see that love is not love at all, because the individual himself is separate. Right? Oh, come on, sirs, you don't see the...

And therefore that love is not love because it contains jealousy, all the activities of thought which has created the individuality. I wonder - come on sirs!

Q: It was possessive love. I love you, that's possessive.

K: I said that is not love.

Q: That is not love.

K: Therefore, no - so, then what is love? Does it discriminate? I mean, love is love, I can't say I discriminate and say, "I love you, I don't love you."

Now let's move a little further. Are we all together in this or am I just - no? Are we? No. You see, when there is the realization that I am the world and the world is me, you know, that very fact is a tremendous revolution, you understand? It has an extraordinary feeling in it. I don't know if we realize it.

Solitude is never secure, it has no security. Right? Isolation can only be insecure, the individual can only be always insecure, for him there is no security. Come on, sirs.

Q: I think, you see, since the individual is actually dependent on everybody...

K: Of course.

Q: ...he pretends he's not, he's actually very insecure, it's clear.

K: So, if when one realizes, when there is - not 'one' - when there is the realization that the individual can never be secure, can never have protection, safety, certainty, when one realizes that, and

that the world is me and me is the world, in that there is tremendous sense of security. I wonder if you - because there is no separation.

Q: I think that maybe we should try to elaborate, perhaps it's not entirely obvious.

K: Let's go into it.

Q: I mean I think that first of all one may think there's material security, you know, he needs money, he needs...

K: Even material security is becoming almost impossible. Right? Individual security means, "I am British, my interests are the British, my safety lies in Britain, in this island, my security lies in opposing others," and so this division is bringing greater and greater insecurity to me. To what I want as security as an individual is being destroyed. I wonder...

Q: I don't know if I make myself clear. Several of us may see this together, but the world, we're surrounded with a lot of people in the world who don't see it and they may make us insecure.

K: What shall I do? That's it. The world round me, as Dr. Bohm points out, is thinking security lies in isolation.

Q: They may affect us nevertheless, even though we see point.

K: What?

Q: They may do something to us.

K: Yes, they see that and you and I may see in that separateness doesn't bring security. So they are going to do something to us.

Q: Then we see danger.

K: We can't do anything for them, because there are too many of them. Right? What shall I do? Come on, meet me. Look, you are all individualists, and your separateness, and there is one person

who says "that's all wrong, you can't live that way." What are you going to do to that man? He's a danger to you. Right? Go and tell that to the Communists or to Mao Mao, or not Mao Mao.

(Laughter) To who? Yes, Arafat. They'll kill you. See what's happened? Either they kill you or put you on a pedestal and say you're a marvellous, he's a freak - forget him. Right?

That's what you're all going to do. You either worship him or feel this thing absolutely, you understand what it would mean?

Q: I don't understand what that would mean.

K: What is the difficulty, sir? We explained, if you are one person amongst many who think differently, who act differently, who live differently, they either kill you or say, "He's God," put you on a pedestal and forget you. Forget you in the sense, you're God, and worship, put a candle round you, but we carry on.

Q: But would things change even if there were...

K: Wait, watch it, sir. Are you like that?

Q: No.

K: No.

Q: That's a sincere answer.

K: What is the answer to my question, are you like the rest of the world, or, sorry, no - you understand?

Q: Now I do.

K: Are you like that? What would happen if many of us did that? Many of us realize there is no security in isolation, either the family or individual, there is no security in separation. Gosh, talk to the politicians, they'd throw you out. And talk to the Pope, seven hundred million people are separate. So what will you do - you see - go on, sir, investigate, find out.

Fortunately when you are talking like this, they really don't hear you. Right? You understand, sir? You understand what I'm saying?

Q: They, you mean...

K: They, the politicians, the establishment, the police, the immigration people - (Laughter) I go through that, the immigration people, none of them listen to you, fortunately. Because they are so enclosed in, they won't...

So what will you do? Come on, sir - what will you do?

Q: Surely, sir, this doesn't tell you what you will do, it removes the lines on which you did things before, so you can't say you will do this or that.

K: No. Do you realize as a human being representing all mankind in essence, an integral part of mankind, when you see isolation is the most destructive way of living - right? - what is happening in your relationship with the world, with your wife or with your neighbour? Come on, sirs.

Q: A certain clarification takes place.

K: I am married, or I have got a girlfriend, and I see isolation as the most appalling way of living, death. And she doesn't realize it. Right? Face it, sirs. What shall I do. I realize it, my wife says, "Nonsense." Right? What is my action, what am I to do, what is my responsibility?

Q: I must change.

K: My wife says, "Nonsense".

Q: I love...

K: Be British, be etc., etc., Catholic or whatever you want, because she's entrenched, bound to that. What am I to do, what is my relationship with her? Apparently you don't face all this.

Q: If I have love in my heart I will be talking to her.

K: I have talked to her and she says, "Go to hell!" (Laughter)

Q: (Inaudible)

K: But sir, you're not facing the thing. She lives an individual life. She wants that, it's in her blood, it's her education, her conditioning, all that. And I see the truth that individuality is the most terrible thing in action. I love. What happens to my relationship to her - I can talk to her till Doomsday.

Q: Yes, there is nothing to do...

K: Wait, find...

Q: What do you want me to do?

K: We're going to find out what to do - don't say there is nothing to do, I will divorce, I will do something - let's go into it for a minute.

Q: Unless she is prepared to change what can you do?

K: That's what - she's not prepared to change. Look, are you prepared to change?

Q: That is the question.

K: For God's sake, you're my wife or my husband - are you prepared to change?

Q: Fortunately there's no attachment to her.

K: No, sir - look, what is happening now - you're my wife and my husband, we are in that relationship. What is your action, what is my action?

Q: If you have love in your heart, you...

K: Sir, I have love in my heart, I don't question it, I know what love is.

Q: You have a relationship.



K: Unfortunately I have you! (Laughter) My wife, my husband - what am I to do?

Q: I keep on talking.

Q: I think there's nothing to do: the person, the wife or the husband either comes to you, trying to understand you, or if he or she cannot, she leaves. There's nothing you can do, you cannot change the mind of another person, can you?

K: I live in the same house, share the same bedroom, don't fool yourself.

Q: The fact is we have no relationship.

K: You are my wife and my husband, what is my relationship with you?

Q: It is only nominally, maybe only in name, and no more. Maybe. Maybe our communication stops at "How are you today, it's a lovely day." Maybe that's as far as we can go.

K: Is that all?

Q: Maybe. But if it is, we shouldn't run away from it.

K: Sir, look at it - between you and me, what is happening?

Q: Well, isn't there, sir, a feeling of compassion then, because you see they can't do anything.

K: Sir, put yourself in this position. You are my wife or my husband, you and I, we have a relationship, sex and children perhaps - I hope not - then what is our action? Look, here you are, sir.

Q: Your reaction is one of love.

K: Do you know what's going to happen? You may love, have that - I won't call it love - you may have lost your individuality, I haven't - so what happens? I leave you, at the end of talking,

talking, talking, you're going to do exactly the same thing now.

Q: Exactly.

Q: But if that's the way it is, why shouldn't we create another image to which we should attach ourselves.

K: Sir, you're missing the point. You, the man who has lost his individuality, you're going to drive him out. Yes, sir.

Q: Unless I see the urgency of change, I can't have a relationship with him, can I?

K: But...

Q: This is an impossible question.

K: Sir, you're not facing it.

Q: I look, and I would simply be at a loss to know what to do and out of...

K: We have talked, the fifth morning, this is the fifth morning we've talked, we've gone into it very, very deeply. And you have lost, really lost individuality, because you see the consequences of it, you have an insight into it. And so you have wiped it away. And I haven't. So what takes place? I drive you out of the house, which is what you're going to do here, when you leave.

Q: Well, let's face that.

K: Sad?

Q: No, let's face that, if that is what is, let's face it.

K: You are doing that, sir, now.

Q: Exactly.

K: So let's go on. What is action without individuality. Right, sir? I want to move somewhere else. What is action without this separative concept of 'me'? You understand my question? I knew what was action from a self-centred point of view. Right? I acted

from that. And you come along and point out to me, and I've listened to you very carefully, and by the very listening I'm following you, my mind has become somewhat intelligent.

And I realize that intelligence sees what the individual action has been, the consequences of it, the danger of it, the degeneracy of it, and now it says, "What is action without this separative element in my mind." You understand? Right, sir? You're following all this? What is that action? (Pause)

I don't know what that action is but I'm going to find out - I must. You understand, sir? I must find it, because that's how I started on it. What is a human being, surrounded by wolves - sorry - what is he to do? He can't kill all the wolves, and he can't become a wolf himself, so what is he to do? What is the mind that is not separative, what is his action? Oh, you're missing something marvellous - come on, sirs.

Q: Is it that he begins to learn from moment to moment...

K: No, sir.

Q: ...by seeing that moment...

K: I have been through all that. I've had an insight - please listen, sir - I've had an insight into the nature of individuality. And I've also had an insight into the organizations which that individuality has created. Right? I've had an insight into that, the organizations, that individualities, the separateness, the separative element has created - I've had an insight into it. And that very insight has put away that. Right? I don't know if you are following.

And that insight now says - doesn't say - that insight is now - sorry - that has dropped it. I'm asking a question with regard to action. Can I have an insight, can there be an insight into the nature

of action, which is not individualistic? You get my point? Are you meeting me?

Q: Yes.

K: An insight.

Q: Is this a different insight, sir, or is it part of the same insight?

K: Insight is never the same. Insight is finished with that. Right?

Q: You mean it's not comparative.

K: No, no. I said, it has had an insight into the nature of individuality, and all the structures and organizations that individuality has brought about. He has had an insight into it. And therefore that very insight has abolished individuality. Right? You might say, "What do you mean by insight?" "Is it continuous, or is it from moment to moment, or is it - what? Or it has no time."

That's it.

Q: When you say...

K: Now, this is becoming difficult.

Q: That the insights are neither the same nor different, that if there is no time, the insight...

K: I can only have insight into the individuality and what that individuality has brought about, organizations, insight, which is, that insight is not a remembrance, it isn't brought about through remembrance, through recollection, through arguments, it is quick perception, and action. Therefore it is not brought about through time. Right? I don't know if you are following all this. Does it interest you?

And, I'm asking, is this insight the same as the insight there was with regard to individuality, has that insight varied when I ask the question? Is it a different insight?

Q: Now that you have asked the question?

K: No, you're all getting too - your brains are functioning or? All right, let's put it that way. Our action has been based upon time. Right? I will do, I have done, and I remember what I have done, and according to that or modifying that, I will do. It's all based on self-centred recollections, projecting into the future and so on and on. All that is a movement of time. Right? Do you disagree with that? Right? Don't let me talk to myself, please.

And I'm saying, and the next thing is, there is an action which is not born out of time, which is the action brought about through insight. Now, what do I mean by insight? Insight means a quick perception into the whole nature of individuality and its organization - quick perception of it, which is not intuition.

Q: May I ask you, sir? You said a quick perception, would it mean really quick in the ordinary meaning of time?

K: I'm going to go into it, sir. Perception which is not of time, which is not the result of careful analysis, examination or exploration. Seeing something immediately to be true. Right? You must have had all this, this is nothing strange. You hear something the speaker says, yes you quickly grasp it. That quick perception is insight.

Q: I think the trouble is the word 'quick' sometimes may mean time.

K: Quick - all right - quick means time.

Q: I think immediate is better.

K: Immediate. Immediate perception and action. Our action is understanding, analysis, allowing time, and then acting. That insight can only take place when there are no arguments, no

opinions, no conclusions but seeing immediately the truth of something. Right? Can we go on from there?

Q: So insight is beyond thought.

K: Obviously. Thought has said, "Let me analyse, let me examine, let me explore and from that exploration come to a conclusion and from that conclusion act." This is what we do. Let me think it over. Whereas we are saying, perception, immediate perception takes place when there is no movement of thought. Right? Are you meeting? Of course, yes.

So I want to know, what is - you understand - what is action without this sense of individuality? You understand my question? Please, sir, come on - don't go to sleep, please. Because our question was, living in this world, which is so deteriorating, violent, all the rest of it, what is action without the individual, without the actor? Right? Now we can come to that point. Is there an action without the actor? You understand, sir? Have you understood my question? I have always...

Q: Verbally only.

K: No, no, not verbally. Just see, look, listen to the question first. I'm asking, is there an action without the actor? The actor was the individual, the actor was the entity which struggled, which analysed, which remembered, "I must do this," - I'm saying, the actor is the observer, of course. Now I'm asking, is there an action without the observer, without the - what did I say - the actor? I must have quick, I must have immediate perception of it.

Q: Sir, it seems the only one we are aware of in our lives is when there is danger. The only one we are aware of in our life is when there is danger, this action, when we can actually see danger.

K: Yes - the danger we said exists only when there is the individuality who thinks he's permanent and separate. That is the greatest danger.

Q: Yes, but we have to see it.

K: Ah! That's up to you. I pointed out the whole thing for you, laid down the map, there it is - immediate perception of it. So I say, what is action without the actor, is there an action without the 'me'?

Q: Could we say it is simply being?

K: No, sir, don't say it - first listen to the question, see all the implications involved in it. Don't exercise your mind, say 'Let's examine it,' just look at it, like a river flowing, you follow it. That is, the actor is the individual, the observer. He said, I will do this, I must not do this, this is right, this is wrong, this I will do in the future, based on the memory of the past, that has been our accepted norm of action. Right?

Now that norm has disappeared. So now there is only the question, what is action without the observer? Is there action, action not in the sense of the word, of the individual doing, but action when I am the world and the world is me. That brings about great sense of love, great sense of non-isolating existence, which is love.

Now, what is action without the actor, without the observer? You're following all this? No. Are you asleep? I'm afraid so.

Q: Krishnaji, every way I look at what you're saying seems to come from some idea already that I have. So I really don't know what the right action is.

K: We are doing it - find out, sir. But you haven't - have you had an insight into the nature of the individual and his

organizations? Finished. If you have understood that, seen the truth of it, finished, it can never enter into that.

So my question is, what is action without the actor?

Q: An action which will derive from your new state of mind, which is a state of mind of compassion.

K: Have you that new state of mind? That's all my question.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Go slowly. Have you, not M. Maroger, but I'm asking, have you dropped that individual concept, completely? You must have, it is inevitable if you realize the truth that you are the world and the world is you, in essence. What is action? Are you all tired?

Q: Immediate response to the...

Q: Krishnaji, I think we've come to a crossroads, as you mentioned the other day.

K: Last night I heard somebody for about 10 minutes about mysticism. Did you hear it? Some of you? He was a scientist and has studied science and had an experience of some kind and he's now pursuing mysticism. And dropped more or less, he says, I might go back to science but for the time being it's in abeyance. Now he's following various forms of mysticism. Now watch it carefully. He's still separate, you follow? - and he's pursuing something that is not separate. For god's sake!

Q: Could I have a go at this one, because I'm not clear about this question of your being in communication with someone else here. Then this communication involving insight or...

K: Is immediate.

Q: ...love without attachment and so on. This then is there. Now this may then lead one's thoughts in this head or another head, an



action to be carried out by the individual in one sense. But this is set in motion, so to speak, by this thing which is non-individual.

K: Yes.

Q: I think, you see, where I'm a bit confused is that, I mean obviously you have this non-individual component and then you have this followed up by thought, arms and legs, which are attached to individuals, being in motion. But it seems to me, that if that state exists, then all thoughts will be springing from this sort of principle.

K: Yes, sir. Could we - now a minute, sir. When I've dropped my individuality, I haven't lost my arms, I haven't lost my face, but the quality of separateness has come to an end. Right? That has come to an end through immediate perception. And that perception and immediate action brings about a quality of intelligence, which is not thought. Right? A quality of intelligence that is not the product of environment, education, all the rest of it, but it is intelligence that has the quality of compassion, love, and the enormous responsibility involved in that compassion. Right? Responsibility.

Q: I think responsibility does introduce difficulties because it involves the idea of one individual being responsible...

K: No, no, the feeling of being responsible, not for one individual, or for a group or for some idea or some cause, but the feeling of total responsibility. Otherwise I wouldn't talk here, I wouldn't open my mouth, if there was not the feeling of immense responsibility, not to a cause, to some divine purpose, all that nonsense.

Q: Intense involvement.

K: Not quite - I'm not involved. Again that's a dangerous word. Wait. So, intelligence has taken place when there was an insight into the individual, that disorganizes - there is intelligence. Right? Now that intelligence is love, compassion, without intelligence there is no love, no compassion, they all go together.

Now, what is the action of that intelligence - that's right - what is the action of that intelligence when surrounded by a million people who are not - forgive me - intelligent, in that sense. They are all clever, they have all super knowledge, they have got immense power, position, prestige, all that. What is the responsibility of that intelligence and its action?

Q: It can only be love.

K: No, no, I've said that, Madam. Without intelligence there is no love. I mean, the individuality says, "I love you," and it's full of jealousies, anxieties, ugliness, and that's not intelligence. So what is the action of that intelligence surrounded by people who are completely indifferent?

Q: Is there any action, Krishnaji, surely it just is.

K: Therefore what does that mean? Go on - that's what I'm coming to. If you are that in a world, what will you do, what is your movement?

Q: If you are not separate from the world, then the world need must be the trigger to...

K: Sir, you are the world, just now.

Q: yes.

K: And you, X happens to have this intelligence, compassion - really I mean it, he's got it in his blood - and feels utterly responsible for everything that's happening, without guilt, without

cause, the feeling, you know, you love somebody - now, when there is love, you care, there is care, there is attention, there is everything involved in it, which is - if I can use the word 'responsible', that's implied in that. You are the world. What is this X to do with you?

Q: You've just replied there. You've just given the reply: care.

K: Now, I have to go through it. (It's hot, isn't it?) You are the world, you, and the X here sitting in this chair says, "What is my responsibility towards you?" He cares, he has love, compassion, and intelligence, those three go together absolutely. And you won't even listen, you won't even care. Right? Then what is he to do? He feels responsible, you understand, sir?

Q: Doesn't he somehow touch...

K: Don't you feel, don't you feel all this?

Q: What is this person to do, what is he to do?

K: I'm asking you, sir.

Q: I've no idea, I'm not that person.

K: Why aren't you?

Q: I'd like to be.

K: Because you haven't given time, you haven't given your energy, you haven't listened.

Q: That's perhaps the case.

K: Therefore you're like all the rest of them, so what will you do with X, sitting in this chair, throw mud at him? You will, of course.

Q: I would not.

K: Of course you are throwing mud at him, obviously, because you don't care. You don't face facts. Now, X says, am I talking to you at the conscious level? You understand my question? Please

follow this, sir. You go to a class, physics or learning a new language, there you are learning, listening at the conscious level to acquire a new language, learn all about science, physics or mathematics, it's all at the conscious level. Right? Right, sir? Now are we talking to each other at the conscious level?

Q: No.

K: Before you say "No" sir, find out, sir, don't...

Q: That's the problem, before, with the wife, wasn't it, why - the problem before with the wife.

K: I wasn't talking - I left my wife long ago. (Laughter)

Q: Are we receiving...

K: Sorry, poor lady - I haven't got a wife, so - anyhow. So I'm asking a different question, sir, totally different question. When the speaker is talking, is he communicating at the conscious level, as when you go to a school or to college, university, you're learning various subjects which are at the conscious level, mathematics, history, whatever it is.

So that conscious level has acquired knowledge. Knowledge can never be complete, therefore knowledge always goes with ignorance. I wonder if the scientists will agree.

Q: Yes, there is also a lot of unconscious conditioning during the learning of science.

K: Yes, I'm coming to that. So are we merely listening at the conscious level, or partly at the deeper level, partly? You understand my question? Which is it we are doing? Or is there a listening with all your consciousness, the part, the deeper, and the superficial, whole of it listening. You understand my question?

Q: This is the problem. This is the problem, because to have this

kind of listening it seems that we have to have left our personality already.

K: No, no. Just to listen, sir. I'm not talking of leaving your wife, husband, daughters, etc. individual, nothing, I've moved away from that for the moment. I'm asking, we're asking each other, are we listening with the hearing of the ears, or listening with all your consciousness, with all your being, so that there is no part of you asleep, there's no part of you withholding, just listening?

Now if you so listened that listening is complete attention, isn't it? Complete attention. Professor Wilkins says something to me, and I am listening entirely, there are no barriers, there is no effort, there is no sense of "What do you mean by it?" None of that, I'm just listening to everything he says. That is, I have given complete attention. Right? Now, in that attention there is no 'me'. I wonder if you see. There is no centre from which I am listening. Do you, understand what I'm saying?

Q: Yes.

K: Explaining, rather. So if one listens in the same way, without the 'me' to the nature of the individual, the nature of his activities and his organizations, then there is no problem, you have got it, because you are listening entirely without the centre.

Q: Action without will.

K: No. I'm not talking about action without will. I'm just listening. Now in the same way, can I listen to something that I've not even thought about, that isn't even anywhere near my consciousness, which is, is there an action without the actor, without the self-centred entity who has always acted, acted, acted?

We must stop now, it's nearly one o'clock. Lunch is more

important than this, for the time being.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 6TH SEMINAR MEETING 18TH SEPTEMBER 1979**

KRISHNAMURTI: As this is the last discussion or dialogue or whatever it is, do we sum up the whole thing, or do you want to investigate further into what we've been discussing? No answer?

QUESTIONER: Could we investigate further?

K: Could we investigate further? I think you were not here for the last two discussions. What we were saying was that there is actually no individuality at all. And if, when, not if, when the individuality is understood, its nature, its activities and its institutions, is there an ending of that individuality, because the individual is really the whole world, in essence, so there is no individuality. And if there is no individuality, does it carry the memories, the recording, the various forms of remembrances, do they exist when the individuality comes to an end. We went into that very carefully.

And, if you want to go still further, can the individual ever be complete, whole? But individuals seek that, try to integrate themselves and imagine or work, think, that they have become the whole. Isolation, which is the activity of the individual can never be complete, can never be whole. And when the individuality comes to an end, which is, it requires a great deal of investigation, which we did, and what is the quality of the mind that is no longer centred in itself? What is the action of a mind that is not self-centred. That's the whole point.

We said, to perceive this whole movement of the individual and its activities and its organizations, is to have an insight into the

whole movement of it. And that very insight is out of time. I don't know if we have understood that. Insight is not a remembrance, is not a calculated, investigated result, it is not a process of recording and acting from that, and it's no longer the activity of thought, which is time. Therefore insight is the action of a mind that is not caught in time.

I don't know how far one has understood this, or gone into it even verbally or intellectually. And then, if there is that insight and that intelligence, and we said, intelligence goes, must always go with love and affection, have compassion, then what is the action of such a mind, in a world of violence, of degeneration and all the things that are happening around us? What is the action of such a mind? We've come to that so far.

And we also said, is there an action in which thought as the actor - is there an action without the actor? Can we discuss a little bit, that? The actor is the observer, the actor is the self-centred accumulation of activities, the various forms of various remembrances, recollections, the whole process of recording, as the individual. And from that we have acted. And that is separative, exclusive, and isolating. When there is isolation there must be conflict, obviously. So is there an action which is not individualistic in the sense we have described it and therefore without the actor?

All this may sound rather intellectual, verbal and perhaps nonsensical, but if one examines very closely, really earnestly and goes into it deeply, it is not. And the individual has always sought experience. Experience, not only a doctor or a surgeon who has had a great deal of experience and therefore skilful with his hands



and mind and so on, that's one kind of experience. Any other kind of psychological experience implies that there is a centre which is experiencing. I don't know if you are following all this.

And the experience must be recognized, which means it has already had an inclination of it. So a mind that is free of the individual - may I go on? - has no experience. Won't somebody catch me out?

Q: Because it's experience that stabilizes the sense of individuality.

K: Sir, look - experience as a good driver, as an engineer, as a skilful surgeon, a carpenter, he has accumulated a great deal of knowledge and according to that knowledge he skilfully acts, performs. And that's one kind of experience. The so-called spiritual experience the word 'spiritual' I don't like to use, the so-called psychological experiences only exist when there is a centre from which the experiencer is experiencing. I wonder if you get it?

Q: Why is that necessary, you see - why is it necessary to have this centre.

K: The centre has been formed, has been accumulated through generations.

Q: That's memory.

K: That's memory. That is, the tradition, the various impressions, pressures, all that has created the centre.

Q: And the memory of all the pain and pleasure.

K: Memory involves pain and pleasure, obviously, which we talked about the other day. So I'm saying, sir, or asking, we have always sought mystical experiences. Right? So-called spiritual experiences, something more than the ordinary, sensory self-

limiting experiences, something more. I question that whole mystical search and experience.

Q: If it's not an experience, then how do you distinguish...

K: That's just it. If it is not an experience, the doctor asks, then what takes place?

Q: Do you have the feeling, I mean, experience include the feeling, sensation - does it?

K: No. This is really - are you interested in all this?

Q: Yes.

K: Why? (Laughter) Sir we've had every kind of experience. Right? We have had different kinds of experience, sensory, emotional, romantic, experience of so-called love, intellectual, all that, experiences of cultivating knowledge. Right?

Q: Something you do, something you go through?

K: Yes, there is something we do.

Q: And we experience...

K: And there are experiences which the so-called mystics have. Right?

Q: What do they claim their experiences are?

K: I don't think it is an experience.

Q: But they say, some people say...

K: Some people say it is an experience, suddenly the whole world is me, suddenly the universe and me don't exist.

Q: Now why is that wrong?

K: Wait, I'm coming to that. I want to first get the thing clear. There is sense of universal harmony, universal something or other. That means there is a recording taking place. Right?

Q: It may.

K: No, it must.

Q: If they have a centre in it.

K: Yes, that's my whole point. As long as there is a centre which is experiencing this spiritual, this super

## MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 30TH DECEMBER 1978

I hope you will not mind if I do not speak as was intended this afternoon at 5 o'clock under the trees, because as it is raining it is impossible, so I hope you won't mind if we turn this into a discussion, or a dialogue. Would that be all right?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes, good. First of all what shall we talk about together? Not some fanciful, theoretical, superstitious ideals but rather something that is actually in our daily life that we can live with and bring about a different quality of mind in ourselves. So if I may ask what would you like to talk about, discuss. It is easy to ask questions, quite easy, but in the very asking of the question, if it is really a question which is serious, demanding a great deal of attention, care, such a question is worthwhile; but if you ask some kind of superficial rather obvious question then I am afraid it won't be. And to ask the right question is also very difficult, because if you ask the right question one is apt to get the right answer. So what shall we talk about?

Q: You said, give me a way of life in which there is no need for transformation.

K: Is there a way of life which doesn't demand transformation. Any other questions? That isn't the only question surely?

Q: What is the quality of innocence, and its relationship to intelligence?

K: The quality of innocence and its relationship to intelligence. Is there a way of life which doesn't demand transformation -

transformation being change; and what is the relationship between intelligence and innocence. Won't you all play the game, it's in your court.

Q: How do we know transformation instantly?

K: Is that a serious question, sir - how to bring about transformation instantly.

Q: Has healthy competition a place?

K: Has healthy competition a place in society.

Q: What is death?

K: Perhaps you would ask this audience!

Q: What is the reason for poverty?

K: What is the reason for poverty.

Q: What is the purpose of life?

K: What is the purpose of life.

Q: In spite of listening to Krishnaji for a number of years violence is persisting in me, how am I to get over it?

K: I have listened to you for a number of years, why isn't there a radical change in me?

Q: Violence persists.

K: Violence still goes on. I have listened to you for a number of years - most unfortunately - and violence still goes on in my life.

Now that's enough of these questions. So let us see which is the best of them and try to answer all the questions perhaps by choosing one of them, if we could go into it seriously. You said, can there be a change, a way of living, without transformation; what is the relationship between innocence and intelligence; what is death; and what is the purpose of life, and so on. Now which of these questions would you like to take and go into it in detail

seriously, if you are so inclined? Because after all this is a serious meeting, not just an afternoon to be spent in a room when it is raining.

I think if we could take the question: is there a possibility, a way of life which doesn't demand any kind of change. Could we take that? Would that be worthwhile? Isn't the question itself rather absurd? Because one wants to live, one wants to find a way of life which doesn't demand effort, change, transformation. Which means one must be totally satisfied with one's own way of living, or a way of life in which there is no conflict, no pain, no suffering. Is that it? Do you want to discuss that? Is that what you want, to find a way of living where - in which, rather - there is no need for any kind of change?

Q: Sir, why do you say that in that particular life there would be no conflict - why do you speculate?

K: I don't speculate.

Q: You said that just now.

K: I know. I said is there a way of life in which...

Q: There is no need for transformation.

K:... there is no need for transformation.

Q: It need not be so. That is the problem.

K: Just a minute, sir. I am going into the question. A way of life in which there is no need for change. Aren't most of us satisfied with our way of living? You might be a little discontented, dissatisfied, and there are slight peripheral changes, but most of us prefer, don't we, I am just asking, for things to remain as they are, status quo, hoping that it will remain that way. If you are a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Catholic, or whatever it is, we don't want to be

disturbed. We want to have our beliefs, our homes, our families completely secure. And we are satisfied with that. And that doesn't demand any kind of transformation, we are satisfied as we are. But the moment you begin to question the way we are living, the society in which we live, the so-called culture, the so-called beliefs, the moment you begin to question those you inevitably bring about a sort of disturbance. Don't we? And most of us don't like to be disturbed.

So we should in answering this question, go into why human beings remain in a narrow groove of their own beliefs, of their own rituals, of their own gods, of their own conclusions, either communist, socialist, liberal, conservative, or various forms of political principles and dogmas. Why do we live that way? Would that be a right question? Why do we accept to live a life in which there is absolutely no security, in which there is constant struggle, competition, uncertainty, confusion and so on - infinite divisions, why do we live that way? And when we perceive that, don't we ask ourselves, if we are at all serious, is there a possibility of changing all that?

Q: (In French)

K: The gentleman asks, sir, is there a way of living which doesn't demand transformation. So I am asking first, to find out if there is a way of living which doesn't demand transformation, we must begin with the life that we lead everyday. From that can we find out the way we live with all its complexities and see if there is a possibility of living a life which is totally different, without any question of transformation. So shouldn't we begin - to go very far shouldn't we begin very near? Would you accept that?

Q: Yes. The complexity is there, it is a reality.

K: What do you mean?

Q: The complexities of our life, it is there. I am not perceiving that. When I question it, I believe there must be another way.

K: No, sir.

Q: I am not postulating, when I postulate I begin to think there must be another way, whereas just seeing the complexity is there, because you are trying to speculate.

K: No, sir I am not. I am not trying to speculate anything. I am saying first, if there is a way - to answer your question - if there is a way of life which doesn't demand transformation. So I am examining the way of our life, present life, now: the way we live, the way we think, the way we feel, all our life is a constant struggle - which is an obvious fact. Now can all that be changed without any effort? That is the basic question, sir, if I understand it rightly. All right, sir?

Can we say, sir, that most of our lives, our everyday life, which is not a speculation, not a theory, not something that should be, but actually what is our daily life, and can that daily life with all its complexities be changed. Right? Do you want to go into that? Sir, please, do you want to?

Q: I don't think that is his question.

K: Then what is his question?

Q: I think his question is why don't we deal with the problems as they are, why do we change at all.

K: Why should we change at all. Don't!

Q: I don't think...

K: Sir, I said before, if you are satisfied with things as they are,



be satisfied, there is nothing more to be said. But if one is enquiring into this whole human structure, human behaviour, human conduct, human way of living, if we want to enquire into that seriously, let's discuss that. That's all. If you don't, if you say, let everything remain as it is and you are satisfied with it, there is nothing more to be said.

So can we discuss, have a dialogue, a conversation between two friends who have met seriously and say, we have problems in life, various types - political, religious and so on - can we talk about those problems seriously and try to find out if these problems can be eradicated. That is the reason of this dialogue. If you are not interested in that, then what are you interested in; and if I can answer what you are interested in, let's do it.

Q: Sir, there is discontentment existing in our life all the time. And it is also pointed out that there is a discontentment existing in itself, and from that there could be a right action.

K: The same thing which we are going into now. Most of us are discontented, most of us are dissatisfied, most of us want to find a way of living where discontent, conflict, violence doesn't exist, all that doesn't exist. Now first of all, what is it we are discontented with? Is the discontentment superficial - I am asking, sir, I am just enquiring, going into the question - is it superficial in the sense, I want a better house, or more money, or better position, I want to become the Prime Minister, this or that. So I would call all those things rather superficial. But we are discontented not only with the superficial things, but also deeply, if one is serious and concerned, one is deeply discontented with things as they are - with society, with politics, with religion, in our relationship with each other,

almost with everything, if one is enquiring, serious, one is totally dissatisfied.

Q: We are discontented.

K: So let's find out if one is so seriously discontented, what shall we do? Shall we become communists? Shall we become...

Q: No.

K: Listen, sir, let me go on a little bit and you will see. Shall we become communists, or join a new sect, a new guru, a new ideologist, a new Lenin, a new Marx, a new Mao, or go back to the Upanishads, the Gita, or go back to some theory? So what shall we do? You understand my question, sirs?

Q: We have come to rather a dead end.

K: I am going into it, sir. Suppose I am dissatisfied, I don't know what about, but I am dissatisfied. Suppose, I am taking that as an example. So I say, being dissatisfied I am trying to find satisfaction. That's the reaction to my dissatisfaction. So I start out with dissatisfaction, discontent, a burning sense of revolt, and I want to act, I want to do something about it. Then I join either a party, a political party, a socialist party, or ideological group and I begin to identify my dissatisfaction with that, and so hope to lose thereby my dissatisfaction. I hope you are following all this. If you are not interested, it's all right. That is, being dissatisfied I identify myself with a group, with a community, with some principle, with some belief, with some society, with some guru, or a political principal. And thereby I hope I will lose my discontent. This is generally what happens in the world. One must be aware of this, surely.

And this very identification out of dissatisfaction brings about a

great division between people. Right? Please, sir, this is a discussion, this is not a discourse by me.

Q: Is this a primary identification with dissatisfaction itself?

Q: I think the suggestion is of dissatisfaction itself.

K: Of course, of course. When we say - I am going into it slowly, sir, let's go into it slowly and we will come to this question. Why do we, as human beings, identify ourselves with something? You understand? Why? Don't you identify yourself with a class of people? As a Brahmin, non-Brahmin, as an Indian, a Muslim, a Christian, a Buddhist - that's a form of identification, why do we do this? Sir, why don't you discuss this?

Q: We think we have security in that, that's why we identify.

K: So you identify yourself with the nation, as Indians, because in that there is security. And you identify yourself with a group, hoping thereby to find a security. Or identify yourself with a guru, and so on and so. So this identification is born out of the desire for security. Right? Would you accept that?

Q: Also for satisfying material needs.

K: Yes, it means that.

Q: Not only psychological needs.

K: Not only material needs but also psychological needs. If you are in a country that is purely Catholic, or communist, you identify yourself with it in order to earn a livelihood, if you don't you are thrown out, or put into a camp, or tortured, or whatever it is. So this constant desire to identify oneself with a principle, with an idea, is to find security. Now when each one of us does that, what is the result of it, the consequences of it? I identify myself with India and you identify - no. I identify myself with a Muslim, and

you are a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or whatever it is, what takes place between us?

Q: Discontentment.

Q: We are broken up.

K: Just watch it, sir, what is happening in the world.

Q: Hatred.

Q: You form a suppression, and I form a suppression.

K: What happens, what is the consequence?

Q: We are not meeting at all.

Q: Conflict.

Q: There is a division, sir.

K: That's right, sir, just hold that. There is a division. And when there is a division what takes place?

Q: Conflict.

K: You see what is happening, sir. China, Russia - that's what is going on, there is division. Though they talk about being communist, in that very monolithic idea there is division. Where there is division there must be conflict - the Hindu, the Muslim, the Jew, the Arab, and so on and so on. Where there is division there must be conflict, it is inevitable. So seeing that, why do you identify yourself with India, or identify yourself with a particular group of people as the Brahmins, or non-Brahmins, anti-Brahmin, pro-Brahmin, this or that - why? Knowing that it will create division, and that division will bring about conflict which will destroy your security. You start out wanting security, and identify yourself with some group, and thereby bring about a division, and that division implies conflict, violence, brutality, torture, and so your desire for security is denied. This is obvious, isn't it sir? No?

Q: No.

K: Then why do you call yourself a Hindu?

Q: I don't, sir.

K: Wait, sir, I am asking. You don't call yourself a Hindu, all right. What do you say sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, can you be totally unidentified with any belief, with any society, with any group, can you remain that way? That means being absolutely alone. Can you? Answer sir, you started out discussing.

Q: It is possible to remain like that provided you know that all conflict stems from identification.

K: Sir, I have just explained that all conflict arises, part of it, through division. You hear that statement, that where there is division between man and woman, between human beings, black, white, purple, whatever their colour is, wherever there is division there must be conflict. That's a law. You hear that statement, you hear it with the ear, and what does it mean to you? You understand my question, sir? You hear a statement of that kind: where there is division there must be conflict, there must be violence. That's a statement, that's a law. And you hear that, and what do you do with it? Please, tell me. I am enquiring. We are enquiring, we are having a conversation with each other. What do you do with it?

Q: You compare it with our own experience.

K: No, sir, I am asking. You compare what is being said with your own experience? You know what you are saying? I tell you something, would you listen to it, or do you say, I must compare what you say with something else? So you actually are not

listening. Your whole mind is occupied with comparison, so you are actually not listening - are you?

Q: Can one do anything about it?

K: Shouldn't you, if you want to live safely, to live peacefully.

Q: What could one do?

K: I am going to tell you. Don't be a Hindu; or a Muslim, or belong to any society, any group of people. That's what is happening in the world, sir.

Q: Looking into myself I find that this kind of identification is very rigorous in our daily life, that is why we are going into things.

K: God is very vigorous in one's life - what did you say sir?

Q: No. Looking into myself I find in my daily life that this kind of identification arises only in a very small measure.

K: Yes, sir, that's what I am saying.

Q: He says it exists in a very small measure in our daily life.

Q: Discontentment and conflict arises when we get into the groove that we already belong.

K: Yes, sir, agree. But I am asking you, sir, if I may, most respectfully, you hear a statement of that kind, the kind which has just been repeated: where there is division there must be conflict, there must be violence and destruction and therefore there is no security in division. And yet we maintain that division in our daily life, why do we do this, knowing division is corrupt, division brings about violence and all the rest of it, why do we keep to that division?

Q: We are not capable.

Q: There is some difficulty because of the fear of insecurity.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, sir, I have asked a question and you don't reply to it, you go off saying something else. I am asking sir, most gently and respectfully, you hear a statement of this kind, that where there is division there must be conflict and so the destruction of security - you hear that, what do you do with it? Do you still remain a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Vishnu-ite, or some other little god or this or that, do you?

Q: A good Christian can never be a threat to a Hindu or a Muslim.

K: Oh gosh, you see how clever we are. So you remain a good Christian and he will remain a good Hindu. And the division is kept. Sir, please, just listen, sir. Why do you waste your time? You are not interested in this, are you? To wipe away division. This is a very important question, sir. This is what is happening in the world.

Q: Sir, I remain with the division because I do not know what else to do.

K: I'll show you. First I'll go into it carefully, sir. First you must listen to it, mustn't you? You must listen to this statement. Do you listen to the statement? Or do you say, yes, that statement sounds right because some other guru has said it, or some book said it - so you are not actually listening. Are you? So first, please, I beg of you since you have come on a rainy day and are uncomfortable and all the rest of it, I am pointing out that where there is division there must be conflict and war. Now you hear that statement.

Q: Sir...

K: Wait.

Q: The reason of this division does not encourage conflict if

there is no self and we have evolved.

K: If there is no selfishness then everything would be perfect. But there is selfishness. It's a lovely theory. You see, sir, this is what I am saying, you indulge in theories - if we were gods everything would be all right. But we are not gods. So I am just asking you sir, do you listen to what is being said? Then we can proceed after having listened carefully to what you are saying, then we can investigate how to live a life in which there is no division. First I must listen. It's like a seed planted in the earth, the earth must have good soil. You can't plant a seed on a rock. It is important that we understand this. And having listened carefully then we can proceed, from facts only, not from theories. The fact being you are a Hindu, and I am a Muslim. Why does this take place? Why am I a Muslim? Why are you a Hindu? Is it our conditioning? You understand my question? From childhood I have been told I am a Muslim - Muslim, Muslim - or whatever it is. And you are told from childhood, that you are a Hindu - or a Parsi, or a Christian, or whatever it is. So this division exists because we are both conditioned as a Muslim, as a Hindu - conditioned. Do you see that sirs? It is a vast propaganda. Would you agree to that?

Q: Sir, nothing and nobody can exist except with identification and in duality, and nothing can exist in unity. What can we do about it?

K: You are talking about duality, what can we do about it.

Q: He said, nothing can exist without identification, nothing can exist without duality, what can we do about it.

K: I am doing, I am pointing out something. We can do a great deal to put away this division. We are going into it. You are not.



Are you interested in this, sirs? Or is it just words, words, words? If I am a Hindu or a Muslim, and I realize that it is bringing about conflict, being reasonable, sane, healthy minded, I say, 'I won't be a Hindu' - it is finished. There is no conflict involved in it because it is so reasonable, so logical, so sane. So I put away my insanity, which is my saying, I am a Muslim. Will you do that?

Q: We are content with one conflict.

K: Wait, I am just asking that question, don't, if you don't mind, go off into another question. You have heard a reasonable, logical, sane statement, and will you put that away, being a Hindu, will you drop it?

Q: I don't know. The difficulty for me would be dropping away being a Christian. The moment I drop it I fear I am something else.

K: Yes.

Q: I am not a Christian, but I am something else.

K: The moment I say I am dropping it I feel a certain sense of emptiness, a certain sense of loneliness, a certain sense of having no relationship with others who identify themselves with something else. You understand this? My question is, sir, if you will kindly answer it, will you drop your being a Hindu? Or a Christian, or a Buddhist, or across the river, or this or that, will you drop it?

Q: We should drop it.

K: The gentleman says, we should drop it. Sometime in the future when it is convenient! Sir, you understand how serious this all is, sir. You must know what is happening in the world: every little business, every little community, every little state is breaking away, separate, they are bringing about fragmentation in the world.

Where there is fragmentation there can never be any question of living peacefully. And apparently you are not interested in it. So I am asking what is your mind, what is the quality of your mind that you won't even act when it is logical, sane, reasonable? Why don't you? What is the quality of your mind, sirs? You have taken the trouble to come all the way in the rain, and all the rest of it, and you are sitting in a hot room, I am asking, why don't you do something.

Q: I find that after many times of being asked by Indians what my religion is, when I try to explain that I identify with no one religion, I find this often causes conflict in the Indians because they identify with being a Muslim, or Hindu or Buddhist. Whereas if I say that I am Hindu or Buddhist, then it doesn't bring a conflict, because I find many people cannot understand not identifying with any one religion.

Q: He says when he is asked what religion he belongs to, and he says I belong to no religion, there is always conflict in the other because they are either Hindus or Muslims.

K: When I say I do not belong to any religion, or any political party, this or that, it causes conflict in the other. It should! I am glad it causes conflict in the other. At least he is awakening to something that he hasn't thought about it. You haven't answered my question, sir. You see, puja, which probably many of you do, is so nonsensical, meaningless. Right? Would you agree it is unreasonable, illogical, superstitious, a routine, like repeating something which you don't know the meaning of, offering some prayers to some god which you have invented - the gods are your invention - no?

Q: No, sir, they serve a purpose.

K: Are you saying your gods serve a purpose?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I give up! If one realizes the dreadful things that are going on in the world - I won't enumerate them because I have been in America, Europe and all over the world, except Russia and China, the things that are happening in the field of war, preparing for wars, the defence mechanism and all the rest of it, the appalling things that are taking place, of which very few people seem to know, or be aware of, human beings must do something about all this insanity that is going on - the insanity that is going on in this country, the lawlessness, the disorder. And when you see all this, one asks, why do human beings put up with all this? They are supposed to be intelligent.

Q: How can we be aware, know, investigate into ourselves?

K: How can you be aware, know, investigate into yourself. You understand my question, sir? This is what Mrs Jayakar is asking. How am I, who have never thought about any of these things, as most people have not, how am I going to learn? Learn, not repeat, learn how to be aware. May we discuss that a little? Would that interest you? If it doesn't, it doesn't matter.

I want to learn to know myself. Learn, I mean not imitate what other people have said about me - the psychologists, the analysts, the professors, all the gurus and all the rest of it. I want to know what I am, I want to learn about myself. Now learning is one of the most difficult things in life because we learn as a way of memorizing, learning to us is memorize, and with that memory we try to understand ourselves. You understand what I am saying? Are

you following this sirs? So we must be very clear when we talk about learning what we mean by that word, and is it possible to learn without being told how to learn, what to learn, and be free of the outside influences that teach me how to learn. You understand my question, because I want to know myself, I am not interested in what Sankara, or Buddha or XYZ said, I want to know what I am. So how shall I begin? Where shall I begin? You understand my question, sirs? No?

Q: What do you mean by free myself from outside influences?

K: I am going to show it to you in a minute, sir.

Q: I mean they are there. Because when you put that technique you separate them in your mind.

K: No, not in the least. It's in your mind, it is not in my mind. I am very clear about it. I said I want to know myself. I want to know my thoughts, why I do certain things, I want to learn about myself, sir. I am curious. I am very curious to find out why I do this, why I don't do that, why I go to church, or don't go to church, why I do all these things, why I belong to a political party, why I am a Hindu - all that. Because all that is me. Right? I wonder if you understand this. So I want to be aware, learn what I am. Which means I am not going to accept any authority. Right? The authority of Freud, Jung, or your guru, or the Upanishads, the Gita, nothing, I am not going to accept a single authority. Because all these books have led me to a miserable life. Look at your faces, that's enough.

So where am I to begin to learn? I begin to learn where I can look, observe, not theories, not speculations, when I can observe. I can observe in my relationship with another. Do you understand? My relationship with my wife, if I have one, or with my husband,

with my girl friend, or my friend, I observe myself in relationship to another. Because in that observation I see my reaction, that I lie, that I am greedy, that I am envious, that I am frightened, that I am lonely, miserable. In that reaction I find myself. Right? Right, sirs? So I begin to learn about myself in relationship to another, and the relationship awakens my reactions - I am jealous when I see my wife, or my husband looking at somebody else, or having fun with somebody else, so I become jealous. So I am - please listen - I am learning what jealousy is. Are you doing that as we are talking? Or are you just listening? Are you listening as I am explaining?

In my reactions with regard to my relationship with another, intimate, or not intimate, I begin to find out the state of my responses, so I discover that I am jealous, I discover I don't like people, I discover I am envious. So what am I to do? I discover that I am envious - aren't you? Aren't you envious? Don't be ashamed to acknowledge something which is so common. Now envy implies measurement, doesn't it? Or is that too difficult? I envy you because you have got a bright mind. I envy you because you have got a car. I envy you because you have got a status in a rotten society. I envy you because you write books, you talk, you are brilliant, and I am not. What does that comparison mean?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am leading to something, follow it, sir, please. Which is, in comparing myself with you who have got a house, a car, a position, money, I am envious. And envy implies comparison. Right? Right? Can I live - please listen - can I live without comparison? Have you ever tried to live without comparison? No comparison whatsoever.

Q: What happens when you are hungry?

K: You eat, if you can. Oh, you are so silly, you people.

Q: I am dominated by others.

K: You are dominated by others. Wait, you have discovered. Now just a minute, sir. You are dominated by others, your mother, your father, your wife, your husband, or whatever it is, you are dominated. Why? You learn about it, sir. Don't say it is right or wrong, you learn, find out why you are dominated. Why? Go on, sir, explain. You are dominated, aren't you?

Q: Because we are weak. I am weak.

K: Sir, I am asking.

Q: Because I am afraid of them, and I have no security.

K: Please sir, don't go back to security everlastingly. We have gone through that. I want to know myself, not according to books, not according to Isvara, or Buddha or anybody. I want to know about myself, because if I don't know myself I have no basis of any kind of lasting relationship with another. You understand? What is the matter with you? Are you all tired?

Q: Learning to know yourself implies violence.

K: I am going to point out something so please kindly listen, it may be something new you have not heard. I first said envy arises through comparison. Right? Do you dispute that?

Q: No.

K: Good. Why do you compare? I compare myself with you, and I said you are more bright, more brilliant, clever, nice looking and all the rest of it. And by comparing myself with you I make myself imitate you. Right? I want to be like you. So what does that make me? You understand? If I want to be like you what have I done to myself? Oh, for god's sake.

Q: The moment you ask that question, if I may say so, you are condemning the factor of envy.

K: I am not.

Q: If you are not condemning it and you are just learning about envy, and you are just exploring into the discovery of what I am, then envy is, it comes into being from several factors, it exists. Are you saying, can I be free of envy at this stage?

K: Yes, I think at this stage.

Q: Then you are bringing into it a totally new set of...

K: Of ideas.

Q:... of ideas and action.

K: No.

Q: If you are only learning...

K: I am only learning, the very learning is the very action. I am not separating learning from action.

Q: That is what I think.

K: Yes, I know. Sir, there are two ways of learning. Learning by accumulating knowledge, and acting from knowledge. That is, I learn to be an engineer, all the complications of accumulating knowledge of being an engineer, then I go out in the world and apply that knowledge skilfully or unskilfully. There is the other way, which is, go out, act, from that action accumulate knowledge. You understand? You have understood? So both spring from knowledge. You understand? Is this clear?

Q: Yes, it's clear.

K: Thank god, thank god somebody understands. So that is, knowledge is always in the past. Right? There is no knowledge of the future, unless you project what you have known, modified, and

that becomes the future. I won't go into it.

So I am learning about envy, and I see measurement, comparison, is the beginning of envy. I am learning. And in the very act of learning there is action to end envy. I don't separate learning from action. I don't learn, accumulate knowledge, and then act. But in the very act of learning I see the enormous implications of envy and therefore end it. You understand?

Q: I hope you are not trying to end and therefore learn. In the very process of learning you have dropped envy.

K: You haven't understood what I said. Sir, you hear a statement, and from that statement you make an idea of it, don't you, and act according to that idea. Whereas pure observation, the very observation is the acting. When you see a cobra, or some poisonous animal, you don't speculate about it, you don't draw a conclusion, you act. The very perception is the action. With most of us there is perception, an interval of time, which is the idea, and the idea is not actual and so on, we get lost in that. So I am pointing out that most people are envious, envy arises through comparison, and learn to live without comparison and see what happens. Learn, and therefore act from that learning.

Q: May I ask you something?

K: Yes.

Q: Is this learning separate from observation?

K: No Oh lord. Sir, I don't want to go into all this, it is too difficult. There are three arts one must learn: the art of observation, the art of hearing, the art of learning; they are not three separate things but we divide them for convenience. There's the art of listening, which means, I listen to what you say, I don't bring in my



own ideas, my own prejudices, my own opinions, I listen to find out what you want to say to me. And I observe, I don't bring opinions about what I observe. Right? So there is only observation, not my opinion about what I am observing. And the art of learning is not merely accumulating knowledge and to act, but the act of listening, the act of observing implies learning and acting, they are all one. Is this all Greek to you?

Q: That means that way of looking is a way of life?

K: Yes, sir. If you do it, that is the way of life. If you listen to your wife, or you say, 'I know her, it doesn't matter'. But if you listen to her she will tell you lots. That's why life, sir, is a way of listening, perceiving, learning. And when you know those three arts, then you live a life of complete awareness.

Now, all right. You have heard all this, where are you? Just as before? You haven't changed, or moved, you haven't learnt, or heard, are you just carrying on? I am asking sir, please kindly - I have talked, so kindly talk to me.

Q: We have learnt envy arises out of comparison. Now the moment the envy arises, then I see what happens, then I am rather confused, I want the end of envy.

K: Learning is never ending.

Q: The immediate reaction is to drop it.

K: Sir, first of all, I say please listen, sir. Listen. Not how to drop envy. Just listen. Have you ever listened to your wife? Or your husband, or your girl friend, or whatever it is, have you listened to any friend? All right. I am your friend, will you listen to me? I am not trying to convince you of a thing. I am not a propagandist. I don't care if you listen, don't listen, but since you

have taken the trouble to come here have the goodness, the courtesy to listen. To listen implies you don't interject your opinions, your conclusions, your beliefs, you want to learn, you want to hear what I have to say. You know what you think, what you feel but you haven't listened to what I have to say. So first learn to listen. Can you?

Q: Yes.

K: Oh, no, sir. Sir, you say, yes. It is one of the most...

Q: Now.

K: Now, because I have put you in a corner.

Q: Put me in a corner.

K: I don't want to put you in a corner. We are learning. We are not putting anybody in a corner, forcing anybody, we are learning: learning about envy, the whole complexity of envy. When you say, I compare this building with another building, when you say, I compare this picture with another picture, when you compare this picture with that picture you are not looking at the picture, one picture, you are always comparing, comparing.

So can you live a life - listen to it, listen to it - can you live a life without comparing at all?

Q: Is it possible to see without opinions?

K: Of course, sir. Look. This is a microphone, isn't it? We both agree this is a microphone. Why do I have to have an opinion about it? Facts...

Q: I cannot see without my opinions when I look at you.

K: Why should I have an opinion about you and you have an opinion about me, why? Why do you have a conclusion about me? Otherwise you wouldn't be here, would you? Just enquire, sir,

whether you can observe something, observe yourself, observe another, without saying he is a Greek, he is a Roman, he is a Jew, he is an Arab, just to observe without an opinion. Can you? Then you observe, but if you interject between your observation and the thing you are observing, your prejudice, you don't observe. It's so simple. That is the art of learning, sir.

Q: When you see humanity without comparing, without what you know before, you can't see.

K: You can. You see, please sir, you have learnt to compare, that's our conditioning from childhood. 'A' is compared with 'B', 'B' gets better marks, he is more intelligent, so 'A' is sacrificed and 'B' becomes important, and on that conditioning we are brought up. And I am saying, look, such conditioning is destructive, because perhaps if you don't compare you will find out what you are actually. But if I say, I must be like Mr 'D', I hope not, I am just imitating, conforming. You don't understand all this.

Q: Reaction comes instantly.

K: The reaction comes instantly. Sir, if you are learning about your reactions, learning, they never come quickly. You are watching, learning. You understand? I wish you would understand. I wish we could communicate with each other, it is so simple, all this. I am learning about my reactions: I am jealous, I am envious, greedy, or I want power, position, or domination, and so on. Now when I am learning every reaction, you follow, there is no quickness about it, it comes slowly as I move in it. No? Have you ever tried it?

Q: In learning what is the role of talking?

K: What is the role of talking. It is half past six. Shouldn't we

stop? An hour and a half. You must be nearly asleep, aren't you?  
At the end of the day.

Q: What about the mind?

K: What about the mind. You will hear it tomorrow, or Sunday, Monday, another time. First mind - I'll just explain quickly - mind includes the brain, all the retentive memories, experiences, knowledge of humanity, mind includes your feelings, your sensitivity, it includes your love, your affection, your compassion, all that, the whole totality of human existence is the mind. You might say, that is not the mind, that is the intellect. All right, include the intellect also in the mind. The intellect, the emotions, the sensations, all the accumulated knowledge, both scientific knowledge, technological knowledge, all the generations upon generations that have accumulated experiences, all that is part of the mind. And if that mind is not totally unconditioned it is no longer a mind, it is just a machine operating. That's enough.

## **MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 31ST DECEMBER 1978 'THE ART OF LEARNING'**

First of all I would like to point out, if I may, that this is not a propaganda, not a new set of ideas, a new set of beliefs, or setting oneself as a guru; but together we are going to talk over our many problems. The implications in talking over together are that as there are so many of you one cannot possibly communicate with each one, but if we are able to think together, not agreeing or disagreeing, but able to think clearly, objectively, sanely, and that implies that you are not prejudiced, that you don't start out with a lot of opinions, judgements, opposing arguments. We are not dealing with arguments, or with opinions. We are trying, actually doing, trying to find out a way of life in which we understand the total complexity of our lives.

So if I may point out that to think together implies, does it not, that you approach the problems, that you approach without any previous conclusions, previous ideas, or beliefs. We are thinking together. And that implies that you must exercise your brains and not go to sleep, not accept.

First of all we must look at the problems that surround us, both outwardly and inwardly. We must first examine clearly what the outward things are, what is going on in the world. Because we have to think globally, not provincially, not with a class mind or a sectarian mind, believing in one thing and contradicting what you believe by your actions and so on. So we are together examining, clearly if we can, what is happening in the world, outside us, not only environmentally but politically, religiously, ecologically.

Because if you don't examine from the outside accurately, as far as one can, it is very difficult to examine oneself accurately. You must begin with the outer and come inwards - like a tide that goes out and comes in. It is the same movement, the world outside us is not different from us. But at least we can clearly observe what is happening around us. And we have at least a criteria from which we can work inwardly. I hope that is clear.

First we are together going to examine what is happening around us in every possible way, if we can, with the fact which we have. And we have not many facts because we are dealing with politicians, with so-called rulers, right throughout the world. And they are governing us. And if you observe each in country, a group of people are concerned about their own little area. This is obvious. And if you further examine, not only they are concerned with their own little area of a vast field, which is the world, but also that little area is broken up, fragmented more and more and more. So there is fragmentation going on in the world - nationally, religiously, politically, economically. Breaking up. It is so obvious in this country, and in the rest of the world.

So there is fragmentation, not only politically but also within oneself. We are broken up human beings, we are not whole. That's clear. And each nation is fighting the other nation - the Hindu, the Muslim and so on and so on. And one has relied, one has hoped that politics will save man. And it has not saved man. On the contrary it has brought about much more suffering through wars, through division. One has hoped through science man would break through. And that also has failed, economically and so on. We have relied on politics for the saving of man; we have relied on religions

for the saving of man; we have relied on science, which is the accumulation of knowledge in action, we have relied on that, and none of these have helped man. They may have given man a little corner somewhere or other but it has been a constant struggle. It is obvious.

And we have also seen that no organization of any kind, whether of the left, the right, or the centre, the communist, the socialist, no organization of any kind is going to save man. Right? I hope you will see that. Even small communities are not going to save man, because it is a world problem, a global problem, and it must be dealt with globally, with a global mind, not with a little sectarian, parochial, narrow little mind.

So organizations have failed. Institutions have failed. The gurus multiplying like so many - what shall we say - mushrooms all over the world, and they are not going to save man. On the contrary; they make their own little whirlpool, little noise, little - you know what they are doing so I don't have to tell you all that. So what is going to save man, because we are now, when you observe what is happening in the world - preparation for war, four hundred thousand million dollars are spent on armaments every year by all the governments. All the governments put together are spending four hundred thousand million dollars every year. That is totally insane. Right?

So when you see all this, what is man to do? You understand my question? What are you to do? Where shall we start with the reformation of man? We have tried every way to resolve these problems. We have had principles, extraordinary ideals, great theories, volumes of sacred books - so-called sacred books, no

book is sacred, including the Gita, Upanishads or the Bible, or even the Koran.

So we have tried everything to resolve our problems - the Mao people in China, Lenin and his group in Russia, the Capitalists, the Socialists, the Liberals, every way we have tried. So in looking at all this, with all their divisions and fragmentations, with their confusion, and every human being against another human being, one guru against another guru, my guru is better than yours, he is more peaceful than yours, he knows and you don't know, and so on and on and on. I hope you realize how serious all this is.

So this is not a gathering of an evening which you casually attend and forget. We are gathered for a serious purpose. And that serious quality depends on you, whether you are being challenged, whether you accept the challenge, or you just pass it by. Various cultures have failed, including the culture of this country. So when you observe all these outward signs of violence, terrorism, brutality, enormous cruelty and torture, and politicians fighting for power, and so on, when you see all this, and you are challenged: what is a human being to do? What are you to do? Where do you begin? Because man, human beings like you and me, we are now facing a great crisis of humanity. I do not know if you realize it. And we must respond to that crisis which is a challenge accurately.

So realizing all this, who is going to save man? You understand my question? Who is going to save you, to save you from your confusion, from your conflict, from your suffering, from your constant contradictions, from your envy, from your petty nationalism, from the gurus which you have accepted with their authority? So when you observe this surely there is only one



answer. Since organizations have no value any more, since leaders cannot help us, since no book is going to give freedom to each one of us, so one can only begin with oneself. Right? I hope we are in communication with each other. Communication implies sharing; sharing in our thinking, in our feeling, in observing what is going on, and demanding of ourselves the highest capacity to act correctly. So from the outward we are moving inward. It is the same movement, the world is not different from us. We have made this miserable world. We have made it. No gods, no external agency, we human beings have created this society in which we live, with all its corruption, with all its malignant superstitions, with all its absurd gods. We have made this. The national class divisions. Please see all this.

So we must begin with ourselves. Right? Nobody on earth, or in heaven, is going to save us. No book, no guru, no system, no method, no leader, no hero, no prince. Right? We have to begin with ourselves and see if we can transform ourselves, if we can change radically from the very root of our being so that we have a free mind, not a mind that is broken up, corrupt, fearful, anxious, greedy, in sorrow. So is that possible? You understand my question? Right sir? Am I making this clear? Is the speaker making this clear?

So to go very far you must begin very near. 'Very near' is you. That's why we are asking: what is the quality of your thought, what is the quality of your mind that is willing, seeing what is happening, demanding that it must change the society in which we live, a different kind of education, different kinds of global government, and so on and so on. So are we as human beings, you,

willing or desirous, or deeply serious to find out, to investigate the whole human structure, psychological and religious, to see if it is possible for every human being who is good enough to listen to all this, whether he can investigate into himself. You understand sirs? Right?

So I am asking: what is the state of your mind, your consciousness that is serious enough to investigate? You understand my question? Are you serious? Or you want to spend a pleasant evening under a tree - not that it is not beautiful after the rains, the clear sky, but do you know for yourself the state of your own existence, your daily existence, the way you think, what you feel, whether you are greedy, envious and all the rest of it, the whole human structure. Are you aware of it? Do you know what you think? And why you think? Do you know your feelings, your prejudices, your anxieties, your fears, which is our life, our daily life? Your relationship with another, intimate or otherwise, what that relationship is, whether it is superficial or deeply real? Or is it merely sexual, sensory, or in your relationship there is affection, care, tenderness, love?

So we are asking whether you are aware of your own daily life with all its complexities. And it is only from there one can start, not with some belief, with some ideal, with some conclusions - belief in Brahman, or god, or Jesus, or something or other. Those are all illusions. So one is asking - please listen - one is asking if your mind is caught in an illusion. If it is, you cannot possibly bring about a radical change in yourself because you are the world, you are not different from the rest of humanity because you suffer, and the people living ten thousand miles away suffer. They are

afraid as you are afraid. They seek security and find very little both in the world and psychologically, there is very little security. They want happiness, they are unhappy. They are gullible, like you. So you are essentially similar to another human being. It is not an intellectual concept, to argue about, it is a fact. You may be brown, or black, or white, or pink, but apart from racial division every human being throughout the world goes through what you go through psychologically, and physically. Isn't that so? You are afraid of death, and so are the others. You believe in reincarnation because that gives comfort, others have their own theories about afterlife. It is exactly like every other human being in the world. So you are essentially the world.

But the realization of it is not an intellectual affair. It is not an idea, however good or bad. Unless you feel it with all your blood and brain and guts that you are the world, therefore to bring about a change in the world you have to change radically. Right? Can we start from there? Which means, is one aware, know one's thoughts, one's feelings, one's beliefs, one's ideals, one's corruption, one's fears, pleasures and all that, do you know all that? If you do, or if you don't, one has to investigate why we live as we are living, why we accept to live this way. Do you understand my questions?

So we are together, and I mean together, we are together going to examine, explore, into ourselves. And this isn't a group therapy, which is an abomination, exposing each other's faults, and hoping thereby to clear up something. We are going to talk over together, examine the quality of our minds, the quality of our hearts, the quality of our brain. To examine you must be free to look. Right sirs? Free to look into yourself. That means there must be no

conclusion. Right? There must be no sense of authority. There must be no person who will tell you how to look because then you look according to him. There must be no guide. You must be free to listen to yourself, to observe yourself, and learn as you observe, and act as you observe.

So we have this problem first: to know what actually is going on, what is happening now in your minds and hearts, in your daily life. And to be able to listen to your own mutterings, your own fears, your own miseries, to listen to it. And to observe in your relationship with another the reactions, because that is the only guide. Your reactions with another, how you have respect for those who are above you, or have better position, status, power, and those below you whom you kick. Right? You see that in this country, this total lack of care, respect for human beings. So you have to find out for yourself by thinking over together as we are doing now, how to observe yourself. Not what to think, but how to think. Not my way of thinking, or your way of thinking, or the professor, or the guru, or the specialist, but thinking together without any prejudice, without any opinion. Otherwise you cannot think together. Right? Do we see this? Do we see that you have an opinion and I have an opinion, our thinking is distorted. Right? So is it possible to think without opinions? Please go into it with me, I am going to go slowly into it. Is it possible to observe without any conclusions? Is it possible to listen purely without any distortion? So we are going to go into that slowly step by step.

It's a nice evening, it's nice to sit under the trees and talk about serious things, not to forget to look at the leaves, the branches and the blue sky that is beyond, and to see the sunset and the beauty of

the colour, the clouds with their light on it, and also to see ourselves exactly as we are. You can't change the clouds, you can't change the sunset. So to look at yourself without the desire to change. Because the very desire to change is born out of a motive either of greed, or to better oneself in order to meet some principle, or ideal. So can you observe yourself without a single movement of thought? You understand my question?

So first let's find out what it means to listen. Don't say, I have heard that before from you. There are many people here who unfortunately come year after year without changing. It becomes a game. They are not serious. But even though they have been here very often and heard the speaker please forget what he has said previously, totally forget all that he has said, and begin again. You know when you look at a flower day after day the flower is never the same - is it? The beauty of the flower varies from day to day. In the same way those of you who have listened to the speaker for many, many, many years, listen to it as though you were listening to it for the first time. Then you are learning, not memorizing, but you are learning about yourself. Without learning about yourself you have no basis for a correct action, for right response, for objective comprehension.

So first we are going to find out together. I am not telling you what to do, but together we are going to find out what it means to listen. Do we ever listen to anybody? Are you listening to what I am saying now? Are you? If you are honest, are you listening? Or your mind is so occupied with other things. Or you are here because the speaker has a reputation, and you are searching what he is going to say. So all these movements prevent actual listening.

Right? Because it is very important to learn the art of listening. Because if you learn that art, not memorize it, because if you merely memorize how to listen then you are not listening. So what does it mean to listen, not only to the world outside of you, but also to listen to one's own deep mutterings, the deep anxieties, fears and pleasures. What does it mean to listen? There is a listening with the ear, and also there is a listening without the operation of the nervous reactions. Do you follow what I am saying? Are we somewhat together in this? Am I speaking Greek, or Chinese, or are we understanding each other? Because it is very important to find out what it means to listen, to observe. Because we are going to observe without any distortion the actual movement of ourselves. And so to observe, to listen is a great art. And we are learning that art together. I am not your teacher. And I really mean it. I am not your authority. But as two friends talking over together their problems, their fears, their anxieties, and each friend talks about his own problems, and together they approach, they resolve the problems. So we are doing the same. Not that the speaker has resolved - he has - but we are trying to communicate, so we are sharing together.

So first, what does it mean to listen? To listen to a statement, to listen to the noise of that crow, to listen to that honking of that car, to listen to your own thought, to your own feelings. And to listen implies no interference of thought. Because the moment thought intervenes by saying, it is good or bad, I don't like that noise, I do like that noise, you are not listening. Please do it now as you are there and I am explaining it, do it now, not when you go home, then it is too late, then you haven't heard.

So the speaker is going to make many, many statements and you have to find out for yourself whether they are true or false. But if you listen with what you have learnt from books, from authority, from this or from your experience, then you are blocking yourself from actually listening to what the other person has to say. Do you understand the responsibility on your part: to listen to the world and to your own anxiety, insecurity, uncertainty, sorrow? We will go into it step by step into the whole of fear, sorrow, pain, anxiety, the whole of human existence, we will go into it. But first we must learn how to listen to all this.

Then comes also how to observe, what it means to observe. You are observing me, the speaker, how do you observe me? Examine that very simple fact: you are sitting there, the speaker is here, you are watching, you are seeing him. Are you actually seeing him, or you have images about him, conclusions, ideas? So conclusions, reputation, image prevent you from actually looking at the person. Right? Do you understand this very simple fact? If you say, he is a socialist, you don't look at him. If you say, oh, he is communist, the label prevents you from observing him. Then if you say, he is a Muslim, it is finished, for a Hindu.

So can you observe - please listen - can you observe without a single movement of your prejudice? That prejudice is put together by thought. If I want to know you I must forget all my labels, whether I like you or not, this or that, and just look at you. By observing I learn. That's the beginning of wisdom, to observe, not from books. That's one thing. Listening, observing and learning.

What does it mean to learn? From the age of five or six we go to school. There we learn facts. We learn a great deal of information

and store it up in the brain as memory. Right? Right sirs? Memory stored up, and with that memory we act: to have a career, a job, money; and so we accumulate knowledge both biological, physics, mathematics and so on, and gather all that information from past researches, from all the people who have gathered information, they have handed it down to us, from generation to generation, and that is stored up in the brain. And that's what we call learning. Learning, gathering information, gathering what other people have said, about god, about heaven, about how you should live, how you should not live, what is right and so on. Gathered all that, and stored up in our brains. And that's called knowledge. That's one way of learning. Right?

There is also another way of learning: to go out and act and from that action learn, which becomes knowledge. So we are always acting from knowledge, and knowledge is always the past, that which has been. Right? That's what is called learning. Learning from other people's experience, from your own experience, from the habits, the customs, tradition handed down from generation to generation, it is stored up in the brain. Our brains are very, very, very old. And that is generally called learning. So we are acting with knowledge, which is the past. Right? Please see this because we are going to investigate into what is learning.

There is another way of learning which is not the accumulation of knowledge, which I am going to explain presently. But first we must understand very clearly where knowledge is absolutely essential - to drive a car, to do anything, speak a language, to know where your house is. So knowledge is essential. But knowledge is



always in the past. So we are living in the past. Right?

And there is another way of learning which is not the accumulation of knowledge. Will you kindly listen to what I have to say? Listen, don't agree or disagree, don't accept or deny, just listen as you would listen to that bird. As I said, as the speaker said just now, we only know one method of learning, which is to accumulate knowledge. And from that knowledge operate, function, to have a job, to have a house, and so on and so on and so on. That knowledge becomes dangerous in relationship. Do you understand? If knowledge, which is remembrance, becomes important in human relationship with each other, that very knowledge divides people. We will go into it. Just listen to it.

We are saying there is another way of learning. Shall I go on? [Pause] I am not trying to be clever, making you impatient, but I want to communicate so that you really understand this, that you understand it not only with your brain but also intellectually and also with your heart. You understand? With your mind, with your brain, the quality of the brain that listens, and the intellectual capacity to reason logically, sanely, and also to have this quality of affection, care, love, because those are demanded when you want to discover something new. You understand? When you want to find out something totally new there must be complete harmony, not just intellect operating on its own, or the brain remembering all the past incidents, happenings, conclusions, and holding on to them, and also to have, perhaps which is the most difficult thing, to have care, love, affection.

So we are going to find out together if there is a different way of living which is learning and acting. Just see the difference

between what I am going to say, and what we generally do: we accumulate knowledge, and from that knowledge act. There is a time interval - please listen - there is a time interval between the idea and the action. Right? You are following all this? That is, there is the ideal and you are trying to put that ideal into action, so there is a gap between the principle, the ideal, the belief and the actuality. Right? Now we are saying the interval of time between the ideal and action is non-existent. It is going to be a little difficult, please give your attention if you are interested. If you are not, carry on in your own way.

Please see what we do actually. We conceive an idea, and try to put that idea into action. So there is a time interval, a gap between idea and action. This is clear. Right? Would you disagree with that? Now we are saying there is a way of acting, there is a way of learning, in which there is no time interval, and therefore the learning is acting; not acting from previous knowledge. I wonder if you see. I am going to explain it. Go slowly. First I want to establish communication between us.

A first-class engineer is very well acquainted with the piston engine, the internal combustion machinery. And he wants to discover something new. Naturally the brain is full of what he has learnt, full of the knowledge of the combustion engine. Right? And if he wants to discover something totally new he must put that aside. He must have a mind that is free to observe, to listen, to grasp something that may be just there. So the requirement for learning, which is not merely the accumulation of knowledge, is to have a mind that is not burdened with knowledge. And all our brains are burdened with knowledge. Just see the fact. The more

traditional you are, the more you have read, read, it doesn't matter what you read, it is all stored up, it is registered in your brain, and so you can never find something totally new. I was once with a friend, a very well known author, and we were talking, he was a friend of mine, and he said, "You know, I have read so much, I have read all the Eastern philosophy, the Chinese, of course the European, I know all about communism, Marx, and so on, and I have no space for the new." You understand? A mind that is traditional, like most minds are, something handed down from generation to generation, a custom, a habit, a ritual, a puja, you know, all that, how can such a mind find something new? Do you understand my question?

Therefore to find a way of learning which is not accumulation of knowledge, the other must be put aside completely. That means no tradition. Are you willing to do that? No sirs. Tradition is very comforting, caught in a routine, like a machine you go on and on.

So I am telling you something, which is, the mind, the brain, must be completely free of prejudice, of opinion, of belief, of all the things thought has put together in the brain. You understand this? Now is that possible? Are you following? A professor, a scientist, if he wants to discover something new naturally he can't keep on repeating his own knowledge. It is absolutely useless. He wants to discover, he wants to find something fresh, not put together by thought. So first to learn, which is not mere accumulation of knowledge, the mind must be free to observe. That is, the mind, though it has got tremendous knowledge, must be capable, have the capacity, have the energy, to set it aside and be free so that it has an insight, insight into what is actually going on.

You understand my question? Are you following? Am I explaining things clearly? If not please tell me, I'll go over it in different ways.

We live in the past and therefore we are always destroying the present. The past modifies itself in the present and becomes the future, but it is still the past. Right? I wonder if you are following all this. Please. So our life, our daily life is based on a routine - going to the office for the next fifty years - just think of it! And tradition, your sexual habits, your loneliness, all that is part of this enormous accumulation of knowledge. And from that knowledge, which is the past, we act. Now the speaker is saying there is an action which is not of the past. That implies a mind, a brain, that has put aside all remembrance. I'll show you, I'll go into it and you will capture the meaning of it.

No remembrance, and therefore it is capable of observing instantly and acting instantly. The very observation is the action. Not, I have learnt, and then act. Therefore that implies a time interval. In that time interval all other factors enter. Therefore in that interval there is contradiction, there is pain, and so on and so on. Whereas what we are saying is, to have insight into the whole structure of my consciousness, of your consciousness. I am going to go into it. To have an insight into your whole consciousness, and that very insight is the action which dispels the content of consciousness, which makes up consciousness. I hope you understand all this. I doubt it!

Look sirs, what is action in your life? I am sorry to go back to it, I must until this is absolutely clear. It is based on memory, on knowledge, or a motive based on some self interest and so on and so on. So knowledge has its place. And in relationship with each

other, has knowledge any place at all? It is very important to find out. Which means in relationship there is mere memory, is memory, remembrance love? When you say, my wife, it is a remembrance. You have the image of her - or the husband, or the girl, you have an image of her. That remembrance is the outcome of past incidents, experiences, memory, and so in relationship when there is memory there cannot be love. Logically.

So we are saying to have an insight is not a continuation of memory or remembrance. I am going to explain what that means. Our brain - I am not a specialist on the brain, I have watched it, in oneself you watch it, if you watch you don't have to pick up a single book, you can see it all yourself - our brains have the capacity to register, register an incident, an event, a happening, an insight, a flattery, a hurt, it has the capacity to register as a computer. As long as the computer is in operation there is no sense of freedom to observe. Please listen to this. If the brain is registering and therefore retaining it as memory, and acting from that memory, then that action is born from the past. That's logic, that's so. And so between the action and the past there is an interval, therefore there is conflict, therefore there is adjustment, and a sense of constant struggle to approximate. Now can the brain - please listen to this, give two minutes concentration, or attention - can the brain register only what is necessary and nothing else? What is necessary is your physical needs. What is necessary is to have knowledge to act in daily life - where you live, what language you speak, how to drive a car, how to design a house and so on, or design a machine to kill other people. That is the function of the brain, to register. And we said register only what is necessary. And

psychologically don't register anything. Try it, do it! Because that is where the trouble begins. I am attached to you psychologically, inwardly, because you give me money, you are my this or that, you give me satisfaction, comfort, sex and all that, I am attached to you psychologically.

So the attachment is totally unnecessary. Whereas the other is necessary. Do you follow all this? So can you see the importance of keeping knowledge in its right place, and psychologically have no knowledge at all? You don't understand all this. There is a great deal of fun in all this if you go into it. So your brain is capable of registering what is necessary, and psychologically nothing. So the brain is free - you understand - because it has settled what is necessary, not extravagantly necessary, what is necessary. And psychologically it has no content. You don't see the beauty of it. And so the brain then, being free, can perceive instantly, and act, the very perception is action.

Now I'll show you something. You probably belong to some kind of religious organization. Your particular organization is different from another particular religious organization. Right? So there is conflict between the two, or you tolerate the two, or you adjust between the two. But there is always the two. And therefore there must inevitably be conflict. All religious organizations have this element. Now to have an insight into it and never belong to any religious organization. You understand what I am saying? So that the very insight dispels the illusion of belonging to something, a religious organization. That is insight. Which is to observe completely free so that the whole nature of organizations is revealed, and it is finished, you never again belong to any single

religious organization, or even perhaps political - much more important nowadays, because you are dealing with man as a whole, it is a global problem, not the problem of India, or America, or Russia, it is a global problem, which is the human problem.

Now if I have conveyed this to you, if the speaker has conveyed the reality of this insight - please be careful with it because it is not a continuous thing that you keep going, then it becomes memory, then it is gone, it is finished. You can't use it for personal use. You understand? To have an insight into your fear, which we will go into in a few days, as we go along. To have an insight into pleasure, into death, so that you see the truth of it, not your belief, not your prejudice, not your conclusions, not your imaginary illusory projections, but the actual truth of it. So that is the way, the way of learning which is from moment to moment. You understand? Love is that.

We have talked for a hour and twenty five minutes. That's enough, isn't it?

## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 1ST JANUARY 1979

I hope you will not think me rude or impolite if I ask you with due courtesy why you are here. What is the reason? What made you come to listen to this speaker? Is it out of curiosity, is it out of old habit, out of some illusory desire? Or have you come, if I may ask, with a serious intent to hear what the speaker has to say and whether it has value, any meaning in one's daily life? And if you discover for yourself what the speaker is saying, either true or false - if it is false, then you will naturally put it aside, but if it is true, sane, logical, reasonable, then you will obviously either intellectually, which is verbally, accept and do nothing about it. But whereas if you do not merely accept intellectually what is being said, and if you accept it with all your heart and mind and with your total being, then you will naturally do something about it, then you will naturally change your life radically. Because that is what we are talking about - the total transformation of man, which is you.

And that is important because any new culture - because the old cultures throughout the world are dying, are decaying, are beginning to degenerate - a new culture can only come into being when there are really profoundly serious religious people, non-sectarian, who do not belong to any society, to any group, to any guru, to any particular religion, because religions as they are, have no meaning whatsoever. So one asks, if I may, with courtesy, why are you here? I think you should know why you are here. Whether you are adding one more illusion to the already illusory life that



one leads, do you understand? Whether you are making what the speaker is saying into an illusion, into a make-belief, into a theory and being theoretical, which has very little value - so, if one may ask, why you have taken the trouble to come and listen to the speaker. Can you find out for yourself why you are here? And if you do find out, that is, if you are honest with yourself and not slightly demented, slightly neurotic, slightly hoping for some miracle to happen that will bring about a revolution, psychological revolution in society, so that you will be comfortable, you will have a nice house and everything financially, physically secure, then if you have come with that purpose, you will be deluded. You will be deceived.

Whereas, if you have come with a serious intent, and with that serious intent there must also go hand in hand with it a quality of scepticism, a quality that questions, that demands an answer, not from the speaker but the very challenge that you ask, that you put to yourself, that challenge demands an answer from yourself. I think it is important for us when the world is going to pieces, there is such anarchy, when everything around us is crumbling, it behooves us as serious people, to know what it is that we are seeking. Most of us seek physical security - money, job, a certain physical security; and there are others who don't care so much for physical security but they want psychological security, inward security and in the search of the security they fall into many traps: the do-gooders, the social workers, the narrow parochial sects, into a false sense of meditations, and so on and so on. There are a great many traps around us. So we must ask ourselves, if I may suggest, what it is that we are trying to seek, what it is that we want, what it

is that our hearts and minds demand.

As we were saying yesterday, if you have followed it and if I may go back to it a little, we will continue with what we were going into yesterday - we were saying that action is part of life, the doing, the doing, the action in our daily, everyday troublesome life, and we were pointing our action born of knowledge must always be limited. Right? Because knowledge is the past, and when you act with that burden of the past, then such actions are incomplete, limited, fragmentary. And is there a different kind of action which is not fragmentary, which has no regrets, which has no sense of incompleteness? And we were saying there is such action, that is, to have total insight into the problem. We explained, if you do not mind hearing it again, that all our daily activity is either based on a principle or an ideal or a memory. See it in yourself, I am only describing, but the description is not the described. Right? Right sir? The word is not the thing. So I may describe, but what is described is not that which is actually taking place. So, don't let us be deceived by the description but the description may help you to observe what is actually taking place, knowing that the word is not the thing. Right?

If most of us are seeking psychological security, which apparently is the human endeavour, the human struggle, in our relationship with each other, however intimate or not intimate, this desire, this urge, this compulsion, to find a deep abiding psychological security which can never be disturbed, which is totally complete in itself, that is what most of us want. I don't know if you have examined yourself and if you have, psychologically, inwardly - that is what we want. Isn't that so? And we have never

questioned if there is such security. In the search for the psychological security, thought has brought about all the gods. In them we have invented our urge to find security. Right? The gods, the rituals, all the circus that goes on in the name of religion, there we try to find security. And is there security in all the things that thought has put together? Right? Please, this is a challenge to you. You have to respond. You cannot all of you respond, that would be impossible, but you can respond to yourself. This challenge is put before you, and you have to answer it and not evade it, if you evade it, then the consequence of that evasion, of that avoidance, leads to further illusion, further misery. Obviously. Whereas if you face this challenge and find out for oneself whether there is security psychologically, or is all psychological security an illusion? I mean by that word 'illusion', in the course of sensory perception, when that perception is coloured by a belief, by a hope, by an unconscious desire, then that which is brought about is illusion. Have you followed all this? I doubt it.

We said, our minds are filled with a great many illusions. We have physical security, some of us, and the vast majority of mankind has very little physical security - that is another story. We won't go into it - why man has brought about this extraordinary division between poverty and riches, and every kind of physical revolution has not solved it. Perhaps there is a way of solving it, which we might discuss later on, but for the moment we are not discussing, going into that. We are saying an action born out of knowledge, knowledge being that which we have accumulated both biologically as well as psychologically, when that action is born from that which has already been experienced, known, that

action must inevitably lead to further illusion. And we were saying that there is an action, as we pointed out yesterday, and if you have seriously thought about it, there is an action which is not the outcome of thought. All right? May I go on? I don't know how much you understand. I really would like to communicate this, not merely verbally, intellectually, but really out of one's heart, one's whole being, to communicate to another that there is a different way of living, in which there is no conflict, no pain, no sorrow, no fear, and a quality of intelligence that is totally, completely secure. But to find that way of living one must attend, one must give attention.

Are you all comfortable? Because if you are not comfortable, you won't be able to attend. Right? Because we are going to talk about this quality of attention. Most of us know what concentration is. Every schoolboy is taught to concentrate on a book or something or other, so that he applies his mind to a particular thing, resisting all other invasion, all movement of thought, resisting all movement of thought and concentrating. You know this, don't you? This is obvious. And the more that you can totally concentrate without any interference of other activities of thought, one thinks one has achieved something. We are saying attention is nothing whatsoever to do with concentration. Right? Exam it, critically examine what is being said. Don't accept. Don't swallow it hook, line and the rest of it. Find out if what the speaker is saying is correct or not - correct being accurate, precise, not vague, romantic, nonsensical. Concentration emphasizes, gives importance to a particular activity of thought. Right? Whereas attention is not the product of thought. Just play with it. Don't

accept it. Just look at it. Because most of us know what is inattention. When you are listening to the speaker, you listen for a minute or two, or perhaps less than that, and your thoughts wander away to something else, and you try to pull it back and listen. Aren't you doing that? Good lord!

So your mind is chattering and occasionally the chattering stops and you attend, you listen. But most of the time there is constant activity, and in that constancy there is a particular demand made by circumstances, or by yourself to apply, concentrate on a particular activity and resist all other activity of thought. You are following all this, right sir? If you understand this movement, that thought is bringing about a quality of concentration, and that very thought is moving away in other directions - right? - and there is an urge, a compulsion to hold the thought in a particular direction. Right? This is what is generally called concentration. Attention, to attend, in that attention, if you really attend, there is no centre from which you are attending. Right? You all look so puzzled. Sir, it is important to understand this, because attention and inattention, there are the two things we have to face. Right? Are you following? Am I communicating something or not at all? Have you ever given attention with your mind, with your heart, with your nerves, with your whole being, to something in which there is no otherness, in which there is no sense of deviation or distraction? Sir, there are three things involved - concentration, distraction and attention. Right? Most of us, when we are concentrating, are afraid of distraction. Right? I wish we could talk to each other quietly like this. Now, is there a distraction at all? Perhaps thought itself is a distraction. I'm going to show it to you in a minute. When you say

there is a distraction, it implies thought has made up its mind to pay, concentrate, on a particular object. And when there is any other kind of movement away from that, that movement is called a distraction. Now is that a distraction? We are saying there is no distraction. Right? Because, it is thought - please listen - it is thought that has said, I must concentrate on that, but that very thought is moving away in another direction, and that is called distraction. But is it a distraction because the thought has pinpointed in a certain direction and that very thought is moving away from that. And that is generally called a distraction. Right? Why do you call it a distraction? It is still the movement of thought. Right? So any movement of thought is another distraction. I wonder if you get this? No, you don't.

So, what we are trying to point out is that there are two qualities of the mind - inattention in which there is no attention, which is inattention, and attention. Right? And to be aware of inattention is to be attentive, in which there is no distraction. You get it? I wonder if you understand this. Because we are always struggling between the two - inattention and attention - and that takes all our energy. In meditation, for example - which is not the moment to talk about now - this is the battle that is going on, to be totally attentive and a second later, completely not attentive. Right? Now we are saying the inattention is not a distraction, but to be aware of that lack of attention, to be aware that you are not attending, that is good enough. So that your mind is never in conflict, because conflict is a wastage of energy. So we are coming back. Now we have explained what attention is - not explained, the fact of attention. That when there is attention there is no centre from

which you are attending, as there is in concentration, which then has what you call distraction. Whereas there is attention and there is inattention. When one is aware of not being attentive, that very awareness is attention, in which there is no distraction whatsoever. I wonder if you get it sir? Even verbally have you got it?

Intellectually? Which is nothing at all, but at least it is a whisper.

Now will you so attend without concentration, without effort, to what is being said? That is, there is no distraction. You may attend, listen for a minute and wander off and be aware that you are wandering off. That very awareness of wandering off is attention. Right? Got it sir?

We were saying yesterday that all life is action, whether you are sitting in a Himalayan cave as a hermit or in a monastery or living an ordinary life. Life, the whole of existence, is action, as the whole of life is relationship. Relationship is action. And our actions, as they are now, politically, religiously, in every way, such action breeds further misery, further confusion, further sorrow, which is what is happening politically, if you observe, which is what is happening religiously with their hierarchical set up - you will eventually reach illumination, do this, this and this and you will get it. The carrot before the donkey! And we are questioning the whole activity of what is called action. You understand? We are questioning, we are saying that action based on a principle, ideal, a remembrance, a memory, knowledge, such action is fragmentary, incomplete, and therefore it will inevitably lead to further misery, further sorrow, further confusion, which is what is happening in our daily life, if you observe. Whereas there is another action - if you are attending - please attend - if you are not

attending, if your thought is wandering off, be aware of it, that very awareness of your inattention is to attend to what is being said.

Have you understood?

So, we are saying that there is an action that is not based on knowledge. For that, to understand it much more deeply than yesterday, we must go into the whole question of what is thinking, what is thought, why human beings throughout the world have given such extraordinary importance to thought. You give importance to thought, don't you? Everything that you do is based on thought - the job, the technological knowledge, the gods, the churches, everything is built by thought. Right sirs? Do you question that? Thought is the outcome of memory, is the response of memory. Right? If you are in a state of amnesia, you could not think, but as you are not - I hope you are not - and as you are not, your thinking is the result of centuries of experience, accumulated knowledge which is stored up in the brain - which is so obvious. If you have looked at yourself, your actions, repetitive, occasionally free, constantly caught in a routine, in a groove, and if you observe your own thinking, you will see that your thought is a material process, which is the outcome of knowledge. Right? It is a material process. It is not something extraordinarily super spiritual. Right? Right sirs?

Thought is always active. It is never still, and man has said, you must make it still in order to - you understand - in order to find some higher spiritual consciousness, which I doubt. There is no higher spiritual consciousness, there is only consciousness. Man has invented super, super, super consciousness, but that invention is the product of thought, and people who talk about super-



consciousness are worshipped, made into extraordinary gurus, because you also want super-consciousness. But you never examine that thought has produced this whole area of consciousness. Whatever it thinks is still part of that consciousness. You understand this? Are we moving along together or are you tired? If you are, let us take a rest. I can go on talking to myself, because I am investigating as I go along. If you are tired, please take a rest because we are asking your brain to think anew, to look at things afresh, not in the old traditional way, to look at your life as it is anew, afresh and that is a challenge that the brain may get tired of. It wants rest - give me a moment, let me be quiet so that I can recapture.

So, we are saying that thought has created our society and all the miseries contained in that society, the class division, the rich man, the poor man, the man of power, the man of position, the man of greatness, and the poor, downtrodden, and all that. And all the gods on the earth are created by thought; the temples in which the gods are supposed to live are the construction of thought; all the rituals, the dogmas, the beliefs, the puja which you perform everyday in the hope of having some kind of peace, and all the so-called meditations, the transcendental and other nonsensical meditations are based on thought, and thought is always limited. Right? There is no limitless thought. Thought can think it is limitless, that it can find the immeasurable, that is part of its illusion, because thought is the outcome of knowledge, memory, and therefore it is time-binding, and therefore limited. Right? Are you attending to this? Do you listen to this? When I ask a question, your thought comes into activity and it is beginning to ask, search

to find the answer, and to find the answer it goes back to memory - where did I read, who told me? You follow? The activity goes on. Whereas if you are asked a question that you don't know and you cannot find it in books, from your guru, from anything, then your brain naturally says: I really don't know. Right? Are you in that position? You follow? Can you ever say to yourself, I don't know? Because that quality of mind that says, I don't know, is not seeking to know, because the moment it seeks, thought is in operation and then it will project what it wants, and will say, I have found it. You understand all this? Are you getting tired?

So, to enquire is to have a mind that does not know. And we are enquiring into an action of which we are not aware at all. We know our actions based on memory, that is simple, clear. And we know the technological activity of knowledge, the accumulation of thousands of people, scientists, working, accumulating. And from that accumulation, they have created the extraordinary things, the most marvellous surgery, the most delicate extraordinary things they are doing. And also technologically, they are preparing destructions of wars, material for war; and also thought has created the illusions - right? - I believe in god; I am a nationalist; I belong to this party which is going to save mankind; my guru is the most marvellous, and so on and on and on. All that is the movement of thought. So, whatever thought does in its action must inevitably be limited. Now, have you an insight into that? You understand? If you attend very carefully to what is being said, then you will see the whole movement of thought, the hidden thoughts, the open thoughts, the thoughts that are extraordinary secretive, hidden, does not want to be open, the whole structure and nature of

thought. When you have an insight into it, thought gives itself its own place. You get what I am saying? Have you got what I am saying?

The meaning of the word 'art' means to put everything in its right place - the art of living, not the painting and sculpture, that has its own art, but we are talking about the art of living, and there art means to put all things in their place so as to give order. So, the art of living is for thought to find out its own place. Have you understood it? Can you do it? That is, to give knowledge its right place, and psychologically knowledge has no place. Have you understood madam? No? At least somebody says she does not. I am glad.

I think most of us have never looked at the movement of thought. Right? Most of us have never asked what is thinking. Why has man given such extraordinary importance to thinking. And the very process of thinking born of experience, knowledge and memory stored in the brain, that process of thinking is always limited. Right? Is that clear? Thought is limited. Thought is fragmentary. Fragment means something broken, like a vase - when you break it there are pieces of it. So thought is broken, limited. Right? Because it is born out of knowledge, and knowledge is the past, knowledge is not the whole. Right? It can never be the whole. So thought, whatever it does, must be limited, and any action born out of that limitation must have regret, confusion, feeling of guilt, anxiety and never ending conflict, because thought in its action is limited. Right? Is this clear - clear not verbally, inside, know it as you know your language, as you know your eyes, your face, you know it.

So thought can never lead to the immeasurable, that which is not measurable. Thought is measurable. Right? And therefore that which is measurable is limited. Though it can measure 100 yards it is still limited. So, when thought seeks illumination, tries to meditate, that meditation, that struggle, all that you go through is always limited and therefore broken up, fragmentary. Right, sir?

Now, we are saying there is an action that is not born of thought. Are you interested in this? Now will you pay attention? That means you have no centre from which you are listening. If you are listening from a centre, you have already brought in the sense of distraction. You understand this? So, can you attend? We are saying there is an action that is not of time. Again I mustn't use time for the moment, that leads to something else, we will talk about it. There is an action which is not the outcome of memory. I am pointing out something else. I will come back to it. In your relationship with another, however intimate or not intimate, when memory operates in our relationship, what takes place? There is inevitably division. Right? Haven't you noticed it? You are related to a husband, wife or girl or whatever it is, and in that relationship there is the whole movement of thought, which is built up out of constant contact with each other, a sense of pictures, images, which are memories. Right? And those memories, those pictures, those images, divide you and your husband, girl, or boy. So there is always a division. Right? So, we are asking from that - we won't go into more detail about it, we are asking from that: is love a remembrance? Right? When one says to one's wife or husband or girl whatever it is, I love you, is that a remembrance? Or when you say, I love your god, your image, tremendous emotional devotion,

is that love? We will go into this question much more deeply another time. What we are pointing out is that where there is the activity of thought, thought itself being limited, must bring about division - national, political, religious, the whole structure of man's activity, which is destroying the world. You go up to the moon and plant a flag up there. That is a limited action. When you worship your petty little god round the corner which has been put together by thought, that is a limited action. So, when you have an insight into that - insight being the mind comprehends the whole picture, the whole structure, and nature of thought, then thought comes to its own limited place. Have you got it? Have you understood some of this? Come on sirs?

So, when thought has understood its own limited place, then action is not the outcome of thought. Then action is the outcome of that total insight of the nature of thought. Has somebody got it? Have you understood all this? Probably I should read to you the Gita and then you will all be happy, or read some commentaries on commentaries on commentaries. But this needs your active co-operation to find this out. You have to think, you have to work, which is to work to find out how you think, how your whole life is based on thinking. You have to catch a bus, but catching the bus has its right thought, right place, but when thought interferes into the whole psychological structure of man, then thought has limited the psyche of man. You understand this?

So, sirs and ladies, another five minutes more. I do not know how much you are learning - learning, not accumulating knowledge and memory - learning to find out this quality of insight from which action takes place. You see what we are really saying

is that man has extraordinary capacities - woman too please! Man has extraordinary capacities, and those capacities are limited by thought. And if thought is given its right place it releases a tremendous energy, not to do more mischief, but to live a life in which there is no shadow of conflict, a life that is supremely excellent, a life that has this extraordinary quality of compassion, love. That is why one has to understand the nature of thought. Thought is not love. And when one worships the intellect, as you all do, because when you are studying or reading or being lectured to about the Gita, the Upanishads, the various commentaries, you are encouraging the intellectual capacity and therefore denying love.

## MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 6TH JANUARY 1979

May we go on with what we were talking about when we met the last two times here? We were saying - weren't we? - that we must think together, not what to think but how to think. And we are, as we said previously, that we were taking a journey together, sharing the problems, the various incidents and happenings in our daily life. And we are not concerned with theories, probabilities, suppositions, but with what is actually going on. The word 'actually' means that which is happening, happening now, not only externally, outside of us but also inwardly. And we said one can have correct examination inwardly only when we understand what is happening outwardly, because one can deceive oneself enormously examining ourselves, our attitudes, our prejudices. But if we approach it from the outward world, then perhaps we shall have clear observation of ourselves. We said also that the society in which we live is created by us, by every human being, not by some divine edict. The society in which we live is the expression of our greed, our ambition, our sense for power, violence and so on.

So this afternoon, if I may, I would like to share together, of course, to talk about time, to investigate the nature of culture and tradition. And also we pointed out the other day, if you don't mind my repeating it again, that this is a serious meeting, gathering. I mean by that word 'serious', weighty, heavy - not casual, not something that you come on an evening, a pleasant evening, sit under a tree and listen to talk, but we are sharing together our investigation. Our concern, as we pointed out the other day, is that

our society is so corrupt, so dangerously violent, and all the rest of it, unless every human being, each one of us radically, psychologically brings about a revolution in himself, then there is no possibility of bringing about a change in the world. That's what we talked about. Perhaps you might remember it.

With what we are talking about you may not agree, or you may agree: agreement or disagreement is irrelevant. We are not dealing with opinions, ideas or speculative philosophy. We are dealing with what is actually going on in our daily life, because as we pointed out again, we must begin near to go very far. But most of us start with theories, abstractions that are very far and therefore valueless, irrelevant. So, I hope that we are clear on this point, that we are not concerned with philosophy, philosophy being, as it is understood now, a series of suppositions, theories, concepts, conclusions - the word actually means the love of life, love of truth.

So, first, why have human beings throughout the world been caught up in tradition, whether it is the tradition of a day or a week or three thousand years. Why? The very word 'tradition' means - doesn't it - something handed down from generation to generation. And also the word etymologically means betrayal, treason. And this tradition is to hand over, given from generation to generation, certain values, certain beliefs, ideas, rituals, concepts, conclusions. This has been going on, handed down for century upon century. And like a steam-roller flattening the human being with these values, conclusions and so on. And when those values, conclusions, concepts, principles and so on, have been thrown aside, as is happening now, we are back to where we started. We



are violent, greedy, anxious, insecure, uncertain, confused human beings. That's what is going on actually. Right? Since tradition held human beings along a certain groove, when those traditions are thrown overboard, as they are being done now, we are where we started. Perhaps we have more comforts, more bathrooms, able to drive cars, transportation and communications and so on. But as human beings we suffer, we are envious, we are violent, there is a great deal of fear, utter insecurity. The world is becoming more and more dangerous. This is all a fact. And this tradition implies - does it not - a process of evolution - from the wheel to the jet plane, there has been evolution, it has taken many, many, many centuries for the wheel to come to the jet. And in this tradition, there is so-called culture. Culture, the word implies, to cultivate, to grow, to blossom, to flower - the human mind as well as the human heart. And as human beings living in a certain tradition, have we flowered, morally, perhaps intellectually we have, more or less, that is we are spinning a lot of words, theories, principles, ideals and try to live up to them, which are all an intellectual process. Culture, as we pointed out, implies the freedom of man not to be steam-rolled by centuries of tradition, and in that there can be no culture. That is obvious. Where the mind is following tradition, rituals and all the rest of it, in that there can be no possibility of the human mind and human heart growing, developing, you know all the rest of it. Technologically, we have advanced tremendously. That is based on the accumulation of knowledge, but morally, so-called spiritually, we are almost savages, with a lot of superstition, ideals, principles which have no meaning whatsoever. Right? That is the state of our daily life. Technologically we are excellent, at

least we try to be. And we have never challenged ourselves whether it is possible to live ethically at its highest. And when one sees what is happening in the world and in ourselves, that is our greatest challenge, that we each individual, each human, cultivate in freedom.

Is freedom a matter of time? Time being division in movement. Time is movement. Obviously. And in that movement there is division, as yesterday, today and tomorrow. The yesterday meeting the present, modifying itself and proceeding to the future. This is the movement of time in which there is division. To get from here to there, it takes time. From the wheel to the jet has taken centuries. Time. So, there are two different kinds of time: the biological time and psychological time. The time that a child goes through adolescence grows up to a man, and so on, that takes years, like a seed planted, it takes time to become a tree. And we are questioning whether there is psychological time at all? That is, psychological evolution, that is, to become or to be. I hope we are communicating with each other. I think this is rather important that we understand this question, that time - it is really quite extraordinary if you come to think of it - we have depended on time, we thought our whole human progress is a development in time. We have achieved technologically great varieties of excellence, and to achieve that one has to have an enormous amount of time. All accumulation of knowledge is time. And we are asking whether there is psychological time at all, that is, psychological evolution, that is, I will be something, I will achieve goodness. The very word 'achieve' implies time: I am not this but I will be that, both in the business world as well as in the so-called

world of spirit, mind. Is it that we have seen a seed grow into a tree and have accepted that as a process of growth in time and therefore move with that concept, with that understanding into the psychological field? You are following all this? Psychologically we think we are growing, we are developing, we will become something, and we are questioning that very concept, very idea, very feeling that we will be. Right? All organizations are based on this, both worldly as well as so-called religious: give me time, I will achieve enlightenment through practice, through systems, through mechanical processes - which you achieve in the world, in the mechanical world - you apply the same attitude, the same approach, or come with the same approach, to the psyche.

There is no psychological evolution at all. Right? Please, don't accept what is being said, or deny, but listen first. You may have your own opinions, your own conclusions, your own beliefs, your own way of approaching the problem of time, but since you have taken the trouble to come here, obviously you have to listen to what the other fellow has to say. Listen, not casually listen, or listening interject your own opinions, your own comparative values, and so on. Just listen. Then after having listened, you can begin to examine. But you cannot examine before you have listened. That implies giving attention, not partial attention, attending one minute or a few minutes, and then thinking about something else. Right? Which implies, attention needs freedom. Because if you are investigating there must be freedom to observe. Right? We are actually doing this, I hope, not accepting what is being said and turning it into a theory or an idea, but actually listening to find out for yourself whether evolution, gradual

growth, psychologically exists or not, and if it is not, then how do we deal with a problem? You understand? With a reaction, with say, for example, with fear? You are following all this? We must be very clear in this matter. Time is fear. Time is pleasure. Time is sorrow. And is love involved in time? You are following all this? We are denying the total acceptance, up to now of psychological evolution altogether.

So we are going to examine that. There is no need to examine the wheel and the jet. That's fairly clear, that's obvious. The whole of science is based on the accumulation of knowledge. And not being burdened with that knowledge, you examine more and acquire more knowledge, and you are all the time adding more and more and more knowledge - knowledge being the past. Now, we are asking, is time necessary, time being movement in division? Right? Please understand this carefully. Time is movement with divisions, yesterday, today, tomorrow, or time immemorial, time which has no beginning, and time that may end. Eternity is out of time, that which has a continuity is not eternity, it is still part of time. You are following all this? If one observes oneself, because we as a human being, as a human being, we are the representative of all mankind, because we suffer, we go through all kinds of tortures like every other human being - we are poor, we are rich, we are greedy, we are suffering, we are lonely, we have no love, all that is the rest of mankind. So, you as a human being are the rest of mankind, which is not an intellectual concept. You can turn it into an intellectual concept, but it has no value, like any other theory. But if one sees the truth of it, the actual reality of it, with your heart, with your mind, then a human being becomes an

extraordinarily serious, committed human being - not an individual, because we are not individuals. Individual means indivisible, not broken up, not fragmented. And most human beings are fragmented. Right? So we are not individuals at all. We may think, because we have a name, we have a bank account, or a car, or wife or house - we call ourselves individuals. I think that is wrong usage of the word. We are human beings like every other human being living in the world with enormous problems, our relationships are very complex, our sorrows are limitless and so on.

So, when we realize that we are the world and the world is us - realize - not intellectually play with words - one has a tremendous responsibility. And that's why perhaps we avoid that responsibility by calling ourselves individuals. And being a representative of all man kind, as each human being is, and when that human being psychologically transforms himself it affects the whole consciousness of mankind. Please listen to all this. Don't accept it; look at it. Examine it. And the speaker is only concerned with that, not with theories and so on. That is, is it possible for human beings, not through evolutionary process, not through time, but fundamentally, radically, basically change, totally? Because that is our challenge, because traditions have gone, religions have no meaning any more; institutions have their limited place but cannot possibly transform men; no government can possibly change man - they may improve the outward circumstances, but deeply they cannot - as it has been shown in Russia, and all the rest of it. We don't have to go through all that.

So, understanding all that, we are asking: is there a possibility of transformation of man in which time as movement with its

division has no place? You have understood my question? Because our whole ethical, moral and so-called spiritual world is based on time. In the business world, in the political world, unfortunately, the hierarchical system exists, the pecking order. And in the so-called world of the mind and heart, we have also this pecking order. This is so obvious. And, is it possible for a human being psychologically to change fundamentally, without having time at all? You understand sir? This is a very important question to ask - you may not find the answer, but one must ask it. Right? Because we have lived for a million years, probably more or less the same psychologically. There has been tremendous technological revolution and progress. So, let us find out if it is possible for a human being to be free totally of this idea of evolution, psychological evolution which involves time. Right?

Will you examine, can we examine it together? That is, your tradition says: take time. Right? All your scriptures, religions, everything is based on time. Our brains work in time. We are conditioned by time, and we are asking a question which puts aside time, which denies totally evolution. Right? So we are going to investigate whether a human being can really bring about this radical change in which time is not involved at all. Right? Are we meeting each other? Right? That is, are we sharing this thing together, are we deeply interested in this question? Or are you just waiting for me to examine it, explore it, investigate it, and you say, 'Yes that is possible or not possible, I have different opinions and conclusions', and go away? Which implies that you are not really sharing in the problem at all. Because we have lived for over a million years and more, and we are practically the same as we

were, psychologically, inwardly. Right? And to reverse the whole process - is that possible?

How do you examine, in what manner or what capacity of the mind is capable of investigating something which appears totally impossible, a mind which is so heavily conditioned by time to which a new kind of proposition is put? Is it capable first of all of receiving problems, receiving the question, or it has been so heavily conditioned it is incapable of even hearing it? So, what is actually going on with each one? Do you hear the question and make it into an abstraction which means avoidance or being so heavily traditionally conditioned, you say, 'Sorry, I am not going to even listen. It does not mean a thing to me'. Or you have the quality of mind that says, 'Let us go into it - not theoretically but actually'? Which is, whether fear which is one of the reactions from timeless, immemorial time, whether that fear can totally end without involving time at all? Is that clear? Right? Perhaps, fear is a little more complex, we will take it up a little later - whether a human being from childhood who has been hurt psychologically, both physically as well as psychologically - listen to it carefully - whether that hurt, the inward hurt, which expresses itself outwardly by withdrawing, by resisting, by wanting to be more violent to another because you are hurt yourself, whether that hurt which has been gathered, which has been kept cherished, almost loved, can that hurt be totally abandoned instantly without time? Right? You see the fun of it? It is not fun, it is really very, very serious if you go into it, but the very question is so challenging and therefore demands your attention, demands your care, demands your response totally to it.

We are hurt from childhood, inwardly, psychologically, inside the skin as it were, and the consequences of that hurt are resistance, building a wall around oneself, a withdrawal not to be hurt more, always having fear of getting hurt more and more, the consequences are violence, having no actual relationship with another - because you might get hurt and so on. The consequences one sees very clearly. Now, can all those consequences, which is the beginning of the hurt, end? To find that out - are you waiting for me to answer it - to find that out, and go into it very deeply, what is hurt? You say, the 'me', the me is the image which you have created about yourself or the society has imposed on you. The society is your relationship with another which is your making. So you are hurt because you have an image. The image is the symbol, the idea, the name, the form, the whole structure of the psyche. Right? That gets hurt and our conditioning is to get over that hurt gradually, do it, go into it, examine it, analyze it, find the cause and the action, which all takes time. Right? Now, is it possible not to have an image about oneself at all? Then there is no hurt. You understand? Right? Is it possible? As long as you have an image that you are a very powerful person, dominant, aggressive, beautiful, clear intellect, and the rest of it - the image that one builds up for oneself from childhood right through old age and death - we are asking, we are saying as long as that image exists there must be hurt, superficial or very, very deep. Right? Now, can that image, seeing the truth of it, you understand, seeing that as long as you have an image about yourself you are bound to be hurt and the consequences are you are violent, you are becoming more and more dull because you are withdrawing, fear and so on - seeing



the consequences, seeing that the image is hurt, seeing the truth of it, not just the intellectual concept of it, the very perception is the very ending of the image. Right? Perception. So, we have to examine what we mean by perception, seeing.

We see both optically, visually, the things around us and we name them because it is part of our training, part of our conditioning, the moment you see this thing you call it a tree. That is, the action of knowledge operating in perception. You are following all this? Is there a perception without the accumulation of the past? To observe without time? Right? That is, when we observe, we observe not only visually, optically, but when we observe ourselves, if you have ever done it, which I doubt - most of you don't, I am pretty sure - if you observe yourself, in that observation there is the observer and the observed. Right? The one who witnesses and the observed, which is, the thinker and the thought. Right? The thinker is the thought. There is no division between the thinker and the thought. You will not accept this - examine it, please. The thinker is the result of many, many, many incidents of thought, which is the past. The thinker is put together by thought. So, thought is the thinker. Right? There is no division between the thinker and the thought. That division is created by time which is the movement in division. You are getting all this, sir? No? Right sirs. At least I must see somebody who says, yes, I have got it.

Q: I have got it.

K: No, no, you can't get it so quickly as that.

You see what we are trying to point out is, our conditioning through the millennia has been to make an effort, conflict. Conflict,

effort, involves time. Right? Of course, because it is a division in time. Right sir? So there is always conflict, from childhood till we die, there is always struggle, struggle, battle because of this division in time. Right? (I am glad there is at least somebody who is seeing this.) And is it possible to act without effort, without time? That is, to perceive, and that very perception is action - not idea and then interval and action, which is the division of time. In that division various other incidents take place: if I have to go from here to there, then other things are happening. So, when there is the division in the movement of time, other incidents take place, which we call problems. I hope you are getting all this. Right sir? We are asking: can the brain which is so conditioned by millennia, by a million years, perceive and that very perception is instant action? Because we have no time. We are decaying, we are degenerating, we are corrupt, and if you allow time, you will become more and more degenerate, which is what is happening. Which is, when you say, I will not degenerate but I will regenerate, you have lost it: so, we are saying, what does it mean to perceive? You understand my question sir? Which is, can I - is there a possibility of this perception of the image, which gets hurt, and perceive the danger both biologically as well as psychologically, the danger of having an image - to see it instantly and the very seeing is the ending of the image, which does not allow time? Have you got it sir? Please, intellectually even grasp it. So, if you have grasped it verbally, which is the intellectual process, and the watching with intellect, what it does, the moment you have grasped it intellectually, it has already become an idea. Right? Of course. Right sir. It has already become an idea. Therefore, you have moved away from perception.

I wonder if you see this. Right?

So perception implies the comprehension of the word, the word has a relative value which is the understanding of the intellect, and being aware of that and not letting it wander off into an idea. And perception implies the operation of the intellect, the whole reactions at their highest level, and seeing what is exactly the truth of an image, and therefore the ending of it. Are you doing it or are you playing with words? Please. We are saying something that goes totally contrary to everything that you have accepted. So what you hear, don't let that become a tradition, then you are lost; but whereas if you actually listen - because what we are saying is the truth that as long as you have an image created by your society, by your colleges, universities, by your relationship with another and so on and so on, as long as you have an image about yourself, that image is going to get hurt, and that hurt expresses itself in various forms - trying to dominate people, trying to withdraw from and so on and so on. Seeing, listening to the truth of that, listening with all your capacity, your intellect, every nerve listening, then that very listening is the perception and ending of it, which has no time. You understand this? That is, violence is one of the inherited responses from the earliest of times. Right? Man has been violent from timeless time. And we have done everything to be free of that violence. We have invented non-violence, an idea which goes overboard. We have tried every way - to be gentle, to be kind, to be generous, and yet in our hearts, in our relationships with each other we are very violent people.

And religions, what they have said, 'Try, work, forget yourself, don't be violent, don't kill,' but from time immemorial we are still

doing the same thing. So we say it will take time to dissipate this violence. Such a deception, you follow, sir? We have taken over a million years and we have not got rid of it, and we think in another million years we will be rid of it, in the meantime let me be violent. That is the game we play. So we are saying: is it possible to end that violence instantly? That means the understanding that psychologically, inwardly, there is no time at all, that you don't become. You follow sir? You don't become, you don't achieve enlightenment. Which means the whole movement of time.

So, we are saying: observe violence, which is to be angry, to hate, to be jealous, various forms of violence, and don't escape into a non-violent movement, which is the opposite. So, when you observe the fact, there is no opposite. Are you following all this? I observe violence in me. I am violent. Why should there be non-violence? That's my conditioning. Right? That's my hope. That's my intellectual concept - one day I will be non-violent. So the fact of violence, the fact has no opposite. Right? Do you see that? If you see that, it is finished. You understand? Because all our education, all our religion, everything traditional has said: work at it, gradually get rid of it. Which is movement in time, which is division. Time is division. So when there is observation of violence, only violence, the observer who is watching the violence - you follow? - that very observer is violence. Right? Right? So the observer is the observed. Are you getting tired? You understand sir? The moment you have a division is the movement in time, and therefore there must be effort which is, the observer is thinking, the observer thinks he is different from the thing he observes, and so the very division brings conflict, conflict, suppression and all the

rest of it. But when the observer realizes that which he is observing is part of himself, so there is no division, there is no duality at all. Right? So, can you see this fact that you are violent, and the fact has no division.

So, what has taken place in the mind? What has taken place in your mind when you are only observing the fact and not inventing the opposite? You understand? That you are jealous, that you are envious, that is the fact, and the observer is the observed, which is envy. So there is no conflict or suppression with regard to a particular reaction. The reaction is a fact. Now, can the mind totally observe this reaction which is a fact, called jealousy? You get it sir? Observe without any movement of time. The moment you have the movement of time, you have brought about division. Is this actually taking place? Because, we are saying: you eliminate totally every form of conflict in which you have been conditioned for millennia, to live without a single conflict, which means to live without a single problem. I wonder if you understand this. You may have technological problems: how to go to the moon, it took them a long time, three hundred thousand people working at that one thing, it took many years. But if we understand the nature of time, the whole structure of time, psychologically as well as physical time, then we relegate physical time to its proper place. I have to catch a bus, train, aeroplane, whatever it is, go to the office, and so on. But psychologically there is no time. Which means to live a life without a single problem. Have you ever gone into this question? Right? Meditation is not a problem which you are all making into a problem: how to sit, how to breath, you know, the system, the methods, the various gurus offering various tricks, and

all that.

What is a problem? Please apply it. Test it in your life and you will see it will work. What is a problem? The problem is something that you have not resolved. There are mathematical problems, scientific problems, biological. We are not talking about them. We are talking about psychological problems between human beings, the problems that exist in our relationship with another, husband, wife - you know, and all the rest of it. A problem implies the non-resolution of it. Now, can you resolve that problem as it arises and end it, not carry it over even for a day? Because, see what happens - a problem continued makes the brain dull actually. You can test it out for yourself. The brain's activity is made slower because it is burdened, it makes itself incapacitated. It has no capacity or elasticity when you carry over a problem for many, many, many years, or even for a week. So the question is: can you end the problem as it arises? You understand? Are you interested in all this? Sir, do it. Don't accept the words but actually test it. Then it is worth it. But if you say: 'Yes, nice idea, nice thing, but I cannot do it. You tell me how to do it,' there is no how, because the how implies a method, a system. If somebody tells you what to do, you are back in the old game of tradition. Right? So, a mind that is clear has no tradition. So, one has a problem; problem implies that which has not been thought out, investigated, resolved. Our problems exist in the field of relationship. Right? And between man and woman, sexual, non-sexual, friendly - you follow - the whole communication between man and man and woman and man, the whole field of it, not just one particular problem, either sexual or this or that. We are dealing with the whole human problem in

relationship, not a particular problem. Because, if we were examining only a particular problem, then we are dealing with a part and not with the whole. Is that clear? Come on sirs.

So we are dealing with the whole problem of human relationship, with the boss, in the factory, when you come home, with your wife, with your husband, sex, non-sex, domination, wanting to possess, attachment - all that implies problem. First of all, why do we have problems? Why do we live with problems? You understand? Is it we are lazy, is it that we have accepted as the norm of life to have problems, or is it that for millennia we have problems, why not now, carry on? Which means, the mind, the brain has accepted problems as part of life. Right? So, refuse to accept problems. You understand? Challenge the brain and the mind to have no problems. No, don't agree sir, you have to do it. Which means the problem arises as it inevitably will, unless you have real love in your heart - not sexual love, not love of power, position and all that nonsense; I won't go into that, that goes off somewhere else - but how to deal with a problem without allowing a single second of interval. Right?

We will go into it. A problem arises as long as there is a centre. Right? As long as there is the centre, there must be circumference, diameter - you follow? The whole circle. The whole circle is our problem. Right? To have no centre is to have no problem. Please sir see what is involved in it, not just shake your head and say: Yes, I agree with you. That has no meaning, but see what is implied in it. First of all, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the rationality of it, the sanity of it, that as long as there is a 'me' with a centre, I must have problems. Right? They may be very dangerous problems,

destructive problems or superficial problems. And as long as there is a problem, there is no love. But of course that does not exist, so we can skip that. We shall come back to it later.

So, is it possible to live in a world, in the modern world, having a wife, husband, children, going to a job and all the rest of it, without having a centre? You understand sir? See the fact, the fact that as long as you have a centre, there must be problems, and if you say that's my life, to have problems, perfectly right, carry on. But if you say problems are most destructive, not only to the brain but the wholeness of the mind, the mind that is fit, alive, active, because every problem is like a blanket that smothers. So if you see the fact that the centre is to have problems - right? Not only hear it but see the truth of it - then what takes place? You understand? A mind, a being that has no centre and has to live with a wife and a husband, and the whole culture - no, not culture, I won't call it culture - the whole world, which means you are acting every minute. Life is action. Right? But when you act from a centre, you are introducing the whole problem. I don't know if you see it. See the framework of it, the wholeness of it. That is, the mind that is functioning with a centre has created innumerable problems - politically, economically, socially, and in the intimate or not intimate relationship. And having a problem is the most destructive way of living. That destroys the youth of the brain, the youth of the mind. If you listen to it and see the truth of it, it is over. There is no how. There is only the act of listening.

Tradition means - the word - to hand down from generation to generation values, rituals, dogmas, beliefs, gods, pujas - the whole thing that man is caught in, and in that tradition nothing can



flourish. It is like a steamroller going over human beings, and if you accept that, all right, live with it, and be happy with it. But you are not going to answer the challenge of the world, the global challenge which is that man must free himself of everything to flower. Flowering can only take place in the soil of human relationship. Right sir? Not somewhere else in the Himalayas or in some monastery - even there, he is in relationship with his fellow beings. And culture which is to grow, to develop, to have the highest excellence ethically, is not possible when you are merely, your mind has become merely a machine, which tradition does. And tradition has said, accept time. Then, somebody comes along, like me, and says, don't, you won't find light, enlightenment, at the end of time, you will find it where you are now.

## **MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 7TH JANUARY 1979**

I wonder often why we come together like this, listening to a speaker, half serious, curious and not really wanting to change one's life totally. One has become rather mediocre, without a flair, without any quality of genius. I am saying genius in the sense, not of any particular talent or particular gift, but the genius of a mind that comprehends the totality of life, which is our life, a vast complex, contradictory, unhappy existence. And one listens to all this, to what the speaker has to say, and one goes away with partial understanding, with no deep intention and serious attention to bring about a deep psychological revolution. And one wonders often why human beings tolerate the kind of life one leads. You may blame the circumstances, the society, the political organization, but blaming others has not solved our problems. We drift and our life seems such a waste, either going to the office from morning till night for the next fifty years or so and then retire to die or vegetate or grumble or fade away quietly.

And when one looks at one's own life with all its extraordinary beauty, the vastness of what man has achieved technologically, one wonders why there has been so little beauty in our life. I mean by that word not merely the appearance of beauty, the decoration of the outer, but that quality of great communication with nature. If one loses contact with nature, one loses relationship with other human beings. You may read poems if you are so inclined, you may read all the beautiful sonnets and the lyrical swing of a lovely poem, but imagination is not beauty. The appreciation of a cloud

and the love of light in that cloud and a sheet of water along a dry road, or a bird perched on a single branch - all that enchantment we rarely see or appreciate or love because we are occupied with our own problems, with our own worries, with our peculiar ideas and fixations, and are never free. And beauty is this quality of freedom which is totally different from independence.

When you listen to all this, I wonder what you make of it. Whether we see a dog and love that dog or a rock or a stray cloud passing by, when we have not that sense of extraordinary communication with the world which brings about great beauty, we become small human beings, mediocre, wasting our extraordinary life and losing all the beauty and the depth of existence. But I am afraid we must get back to realities. Though that is also real, extraordinarily real, the branch, the shadow, the light on a leaf, the fluttering parrot, that's also actual, real, and when we understand the swaying palm tree and the whole feeling of life, then there is a great sense of depth to beauty. But we are not interested in all that. Are you? I am afraid we are not. We listen, and let it slip by. You may sound romantic, sentimental, but beauty is not romantic, not sentimental, nor emotional. It is something very, very solid, like a rock in the midst of a fast flowing stream. So, we will leave that for the moment and come back to what we were saying yesterday, and I think some of it must be repeated, and I hope you won't mind if one repeats it.

We were saying, weren't we, that where there is tradition, there is no culture. Tradition handed down from generation to generation, certain concepts, beliefs, values, principles, all laid down intellectually, and such abiding tradition of 3000 years or 10

days old, in that soil culture cannot possibly blossom. Culture means to grow, to develop, not merely the intellectual side of life, but the whole totality of one's own life. Not merely to function in one direction completely, politically or have certain genius with regard to words or with stone or painting but to develop, cultivate one's mind and one's heart. That's not possible where there is tradition, that is, values handed down - in that soil nothing can grow. And that is what we were saying yesterday.

And also we were saying time which is a very complex thing must be investigated, must be considered. We said time is movement in division. Right? Yesterday, today and tomorrow. The knowledge which man has acquired, both scientific, so-called religious, and experience is the past, and that past meets the present, modifies itself and goes on - the future. That's the whole movement of time. And we were saying yesterday too that our minds are so conditioned to accept time as a means of comprehension, as a means of becoming, developing, evolving. Our whole life from childhood is based on this idea of becoming, growing, evolving. In a certain sense, both biologically and physically, time does exist: the acorn growing in to an oak, that needs time. And we were saying that psychological time does not exist at all. The idea that through time psychologically, which is ethically, morally, spiritually, if one can use that word spiritually without being romantic or nonsensical, to really understand the religious mind, time is a destructive element. That is what we talked about yesterday more or less.

If one may, we must investigate what is order. Order - please just listen, don't agree or disagree but like the wind, breeze comes,

so in the same way just listen - order is sequence in space. You understand that? No. We said order cannot exist without sequence, and there must be space. We are going to examine that because our life is disorderly, confused, contradictory. We are talking very simply. And where there is contradiction, there is no order. Where there is confusion, conflict, there is no order. And our life, as we live it daily, is a mass of contradiction, confusion and conflict and dishonesty. Right? That's a fact. And one wonders if order can be brought about in this confusion. Because without order there is no efficiency, both intellectual or if you have capacity you must have order. Order has nothing whatever to do with sentiment, with romance. Order is very, very sequential, logical, sane. So, we are going to enquire into what is order, whether we can have order, not a blueprint, not something laid down by tradition or by a guru or by a leader or by our own little desires and compulsions, but we are going to enquire in what is lasting order. Are you interested in this? How to bring about order in our life so that there is no opposite, duality, contradiction, dishonesty - politically, religiously or in our relationship with each other. You are interested in this? Or do you want me to talk about meditation? And you can go often into some kind of illusion and think that we are meditating. Because you see without bringing about order in our daily life, do what you will, there can be no meditation. So we are laying the foundation of what is meditation.

If one realizes actually what our daily life is, how disorderly it is, how contradictory it is, controlled by various objects of desire, seeking power, position, living in arrogance and vanity, and yet at the same time talk about the people, the goodness and read books

and you know, you play around with all that - all that indicates, doesn't it, a terribly dishonest life, a life of total contradiction, like an excellent lawyer who is capable of arguments and beating the other side and going off to some temple miles away to worship. You understand the contradiction? And they are totally unaware of that. So, the first thing is to realize how disorderly our life is. To be aware, not how to bring order is disorder. Please listen to this - not how to bring order in disorder, but to understand the nature of disorder. Right? When I understand the nature of disorder, then out of that comprehension, out of that obvious fact, comes the beauty of order, not imposed or disciplined or suppressed or conformed, but in the very investigating of disorder, naturally out of that investigation order comes. Right? You understand this? Now, let us do it.

First, let us be aware, as human beings who have got such extraordinary capacity, look what they have done technologically - immense things have been done. And as human beings who are so extraordinarily capable, who have thought out almost every form of concept, principles, ideas, religious projections, invented rituals that are really most beautiful some of them but have no meaning at all. And the human mind - I don't know if you have gone into your own mind, if you have, you can observe it - what great quality it has. And to challenge such a mind, to demand that it shall operate at its highest excellence. Will you do it as we are talking so that your mind - your mind being not only the various forms of sensory activities, your mind being the emotions, affection, love, care, attention, the intellectual capacity, and that sense of great love - all that is the mind, the wholeness of the mind, to challenge that. Do

you understand what I am saying? That it shall operate at its highest, at its greatest excellence.. Because if you don't challenge it, we live in disorder. You are following this?

So we are enquiring into what constitutes why human beings centuries upon centuries have accepted to live in disorder, politically, religiously, economically, socially, and in our relationship with each other. You understand? Why? Why have we accepted to live this way? From whom do you expect the answer? Do you understand? A challenge implies that you respond, that you respond with your highest capacity, and not wait for the speaker to respond and so how to respond. You follow? You understand what I am saying? I have challenged your mind, the speaker has said: exercise your highest capacity, exercise all your energy to find out whether it is possible to live in a world that is degenerating, corrupt, immoral, whether you can live a sane, a life that is completely whole - that is your challenge. You understand? What is your response to it? Whole, the word 'whole', means first healthy, both physically, psychologically, with all the capacities of your mind, and that is sanity. And the word 'whole' also means holy, sacred. That is the whole of life.

So we are asking whether you as a human being are aware of the total disorder and degeneration out in the world around you and in yourself, the degenerating process going on. Are you aware of it? Aware in the sense, observe what is actually taking place, not imagine what is taking place, nor idea of what is taking place, but the actual happening: the political, the religious, the social, the moral degeneration of man. And no institution, no guru, no higher principles, are going to stop this degradation. Are we aware of it?

If we are, then what shall we do? Right? Right sir? What shall we do? What is your action - not in some future date - what is your immediate action? Will you join some sect, will you follow some guru or will you go back to your old tradition, repeat something or other, which is to escape from the actual fact of the brain that is getting old, degenerating. Or will you, together, you and I, investigate, explore why human beings have become like this? It is happening the world over, it is not just the speciality of this spiritual land. Sorry to use the word 'spiritual', because you are so proud of your own culture. It is like a politician saying we are very old, our culture is ancient, then that gives him a certain sense of dignity, but in his heart he is - you know what it is, I don't have to tell you. So, what shall we do? I would suggest that we first look at our life - actually what it is, what is happening in our life, because our life in action is society. Right sir? You get it? Agreed? Our life in action is our society, and you cannot transform that society unless you transform yourself. That's so obvious. The communist, the liberal, the socialist will not alter it. Or your reading the Gita or the Upanishads will not alter it, or becoming terribly interested in what Buddhism has to say, or follow Zen meditation - none of those will solve it.

So let us look at what is happening in our life, our daily life. Our daily life is based on relationship. Without relationship you cannot possibly exist. Right? What is our relationship with each other, not you two sitting together, I don't mean that, but with your wife, with your husband, with your boss, with your factory worker, with your neighbour, what is the relationship with each other? In that relationship, is there order? Not self-centred activity, opposed



to another self-centred activity - you follow that? That's contradiction. I may be married, have children, sex and all the rest of it, and if I am self-centred, concerned about my own success, my ambition, my status, worrying about my - all the rest of it - and she is also concerned about herself, her problems, her beauty, her looks, you know, and all the rest of it - how can there be any kind of relationship between the two people? You understand all this. If you have one belief and the other has another kind of belief or another kind of conclusion, another kind of dogma, there is no relationship. Haven't you noticed all this? So, is it possible to bring order in our relationship, with your wife and husband, not with the universe, not with cosmos, not with god. God is an invention of the intellect. You can have extraordinary relationship with those things that you have invented, deal with illusions. But to have relationship with your wife and husband and children so that there is no conflict between us, that's where order begins. Right? Right sir? Now, how will you bring order there? Because order is - please listen to it, listen to the beauty of it at least - order is sequence in space. We are going to examine this, what we mean by space, what we mean by sequence, what we mean by order.

If we have no relation with each other, there is fear. Either one dominates the other, either they separate but only come together in bed. So we live a brutal life with each other. Haven't you noticed all this? Don't you have all this? And in what way shall we bring order so that it is enduring - not one day order, the next day disorder? What brings about this contradiction in relationship? What brings this division between you, your wife, your husband and your children? Division is disorder. Right? Right sirs? Muslim

and the Hindu, the Jew and the Arab, the communist, totalitarianism and freedom. These opposites are the essence of disorder. Right? So what brings about disorder in our human relationship, with the most intimate and not so intimate? Have you ever thought about it? Come on, sirs. Or are you frightened to look at this disorder, because, when you become aware that your wife and yourself, and the husband or the wife become aware of this disorder, either they accept it and live with it or they analyze it, go into it, and investigate it, and that may bring about a tremendous change, and there is the fear of change. You are following what we are saying? Right sir? There's my friend at least that I can talk to!

What brings about this disorder? I am saying something, please listen carefully, we are investigating. I am not saying it is right or wrong. Is it desire? I mean by desire, the sensory responses, with its images thought has created, and the action, the urge of that desire? You understand me? I mean by desire, the speaker means by desire - please investigate it as we go along, don't accept what he is saying - the perceiving, the seeing, sensory seeing, contact, sensation, and with the sensation goes the images which thought has created, and desire. You have understood this? Is this fairly clear? You see a nice thing: the seeing, the touching, the smelling, the tasting and the sensation, the sensation which is identified with the image which thought has created, and desire is the outcome of it. Right? Clear? So we are asking: is one of the factors of this contradiction this lack of relationship? I am using the word 'relationship' in its right sense - to be wholly in contact with each other, not merely sensory contact, not merely sexual contact, but in contact holistically, wholly with another. Is that prevented by

desire?

So we are investigating, is desire love? Because with desire goes fear and one of the factors of disorder is fear. Right? So, we are saying: the factor of disorder is desire and fear and the incessant pursuit of pleasure. We have explained what desire is. With desire goes will. Will is the action, concentrated action of desire. Right sirs? Just investigate. And we function, our life is based on desire, will and fulfilment, and with it goes frustration. And out of this comes fear, various forms of fear: fear of not being successful, fear of losing a job, fear of being lonely, fear of not having loved, or given to you, fear of losing attachment, fear of darkness, fear of physical pain, and so on and so on and so on. You are familiar with all this, aren't you?

So we are saying: the major factor of disorder is the operation of desire, always with the picture of achievement, and fear, the fear that has not been resolved by human beings - fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of not having the capacity to act greatly, and so on and so on. And also one of the causes of disorder is this incessant pursuit of pleasure. So we are going to examine those three things very carefully because our concern is to bring about order, and to bring about order one must understand this confusion in which we live, and the confusion is this activity of desire with its changing objects. You may not, when you are young, you may not want to have a great status, a great position, great wealth, but as you grow older the thing changes, as you approach death, you want enlightenment, god and all the rest of it. So, the objects of desire change constantly. And fear which is one of the major factors of disorder in our relationship, intimate and not intimate, and the

longing, the private personal pursuit of pleasure. So, these are the major, deep factors of disorder in our life. We have explained the process of desire - seeing, touching, tasting, smelling, the sensory responses, from that sensory response sensations, with contact, then thought, saying, how marvellous it would be if I could have that. Which is the thought creating the image of a car with you driving it and having fun. So that is the movement of desire.

We are saying: what is fear? Please go with me, find out for yourself because we have lived generation after generation with fear. We have good brains. We have got capacity to resolve fear, not to live with it. To live with it is to live in darkness. To live with it is to deny the beauty of total existence, the beauty of the earth, the beauty of the sky. So, we have to understand it, not intellectually but delve deeply into the very roots of fear.

Fear is time. Look at it carefully. There is physical fear: the bodily pain, the remembering of that pain and hoping that pain will not happen again, that is duration of time. Right? You are following this? Please, if you don't give your mind to it - because it is very important for us to understand this, because the mind demands that human beings be free, because when you are free, life becomes totally different. And a person who is burdened with fear can never be free. And when the mind is enveloped with fear, there is no possibility of clarity, of insight, or pure unadulterated perception of things. So, we are saying that time is the movement of fear. I have had pain last week, the remembrance of that pain, physical pain, and there is the fear that it might come back again. Right? That is one fear. The physical fear of getting hurt, having pain, or having been ill and hoping it will never come back again.

Now, can you - please listen to this - can you, when you have pain, physical pain, when it is over totally forget it, totally non-register it? You understand my point? Have you understood what I have said? I am sure most of us have had some kind of physical pain of different kinds, varieties, multiple kinds of physical pain. When it happens, to observe it and not let that pain be registered in the brain. Will you do it as we are talking? Now let us look at it for a minute. The brain's capacity consists in registering everything that has happened to it, like a computer, it is registering. You must have noticed, obviously. The happening to the physical is registered, and then that registered happening is a remembrance, and that remembrance, that memory of that pain brings about fear that it might happen again. We are asking a very simple thing but very subtle. Go into it. You will see it for yourself. Having physical pain and not let it become a memory. You understand sir? Do you follow what I am saying?

Now. Just a minute. You hurt me by calling me a name, or praised me, as yesterday somebody did - not to register the pain or the insult, so that your brain is fresh. When you register, it is the movement of time. Right? So, we are saying, fear is the movement in time. I can understand physical pain. I know I can look, observe it very carefully when it is happening, be very, very attentive or let it happen and not be associated with it at all. I am telling you something which actually happened to the speaker. I am not inventing this. Then, fear is what might happen, or what has happened and the remembrance of it and projecting that remembrance into the future and saying: I am afraid. Do you understand? That is, the movement from the past through the

present to the future. Most of us are afraid of, what? Look at yourself sir, investigate what you are afraid of. You may not be afraid of sitting there now. Obviously. But when you leave here, the fears come back, conscious or deeply hidden. What are your fears? Fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of not achieving enlightenment, fear of not being very successful and having a lot of money, fear of being dominated by another, whether it is the husband or the wife - what is one afraid of? And can you analyze it? Please listen. In analysis several things are implied. There is the analyzer and the thing which is going to be analyzed. Right? In analysis is implied time. You follow? I have to analyze all the time, that includes time. And every analysis must be complete, otherwise, I remember, the remembrance continues, and with that remembrance you analyze, therefore, it is never complete. You understand? It does not matter. First of all, in analysis, there is the analyzer and the analyzed. The analyzer is the analyzed, right? That is, thought has divided itself as the analyzer and the thing to be analyzed. So, it has created a division. Thought in its very process is limited and therefore fragmentary and therefore has the capacity to divide. That which is limited is always capable of division, that which is whole is never, can never be, divided. I wonder if you capture all this? Please don't look at me like a guru.

So, we are saying analysis will not solve the problem. You can discover the cause, and the discovery of the cause and the effect of the cause, and the effect becomes the cause for the next happening. So this is a constant chain, the cause becoming the effect, the effect becoming the cause. Right? In that circle there is no answer. You will have to think it out for yourself if you are so inclined, because

we are so used to analysis which prevents direct perception. So we are asking: what is the cause of this extraordinary fear that human beings have, both conscious as well as deep hidden fears? If you observe or look into fear, fear is never actual. Do you understand? Only you are recording either when it is over or might happen in the future. Right? I don't know if you understand this. All right, let me put it differently. Why am I working so hard for you? The other day a man asked me when I went out of the talk, he said to me: you ask us why we come, what reason, curiosity or this or that. He said: why do you speak? Do you want to know why I speak? Because sir - oh, forget it, it doesn't matter, it's not important.

Like pleasure, at the instant of pleasure there is no recording. It is only a second later that recording takes place. Haven't you noticed it? Have you? Sexual, any form of pleasure, as it is actually happening, you are totally unaware that it is called pleasure. If you have been angry, I hope you haven't, if you have been angry, at the moment of that feeling, it is just a feeling, but when you begin to name it, which is a second later, it becomes anger. Then you say, I must control. I must not be angry, and all the rest of it. So please just listen: at the moment of a pleasurable thing happening to you, there is no recording, the brain is not functioning. Only a second later, thought comes along and says: how marvellous that was, that meal was so good, that sunset was so lovely, I must have more of that kind of food, or I must see more sunsets with such delight. You follow? Are you aware at the moment of fear, at the second of the thing arising, and as it arises not to let thought come into it, recognize it from its past experience, say, that's anger, but to realize thought has no place at the moment of action? You

understand all this? That requires great alertness. So, if the mind is so alert, at the moment of arising of the feeling called fear, to realize it, and the very realization of it, the truth of it, prevents thought from interfering. Have you understood this? Are you doing it?

So fear and pleasure go together. Have you realized that too? You cannot have one and deny the other. So, to delve into both, see the whole movement of fear and pleasure, and the desire which is involved in fear as well as in pleasure, see the whole nature and the structure of it, not intellectually, verbally, but actually as you see this microphone - then you come to the question that the fear or the pleasure is not different from the observer. The observer is fear. Please listen to it. There is no thinker without thought. Thought has separated the thinker and itself as being separate from the thing which it has created. Right? So, the thinker is always trying to control, shape thought. So, fear is not separate from the observer, yourself, you are part of it. And when you say, I must control it, I must have courage, I must escape from it, I must dodge it, I must analyze it, you are playing a game with yourself. Whereas if you recognize that fact, the truth that this fear is you, you are the result of time, you are the result of thought put together by various... I won't go into all this. It is fairly simple. So, fear is you, and when you have realized that, you cannot possibly act, and therefore you are observing it purely. When you observe, the very thing which you are observing undergoes a radical change. Are you doing it? Will you do it? Will you observe without the observer because the observer is the past and the observer will prevent clear, objective, direct perception. So, realizing that, the observer says: I have no



place in observation, and therefore the observation is pure. When you observe fear without the observer, which is the past, then that very fear which is being observed, undergoes a radical change. It is no longer fear. At least, will you memorize this? Intellectually see what is implied? That fear and the avoidance of it or the suppression of it or the transmuting it or saying, I must struggle with it, all that will not wipe away fear because you have done all these things and it has remained with you for millennia. And we are saying something entirely different. We are saying the fear is you. You are the result of time, and can there be observation of that fear without time, without remembrance. Just to look. That is, can you look at your wife or your husband as though you are looking at them for the first time in your life without all the remembrances of the sexual pleasure, the nagging, the bullying, dominating, without any of that, to look? Because, knowledge prevents you from looking, and it is the freedom from knowledge that will end fear completely, not partly, not this fear, that fear, but the root of fear.

And in the same way, can you look at pleasure? Right? You have lots of pleasures, haven't you? Sexual pleasure, pleasure of having money, pleasure of having a position, pleasure of being somebody politically - you know all that business - pleasure of having power, pleasure of having a good mind, pleasure of having a good body, the pleasure that comes through comparison with its fear, the pleasure of imitating somebody and becoming more than that which you are imitating. Right? All these extraordinary forms of pleasure; pleasure to find enlightenment, which is the ultimate pleasure of seeking god, which is really a tawdry affair. So, can you investigate into yourself the whole nature of pleasure?

Because, as we said, pleasure is the movement of desire, broken up in time. To observe it minutely, precisely, with great precision, to observe, not to analyze.

So, we are saying: the cause of disorder is desire, fear and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure. It does not mean suppressing the delight of seeing a beautiful thing, the delight and the enjoyment of a lovely sky, looking at the morning star, bright, alone, or seeing across towards the southern cross towards the South - the very seeing of the heavens is a great delight. But the moment thought says: I must go back again on the balcony, look at that Venus, the morning star, then begins the whole pursuit of pleasure. Just to look.

So, we are saying these are the causes of disorder. When you have understood that, not intellectually but actually finished with it, so that you have joy in your heart. Joy is not pleasure, but the moment you remember the joy and say, I have had a most marvellous moment of joy, how I wish I could get back to that, then it becomes pleasure, and you have lost it. This is the sequence in our life to establish order with our family.

What is space? It is twenty five past six. I think you are too tired. I cannot deal with space. It requires a great deal of investigation. Space in the mind. That means never a mind that is occupied with any problem. But our minds are so occupied, so crowded with belief, with pursuit, with all kinds of things, confusion, illusion, so, there is no space. So, where there is no space, there cannot be sequence and order. And if there is no order in our daily life, for heaven's sake, realize this, in our daily moments of everyday life, your meditation is merely an escape

from your ugly life. And escape into meditation only leads to illusion. So one must lay the foundation to find out that which is beyond thought, that which is immeasurable, that which has no word. But that cannot come into being without this sense of great order in which there is total freedom.

## **MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 9TH JANUARY 1979**

Personally I don't like to sit on platforms. The little height doesn't give the speaker any authority. So this morning let us talk over together as a dialogue between two friends concerned with their life, with all the calamity of daily existence around them, their confusion, their misery; they are not talking about their theories or beliefs, they are deeply concerned to understand their own problems, their own misery, their own confusion. So if we could not discuss, or have a dialogue about theories, but actually be concerned with our daily life, then what shall we talk about together? It's up to you, sirs, this is a dialogue.

Q: Knowledge is essential and knowledge is also not essential, but living in a daily life we seek the knowledge, but as a matter of fact in daily life we must corrupt others, or we have to be corrupted ourselves. How to remove this confusion otherwise if we don't corrupt others or if we are not corrupted then we cannot have our basic needs.

K: How can one live in this world, in India, and probably he means Madras, without being corrupted amongst people who are already corrupt, how to live such a life in which there is no corruption. Any other questions? Sir, this is a dialogue between us two, between that gentleman and you, so let's all talk over, discuss, what would you like to ask apart from that question?

Q: You said psychological memory has to go altogether. Can we dispense with psychological memory altogether?

K: Can we dispense with psychological memories altogether?

Any others?

Q: You said the observer is the same as the observed, and in the same breath you ask us to observe ourselves without referring to the past.

K: The observer is not different from the observed, and at the same time you say, observe without reference to the past.

Q: Are there two kinds of observation?

K: Yes, yes, we will go into it.

Q: Your teachings, sir, are very good directives so far as individual lives are concerned, but we are today in an atmosphere where politics is dominating the whole life, not merely our economic life, social life, political life, even philosophical life. How to combat that and improve the situation so that an atmosphere is created in which individuals can continue their own psychological and other ideas as well as the aims and objectives of individual lives.

K: The questioner asks, politics dominate, all our lives are controlled, shaped by politics. And is it possible for the individual to be free from this pressure of politics. Right sir?

Q: No, how to control that controller.

K: How to control the government. Right sir?

Q: Yes.

Q: Sir, you said it is thought that creates the division between the thinker and the thought, and therefore this division can go when we operate outside the realm of thought. But at the same time you can see, sir, that thought is necessary for mechanical things like driving a car, locating a house, or taking the drive which we did yesterday. To establish this order of keeping thought in the proper

place, and excluding it, it means giving up every little thing that we have been caught up in. I have been hearing you, sir, for so many years, it is an extraordinary and very difficult effort to give up every little thing to which we have been clinging to. This is the difficulty, sir.

K: Right, sir. How is one to be totally detached from all the things that man has accumulated through thought, through millennia. Is that the question, sir?

Q: Yes.

Q: You say there is no god except that which is created by thought, then what is there?

K: What is there? Since you say, the speaker is saying, since you say there is no god except that which is created by thought, if there is no god then what is there. That's enough questions.

Q: One more question. I am not indulging in a trick of words, but you say keep your memory off except for facts, and do away with tradition. But we all listened to music yesterday, for example, and that music was wholly tradition and wholly memory, without perfection of tradition and the perfection of memory there would not have been that music. How do you explain that, sir?

K: There would be no music as yesterday afternoon if it wasn't traditional, and all the content of the song were totally and completely traditional.

Q: And also memory.

K: Memory is operating. I think that is enough. Just a minute, sir. All right, sir.

Q: Can we discuss observation is an instantaneous action.

K: All right, you have stated it. Yes, sir?

Q: Truth is indivisible and unchangeable, and how can it change from day to day, sir?

K: Truth is indivisible and unchangeable, how can truth change from day to day. If you don't mind my pointing out - how do you know what truth is? You have taken it for granted that there is truth, and how to apply that truth in daily life, from moment to moment. Sir, we very carefully explained - I will go into it later.

Now there are several questions put: the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, is it possible to observe without the observer; governments are controlling all our lives, can we unburden ourselves of this weight of governments; and - what else? I think generally all the questions apply, come to that point. Now which of the questions would you like to go into? And please bear in mind, has this any relationship with your daily life, or are we just playing with words outside somewhere?

Q: The question about relation which this gentleman put.

K: Has that any effect in our daily life? Are you asking this question from your consideration of your daily life? Can we go on with that question, do you want to discuss that question?

Q: We can discuss about the control of the government and our day to day life.

K: The control of government from day to day in our daily life. Can we dispense with that question? No, I'll answer it, we'll discuss it. What is government? And who are the politicians who are taking the responsibility of governing the people? In a democratic society, in a free election society, you elect the government, the politicians. Right? You are responsible for the government. And if you don't want that government, pull it down. It's for you. Right?

By your vote, change the government, if you don't like it.

Q: The whole difficulty is with the majority of the people.

K: Wait. I am coming to that sir. The whole difficulty is that a few of us may desire, or want, feel the urge to change the governments, but the vast majority of people, ignorant, they don't know actually what is going on - right, sir - they are hood-winked, they are cheated, they are cleverly put into a corner where they cannot possibly respond, and what is one to do. Is that the question, sir?

Q: Though the governments are democratic they have authoritarian power, and these voters are merely individuals.

K: I know, he explained that, sir. The questioner - now first of all let's be clear. Those who are capable, desirous, wish through voting can bring about change, a few. The vast majority of people are ignorant, deceived, promised and all the nonsense of electioneering goes on, what is one to do? You and another may want to change the government, you may vote right, liberal, centre, conservative, and so on, what will you do when the vast majority of people elect somebody who is corrupt, power-minded, concerned with his own self, with his own little family, what are you to do? Answer me sir, it is your problem, not mine, what will you do? In a totalitarian government you have no choice, they are firmly fixed in their power. So what will you do? It's your problem, sir, don't just leave it to me because I am off in three weeks to Europe and America and so on, I have no vote, I don't want to vote. The whole rotten system, I don't want to come into it. What will you do? You understand, sir? This has been a human problem all along, from the ancient of times, the few want to change, live



decently, not be corrupt, a few, but the vast majority is living a life of corruption, that is their way of living, smuggling and all the things that are going on. And what are the few to do?

Q: May I say a word, sir? On the lines we are discussing and on the lines we understand you.

K: No, you don't have to understand me at all.

Q: No. On the lines you want us to work.

K: No, no. We are thinking together.

Q: Yes, we work hard every day on this problem with ourselves, and yet we find thought is the stumbling block all the time, and so we continue to be clear and confused, clear and confused. That's what is happening.

K: That's what that gentleman was saying, the same thing, sir. Government is elected by the vast majority, the vast majority are ignorant - you know what they are. And the few wish to change, what will you do to bring about change in the vast majority? Please answer me, sir, it's your life.

Q: You have got to change yourself first. If you are at the centre of the change it permeates.

K: Right, sir, change yourself first. Will you? No, sir, I am not asking an insulting question or an impudent question. No, sir, please just listen, sir. It is very easy to say somebody must change, I must change - will you radically, deeply change?

Q: Why not?

K: I didn't say, why not. Will you?

Q: I will.

K: When?

Q: I am, right now. All the time I have been listening to you,

yes.

K: Good, sir. Then how will you, if you change, affect the mass? That's the question, sir. That's one problem. Just listen to it. The other problem involved in governments, both totalitarian, communist, socialist, liberal and so on, is the question of power. Man desires power, both so-called siddhis as well as physical powers. Right sir? That question has not been solved. So how will you bring about a change in the cessation of power of the few, democratic, whatever party you have, and educate or help the vast majority who don't care as long as they have a little land, a little food, they are absolutely satisfied, what will you do?

Q: Educate is the only way, there is no other way.

K: Educate is the only way. Then why isn't there proper education in this country? Now education is being gradually controlled by the government, both in totalitarian states as well as here. Right sir? Now how will you change a government who will bring about the right kind of education? You see you are dodging the question. You move from government, to education, to individual. So it comes down to this, sir, doesn't it, if one may point it out: that we don't take the responsibility, each one of us, to see the thing doesn't happen. Will you educate your servants, if you have them? Come on, sirs. Educate their children? Obviously you won't because you are only concerned with yourself, with your little family. Right, sir? So will you do it? Absolute silence! Therefore you are going to have the government that you want - you deserve. Right, sir? Right sir? Let's face things as they are. One sees a great many officials, members of parliament, cabinet and all the rest of it, you know the game they are all playing so I

don't have to go into it. So will you, as people who have the capacity to vote, be responsible for the care of human beings? You understand sir? Right? Will you do it? That means, sir, care implies love. Right, sir? Have you that care, that attention, that love brings? Go on, sir, answer it. Which means you will educate your servants' children. You must begin very near to go very far. But you attack at the top and not begin near. Is that question answered, sir?

Q: No, sir. How can a few individuals solve the problem unless you admit as a nation that the whole vast majority changes itself into this programme of action nothing can be done. And how to change the vast majority.

K: I am telling you, sir. The vast majority - how will you change it, sir, why ask me?

Q: Because I think I can get more light from you I ask you.

K: No, sir. We are friends. Right?

Q: Yes, but...

K: Wait, wait, wait. We are friends. And I am pointing out what can be done. The vast majority must be changed, must be made - I don't know if you want to go into the question of education, how to educate the vast majority. That's another one for the moment. What am I to do, or you to do surrounded by a vast majority of people who are so ignorant, so deplorably, you know, inwardly nothing. Right?

Q: When I say a vast majority, I don't mean those illiterate people are lost, I mean highly educated, learned, moneyed, the light of the society also.

K: Yes, sir. The moneyed people, educated people, the people

who are very poor, and so on, how will they change? You tell me.

Q: Sir, in the tradition individual salvation has been the goal, so those who are capable of changing society are looking after themselves and their own souls rather than caring for what is called the community, the society, the raising effect. So they are as selfish as the other man who is pursuing money, wealth and pleasure.

K: Have we answered the question?

Q: Sir, you have just now described that we don't have the care and love. I may care for my children, or my employer, employees, as well as the leaders, but there is a limit to which an individual can act, beyond that he may not have the capacity.

K: Yes sir. Has one noticed that in history, only very few individuals bring about a change, don't they? Right, sir? Will you have the energy, the capacity, the drive, the love to bring about a different world? Sir, I do not know if you have realized that it is not a provincial problem, a tribal problem as it is becoming in India, tribal, but it is a global problem. You understand, sir? And the global problem can only be solved when we cease to be nationals. Right, sir? When we cease to be Indians. But nobody wants to do this. We want the top to bring about a change and then we comfortably fit into it. And the top, the highly political power-minded people are not going to change. That's enough of this.

Now we want to discuss what is one to do in daily life the question of the observer and the observed, the two divisions. Right sir? Now in understanding that, which we shall go into, will you see the relationship with your wife, with your children, with your neighbour, with the poor, it is related to that. Right, sir? So we are going to discuss, talk over that, to find a right kind of relationship

with each other, with humanity. Right? Are you interested in that? That's what you are, sir. And that is what most of you want to go in to.

First of all let's begin at a very simple level, which is, have you observed visually with your eyes, a tree? Have you? Just a tree. And when you observe the tree what is going on in that observation? There is that thing, and you call it a tree. You call it a tree because the memory has come into operation, and it is generally recognized that thing is a tree. You give it a name, from recognition, and then the name, the recognition, the memory operates. Right, sir? It's simple enough, isn't it? Now can you observe the tree without naming it? Just look at the tree, sir. Just look at it and see if you can look at it without the operation of a single word or memory, just look. Can you?

Q: Without a motive, sir?

K: Just begin, sir, begin slowly.

Q: Momentarily, yes, for a moment.

K: Now wait a minute. For the moment.

Q: Then we are in time.

K: Just a minute. For the moment. That's fairly easy, isn't it. Which implies - just listen to it, sir - that the word 'tree' is not the actual fact. Right? Right? No, sir, don't accept what I am saying, just see. The word is not the thing. Right, sir? The word 'microphone' is not this actual thing. Right? Just a minute. So a description of a tree is not the described. Right, sir? So let's be clear. The word, the description, is not the thing or the described.

Q: How has it come into being?

K: Wait, sir. Find out, sir, do it.

Q: It has gone a functional reason, it works.

K: I am coming to that, sir. Have a little patience, sir.

Q: Sorry.

K: Don't be sorry, sir.

Q: OK.

K: Don't say, OK. So the word is not the thing. Can you look at that without the word? That's all. And you say, I can. Now can you look at your wife, or your husband, without using the word 'my wife'?

Q: Very rarely.

K: You are asking, the observer and the observed, are they different, if they are not different there is only observation. And we are going into this question very slowly, step by step, because if you once understand this there will be freedom from effort. The word is not the thing, the word 'door' is not the actual door. Right, sir? Right? The name 'K' is not the actual person, the reputation is not the actual person, the description is not the actual person, the photograph is not the actual person, or the image that you have made about this person is not the person. Right? So let us be very, very clear on this point: the description is never the described. You can paint the most beautiful mountain, but the picture is not that. Right? So the symbol is not that, the theory is not fact. So can I look, can you look at your wife or your husband without the word, first?

Q: Sir, to look like that is only possible when we are in an specific state, at other times it is not there.

K: We are going to go into that, sir.

Q: My point is whether I can attain this state by some other

means and start looking at things like this.

K: Yes, I'll tell you other means: drugs, alcohol. They have tried that. They have tried LSD, cocaine, marijuana, hashish, there is the latest thing which is called angel foam or angel dust, which really kills you or you see something out of this world. So there are other ways of doing it, which destroys your brain, which destroys your body. If you want to go along that way this is a free country and if you have got drugs, go to it. But we are talking of a much more sane rational way of doing this. That is, we are saying when you observe your wife - I am sticking to wife and child because that's you life, your boss, your servants, your children, your neighbour, your politicians, all of them - can you look without the word - slowly - without the word, knowing the word is not the person, and the word represents a continuous memory, continuous association with the past. Right? That's simple, isn't it, sir? Sir, are you following this?

Q: Children alone can do this before they have not learnt any language.

K: At least children, you think, can do it. We are not children, we are grown up people so don't let's go back to children. Sorry, sir, I am not being rude.

Q: Sir, even if the naming process is suspended in the act of perceiving, you are still left with the problem of assuming. We assume on many levels. To assume means to act as if something was so. We assume the universe, you assume the presence of the audience. Now we act on the deep level as if there was another world outside.

K: I understand, sir. May I go on with this a little bit, step by

step. So can one observe without the association which the word awakens? You follow all this, sir? And to observe the person, intimate or not intimate, can you do it? The word, the memory, is the past. Right? The past being all the incidents, events, all that you have accumulated during one's relationship between a husband and a wife, and a family, and a neighbour, and the government. Now can you observe - is there an observation, not you - is there an observation without association?

Q: Tell me the way.

K: You want to know the way. Yes, the gentleman wants to know the practical way. That is, tell me how to do it. That means what? Just listen. When you ask, how am I to do it, you are not actually doing it, are you. Please I am not insulting, I am just asking. So you are not doing it. So you want somebody to tell you how to do it, which means somebody who has found - who has done it and says, if you do this, this, this, you will also do it. Right? You want a system, a practice, a method. Right?

Q: But a genius like you...

K: I am not a genius.

Q: But as lesser mortals...

K: No, you are not listening, please, my darling sir, please listen. Sir, if one has lived this way, that we have lived in division, and from that division arose all the conflicts of humanity - the division of class, the division of nations, division of people, division of tribes, division of beliefs, division - you follow, the whole set up of human existence is based on this. And that has brought about tremendous conflict, wars, misery. Right? So one asks, is there a different way of living? You understand, sir? In



which there will be no conflict. So one has to find out - and if you say, suppose somebody has found it and he says, do it. And if he says, follow this system, this method, this way, he is putting you back into the old rut of authority, following. You understand, sir? So as I explained many times, please: I am not your authority, I am not your guru, don't follow me but as two people, friends, talking over together let's solve this problem. That's all.

So I am saying, can you observe? You can observe that thing called tree without naming, can't you. That's fairly easy, if you have at all looked at nature, looked at birds, it is comparatively easy, to observe the world outside you is fairly easy. But the moment you turn it inward it becomes extremely difficult. Your reactions are so strong, so conditioned, so instantaneous, it is very difficult to say, well, I'll hold it back. So we are going into it step by step. First, see what you are doing actually in daily life. You and your wife. Right? You separate from your wife, and she separate from you, or you and your neighbour, separate, and so on. Where there is division there must be conflict. That's understood. Right, sirs?

Q: Yes sir, but this division is a fundamental sense of being alive.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It's fundamental to the experience itself of existence. And it gives the sense of being separate.

K: That's what we have accepted.

Q: Right, that's what we have accepted.

K: We have accepted this illusion that we are living when we are separate. And that living when we are separate has brought

such extraordinary misery.

Q: What is the alternative, sir?

K: You are all wanting the alternate road.

Q: Only to understand.

K: Yes, we are doing it, sir, we are doing it. I am asking you, or we are talking over together, will you find out how to look at your wife or your husband without all the memory of twenty or five days, or thirty days coming into operation, will you find out how to do it?

Q: If I reduce myself to a mirror which has no reaction, I think one can do it.

K: Sir, if you say 'if' - when you introduce the word 'if' then we are not doing it. If I am queen of England it would be marvellous, but I am not!

Q: That is the way in which we can wipe out all this.

K: No, sir, not by saying, if I am this, but only by facing the fact. The fact is governments want to control people, governments are incapable of governing as a whole humanity. Right, sir? So face the fact. Not, if we had a marvellous government - we haven't got a marvellous government anywhere. So the fact is we have this division, and this division bringing us as separate entities has caused tremendous misery in life - wars, destruction, and all the rest of it. And we have accepted that through centuries. That's our conditioning. So somebody comes along and says, let us find out if there is not a different way of living. So he says, first can you find out why this division exists. Right sir?

Q: When we observe you there is no need talking, there is no you and me.

K: That's right, sir. You have said it.

Q: That is, we are living one way, and what we are talking about.

K: Just listen, which means you are actually listening. Wait. There is no person, you don't exist and I don't exist, but you are actually listening to what is being said.

Q: Yes, sir.

K: That's all. Leave it there. You see it is so difficult to go step by step into it when you bring in something all the time. Now one realizes our brains are conditioned to this division. Right? Do you realize it sir, are you aware of this, that you are conditioned to accept this division - me, my wife, me and my country, me and my government, me and belief, you follow, this constant division. Are you aware of this division? And the consequences of this division?

Madam, you can't hear and at the same time take notes. Forgive me for pointing out. It is so impossible to go into this. As most people don't, and as most people have accepted this conflict between two people, between a group of people of different religions, we accept it, that has become our habit, that has become our custom. And we say, help me to break that custom. Right? Right, sir? Nobody is going to help you. Right? The gurus have promised it, the books have promised it, and you are still keeping this division. So can you - please listen - can you discard your books, your gurus, all your authority and face the fact? Will you? Face the fact that this division must create a corrupt, disintegrating world. If you accept it and say, 'Look, one can't live that way', you are challenging your brain, asking it to find a different way of living. Will you challenge your mind? No. You understand, sir?

Will you? If you do then you have to find out, haven't you, not accept, not ask, 'Please tell me how to do it', it is that you have to do it. So what will you do? First see what is actually happening. Right sir? Then you ask, why does this division exist? Right, sir? Is the division created by the word? Is the division created by the image which I have built about my wife or my husband? Right? Is it this division exists because I am pursuing one line of desire and she is pursuing her own particular desire? You follow? So is it I am ambitious - one is ambitious and the wife is docile? Or is the wife ambitious and you are docile? You follow, sir? Are you aware of this?

Q: What is there to observe if there is no division?

K: We are going into it, sir. What is there to observe if there is no division. That's again, sir - you see you haven't even had the courtesy to listen.

Q: It is understood sir that only when we are aware there is no division.

K: When you are aware, if you are aware, should be aware, must be aware - it means you are not aware. So I am asking - so one is asking are you aware of this division? If one is, then why is there this division? This division has existed through millennia, through time immemorial. Right? Right, sir? Me and my god, me and my language, me and my belief. Right? From the ancient times, from the Sumerian times, that is about 7,000 BC it has been going on. And we have accepted it, and we say that is the way to live, with war, with destruction, with conflict, with faith. So we must find a different way of living, which means why is there this division, who has created it? You understand, sir? We are thinking

together. Please, who has created this? Don't say, nature, god, something external, force. Human beings have created it. Right, sir? That is, what is a human being? His capacity to think. Right? So thought itself is limited, so whatever it creates it must be limited. Right? So in relationship with another when thought operates it must be limited. Right? When there is limitation there is division. When one tribe says, 'I am this particular tribe' and there is another tribe, there is a division. Right? So thought has brought about this division. Right, do you see this?

Q: Thought seems to be operative on all levels. The sensational level, and...

K: Sir, I agree.

Q: What do you mean by thought? Is it just the internal level that you are meaning?

K: Partly verbalization, partly - just a minute, I am describing the parts, but the parts do not make the whole. Right? I want to go into this a little bit.

Q: Division need not necessarily be a conflict, it can be co-operative.

K: Oh, sir, don't say necessarily, this is going on, why do you say necessarily? It's just an idea. You can't listen to sequential listening. Sir, you are here to find out what the speaker has to say. Right? You have asked this question, so kindly first listen and then you can tear it to pieces. You can throw it overboard, tread on it, do whatever you like, but first have the courtesy, the amicable attention.

First I say, why has this division existed, why has man accepted this division, who has created it, and how has it come into being?

So one sees that it's either belief, tribalism, one tribe against another tribe. Right, sir, are you following all this? One set of dogmas against another set of dogmas, one set of tribal gods against another set of tribal gods, language divides people, and so on and so on. How has this come about?

Q: Isn't it, sir, that these things you have described have brought about division, but there is a very subtle level of division, the feeling that I am something separate. This seems to underlie all these other grosser forms of division.

K: I can't hear, you have to speak much louder.

Q: The divisions that you have been talking about, tribalism, nationalism, religion, all seem to be on a somewhat gross level, and that they are things which, if you turn your attention towards them, you can see somewhat into them.

K: I am coming to that sir, first I must begin from the outside and then come inside.

Q: So what seems to me very difficult to see into is the very basic sense of separation of the self as an individual.

Q: For him the difficulty is that there is a feeling, a sense of separation as an individual more fundamental to all of these separations.

K: I am coming to that, sir. We have nearly spent an hour, and we haven't even reached the rock bottom of it.

We are saying, man has lived not only on the senses, but also much more on the intellectual, verbal, thought level. And we are saying, thought in its very activity is divisive - divisive in the sense breaking up. Is that clear? You can observe it yourself, sir. All thinking is limited, fragmentary. Thought can conceive the whole

but the conception is still thought. Right? Right, sirs?

So: now can thought, which is memory, experience, knowledge, which is the past, can that knowledge not operate when you are observing? That's all. When you are observing your wife and your husband and your family, or your servant or your neighbour, can this memory associated with the wife or the husband, be in abeyance, just to look. Will you? Will you do it? Can you do it? Realizing that thought is divisive, that thought is fragmentary, that thought is born of knowledge which is the past, and so you are always looking at your wife, at your neighbour with the eyes of the past. Or, looking at yourself with the eyes of the past which gives you the traditional conditioning, which is, I am different from somebody else. Have you followed all this, sir? Are you doing it?

Q: What becomes of the neighbour?

Q: It is all ego, sir.

K: What sir?

Q: It is all the ego in here that gives us all this sense.

K: That is, that ego, you are saying, the 'me', the self, is put together by thought - your name, your form, your desires, your anxieties, your sorrow, your pleasures, your fears, your arrogance, your vanity, your desire for power, is you.

Q: Sir, as I understand, you're saying that this ego, or this division is an activity maintained by the thinking process.

K: Yes. So can you observe - I am coming back to that - can you observe your wife or your husband without the past memory intruding? If it doesn't, then what takes place? You haven't even reached that point. You understand my question, sir? I look at my wife - I have no wife, but I can look at my wife. Can I look at her

without the sexual memories, without the memories of dominance, without the memory of having comfortable associations, without all the petty little impatience and all the rest of it, can I look at her as though I was looking at her for the first time? Then when you do look in that way, which means there is no observer only observation - right? - then what takes place?

Q: Absence of the self.

K: Don't invent sir. Don't say, if, when, absence. You are not doing it.

Q: I am not able to do it, the past interferes.

K: Then find out why it interferes.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Do it, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Can you look at that tree without the word? Why can't you do it there?

Q: But we are relatives.

K: Oh, you people, you don't test it, you don't work at it, you don't want to find out. You make statements. Sir, look.

Q: Pure existence. If we are aware only of existence and no division.

K: That is all just theories, sir. What are the good of theories? Your books are full of theories, your gurus, your churches, your temples, are full of theories. Where are you at the end of it? You and your country, and your people, where are you?

So, now sir, just listen to it. I have been assured by a prominent scientist when I have stated to them, the observer is the observed, they took some time to understand the verbal meaning of it, then



they explained something to me. They said, when you observe without theories, without memory, without all the things, through a microscope, as you watch it the very thing you are watching is undergoing a change. Don't agree to this, you know nothing. The very thing you are watching is moving, changing, it is never the same. So - please listen - when you watch your greed, that is without the word, without the memory of 'I mustn't be greedy' and all the rest of it, when you watch that fact of the reaction called greed, that very reaction undergoes a radical change. That is the way to observe. To observe myself, my whole structure and nature of myself, with all the qualities, with all the ugliness, with all the pleasure, with all the misery, when I watch it - when there is a watching without the past association, that very watching brings about a change in what is happening.

Q: Putting it in words, in that state I am simple, humble, affectionate and loving.

K: What sir?

Q: Putting it in words...

K: Oh, no, don't put it into words. Have you understood what the speaker has to say?

Look, sir, let's look: there is violence. Right? Now it has become in the world tribal violence. Right, sir? Right? Even the so-called Brahmins - who unfortunately don't exist any more - even the so-called Brahmins have now become tribalists. So this very tribalism is creating violence. Can you look at violence - just listen to it, follow the sequence of it, I am going to explain step by step. First, you have become aware of your violence, which is anger, imitation is a form of violence, imitating somebody. When you

compare yourself with somebody it is a form of violence. When you try to achieve a result, a success, it is a form of violence. So I am using violence in its widest sense, not only physical violence but psychological violence. Now when that feeling arises thought then comes and says, that is violence. Right, are you following this? Because thought can only operate through words, through pictures, through symbols, so it says, that's violence. So the past has recognized the new feeling and has called it violence. Are you following this, sir? So can you observe that emotion that has been called violence without naming it? Because when you don't name it, the very thing that is being observed changes. And in that there is no conflict. The moment the observer says, 'I am violent' then conflict begins: I mustn't be violent, tell me how not to be violent, I must pursue non-violence, and all the rest of it begins. Right, sir?

So can you test it, do it. Test it out. That when a feeling arises, anger, jealousy, greed, violence, sex, which is most important to most people, when that feeling arises watch it, observe it without bringing all the images, the pictures, the contradictions, you follow, only the fact, the fact of that feeling. Then you will discover for yourself that the fact has no opposite. Right? So when you move away from the fact the opposite comes in, and therefore conflict begins. Now we are saying just observe the feeling, and realize thought is destructive in observation. Have you understood this, sir?

Q: The last sentence I don't understand.

K: We said, thought is divisive.

Q: Thought is destructive in observation.

K: Yes, of course. When anything is divisive it is destructive.

When I say, I am a Catholic, I only believe in the saviour of Jesus or whatever that stuff is, and you say, I am a Hindu with my - and the Muslim says, with my - you are destructive, you are destructive people.

So we are saying it is possible, not in theory, actually, in daily life, it is possible to live without any conflict when there is only pure observation. That demands no discipline, no control, just to watch: which means, the basic idea, the basic concept that me is essentially different from the other.

Q: Sir, you are saying that that assumption, that concept, must be radically undermined. It appears to me that when you watch, that watching is necessary, there is a tendency from the point of view of one who hears you to strengthen the sense of the ego it has appropriated...

K: Of course, of course.

Q:... and one isolates further.

K: Of course, of course. Because when you listen to it you are not listening to it completely. You are not listening, sir. We must go into again the question of listening.

Q: That area in human consciousness...

K: Yes, sir I know all that, we know all that. Look, sir, if one knows the art of listening everything becomes extraordinarily simple. You listened to that music, some of you, if you listened to it it is very simple. But our mind, our brains are so conditioned to complexity that we don't even listen.

Now at the end of this, an hour and a quarter, where are you? I know where I am, but where are you? Have you really understood this; that there is a way of living without a single shadow of

conflict? When there is no conflict then you bring about a different society. For god's sake, and therefore different governments.

Q: Sir, a moment before you said, what is the feeling, and you defined it in terms of his ability to think. Now granted that there must be some failure of listening, or some misinterpretation of what you mean by thinking, because you seem to be asking for a radical change in the manner of experience, and yet you are asking for it on the level of the mind, and that is the level on which it is done by feeling, so that we seem to step more intensively into the process of separation.

K: I understand, sir. One has to use words to communicate. If we could communicate without words, which means - just listen - to communicate without words means you and the speaker must be at the same level, with the same intensity, at the same time, otherwise verbal communication is only possible. If you cannot meet the speaker at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, then words must be used to communicate. Love is that. When you have real love then communication is not necessary.

So I am asking, sir, before I stop, if I may, where are you, have you understood this? Which can be only tested when you go home, when you face your wife, when you face your boss, when you are working in an office, find out, test it. And the person who is seeking experience, he doesn't realize the experiencer is the experience. Because the experiencer, when he experiences, must recognize that experience. Which means he has already tasted it before, known it before, therefore the experiencer is the experience, the thinker is the thought, the observer is the observed. Right, sirs.

# MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 11TH JANUARY 1979

K: As we said the last time that we met here, the day before yesterday, this is a dialogue, a conversation between two friends who want to talk over any problem, any issue they have. So what would be the relevant and worthwhile question to ask, and out of that perhaps a right answer can come. What shall we talk about this morning?

Q: Sir, most people believe in things like god, religions, astrology, numerology, and the like, they spend a lot of time, money, their material resources, believing that these things will reward their efforts. How to save them?

Q: Sir, in this existence only at the point of death all our accumulations come to an end. So unless we understand death very deeply any amount of effort on our part to end the psychological memory would be absolutely futile.

K: Right.

Q: Can we discuss the relationship between time and awareness?

Q: You have often urged people to be free of violence but I really wonder what we could do if we are faced with a practical problem. Let's say somebody attacking you, when you are defenceless, so shouldn't you have to retaliate with violence?

Q: What is creativity?

Q: Can we discuss the relationship between time and awareness?

K: I have understood, sir. What is the relationship between time

and awareness.

Q: Can we discuss the relationship between truth, actuality and reality?

K: The relationship between actuality and reality.

Q: It is pointed out that listening is the way of life, but the quality of listening, or observation that you point out indicate a feeling that is beyond the mind.

Q: I have a problem, sir.

K: Thank goodness!

Q: Meditation as generally understood is taking some time apart from our daily activities and concentrating the mind on some form, or some name, or some idea. Well, sir, I have practised it for years and I have found that it has had absolutely no effect on my life or on curbing any of my evil tendencies. Well, sir, could we explore the possibility of making one's daily life, including the time we spend on our activities, into one continuous form of meditation?

Q: Is not the observation in itself an instantaneous action? Can we discuss about it?

K: No, sir. Now we have had so many questions I am quite lost.

Q: Krishnaji, maybe this question would cover a lot of them. We seem to be interested in a religious life but it seems that culture and tradition get in the way. One wonders how we can live with culture and tradition or can one live with culture and tradition?

K: Can one live a religious life, in daily life, without tradition. Is that it?

Q: And culture, yes.

K: I don't quite follow your question.

Q: It seems we are interested in a religious life but we are not

able to get anywhere because we are so involved with tradition and culture, and how do we live with tradition and culture, or does that have any part in religious life?

K: Has tradition and culture any part in a religious life. Do you want to discuss that?

Q: No. As we have been talking about, when there is deep profound interest thought won't interfere.

K: I can't hear, would you please speak a little louder, sir.

Q: I heard you saying that when there is profound interest thought won't interfere. Is that interest free of thought.

K: Is this a problem to any of you, all this? Just a minute, sir, there are so many questions. Perhaps if we could take the question: what place has tradition and culture in a religious life. Would you like to discuss that, would that be worthwhile? I think perhaps if we could go into that question and answer deeply that enquiry perhaps we could include all the other questions in it. May we do that? Yes, sir?

What would you think is culture? No, not theoretically, actually, what does culture mean? The word 'culture' means to grow, to cultivate, to develop, to expand, to flower, to be, or to become, and so on. Have you had culture in that sense in your life? To grow, to develop the intellect, the mind, the heart, all the very, very subtle senses and so on, that's part of culture. So that is what we mean by culture. Do we agree to that? To the meaning of that word, would you agree to all that? No?

Q: Yes.

K: Right. And what do you mean by tradition? Go on, sir. Tradition implies, doesn't it, values, beliefs, dogmas, rituals,

handed down from generation to generation, handed over from father to son, to son, to son. There is the tradition of the Upanishads, the Gita, handed down, what the writer meant and it has been handed down in this country, or in various other countries, and that is what we call tradition. Is that right?

Q: The preservation of culture as well.

K: Which means culture being values, beliefs, rituals, gods, concepts, principles, ideals, all that has been handed down and you have marvellously preserved it. Is that it? As you cultivate a beautiful garden where flowers grow, the shadow, sunlight, beauty, and you preserve that. And tradition means also to hand it down - concepts, beliefs and so on. Also please bear in mind that word means treason, betrayal. Right? So what has tradition and culture to do with a religious life? Go on, sir.

Q: Is it the religious life that is being betrayed by tradition? You say that tradition is treason, a meaning of tradition. What is being betrayed?

K: What do you mean by betrayal. When you are functioning with a deep, ingrained, conditioned mind, as most people who are traditionalists, how can they betray? They are betraying the present. No?

Are you interested in all this? Or is it a nice cool morning and we can sit quietly together under the trees? You understand my questions, sirs? What has tradition and culture to do with a religious life, and what do we mean by a religious life - so we can expand it, shall we? Are you interested in all this? What do you consider is life? Your life, what is your life? Come on, sirs. Two friends talking over together, what do you mean by your life, my



life?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I am asking a question, sir, if you would kindly listen to it. What do we mean by a life?

Q: A relationship with another.

K: You say it is a relationship with another - intimate or not intimate, neighbour and so on. But what is that relationship? What is that life that you daily live? Come on, sir. What's your life? For god's sake.

Q: An act of living in harmony and understanding.

K: Oh, sir, what is your daily life, actually, not theoretical.

Q: A bundle of experiences.

K: Is that it, a bundle of experiences, your life?

Q: Eating and sleeping, sir.

K: All right. Eating, sleeping and what else?

Q: Expecting something from the other.

K: Look at your life, sir. For god's sake talk factually not theoretically.

Q: And work.

Q: Conflict.

K: A most extraordinary generation.

Q: Searching for pleasure, based on sensation. That's what my life is.

K: Your life is based on pleasure, pain. You see how we are avoiding to face our life, our daily life, aren't you?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, sir, don't invent something. Your daily life, sir.

Q: It is a compulsion to completely satisfy, to alleviate pain.

Q: Facing problems, sir.

K: Facing problems. What are those problems?

Q: Changes.

K: Changes. That is, sleep, wake up, work, sex, what else?

Don't you know your life?

Q: Hatred.

K: Hating.

Q: Jealousy.

K: Go on, sir, your life.

Q: Constant search.

Q: And then in the field of work you have problems.

K: Is this your daily life, sir?

Q: At the mundane level it is, then at the spiritual level it is questioning who am I and what is all this.

Q: Constant search for pleasure.

K: Sir, I am asking you, you repeat the same thing, sir. Find out what the others say.

Q: My life is based on pleasant sensations.

K: You have said that, sir. Pleasant sensations, avoiding pain, work, seeking something more and more, physical pain, and what else?

Q: Strengthening the ego.

K: I think you don't know your own life.

Q: Following a routine in which I have already contented myself with. That's my honest answer.

K: Neither honest or dishonest, what is the actual fact?

Q: Violence.

Q: And going for a goal.

K: I give up! You are really the most extraordinary generation of people.

Q: Experiencing continuously, from moment to moment.

K: Are you doing that? Incredible! You don't know your own daily life.

Q: Sir, it is expecting something out of the other, and expecting something from you now.

K: You are expecting something from me, you are expecting from another, dependence, attachment, pain, annoyance, anger, irritation, sorrow. You know all this, don't you. This is your daily life: going from 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock to the office and coming back in the evening exhausted and so on and so on - is that your life? Going to the temple and doing some kind of noise with a bell, and doing puja, doing yoga, is that your life?

Q: Study.

K: If you want books. Please, is that your life?

Q: Let's proceed.

K: How can I proceed?

Q: We agree.

K: You agree to this? I'll ask that gentleman out there - do you agree to this, sir?

Q: Yes. One point, sir. I am interested in the part of the whole, and I see I am the whole myself.

K: Oh, good, that settles it!

Q: What is obvious doesn't need our acknowledgement, so let's proceed.

K: That we say, that is our life. Then what do you mean by religion, a religious life? You tell me. What is religion to you?

Q: Morality.

Q: Just a word.

K: Morality, just a word.

Q: Not to be envious.

K: Sir, I said, what do we mean by religion, the word. The word itself, what does religion mean to you, the word? Not what it implies, the meaning, the significance of the word.

Q: The brain.

Q: Relationship with the divine.

K: Relationship with the divine - how do you know about the divine? You see, you are so incredible. The word 'religion' comes from, etymologically, from the Latin, and Greek, which meant originally tie, to bind. Now they are denying that etymological meaning, they have given a new meaning to the word religion. Which is - if you are interested in it - it means to gather all your energy. That's all they mean. Do you understand, sir? To gather all your energy to enquire, to find. Right? Not all the nonsense of temples, rituals, and all this either, sir, what you have put on your head. You see how you all agree. Would you agree to that, the meaning of the word? That means gathering every particle of energy that you have to enquire into what is truth and what is reality, to enquire into what is meditation, to enquire into why human beings live the way we are living, to enquire if there is an end to sorrow, to enquire into what is love, whether one can live without any effort, and control, all that is implied in that word.

So we are asking - you are putting the question whether tradition, culture, can live, is tradition, culture possible in a religious life. Do you understand now? I say - I say, tradition and

culture has no place in religion. Right?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I don't follow. Sir, if you want to talk, answer the question, please say it loudly, kindly.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, religious life implies also having no authority. Sir, I am saying something. Having no authority of any kind, no spiritual authority. Right?

Q: The development...

K: You go on, sir and I will go on - it will be all right, sir. A religious life implies being a light to yourself. Which means, no outside authority, except law, policeman, taxes, that's a different matter - if you have to pay taxes, or if you want to deceive the government by not paying tax and so on. We are talking about having no spiritual authority including me, the speaker. Have you any authority, spiritual authority? Have you, sirs?

Q: No, sir

Q: In the sense that we don't take it as an authority but as an experimentation and see where that leads us to.

K: Have you done it, sir?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Have you experimented and found what?

Q: I have found myself...

K: Has it in your life?

Q: For example, meditation...

K: Have you found it in your life?

Q: In some aspects, yes. I'm on the way.

K: When? Sir, you are just asking some - you are not being

serious, are you sir. You know, sir, what we mean by authority?

Q: To blindly accept.

K: Oh, not in the least, sir

Q: Authority implies blind acceptance.

K: No. Please kindly listen to what the other person has to say before you answer. Authority comes from the word 'author', one who originates something. You understand, sir? One who originates an idea, a concept, a belief, a statement of his own experience and so on, he is the author - not merely the writer but he is the author, and from that word authority comes. Now you have the Upanishads, the Gita, the Bible and so on and so on, the Koran, they become your authority. Have they? You see, you don't even... Have they in your life?

Q: You seem to be the author for new ideas.

K: Do you follow a guru?

Q: I don't.

K: You don't. But do you? You see you are so frightened to answer. You have had various gurus, Mr Gandhi and so on, all the way from the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, century, down to the present. And where are you, having been led for these thousands of years, where are you? Do you want to be still led?

Q: No.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I give up.

Q: Could we approach it in a different way since you are giving up, sir?

K: Sir, you don't respond, you don't find out for yourself.

Q: I think in the beginning most people do need some guide or

some teacher.

K: There is no beginning and no end.

Q: They are at a level when they do need it, and then may be through expansion.

K: Madam, I understand. At the beginning you need a guru, later on you can throw him overboard.

Q: No, find out for ourselves.

K: Yes, madam, understood. First I need somebody to help me to walk, I need a mother, a father to cling to when I am a baby, to cling to their skirt, to their trousers or whatever it is. So when one is ignorant, inexperienced, not thinking, you need somebody to help you to think, to clear away your ignorance and so on. So we say at that state we need a guru, later on we don't need it.

Q: You can do it.

K: Yes, you don't need it.

Q: You give him up.

K: Yes, madam, you don't need it. Are you in that position?

Q: I don't find my understanding is the same as when I am in your presence.

K: I am not your guru, thank god, or anybody's guru.

Q: No, no guru, but...

K: Sir, you asked a question: can tradition and culture exist, or co-exist with a religious life? And we said very carefully tradition - apply it, sir, find out - tradition means handing down certain authoritarian statements, certain values, rituals, principles, conclusions, and so on. That's what tradition means. And that word also means betrayal, treason. Culture means to develop, to grow, the mind, your heart, to flower, to have beauty in your life, all that

means culture. And a life which we live now daily is constant struggle, work, gathering money, having influence, having pain, suffering a great deal, insensitive to everything about us, and only sensitive to our own little problems, and so on and on and on. That is what we call living. And religion as it was explained, means gathering your whole energy to enquire into what is truth and what is reality. Now do you want to go into all this?

Q: Yes, sir.

Q: Before we go into that, we have seen what religion is, we have seen what religion is, it is gathering our energy to enquire. We have seen what religion is, we have seen what culture is, let us see what life is and then go ahead. Let us enquire into what life is, what living is.

K: Enquire, sir, enquire what living is in your life.

Q: How? We haven't enquired into what living is; we have enquired into what culture is, what religion is, but not what life is.

K: Sir, I am telling you. What is your life?

Q: My life is my life, but what is life I am asking? What is living?

K: Are you saying what life should be?

Q: Yes, what is life? We have said religion is gathering all our energy to enquire.

K: You want to know what life is.

Q: What living is.

K: Just a minute, sir. I understand your questions. You want to know what life is independent of our suffering, of our pain, of our anxieties, or our grabbing, greed, you want to know what life is.

Q: Yes, that's it.



K: How are you going to find out? You see...

Q: I am trying to find out now, what living is. Let us enquire what life is.

K: Sir, don't repeat, sir. I understand that. How will you find out what life is? If you remove all the colouring, all the attributes and all the rest of it, will you first remove it to find out.

Q: Let us go into it.

K: You want to know what life is and we are saying you can only find what life is, which may be eternal, which may be nonsensical, which may be extraordinary, only when we understand our living, daily living, and from that daily living understand the beauty of life. So if you want to enquire into pure life, go ahead and do it.

Q: Religion has tried to deliver us from what we have just described, we might say is the failure of life. Now there has been some error of that has been communicated since the dawn of time, across all efforts. Can we attack that error? Because we must be reproducing it if we continue to suffer

K: Look, sir: you say you start with error.

Q: That is our tradition, an error. What is that error?

K: Yes. Or also you can say, what is the original sin.

Q: What's the original sin, yes.

K: It is the same thing, we are back into some kind of... Sir, we have described what tradition is. Are you free of that tradition? Because otherwise you can't proceed to find out what a religious life is. Because one must be free to climb great heights. If you want to go to Everest you must throw away all your burdens and carry very little. So I am asking, we are asking you, courteously, if you

have thrown away your traditions.

Q: Yes, sir, I have.

K: Traditions being nationality, your caste, your beliefs, your rituals, going to the temples, all that - have you thrown it away?

Q: No.

K: No. Then how can you find out what a religious life is when you are blind? So you want to find out what a religious life is and yet you won't leave your little enclosure. Right? See your own tragedy, sirs. And you are slaves to certain things, and you say, 'I must find freedom' - you won't let that go to find it.

So what shall we do?

Q: We are caught by the crocodile, sir.

K: Crocodile? Like a donkey tied to a post, it can't go very far, you are tied to your tradition, and you want to enquire into something that demands a mind that is capable, a heart that can really love. Without that, freeing yourself from your tradition, your culture, your belief, how can you find out anything? You can repeat what the Gita said, or the Upanishads, or some other book, what value has it? I was told the other day, some of the gurus now give lectures, or talks on the Gita. Is that right?

Q: Yes.

K: And hundreds and thousands go and listen to it. What value has it? What are we all playing at, sirs? Apparently one doesn't see one's own tragedy. Right sir?

So what shall we do? I can go on talking, I can become another one of those people who read, who lecture on the Gita, and you will all sit down and shake your head and say, yes, marvellous.

Q: I think most of us know our own tragedy, we see it, but we

can't be bothered to do anything about it. Too lazy, we don't want to see the truth.

K: One sees the tragedy, the misery, the confusion, the uncertainty and we are too lazy to clear it up. Is that it?

Q: Yes.

K: Then please take some vitamins, put some guts into you and wake up.

Q: That's the problem.

K: It's not a problem, sir, if you want to do something, you do it. You wanted to come here, so you woke up early and you took all the trouble to come here - you have enough energy to do something when you want to do it. But we don't apparently want to do this.

Q: Sir, would it not help us to know our ourselves, our mind if we read the scriptures?

K: Would it not help us if we read the scriptures and other books to understand ourselves. Please listen - you have asked that question, sir, please listen. To understand yourself must you read somebody else to tell you about what you are? If you read what they tell you, what you are, you are conforming to their idea of what you are. Right? You understand what I am saying?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You haven't even listened.

Q: You go on.

K: Look, sir, if I tell you what you are, and you try to understand yourself according to what I have said, have you understood yourself?

Q: No, sir

K: Or are you imitating what I say, what you think you are. So

can you stop reading about what you are and find out for yourself what you are, what actually you are - isn't that much more simple, much more practical?

Q: Sir, even if we were to give up reading books...

K: I am coming to that. Can you first realize, if I may suggest, that our minds have become so imitative. Right, do you realize that, sir? Conforming, obeying, so that we are never original, find out for ourselves. So can you put away what the psychologists have said, what your Gita has said, what other books have said, and say, 'Look, I am going to find out for myself'? Won't you do that? No, you won't, because if you follow others you think that is the easiest way to solve life; and you have followed for millennia, and you are still where you are. Right?

Q: Sir, habit excludes creativity, and the brain and the mind are locked into patterns of habit, so people will not respond to the fresh, obviously. You are speaking about de-habitualising the mind. Now we know.

K: Yes. I'll show it to you. That means, the word is not the thing, the description is not the described, the word 'tree' is not the actual fact, so when I explain it is an explanation, but not the actual thing that is happening. Right?

First of all, forming habits, both physical as well as psychological habits, is a thoughtless repetition. Right? Why do we form habits?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, sir.

Q: In order to be safe.

K: Please, just listen sirs, you are all so quick to answer

something which I am asking you, if you will kindly listen - why does the brain, your brain form habits

Q: For convenience sake

K: That's right. He says, for convenience, for comfort, for following daily certain routines, both physically as well as mentally, psychologically. Why? Because the mind has found the habit convenient, it hasn't to work anew again, and so habit is formed. Which means routine, a machine. The piston engine has a marvellous habit. Right? You understand, it is a marvellous habit, the piston engine. So our minds have become piston engines - repeat, repeat, repeat, repeat. Because that way you think is the easiest and the most comfortable way of living. Right? So habit is formed, good habit, bad habit. Which is the brain refuses to think anew, to work afresh. Right? Isn't this so obvious, isn't it? I am describing, you do it actually, watch your own brains. So habits are formed, which is the tradition. Habit is a tradition, there is nothing holy or unholy about it, it is just tradition. And once caught in that the brain refuses to let go. If it lets go it immediately forms another habit and it pursues that. So one has to question why the brain operates this way. You understand?

Q: Why does the brain refuse?

K: Have you followed up to now, what I have said, sir? Forgive me asking you a direct question. You see if you interrupt all the time I lose it.

So we are saying, why does the brain form habits, which is tradition, whether it is ten days old or ten thousand years old, why does it do it? You understand? You have a leader of non-violence in this country, and he establishes a certain principle, or whatever

you like, and then the brain says, all right I accept that, and I will follow that. Which is tradition, which is habit, and you don't like to call it habit, you say you have principles, you are following a principle. So I am asking why the brain does this constantly - you relinquish this habit, pick up that habit, then throw that away and a new habit. Why? Sir, just think it over, sir, don't answer quickly, enquire, go into yourself, look at your brain, why does it do it.

Doesn't it do it because - listen quietly - the brain can only function in security. Because it is secure in habit, it is secure in a tradition, it is secure in a belief, it is secure in an illusion. The brain demands at all time to be secure, whether it is false, whether it is real, whether it is absurd, whether it is superstitious, it says, please I can only operate where there is complete security. So it forms habits, thinking that will give it security. Right? You have understood this? No, not description, the actual fact. Then is there such security? That is, forming a habit, living in it, breaking it up with a new habit, and then following it, breaking it up, another habit. That is, the brain wanting security but never investigating into the security it thinks it has in habits. Are you following this? No, sir you are not, otherwise you wouldn't put on this thing, sir. That's a habit we have.

So I am asking - we are saying, there is a security not in habit. Right? I wonder if you understand this. I am going to show it to you. When the brain sees that this habit-forming is the most dangerous way of living - you understand what it does. You understand, sir? I don't think you do. It is the habit to call yourself a Hindu. Right? And that habit is most dangerous because on your border there is the Muslim. Right? And on the other border is the

communist. Which is their habit, and it is the other habit, and your habit, so you have got three habits, and there will be constant wars. So when the brain realizes any formation of habit, or the continuance of habit is the most dangerous way of living, which is, when it comprehends the danger, the sequence of a habit, the very perception of it is intelligence. The brain then has this intelligence, which is total security. It is not habit, it is not tradition, it is not one habit after another, but the perception, the seeing, logically, sanely, the consequences of habits. And when it sees the consequences it says, 'Right, finished'. I wonder if you understand this?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Will you do it? That is, not to be a Hindu, or a Muslim, or anything. You are a human being. This human being, has this extraordinary capacity to create an illusion, and in that illusion, like temples, like churches and all the rest of it, create and live in that illusion and say, 'I find security there'. Right? And there is the other which says there is security in Islam, and so there is a battle. And it destroys itself. You follow all this? So will you, seeing this, throw away your illusions, throw away your habits because you see the reason, the logical sequence of forming habits? Have you understood?

Q: Sir, what you described, on the level you describe things to me, referring very much to the consciousness, the mind itself is a form of habit so in effect you are asking us, you are leading to the question, can we throw away this psychological mind. Can we pursue that?

K: Yes. You are saying the mind is itself a habit.

Q: The mind orients itself towards safety, security.

K: The mind itself orients towards a habit.

Q: No. The mind orients towards security, psychological security, is a habit.

K: Yes. Sir, you see the mind, what do you mean by the word 'mind'? I know - we know what the word 'brain' means. Right? What is the mind? What is your mind, sir? Ask it. Please ask, demand, challenge, what is your mind.

Q: Sir...

K: You see you don't even ask. You don't put your guts in it to ask this question: what is your mind by which you live? Don't look at me, sirs. I am not your mind.

Q: Sir, may I respond, sir?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: It is a modification, a formation of force, of the total force that you are into certain forms.

K: Are you saying, if I may interpret what you are saying, your mind is your senses, your emotions, your sensory responses, your beliefs, your desire for security, the confusion, the sorrow, the misery, all that is your mind, which is, your consciousness is that. That is, your consciousness is the content. The content is sorrow, pain and all the rest of it. That's what we say is the totality of your mind. Out of this totality you can invent a super-consciousness, you can invent a final divine consciousness, Buddhist consciousness, Krishna consciousness, and banana consciousness. You can invent anything you like. And the more superior, the more gullible you become. So we are saying, can you observe your consciousness? Are you aware of your own mind? Are you aware of your own mind? Are you aware of your own reactions? It is



twenty five to nine, sir.

Sir, you respond with one particular sense, don't you? You understand? Either the response, sexual response, which is the particular, or response to your taste, to your smell, to your touch. Please listen to this. That is, we generally operate along one particular sensory response. Right? Tasting, smelling, hearing, touching. Now can you respond all this together? You understand my question? Understand the question first. When you respond only with one particular sense, in that response there is division, breaking up. Right, sir? Now we are asking, can you respond wholly, with all your senses? Have you ever tried it, or is this something new? Something new.

Q: No, sir.

K: You don't understand?

Q: All the centres...

K: You haven't even listened. Understand the question first, sir. We have so far responded with one of the senses. Right? We are saying, is there a response with all the senses?

Q: Sir, it seems to me you are leading to something else. The super-sense is the sense of I.

K: No, no, absolutely you have gone off.

Q: Have I?

K: Yes, sir. Forgive me. Can you look at the sea - the sea - with all your senses, the tasting, the smelling, the touching, the feeling, with all of that? When you do that there is no centre from which you are holistically responding. I wonder if you've understood this.

Q: We do that when we are playing with a child.

K: Where do I put the child. You don't even do it for yourself

and you talk about the child. Have you ever tried this?

Q: With a tree.

K: Look at that tree, sir. Wait a minute. Look at that beautiful tree with all your senses: touch it, smell it, taste it - you know, you can't of course - but with the feeling of all that.

Q: There is the complete cessation of the past, actually there is only observation.

Q: Sir, the use of one sense is still conditioned by a central experience - you have just said, the centre - so if you synthesize all of the senses you will still be conditioned by that centre.

K: Have you tried it, sir?

Q: I've tried it and thought gets in the way.

K: No, sir, you can't try, do it, and you will find out thought doesn't.

Q: But...

K: You see, sir. You want to try something the other fellow is saying. Don't try what the other fellow is saying, but see what you are doing, that you are responding partially, either hearing, seeing, tasting, touching, partially. I say, don't respond partially but respond totally with all your senses.

Q: Sir, my difficulty is this: you are right, it works, however I cannot conceptualize it in your terms.

K: I don't want - you see, you have introduced concepts. That means you are...

Q: But I have said that it works, sir.

K: When you make a concept you are not listening.

Have you given up your (?), have you given up your principles, ideals, and concepts, which are all habits. Right? Give one up

easily. Try and see what happens.

Q: Sir, when we give up concepts, what you speak would be just sounds for our ears, we would have no way of understanding what you say.

K: One has explained very carefully how concepts are formed, ideas are formed. The speaker makes a statement, and from that statement you draw a conclusion. You don't listen to the statement without conclusions. Just listen. That's one of our habits, which is, you listen to something, instantly you form an idea, a conclusion. Now, break that habit, which means listen. Now I will make a statement, and please listen, don't make an abstraction of it, an idea of it, or say, how am I to do it, just listen. Which is, when sorrow ends completely there is love. Don't draw a conclusion, don't say what do you mean by sorrow, what do you mean by ending - you follow, all that, just listen and find out why you form a conclusion, which is a habit. So you have wandered away from the act of listening.

The question was put: can tradition, culture co-exist with a religious life? We went into that very carefully. We said, culture, tradition, cannot possibly exist with a religious mind. If one is to find out what is truly a religious life one must abandon totally tradition, totally any form of culture as it is understood. Which means, I have a free mind, the mind that is not caught in Christianity, in Buddhism, in Hinduism, Islam, or some other sect or guru, none of that. That means total freedom. And in that freedom there is tremendous energy because there is no conflict, struggle, nothing. Right, sirs.

## **MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 13TH JANUARY 1979 'WHAT IS A RELIGIOUS MIND?'**

I would like to talk, if I may, this evening, about a religious mind. And before we communicate with each other about it I think it would be wise and necessary to go over a little bit what we have been talking about during these last four talks here. I think it is fairly obvious for most people who are at all aware of the events that are going on in the world that there is general degeneration. Though there is vast incredible technological advancement, man has, if I may use the word advance, he has advanced very little. And as one observes the decline of human capacity, affection, love, and all the essential things of human nature are gradually declining. And one can see in every country that one goes to that this is taking place. And the problems that human beings have, everyday problems, not some fantastical, romantic, sentimental problems, but actual daily problems of relationship, of hunger, of beliefs, dogmas and rituals, and intimate relationships or otherwise, are again on the decline.

And when one observes all this in different parts of the earth, all these problems are not of any particular country but it is a global problem, the problem of all mankind. And so our approach must be surely not sectarian, not nationalistic, or a class, or a particular dogma, or communism, socialism or any other political endeavour, but one has to find now a global answer, a global outlook, a global action.

And we were saying too that every human being throughout the world is the representative of all other human beings. This is not an

intellectual concept to be accepted and worked at, but a reality, an actual fact - fact being that which is taking place now. And every human being goes through extraordinary agonies, loneliness, misery, confusion, every form of dishonesty, both political, religious and otherwise. And as it is not an intellectual concept, an idea, but a reality that must be not intellectually grasped but to be understood with one's heart, with one's mind, with one's whole being. And so every human being is the rest of the world and therefore he is the world. His consciousness modified is the rest of the world. And so when one particular human being transforms himself so radically, deeply, fundamentally, then he does affect the whole consciousness of mankind. Again this is fairly obvious. There was a Hitler who affected the whole of mankind, he was crazy, whatever you like, but he has affected mankind. So has Karl Marx, so has Buddha, and so on. So one human being, you, brings about psychological transformation, psychological revolution that brings about a change totally in consciousness, which affects the consciousness of mankind. We went into all this very carefully.

And we were talking also about desire, fear and pleasure, as perhaps the major causes of our confusion, contradiction and conflict, which we talked about last Sunday, if I remember rightly. And we said also, if one may again point out, that we are thinking together, not arguing together, not offering one opinion against another, not one particular dogma against another, but rather as two friends may talk over their problems, we, you and the speaker, are investigating, examining, not accepting, nor rejecting, the examination of our whole existence as human beings; why we human beings live the way we are living, with our confusion,

sorrow, misery and all the rest of it, why we accept our daily life of conflict, struggle, in our relationships, why we dominate each other and so on. We went into all this.

And I think, if one may, this afternoon, go into the whole question of what is a religious mind. Would that be all right? I am glad you approve. That is not a sarcastic remark but I am glad you want to go into it.

First of all in understanding this problem, what is a truly religious mind, we must grasp the significance of the word, the meaning of the word, and realize that the word is not the thing. The word 'tree' is not the actual thing that is there, nor the description of what is a religious mind - which we are going to explore today and tomorrow. The description of it, the verbal explanation of it is not the described, is not the actual fact. But words are necessary to communicate. And we all perhaps understand English. We are using words without any slogans or jargons, but ordinary words with which one is quite familiar.

So we are talking over together, examining together, investigating together, not that I investigate and you listen, and agree or disagree with the investigation, which would be absurd. Whereas if we could go together and explore this extraordinary question, which has haunted man throughout the ages: what is religion, what is a mind that can hold, or understand, or comprehend the beauty of a profoundly religious mind. Because every form of political organization has failed, they have not solved the problems, human problems. The politicians are seeking power, position, they are not at all concerned, though they pretend with us, with other human beings. Nor have religious organizations

ended man's suffering, his agonies, the wars, the appalling chaos that is spreading throughout the world, semi anarchy. On the contrary religions have separated man with their beliefs, dogmas, rituals and all that nonsense. When I use the word 'nonsense' it means no sense.

And I believe historically a new culture can only come about with a different religion - rather a new culture only can be born out of a religious mind. And cultures throughout the world are degenerating, disappearing. So religion - which we are going to examine the word and the whole sequence of it - religion becomes extraordinarily important.

And again scientists have not solved any of our human anxieties, human relationships. So when one observes all the things that the intellect has brought about, it has only brought greater misery, greater confusion. Which is again obviously taking place.

So we are together going to examine not only this afternoon but tomorrow afternoon, what is a religious mind. I am not going to do all the work, you are going to join me. You have to work too. That is, we are challenging, demanding, asking, challenging the brain, the mind, the whole nature of our mind, what is a religious person.

The word 'religion' - one has looked up various dictionaries, and they more or less say, originally, etymologically, the meaning, Latin, Greek and so on, the meaning was to bind. But many of the etymologists have denied that. Now they are saying religion implies, the meaning implies gathering all your energy to discover - they don't say what. Gathering all your energy. And we are saying, gathering all your energy to discover what truth is, if there is anything sacred in life - not the temples, churches, mosques, they

are not sacred, they are illusions created by thought. But there must be freedom, complete psychological freedom to find out, or to come upon that thing that is wholly, completely, irrevocably sacred, not invented by thought, by man. So that is the meaning of the word 'religion'.

And the word 'mind' includes not only the sensory activities, all the emotional reactions, the images - I hope you are following all this - the images, the beliefs, the anxieties, the intellectual capacity to reason logically, reasonably, or unreasonably, to be caught in illusion and to see that one is caught in an illusion and to be free of that illusion - all that is the mind. Right? Right sir? When we talk of the mind it includes the brain, which is very, very, very old, ancient, beyond memory, and the brain which has been conditioned upon millenia upon millenia. The genetic conditioning and the cultural conditioning, the social, religious conditioning. That is the brain, which contains all the genetic memories, the experiences, the knowledge of man's existence on this earth. Which again is an obvious fact.

And the tradition, the values, the beliefs, the dogmas, the concepts, handed down from generation to generation is part of that brain, is part of that mind. All the knowledge which you have acquired recently, or throughout the immemorial past, all that is part of the mind. So we are using the word 'mind' to convey a holistic, a whole process of the past, with its tradition, with its culture, with its rituals, with all the things man has collected.

So we are using religion and the mind. We have explained through words what the speaker means by religion and the mind. And we are asking, or rather challenging: what is a religious mind?



You are challenging it, I am not challenging, I am not pushing you into a corner to answer. After all existence, living, is a constant process of challenge. You can duck, or run away, or answer it along a particular cultural tradition. But when you answer according to tradition or culture, or environment, then that answer will be very limited. So we are saying, we are asking, we are challenging each other to discover, to find out by careful observation, by careful examination, by investigating 'what is' and whether 'what is' can be totally transformed.

Revolution means gathering together certain incidents, concepts, beliefs, and forming a circle, which is - are you following all this? No, no. Physical revolution, either the French or the Communist and so on, are the result of incidents, accidents, concepts, ideas, conclusions, forming a circle. And that is what is called revolution. I'll explain what I mean. Are you interested in all this? Because it is very exercising of our brains because it is part of our life, because they are all talking about revolutions. Generally what they mean by revolution, the terrorists, even the idealists and the Communists, if they are really serious Communists and not totalitarian slaves, but people who are talking, investigating into what is revolution, it generally means working along concepts, conclusions, conclusions drawn from incidents, social, environmental, religious, political and thus forming a circle. That is the circle begins and then come back to the same thing. Right, you are following? You start. This is so obvious, isn't it, must I explain all this? You start, saying, Capitalism, or Socialism is wrong. Draw a conclusion, concepts, and work it out, and then bring people to accept that, which inevitably, bureaucratically becomes the same

thing it was before, which is going round in a circle. Though, if you are interested in all that, I used to have a great many Communist friends at one time, their idea was thesis, antithesis, synthesis. And from synthesis, antithesis and climb, climb, climb, change. Always intellectual concepts, based on intellectual conclusions and therefore intellect being only a part of our whole mind, such intellectual action must inevitably be divisive, contradictory, destructive. We are talking about revolution not in that sense at all. We are talking about revolution in which man, the psychological structure of man is radically, fundamentally transformed. That is the only revolution. The physical revolution cannot bring about the solutions, the ending of man's utter misery. Again this is proven when you examine all the revolutions. Going round and round in circles, coming to the same point only different people in different positions.

So we are asking, challenging each other, and I hope you are challenging yourself, I am not challenging you, the world is challenging, your husband, your wife - of course the gurus dare not challenge you. The world is challenging you, the things that are in the world demanding a real answer. And you can't impose on this challenge your own particular ideas. Right?

So let's proceed to examine together, think together, what is the nature of a mind that is profoundly religious, because religion is the only solution. You see there is so much to investigate, to go into, one doesn't know quite where to begin. All right, I've got it. Either you perceive purely the whole nature and structure of the mind instantly. I mean by that the nature and the structure. We are using the word 'structure' to mean movement. Structure means

movement in the dictionary. So the nature of the mind and the movement that is going on. Not my description of the mind, not my word of the mind, but the operation of your mind, the nature of it, the quality of it, the depth of it, the superficiality of it, whether it lives on opinions, words, superficial reactions, whether it is being driven by a motive, whether the motive be enlightenment or sex or money or power, or wanting to retain what you have. So we are asking, challenging, what is the nature and the movement of a religious mind. Right? Obviously to investigate the nature of such a mind, the mind that is whole, that is sacred, that is totally free, to enquire into it one must begin with having freedom otherwise you can't enquire. Any form of investigation demands that the mind observe either microscopically, or observe the whole human activity outside there, or inside, there must be freedom to look. Right?

Freedom. That is not the freedom that has an opposite. You understand? Do you understand what I am saying, what I am trying to explain. A prisoner demanding freedom while in prison is absolutely meaningless. He can imagine it. There is only freedom when he leaves the prison. Now most of us are caught in the prison of ourselves. And to enquire into one of the most ancient demands of man, which is - what is it to have a religious quality of mind - and to enquire into that you must have freedom to look. Which means you don't belong to any religion. Right? You are neither a Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, Christian, with all their dogmas, images, all the rest of it. You don't belong to a thing to examine what the religious mind is. Right? Are you doing this? You understand, sir, this is a very serious thing to be gone into, it isn't just a thing to be

played around, not made into a philosophy, which is a bundle of theories, concepts. A religious person has no philosophy because such a mind is with that which is eternally sacred.

So that is the first requirement if you are interested to examine into the question of the mind that is religious; the first thing is in an investigation of any kind, freedom is utterly important. You can't investigate in freedom now and go back to your temple. You cannot possibly go back to your tradition, to your rituals, to your puja, all that thing that goes on, this vast circus that goes on in the name of religion. Now that is the first thing if you are at all serious, not to belong to any organization, to any sect, group, community, because to enquire you mustn't be tied. It is like a donkey tied to a tether, or hobbled, it can't go very far. So that is the first thing if you are really serious, because there is no guru, no scripture, no ritual, nothing, in order to find out. It doesn't mean that one becomes lonely. It doesn't mean that you have to stand by yourself against the current. Because mankind is going in that one direction, tradition, accepting the culture they live in, the appalling things that are happening around them, they accept that. And when you break away from that you might feel that you have isolated yourself. You break away from that because that is illusion, that will never under any circumstances lead to truth. And the very observation is the operation of intelligence that says that is false. When you see that which is false, the seeing, the perception is the operation of intelligence.

Now we will have to again explain what the word 'intelligence' means. Are we all communicating with each other, or am I talking and you are just listening? I mean by the word - I won't go into the

etymological meaning - not only to read between the lines, between the two printed words, but to see that which is behind the word, to understand that which is not written, that which is not said, without distortion. We will go into that as we go along. Because intelligence is the essence of compassion. And there can be no compassion without the ending of sorrow, which we are going to examine as we go along, today and tomorrow.

In this examination, in this enquiry, we will also go into the question of what is meditation. That is part of our ancient tradition.

So we said there must be freedom: freedom to observe, freedom to discover that which is false. Commentators, which is part of the Hindu tradition, the commentators of the Upanishads, the Gita, there are so many commentators, and you read them and they never help you to discover that which is false. So first to understand what is a religious mind there must be freedom. Freedom implies that you are not attached to a thing, but to observe. You have no opinions, no conclusions, no concepts, but mere observation of what is actually going on. Right sir? Will you do that? That is our communication with each other.

Who has created the gods, or only one god, or the representative of god or the god's son, or all the innumerable gods with their goddesses, who has created them, which we call religion - going to the temple, to the mosques, the churches, you know, the whole thing - who has created them? Answer it sir, answer it yourself. Man has obviously created them. Thought has brought this about. God - I am sure he will forgive us, I am only making a joke of it, please - god is the invention of man. There are the Hindu gods opposed to the Christian gods, the Muslim god, but the Buddhist

have no gods but they have their own peculiar Bodhisattvas and so on.

So man has created this out of his sorrow, out of his fear, out of his death, out of his confusion, uncertainty, physical insecurity, out of this matrix the things that we have called gods have been born. And these gods have been handed down from generation to generation. If you reject all that then you create a god of yourself. Are you following all this? Your own concepts, you become an atheist, which is another form of godhood. Or because of your own uncertainty, out of your own sorrow, total insecurity, you want something continuous, something that is timeless, something that knows no death, and out of that longing you create some marvellous image for yourself. And you say, that is reality.

So one has to understand why thought does this all the time. It has done it from time immemorial. You understand sirs? Every tribe has done this. The moment man began to think, he has created the gods in heaven, or on earth, and worshipped an image, or a tree or a stone, made by the hand or by the mind. Do look into yourself because any particular religion, any particular tribal religion is not going to answer, it is not going to be the salvation of man, it has to be a global religion.

So freedom to enquire into that which is false. I am not telling you what is false. The observation of what is going on actually, that which is happening now, and seeing the false or the truth in that which is happening now is to investigate and see that which is illusory and put that aside totally. Right? That is the beginning of freedom.

Then we talked about fear, desire, and the continuous demand

of various forms of pleasure - pleasure of possession, pleasure of status, pleasure of being somebody, pleasure of identification with a country, with a group, with a conclusion, the pleasure of sex, the pleasure of one's own experience, and living that experience - and ending fear, because a mind that is clouded with fear can never be religious. You understand? Obviously. How can a mind that is frightened, that says, "I must find some comfort out of my insecurity, out of my confusion"? As long as a mind is frightened it cannot possibly have the religious quality of a mind. Right sirs? Which means in the enquiring are you free of fear? Otherwise you cannot possibly have a mind that is the essence of religion. Because desire, fear and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure not only creates, brings about confusion, but also those are the elements, the qualities, that make up the self, the 'me', the centre from which all activities begin. So it does not mean that you cannot enjoy the sound of that bird, it does not mean that you cannot look at a beautiful sunset, or the sky through the leaves. That is not pleasure. The looking at the sky through the leaves, which is a delight, which is a sense of great depth and beauty, it takes place in the instant and when that is over thought comes along and says, "What a marvellous thing that is to have had. I want more of it." Then the 'more' is the pleasure, not the actual moment of the perception of something beautiful, lovely. You understand all this? Not understand verbally, in your heart you do it.

And also to understand the nature and the structure, which is the movement of a religious mind, obviously must end sorrow. I do not know - one does not know if you have gone into this question at all. Because man has carried this burden of sorrow for millenia.

And we still have it. Every human being throughout the world goes through the agony of tears, loneliness, grief, the ending of something. And every human being is caught in it and doesn't know how to put it away completely, totally. Religions haven't solved this. They said, "Think about God and forget yourself", or "The son of God, he sacrificed, he suffers for you therefore you don't suffer". You know all the religious games they play.

So we are asking, you are asking whether sorrow can end, as fear? Because fears is part of sorrow. And desire is part of sorrow. And if you go into the whole question of the whole movement of pleasure it is also part of this sorrow. Only we want pleasure and avoid the other. So we are asking, can this sorrow end, not only your particular sorrow, but the sorrow of mankind? Mankind's sorrow which is poverty, the utter degradation of poverty, class division, the constant uncertainty of life, the imminent wars, the destruction, the brutality of wars, man has never stopped wars. You understand sirs, all this? So there is not only your particular little agony but also the agony of the whole of mankind of which you are a part. So we have to resolve this. Without the resolution of it there is no religious mind, because when there is the ending of that sorrow something else comes into being - which is not a promise from me.

So we have to enquire whether sorrow can end. Which is, can fear end? Now we will go into it, bearing in mind the words are not the fact. The word 'sorrow' is not the agony that one has inside. And the description, however great, however subtle, however magnified, that description is the not the actual fear. Because we also have to understand the whole meaning of death because that is



part of our life - the ending of the brain cells, the ending of everything that one has collected, gathered, held on.

Are you all waiting for me to answer, go into all this? What is sorrow? What is your sorrow? Don't answer it to me. Can you find out what your sorrow is? Is it loneliness? Is it that you have not been able to identify yourself with something or other? Is it that you have lost somebody whom you loved, or had a great affection, or companionship? Is it that you cannot have the power, the position, the prestige of someone who has? Please examine all this for yourself. Is it that you want happiness and you can't have it? You want to be loved and nobody loves you? Sir, you understand? Is it that you want to achieve some extraordinary status and you know that you have not the capacity, the brains, the essential activity, and you cry?

Now please listen. Either you take one sorrow after another, one grief after another, one particular grief and resolve it but in the resolution of it another grief arises. You understand this? Or can you observe the whole nature of this sorrow as a whole? You understand? Not a particular sorrow, because the particular can never lead to the whole, the particular is the broken piece, the broken piece is not the whole. So can you see the truth of that: the particular cannot possibly lead to the whole. And you may investigate each particular hoping thereby to come to the end of sorrow, and that is an impossible thing to do because one sorrow leads to another. Right? I wonder if you understand all this?

So can you observe the whole nature, the whole movement of sorrow? That is, to observe wholly. I mean by that word 'wholly' not only to have a very clear, logical, sane mind, sane observation,

logical, clear, precise, and that precision is not diluted by your prejudice, by your longing, by your motive, so that you can observe without any distortion. Which means, can you put aside your opinions, your conclusions, or the commentator's conclusion, or the Gita's, the Upanishad's, the Bible's, put away all those conclusions, concepts, and to observe wholly the whole movement of man's agony and sorrow. You understand? Through the particular to come to the whole is false. Right? So when you see that which is false, that falls away. The very falling away of it, the disappearing, or non-existent, the very perception of the false is the beginning of intelligence. It is this intelligence, not yours, or mine, or a particular intelligence, this seeing that which is true, and that which is false - not the truth according to your conclusion, according to your prejudice, according to your tradition. You must be free of all that.

So can you observe not only your sorrow but the sorrow of mankind of which you are a part, as a whole; the sorrow of a person who is physically ill, and the sorrow of a person who doesn't believe in anything? And that person who doesn't believe in anything is the same as the man who believes. Don't agree with me, please, this is very, very serious, it is your life.

Now in the same way as we talked about it the other day, fear; can you observe not a particular fear but the root of fear? We said the root of fear is time, time is thought, thought is fear. Right? We went into that very carefully the other day. And in the same way this enormous burden of man which is called sorrow, can it ever end? The moment you have a motive that it must end in order to have something else, then you are lost. So in observation of this

question of sorrow there is no motive. You understand? So when there is a motive - motive means movement - when there is a self-interested movement there is distortion in observation. Right? So when there is no motive in your examination of this enormous burden which man has carried then is that sorrow different from you? You understand? No, please sir, look at it, go into it. You understand? As you are fear, as you are angry, as you are jealous - jealous is not different from you, your greed is not different from you, that's our tradition - not mine - tradition says, you are different from you greed, therefore battle with it, fight it, control it. So we are saying quite the opposite: anger is you. Only when there is a moment of anger, anger being violence and all that, at the moment of anger there is neither you but that reaction. Then thought identifies itself with that reaction, saying, that's anger, I have been angry. Therefore thought separates itself from that thing which is called anger. I hope you are following all this. We went into it.

So we are saying, the observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience, and sorrow is not different from himself. You understand? When that takes place, that there is no division between you and that which you are observing, that is the observer is the observed, the man who has tears, or the woman who cries, is that sorrow himself. You understand? That sorrow is not separate from himself or herself. When there is no division, the very observation of that brings about a radical change in that which is being observed.

So is there an observation of sorrow without the observer? You understand what I am saying? I lose my son and I am lost. It is a shock, I am paralysed for the moment. Then I realize I have lost

something which I have treasured, which I have held, with which I have identified myself, my son. So sorrow is the loss of that. And so I then ask, please help me to get rid of my sorrow. Or, I will meet my son next life. You follow? The avoidance and the escape from what is actually going on. The observation of what is actually going on - when one loses a son, or a husband, or wife, anything, that which is actually going on, in the observation of that, if there is no division, when the observer is the observed, then in that observation that which is being observed undergoes a radical, fundamental change. Test it out!

Because in our enquiry into what is a religious life any form of fear, any form of the activity of will, which is the essence of desire, any form of seeking pleasure, will distort your observation - distort not your, observation.

So we are saying there is an ending to sorrow. And when there is an ending to sorrow out of that comes passion, not lust, passion being compassion. So a religious mind, we are enquiring, we are not learning, we are not memorizing, you understand. The sacred books - no, I won't call them sacred - the books say, your traditional books say, the perfect man who has attained enlightenment is this, this, this character, that character, he is that kind, etc., it gives a complete description of what the enlightened man is. But the description is not the described, so you can throw away all those books. But to find out for yourself there must be freedom - freedom from fear. And pleasure is totally different from the perception of something beautiful, marvellous, a lovely sky, or a single star in the heavens, or a single tree in a field. There is in that a great beauty, great love, great joy. But when thought takes

over that joy it becomes pleasure.

So we are saying there is a total ending of fear and when there is the ending of that fear there is no illusion whatsoever. And with the ending of sorrow there is passion, there is that extraordinary sense of tremendous energy. Not the energy to do more mischief but the energy of this great limitless intelligence of compassion.

And we have to stop now because it is time. And we have also to go into the whole question of death, and what is meditation, because in the understanding of that the religious mind comes into being. The religious mind comes into being when we understand the whole human existence of relationship in which there is no fear, no domination, no control, when we know what love is, then there is love. We will go into that tomorrow, because love has no remembrance, love is not the movement of desire, love is not the activity of pleasure. That's why it is so essential to understand all this because we have lost that thing, probably we never had it, that thing called love. Right sirs.

# MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 14TH JANUARY 1979

I would like if I may to talk about a great many things this afternoon, and if we can together go into something very simple, but very, very complex. First we are going to, together - please bear in mind always together, I am not just going by myself galloping along - we are going into the question of if it is possible to keep the brain very young probably this has never been tackled by the scientists or by the gurus or by the religious people. I don't know, they may have, but I don't know. I would also like to go into the question of continuity and advancement and death; and whether it is possible for human beings in our ordinary daily life, to have a full heart, to know, to be aware, to have in their consciousness the quality of love. And also if we have time, to go into the question of meditation - a mind that is in meditation, not what is meditation or how to meditate, but the nature of a mind that is wholly involved in meditation. Meditation when it is done consciously, deliberately, is no meditation at all. We will go into all these things, if we can, this afternoon.

So, first of all, we are going to talk over together whether the brain, which is part of the whole mind, with its capacity to think, to store up a great deal of information, knowledge, experience from generation after generation, millennia after millennia, whether that brain, so heavily conditioned and so constantly wearing itself out, whether the brain can rejuvenate itself. That is a very complex problem, you understand the question first, because I am sure, one is sure, this question has been asked in different ways probably, but

one has never gone into it deeply. And if we can be, at least for ten minutes serious giving your deep attention, not to what I am saying, not what the speaker is describing or going into, but we are together taking a journey into the whole business of this brain, which is so very old, which is so extraordinarily capable, which has infinite capacities, which through time has evolved, acquiring a great deal of experience, knowledge, and whether such a brain, yours, not mine, yours, can unburden itself of a continuity and end continuity to begin totally anew. I don't know if you are following all this.

The scientists with whom the speaker has talked a great deal, they maintain there are two parts of the brain - the left and the right. The left holding all the information, knowledge, technological, and the whole knowledge and the active process; and the other, the right, is new, not too conditioned, and the not too conditioned brain moving forward and shaping or controlling or driving the left. You understand all this? I am not a brain specialist, nor have I read all these books, but one can observe something quite different, which is the totality of the brain, not the left or the right, but the quality of the brain that has been evolved through various experiences, through various cultures, through various racial limitations, through various social, economic pressures. This brain is an extraordinary instrument. And whether that brain which controls all our thinking, all our activities, all our sensory operations and so on, whether that brain can become totally innocent. I am using the word 'innocent', please carefully, not the Christian idea of innocence, the lamb and all the rest of it, but we are using the word 'innocent' in the sense, it comes from the Latin,

'not to hurt'. Not to hurt, that is, a brain that is capable of not only not hurting others, but also not being able to be hurt. You understand?

Please don't merely agree with words. Go into it. Observe your own mind, your own brain, because we are going into something very, very subtle, very difficult and unless you are observing it yourself, you will miss the whole thing. You have to do it, you have to work with the speaker, not just listen and pass by. We are asking a very, very serious question. We are challenging the brain itself to find out whether it has the capacity, the energy, the drive, the intensity to break down this continuity of the past with all its accumulated experience and in the very ending of it, the very brain cells themselves undergo a change, a transformation. You understand my question? Please understand the question first before you agree or disagree. I wish there were only a few people with whom I could discuss.

Thought is a material process, because thought is the outcome of memory, experience, knowledge stored up in the brain, in the brain cells themselves - we will keep it to the brain, that's good enough. And it has functioned in a particular direction continuously evolving, evolving and thought is a material process. Of that there is no doubt, because memory is part of the brain; brain is material. And this brain contains the memory, the experience, the knowledge, from which comes thought. So thought is a material process and thought has its continuity because thought is based on knowledge which is the past. The past is operating all the time, modifying itself in the present and continuing, so there is a continuous movement which is the movement of brain. You are



following all this? I'll go on. And in that continuity the brain has found security. Watch it yourself. A continuous tradition - values, opinions, judgements, evaluations, conclusions and so on - a continuous tradition which conditions the brain and that continuity is in time, a duration, so in that duration, in that continuity, the brain has found security. You are following all this? Watch it yourself, sir, because this is your life, for god's sake, not my life. Watch it yourself. So in this continuity it has found an immense sense of being safe, because the brain can only function when it is completely safe; either safe in a belief, safe in an illusion, safe in certain kinds of knowledge. This is what is happening to us. So the brain needs security. That is clear. You can watch it yourself, your own operation of thought, the movement of thought. Any disturbance in that continuity, either the brain becomes neurotic, when it is profoundly shaken - trauma as it is called; or when there is a great challenge, and when it cannot respond properly, then as it cannot respond properly, it finds its continuity in which it has sought in security is disturbed. You are following all this? Watch it. It is so obvious. When you go into it very carefully this becomes very simple.

So we are asking, whether a brain, which is your brain, which is the brain of all human beings evolved through immemorial time, conditioned by cultures, religions, by economic, social pressures, that brain has had a timeless continuity till now, and in that duration it has found a sense of being safe. That is why you accept tradition. Because in tradition there is safety, in imitation there is safety, in conformity there is safety, and there is also safety in an illusion. Obviously all your gods are illusions put up by thought.

So there is not only the obvious continuity, in which the brain seeks safety, but also it finds safety in all kinds of illusory activities in our daily life. Which is a belief or faith is an illusion. There is no need for belief or faith, but having a faith in God, in Jesus, in Krishna or whatever you like to call it and in that faith, in that belief, in that devotion, there is a sense of being protected, being in the womb of god, which is an illusion. So we are asking now, whether the brain can discover an ending of this continuity of time, because the continuity of time is considered advancement, progress, evolution, evolution based on the continuity of knowledge. And we are challenging that.

So we have to consider what is death. Please don't be stimulated by the speaker, because if you are stimulated by the speaker then when you leave the place your stimulation disappears. But if you are actually partaking in this challenge, in this movement, then it is yours, it will be abiding, it will stay. But if you are being stimulated, it's like taking a drug, whisky or whatever you take, it will stimulate for the time being, but it disappears. So please don't be stimulated by the speaker. If you are stimulated by the speaker then you will depend on him, then he becomes the authority, and your beastly little guru, and I am not your guru because this demands that you be a light to yourself, not the light of another.

So, we have to go into the question, because that is part of the brain, death. Death means total ending, and the destruction of the brain. Because the oxygen cannot go into the brain, and all the rest of it. Death implies an ending, ending to a continuity of life, the life which you now lead, your life, and opposed to living, the ending.

So first one has to examine the continuity of what we call living, and the ending of it which we call death. And to examine this, any form of fear, any form of opinion, judgement, evaluation has no value. We have to examine 'what is', the 'what is' of your life, your everyday life. That is a fact. And man throughout the ages has clung to this continuity - the continuity of life, the life that he leads, hoping next life will be a better opportunity, be born in a palace, or have more money, more beautiful and all that kind of stuff. So we are asking something very clear, which is, not only to observe, to examine what we call living, which is our relationship, our ambitions, our greed, our desire for power, status, anxiety, fear, pleasure, sorrow, attachment, detachment, the battle between the opposites, the contradictions. That is our life, with all the gods, superstitions, all that, the ideals, hoping one day we will all be brothers. That is our daily living and that has had a continuity, generation after generation. Please watch it, it is extraordinary what we are doing.

And what is the meaning of death, and what is the meaning of living? We have put death in opposition to life. So there is a fear of what we call living and avoiding or putting as far away as possible what we call death. So continuity in time, continuity in our sorrow, continuity in our fear, continuity in our attachments - please follow all this carefully - and when that attachment is disturbed, broken down, again another continuity, another attachment. Continuity implies time. Right? Time is the movement of thought. Time means movement. From here to there takes time, or psychologically to reach from that which is not beautiful to that which is beautiful. So the movement of continuity is time, and this

movement is thought. Right? And that is our life, your life, not the idealistic life, not the life in heaven, or Moksha, or liberation, or the ideal of a non-violent life and all the inventions that thought has created in order to escape from actuality, from the actual daily living.

So, we are asking whether that living, with all its confusion, all that, can end to find out what death is. You have understood? Right sir? I'll show it to you. Go slow.

We are attached to a house, a person, to a belief, to a conclusion, to a concept, to an ideal and so on. We are attached. Analytically you are attached because inwardly you are desperately lonely, and being lonely you want something to escape from this sense of total isolation. That is called loneliness. You must have experienced it, you must have known it, if you have at least observed a little bit. And so you get attached to something, generally a person, an ideal or an experience which you have had.

Now, attachment implies continuity, does it not? The very word implies a duration. When you use the word 'relationship', having a relationship with my wife, one's wife or one's husband, the very dependence, attachment implies time, a duration. Are you following all this? Is this getting a little difficult? Thank goodness. Right sir, verbally you may be following, but the word is not the thing. The description is not the described. Please bear that in mind all the time, that the word is not the thing and if you are caught in the word, you will miss the real thing. That's what you have done. That's part of the intellect that enjoys the stimulation of words and clings to that stimulation and from that intellectual operation, you have created such havoc in the world. The intellect is only a part,

not the whole. When the part dominates, there must be division, there must be cruelty, there must be violence and that is what the intellect has done in the world. The intellect has invented the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, the Muslim, the Jew, the Arab and they are at each others throats. And because we have given such importance to the intellect, it has brought about great misery in this world, which does not mean we all must become dull. On the contrary, we are pointing out when the intellect is only a part and when that dominates, there must be decay, degeneration, which is what is going on in the world.

Now we are saying attachment, the very word implies a sense of permanency, a sense of continuity, a quality of duration, and in that time, duration, we hope to have a constant companionship, wholly, safety. Death says to you 'end it'. That is what death means - end your attachment completely because that is what is going to happen when you stop breathing. You are going to leave everything behind. It is like the rich man said, 'At least I can have it till the last moment'. Right? So, please watch it.

Can you know the implication and the consequences of attachment, to a house, to property, to your wife, to a belief, to a concept, to a conclusion, to an opinion, to a god - attachment? Can you see the implications of it is fear, jealousy, anxiety, you may get lost and so on, so on? Can you, listening now, end your attachment completely? Now, you won't shake your heads. That is the test and you are unwilling to test it out.

So, we are saying the brain, when it has continuity, it becomes mechanical. And all thought is then mechanical. There is no new thought, because all thought is based on memory which is the

response of knowledge and so on. So there is no new thought.

So death implies the ending of attachment. It is only in the ending there is a beginning. Do you understand? This is something serious, don't play with words. Because, the moment there is an ending, something new takes place. But if there is continuity, there is nothing, there is nothing new under the sun. And it is very important, this ending, because it is only then the brain can discover for itself a quality of movement that is totally not in the past. I wonder if I am explaining all this. Right? Are you following? Are we communicating with each other a little bit?

So death implies the ending, not only the physical organism, but all the things that man has accumulated. If it does not end, there is this whole question, what happens to the mind, to the whole movement of consciousness, not yours or mine, consciousness of man, what happens to that? You understand my question? No, you don't. You see, one has to explain every little thing, you don't capture it. Sir, our daily life is like a vast river - watch it - like a vast river, and the whole human living is like that in which there is all these complexities, problems, pain, sorrow, anxiety. Everything is that river of which we are a part. When the part dies, the stream goes on. The manifestation of the stream is you, with your name, quality and so on, but you are still part of this stream. Are you following? Part of the stream. And we are saying the ending of that stream, you follow, moving totally away from that stream, never belonging to that stream, because that stream is conflict, confusion, pain, attachment, detachment, what is right, you follow, this battle that is going on. So we are saying while you are living, conscious, alive, full of your mischief, or your activities, all that, see that the

ending of something voluntarily, not with a motive, ending voluntarily attachment is the beginning of something totally new. You've got it? Because the 'I', the 'me' is a continuity. The 'I' has been not only genetically, from millennia handed down, generation after generation, it is a continuity, and that which is continuous is mechanical, there is nothing new in it. Right? You see it. It is marvellous if you get into this.

Now there is another point, another thing. There is continuity as long as the brain - please listen quietly, don't agree, just listen - as long as the brain is registering. Right? You are following this? As long as I am registering the hurts, the pain, the brain is registering all this, and that gives it a continuity. That gives the idea that 'I am continuing', and that continuity is considered a progressive diminution, gradually ending the 'I'. You follow? As long as the brain registers, like a computer, it is mechanical. When you are insulted or praised, it is registering and millennia after millennia it has registered. You follow? That is our conditioning, that is our whole progressive movement. Now we are asking is it possible, please listen to the question first, is it possible not to register except that which is relevant, and nothing else? You understand this? Why should one register when you are hurt, why should you register when somebody insults or flatters? I am asking why? And when you register, when the brain registers, that registration prevents the observation of the other who has insulted. That is, you observe the person who has insulted you or praised you, with the registered mind, brain, so you never see him actually. You are following what I am saying? Oh, come on sirs. Your brain registers again. This registration is a continuity and in that continuity there

is safety. It says I have been hurt once and therefore I'll register it, keep it and therefore avoid being hurt, both physically and psychologically. Physically it is relevant, but psychologically, is it relevant? Do you understand my question? One has been hurt. One has been hurt because the hurt is the movement of time which is the building up of the image you have about yourself and when that image is pricked, you are hurt. And as long as you have that image you are going to be hurt always. So is it possible not to have the image and therefore no registration? You are following all this?

Please listen carefully. We are laying the foundation to discover what is meditation. Because if you have fear, do what you will, there is no meditation. If you are nationalistic, if you are ambitious, if you are greedy, this or that, you can stand on your toes for the rest of your life, you will never know what meditation is. That is why we said very carefully from the very beginning of these talks, the understanding of ourselves is part of this meditation; the understanding of sorrow, pain, fear, anxiety, so that the mind, your consciousness with all its content is being washed out. So we are asking, is it possible not to register psychologically, but only register what is not only necessary but relevant? Because when you have established order, when there is order in our life, which we went into very carefully the other day, when there is order there is freedom. It is only the disordered mind that seeks freedom. When there is total order, then that very order is freedom. And we are saying, is it possible only to register knowledge for functioning. Please listen to this. Work it out with me. Register the relevant necessary knowledge to live an orderly life in the ordinary sense - going to the office, driving a car, recognition of your wife and



husband, recognition of your name and so on, knowledge that is relevant, that is necessary. Now we are saying, psychologically, inwardly there is no necessity or anything relevant to be registered. Is this possible? You understand sir? Intellectually, logically you can see this, or verbally, but to bring, to come upon this, to see this happening in life, that is quite a different matter. I am going to go into it if I may, because I have so many things I wish to talk about that I wish I could talk to you every day. But I can't. And probably you wish that I couldn't!

So, first of all to go into this very deeply, one has to understand the nature of your consciousness. I am sorry to make it all so difficult, it isn't. What is your consciousness? Have you ever asked yourself? Your consciousness is its content. Without its content it is not. Right? You see this? Come on sir. Help me out. So the content makes up our consciousness. The content is our tradition, our anxiety, our name, our position. You follow? The content is that and that is our consciousness. And thought is dissatisfied with this consciousness and says there must be super-consciousness, above all this. But that movement from the below to the upper is still the movement of thought. Thought is a material process. Therefore, it is still part of this consciousness. You understand, have you understood it? It is part of this consciousness, though thought says there is infinite consciousness, cosmic consciousness, the highest consciousness. It is still within the field of this consciousness which has its continuity and the continuity is its content. Right? See this even verbally, intellectually, it is good enough. And this consciousness has its continuity, attachment, all the rest of it.

So, we are saying, can this consciousness with all its content, which is part of the brain, which is part of the mind, the mind being brain and all that, mind is part of this consciousness, can this whole consciousness realize its content, realize its duration and take one part of that consciousness as attachment, and end it voluntarily. You understand? That means you are breaking continuity. I wonder if you follow all this. Which means, we are asking is it possible to register only what is necessary, relevant, and nothing else? Understand the beauty of that question, the implications of that question, the depth of that question. I say it is possible. I'll explain, but the explanation is not the fact. Don't be caught up in the explanations. Through the explanation, come to the fact. Then the explanation has no value. The commentators make explanations but they never come to the fact. So we are saying, what has continuity is the movement of time, is the movement of thought, the movement of knowledge from the past, modifying itself in the present and proceeding. That is the whole process of registration, the whole movement of registration of the brain, otherwise we could not have knowledge. So that is the whole movement and we are saying that movement has taken over the psychological field. Because one sees knowledge is necessary, otherwise I could not function, I couldn't talk - I won't begin on talking, that is a different matter, that is tremendously interesting if you want to go into it, but I won't go into it now.

We said knowledge is continuity and the brain has found safety in this continuity and therefore it must register. Right? But knowledge is always limited. There is no omnipotent knowledge. So, the brain, having found security in the movement of

knowledge, clings to it, and translates every incident, accident according to the past. Therefore, the past has tremendous importance to the brain, because the brain itself is the past. And your own intellect says, logically as we have explained, the intellect says - which is a verbal explanation of intellect - the intellect says, I see very clearly that which has continuity has nothing new, there is no new perfume, there is no new heaven, there is no new earth, and so the intellect says, is there an ending of continuity and not bring danger to the brain, you follow, because without continuity it gets lost. So it says, if I end continuity, the intellect says to itself, if I end that continuity what then? The brain demands to be secure, what then? If it can find something in the ending and the beginning, then it says, all right, I have got it, I am safe. You understand? Now the brain has said 'I can only function in security', whether it is false or true security, and continuity has given it security, which is the registration process. Are you following. Registering, that has given it security. And you come along and say to me, to the brain, register only what is necessary, relevant, and don't register anything else. You understand my question. It is suddenly at a loss. It says, what do you mean by it? Because it is functioning out of security, it says, give me security and I will go after it. Do you understand this?

I say there is a security, but not this kind of security, which is, to put knowledge, thought in its right place. Right? The very orderliness of life is possible only when the brain has understood that it is living in disorder, which it calls security. And when it realizes that security implies putting everything in order, which is everything relevant and nothing irrelevant, then the brain says, I

have understood this, I have got it, which is, I have an insight into this whole movement of continuity. Right? You are following? It has an insight. That insight is the outcome of complete order, which is, the brain has put everything in its right place. Then there is total insight into the whole movement of consciousness. And therefore, it means the brain will only register what is necessary and nothing else. Have you got it; you have captured something? In that is implied the activity of the brain undergoes a change, the very structure of the brain undergoes a change, because the seeing something for the first time anew brings a new function to operate. You understand? Sir, your arm, this arm is developed because of its function. Right? So when the brain discovers, sees something new, there is a new function being born, a new organism is taking place. So we are saying, it is wholly necessary for a mind, for a brain to become very young, fresh, innocent, alive, youthful when there is no psychological registration at all.

And we must also go into the question, is love within this consciousness? You understand my question? Has love a continuity? Please listen to the question first. Don't agree or disagree. Just listen to it. We said consciousness is a continuity, tradition, all that. And is love part of this field or entirely outside the field? I am asking, I am challenging. I don't say it is or it is not. We are going into it. Because if it is within the field of our consciousness, it is still part of thought. Right? Because the content of our consciousness is put together by thought - beliefs, gods, superstitions, traditions, all that, fear, is part of thought. And is love part of thought, is part of this consciousness? Which means, is love desire, is love pleasure, sex and all the rest of it? Is love part

of this thought process? Which means, is love a remembrance? You are following all this? Love cannot possibly exist or come into being like the fresh morning dew, if the intellect is supreme. And our civilization has worshipped the intellect. That is, worshipped it because it has created theories - there is Brahman, there is no Brahman, there is god, there is no god, you follow? It has created the principles, the ideals, the supreme one or the supreme double or the supreme triple. So we are asking you, is love part of this stream, this consciousness? Can love exist when there is jealousy? Can love exist when there is attachment to my wife, to my husband, to my children? Can love exist when there is the memory of sexual action, a remembrance, a picture, all that? Has love a continuity? Please go into it. Find out because that thing does not exist in your heart, that is why the world is in such a mess.

To come upon this love, the whole stream of consciousness must come to an end - consciousness being your jealousy, your antagonism, your ambition, your desire for position, your desire for becoming bigger, nobler and all the rest of it, or seeking power. You understand, power, either siddhis, you know, levitation, all that kind of business, or power, position politically, religiously, or power over your wife, husband, your children, all that is implied. Where there is any sense of egotism, the other is not. And the essence of egotism is the process of registration. And we said the other day, yesterday, the ending of sorrow is the beginning of compassion. But we have used sorrow as the means of advancement, becoming better, better, better. On the contrary, the ending, then there is something infinitely new takes place.

Now we can talk about meditation. Don't take postures. Don't

suddenly sit up and say, I am going to meditate. Be comfortable. That is all. Sir, there are several things implied in meditation. First, there must be space, not physical space only, but space within the mind, which means no occupation. You understand this? Because all our minds are occupied. How shall I stop chattering? I must be occupied with having a space. I must be silent. You follow? This occupation like a housewife with her cooking, with her children, like a devotee with his god, a man with his occupation, with his sex, with his job, with his ambition, with his position, the mind is wholly occupied, therefore, there is no space in it. You follow? We have established order in our life, not the order of discipline, control. That is out. But we have established order because we have seen, intelligently we have seen that the order can only come out of the understanding of disorder. We have gone into it. I am not going to go into it.

So we have brought about order in our life, order in our relationship, which is very important, because life is relationship a movement, an action in relationship. If there is no order in your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your children, with your neighbour, whether that neighbour is near or very far, forget about meditation. Because if out of having disorder in your life, you try to meditate, you will fall into the trap of illusions. So that's why we said in these talks, if you have been serious, if you have followed, we have brought about order, absolute order, not temporary order, but absolute order. That order can look to the cosmic order. It has relationship - I mustn't go into it. Just let me go into it a little bit. That order has relationship with the cosmic order. Cosmic order is the setting of the sun, the rising of the moon, the

marvellous sky of the evening with all the beauty. And merely examining the cosmos, the universe through a telescope, is not order. It is order here, in our life. Then that order has an extraordinary relationship with the universe. You understand all this?

So we are saying when a mind is occupied there is no order, there is no space. When the mind is full of problems, how can you have space? So every problem as it arises must be immediately solved first, to have space. Do you understand? That isn't part of meditation, not to carry problems over day after day, day after day. I met the other day a lady who said to me, 'When you were a little boy you hurt me psychologically and I am still carrying that hurt.' Sixty years hurt. Oh, you don't see this. So is it possible not to be occupied, which does not mean irresponsibility. You understand? On the contrary, when you are not occupied, you give your attention to responsibility. It is only the occupied mind that is confused and therefore responsibility becomes ugly, and responsibility then has the possibility of guilt and all that. So please don't ask how not to be occupied. If you say, please tell me a system, a method, all that, then you will be occupied with the system, with the method, with the slogans and all the rest of it. But if you see, if you have an insight, if you see that a mind occupied is a destructive mind, is not a free mind, it has no space, if you see that, it happens.

The next question is attention, inattention and distraction. You follow - attention, inattention, concentration and distraction. Are you getting tired? We are saying there is no distraction at all. Please see that point very carefully. There is no such thing as

distraction. I will explain, I will go into it. When we are attempting to concentrate, only then there is distraction. Right? That is, thought says - listen carefully to this - thought says, I will concentrate on that, the image, the picture, the idea, the word OM or whatever it is, I will concentrate on that and thought is focusing its energy on that. But thought also wanders off and then thought says, that is distraction, I must come back to this. Both are the movements of thought. Are you following all this? So there is no distraction, it is only the movement of thought. Right? And concentration implies enclosure, resistance. So we are saying, where there is concentration, which is thought focusing its energy on a particular thing, image, whatever you want to concentrate on, and in that process of concentration, thought wanders away. And that you call distraction, but the concentration and the movement away is part of thought, is thought. So don't ever say to yourself that I am being distracted, because you eliminate the conflict between concentration and distraction. You are getting what I am talking about? And we are saying if you have understood that, then attention.

To attend - are you attending now? Attend, which means what? If you are really deeply attending, there is no centre from which you are attending. Right? You understand? And that attention cannot, as you would like it to, continue. Right? You are following? The continuity is inattention. Have you understood this? I will explain. When you are attending, which means, listening - I will explain what it means, listening, the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. That is the total movement of attention. In that attention there is no centre that says,



I am learning, I am hearing, I am seeing. There is only this enormous sense of wholeness, which is watching, listening, learning. And in that attention there is no movement of thought. I don't know if you have noticed it. There is no movement of thought. Then that attention cannot be sustained, then thought says, I must find out how to come by, arrive or achieve that attention. This movement away, this movement of wanting to capture that attention is inattention, is lack of attention. You have understood this? Now to be aware, to be aware of this movement away from attention is to be attentive. Have you captured it?

So we said the mind must have great space, limitless space and that can only take place when there is no chattering, when there is no problem, because problems had been resolved, and the movement of the mind in sleep is also quiet, because it is not constantly dreaming, because you are resolving the problems as they arise. I won't go into it, it's too long. So having great space, and you can only have great space when there is no centre. The moment you have a centre, there must be circumference, there must be diameter, a movement from this centre to the periphery. Space implies no centre. Therefore it is absolutely limitless. And we are saying concentration is a distraction of thought. Thought itself is a distraction. And attention implies giving all your energy to listen, to see, in that there is no centre. Then comes a mind that has understood order, and is free of fear, ending sorrow, has understood the nature of pleasure and given its right place and so on. Then the question is what is the quality of a mind that is completely silent? Not how to achieve silence, how to have peace of mind. That is what you all want, a peace of mind, and you will

only have a piece! We are saying the quality of a mind that is absolutely, timelessly silent.

Now there is silence between two notes, there is silence between two thoughts, the silence between two movements, the silence between two wars, there is silence between husband and wife before they begin to quarrel, before they begin to have all kinds of things happen. We are not talking of that kind of quality of silence, because they are temporary, they go away. But we are talking of silence that is not produced by thought, that is not cultivable, that comes only when you have understood the whole movement of existence. And then, there arises, in that there is silence, there is no question and answer, there is no challenge, there is no search, everything has ended. In that silence, if you have come to that, with a great sense of space and beauty and extraordinary sense of energy, then there comes that which is eternally, timelessly sacred, which is not the product of civilization, product of thought. That is the whole movement of meditation.

## **MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 22ND DECEMBER 1979 'THE SEED OF A MILLION YEARS'**

It is a large crowd, and I hope you will understand what I am talking about.

First of all one would like to point out that we are not doing any kind of propaganda for any ideal, for any society, for any organization. We are not trying to convince you of anything. We are not trying to sell you something. But I think we can talk over together, think together, see together, and understand the enormous significance, which we seem to miss, of existence, of our daily life, our miseries, our confusions, our great sorrows, and the corruption that is going on throughout the world. And so please bear in mind, if one may point out again, throughout these talks and discussions, we are together thinking, working.

To think together is one of the most difficult things to do, because each one has his own opinion, his own prejudices, conclusions, and aspirations. And one can never meet another who is free from these, from his superstitions, from his experiences, from his knowledge which he has gathered through books, or some guru. And it is infinitely difficult, except under great crises, that we can come together to think out the problems, not only one's own problems, but the problems of human kind of which we are part.

So if we could begin this evening attempting to think together. Because we are going to go into the question of the whole structure and the nature of the mind, which directs all our lives, which shapes our activities, our specialties, our miseries, our meditations, our innumerable escapes. So, if we can, this evening, think

together.

One is likely to agree to think together about something; about the nation, about oneself, about what organization to belong to, and so on. To think about something is fairly easy because that is comparatively adjustable and easy. But to think together is quite different. I hope you see the point. That is, to think about something and to think together not about something. Right? Can we go on? That means can we together forget our prejudices, put them aside for a while, if you can, perhaps permanently; put aside our experiences, because if you have your experience and you cling to that, and I cling to mine, then we will never meet. If you have your conclusions and another has his, it is impossible to think together. So one has to put aside not only one's experiences, one's knowledge, one's prejudice, one's ideals and superstitions, if you can, then we can talk together, then we can think together, because our minds then, our brains, are meeting. But if we, or each one of us, holds to his point of view because he has read so much, or he is ignorant of books, or he wants a particular answer to his own problem and so on, then it is impossible to think together. Right? I hope you will meet this point.

That is, you and the speaker are thinking together, not about something, but the quality of a mind that is capable of putting aside its own particular points of views and opinions and ideals, and meeting another who has none of those. Then only it is possible to think together without any kind of pressure.

I do not know if you have not noticed that we think together when there is a great crisis like war. When this country is fighting Pakistan or Germany, not this country, another country, then

everybody is together. Because their security, their so-called patriotism, which is nonsense, their flags, which they worship, I don't know why, it is just a piece of coloured cloth, and they are willing to kill each other. And for this they come together. One has seen this all over the world. When there is a great immediate urgent crisis then we drop our own particular selfish arrogance and meet each other. And I hope we can do this not only this evening but throughout the talks, because then we can move together. Then we can touch something that is beyond all knowledge, all words, all experience. And that is after all the essence of religion. Not the organized religions of the world which are merely a lot of superstitions, and make-believe and doctrines and rituals invented by man out of his fear and loneliness; but when one uses the word 'religion', etymologically it is rather doubtful, its origin, but it is generally accepted now that it means, coming together, not physically, coming together to observe, to collect one's energy completely to see, to perceive. And that requires a great diligence, that is great care, not a mind that is negligent. That is, a mind that is capable of investigating, looking, observing, its own structure, its own nature both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the deeper layers of one's mind.

And in this gathering of this total energy is the beginning of a religious life, which demands diligence, not superstition, not all the images that man has created - the temples, the mosques and the churches and the cathedrals. They are marvellous architecturally, the structure, but inside them there is nothing.

So we are thinking together without resistance. You may be Hindus, Muslims, or Christians, or some sect, or belonging to some

guru - I hope you don't. If you do then I am afraid we shall not meet each other, because this is an enquiry into the very depths of the mind, because the mind is the most important thing man has. By the word 'mind' one means not only all the senses, the sensory responses, with their emotions, with their desires, the capacity to discern, to understand, to awaken that intelligence which is not mere book knowledge, or clever argumentation. This is the mind which we all have. Our brains are very, very, very old. Perhaps you are hearing this for the first time, so please don't resist. Not that you must accept, or reject, but in the process of evolution, from time immemorial the brain has collected innumerable experiences, innumerable accidents, incidents, crises, various forms of despair, agony, anxiety, fears, seeking everlastingly security, both outwardly and inwardly; seeking that which may be timeless, which may give a total comprehension of life. This is the result of a million years, which is our brain, our minds. It is not your mind and my mind but the mind. I hope you are all understanding all this. No?

Please, you may not have thought about all this, or enquired into this. Or if you are a neurologist, or a brain specialist, not in the sense of surgery, or pain, but a professor who investigates the brain of an animal, of some other thing but never his own brain. I hope you are understanding all this. He is willing to examine the brains of others, accumulating much knowledge throughout the years, and may be a brain expert. But to understand one's own brain, one's own mind, is much more arduous, demanding infinite, scrupulous attention.

And to go into this, to examine, to understand this nature of our

minds, the very core of it, and whether it is possible to bring about a mutation in the very brain cells themselves. Because unless we do this we are always operating, functioning, moving in the field of the known. Right? Our brain, as we said just now, is the result of a million years. During those time periods it has gathered innumerable experiences; it has suffered, there has been pain, mutilation, wars, despair, a sense of great sorrow. It is all there, of which you may not be conscious, but it is deeply seated there, that is the ground of the brain. You can observe this yourself very simply if you watch yourself. You don't have to study innumerable books. There is a danger in books. There are those people, the worshippers of books, who live according to books. That is, live on other people's knowledge, or experiences, and so they become secondhand people. As most people are.

So together we are going to observe, not what the speaker is saying, but what is actually going on in our brains, in our minds. That is - I hope you are all following this, some of you at least. I am not talking to myself! I can do that walking along the beach, or sitting in one's room, have a dialogue with oneself, which is fun. But here we are together, we are together to find out. To find out first what it means to observe. Not only visually, optically, but also to observe without the word, without the past, which is knowledge, to observe without any kind of distortion. That's the first thing one has to learn: to observe so precisely, so accurately, with a sense of scrupulous honesty. And that is very difficult for some people. Probably they have never been honest with themselves. Probably they have never looked at anything without the word, without the image, without the symbol, which is the memory. Please as the

speaker is talking find out if you can look optically, with your eyes, look at something. And see whether you can observe without the word, without the past impinging on your observation, without the accumulated memories interfering. Can you look at a tree, at the person sitting next to you, at your wife or husband, girl friend or whatever it is, to look and see how extraordinarily difficult it is to observe someone to whom you are related so precisely, so accurately. You may be able to do it with regard to a mountain, swift running water, or a sheet of water full of light and beauty, that is comparatively easy. But to observe the activities of one's own mind, the desires, the sensory responses, the tremendous sense of insecurity, to observe that without the word. You understand what I am saying? I hope you are doing it.

As we said, that is the first thing, the capacity to observe. You know - I hope you don't mind my digressing - our capacity is based on knowledge, on experience, on specializations. Your electronic expert and your capacity has come through great study, examinations and you know, all the rest of it. That capacity of specialization is very limited. Right? Like a carpenter, a master carpenter, he has spent years with his tools and with his hands. He produces a marvellous thing. And his capacity is limited naturally; like the scientist's capacity is limited, like an engineer, his capacity is limited because it is always based on knowledge, experience, accumulation of information and so on. Right? That's simple.

There is a capacity which is not based on knowledge, which is not the result of experience of others, as well as one's own. Which we will go into presently when we begin to understand the nature and the structure and the extraordinary complexity of the mind.



And the other thing is to listen. To listen not only what is going on around one, that car going along the street, changing its gear, but also to listen to all the noise and the rumblings of the mind. Not only listen to what is being said now but also listen to your wife, to your children, to your neighbour, to the politician. In this country there are no politics, they are all ambitious men trying to achieve power. Politics means to govern, concerned with the people, with their food, clothes, shelter and their happiness. But when politicians change from one party to the other over night without any scruples, without any statesmanship, then those people are unworthy of government. And to listen to them too. And to listen to your gurus, if you have one. Have you ever listened to them? Have you ever listened to your professor, if you are a student? And if one may ask, are you listening now? Actually listening to that crowd, to the words that are spoken, to the words that have their meaning, listening not only to the word but behind the word, to capture the meaning of listening. Not only through the nervous organism of the ear but also to hear not only with the ear but to hear beyond the ear. That requires great sensitivity, that means no barrier, no resistance. Are we doing this? Or we are merely waiting for some deep revelation?

Because if we are not capable of listening we are not capable of learning. That is, not from the teacher, from the professor, from a book, but listening to the vast depths of one's own existence, one's own anxiety. Have you ever listened to your anxiety? That is, to listen to it so that you are not escaping from it, you are not trying to translate what it must be, what it should be, or trying to go beyond it. Just to listen to that feeling that comes about when one is

anxious. You need to have a sharpness, a quickness because those moments of great anxiety, the moment you listen they slip away. I don't know if you have noticed all these things. But to listen to them without demanding a solution, an answer, a way out of it, an escape, but just to be with it, move with it, so that it flowers. And as you listen, as you observe, the flowering of that anxiety comes to its head and withers away permanently, if you can do this.

And the other thing is to learn, not from another, not from a book, not from those people who have accumulated, or think they have accumulated knowledge, and enlightenment and all that business, but to learn through observation, through listening. We have only learnt as a means of acquiring a capacity, a job, and that learning has become the accumulation of information and memory. I hope you are listening. And that memory is limited, as all knowledge is limited. All knowledge is within the field of ignorance. All right? Isn't it? I hope you understand all this. It is rather fun sirs, and ladies, don't be so serious. It's fun to discover for oneself. That is the beginning of creation. You see, there is learning through accumulation of knowledge, in many ways, acting, then knowledge, and further action. Accumulated knowledge then act, but they are both the same. And therefore all action which is based on knowledge must ever be limited. Right?

And our brains, our minds are the result of a million years of knowledge. Man from the beginning of time must have asked himself if there is something more than this everlasting grind of work, of thought, of suffering, of sexual desires satisfied and the agony of having more, and all the rest of it. He must have asked a million years ago if there is a reality, if there is truth, if there is

something timeless, something that cannot be measured by man, however clever, however erudite, from the very beginning of time.

And that enquiry, that seed, is still with us. You are following all this. But in the enquiry, in the flowering of that seed of a million years of human longing, hoping, trying to find out, we are caught by illusions - the illusory nature of gods, the illusions that man has created, not only for himself, having created them for himself he imposes those illusions on others, which is the function of the guru. So that seed has never completely developed because we have been side tracked, we have been carried away by those who say, "I know. Do this, don't do that, follow this system, don't follow that system. I am a better guru than your guru. I know more, I am much more illumined than you". So we have been side-tracked through centuries by the priests, by believers in books, by those who say, "I know god". You know, all that. So that this seed that has been planted in man, in the brain, for millions and millions of years has never had the right soil, the right light, the right darkness. You follow? Nothing! So it is there still. I hope you are following all this.

And during these talks we are going to find out whether it is possible for that seed to grow and flower, multiply and cover the earth. That is the function, the necessity of every man because in this world there is such confusion, such violence, corruption, every form of degeneration, and if we do not find that seed and let it flower we are going to destroy ourselves.

So can we now think together, not about the original beauty of that seed or the flowering of that, but think together. That is, thinking is the capacity of the brain, the function of the brain, one

of its major functions. And on thinking all civilizations are based. You can observe it. All the things that fill the earth and the air, all the things that are created by man, the churches, the mosques, the temples are the result of thinking; and the gods within them are the result of thinking. Thinking is the basis of our life, the basis of our action.

And thinking, if you have noticed very carefully, is always directional. Right? Please, we are doing it together, don't go to sleep. It is directional, which is either horizontal or vertical. Thinking, when you read a book, is linear, straight line, horizontal. So our thinking is always in a straight line, or moving forwards and backwards. You must see this, obviously. So thinking, which brings about all our action, all our perceptions, all our activity, is based on thought. And if you observe, thought is limited. It may be extended in any direction - horizontal, vertical - but it is still limited. One may be a great thinker, but the thinker, that great thinker is limited because knowledge, which is the result of experience, knowledge has come because one has had a million years of experiences, that knowledge is limited. There is no complete knowledge. Right? So thought is the result of that knowledge and experience, which is the memory, and so thought is everlastingly limited. Right? I hope we are together in this, please. Because we are going into something in which we must go together. We are working together. Not I am working and you are listening, which is generally what happens when you go to meetings. But we are working together, which is much more fun, much more alive. You are not just listening to a series of ideas, but together we are working to see how extraordinarily this thought has

pervaded all our actions, all our life. And thought being limited our brains have become limited. You understand? Oh, for god's sake, come on sirs.

And when specialization takes place the brain becomes much smaller - smaller in the sense the other parts of the brain become rather dull. Have you ever talked to a specialist, whether he is a doctor, a scientist, an engineer, or a first-class master carpenter, or even to your gurus, how it is all so small. They may talk about the universe, god is love, and beauty, you know, all that kind of stuff, but it is all the movement of thought.

So thinking is corrupting our lives. Right? Because everything is based on thinking. Your meditation is the result of thinking. Your religion is the result of thinking. The sects, the gurus, all this is this immense movement of thought.

And thought has its right place, otherwise you couldn't come here and go back home, you couldn't go back on Monday morning to your work. So thought and knowledge are necessary to employ them skilfully. And on this thought mind has lived. Isn't it, have you noticed in yourself? One thought contradicting another thought, one thought trying to control another thought, one thought seeking something more and failing and then that thought says, I am frustrated. One thought says, I must become some marvellous human being, and another thought craving for money, position.

So thought is always dividing itself; one group against another group of thoughts. I don't know if you are aware of all this. And we give such tremendous importance to thoughts that have nobility. You understand? That act on principles, on ideals, on service. You know. So watch it.

So we are saying that as knowledge is limited and is always in the shadow of ignorance, because knowledge can never be complete, however distant in the future, and so all our life is limited. Just listen to that. Listen to it, not resist it, not agree or disagree, but just listen to that absolute fact that your meditation, the deliberate posture, the deliberate control, the deliberate breathing, the deliberate directive, will to achieve something, that's the thought. And so through that meditation you hope to discover something which is limitless.

So the mind, which is the senses, from the senses emotions, from the senses desire, from the senses the accumulation of experiences, knowledge, memory, thought. That's the whole content of our mind in which there is contradiction; saying one thing and doing another, wanting peace and doing everything to contradict that, wanting to be happy and destroying that by an action. Every desire opposing another desire. Haven't you known all this? So the mind - please listen to this - the mind has become so confused, so torn apart. And thought sees this and thought says, I must do something about it. Which is to control it, to go and join a guru, to become a Catholic, Protestant, Hindu, whatever it is. Are you following all this? When you are doing this the mind is becoming more and more confused, more and more uncertain, more and more destroying itself. Please realize this.

And from that deliberating process comes violence. Look what is happening in the world, you all know it. So can this course of the mind be totally altered? You understand the question? No, please just listen quietly. The mind, which is the brain, the senses and all that, has been moving through time for millennia, and getting more

and more experience, more and more knowledge, and more and more the capacity to think, memory and so on. And its activity is always limited because it is of its own knowledge, it is breaking up. It is happening in this country, don't you know it? One group against another group. The group which is anti-Brahman, and the group which is Brahman, the Muslim. You follow, you know all this. And in this state the mind says, is there security? Because it cannot live, the brain cannot live without security. You understand all this? Like a child, if you observe a child, it needs security, it needs the security of the mother and the father. The baby has to be held, nourished, looked after, put on your lap and love it, protect it. Which very few mothers do anyhow. They treat the babies as their toys. That is irrelevant, that's a side issue.

So the mind, the brain has now reached a point where it is completely confused. Aren't you all confused, if you are honest to yourself, not knowing what to do, what is the right action? The right action which would be right under all circumstances; not the right action this moment and another action which is not right. An action which will be absolutely accurate under all circumstances, right. Right means precise, accurate, absolute. How can that right action come into being when the mind is so... you understand, sirs?

So we are saying can there be for the brain not security of knowledge, because in that knowledge there is no security. I don't know if you realize it, because it is in the field of ignorance. Therefore that knowledge brings about contradiction. You are following all this? Am I struggling by myself, or are you joining me? The brain needs absolute security for that seed to flower. You understand? The seed that man has sown throughout the ages to

find something beyond all this confusion, misery, something that is incorruptible, something that is not measurable, something that may have tremendous ecstasy. But a mind which is so confused can never find it, can never allow that seed to flower.

So we are asking: what shall we do together? You understand, sir? What shall we, you and the speaker do together? Not the speaker for himself, but you and he together. That is, what is our relationship? You understand, sir?

It's half past six, have you had enough of it for an hour? I think you have, haven't you? If you have been working together for this whole hour, giving your attention to listening, to seeing, to learning, you must be... you follow? You must have gathered tremendous energy, and with that energy we are going to enquire. Not stimulated by the speaker, then it is like taking a drug, it will be a verbal drug. But if we have been moving together, like a river, which has tremendous volume of water behind it, then we can move together, bring about a mutation in the brain itself. Which we shall go into as we go along. That's enough.



## MADRAS 2ND PUBLIC TALK 23RD DECEMBER 1979

My we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying how important it is to think together so that our minds meet, because the mind, as we pointed out yesterday, is the whole conglomeration of the past with all its innumerable, thousand experiences, sorrows, pleasures, and the agony of life that is fragmented and broken up. And to think together requires, if one is at all serious, that one should put aside, each one of us, our own particular point of view, our conclusions, theoretical acceptance of something which we fancy exists, to be free of beliefs and dogmas and all that, so that we can freely, happily, diligently meet each other. Because, as we pointed out yesterday also, it is easy to think about something - about that noise that is going on there. But to think not about something, but to have that capacity to think impersonally, objectively, not according to circumstances, so that our minds are capable of meeting each other freely, and in that freedom enquire into the whole problem of existence.

So if we could this evening meet as we did yesterday - I wonder if we can compete with that noise. It is good to have some humour, and not get irritated with it. Let's get on with it. We said our mind, not only the objective superficial mind which is consciousness, but also all the deeper layers of our mind of which we are very rarely acquainted, or familiar with all the activities that are going on below the ordinary daily activities of life, our mind and brain is the result of million years. It has evolved through time, through various civilizations. Our brains and our minds, and our senses, our

emotions and all the responses that lie therein are the result of million years, evolved, grown, multiplied, but it is the mind of humanity, it is the mind of each one of us, it is the mind with which we live every day of our life.

As we said yesterday, and I hope you will allow me to repeat it - we are not here to exchange ideas, opinions or agree or disagree, but to see logically, reasonably, sanely, the fact - not the fact expressed by the speaker but the fact of what we are, which is the mind, with all its confusions, travail, sorrow, mischief, dishonesty, corruption, all that is the whole of our mind grown through time. This is a fact, if you observe very closely that your mind is the result of circumstances, of your culture - if you have a culture, apparently it does not exist - nurtured by the religion with all its superstitions, rituals, with the education that one has had, that is our mind. It is not your mind and my mind but the mind of man, mind of every human being, which is obvious.

And man, including the woman, throughout the ages from time nameless has always enquired deeply, if one studies history, if there is a reality, a truth that transcends all time, all circumstances, that is ageless and deathless - this has been his search, asking, groping, enquiring and in these enquiries he has created civilizations, new civilizations, as all civilizations when they are new must be born out of religion, not out of Marx or Mao or some clever philosopher, but out of religion. We explained that the meaning of the word - etymologically it means gathering together, not people gathering together as we are, but gathering together - I will explain presently - collect, be diligent, scrupulously attentive in this enquiry, not to find, not to achieve enlightenment, not to

become something. The meaning now accepted etymologically is religion means gathering together all your energy, so that that energy given the right environment, right circumstances, right physical, mental, emotional balance, it can explode. That is the meaning of religion, not all that tommy rot that is going on, nonsense of saviours, gurus, the images put in the temples and so on. That is not religion. We like to think it is religion because it is pleasant to escape from our daily routine, grind, to escape into some emotional, imaginative, superstitious sensations. We are not attacking anything, neither your religion nor your gurus, nor the society that you belong to, nor your sect, nothing. As we said yesterday, we are not doing propaganda or trying to convince you of anything, and I really mean it. Nothing. But together observe the facts, if we can. To observe a fact means that one must be free to look, to look at your own gurus, your own wives, children, husbands, to look at the beauty of the earth, the skies, the marvels of the trees and the bird on the wind - to look at it. And to look at them one must be free.

So our mind are the result of thousand experiences and man, as we said, has been searching for this eternity - not immortality; immortality is merely the continuity of one's own ignorance. You accept all this? You won't. I will show you presently. And there is this deep-rooted, deep-laden seed which man has not cultivated, nourished, looked after, cared for, which is the beginning of that which he has sought. But we have cultivated every other faculty. If you observe in yourself, we have cultivated through time the idea of the individual, of the 'you' and the 'me', we and they. This has been handed down from generation after generation. Is that so? Is it

a reality or a fiction or something thought has carefully cultivated? Please, as we said yesterday, please do not resist. I know you all believe in individuality, your fulfilment, your immortality, your birth after this and after that. You are rooted in this individual concept. Now we are asking if that is so. We have also cultivated various other things, and by questioning everything that we hold both consciously as well as unconsciously, in questioning objectively, sanely, rationally, and not wanting to change it, seeing things as they are, what actually is, and not moving away from that or escape from that, not wanting to go beyond it - that calls for scrupulous attention there comes intelligence. The etymological meaning of that word intelligence is to be able to understand, to be able to discern, to be able to see without direction, without pressure, what actually is going on, and in the pure perception of what is going on, there is insight into what is going on, that insight is the movement of intelligence - not cleverness, not erudition, not experience but the immediate perception of what is true. And the perception of what is true can only take place if there is no direction, no motivation, the pure unadulterated unpremeditated observation.

So that intelligence wipes away the centre from which we are acting, the 'me'. We are going to go into that. So, we have, as we said, cultivated throughout the centuries this idea of the self, the 'me' that must evolve through time, many births or saved by some saviour and live everlastingly in light. Now, we are questioning that. I mean questioning, enquiring whether it is true or it is an illusion created by our desire, created by thought, and we have accepted that image, that idea, that network from times past. You are following all this? I hope you are not going to sleep. I really

mean this, it is very serious. You are not here to admire the speaker, you are not here to bask in some atmospheric spirituality. You are here to find out, not the speaker finds out and tells you, but you who are listening find out. So we must enquire into what it is, what has created it, the 'me', the self. You understand the word self? You, your anxieties, your problems, your sexual demands, your fears, your hopes, your depressions, moods, the sorrows, the pains, the jealousies, hatreds, the violence, the fear of fulfilment, and not being able to fulfil, the constant competition with each other. That word 'competition' means etymologically, to compute, which means to help to grow, to increase, not what we are doing now, fighting each other. Right? Please understand all this.

So we are enquiring diligently, with great deal of serious attention, whether the self, the 'me', which has been handed down through generation after generation from the ancient times, whether that 'me' is an actuality in the sense that it has its root in truth. One must distinguish between reality and truth. Reality is everything that thought has created. Please listen carefully. Are you following all this? Reality is everything that thought has created - the microphone, your beads which you are wearing, houses you live - all that is created by thought, obviously. But nature is not created by thought - the trees, mountains, waters, the birds. You can write poems about them. But thought has not created them. Thought has created the chair out of the wood of a tree, but the tree is not the product of thought. Please follow all this carefully otherwise you will miss the whole thing. So reality is that. Truth has nothing whatsoever to do with thought. The relationship between truth and reality is one way, reality cannot

touch truth, but truth can employ, use thought.

So, we are enquiring whether the 'me' which has been created, to which mankind has clung, creating round it innumerable philosophies, whether that is rooted in truth or it is merely a reality, reality being created by thought. Right? Are you not created by thought, the 'me'? The 'me' is your name, your form, your ideas, your concepts, your prejudices, your desires, your fears, your longings, your aspirations, your sorrow, your degeneration, all that, this vast structure of the 'me' is put together by thought. Nobody can deny it. But thought has invented the super-self which is still thought.

So one has to be very alert in this enquiry that thought is the result or the response of memory, memory is the accumulated experience as knowledge, not only the experiences of your present day but also the experiences of your fathers, grandfathers, generations after generations past. That is the knowledge that one has, that is our brain, our whole structure is that. And this self created by thought, and thought itself being limited, as we explained, because knowledge is limited, there is no complete knowledge about anything, there can never be. That is obvious. And that knowledge whether in science, in our relationships with each other, is based on experience accumulated, which is stored up in our brain cells as memory. This is so, whether you accept it or not. It is so. You can discuss if you wish with professors, with brain specialists, but not with your philosophers, not with your gurus because they have already made up their mind. But if you really want to know, enquire, you can discuss with them. They will offer you their opinions, but to find this out for oneself, which

transcends all information, all philosophies, all gurus.

So we are saying that thought has put together the whole structure of the 'me', the 'me' is the result of our senses, of our desires, of our reactions, and thought making an image out of these reactions as the 'me'. Right? You are following all this? Please observe it in yourself, not what I am saying, then it has no value, then you can be just another lecturer, agree or not. But if you yourself see this, which is, basically we are all the same including the philosophers, the gurus, the gods, and all that, we are essentially, basically the same, which is, we suffer, we are anxious, we have pain, we are terribly lonely people, from which we try to escape. Our relationship is based on this. You may love your wife, you may sleep with her, but relationship means - the meaning of that word, to relate, is to look back, refer to. Are you following all this, or am I going too quickly? Please tell me, am I going too quickly? It doesn't matter.

So, we have cultivated memory, which has developed extraordinary technology, terrifying, beneficial, but it is still based on thought, and thought being the response of knowledge, knowledge can never be whole, therefore, thought is partial. Please take this in. Partial, limited, and that which it has created will always be limited, will always be divisible, and thought has created the idea of the separate individual and therefore is always divisive. Look into yourself sir, don't look at my words, my face, or my gesture. Look into yourself and you will see the truth of it. Because each one is struggling, competing with another, wanting to fulfil, and this divisive activity which is self-centred is breaking up the world - divisive as a nationality, as a race, belonging to some guru,

belonging to some god, belonging to some sect, wearing different robes, divisive. And the mind, thought is seeking the whole. And it will never be capable of it, because in itself it is divisive, because knowledge can never, never, never be complete, it always lives within the shadow of ignorance. Right? Have you understood this in the sense you have seen this in yourself as an absolute truth, fact?

Then the question arises: since it is so deeply rooted in all of us, free enterprise, individual enterprise, competition - as I explained the word means to grow, to help to grow, not to fight with each other, the competing countries. Sirs, you don't know what you are all doing. Can this self-centred structure be dissolved? Look: as we said yesterday, the mind, the brain is seeking security. You are seeking security in your relationship, in your jobs, security with your wife, husband. Security means that you are safe, certain in a state, not the state of a country, but state of mind, the brain must have complete security otherwise it cannot function. That is why it specializes. You are following all this? As an engineer, scientist, then it is completely safe - safe in having the capacity from that knowledge - and therefore competition arises, beating down each other politely, conveniently, comfortably or respectfully, or traditionally - and the gurus are doing it. One says I am better than the other, I am nearer, I have the way and the other fellow does not have. He is a cuckoo and you come to me. So, can this structure which dominates all our life till we die and after death there is the desire that says: will I live? And the philosophies that have been worked into it, beliefs, reincarnation, the whole of it is based on thought, and thought cannot dissolve it, because it is part of itself. I



wonder if you see that. It is like a person who wants to meditate, but his meditation is the continuity of thought. There is no ending to thought. He attempts to end thought. Therefore he disciplines, again the activity of thought - to discipline, to control, to follow, to imitate, systems, practices, all that is the movement of thought.

Now the question is whether that self which is creating so much mischief in the world, because in itself it is divisive, the nationalities divisive, the groups, the sects, the races, everything in the world is now divisive, divided, broken up, and that is because of thought. Can that thought dissolve the structure which it has created as the 'me'? Go into it carefully sirs. It means if you understand, there is total, complete, psychological revolution. It is not just you are playing with words.

How do you approach this problem? You understand the problem? The problem is the self with its self-centred activity, which has created such divisions in the world, division in our intimate relationship - man and woman - division in ourselves, the constant contradiction in ourselves, the wanting, the not wanting, the whole travail, the structure, how is all that to be dissolved? That is the problem. You understand the question? Otherwise we can never be, to put it mildly, happy, you can never be whole, you can never be sane. A man who thinks he is separate from the others, he is not sane. Sanity means to observe clearly, to see what is going on, to see the facts, not to invent facts. Now how do you approach the problem? Because on your approach the problem is resolved. How you approach it - you understand my question? That is, if you approach with a motive, however noble, however pleasant or idealistic, that motive distorts the action with regard to

this problem. So, has one a motive - motive means movement. So please enquire carefully what your approach is to the problem, to any problem, whether you approach with all the knowledge you have in the resolution of that problem, or you approach with a motive that I wish it will help me to get a better job or I will be free of sorrow, or I will reach nirvana, moksha, god or whatever it is. So, I have to find out accurately what your approach is, to any problem, and specially with regard to the psychological problems, the problems in oneself. So, what is your approach? Right? Not clear, sir? When you say clear, is it verbally or actually? That means you want to find out if there is an answer to this question, if there is a resolution to the question, which means you don't know the answer. If you know the answer, it is not a problem. If you have come to the answer through some divination, which is doubtful, or if you have studied some philosophies, upanishads or various books and come with that knowledge, you are approaching it with knowledge which you have acquired, which is past. Right? So your approach dictates the resolution of the problem. Please see the importance of this. This is the beginning of intelligence: to see not only verbally, logically, but to see the fact that psychological problems can only be solved in the manner how you approach it. If you approach it with any form of motive, try to escape from it, the problem will always remain. It is like having a cancer. If I had a cancer, I can't escape from it - the doctor tells me, 'On the table, old boy, otherwise you are going to die'. So I have to look at it very carefully. So I must approach this question. In the very approach is the beginning if intelligence, the intelligence that will give you insight into the whole phenomenon of the 'me'.

Do you understand this, or you are all being mesmerized? This is a very, very serious problem. It will change our whole relationship with each other, because now it is based on me and you as two separate individuals, with their images of each other, with their memories of each other, and so sustain the separation, though they come together, they are separate. You and your guru are separate. They may say, we are all one, I am up the ladder, you are down below. But actually as long as this individual activity goes on, there must be separateness and therefore there must be conflict, nationally, racially, collectively, economically, socially, in every way.

Now, is that intelligence, which is not cleverness, which is not logic but in the observation of these facts we have used logic, reason, sanity, but intelligence is not reason, is not cleverness, is not analysis, it is the quality of a mind that sees instantly the truth, the fact as it is. This intelligence is not of the book. It is not of experience. If there is this quality of intelligence, everything comes like water down the river.

So, your approach matters enormously, and it is only the sea of intelligence can wash away the 'me', nothing else - changing names, going to various disciplines, belonging to monasteries, nothing. Nothing will wipe away this structure which thought has created as the 'me', which is creating so much mischief in the world, because in itself it has no love. Thought is never love.

And so we are examining the nature of thought and its activity, not how to stop thought, but seeing the movement of thought, what it has done in the world outwardly, and also what it is doing inwardly, the two are not different. It is like the sea going out and

coming in - ebb and flow, coming in and going out. But thought has separated it, the outer and the inner. The inner is the result of the outer. If you want to change society, which is corrupt, which is immoral, which is destructive, which is totally ugly as it is, one has to change the individual who has created this society - not the individual, but the human being who has created this society. But what are we doing, the politicians, the economists, communists, socialists, Maoists, all these people they want to change the structure of the society, to bring about a change in the structure they invent a new structure. But it is the same mind. Come on sirs, look at it. And we fall a prey to all that so thoughtlessly.

So, we have come to a point when we see together, not I see and you don't see and I have to explain it to you, together we see this thing, that is, we have together thought, we have exercised our brains neither accepting nor doubting, neither saying this is right or this is wrong - you cannot say this is right or wrong when you see something actually. It is so.

From that question arises another which is: what is human relationship? Because all society is based on human relationship. Because the human beings are immoral, our society is immoral. Human beings are corrupt beyond measure, we create a society that is utterly corruptible. So, we have come to a point when we ask, what is our relationship. Not yours and mine, we will come to that later, but your relationship with your wives, husbands, and children. As we explained, the word etymologically means to refer to, to look back. You understand what is the significance of that means? Our relationship with each other is based on memory, that is referring to something that has happened - sexually, something,

either insult or flattery, something that has happened, stored up in the brain. You have your experience sexually in relationship with each other, and he is the same. You are following all this? So our relationships are based on remembrance. Just think of it sirs!

Which means what? Is love a remembrance? Do not accept or reject. Find out sir. Is love a remembrance? Is love the result of thought? When you say you love your wife - I wonder if you ever do, perhaps not in India but they do abroad - I don't know what that means and you don't know what it means either. So, we are asking - please, sirs, be serious, this is terribly important in life - life is relationship. Because all life being relationship, if it is based on memory, then it is only partial, your relationship based on knowledge which means sexual knowledge, the pleasurable knowledge, the irritations, the possessiveness, the jealousies, the hatreds, the anxiety between two people, the agony of not being loved and loved, all that, all that is based on memory. For god's sake, look at it. When we are asking, if that is a fact, which it is, then what is your relationship? Just words? A piece of paper says you are man and woman married either in a church or this or that? Sir, go into it, find out, don't sit there. If there is no relationship except on memory, see the tragedy of it, see the sadness of it, see the appalling condition which we have made ourselves into. Which means thought has brought about this relationship and therefore thought excludes every kind of affection and love. Therefore, there is this constant struggle between man and woman. Thought cannot bring about love. You cannot practise it, as you can practise politeness, even that is doubtful. Politeness requires care, concern for another. So, whole generation after generation of people

without love, you understand sirs - so your children are not loved, your education has no meaning, everything is degenerating. After a million years we are like this.

When one observes this very closely, attentively, with care, there is not only the pure perception of these facts, but out of that perception comes this ocean of intelligence. Sir, intelligence and love go together: without love, you cannot have intelligence. And it is that intelligence that gives place to division, to quarrels, all the misery and confusion that we live in.

Now, you have listened for an hour. Where are you? I know you are sitting there. But where are we? Has your mind understood the nature of itself, conditioned by a million years, by experience, by knowledge, and that seed which man has carefully hidden, the seed of religiosity - not all the beads, that is not religion. But this tremendous demand on man from the timeless ages to find that which is eternal, nameless, that is inborn, everybody is asking, asking, asking and therefore they caught in the gurus and all that nonsense, join churches, and this and that. But they never develop this seed, this marvellous seed of religiosity, and that can only flower and cover the beautiful earth when there is this intelligence.

## **MADRAS 3RD PUBLIC TALK 29TH DECEMBER 1979**

May we continue with what we were talking about last weekend? We were having a conversation between you and me, the speaker, about the nature of the mind and its extraordinary capacities. And we human beings through millennia after millennia have reduced this capacity to a very narrow limited field. This vast energy of the mind has created technologically astonishing things. They have been to the moon, under the sea, they have invented the most diabolical things. They have also brought about great benefits like surgery, medicine. And this vast energy, which we will go into very carefully a little later on, has been curtailed, limited, narrowed down into as our lives which are basically, if one observes it closely, a field of struggle, a field of conflict, an area in which human beings are against each other, destroying each other; they have not only destroyed human beings but also they are exploiting the earth, and the seas. The word exploit means to use another for one's own profit. This exploitation goes on in every field of life. The oppressor becomes the oppressed, as is happening in this country.

And one wonders why human beings live the way we are living - the battle, the conflict, the confusion, the utter misery, sorrow, pleasure, and joys that soon fade away and we are left empty handed, bitter, cynical, not believing in a thing, or we turn to tradition, which is perhaps the safe thing to do. And even that tradition is now losing its grip and if you observe very closely the mind is now living not only physically but much more

psychologically on commentaries, books, scriptures, the Bible and the Koran. What happens to a mind that lives on books which we are all doing, not only in the schools, colleges and universities, but also religiously. I am using the word 'religious' in the ordinary sense of the word. And when one lives by the book, we live by words, by theories about what other people have said. And when one lives in that fashion, degeneration obviously must take place. Or you go back to the book as the Islamic world it doing, and use that as authority - brutal, dogmatic, cruel and destructive. And in this country too, the Indians, the Hindus, whatever your name be, you live by the book, what other people have said, which you have accepted, the commentaries and the commentaries on commentaries and so on and so on and so on. And when faced with crises, this civilization which has existed perhaps for 3000 years or more collapses, degeneration takes places, corruption at all levels of life - the industrialized gurus, the politicians, the businessmen, the religious people, the whole thing is collapsing.

One has asked various people what is the cause of this decay, this degeneration, they have really no answer. They give you examples of degeneration, but one never, as far as it has been possible to find out - one has discussed with various pundits, scholars, professors and all the rest of it - they do not seem to find the root of this decay. I do not know if you have thought about it. Probably you have not. If you have, if you have given serious thought to it, would it be true to say if one is really honest, that you have lived on other people's ideas, other people's doctrines, other people's beliefs, as now you are living with the western world's materialism - they are really not materialists any more than you



are. Money-minded the world has become; you will do anything for money, which means power, position. And so the cause apparently, subject to correction and further investigation, is that when one lives a secondhand life, a life on words, ideas, beliefs, your mind naturally withers, the totality of the mind. You may be an excellent lawyer or a good carpenter - I doubt if any of you are carpenters here - but you are all very good lawyers, professors, businessmen and so on.

So, we are all together thinking over this problem, that is, a mind - we mean by that word all the active senses with their neurological reactions, the mind, all the emotions, all the desires, the various technological, professional knowledge and the cultivation of memory, which is the capacity to think clearly or confusedly - and this mind from the past millennia has been seeking that germ which man has planted from the beginning of time, which has never flowered, that germ, that seed of real religiosity. Because without religion there can be no new civilization, no new culture. There may be new systems, new philosophies, new social structure, but it will be the same pattern repeated over and over and over again, which is an exploiter becomes exploited, which is happening in this country.

So, why have human beings, with their extraordinary minds - I am using the word 'extraordinary' in its deliberate sense, not exaggerated at all - why human beings, with their extraordinary brain and mind, have become like this - living in a narrow groove, in narrow activities, self-centred impulses, actions, urges. Why? Please sirs, as we pointed out the other day, we are thinking together. This is not a speech or a lecture or a sermon but you are

exercising your mind, your brain with the speaker to find out if it is possible to break through this, the narrow grooves in which we have settled, not only in our relationship with each other as man and woman, but also the society which we have created, the society which is so corrupt, which is so immoral, which is so destructive. You understand all this sirs?

So what shall we do? You, as a human being living on this marvellous beautiful earth with all the beautiful mountains and landscapes and the seas and the waters, lovely hills and mountains - which is not poetic, I am just pointing out. What can we do together to break through? That is, not to create new systems, new social systems, new social religious orders, new set of beliefs and ideals and dogmas, new rituals, because that game has been played over and over and over again. So to bring about a different world, if you are at all serious, the quality of goodness has to come into being. The word 'good' means to be whole, not broken up, not fragmented, but a human being that is good implies there is no sense of division. He is in himself complete, whole, without any sense of conflict. And this mind which has lived a millennia has not brought about a society which is good because we human beings are not good. Please bear in mind the meaning of that word. Not a good actor, good book, good meal, but that word implies to be whole - it originally comes from the word, good means god, not the invention the human minds have created about god, but that sense of wholeness. The word 'whole' means healthy, sane and holy. That is the meaning of that word. How can we transform this mind with its emotions, senses, and that external brain which has evolved through millennia, carrying thousands of experiences,

knowledge, and every part of the brain is full of memories, not only the inherited memories, the genetic memories, but also the memories that are acquired recently, it is all there as knowledge. And as knowledge is always limited, there is no complete knowledge, it is always limited, therefore, thought will inevitably everlastingly do what you will, it will always be limited. There is no infinite thought, there is no complete thought. I don't know if you have observed it in yourself, but thought has become most important in our lives. All our meditations are based on thought and desire. All our activities are based on thought. All our sexual relationship is based on thought - the past memories, the past pleasures, the pictures that you have created, the remembrance of all this is the operation of thought. The gods, the scriptures, the Bible, Koran, everything on earth that man has created is brought about by thought - going to the moon has to be thought out precisely, every part of that machinery has to be perfect, I believe 3000 people were employed in it. Everybody thinking accurately to produce the rocket - to produce a submarine, to produce a gun and to create war. So, thought being limited and our actions being limited, and out of this limitation comes all our anxiety, all our fears, all our conflicts and sorrows.

And thought in its movement is using extraordinary amount of energy: to build a house, to have a beautiful garden you must expend a great deal of energy. The way you go to the office every day from nine to five, whatever time you spend there, the boredom, the routine, the ugliness of all that, the extraordinary amount of energy used. And thought cannot be altered. It is there. Please follow this. We are talking over together. I am not talking to

myself. We are sharing, partaking the thing together which is our present crisis - not economic, social merely, but the crisis in our consciousness, in our very being and we do not seem to pay very much attention to it, we just want to live for a day or a year of 50 years and then die. There is a crisis in our consciousness, not the crisis of the exploiter being exploited, not the crisis of a new system, not the crisis of war and so on. It is a crisis in the very being of human beings. You may not be aware of it, but if you are, you must be if you are at all serious, concerned and sufficiently informed, sufficiently educated, somewhat intelligent.

And how can this, in what manner can this consciousness be transformed? You understand? Our consciousness, you are the result - the consciousness is the result of all the things that have happened to you as a human being, not as an individual, as a human being, whether he lives in America or Russia or whatever it is. His content of his mind, his action, his consciousness, beliefs, pleasure, dogmas, superstitions, illusions, believing in god or not believing in god, authority, obedience and the submission to established authority, and the everlasting search to escape from all this. So the escape is god, the book, the cinema, the meditation, the guru, the temple, football, and cricket in this country. You are doing all this. We have established a very good network of escapes, but we have not solved the problem.

So, together please, if you will this evening and the last two evenings that we met here, last Saturday and Sunday, and tomorrow and another weekend, let us think of this thing together, that is, put our hearts and minds into this to find out.

First of all, mind, the brain needs security, like a child clings to

the mother, is seeking security to be safe, and the brain can only function excellently, efficiently, precisely, when it is completely safe. Our education helps to find the safety, this protection in careers, in jobs, in specialized human beings. Please follow all this, you are in it. A doctor, a surgeon, if he is honest, good, he is safe there. His brain has been educated for 10 years to be an excellent doctor, and in that the brain has found complete safety. And an engineer, a scientist. So careers, jobs, systems, are offering security, like a nation is offering security, a family, a unit is offering security to the brain. And that brain is not yours or mine, it is brain of human beings, which has evolved through millennia. And in this security, if you have observed, there is total insecurity. You will find security in a nation, as an Indian, whatever that word may mean, which is another invention of thought, with its flag and all the nonsense that goes on with it. One has found security in that, which means isolation. Please follow all this. Isolation. Another nation does exactly the same thing. So you two are at war perpetually, economically, socially, morally and religiously. But the brain needs an enormous sense of protection, safety, security, and where does one find it? Not in the family. You know what a family is, the perpetual quarrel, perpetual fighting each other, anger. There is no security in the family. There is no security in the nation. There is no security in careers, because there are thousand people after that career. There is no security in your temples, in your gods, in your beliefs, in your dogmas, in the books. Books are words. And your brain is now living on words, finding safety there, in words. I wonder if you realize all this. So where is there security which the brain must have? There is no security in tradition - you

know, going back - tradire, which means to hand it down. There is no security in that. There is no security in your wife, or in your husband. You may like it, you may want to hold on, be attached, but in that there is no security either. So, one asks, you are asking, I am not asking, is there is any security at all - you understand? - for the brain to feel safe, protected, to have a sense of complete certainty.

There is security, complete, whole security. We will go into it in just a minute. We have sought security in discipline. Go into it carefully please. We have sought security in discipline. The ordinary translation of that word, which is commonly used, is submission to established authority. The soldier obeys. In that obedience there is safety involved. In the school, the discipline is to conform to the pattern. University. So, the brain is trained. Please watch your own brains for god's sake - your brains are being trained through ages to conform to established authority. Either that authority is tradition, authority of a superior who has more knowledge, the authority of power, the authority of one who says, I know, you don't know, the authority of an ideal, the authority of the priest, the authority of Christ, Krishna, Buddha, all that. So, our brain - please watch your brains - is trained, subjected, submits to established outside order or inside order, inside discipline, essentially to obey. The word 'discipline' means to learn, it comes from the word 'disciple'. Disciple is one who is willing to learn, not submit himself to some authority, but having the urge, the intent, the beauty to learn. And so what we have done it to make that word which is to learn, to conform, to obey, because there there is safety, not in learning, not in the capacity to learn, but in the capacity to

obey, the capacity to conform, to imitate.

So our brains have been trained through education to conform to Marx to Engels, conform, and in that conformity there is the safety and so there is conflict. There is rebellion, revolt against authority, and that very revolt creates its own authority, and so the mind moves from one authority to another, one knowledge to another. And we think discipline in the ordinary sense of the word we are using, we think that discipline will bring order. You are all waiting to have order in this country, to have a good dictator. Right? Because there is such disorder. So you are all saying we must have discipline. Aren't you saying all that? And the politicians are shouting it.

So, let us enquire into what is order. Please listen carefully. Forgive me if I sound rather emphatic. If you have observed, we said the brain has extraordinary energy, incalculable energy, and that energy now is being used in a very narrow, limited way - obedience, fear, pleasure, the sense of individual importance, and caught in extraordinary conflicts between each other, and the eventual thing called sorrow and finally death, the ending. Now, we have examined carefully the quality of a mind that is whole, that is good, which means holy - h-o-l-y, not the holiness of priests or temples, there is no holiness in it. So, we are saying this energy is being misused and that is why there is such tremendous crisis in our lives. We are coming to a great crisis or we are in it, which is our consciousness. The content of our consciousness is our consciousness, the content being fear, anxiety, action, exploitation, grief, misery, confusion, pride, envy, all that is our consciousness. And we are asking, can that consciousness be transformed totally,

something totally beyond. And we are saying it can. That is, it can be transformed, and there is a different kind of security, not the security which thought has created, which is not security. And if in listening to what is being said, and you follow it carefully, you are awakening that intelligence, in that intelligence there is complete security. We are using the word 'intelligence' in a different sense. The word 'intelligence' means ordinarily the capacity to understand, to discern, to subtly read between the lines - inter legere, which means to read between the lines, from Latin, Greek and so on, I won't go into the etymological meaning. So, we are using the word 'intelligence' in its purest sense, not the intelligence of a clever man, argumentative, opinionated, wanting to discuss, trying to find out through opinions what is truth, and all that, that is not intelligence. That is mere cleverness, which is the operation of thought. We are saying intelligence is not the product of thought.

Intelligence - please I am going into it now, please listen - intelligence is the observation of these facts, the facts that discipline has been made to submit, submit to authority. If you see the falseness of that, if you see what is the implication in that word discipline, which is to conform to authority, submitting everything to accept that, if you understand that, which is, if you understand the truth of that, that is, to learn, if you see the truth of that, you are awakening intelligence, so you no longer submit to external or inward authority. I am not saying you shouldn't pay tax, don't jump into that. Or the policeman, you cannot drive on the wrong side of the road. So if you observe how discipline has become, the ordinary word - discipline is a means of security, and you see in that discipline conformity creates conflict, and if you see that,



observe it closely, and that very observation is the awakening of intelligence, which is to learn. Learning is a movement, not a static state.

So we are going to examine what is the order. To find out the order that has been created by man through thought, with the desire to be secure, and is there security in that order? If there is not, then the discovery of that which is disorder is the awakening of intelligence. So when there is this intelligence, in that there is complete and total security. That is the function of all of us here, to think this out together, what is order. I hope you are all working as hard as I am working. I don't know why I work so hard for you all. I know you will go back home and do exactly the same thing as you did before, which means that you don't take anything seriously, as long as you have your little jobs, little house, wife and a few children, and god knows what else, it doesn't matter what happens, just little corner of the vast field of humanity.

So, we are now enquiring into what is order, which one must have. All religions throughout the world have laid down certain rules: if you want to achieve god, you must be a celibate, you must be poor, you must have the capacity to obey. Haven't you noticed all this? And the church, Roman Catholic and other churches say, this is the law, and as long as you obey you are going to realize that extraordinary thing called god - it there is such a thing. That is order. Joining an organization, spiritual or worldly, joining it you feel safe, and the organization says, you must do this and you must not do that. And you are trained to obey, and this obedience is called order. If you go to the office - I do not know why you go to the office. No sir, don't laugh. Just think of it, going every day of

your life for the next 50, 60 years - see the tragedy of it all. And you say, if I don't go, how shall I support my family, educate my children, I must have money, so I must be stupid. We don't want to find a new way of living. We have created this society, we human beings, and we won't change it. Too bad!

So organizations, societies, ashrams, gurus offer a peculiar kind of order, and most people, intelligent people, are rebelling against it, throwing out all that kind of order, and in their rebellion they are creating an order which is also disorder. You see it sir, drugs, drink, sex, all that in a permissive world.

So what is order, order in which there is no conformity? No - I am using the word carefully, please attend - I am using the word, no discipline, discipline in the sense submitting to authority, but discipline in the real meaning of that word, to learn. When the mind is learning, it is creating its own discipline, not discipline of conformity, the discipline that comes through attention. Sir, when you are learning, as you are doing now, I hope you are, when you are learning, as we are, your mind is soaking in, if you are alive, if you are sensitive, if you are really hearing what is being said, it is absorbing without any compulsion, without any reward, without any punishment, because we have gathered here to be serious, and your seriousness is awake, wants to find out. So, there is order where there is intelligence. The word 'intelligence' which the speaker has explained. There is no order if there is mere compulsion, obedience, conformity - you are following all this - joining organizations, spiritual this and that, ashram, dictatorships of the gurus, in that there is no order. And because human beings have done this for millennia, somebody will tell us what to do. I

don't know but tell me please - that is the cry. And that very thing has created disorder.

So, one finds the fact of disorder which is our life, in understanding that disorder in our life objectively, that is not trying to change the disorder to your own particular comfort, your this or that. To observe, to see disorder in our life - disorder being contradiction, say one thing and do another, the cultivation of hypocrisy, which we have indulged in, the contradictory desires, contradictory ideals, this desire for power, position, all that is creating in our daily life disorder. If you see that clearly as a fact, then that clear observation brings about intelligence. And that intelligence wherever it is, is creating order. You are following all this? For god's sake follow it. It is your life sir.

So the mind, the brain has always sought in this confusion, the confusion created by itself, nobody has created it, you and we all have contributed to this order, and if we see this in our life, daily life, the conflicts, the antagonisms, the pride, the arrogance, the vanity, if you see that very clearly, and out of that clarity of perception comes order. That order is a living thing. It is not a blueprint; shall I do or shall I not do this, what shall I do tomorrow. It is not a blueprint, because intelligence is like a tremendous river.

So the awakening of intelligence is the beginning of the total, happy security of human beings. Nowhere else will you have security except in that. And the moment there is that security, which means all the energy which has been expended in these conflicts, in these ideas where you thought, believed you could find security, which was all wastage of energy, is now centred in intelligence. That is, in our relationship with each other, in our

daily, everyday relationship with each other - the man and woman - in that relationship there is enormous wastage of energy in conflict, each one asserting his own importance, each one acting in his own self-centred way, dominated by desire, and so there is no love, no generosity, no real consideration for each other. So, relationship has become a hideous thing from which everybody wants to run away, either through divorce or trying to find another man or woman, but the same pattern is repeated. There is a man we know who has married eight times, because he wants a relationship where he can feel safe, happy, and he has not found it. And you won't either. Because relationship means - the word means, it comes from the word to relate, to look back, to refer to, to look back in memory - she is my wife, my husband, she has hurt me - all that is looking back, memory and our relationship is based on memory. Right? That is obvious, isn't it? So, in that relationship, there is no love, no happiness, nothing but this disastrous division. You hear this very clearly, you will go on doing the same thing tomorrow or tonight. So, what will make you change? A crisis? Knock on the head? Sorrow? Tears? All that has happened, crisis after crisis, we have shed tears endlessly and nothing seems to change man because you are relying on somebody else to do the job: your masters, your gurus, your books, your professors, your clever cunning people who have new theories, all that. Nobody says, I am going to find out. Because the whole history of mankind is in you, and we never read our book. It is all there, but we never take the trouble, the patience and the persistent enquiry, and we prefer to live in this chaos, in this misery.

So, what will make you change? Sir, please ask yourself, burn

with that question. Because we have fallen into the habit of meditation and we won't break that habit, because we always think we are going to get something. Sir, conscious meditation is no meditation. You understand what I am saying? To deliberately sit down, repeat mantras, is nothing, that is not meditation. That is a cheap escape. So, what will make you change? Your house is burning, and apparently you do not pay attention. So, if you don't change, society remains as it is, and clever people are coming along saying society must change, which means new structure and through that structure hope to change man. And then say, yes, we are doing both: change man and the new structure, the structure then becomes more important than man, as all revolutions have pointed out.

So, after listening for an hour and five minutes or ten, is there a learning, is there an awakening of intelligence, is there a sense of order in our lives, or we are going back to the same routine? So, sirs and ladies, if you have that intelligence, that goodness, that sense of great love, then you will create a marvellous new society where we can all live happily. It's our earth, not Indian earth, or the English earth, or the Russian earth, it's our earth where we can live happily, intelligently, not at each other's throat. So, please give your heart and mind to find out why you don't change. Even little things. They say don't smoke. You get up immediately to smoke. Sirs, please pay attention to your own life. You have got extraordinary capacities. Sir, it is all waiting for you to open the door.

# MADRAS 4TH PUBLIC TALK 30TH DECEMBER 1979

I wonder why you are all here. It would be rather good if we could go into that question, why you have all gathered here. To listen to this speaker, or just to be amused, intellectually activated, or seeking a new excitement, a new experience, or perhaps out of sheer curiosity to find out what the speaker has to say? Perhaps it is all of those. Also, some might be very serious and wanting to find out.

If we may, we will go on with what we were talking about yesterday. First of all, I think we should be very clear that we are not doing any propaganda, nor propagating any ideas or doing a campaign like those fellows across the way; nor are we trying to convince you of anything, and I really mean it; nor persuading you to act in any particular direction, or to think in a certain way, to a certain end. I think that should be very clear. But we are trying or hoping that we can be concerned together to enquire into the whole nature and the structure of the mind, because from that all action, all desires, all beliefs and actions, various types of action take place. Unless we understand this very complex nature of the mind and the brain, we shall not be able to find out for ourselves what is right action under all circumstances. So I hope we are together, you and the speaker, concerned, at least for this evening committed to the enquiry, to the investigation of our own minds - our minds being the result of many, many, many years, millions of years, with all its vast experience, knowledge accumulated through thousands of years and also acquired recently, inherited both genetically and

being under great pressure of evolution. I hope we can go into all this together.

One wonders what length of period this evening one can maintain a certain attention - to attend continuously, sustain for this whole hour. Which means one must have the urge to listen attentively, carefully, precisely and use the speaker as a mirror in which you are seeing yourself. And when you see yourself exactly as you are, then you can break the mirror, then the mirror is not useful at all. Though the speaker is sitting on a platform, he has no authority. The platform is only for convenience. So, bearing all this in mind, we are together concerned to see exactly what we are.

If you have observed, our minds are always occupied. There is never a moment when it is quiet naturally, easily, without this tremendous exertion, conflict. Our minds are chattering, thought moving from one association to another, from one desire to another, from one longing to another, this contradiction of opposing energies. So our minds and our brains are never, never quiet. They are occupied. If you are an engineer or a surgeon or a lawyer, your mind is occupied with all those skills. You may have a few moments of leisure when you might read other things or go to your club or join some game and so on, but this constant movement, endless apparently, and so the mind is never free. It is possessed by ideas, by knowledge, by all the experiences that one has had, by the pursuit of pleasure, fear, great deal of tears, sorrow and so on. So, this mind being so occupied, both consciously as well as unconsciously, is never free. The word 'freedom', etymologically, has a very complex meaning: it means also love. And when one goes into this question of what is freedom, whether

the mind is made up of words, symbols, images, ideas, filling every corner of the brain, memory, if you can observe it yourself you will find out. And also the brain specialists are saying the same thing too.

So the mind, the brain, which has evolved through time has come to a point, it has discovered for itself that there is not one corner where it is free. Only its freedom is from moving from one corner to another corner of the same ground, and imagining, thinking or desiring that it is free because it has moved from this to that. Or, that it is free in its choice, to discriminate between this and that - the choice of will, freedom of will. This has been our movement, going from one group to another, joining this sect or that sect, moving from one authority to another authority, in pain, anxiety, grief, sorrow, jealousy, anxious, that is the occupation of our minds. So, is there freedom at all? You understand my question? Please enquire with me. We are taking a journey together. I am not taking a journey by myself. We are walking together as two friends talking over things amicably, charitably, with certain sense of care and affection, not trying to browbeat each other through argument, through superior knowledge or having a great deal of experience - like two friends who are really friends, moving together with a sense of great affection, understanding each other, moving beyond the words, not just sticking to words, finding out what lies behind the words. So, if we can do that this evening, it will be marvellous. Then we can really communicate with each other not only verbally but much beyond the word, which is to have communion, where both minds meet, not only the minds, the hands, hearts, the whole of their being meet



each other. With that care and attention, if we could walk beginning from very near which is where we are, because that is the only place where you can begin - very near - and then you can walk very far together because we are never alone. All our life is relationship, whether we like it or not. And if you, as an audience, kind of expect, spoofed, or you are going to receive something extraordinary, or ideas or conclusions or beliefs, then we are not walking together, and we are not sharing together the same sky, the beauty of the land, the lovely tree in a field.

So, if we could this evening unsentimentally, not being romantic, but exercising our brains and our minds and our hearts, to find out whether the mind being enslaved as we are, whether there is freedom at all for human beings, not in heaven, certainly not in hell, because without freedom there is no love, without freedom there is no order, without freedom there can be no relationship between each other. You may be married, you may sleep together, you may share the same house, have the same children, but if in that relationship there is no absolute freedom there cannot possibly be love.

So, please together we are going to find out whether this mind so crowded, this brain, every part of it storing up memories of a million years, that is the mind, the brain that lives in the known. You are following all this? Please, we are sharing this. Every part of the brain, because of its long journey of thousands and thousands of years, every part of it, every cell in it, is carrying memory; memory is the result of knowledge and experience, from which thought arises. That is the origin of thought. And within that area, ground, field of that mind there can never be freedom. You

may choose, you may think you are free to choose, you may think the exercise of freewill is freedom, or you may determine that you are free, that is, by being permissive sexually, morally, socially, rejecting the established order, you think you are terribly free. I don't know if you have seen a cartoon in the 'New Yorker'. Perhaps you don't know that magazine which is published in New York. A boy and a girl are looking out the window, looking down from 10th floor, and the boy says to the girl, 'See those people down there, beards, uncombed hair, sloppy dress, those are the new establishment'.

So, is there freedom beyond? Please, this is an enquiry. This is not a statement, that there is or there is not. But one has to see very clearly within the area of the brain, within the area of the mind - mind being the senses with their neurological responses, the emotions, the various forms of sentiments, all that is the mind, mind is not separate from the brain, brain is part of the mind - so, within the mind, within this whole area, can there ever be freedom? If not, man is everlastingly slave to the known. Please understand this. There have been scientists and professors, and those people say man can ascend only through knowledge, that is, gathering more and more and more knowledge. Knowledge is always within the time limit of the past. So, one has to question whether knowledge which is the movement of the past through the present, modifying itself and proceeding, which is the future. Right? You are following all this?

This is a lovely country, no respect for anybody. As long as you do what you want to do - it is great self-concern, this immense selfishness, not be concerned with anybody. And that you call

civilization. And out of that you hope to create a new culture.

So, we are asking whether there is freedom at all within the area of knowledge which is the brain, the mind, because if there is no freedom there, there cannot possibly be love. It is only a man which is completely, absolutely free from the past that can fully comprehend or be in that state of mind where there is love, compassion, intelligence. So it is very important for all of us to find out, not just the speaker alone to find out. As there is no freedom within the movement of the mind including thought, there is no freedom, so no love. And hence is it possible to go beyond the process of time? Time is movement from here to there, both physically, and a movement psychologically from 'what is', to 'what should be', or 'what might be'. This constant movement of thought pursuing the ideal, like a man who is ambitious he needs time to achieve his end, and with that same mentality, that is, one needs time to achieve a certain result, to achieve a certain skill, for a seed to become a plant. That is there is the process of evolution, that is the movement of time which is called evolution. Man has been for a million years, has acquired through thousands and thousands of years of experience, knowledge, and in that process of evolution he has come into this state of mind. All that needs time. And we think time can bring about freedom; freedom from jealousy, freedom from anxiety, freedom from fear, but not freedom from pleasure. So we exploit time as the means psychologically to achieve a result. Right? That is, I am jealous, greedy, psychologically, full of discontent, full of being hurt, and to get over all that I need time. You understand? That is, I will examine it, I will go into the cause of it, I will analyze it,

introspect, examine, and at the end of it, perhaps I will be out of it. All that means time. That is the tradition of the mind, the tradition handed down from generation after generation through thousands of years, that time is a means of changing, is a means of conquering, is a means of achievement, both physically and psychologically. So the mind, the brain is conditioned to time. Examine it. The speaker is not telling you what to think. That would be catastrophic. But we are examining together, being concerned actively into the nature of the mind, which is our mind. Our mind is the mind of man, of human beings - it is not your mind or my mind, it is the mind because your mind is the result of many thousand years, the instincts, the subtle intimations are the result of years. So, you are not an individual. You are the rest of mankind. So we are not in this exploration becoming more and more selfish, more and more self-centred; on the contrary. It is the self-centred activity that is destroying the world.

So the mind which is the rest of humanity has never been able to go beyond the limits of time. Without this conditioning of time, without this sense of moving from here to there, both physically as well as inwardly, that is the result of outward evolution. Right? From a little plant which becomes a tree in a hundred years, like a banyan tree, that same sequential concept is carried over psychologically and so we say, time is necessary. Right? That is our conditioning, that is our tradition. You will eventually achieve nirvana, heaven, illumination, god, or whatever you like, if you do this, this. All that admits this destructive, corruptive nature of time. Right? Are we meeting each other? And, the question arises: is it possible not to be caught in this time? I don't know if you are

interested in all this, because it is your life, not my life, and we are going into this, whether it is possible to act not in the tradition of time.

The immediate is far more important than the future: the immediate. I will show you something, which is, we are full of problems, unresolved, one problem after another, both in our relationships, personal, intimate, there are problems, business problems, scientific problems, mathematical problems. Mathematical problems, scientific problems have their own field. But we are talking about human problems. And these problems, when carried over day after day, day after day, corrupt the mind. In the sense 'corrupt the mind', we mean by that, make the mind insensitive. It is not quick, not active, rapidly responding, because if that mind carrying this heavy burden of problems - you understand what happens to a mind. So you are carrying these problems, and you say time will resolve these problems. If you analyze a problem, find the cause of the problem, go into it, and mind being caught in this tradition of time becomes lazy, insensitive, it says, well it will be solved tomorrow. So the tomorrow is the movement of time, of postponement, and in that there is no immediacy, there is nothing immediate. Now, any problem - anger, violence: this question of violence, to meet violence immediately in oneself, and not to have this idea of non-violence, which is again the tradition of time - eventually we will become non-violent, like the United Nations, all the nations together will eventually achieve brotherhood, which is tommy rot.

So, the mind has become accustomed, trained, conditioned to time. There is never any question of immediate action. And we are

saying the immediate dissolves time. I will show it to you. Not dissolves time, breaks the tradition of time. If you are violent and you have to deal with it immediately, because there is no non-violence. That is a non-fact. Violence is a fact. That is what is actually going on - your anger, your jealousy, your hatreds, your competition, every sense of that self-assertive aggressive movement, that is violence, in different forms. And the mind being accustomed to time has invented non-violence, thought has invented non-violence which is non-fact, and therefore, you say, I will gradually becomes non-violent. But in the meantime you are violent. You are playing a game with yourself. Whereas violence is anger, hatred, forms of competition, and competition is destroying the world, both individual, collective, all that. It is destroying - competition. So, that is a fact and you have to deal with violence instantly, not allowing time to say, I will get over it. You have to deal with that fact immediately. See what happens to the mind which is faced with the immediacy of action. Are you doing it with me? Or are you going to sleep? Come on sirs.

You have your problems haven't you? Unfortunately. Problems of meditation, problems of love, problems of loneliness, problems of competition, problems of your wife and husband, problems of death, and old age, every kind of problem. Now if you take one of those problems, whatever your problem is, not think of the resolution of the problem, which again the time element enters, but deal with it instantly, immediately, which means the moment when you set aside time as a means of achievement psychologically, when that is clearly understood that this time element carried over from the physiological to the psychological has made the mind

insensitive, actually inactive, so when you have to deal with a problem instantly, immediately, you have denied time. Do you understand what I am saying? Are you following this? No, you don't. Where are your minds, for god's sake?

I will go into it. The speaker will go into this problem, but please join me, don't wait for me to explain. Let us move together. One of our great problems is desire. The word 'desire' means the want of, the lack of, longing for something, not having, longing, because that directs most of our lives, desire. Religious people, the organized religions and the so-called religious people have said throughout the ages, desire must be stamped out. Right? You know the game, don't you? It must be killed, because if you want to serve god, you must give all your energy, both sexual desires, any form of longing, because you have not and you want, and most of us are driven by desire. Isn't that so? Desire to be wealthy, desire to be famous, desire to have a better life, desire to marry a better man or woman, desire for happiness, desire for enlightenment, you know, desire is eating most of us. And we have never, never solved the problem. The sannyasis, they put on the robes, but they are burning with desires. Like us, only he puts on a different robe. He is just like us behind that robe. Like the priests, they adorn themselves with all the extravagant robes, they are just like the rest of humanity - ambitious, greedy, wanting position, to become bishops, archbishops, the hierarchical structure.

So desire is one of our greatest problems which is bringing in our lives great conflict - one desire opposing another desire, the desire of one object, changing constantly that object. So, one has to understand the nature of desire, not suppress it, not control it, not

run away from it. One has to understand, which is our problem now. Our problem, we are facing it. I hope you are facing it. It's our problem. And what is desire. What is the nature of desire? How desire comes into being. What to do with desire. That's our problem. And it must be dealt with immediately, not say, I will get over desire, I will suppress desire, I will control the desire or I will let desire run its course. You understand all this?

So we are first enquiring. When we use words like, enquiry, it means time. The very word enquire implies time. But we are not doing it in the sense we are using the word 'observe' rather than 'enquiry'. You understand what I mean? We are observing and observation is always immediate, you can't say, I will observe. It is now.

Desire causes innumerable problems, contradictory problems - conflict, misery, you know, all the gamut of desire. So, we are looking, observing, what is desire, how it arises. And what is the movement of desire. You are following all this? Please come with me. We are observing, not analyzing, not seeking the cause, we are just observing the movement of desire, not the object of desire, whether it is noble, ignoble, beautiful, ugly, none of that, but purely observing the movement of desire, and the observation of that is immediate. It is clear? Are you coming with me? Like two people watching the bird, they are both interested in what the bird is, their senses, their eyes are actively watching. So, what is desire? Desire comes through observation; seeing, then contact, touch, then sensation. Now follow it, stop there for a moment, I must go into it carefully, otherwise, we will miss the point here. First the seeing, a woman or a man, seeing the flower, smelling it, then



wanting it, all that. That is, seeing, contact, sensation. That what happens? Go slowly, observe, precisely, carefully. Then what happens? You see a car, the sensation, the contact and then what happens? Then thought comes in and says, how nice to be in it, driving it, seeing the power of it. You follow? That is, seeing, contact, sensation, thought creating the image, and the moment thought has created the image, desire comes into being. You are following this, right? Is this clear? No, not verbally. You see a man or a woman, you know all the reactions. So, seeing, contact, sensation. Then thought creates the image, a symbol, whatever it is. Then from that image, which thought has created bursts desire. Please look at it for yourselves. You can see it very clearly, only the movement is so rapid. It is accelerated by the thought instantly responding. Now we are saying, watch it very carefully, and you will see the movement, how it begins.

So, desire comes through the movement of thought creating the image, and thought pursuing the image which becomes desire. So, the question is, if you have gone into it very carefully, why does thought create the image? Do you understand my question? Can thought not create the image? Because again it is the tradition of time - thought, thought is time. Right? Or have I to explain that? Oh, my lord! Thought is the movement from the past, knowledge, memory which means thought is time. So thought which has been conditioned to create images instantly flows into sensation, and from that begins desire. You have got it? No? In your heart, observe it, observe it very closely.

Now the question is can you look, contact, sensation, end there? You are following this? Not allow thought - no, can thought see

itself, what it is doing? You have got it? No? Your minds are so slow because you have never exercised your eyes, your ears, you are not quick. You are too educated, that is what is wrong. You are all lawyers, engineers, scientists, businessmen, worried about your wife, and children and so your minds have become dull. For god's sake see this. And when something new is put in front of you, you don't quickly grasp it.

So, I am saying sirs, I am not being impatient, I am just stating what is happening to your minds. I am just pointing out, we are observing together, together. You are as active in your observation as the speaker. He says, look how desire arises. Now, the immediacy and the urgency to see that thought does not come into it, because the moment thought enters into the creation of desire we are lost. Then the contradictions, the conflicts, the urges, the competition, the desire. So, we are not suppressing desire. We are not cutting out desire. We are not saying it's right or wrong. We are awake to the whole movement of desire, attentive to desire. You understand what I am saying? Attentive. Therefore when you attend instantly a different activity comes into being. Right sir, are you doing it?

Now, look at the other aspect of desire, which is will. Will is energy directed in a particular direction. Right? Will which is the exertion of energy and that energy is the movement of desire: I want to be better, a collector or an engineer or a lawyer. I exercise tremendous will to become that because thought, follow it carefully, thought has seen, one has observed the people who have great will achieve - more money, car, better houses, this enormous energy driven in a certain direction, with its consequent results of

conflicts, competition, ruthlessness, brutality, violence - all that is involved.

So, will in which there is choice, is the movement of seeing, contact, sensation, thought taking over that sensation through an image, and the movement of desire and the operation of will. You can see how this comes into being. So, the question then is not whether desire can be stopped - see how our minds have changed. Right sir? You follow? Are you coming with me? Our minds have undergone change the moment I have realized the nature of desire. It has moved out of the tradition that desire must be suppressed, controlled, whatever it is, transformed, and so on. We are treating desire as an energy. Right sir, you follow this?

Now as long as energy creates conflict in any direction, that energy is wasted. Energy is wasted in conflict, struggle, competition, drive, wanting to be superior, and all the rest of it. So, desire is energy, desire which is the result of thought creating the image and pursuing that image. So, one realizes if you are observing very closely as we are now, the nature of energy which has been caught up in desire and directed in a particular direction which creates conflict, and the seeing of that total process instantly is the awakening of intelligence. You are following this? The awakening of intelligence, which is going to direct that energy. You have followed all this? No, you haven't. You are all asleep. I can't repeat it.

You see sirs, ladies, to live a life without a single control, think it out - which does not mean doing what you like, a permissiveness, but to understand the nature of control instantly. Not say, well, why shouldn't I have control? If I don't I will be

sexual, I will be angry. To understand why thought has brought about control and whether it is possible to live a life without a single control. Think about it. See the beauty of it. Because when you control, one thought is controlling another thought, that is all. Right? Thought which is the response of memory, knowledge, time, and that thought has broken up into itself, and one thought tries to control another, but it is still the movement of thought. So, is it possible to observe instantly and act instantly, which needs no control? You understand?

Sir, we began by talking about freedom. A mind that lives in control, lives in conflict, lives in constant desire, wanting, wanting, wanting, is never free, and therefore can never possibly love; and without that extraordinary thing called love, do what you will, you will create misery, you will destroy people. So, this observation into the mind is freeing the mind to have this extraordinary vitality of life, the energy of it. Right?

# MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 3RD JANUARY 1980

We are having a dialogue, not a discussion. The difference between dialogue and a discussion is a discussion implies trying to find truth or a conclusion between two opinions, between two arguments, dialectic, fanciful, imaginary, or romantic, even so-called historical. But a dialogue means a conversation - dialogos - that means conversation between two people. So this is a conversation between you and the speaker. A conversation implies two friends, I mean friends who like each other, who have a certain affection for each other, who are concerned about their personal problems and so they talk over things together, not try to brow beat one or the other by superior knowledge, or superior intellect, but to investigate together their own problems, their own difficulties, their own personal lives and so on. So please, if you don't mind, this morning we are going to have a dialogue, a conversation between you and the speaker. I see there are a lot of questions here, written questions; you doesn't write when people are walking together as two friends, you don't write questions to each other; you talk, you ask. So if you don't mind we will leave these questions aside for the moment and continue with our dialogue. So what shall we talk about this morning?

Q: Pain.

K: Physical pain?

Q: No, psychological pain.

K: Psychological pain.

Q: Pain of the heart.

K: Physical pain of the heart.

Q: No, psychological pain.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: If some one hears it very clearly, would you like to pass it on to me. I am not deaf - maybe - but I like to be informed correctly.

Q: Are impediments in the way of passive observation.

K: Psychological pain, impediments that might prevent clear, acute, passive awareness and observation. Anything else?

Q: Does diet, natural food, help intelligence?

K: Oh, dietary. You can have marvellous nuts, and marvellous fruit, and marvellous diet but you may be equally stupid. So any other questions, sir?

Q: Why do you take only the crisis of a war when people think together, there may be thinking together without a crisis.

Q: He says there may be other examples of thinking together.

K: Oh, he wants other examples of thinking together. Any other questions?

Q: We have a national crisis that we are having within our country. We want millions of people to have this passive, total observation.

K: This country is in a crisis and we ask all the millions of people to be passively observant. I am afraid even those who are here won't even listen, let alone the millions. Any other questions sirs?

Q: Sir, the energy that is produced through drugs, the stimulation in various forms, is that different from the energy that you are talking about?

K: Chemical energy, which is, drugs are chemical energy, and is

that energy different from the energy that we are talking about.

Right, sir?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just a minute, sir.

Q: What is that state when supreme intelligence dawns?

K: What is the state when that intelligence dawns. Now just a minute, sir, you have asked several questions, which of these shall we take? Physical, psychological pain, talking to the millions, what is the state of supreme intelligence, what is the mind, or the state which is passively observant. Now which of these shall we take?

Q: The last two.

K: Which is what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I am asking, sir, which would be the most comprehensive question, which would include all the other questions, to discuss?

Q: Facing a crisis.

K: Facing a crisis, do you want to discuss that, have a dialogue about facing a crisis, or what is it to be attentively - the gentleman used, 'passively observant' - seeing. Which of these two? It's up to you.

Q: Does the movement of the planets affect the brain cells? Is there an astrological influence on the brain cells?

K: Oh, yes sir. Is that all the questions? You mean to say you have no personal questions? No personal problems?

Q: Our personal problems arise out of national problems.

K: Oh! Our problems arise from national problems. No, I won't go into this question. Which would you like to talk about?

Q: How to translate your ideas into the social, economic and

political world.

K: I am afraid you can't!

Q: Would you speak of love and compassion?

K: You speak of love and compassion, would you talk about it, could we have a conversation about it.

Q: Love and compassion are so abstract, why talk about those abstractions when we are concerned with our daily life?

K: You mean to say, sirs, that you exclude love and compassion from your daily life?

Q: I will have a dialogue with you, sir, if you ask me. It is so.

K: What is so?

Q: Love and compassion, I have understood what it is, and how it can be related to daily life.

K: Have you understood the question? How can love and compassion be applied to daily life?

Q: When I came here I didn't know what you were talking about.

K: Quite right.

Q: I am not trying to conclude what you are going to talk about this morning, and I am freely observing what you are going to talk about and I am ready to learn. And when I am troubled about a particular point I am stopping that.

K; Yes, sir. Do you want to talk about compassion and love, which is an abstraction? Do you want to talk about an abstraction also called observation? An abstraction between the movements of the stars and your brain? An abstraction of pain in the heart? So which of these abstractions do you want to discuss, have a dialogue about?



Q: The difference between desire and consciousness.

K: Desire and consciousness, what is their relationship.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What shall we do, sir?

Q: Sir you asked that we should ask a personal question, and my personal question is about intelligence, because I see that lack of intelligence, or absence of it, brings all the problems. If that problem is solved then all the others are.

K: We have spent twenty minutes talking about abstractions, not about actually what we are, what we go through in our daily life, our miseries, our confusions, our travail, our ambitions and competition, but we want to talk about something else quite apart. So please let's come down to earth and let's talk together.

Q: My life, and most people's life that I see, it is because of the pain that they will not look at it.

K: All right, sir, shall we discuss that? Shall we talk over that?

Q: Yes.

K: Right. Most human beings, including ourselves, you and I can we talk about that, why human beings accept, live with, continue with pain, sorrow, anxiety and all that. Shall we talk about that? Right, let's do it.

Q: We want a solution.

K: There is a solution. Sir, before we begin to go into this, will you kindly listen? Listen; I listened to you, I listened to you for twenty minutes, so kindly also listen to each other, not that we are going to find a solution immediately, or try to convince each other of anything; we are trying to find out, or learn the movement of pain, common to all human beings, the tears, the anxieties, the

grief, the sorrow and all that that makes up our human daily existence. Is that all right? Shall we talk about that?

When we say we have pain, are we aware of it, know it, observe it, as it is taking place? We are going into this step by step, if you don't mind, is that all right? Are we, each one of us, conscious of the pain, of various forms of griefs, anxieties, fears, are we aware of it as it takes place; or we are aware of it a few minutes, or a few seconds later? Let's talk about it. You understand my question? I have a toothache - one has a toothache; that's a physical fact and you know it instantly. Right? That is, immediately you know that there is a physical pain. And you act, if you can, immediately because the pain is intolerable and you act. Right? Now when we say we have pain, psychological, inward, inside the skin as it were, the pain, is that pain as acute, clear as toothache? You understand my question? Or we are aware of it after it has taken place? Would you please discuss with me, I am not giving a talk - the day after tomorrow.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I asked psychological pain, not physical pain.

Q: If it is not acute we are not aware of it.

K: So as long as the psychological state is not acute, not aware, not sensitive, we are not aware of it. So that is what I am asking: is the psychological pain, which we say we have, are we sensitive enough to act instantly, immediately, or not being sensitive we postpone it, or look at it a few minutes later and then try to say, what am I to do about it? I wonder if I am conveying this? Come and sit there, sir, out of the sun. Or would you like to come sit on the platform - anybody is welcome to come and sit on the platform,

you can all come!

Is it that one is not sensitive to psychological pains, as one is very, very sensitive when one has physical acute pain? You understand my question? Won't you have a conversation with the speaker?

Q: When the pain comes, like someone you love, suddenly it arrests you, and you say, why.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: And you usually want to run away from it.

K: When you love somebody, or you think you love somebody, and that somebody does something that is not according to your like, or you dislike, then you feel the pain. Right? And what shall we do about it? What do you do about it, sirs?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, don't just throw out words; just see what is happening, sir to each one of us: when somebody you love leaves you - at least, you think you love - leaves you, you go through great agony. I don't know if the Indians do. Some people do, when somebody whom you loves leaves, or you have a battle with your wife - at last you are waking up! - there is pain, there is jealousy, there is anxiety, the sense of antagonism, hatred - which are all various forms of violence - what then do you do? Come on, sirs, meet it, sir, have a discussion, have a dialogue with me; don't just sit there and wait for me to go on. What do we do when this happens - which is a crisis. It is not a national crisis, it is a crisis every day of our life, what do we do?

Q: React selfishly.

K: Yes. You react selfishly. What do you mean by that word

'selfishly'? Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's what I am saying, sir. He says, you react to that crisis through pain, jealousy. That's your reaction, it's not selfish. So when you have that reaction what do you do?

Q: I am just simple observing what is happening.

K: My darling sir, you are not meeting what I am saying. This is the crisis, sir, you won't even listen to what the other fellow has to say.

Q: You try to reduce the pain.

K: You try to reduce the pain, the anxiety and so on. What process do you go through to reduce it? Either run away from it, suppress it, or substitute and so on. Which is, in effect, run away from it. Right? Suppose I have pain because my husband has left me, and I shed tears, then I am lonely, I miss him - sexually, this way and that way and I am deeply hurt and I don't know what to do. Right? Then what happens? Not knowing what to do, I try to escape from it, I try to smother it, I try to go away to some psychologist, to some temple, anything away from the fact that I am in a great state of disturbance. Then how shall I deal with that disturbance if I don't escape? You understand my question? Do I know that I am escaping first? Or is it our natural, or unnatural response to escape? Sir, find out, go into yourself, find out.

Q: I endure it.

K: You don't endure if you have tremendous physical pain. You go to a doctor. Please kindly listen, sir. I said, endure it, suppress it, try to get out of it, escape from it. You do all kinds of things to avoid this pain.

Q: Yes.

K: Please would you mind listening before you agree. So what shall I do? Do we see the futility of escape? Not mentally, as an idea, but do we see the absurdity, the futility of any escape? If one sees that escape does not solve the problem, then what shall I do with the problem? Go slowly, sir. What shall I do with the problem?

Q: I try to accept.

K: I have just now said that madam, I said, escape from it - I included that word.

Q: Accept the problem.

K: Yes, that is endure, accept. So if I don't do any of those things what am I to do? I don't accept, why should I accept? Why should I endure this pain?

Q: In time, it will pass.

K: Yes, that is the same, escape, in time it will pass, endure it, accept it. But you don't accept physical pain.

Q: You must see what the problem is and deal with it.

K: We are going to do it sir. First that can only happen when I don't escape. But we have cultivated such a network of escapes that we don't know even that we are escaping. So I am just asking, most respectfully, do we see the fact, the truth, the fact that the moment you escape the problem still remains? I may postpone going to the doctor because one doctor, or several doctors have told me I have cancer; I say, it doesn't matter, I will put up with it, I can escape, but eventually I must be operated on, or die. So do I, do we acutely realize the fact that any escape in any form - acceptance, running away, enduring it, time will solve it - will never resolve the problem? Do we accept that? If that is so then what shall we do?

Q: Yes I do.

K: Do you?

Q: That situation has not arisen for me.

K: That you don't face the problem?

Q: He said he has not had an anxiety of any kind in his life.

K: You battle it out! This is most extraordinary. Sir, look: I realize the futility and the stupidity of escape, I realize it, the problem will not be solved, then what shall I do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you telling me, or am I telling you?

Q: Understand the problem and then you can deal with it.

K: How do you understand the problem?

Q: You seek for the cause of the problem.

K: Wait, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You try to understand the problem by analysing it, trying to find out the cause of it, trying to investigate it, look at it, and all that you are saying. Now, listen carefully please, if you will. I have a problem, I analyse it, try to find the cause of it - what is that? What is that process of analysing, trying to find the cause of it, what is taking place? Just watch it sir. Kindly give me two minutes. I have a problem, my husband has run away and I realize - I have shed tears and all the rest of it - and I realize I can't escape, it is there on my front door step. It is there. Then I say to myself, I must find the cause of it. Right? The cause, analyse, all that - what does that imply? Watch it sir, in yourself, don't just throw out words. Is that not also an escape? What do you say, sir, is that not an escape? Just a minute, sir, look at it, please. This is what our tradition is: I

have a problem, either we escape in different forms or analyse it, go into the cause of it, there may be several causes and I have to examine each cause, there may be ten causes. So what have I done? I have moved away from the problem. Right? Do you see that, sir?

Q: How do you say that we have moved away from the problem? Are we not analysing that problem?

K: Yes, sir, I am saying exactly the same thing as you are. Which means what? Just a minute sir. Do you know what is implied in analysis? What?

Q: Finding out what has caused it.

K: No, what does it imply? What is implied in analysis?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Right. Now who is cutting it, analyzing it?

Q: Myself.

K: Myself. That is, yourself analysing the problem of my wife escaping from me, which means what? You have spent a couple of days, or a couple of months in analysing, which means what? Wait, sir, you haven't answered my question. I have analysed, I have taken a couple of years, I have been to an analyst, or done puja, or sat by myself and said, what is the cause of all that. What has happened? Have I solved the problem?

Q: It may.

K: You say, it may - have I?

Q: I have solved the problem.

K: I question it.

Q: I have, sir.

K: Good sir.

Q: In my daily life.

K: Yes, I am dealing with daily life.

Q: I think I have more intensive problems in my daily life than your respected self. I know how I am living.

K: Wait, forgive me, I have no problems.

Q: I have problems.

K: I know. I know, sir, you all have problems. I am trying to find out if you will kindly listen to me. I am trying to say that when we have a problem without escaping we begin to analyse. Right? Say, what am I to do. So I say, what is the cause of this, what is the root of this matter? Right? Then what happens? What is actually taking place when I say I am trying to find the root of the matter?

Q: I try to get clear about it.

K: That is, sir, you are analysing, aren't you? Now just let's stop there for a moment. What are the implications of analysis? Who is it that is analysing, thinking the analyser is different from the problem? Careful, go slowly, sir. The analyser thinks he is different from the problem, and therefore he is able to say to himself, I am going to understand, investigate, analyse the cause of it. That is, the analyser is different from the thing analysed. Just a minute, sir. Do you see that?

Q: I see that, but the problem is part of me and I am part of the problem. The problem and I are not different.

K: So what shall we do? If the problem is you, and the problem is interrelated, what shall we do? This is not a conversation between that gentleman and myself, please we are all involved in this.

Q: Step aside and watch.

K: Do you? You see you just throw out ideas.



Q: Stop, we would listen.

K: What am I to do sir? We don't seem to think together, we don't even look at the same thing at the same time together. Look sir, just listen to this for two minutes. I have a problem: my wife or my son or my husband has left me. It is an acute problem because I am then facing my loneliness, my lack of sexual relationship, my sense of isolation, my sense of being deserted, left. And one generally runs away from this fact. Right, sir? Runs away in different ways. Then I say, I won't run away, but then I must understand the problem. To understand the problem it is our tradition that says you must analyse. Now what does analyse mean?

Q: Well I analyse the problem and I think I will solve the problem, I don't know what else to do.

K: I am pointing this out, sir. I think by analysing I will be able to solve the problem. We haven't understood the full meaning of analysis. No, don't smile, look at it, sir. You have analysed, you are all experts at analysis, introspection, conversation, discussion, but the fact remains at the end of it, have you solved the problem? That is, by analysis perhaps you get at the root, all that is time. That is, through time we think we will have solved it, not through analysis. I don't know if you understand this. Wait, wait sir, don't be too quick. There is a problem, no escape and I analyse, one analyses, that involves time which means what? I think through time to resolve the problem, which is another escape. You don't even understand what I am talking about.

Sir, we act immediately - please listen to it - you act immediately if you have a very acute pain, physically - immediate

action. Right? Why don't you do the same with regard to problems? Wait, sir, listen to it. I can answer all the questions you raise, sir. Why don't you act as acutely, shocked, immediately as you do with regard to physical pain, why don't you do the same with psychological pains? That is the real issue. Right? Listen to it. Why don't I do that? You understand, sir?

Q: Make a commentary.

K: We live on commentaries, sir. It's not worth it.

Q: Even in that freedom...

K: You are a free person, sir.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You may take, sir, a taxi to go to the hospital. Sir, don't let's play with words. If you have pain, it may take an hour to get to the doctor, but inwardly you have acted instantly, immediately. Now why don't you do the same? That is...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know all this, sir, I know all these questions. I have lived with these questions for the last sixty years, everybody throws out an idea, and apparently one doesn't listen to what is being said. Listen, sir, please. I am saying, the physical pain may be compared with the psychological pain. The physical pain, you may allow ten minutes to go to the doctor, but the immediate decision is, act immediately. That action may take time, that is, ten minutes in a taxi. Is it possible, I am asking myself, to inwardly decide immediately, without analysis - wait sir, you haven't even listened and you disagree - can I decide immediately to end this problem? Not take time, not run away, not move away from that problem completely.

Q: I immediately accept it, this feeling of shock is the word.

K: This is a question I am asking, madam, find out what the question is first.

Q: I would treat it with the use of intelligence.

K: Yes, sir. When you act physically, pain, your intelligence acts. Here intelligence is not acting. And I say intelligence can only operate at the moment. So go slowly. I am asking myself, instead of going through all the process of analysis, escapes, time and all that, why can't I, the mind, say, this must be tackled instantly, immediately? Now, I'll show it to you in a minute. My wife has left me and I am terribly hurt, lonely. Right? Is it not possible to deal with that loneliness instantly? Right? Now probably you have never asked this question. Now I am pointing out how to do it, follow it - will you?

I am not - my mind is not allowing time to interfere with it. Sir, this is one of the most difficult things to do, don't just... Not to allow time as a means of the solution of a problem - time being analysis, escape, suppression, acceptance, all those imply time. Right? Right, sirs? No, not as an idea, see the fact that all those movements are away from the problem and involve time. And I say to myself, time will not solve it. It's obvious. Time has not solved the problem of war - for the last five thousand years historically there have been five thousand wars. So time psychologically, or outwardly, will not solve the problem. So I say, if I will not allow time to interfere what then takes place? Answer it, sir. It's up to you, the ball is in your court! What do you say, sir? Will you put yourself in that position of not allowing time at all?

Q: You give it your full attention.

K: Now you have said something. Which is, escape, suppression, acceptance, which are all implied in analysis, time, which is what? A wastage of energy. I don't know if you see this. That is, I have done all these things, like a silly person because my wife has run away, I have been through all this. And I suddenly realize time will not solve this. So what has happened? I have wasted my energy through analysis, through escape, through saying, I will accept it, but ache inside. All that allows time. Right? And time is not going to solve it. So I must find a way of dealing with the problem immediately. Right? The immediacy implies what? Please follow this. I have wasted energy in all this, and when I say the problem must be solved immediately I have brought all my energy to it, that means all my attention, to it. Have you?

So that means, what is attention? This bringing together all your energy to look at the problem, and you cannot have that total energy if you are wasting it through analysis, through suppression, through finding the cause, saying, yes, time will solve the problem. Right? Is this clear? Verbally at least? Now can that be brought to reality? That is, can I, having listened to you, say, time will not solve it and, because I am fairly intelligent, I won't remain in my old groove, I say, yes, you are quite right. I say, now am I in that position when I bring all my energy to the problem? What do you say, sirs? My wife and I quarrel, that's a problem. I say, I won't allow time, which is the most destructive way of thinking. So what happens? As the wife and I begin to quarrel, the good old business, then if I give attention at that moment what happens? Come on, sirs, what happens? You should know!

Q: I...

K: No, what actually takes place? Would you please, sirs?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Unfortunately, sir, you don't seem to apply the question to yourself. That is, you and your wife quarrel, don't you?

Q: I become silent.

K: Don't say, 'I become silent', sir. You and your wife quarrel, which is the common thing in the world. As the gentleman says, a daily fact. What happens when you don't escape from that fact?

Q: I open myself totally.

K: No, no, you don't open yourself.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Would you stop talking with your hands. What are you trying to say, lady?

Q: I open myself totally.

K: You open yourself totally to your wife - what does that mean?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I'll wave the hands and you talk! This is most extraordinary. Have you done this ever?

Q: Yes.

K: Then, lady, you have solved the problem. Have you done this ever, if you are honest? That is, I and my wife quarrel, at the moment of the quarrelling not to allow time to interfere. Which means you give all your attention at that moment to the quarrel. What happens? Do it, sir, for god's sake, do it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I know sir, all that, we know all that. I know all that.

Q: Then what does it mean?

K: We know all that, sir. That's the common pattern we live by. And I am saying, forget the pattern and see what happens. Sir, please I am pointing out. Break the pattern, that is, the pattern is escape, time, all the rest of it, break it and say, I am going to give my full attention at the moment of quarrel.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Have you done it, sirs? Now wait a minute: you and I are quarrelling now, it is a quarrel, I'll show you. Will you give your complete attention? Then what happens? If you, as the husband or the wife, give complete attention what happens to the other person? Come on, sirs, what happens?

Q: I don't know what happens to the other party.

K: What happens to you?

Q: I look.

K: What are you looking at?

Q: At the pattern.

K: Sir, that gentleman is speaking.

Q: I watch.

K: That's all. That is, you and I are quarrelling, you are always quarrelling, this is an old game, not a recent game. Now I am paying full attention to what you are saying. Are you? No, no, don't be so quick. Are you giving complete attention when I am nagging you? Don't so easily agree, sir, wait sir. I explained what I mean by attention, don't say, yes, I understand. I am asking you: we are quarrelling, and I give my complete attention to that quarrel, and I mean by 'complete attention' I am not escaping, I am not analysing, all my energies are there, watching. So what happens here? I have stopped any sense of being hurt - being hurt - I am not building a

wall against her, I am in a position of total attention. Now what's our relationship then? Sir, sir, if you don't talk somebody else will talk.

Q: I am absorbed.

K: No. You see you are using words, what do you mean 'absorbed', in what?

Q: I use words which may be incorrect.

K: Then use correct words, sir. It's not absorption.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, that's not the word. To be absorbed in something implies like a child being absorbed in a toy.

Q: I am one with her.

K: This is a hopeless conversation. When you are completely attentive there is neither absorption, nor one with that, you are attentive. Right? You attend. Now what happens to the person who is not attending? That's your relationship now. I am attending because I don't care whether you listen to me or don't listen to me, but you want to quarrel with me, argue, discuss, so what is your relationship to me. I am attentive, but you are not, then what happens? What happens between two people sir?

Q: There is a division.

K: That's all. What do you do with that division? She is attentive, I am not, she is full of that intense energy, it's only when there is inattention, when there is no attention the quarrels begin. Right? You understand this, sir? When there is complete attention on both sides, nothing, no quarrel, no division. Because we think attention means there is a centre from which I am attending. I say attention means there is no centre at all. Right? So will you please

attend? Attend, which means give your total energy to listen to problems that you have - running away from your wife, from your husband, thinking you are frightfully superior than your wife and so on and so on. So as long as there is a division between you and your wife, or your whatever it is, in your relationship, there must be quarrels, there must be fight. Like two nations - look what is happening in the world, fighting, fighting, fighting. So in the same way can you abolish this division? And that can only be wiped away when there is complete attention. Will you give that attention to your problems? You see, sir, in the business world, as I have been told, and I have watched it, the executive finally decides, the top boss, but before it comes to that it goes through various stages. Right? Don't you know all this? The clerk, the minor, it's conveyed to the top, the boss, and he decides. You are doing exactly the same thing. Right? You don't say, this has got to be solved immediately. Our minds don't work that way. We are so traditionally bound that we can't think anything anew. And that's why we become so very dull.

Enlightenment, sir, according to tradition, will take lives, time, struggle, sacrifice, control, you follow. Suppose I don't accept time at all, and say, that's all nonsense - what happens? You do it, sir!

Any more things, sirs? It's a quarter to nine, isn't that enough? Have I answered your questions, sirs? Or are you still carrying on the battle? You can carry on the battle, sir, I won't, the ball is in your court.

Q: In the case of death, don't you think that time helps?

K: I don't. I have explained, lady, time is one of the most destructive factors. Time is death. Yes, sir, you haven't understood



what I have said. Time is death.

Q: You have shown us the pain of...

K: Will you do it? Not, I have shown - I have shown you nothing because it is a problem for all humanity. Which says, one day I will solve it, one day I will go to the analyst, or I will take time to analyse it. All that is a wastage of energy.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What are you pointing at, sir?

Q: Could you explain what you mean by 'time is death'?

K: Sir, explanations are pleasant, but they don't meet the fact. I can explain to you how beautiful the mountain is. Right? How lovely the snow, the lines, the valleys, the rivers and the beauty of the sky, but unless you see it yourself it has very little meaning. Now in the same way, I said, time is death. Right? What do you make of it? Don't ask me to explain, I won't, but what do you make of a statement of that kind? You are allowing time, aren't you now? All your life you have allowed time, so you are dying now. Look at you, you are dying. You think death is the final thing. Death is when your mind has gone, when you are caught in tradition - the tradition of time, the tradition of evolution, the tradition of gradualness, the tradition of analysis, all those are traditions in which you are caught. You see you won't break those and you talk about heaven. Right, sir?

## **MADRAS 5TH PUBLIC TALK 5TH JANUARY 1980**

I wonder what you are waiting for. It would be rather interesting also if you could find out for yourself why you come to these talks, what impels you, why you sit here for an hour or so and listen to something. And if you could find out the art of listening, perhaps one would have learnt a great deal. Not only listen to what is being said but listen to the whisper among the leaves. Listen to that so-called music. Listen to your wife or husband, totally, completely, with that quality of attention which is not attending to something; that is, directing your attention to listening, but rather the way you listen, with complete attention, not to what is being said, but to have this quality of attention. And if we could, as we have been doing in the last four talks, or dialogues, whatever you like to call it, I think we would learn a great deal, not from somebody, not from books, not from hearsay, or follow a particular tradition, but really to attend. That implies not directing your thought in a particular direction, with a particular motive, or intention, but merely to observe with total complete attention.

When you so attend there is no centre from which you are attending. I don't know if you follow this point. Because what we are going to talk over together this afternoon or evening, is why we live on concepts, on theories, on assumptions, why the mind, your mind, the human mind, whether in India, or Europe, or America and so on, whether the human mind can be free of concepts, and why we live in concepts. A scientist, for example, has a hypothesis, tests it, and it becomes either a fact or a non-fact. There it is

beneficial, necessary. But in the psychological world, that is in our daily life, in our struggles, in our miseries, confusion and so on, why the mind lives in concepts. That is, to conceive an idea, as one has a child, a baby, conceive it, why does the mind, your mind, the human mind of which we are part, why do we live in concepts. Either the concepts have been thrust upon us through education, through tradition, or we conceive life as a problem and try to resolve that problem. First conceive, make an idea, a concept, and then try to resolve through that concept our problems. I don't know if you have noticed this. Please give a little attention if you don't mind.

That is, most people throughout the world, specially the philosophers and the so-called religious people, so-called moral people, who have great values and all the rest of it, first have theories, and then concepts, and then twist life to those concepts. Marxism - Marx - conceived a society, after historical study and so on, and then tried to fit man into that concept, into that framework. Mao, all scientists, all philosophers, everybody does this. I don't know if you are aware that we are doing it now. And what takes place when we act through concepts? You are following this?

Please as we said the other day, and I hope you will not mind if I repeat it again, this is not a lecture by the speaker, you are not being told what to think, or what not to think, it's not propaganda. We are together trying to observe, and therefore act with the extraordinary complex society in which we live, the complexity of our own minds, the narrowness of our own minds, which have become specialized - we are concerned with that, whether it is possible to bring about a mutation in the very nature of the mind.

Which means the senses, emotions, affections, care and the capacity to think very clearly, objectively, non-personally.

And we are asking why the human mind conceives an idea from study, from reading, from listening to philosophers, and listening as you are now. First you conceive an idea and try to put that idea into action. Why does the mind do this? All the so-called great philosophers have done it. All the religions, Christianity, Buddhism and so on, Zen, all those are based on concepts. Concept means to conceive - I won't go into the etymological meaning of the word. It means being either thrust upon by the specialist, the philosophers, the social experts and so on, or you, yourself, observing, hearing, make an abstraction of it, and from that abstraction act. This is obvious, isn't it. May we go on from there?

Now why does the mind do this? If you observe your own mind - I am not being disrespectful or impudent - if you observe your own mind, you live in concepts. The word 'idea' comes from Greek, which means to observe. To observe, not make an abstraction of what you have observed into a concept. Now why do we do this? Because I think it is very important because unless we understand this very, very deeply, the culture in which we have lived for three thousand years, whether you like that culture or not, the so-called Brahmanical culture - please, the speaker is not either for or against, so if some of you are anti-Brahmin don't jump up and fight it, or those who are rabid Brahmins, whatever that may mean, don't be encouraged by what is being said. We are enquiring why a civilization, a culture, which has existed for three thousand years and more disappeared over night. You follow the question? Why? The speaker has discussed this question with a lot of

professors, so-called scholars, politicians - they are the last people, of course - various gurus - I don't know why they come to see me, but they do - and one has asked all these people, the experts, philosophers, why. Please follow all this carefully. I am not taking sides; I am neither pro, nor anti. We are enquiring why a civilization, pre-Buddha, has completely disappeared. Is it the western culture with all its vast technological knowledge - communication, railways, aeroplanes, science, medicine - the western culture, which is the technological output has smothered this country? Or they really have no culture at all? They have tradition, they have all kinds of theories. So one asks - please ask yourself, if you are anti-Brahmin or pro-Brahmin, that's totally irrelevant - why. If you observe your religion, like the rest of the world's religions, is purely conceptual, put together by thought. Which means this culture has lived on words. And a human being that lives on words, obviously goes down the drain. And that's what is happening in this country.

So it is very important to find out when we are in a crisis of consciousness - it is not an economic crisis, or a moral crisis, or a population crisis - but a crisis of consciousness, of the mind. A mind that lives on words - just think of it, sirs, what kind of mind it is. You specialize as an engineer, or a scientist, or a sociologist, or a businessman, fixed there, for the rest of your life you don't look at the skies, you never look at the beauty of the trees, you never look at a human being properly, even your wife or husband. So one is always asking why the human mind is living on concepts, what is the process of it? Why you live on words - Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, or any conceptual activity - why? It is very interesting if

you go into it very carefully that concepts we believe will lead to action. That is, first conceive or plan a pattern of action, and then act. You are following I hope, all this. Why does the mind do it, your mind? Is it an avoidance of action because you can postpone it, that is, you have an idea of what you should do and you never completely act according to the idea. So there is a contradiction between conceptual action and action. Right? Are you following this?

So is that what is the root cause of any civilization which lives on words? All the symbols of Christianity are just symbols, ideas. When you call yourself a Muslim, or a Hindu, or a Sikh, or god knows what else, it is just a concept. You are essentially a human being first.

So is the making of concepts an escape from action? Has conceptual activity become much more important than action? A conceptual movement has cultivated the brain, the intellect, and the intellect dominates everything? The function of the intellect is to discern, to understand, to gather information to act. And when intellect, that is the capacity to think, conceptually, when that becomes all important, as it has in the world, because all our education is based on that, both in schools, colleges, and universities, then the rest of the area of the mind is disregarded. You can observe it in yourself.

So what then is action without the formulation of concepts? You understand? Are we in communication with each other? I hope so otherwise I will be talking to myself which is not much fun. Is there an action which isn't born out of concepts? The word 'action' means acting, not, having acted, or will act. Please

understand this. We are used to this idea of acting according to a precept, to a belief, which are all concepts. And when you act according to an ideal, which thought has created, your action is limited. You are following all this? Your action is born out of the past and therefore it is not action. I wonder if you understand this. Because apparently we are incapable of applying. You hear, say for example, that it is possible to bring about transformation in the very structure of the brain cells and mind, you hear it. If you at all pay attention you hear it. If you watch yourself your immediate reaction is, how? Which is, when you ask the 'how' you have already entered into the field of concepts. Right? So then you have systems, methods, practices, discipline, the whole circus begins. Now can you listen and not make a concept, but apply? You understand? That is, most of us, practically ninety nine per cent people of the world, are caught in fear of some kind or another. We will go into it. And whether you can apply it instantly, immediately and not make a concept of it, and then try to translate that concept into action. You are following all this? I wonder. Right, sir, can I talk to you?

Is fear a concept? Go very slowly please, this is a very complex problem. Is fear born of a concept? If it is, and therefore we have never been able to resolve the problem. You are following this? Because we have carried this burden of fear for generation upon generation, it is born in us, part of our brain, part of our life, part of our activity. And from time immemorial this question has not been resolved. Man through fear goes to the temples, the whole business; fear of the future, fear of losing your job, fear of losing your wife, fear of not fulfilling, fear of not becoming a success,

fear of the past, fear of what you have done, that it might catch you up and do something, and so on, this enormous movement of fear. Now we are asking whether it is a word - please listen carefully - which is a concept, or is there that reaction without the word? You are following this?

Look, sir, if you are a Hindu, the word has tremendous meaning, like a Christian, the word, not the fact. Now we are saying, we are enquiring together, observing, observing - now wait a minute, careful. We are not analyzing fear. We are not enquiring into the cause of fears because if you do that involves time. Right? That is, to analyze implies time. To find the cause also involves time, and each one will say my cause is different from yours, and so on, we will everlastingly struggle about it. But a man who says, is there an end to fear, in every way, both physically as well as psychologically, is there an end to it. If you enquire, then is fear a word? That is - I'll explain - that is, there this reaction and that reaction is associated with the memory of a word called fear. You are following this? So the response to that reaction, violence, fear and so on, is immediately taken over by thought as the word, and then the word becomes more important than the fact. Are you following all this? Please, do it as we are talking, otherwise it is no fun, it just becomes a tawdry lecture.

That is, can you look, observe, without an abstraction of what you observe? Are you following this? It needs great attention. You are afraid. That's the common lot. Can you observe it? That is, to look at the arising of fear, and then enquire, watch it, whether it is the product of a concept, a word, an association with previous fears, which means knowledge, and that knowledge then says it is



fear. I wonder if you follow this? This is very important to understand, please spend a little time on this. Because it is possible to be totally free of fear: fear of examinations, if you are a student, and I hope you are not that kind of student who merely studies and passes a lot of examinations, then your brain is very limited, and you end up as a glorified clerk, or a glorified something or other. So it is very important to understand this question. One recognizes, if one observes, that the brain in its very process of responding to memory, which is thought, is thinking in words. Right? And the nervous response to any emotion is immediately translated in terms of concepts, and those concepts then act upon the fact. I wonder if you meet this. Right sir? So can you observe this reaction without the word? The moment you observe it with the word of fear, then the past memory, past reactions, past knowledge, has taken over. So then the past cannot act. I wonder if you meet this point. The past can only act according to experience, knowledge, therefore it is always limited. Whereas if you observe fear without the word - can you observe your wife, or your husband without the word. You understand? The image, the associations, the quarrels, the whole implications of a relationship between man and woman, which has been built up through a million years, can you observe your wife, or your husband, or your friend, the image that you have - image being the word, the concept. Right sir? Can you do it? No, don't - please.

We have learnt in this country, I think mostly, when we say, yes, we don't mean it. We say it, let's get on. Which leads to total dishonesty. So if you have integrity, don't say anything that you don't know yourself, that is not your own direct perception, not

taken over by somebody else, experience. Because we have no integrity, we have lost it in this country, right from the top to the bottom. With money apparently you can do anything. So integrity means saying things that you actually mean.

So we are saying, that there is the possibility of wiping out totally, I mean by that word absolutely, all sense of fear. You might say, that's nonsense. Because you haven't tried it, you haven't applied. So can you observe your fear without its associations? Can you observe your wife or husband without the past associations - of pleasure, of comfort, bullying, of nagging, you know all the rest of that stuff that goes on between man and woman?

And physical fear, we generally don't meet a tiger so we are pretty safe; but the fear of pain, physical pain, which one has had - please follow this a little bit. You may have been to a dentist, to a doctor, had some kind of illness that has given you pain, the mind, the brain registers that pain, because the function of the brain is to register in order to protect itself. You are following all this? So you have physical pain, and it is registered as pain in the brain, and you are frightened that it might happen again. You follow? Now can you end that pain as it arises, when it is over, finish, not carry it over? You understand what I am saying? Please do it, you will see what extraordinary things take place. That's not a reward! I am pointing out, if you are interested, if you are concerned with the freedom of fear, which burdens your lives, narrows, it is the greatest shadow in life, it is the most destructor reaction. If you are interested, and if you feel the utter importance of being free from fear, you have to look at it without any sense of association. That requires a great deal of attention. Not attending to fear, but the

quality of attention that observes. You understand what I am saying? Now you have heard this, have you made it into an abstraction, into a concept? And then say, please tell me how to carry out, how am I to be free of fear? You follow? You don't hear the whole thing but your mind is so trained, caught in this conceptual world and when you hear this, about fear, you have already moved into an abstraction. From that abstraction you say, please tell me what to do, how am I to get rid of fear about my wife. That is, you have not, if I may point out, you have not listened. When you make a concept, you are not acting. When you hear this whole movement of fear, the root of it, which is obviously put together by thought. Fear is time - fear of the past, fear of the future, fear. Time is involved. And somebody like the speaker says you can end it completely - what's your reaction to it? You understand my question? How do you respond to it? Or you are so caught up in concepts that you cannot free yourself from it, therefore you cannot act immediately about fear. Please examine your own minds. Time will not solve the problem of fear. Time, we say, will quieten the fear. It hasn't. It's like having cancer, it is there. You might postpone it, because you said, wait, but the disease is there, so fear is there, time will not solve it. On the contrary time will complicate the issue.

So when you listen, if you at all listen completely, then there is no movement of thought but merely observation. You understand this? As we said, observation is action, not observation, concept, action.

And it is the same with pleasure, it's one of your problems. The mind that is seeking pleasure is invariably attached. Right?

Attached to the action that brings pleasure. That's why sexually you depend, sexually, it is a mutual exploitation based on pleasure, and therefore the attachment begins. And if you observe the various forms of pleasure, pleasure of possessions, pleasure of achievement, pleasure of being able to control your body excellently, the pleasure of knowledge, the pleasure of those professors, philosophers, who have carved out a corner of this universe into a little hole, and there they remain. You know this.

So pleasure takes multiple forms. That is what? There is an action that brings pleasure - please observe it yourself, don't - that is an action that brings pleasure and that pleasure is registered in the brain, and thought says, continue, have more of it. That is, pleasure is always within the field of time. Am I making it complicated? And then one enquires, what is time. You follow? What is time? There is time which it takes for you to go from here to your house. Time is necessary for a seed to grow into a tree, biologically time is necessary. That is to cover the distance from here to there horizontally or vertically. Right? And we have introduced time as a means of psychological progress. Right? One is violent, I will take time to be non-violent. Like the League of Nations - I mean United Nations - all nations there are separate, but one day it will all be international, which never takes places. So time is a movement to cover from one point to another, both physically as well psychologically. Now we are questioning whether there is time at all psychologically. You understand? Question it, sir, ask it. Or it is one of our concepts that time is necessary. That is, if one is violent, one invents the non-violence, which is non-fact, and pursues the non-fact, which is illusion. The

word 'illusion', ludere, means to play with something which is not actual. Come on sirs. The dictionary doesn't say so, I say so.

So is there time psychologically? Is there time for fear to end? Which is a psychological process. That is, can fear end immediately, the whole of it, not just one fragment of it? You understand my question, you are following all this? Are you all tired? I hope you are working. That is, our brain is conditioned to the idea of time, the brain itself has evolved through time, from the anthropoid ape down to now. And that same concept of time is taken over psychologically. That is, I will be, or I have been, and I shall be. Now our brain has used time as a means of healing the wound of fear. And we are asking, can the brain free itself from its tradition? You follow what I am saying, sir? You can free yourself from your puja, your rituals, and all the rest of it. That's fairly simple. You see the nonsense of it, a lot of words which have very little meaning, whether Christian, garbed in marvellous clothes, or a man who is half naked, it is the same thing.

So the brain has been conditioned, handed down from generation to generation: fear can be resolved only through time. Now can you break that tradition? You understand what I am saying? And see if fear, the complexity of it, not just one part of it, can be completely dissolved, immediately. The speaker says it can, otherwise you are playing with words. That means your mind must be extraordinarily alert. Right? Your senses must be fully active. No? Are you all asleep? Are you being mesmerized by the speaker?

Sir, look, our senses, which we kind of disregard, or cultivate one special sense, we have never looked or encouraged all the

senses to be active, which means to be highly sensitive. Because we have never been able because of religious doctrines, and various forms of inhibitions, have never been able to say, now let's find out if all our senses, everything, can be physically, extraordinarily active. When there is such clear, sensory, total sensory response, there is no centre from which you are observing. Are you following this? Do do this, sir. When you look at a sunset, or at a tree, or at water, the sea, look at it with all your senses, not just with your eyes, optical response, but hear, smell, taste, the whole thing is operating. Then you will see that the centre which has been associated with the self, the self-centred activity comes to a total end. Now wait a minute. It may come to a total end for a second, but we say, can that second continue. Because immediately, see what has happened, you have made a concept of that second into a concept and want to carry that concept out. You are following all this? Which means you have moved away from the actuality.

So pleasure, like fear, is the movement of time. Got it? Look, go into it very carefully, you will see it for yourself. Sexual pleasure, the image, the thought, the thinking about it, being associated to it, being attached to that, then what happens? Where there is attachment there is no love. Right? Now just a minute. The speaker says, where there is any form of attachment there is no love. Now you hear that, how do you hear it? You understand my question? What is your response to that statement? Do you say it is nonsense? Or what do you mean by it? Which means, explain. Explanation, commentaries about that statement, is what you live on, because you live on commentaries. So you haven't listened to

that statement: where there is attachment there is no love. I'll explain why, go into it, but the explanation has no meaning if there is not the immediate response to that. Right?

Sir, there's so much to talk about, there's today and tomorrow. I want to cram everything in these two days.

So can you listen to that statement: where there is attachment of any kind, any dependency, any memory of pleasure, it is not love. Now if one asked, do you love your wife or your friend, they would say, of course. And perhaps here in this country you don't even know that word. Because if you loved your wife really you would treat her differently. Right? Woman's place in India is really quite terrible. You have no 'Women's Lib' here. So when you ask, what is love, are you asking it to have a concept about it, to have an explanation about it? Then if you do, you are off. Right? And as we don't know what love is, because if we did there would be no jealousy, no hatred, no competition, this sense of ambition is gone, personal desire for fulfilment and all the rest of it, both sexual and otherwise, all that goes. So if there is to be that love one must be completely free of jealousy. Can you? Completely free of attachment. But you don't want to be free of either attachment, or the complications of your personal relationship, you would rather tolerate all that, put up with anything, as you do put up with everything in this country, from the extraordinary squalor, dirt, a government that is so corrupt, you put up with anything. So you say, 'This is all right, what about love, why should I have it, don't bother. I have carved myself an unpleasant corner in this universe with my wife, with my job, with my little children, that's good enough'. And that's death. That's why now you are all dying. Right

sir?

So how will you have this flower, the great beauty of love? Beauty is not mere form - a beautiful tree with its form, with its trunk, with its leaves, the outward show of it; beauty comes with integrity, with freedom. The word 'freedom' originally, etymologically, meant love. So either you want to come to that water which is everlastingly pure, it can never be polluted by thought, and therefore your life then becomes like a flower, beauty. Or you want to live in the squalor that you are living in. Perhaps your house is fairly clean, but I doubt it. But a squalor of our minds.

So can all this end? You understand sir? Concepts, lack of integrity, having no fear of any kind - you don't know what it means even. And having this extraordinary jewel, which is incorruptible, love. Either that, or remain with this confusion, misery, sorrow. It is not a matter of decision, it is not a matter of choice, saying, I will choose this or that, but the man who is serious, who is concerned with the world, with all the terrible things that are going on in the world, and also the ugliness and the pettiness, and the shoddiness of our own lives, and seeing that, observing that, out of that comes complete action.

And what is the relationship of love to our daily life? Right? You know that is one of the most absurd questions ever put. What is the relationship of your breathing to your life. Right? Exactly!

And also there is this vast question, very complex question of death, sorrow. I don't know if we have time, not now.

Sirs, human beings right throughout the world are at a crossroads, whether one is aware of it or not. And all the scholars, and all those people say, scientists included, that the ascent of man



depends on his knowledge. The more he has knowledge the greater the ascent. Knowledge is memory, past experience, collected in the brain, memory. Which is, if you are living in the past everlastingly, the past is ascending. Get it? Human beings are not ascending.

They ascend only when there is no fear, and they've understood the nature of pleasure and desire, and when there is love there is real explosion of the mind. And it's up to you whether you want to break the shackles of time, or live in it. Right sir?

## **MADRAS 6TH PUBLIC TALK 6TH JANUARY 1980 'SORROW, DEATH AND MEDITATION'**

Shall we sit quietly for awhile, it would be rather nice. Not meditate or anything like that, just sit quietly, then we can probably observe our own activities of mind, our own behaviour, our own conduct, our ways of daily life, our relationship with others, our relationship with each other, intimate or superficial. We have hardly any leisure, we are so occupied, from morning until night. And even if we do sleep our minds, our brains are constantly active, dreaming, unresolved problems being solved consciously or unconsciously, and so on. And in the last five talks we have covered most of the complicated areas of our life. I think we ought to also talk over this evening sorrow, death and meditation. On a pleasant evening like this, a rather nice cool breeze, to talk about death seems rather irrelevant. A lovely sky and looking at the sky through the leaves, and the strange silence of an evening that seems to descend on earth about this time, and to talk about the ending of life, or death, though irrelevant, or may be relevant, it is part of our life, like sorrow. And we want solutions, answers immediately for all our problems. That is what we all expect, answers to a very complex life. We don't want to examine the complexity, the diversity, the enormous superficial differences, height, colour, capacities, skill. And we don't want answers for those superficial problems, like business, scientific research, social studies and so on, but we want answers, psychological answers, solutions for our problems. Probably that's why you are here.

These problems can be solved immediately. That is, if you

immediately change your life, if you immediately behave righteously, if you immediately change your relationship with each other, completely. That is the final absolute answer for your problems. But we won't, because our brains are accustomed, trained, to postpone, to put up with, to acquiesce, to yield, never enquiring, never going into the problem very deeply. We want somebody to tell us what to do. And we have as human beings relied for thousands of years on somebody to tell us what to do - your books, your gurus, your philosophers, the Upanishads, all the rest of it. Probably most of you have read them, but you are where you are in spite of all that.

So the problem is how you approach the problem, not the problem itself but how you come to it. This is really very important to understand because we are going to go into problems like sorrow, death and meditation, which are very complex, it needs all your attention, all your care, all your passion. So how do you approach any problem, both physical and psychological: how you come to it, what's your motive, what's your intention, what's your end? Because the motive, the direction, the demand for an answer, those prevent the solution of the problem because your approach is already directed, is already conditioned, you have already come with a conclusion. The answer must be that, satisfactory, comfortable, if I can use the word, bourgeois, highly respectable and so on.

So it matters very much if you are serious, if you are willing to find out for yourself how you approach any problem. If you are a scientist you approach your problem with a hypothesis, and try to prove that hypothesis to be correct; or if it is not you reject that

hypothesis and pick up another until through hypotheses you prove the fact. Then from the fact you move to another hypothesis, and so on, you build up a series of activities ending in knowledge. If you are an engineer, a philosopher, your motive is obviously to gain money, to fulfil your ambitions and so on. If you are a philosopher, I don't know if you are, I hope you aren't - if you are a philosopher there is not only your private life, which is already very complex, but you try to escape from that complexity of relationship through ideas, through a lot of reading and so on.

So what is your approach to this problem, the problems of sorrow, the problem of death and what is that thing called meditation, what is meditation? What is your approach? Is it traditional, it is an escape, is there a motive that is directing your observation? Or are you free to approach the problem? You understand my question? Because it is only a free mind that can look, that can observe, that can solve the problem. But if you have your prejudices, your conclusions, your concepts and try to understand the problems through the conflict, prejudices and conclusions, you will never solve them, because your conclusions, your concepts are going to dictate what the problem should be. So if you approach it freely then you can look at the problem. Then the problem itself has an answer. You understand? Are we following each other? I must find a face that can say, yes, or no.

If we have a problem of this kind, sorrow, whether there is an ending to sorrow, and the extraordinary thing called death, and the various forms of meditation that have been cultivated throughout the centuries, those are our problems. As we have dealt with other problems previously in the five talks that we have had here, we are

now facing these problems. How do you come to it? If you are a traditionalist you will translate sorrow as something that is the result of what you have done in your past life, and you have solved the problem. At least you think you have. And so you say, next life it will be better. During this life you put up with sorrow, and say it's your karma, or whatever word you use, and you put up with it. Which is one of our peculiar habits, to put up with anything.

Now a mind that is traditional, that acquiesces, puts up with everything, how can it solve a problem, a human problem? Which demands that you enquire, that you look, that you exercise your energy. So if you will kindly find out for yourself how you approach the problem, because the approach dictates the answer or the solution. If you approach it freely the answer is in the problem. That's because problem exists only when you have not comprehended fully, when you have not seen the full context, the full implications, the consequences of all that, and that's why it remains a problem. I hope you are following all this.

So if one is at all serious, and one must be serious in a world that is so rapidly declining, degenerating, and if you are at all serious, not intellectually, not verbally, but serious from your heart, from your blood, from your guts, then you must enquire what is your approach to any problem. If you are free, that is, your mind is capable of observing without any pressure, which is very difficult because we always act under pressure because of over population, and disorder, you are acting under pressure. So if you are approaching this problem of sorrow with any kind of pressure, the very ending of it, which becomes a pressure in itself, if there is not any pressure, any urge to find a solution or an answer, then your

mind is terribly alive. It's logical. If you are logically minded, which is verbally, carefully explain, then you might say, I intellectually understand, but I can't free myself from the pressures I have, the conditionings of my tradition, my beliefs. So your concern is not then with sorrow but with your traditions, which is much more important than the ending of sorrow. So you are caught both ways. You understand? Either you come to it freely, openly, without a single shadow of prejudice, or pressure; or you realize your own prejudices, your own conclusions and concepts, and end those. Only then you can understand the problem with all its implications.

So if you are prepared, not preparation, that means time, I don't mean that - if you have listened to what has been said, and that very listening has brought about your attention to your own prejudices, conclusions and concepts, and you put those aside, not for this afternoon, or for this evening, when you put them aside you put them aside, it is not a game we are playing, either intellectual, or emotional or romantic, it is a very serious affair.

So we are enquiring, observing, and following the movement of sorrow. You understand? It is not a fixed thing, sorrow. You have put it in a cage and you are observing it. It is a great movement of life, a movement that has been started from the beginning of time. So that movement we have inherited, and also we have acquired it. So it is this whole movement which we call, name as sorrow, grief, pain, it is part of our life, it is part of our daily, everyday life. If we approach it freely it means you are not escaping from it. If you approach it freely then what is sorrow? It's like the shadow of our life, you can't escape from it. That's the first thing to realize that

there is no possibility of escape from sorrow. We have tried it, we have said it's karma, past life, but the sorrow remains in spite of your convenient comfortable explanations. Nor can you suppress it by going to the temples, night clubs, drink, drugs, women or men, whatever you do to escape, you can't run away, you can't escape from this thing, suppress it, deny it or put up with it. When you put up with something like sorrow it destroys your mind. When you put up with the dirt, the squalor of the street you are not sensitive, your mind becomes dull, you become insensitive. But if you rebel against it, if you say, I won't have it, then you begin to be active.

So our theories, concepts and our religion all over the world has made us insensitive, has made us dull. So here is the problem: what is sorrow? Why human beings throughout the ages have never resolved that problem. You understand my question? Why you, who have must have sorrow, grief, psychological pain, hurt, psychologically hurt, this is part of sorrow, why we go on with it? So one asks, is there an end to it? The ending doesn't mean an explanation, which is how am I going to end sorrow, which means you are asking for a solution of sorrow. And you will be satisfied, if the speaker is stupid enough to give a comfortable answer, to which you will naturally say, yes, quite right, I accept that. But the explanation, the answer doesn't solve your sorrow. A new explanation, a new answer, will become the old answer in a couple of days, so that will become the tradition. You are following all this? Please, move with me, if you are willing.

So we are asking what is sorrow. What is the relationship between sorrow and passion? I am not talking - we are not talking about lust. Lust is - you know what it is better than I do. We are

asking the etymological meaning, passion and sorrow. When you enquire into the question of passion it comes with the ending of sorrow. You are following all this? Passion means suffering from which arises that passion which is not physical, which is totally the ending of a great burden which man has carried. You understand? Are you following this? Please, sirs, are we meeting each other? Please don't be so mesmerized! You see the word, we are examining the meaning of words, which is passion and sorrow are interrelated etymologically, the root meaning. Now when you suppress, or escape, or try to explain it away, you lose the immense energy that is brought about in passion. You understand? No, no, please verbally understand it first. That is, sorrow, like passion, are words to indicate a state of mind in which there is a great deal of pain, grief, tears, sense of immense loneliness, a sense of isolation. Right? That's how when that takes place you feel great sorrow. Now feeling that sense of great burden, great grief, pain, we don't know how to resolve it. We have tried explanations, causes, we haven't solved it. But not knowing what to do with it we try to run away from it, postpone it, you know all the tricks we play when we want to avoid something. Now if we don't avoid it, and see the full meaning of sorrow, out of that total comprehension, not intellectual comprehension, or verbal comprehension, but the total feeling of that brings about passion. And without passion you can never be free. Yes, sir!

Without passion you can never be creative. You may be creative when you are lustful, but we are not talking about that kind of creation, producing a baby, that's quite easy. But we are talking of something quite different. Which is, most of us have lost this



passion because we are not passionate people, nobody is. They are passionate about something or other - a passionate scientist, a passionate writer, a passionate golfer. We are not talking of that kind of passion. A person who observes the movement of sorrow, which is the loss of somebody whom you love, or you think you love, the sense of loneliness, the great amount of shedding of tears, the weeping, the sense of isolation, having no relationship with anybody else. Don't you know all this? When you are completely isolated. And our minds are so trained, so educated that when there is this tremendous crisis in one's life we seek an immediate answer. We try to seek an immediate answer so we never face that crisis. You are following all this? Face it, as you are now, if you are listening, being forced to face it under pressure of the speaker. But if there is no pressure and you face it for yourself, then what is that pain? Is it something that man has inherited from time immemorial? Go into it sirs, go slowly. Like our brains which we have inherited through evolution. The human mind, which is not your mind or my mind, the human mind, is that part of its inheritance? That is, the remembrance from father's father down to the present generation, where man has solved this problem. Or is it self-pity? Which we are excellent at! Or is it the sense of deep abiding unconscious loneliness? Please, sirs, follow all this. I am not talking for my own pleasure. You understand?

So we are asking these questions. So find out sirs, and ladies, if you are interested, whether this loneliness if you have ever known it, if you have ever felt that desperate isolation. And because we have not resolved it that isolation is part of this sorrow. You understand what I am saying? That is, we are self-centred human

beings. All our activities are centred in ourselves and we act from there. And this self-centred activity is a process of isolation. You see, that doesn't need explanation. Each person seeking his own fulfillment and ambition, his own pleasure, his own importance and so on and so on, all these are bringing about a self-centred, enclosing, narrow, limited, activity, which ultimately deeply unconsciously brings about this sense of terrible depressing loneliness. And can you face that loneliness? Not run away, just observe it. When you so observe you are bringing all your energy to that perception. You understand what I am saying? And when you bring all your energy to that loneliness then you will find, if you do it, your total energy, in which there is no escaping, no running away, no suppressing, no trying to solve it, but this deep perception which brings total energy, you will find that loneliness is dissipated. And the same thing, if you are caught in the explanations of your sorrow - karma, past life, circumstances, competition, you are not so good as your brother, or your uncle, you know, all the rest of it, this perpetual competition we indulge in, which means comparing, suppressing yourself in order to be like somebody, imitating, conforming - all that also emphasizes the narrowing down of this tremendous energy of the mind to a narrow centre from which inevitably action becomes limited and therefore painful. You are following all this?

And if it is immemorial, handed down from generation to generation, this sorrow, then can the mind break that tradition? That is, to observe that tradition, if it is a tradition. Then with that observation, that perception, is the gathering of all your energy to look.

So out of this perception, observation, staying with a thing, you understand, staying, that is staying non-moving from this sorrow, then out of that comes passion. And with passion goes love. Love is not lust; love is not pleasure; love is not desire. It is the ending of sorrow and the passion that comes with it which is love, compassion.

What's the good of my saying all this, sirs? The speaker, to him it is a reality. It is something that, to him is true, it is not false. He doesn't say anything that is not true to himself. It is not that I want to please you, I am not interested. You can go your way, and I go my way. I am not exploiting you as an audience. I am not relying on one's reputation, and all that nonsense. Because one lives this kind of life, therefore one is terribly honest.

And the next question is: death. The first thing is, to ask oneself, if you are interested, why human beings have excluded death from living. You understand my question? Why human beings from the ancient Egyptians to now, all the civilizations which have existed before, have put death at the end - fifty, ten, thirty, eighty, ninety, whatever age, and never said, why am I, why are we excluding death from living? You understand my question? Please understand the question first. Why? Which means, what is living which doesn't know the ending? You understand my question?

Sir, you understand what is being said? Why have people written so much about death, volumes, about reincarnation, remembrances of the past, the psychologists have mesmerized people and gone into the whole business of previous life and so on and so on. Philosophers, religious people, both Christian and Hindu, and all the so-called religious people, they have written

volumes; but nobody has taken the trouble to write about life. You understand? Our daily, iniquitous, immoral, fantastically stupid way we are living. Nobody talks about it. Right? Only we say, you must behave properly.

So we are first enquiring what is living and what is ending? The ending is what we call death. So we are asking: what is living and what is ending? And why we human beings have put the ending as far away from us as possible? You understand my questions, sirs? Right? What is living? What is existence? What is our life? Not super consciousness and all that nonsense, but daily life, what is our life? Is there never - please listen - is there never ending to something in our life? You understand? Ending smoking, if you are a smoker, ending it. If you are a drug addict, ending it. If you are caught in the sexual imaginative pleasure, end it. So what is ending? You understand my question? And what is living? So I am saying to myself, asking, do not living and ending go together? You understand my question? You understand, sir? Are you interested in all this? Not up here, I know you are all very clever at this kind of thing, but I am talking much more deeply, that will affect our life, our daily behaviour, our daily conduct, our daily sense of existence.

So have you ever ended anything without pressure? You understand my question? Anything without finding a cause, analysis, wasting time on it, say, end it. That's what's going to happen when death comes to you. You can't argue with it, say, please give me a few more days. You can't analyse it, you can't discuss with it. I know the Upanishads discuss it, that's in poetic form, but if you are confronted with death consciously, not when

you are unconscious, then you are out, but when you are consciously alive to death you can't argue with it. That is, there is the ending, which means the ending of your brain, your heart comes to an end, the circulation stops, and the brain collapses. Which is the ending of what we call living. And when you examine, if you will, your own life, your life, not my life, nor some saint's life, or some guru, or some other imaginary or real rather unevolved people - you accept all this? If you examine your own life, what is your life? A struggle, conflict, pain, sorrow, grief, and this ambition, competition, conformity, following a tradition blindly or accepting it. So that is business, going to an office from morning until night. Do you realize what your life is? That you go to the office from nine until five. Right? And there bullied. What kind of life do you lead? And you will say to that, we can't alter the society in which we live. A very convenient, comfortable answer. That society, you, your grandfathers and mothers, have created it. Right? Through their ambition, through their greed, through their conformity, through their tradition, and all the rest of it, they have created this thing. And so you are part of it, whether you like it or not. And to change it you have to change yourself. When you begin to change yourself, you begin to change society.

So when you examine your life very closely, it is really a very sorrowful affair. And you would rather go on with it and say, perhaps I will have a chance next life. If you examine the 'me', the 'I', the ego, the soul, the atman, you know, all that stuff, what is that? You understand my question? Are you following this sirs? You believe in some kind of permanency, don't you? Some kind of entity that will get more and more polished as it goes along through

time, until it reaches the highest principle, Brahman, or Nirvana, or Moksha, or whatever you like to call it. So you believe that there is an ego, a self, a higher self, the atman, the soul, the principle, that moves from life to life. Right? Right, don't you? If you are honest. Now what is that? What is that thing that the mind clings to? Right? What is that? Have you examined it? Or you just say, yes, there is this permanent something marvellous, in me. When you examine it very closely, is it not the result of thought? The thought of your ancestors, the thought which has been put in the Upanishads, or the Gita, or some Bible, or some book, the poets that have written the Gita, and they have established that through tradition so that there is in you something that goes on through time. Right? Right sirs? Would you be honest? That's your tradition, handed down. And when you look at it very carefully, impersonally, sanely, you will find inevitably if you are an enquiring mind, it is nothing but the creation of thought. That is you, what are you? Name, a form, educated to have a degree, or not educated, you are a lawyer and all the rest of it, a fisherman - you wouldn't be a fisherman, no, sorry. So you are all that, your sorrows, your griefs, your Brahmin, non-Brahmin, this and that, you are the result of all time. And therefore the result of all thought. Thought is the response of memory, memory is the accumulation of knowledge as experience stored up in the brain. You may accept it, you may not, but scientists and the speaker - the speaker talked about it many, many years ago, and the scientists now are beginning to accept it. So you are that, you are nothing but thought. You don't like it, I know.

So, now watch it, sir. Knowledge can never be complete. That's

obvious. Knowledge always goes with ignorance. Knowledge is always in the shadow of ignorance. Therefore any thought springing from knowledge must always be ignorant. Logical, sir. And so thought has created this entity separating itself from the rest of mankind as the 'me', the individual, who will go on. Right? Now your mind, observe it, sir, for god's sake, your mind, your brain, is the result of thousands of years of evolution, both genetically and in memory, tradition, your mind is that. The mind being your brain, your senses, your emotions, all that has grown through so-called evolution. Not 'so-called', evolution. So you are not an individual. Right? Yes, sir, you won't like this. You are part of this vast mind of man. You understand all this sir? Look at it. I know it goes against all your tradition, against your own desires, against your own comfort. But it is a fact. But when you realize the fact you enter into a world that is extraordinary: you are the entire humanity. You understand, sir? Because you suffer, you have agonies, you have doubts, you are hurt, you are ambitious, anxious, uncertain, confused, like the rest of the human beings in the world. You are part of that humanity, you are that humanity. You may be brown, or white, or pink, or blue, or black, you may be tall, or short, you may be an engineer and another a physicist. That's not what we are talking about - the human being inside, his brain.

So please follow all this. Then what is death? You understand my question sir? When you realize the fact, an absolute fact, irrevocable, that you are the rest of mankind, you are mankind, the man who goes fishing, naked, that poor woman sweeping a street, that little girl making a mess in the road, you are all that. You are humanity. This is not an humanitarian idea, it is a fact. If that is so

- not 'if', it is so, then what is death? You understand my question? Please sir, move. You are all so... Then what is death? Then is there such a thing as death? You understand what I am about? Come on sirs!

I, born in this country, educated abroad, at various colleges and all the rest of it, name, and certain qualities, like you, and one realizes that your mind, your brain, your feelings, your senses are the essence of humanity, then what is K? You understand? Do you follow what I am saying? Then what is K? Then what is death? If when you realize and end this concept - it is a concept, a conclusion put together by thought that I am special - when that ends, that's what I mean, ending. Then what happens? You have never come to that point, you see.

Sir, when you end something, it doesn't matter what, when you end an attachment, to your wife, to your belief, to your gods, to your guru, to your concept, when you end something, what takes place? Have you ever done it? When you end something the new takes place, doesn't it? Something totally new takes place. Doesn't it, sir? If one has a habit of smoking, and you drop it instantly, what happens? Your body rebels, you go through all that very quickly. Not that I have ever smoked or done all that stuff. It ends. Then you have lifted, the brain has freed itself from a certain burden. If you have ended an attachment, completely ended it, then that tremendous burden of attachment with pain, anxiety, jealousy, all the rest of it, when you end it something totally new is taking place. But you won't do any of that. You will listen, and say, "I quite agree, it sounds very nice, but I am too lazy, I am too caught up in my own tradition, in my own etc., etc." and remain there.



This is the game you play all the time, knowing the facts and refusing to face the facts.

So a man whose mind is the universe, the universe of humanity, to him there is no death. You don't get this. Because whatever he is doing he is ending, never carrying.

Then we must talk about meditation. It is seven o'clock, we will go on, if you are not tired. No? You jolly well should be! If you have exercised your minds, your brains, your senses, you must be exhausted. The speaker is not because he is, you know.

What is meditation? And why is it important to meditate? Why have human beings throughout the ages enquired into this? You understand this question sirs? Can we briefly examine, quickly, and set aside completely every form of systems of meditation? Zen, Buddhist meditation, the various types of meditation of the Hindus with their mantras, the repetitions of mantras, you know all that business that goes on, and the Christian form of meditation, the Tibetan form of meditation. They are all based, if you observe it closely, on concepts. Right? Concepts put together by thought. And thought says, I am restless, I am chattering all the time, there must be some time when it is quiet. So we begin with a concept - follow it, sirs - with a concept that it must be quiet, it must be still. So you practise, you follow the system of that person, or that person, that man who says, I know how to meditate, you do this, you do that. And we think he has got something which we want and we are willing to buy what he has, through meditation. Right? I am sorry to be rather... but that is what we do actually.

So if you can see that all those forms are the structure of thought, which they are, then will you end it? That is, no system,

no method, no practice, yoga - oh, gosh, you know all the rest of it. Sir, it has been the speaker's misfortune, or fortune, to talk to all the experts about this - Zen, Tibetan, Yogi people, you know, they are all concerned with the control of thought, suppression of thought, following a system, practising day after day, day after day, making themselves into machines. And this is called meditation. Right? Would you acknowledge that? I know you practise meditation, you do puja, but it is all words. And you are like your gods, they are all put together by thought.

So can we see the whole process of that from the great Himalayas, East and West, and all that, and put all that aside? Then what is meditation? You understand what I am asking? Certainly not standing on our head, or sitting in a lotus posture, or whatever it is, not breathing. If you could put all that aside then you will inevitably ask: conscious meditation is not meditation. Right? Conscious, that is, the deliberate process of will, desire, compliance, imitation, practice, all that indicates a conscious effort by thought, by desire, desire with its strong will to achieve a certain result. That is, to have a mind that is absolutely quiet. Right? Now if you do all those things - practise yoga, you know, all that, what have you done to your mind? Don't you see what you have done to your mind? Look at you. You have become machines, you have established a routine. Right, sir? Do wake up for god's sake.

So - follow it carefully - conscious meditation, with all the implications involved which I briefly explained, is no longer meditation. Right? I know. So then what is meditation which is not conscious? You understand my question? Because man throughout

the ages has searched for something beyond time. Searched, looked at, enquired, something that is incorruptible, something beyond all experience, beyond all knowledge, outside of all human endeavour. Because human endeavour is the movement of thought in different directions. And thought born of knowledge is very limited. So he said there must be somewhere, something that is not perishable, that is incorruptible, that is timeless, eternal. That seed has been sown in man from time immemorial. You understand sir? And we have got that seed moving all through mankind. And we have never opened, or looked at that seed. We have said what that seed should be. You understand what I am saying? For god's sake move sir. We have said what that seed must do, what its activities are, we clothe it with all kinds of ignoble or noble clothes, but we never said, "This thing which man has started from time immemorial, I wonder if it can ever flower, grow". You understand my question, sirs? That is meditation. That is, to be in a life, daily life, behaviour which is correct, accurate, right, in daily life, where there is no conflict, where there is affection, care - not for your children, care for the world around you; care for your woman, for your man, so that there is no domination of each other, no exploitation of each other. If that isn't laid down as a foundation, you can't move. Do you understand, sirs? What you are trying to do, you neglect all that and try to find some god somewhere. If you don't begin there, what you will end up with is an illusion. The word illusion means to play with something that is not real. The etymological meaning is ludere, to play.

So you are playing with illusions, or rather, you are caught in illusions if you don't have your house in order. And your house is

burning, and if you don't begin there, which is bring right behaviour, right order, care, affection, love, compassion, which can only come when there is the ending of sorrow, then you begin to enquire when the mind knows what it means to die, ending everything everyday. Yes, sir! It is too long now, that is, the mind, the brain is registering, it may be quick. I'll show you. The brain is registering, registering in order to live, survive - engineer, scientist, philosopher, whatever it is, carpenter, fisherman, he must register, otherwise he can't be an engineer, but psychologically can we end registering at all? You don't know all these things. What kind of brains have you got? Sir, end your hurt immediately: the hurt which you have carried from childhood, or the hurt which you received from your wife, husband, office, or whatever it is, the hurt inside, to end it immediately. Which is not to register the hurt. That means to pay tremendous attention when the hurt is beginning to come into being.

So meditation can never be conscious, can never be thought out, premeditated. Then you will find very naturally and very easily there is a quality of stillness in the mind. And it is only that enormous sense of stillness and silence, and the brain then is in a vast space, then only truth can come into being. And that's real meditation.

May I sit still for a few minutes, a few seconds?

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC TALK 7TH APRIL 1979

I hope you are all comfortable, that you are used to sitting on the ground. You know wherever you go in the world life is becoming rather dangerous and there is a great deal of disorder, politically, economically and socially. Nobody seems to bring about order in all this mess. And human beings have many, many, many problems, psychological as well as problems of relationship, problems of meditation, problems of death and so on. And we are going to, during these six talks and four discussions, go into all these matters carefully, perhaps in great detail; and before we go into all those I think it would be wise if we could think over these matters together. We only seem to think together when there is a great crisis like war, or great earthquakes, epidemics, and the moment they are over we return to our own particular little desires, petty reactions, our own little conflicts, our own personal problems. We never seem to think together. And I think it is very important, if I may, that we should go into this matter first before we go into the human problems, which are very, very complex, that need resolution, that needs human endeavour and clarity.

So if we may this morning go into this question of what it is to think together. Please, this is a serious meeting, this is not an entertainment, something by which you are stimulated, or asked to believe. This is not a meeting for propaganda purposes. So if we may ask you to be serious because we are going to talk over a great many problems that affect our lives, so you must, if one may ask, give your attention, your care, your mind, your heart to find out the solution to all our problems. And there are solutions which we

shall go into as we go along. But first it seems important that we think together. I mean by that word 'think together', by those words, most of us have our own particular capacities of thought, our own particular prejudices, our own concepts, ideals, beliefs, conclusions, and we hold on to them. They become far more important than to find out if we can communicate with each other, whether we can think together over our problems, problems which demand that we both of us together investigate, explore. And we cannot possibly do that if we do not know how to think together.

First it behoves us naturally that each one of us, if we are to think together, should drop our particular prejudices, your particular experience, your conclusion, your concepts, your ideals, even your experience, then only we can meet each other. I think that is fairly obvious, though perhaps some of you may not have thought about this matter at all, that where there is to be any kind of communication with each other there must be no barriers in sharing the problems together, no opinions, which is very difficult for most people because their minds are full of opinions, about this and that, about politics, about religions, about everything. We are not free to observe our own problems, we are not free to look at the complex society in which we live, with all its disorder, inanities, insanity.

So can we this morning think together? Which means that we must, if you will, if you are serious, put aside for at least an hour your particular experience, your particular opinion, one's own special reactions which are generally rather petty, so that both of us can observe, think together, so that our minds are capable of investigating together our innumerable complex problems. Can we

do that? Can you, if you are willing to think over together our problem, put aside the conclusions that you have come to, the experience that you have had, your particular response or reaction, so that your mind is clear, so that we can look together? That's the first thing, I think, which is most important. Because after all you have taken the trouble to come here. I don't know why you come but since you have come, since apparently you have come, since you must be serious, then we must be able to communicate with each other. Which means that we must be able to think together. We are not persuading you to think what the speaker wishes to convey, he is not asking you to believe what he says, or convert you to a particular ideal, belief, concept, on the contrary we are together here to investigate, to explore our many, many problems. And you cannot possibly do it if you hold on to your particular vanity, to your particular idea. Please, this is very serious if you want to. So, will you be willing to think together with the speaker and look, to investigate, our innumerable problems? I hope that's clear. You may not agree, you may not accept, but if you are willing to think together with the speaker then you can go very far. Right? That's clear, I hope.

We accept, I think, the way we live. We may be dissatisfied, we may be discontented, we may rebel slightly against the way of our life but generally speaking we accept the society as it is, with all its immorality, with its disorder, with its extraordinary dangers that are taking place, with all the political nonsense, the divisions of people, religions and otherwise. We accept this because we do not know how to bring about a change. We want change, any intelligent man, aware of all the problems of mankind right

throughout the world, a man who is intelligent, aware, asks naturally that the society must obviously change, must bring about some kind of decent order. And we do not know what to do. The world is too much, the pressures are much too great, the demands of our daily life, earning bread and butter, and all the rest of it, are excessively urgent. And if you observe, there are those who say that man is conditioned and he cannot possibly change that condition and he must make the best of it. I hope you are familiar with all this. Make the best of what there is of it, make the best of the society, the human mind is conditioned, it cannot possibly change. There is a great school of thought who believe in that, that the human mind is conditioned through many, many years, and cannot possibly break through. And so there are all those intellectuals, theoreticians, great philosophers, who assert that the human consciousness, as it is, can only make it slightly better, it cannot possibly undergo a radical change. There are those also who say, make the best of our society, reform it, better politicians, vote more sanely, and so on. And there is a whole religious group - and I am sorry to use the word `religious' because most people rather despise that word - there are those religious people who say you cannot possible make a paradise on earth, only in heaven. Only you cannot possible escape from your sorrow, from your misery, from your pain, but if you believe in some deity, in some figure then perhaps you will be saved. This is all taking place in the world actually; they are not describing something which is non-existent. And there are those who want to bring about a physical revolution - the communists, the terrorists, the revolutionists. And as one observes throughout the world that by changing the environment,



by bringing about a dictatorship, a human being is not going to be changed. They may conform, they may adjust, but the human consciousness with all its complexity remains the same. So one is surrounded, as you observe, by these various groups, all urging that they have the right way, all asserting, including the gurus, that if you follow, if you obey, if you conform, if you accept, it will bring about a change in society.

Those of us who have lived sufficiently long have seen through all this. They do not offer fundamentally the transformation of human consciousness, of human endeavour to bring about a different human being. We are going to go into all that, whether it is possible for a human mind, yours, to undergo a fundamental, radical, psychological revolution. That's what we are concerned with, whether it is possible to bring about a good society. You know, ancient Hindus, the Greeks and the Egyptians, the ancient ones, have all demanded this, that there must be a good society. And the word 'good', the intellectuals rather despise that word, spit on it, they say, good is very relative, good is not absolute, it is just a modification of the bad. Are you listening to all this, are you interested in all this? I hope you are because you are part of this ugly society in which we live, with all its extraordinary misfortunes, accidents, disease, pain, suffering, and if you are not interested you are not a human being obviously, because it is part of our life. And if we are not interested in the way we live, whether we can bring about a change in that, in our lives, then we become merely a cog in vast machinery that is utterly meaningless. We have lost all value, life has become, if you observe, most people's lives, wholly meaningless. You may go to the office, you may earn

a lot of money, live in an affluent society, have cars, splendid gardens, and pools and all the rest of it, but life is rather shallow, utterly meaningless, without any significance. This is our life. And we try to give meaning to it. The philosophers try in different ways to give significance to life, which then becomes theories, abstractions. And theories and abstractions in themselves are utterly meaningless.

So please bear in mind, if I may point out, that we are thinking together. You are not listening to a speaker who may have certain ideas, certain approach to life, but ideas are merely conclusions of thought. And if you have certain ideas, and also the speaker has, then there is no possibility of thinking together over this vast existence which you call living. So please, if one may request you, be serious for an hour. And that's very difficult for Americans because they are so used to being entertained - the cinemas, the books, the magazines, they try to entertain you, help you to escape from your own every day misery, confusion and pain. This is not an entertainment, intellectual or otherwise. You have to put your mind and your heart into this to understand our lives, so we must be able to think together.

So as we were saying, and I hope we are also seeing the same thing as the speaker is seeing, that there are these various theories, beliefs, dogmas, saviours, gurus, philosophers, exercising all their influence through literature, through personal expansion, through personal desires and so on and so on, have not fundamentally changed man. And one asks, why has not man - when we use the word `man' we also include the ladies, the women, so don't get upset when we say `man', it's a crazy world - why has not man,

woman, been able to change? He changes a little here and there, and yet he demands that there be a good society, he wants order, not only in himself, in his relationship, however intimate or otherwise, he wants some kind of peace in the world, he wants to be let alone to flower, to have some kind of beatitude. This has been man's demand, if you observe, throughout history from the ancient of days, and yet man, the more he becomes civilized, the more he is creating disorder, the more wars. The earth has not known a period when there have been no wars, man killing man, one religion destroying another religion, one institution dominating, destroying other institutions, one organization suppressing others. This constant everlasting struggle. I do not know if you are aware of all this. If you are, don't you ask ever if it is possible to live in this world, not run away from it, not go off into a commune or become a hermit or a monk, but to live in this world sanely, happily, intelligently, without all this battle going on inwardly and outwardly. If you do, and I hope you are doing it now because we are thinking together, if you do then you must demand that there be a good society.

We will go into that word `good', if we may, because most people, the intellectuals, the highly cultivated minds, think good is rather an impossible word, they don't like that word because it is rather a shy-making word. Are you following all this? But I think we should stick to that word in spite of them. So we must go into the meaning of that word, to be good. Because you cannot have a good society which has been the dream of ancient Indians, Hindus, ancient Greeks and the Egyptians and so on, to bring about a good society. And a good society can only exist when there is good man,

because being good he creates goodness, brings about goodness in his relationship, in his actions, in his way of life. So we must be very clear in the understanding of that word `good'. Don't despise that word. Good also means that which is beautiful. Good also means that which is holy, it is related to god, to the highest principles and so on. So that word `good' needs to be very deeply understood. When there is this goodness in one then whatever you do will be good, your relationships, your actions, your way of thinking and so on. So please as we are thinking together let us examine that word. Because one may immediately capture the whole significance of that word, the extraordinary quality of that word, instantly. But generally people don't, they want an explanation of what it is to be good. The speaker is not ashamed to use that word, you may spit on it. Generally the intellectuals do, they say such a thing doesn't exist any more. We are going to find out what it means.

Goodness is not the opposite of that which is bad. Please carefully let's think over this thing together because this is, if you really go into this very deeply, this is going to affect your consciousness, it is going to affect your way of thinking, it is going to affect the way of your life. So please give a little attention to the understanding of that word. First the word is not the thing. Right? I may describe the mountain most beautifully, paint it, make a poem, but the word, the description, the poem, is not the actual. But we are generally carried away emotionally, irrationally by the description, by the word. So please we are pointing out the word is not the actual. So we are saying, goodness is not related to that which is bad. Good is not the outcome of the bad. Goodness is

totally unrelated to that which is ugly, which is not beautiful. So goodness is by itself unrelated to that which we may consider evil, ugly, bad. That's the first thing to comprehend in thinking over together. If you say, the good is the outcome of the bad, the evil, the ugly, then the good has in it the bad, the ugly, the brute. You understand? You understand this? No? The good must be, and is, totally unrelated to that which is not. And the good cannot possibly exist when there is any acceptance of any authority. Right? I am going to go into it. Please, we are thinking together over a very, very serious problem.

Authority is very complex. There is the authority of law which man has put together through many, many centuries; there is the law of Nature, there is the law of our own experience, according to which we obey, according to the law of our own petty reactions which dominate our lives. Then there is the law of institutions, the law of organized beliefs which are called religions, dogmas. We are saying goodness is totally unrelated to every form of authority. Please look at it, examine it, understand it, don't reject it, say, it is too complex, we don't understand - it is very simple if you examine it, if you apply your mind to it. Goodness is not the pursuit of conformity. If you conform to a belief, to a concept, to an idea, to a principle, that is not good, because it creates conflict. The essence is goodness is a mind that is not in conflict. Examine it, look at it. Goodness cannot flower through another, through a religious figure, through dogma, through belief, it can only flower in the soil of total attention in which there is no authority. You are following all this? Is this all too complex? And goodness implies great responsibility. You can't be good and allow wars to take place. So a

man that is really good is totally responsible for all his life. So we will go into that.

So we are asking: can a man who has lived in a society where the pressures of institutions, pressures of belief, pressures of authoritarian religious people, can such a man be good? You are following all this? Please give your minds to this. Because it is only if you are good, if you, as a human being, are totally and absolutely good, absolutely, not partially, we will create a different society.

So our question then is: is it possible, living in this world, married, children, jobs, is it possible to be good - good in the sense we are using it carefully, in which is implied great responsibility, care, attention, diligence, love. The word 'good' contains all that. Is that possible for you who care to come here, listen, is that possible for you? If it is not possible then you accept society as it is. Please this is very serious as we pointed out, this is not for little children, it is not for those who do not want to think through a particular aspect of life. This demands your attention, that means your energy. Human beings have plenty of energy, when they want to do something, they do it. This demands immense energy, that is, if you want to create a different society, a society which is essentially good, in the context we are using that word.

Now having stated that what prevents us? Do you understand my question? What prevents every human being who is here from being utterly good, what is the barrier? What is the block? Why don't human beings, you, be utterly, sanely good? Is it we are caught up in our own petty reactions? Please examine it, don't throw it out. Our reactions: we say, I like, I don't like, I am angry,

you know reactions, sensory reactions, which gradually become psychological facts which we accept. But all reactions, sensory or otherwise are really very petty and shallow. Is that what is preventing us? Please, this is not a group therapy. The speaker has a particular abomination for that kind of nonsense, we are thinking together, we are investigating together, we are not accepting what the speaker is saying, or denying it, but finding out. To find out one must apply one's energy. If one is satisfied with the world, because you have money, you have got a car, a nice wife or husband and everything is satisfactory then you are just a non-existent human being. The man who observes, who realizes what the world is, and he is the world, and the world is not different from him, he has created that world, he has created that society, he has created the religions, with their dogmas, rituals, with their separatisms, with their factions, with their innumerable dogmas and beliefs, human beings have created it. Is that what is preventing us, because you believe? Or you are so self-concerned with your own problems - sexual, fears, anxiety, loneliness, wanting to fulfil, wanting to identify with something or other, is that what is preventing a human being from being good? Please this is not rhetoric, we are asking something very, very serious. If they are preventing then they have no value. You will naturally put all that aside because you see that to bring about this quality of goodness any pressure from any direction, your own belief, your own principles, your own ideals, utterly prevent that goodness from being, when you see that you will naturally put it aside without any equivocation, any conflict because that is stupid.

So we are asking: is this what is preventing human beings right

throughout the world? It isn't only in America, in this country, but there is this great chaos, disorder, a danger to life - it is in Europe, in India, everywhere it is spreading more and more and more. And any man, any serious observer of himself as well as the world must ask this question. You see, sirs, the scientists, the politicians, the philosophers - please listen to all this - the gurus, whether they come from India, or from Tibet, or from your own country, they have not solved our human problems; they give you all kinds of theories, nor the psychoanalysts, they haven't solved the problem, nobody will. We have to solve these problems ourselves because we have created the problems. And we are unfortunately unwilling to look at our own problems, to go into them, investigate why we live as we do, utterly self-concerned, selfish lives.

So we are asking: why do we human beings live the way we are living? Our education doesn't help us to solve our problems; you may get a good job, you may call yourself a doctor, a PhD and so on and so on, but our lives are not changed by them.

So we are asking: can this goodness, with its beauty, with its holiness - that word means that - can we live that way? And if we cannot then we will accept this increasing danger of chaos to our own lives, to our children's lives, and so on down the line.

So after listening, are we thinking together, are we seeing the same thing, you and I together, the same thing? Or we have explanations for all this, or we say, well somebody else is going to alter our lives, an external force, an external agency, god, ideas, principles, are they going to change our lives? So far they have not, and they never will because ideals, concepts, images all those are self-created, created by human beings out of their own confusion,



out of their own misery, out of their own ugliness, confusion. So you see we are deceiving ourselves all the time.

So we come to the question then: what will make us change? You understand my question, sirs? More shocks? More catastrophes? Different forms of governments? Different images? Different ideals and so on? You have had varieties of these, and yet you have not changed. The more sophisticated better education, the more civilized we are becoming - civilized in the sense more away from Nature - we are becoming more inhuman. Right? So what shall we do? As none of the things outside of us are going to help, including all the gods, then it becomes obvious, only I have to understand myself, I have to see what I am and change myself radically. Then goodness comes out of that; then one can create a good society. So are we willing to go into this question to know oneself? To understand oneself because oneself is the world. You understand, sirs? Human beings whatever their colour, their religion, their nationality, their beliefs, human beings right throughout the world psychologically, inwardly suffer, they go through great anxieties, great loneliness, extraordinary sense of despair, depression, a sense of meaninglessness of living the way we do, right through the world psychologically they are similar to each one of us. That's a reality, that's truth, that's an actuality. So you are the world psychologically, and the world is you. So when you understand yourself you are understanding the whole human structure and nature, it is not mere selfish investigation. Because when you understand yourself you go beyond yourself, there is a different dimension comes into being.

So we are thinking together over this, and we shall go into it

tomorrow, because you can't stand more than an hour of this kind of talk. May I get up and go now?

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC TALK 8TH APRIL 1979

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying yesterday that throughout the world the religions, with their orthodoxy, rituals, with their beliefs and superstitions, have not fundamentally changed man; nor the scientists; nor the philosophers with their extraordinary theories, with their wishes, with their particular conditioning; nor the politicians. As you observe the world is becoming more and more dangerous to live in, more and more confused, disorderly, wars are going on all the time over the earth, neither the modern psychologists nor analysts have solved our human problems. Most people throughout the world, I am sure, desire to have a good society, to live peacefully, to live with certain tranquillity, with certain security; but all this is becoming more and more impossible, except perhaps for the very, very rich, but the average man throughout the world finds it extraordinary difficult to live, both outwardly where there is so much insecurity and danger, and inwardly, psychologically he is everlastingly in conflict with himself and with his neighbour, whether he is close by or a thousand miles away.

So when one observes all this, as I am sure you are all aware of all this, one asks, why human beings, each of us, do not radically change, why we accept to live this way, why we submit to this extraordinarily destructive disorder? Why we do not conserve, protect the earth, the air, the environment, which we are gradually destroying? I am sure you know all this. And man, human beings, have looked to some leaders, some statesmen, some heroes, some saviours, some agency outside of us, gods, and these too have

failed us. Which again is an obvious fact.

So considering all this, what is a human being to do? Why do we accept all this? You are supposed to be civilized, educated, affluent, and that may be perhaps rather a misery, and we have practically everything that we physically want. Order can be brought about in society but to live in the society is becoming more and more dangerous. Which again is fairly obvious. So how do we human beings, with all our petty reactions, with all our beliefs and dogmas and prejudices, how do we become, or be good? Because this is really a very important question that one must ask.

As we were saying yesterday, we must think together over this matter. I mean by that word 'think', see the problems together, not have different opinions about it, see actually what is going on. And to observe clearly one must be free of one's own particular prejudices, particular narrow, limited, petty reactions. One must be free, obviously, from one's nationalities, the attachment to a particular part of the earth, geographically divided. This is what is separating, destroying human beings.

So how do we, each one of us, create, or bring about a good society? Please, as we said, we are thinking together, we are investigating together, though previously the speaker has said, thought is very limited, thought is fragmentary, broken up, but we must use thought, though it is limited, though it breaks things up because thought is in itself partial, but we must use thought, realizing its limitation we must exercise thought to find out, to observe very clearly, with reason, logic, sanity why we live the way we do; concerned with our own little problems, with our own sexual desires, with our own psychological conflicts and all the rest

of it. So we said, goodness is not an abstraction, not an idea, not something ideal, actuality, to be good. Because it is only when individuals, or groups of individuals, human beings, are good, in the deep sense of that word, then there is a possibility of bringing about a different society. We were saying all this yesterday. And we came to the point that to have this sense of goodness, we carefully explained what that word means, which is, to have great sense of responsibility, to have certain care, affection, love - all that is implied in that word. And realizing that, the significance, the full depth of that word 'goodness', which is not the opposite of that which is evil - we explained that carefully - and we said, is it possible for a human being to bring about this goodness in himself? Because he creates the society, the society which we have is created by each one of us, we have contributed to that, by our greed, by our angers, by our hatreds, by our various forms of pleasure, ambition and so on, we have created this monstrous society. And unless we understand ourselves, what we are, and bring about a change in what we are, there can never be a good society. So we said, to understand oneself is important. The ancient Hindus, and the Greeks and others have said, 'Know Yourself'. Please, we are thinking together, we are investigating together, don't listen to the talk and go away; you are working as hard as the speaker. We are investigating, exploring, thinking, feeling together into this problem. Because any thoughtful man who is serious must find out for himself a way of living, surrounded by chaos, surrounded by disorder, immorality, to live a life that is essentially good. And to find that out we said, you must know yourself. Know yourself, not according to some philosopher, to some leader, to

some analyst, to some guru, because they only inform you what they think you are, including the Freudians, the Jungians, and all the rest of it. If you discard all those - one must, if you want to discover what you are, and to bring about a change in what you are, you must investigate your own consciousness, your own mind, your own reactions, your way of life. That's fairly obvious, isn't it. We cannot possibly depend on others to tell us what we are. They have done this. I am sure you know all this but you have probably never thought about it.

And priests, the religious leaders throughout the world, have said, you can't possibly change yourself, but only if you can surrender yourself to the highest god, the highest principle, then perhaps you might change. That's not good enough. So we are asking: can you discard what others have said you are, and investigate for yourself what actually is going on within yourself, and look? I hope this is somewhat clear. That is, if you rely on authority to tell you what you are, you are then depending on the assertions, the speculations, the theories of others, however good, however reasonable, however logical. And when you accept them and through their eyes examine yourself, then you are looking at yourself through the authority of another. Please see this simple fact. If I tell you what you are - I wouldn't be such an idiot - then you would accept my theory, or my concept, my idea of what you are, and conform to that pattern. This is what we are doing actually. So gradually we become secondhand people. Right? Please see how important this is because as long as we are living with the authority of others, however intelligent, however much they have explored, we are then accepting their pattern of what our

consciousness should be, what we are, and then use the initiative, the creative capacity to investigate and discover. I hope we are making this clear and I hope we are doing this. Because out of that comes freedom.

You can't possibly investigate without freedom. Right? This is obvious, isn't it? That if you want to know yourself one has to discard totally, completely what others have said about you. Can you do that? Or must you accept their theories, logical or illogical, sane or insane, and accepting what they say and gathering their information which may sharpen your own mind, and with that sharpened mind, sharpened at the expense, at the behest of others, look at yourself. You follow? Or is there a possibility of looking at yourself without all that? Right? Are we thinking together? I hope we are meeting each other. That is, one can know oneself very clearly, objectively in relationship. Right? Relationship is the mirror in which we see ourselves, actually as we are. Because we are apt to deceive ourselves. We are prone to create illusions. We have the tendency to create ideas, formulas, illusions, and they assume reality. Haven't you noticed all this? So one must be absolutely free of all illusion. Is that possible?

I hope we are meeting each other, that we are investigating together, because please bear in mind this is not a talk given by the speaker for you to listen and agree, or disagree, and go home, and carry on in your usual life. But on the contrary, this investigation together becomes very serious; and being serious it affects our lives. And if you don't want to be disturbed, then please don't listen. If you want to carry on your daily life as one does, probably you will even after hearing this talk, then shut your ears and don't

bother. Go to a cinema or do something else. But if you are serious and I hope you are, then one has to look at oneself without any illusion in the mirror of relationship. There you discover all your reactions, objectively, without any distortion. That is if you want to discover yourself, that is if you want to bring about a good society, healthy, sane, moral human beings who have values, not imaginary values.

So we have to investigate, look together into this mirror. You see one of the difficulties is that our minds in observing in this mirror, dictate what the mirror should tell. You are following all this? Our minds, which is our thought, our desires, our pleasures, our fears, our anxieties, our groping uncertainties, dictate what that mirror should show. I hope you are following all this. So to observe very clearly in the mirror there must be a mind that is capable of observing without any distortion. Right? That is, what makes for distortion? Do you understand my question? The mirror is not distorted, obviously. Because in our relationship, wife, husband, whatever it is, in that relationship there is no distortion, those are facts, but the mind begins to distort, which is thought begins to distort. I hope you are following all this. Right? Are we going along together with this? So we have to investigate why the mind - we are using the mind in the sense not only the brain, but thought, emotions, sensory responses, all that is the mind, which is consciousness. I won't go into that, we'll go into that a little later. Which is, your mind is the product of the senses, emotions, thought, desire, and all the experiences, memories, are the content of one's mind. Right? It is very simple when you observe it. That mind with its thoughts, sensations and so on, that thought has



created the sense of the self, the 'me' - the self. Right? So the self is always distorting. Right? Which is, the self, the 'me', is the product of thought, thought which is limited, obviously, thought which is the response of memory, memory being experience and knowledge, inherited or acquired, that thought has created this self. This self is always distorting: my desires, my wishes, my particular idiosyncrasies, my particular tendencies, my desires, my opinions, my longing, my fulfilment. And this self conceals itself in many, many ways. I don't know if you have noticed it? Have you noticed, for example, those who are greatly in the political world or the religious world, the self has concealed itself in the name of god. Right? I wonder if you see all this? Please don't accept what the speaker is saying, but observe the activities of this extraordinary thing called the self.

One can become a religious leader - religious in quotes - and talk about god, teach about god and all that kind of stuff, and the self is identified with that god and it gives him a great deal of position, money, all the rest of the nonsense in the name of god. Haven't you noticed all this? Or you have an experience, there is an experience and immediately the self takes that over, makes it into some philosophical concepts, some experience which it thinks is extraordinary and begins to talk about it, preach about it. And in the very preaching about it he becomes very important, gathers money, position, respectability, you know influence.

So to find out how to observe the mirror without distortion we must understand first the nature of sensation. You are following all this, may I go on? Please, are we meeting together? You see we have senses, that is, we are not using all our senses at the same

moment; we are using the senses as a particular sense, partially. You may be an artist and what you see and what you observe, the colour, the beauty of the mountains, the shape, and so on, there you are exercising vision, you are not exercising all your senses. I wonder if you are following all this? So we are conditioned to function with one or the other senses, giving them importance. Haven't you noticed this? So that we are never operating with all our senses. So that's one of our difficulties. And is it possible to look, observe with all our senses. You are following this. Because this is very important. When you so attend with all your senses there is no centre from which you are observing. I wonder if you see this. Experiment with this, find out if either the speaker is telling some nonsense, or whether it has any validity. So to find out one has to be aware how your senses are operating; whether one sense, or one or two senses have become extraordinarily important and the others are being neglected or atrophied. Whereas if you become aware and find out, you then discover that you can operate with all your senses. Then when all the senses are in full operation there is no centre as the self which distorts observation. You will have to find this out.

So we are saying that as long as one particular, or a couple of senses are taking dominance over the others there must be distortion, obviously. So as we said, the mind is made up of these senses. Then one has to understand desire, because when you looking in the mirror clearly, if you want to look at it objectively, sanely, rationally, clearly, you have to understand the whole movement of desire. Are you interested in all this? Or are you going to sleep on a lovely morning? You know, I was thinking,

should you be serious on a lovely morning? Or you are only serious when it is a rather misty, cloudy, rainy darkish morning? This is a serious gathering, not an entertainment, intellectual or otherwise. We are discussing the whole question of a society that is going to pieces, that is deteriorating, degenerating, and being serious people they are concerned with a different way of living, to bring about a different society, a different culture, not the culture based on waste, disrespect and so on and so on. And to bring about such a society each human being has to be fundamentally deeply good - good being sane, rational, care, sense of deep love. That is the essence of goodness.

And as we said, to observe in the mirror one must investigate the whole movement of desire because we are driven by our desires. Right? Especially in this country, we are encouraged through commercialism to such an extravagant explosion of our desires: we are told to buy, buy, buy - if you listen to the television and the commercials, my god! So the society around us, which has been created by us, by our greed, by our envy, by our anxiety, that very society, of which we are a part, encourages this drive, this energy which has become desire. Right?

And all religious organizations, the ancient Hindus and Catholics and so on, have always said to their monks who come to serve in the name of god, 'Suppress your desire, control your desire', or 'Surrender your desire to god' - give yourself, which is your desire, which is the energy which is expressed through desire, to the nameless, to the holy, to the ultimate. And human beings not being able to do that completely, control themselves, burn with desire, sexual and other forms of desire, and fight, fight, fight,

struggle in the name of god. So such people obviously cannot look in the mirror without distortion - obviously. So we are saying, we have to understand desire, not suppress it, control it, or transmute it, or run away from it. Because when we understand something very clearly, then you can deal with it. It is only when we are not quite clear then we battle with it.

There is one problem in the understanding of this word 'desire: what do we mean by 'understanding'? Please follow all this. To understand means to comprehend, to know, to be aware, to have cognizance, to see the full meaning. But we are using the word in a different sense, if one may, which is, to understand something is to transform it, is to completely change it. I am going to go into this carefully, please we are investigating together, you are not just listening to me, that's useless, because it's your life, not my life. So we are trying - we are investigating the whole movement of desire, why man has never been able to understand it, give it its right place and be free of it. Do you understand? We have not been able to do that. And we are going into this question of desire, please, bearing in mind that we are not suppressing it, we are not trying to control it, we are not trying to surrender this enormous energy to some ideal. We are trying to comprehend this enormous energy of man, which is a driving force of our life, desire, with its will. Because will is the essence of desire - I want this, I will get it, I must be successful. You follow? All that is this enormous energy that man has expressed through desire - I hope this is clear - which has created extraordinary problems because you have your desire, another has his desire, and so there is conflict between the two. Your desire drives you in one direction, and the other in another

direction, so there is never a relationship which is actual but each desire driving one another apart and hoping some day we will meet together, either sexually, or in some heaven - which is nonsense. I hope you are meeting all this.

So we have got this enormous energy, which is operating in the world. To go to the Moon you have to have enormous energy, the desire there. To be a good politician, to become a President, or whatever it is, you must have this extraordinary desire, ambition. And this ambition, which is an expression of desire, is cultivated to the highest degree in this country. And so there is constant ruthlessness in this drive. I hope you are following this. It is ruthless. I may have this tremendous desire and experience something and you know, imagine that I have achieved some extraordinary state and talk about it, preach about it, but it is still this desire that makes me sit on a platform and talk about it - not with me, and I mean it. Then you may ask, why do you talk? If it isn't your desire, why do you talk at all, why have you talked for over fifty years? Right? That's a logical question. Must I go into it? First of all this person talks because he is without any motive. Please understand this. I have no motive to convince you of anything - that I am great, that I am reputed, that I am this, that I am that, that's all beside the point. Nor do I want to convince you of anything, to make you believe in something other than what you believe. On the contrary, belief destroys people, separates people, it has no validity, it is not actual. And the speaker is talking because - I don't know - because it may be that one has love for one's fellow human beings, may be that one has compassion, and various other things. You never ask the sun, 'Why do you get up in

the morning?'-or the sun set; you never ask a flower why it blooms: you either look at it, enjoy it, smell it and see the extraordinary beauty of it and every day look at it. Perhaps that why one is talking. Apart from that, there is much more to be said about it. I think man has lost the direction of life, and also to state something that is beyond all thought, beyond all measure, which no philosophy, nothing can explain, but one has to come to it. So let's get back to what we were saying.

We have this extraordinary desire, this energy which is driving, which is almost uncontrollable. I don't know if you have noticed all this? And we have never been able to give it its right place. So - please listen to this - what is the relationship between thought and desire? You understand my question? Where does thought and desire meet? If thought does not meet desire then what relationship is action without thought? You understand my question? Please I will have to go into it. Please have a little patience because we are investigating a very complex problem. You have a desire, and you act. You see something in the shop you desire and you buy it, or do something. What is the action of desire without thought? Is there an action of desire without thought? You are meeting all this? So I am asking - we are asking: what is the relationship between the two? You understand my question? Please understand my question first. That is, desire is sensation. Right? That is, you see something beautiful, there is perception, contact, sensation. If it is merely that then it is very simple, isn't it. Seeing, contact, sensation. If it ends there there is no problem. Right? I wonder if you understand this. Please go into it with me, it is really important this. You can see a beautiful vase, beautiful house, or beautiful woman or man,

whatever it is, a beautiful thing - the seeing, the touching there is the sensation. If it ends there there is no problem, but when thought comes in and creates an image of having that vase, that person, or whatever it is, in your house then begins the problem. You follow? So I am asking what is the relationship between desire, which is, seeing, perception, contact, sensation, then thought taking that sensation over, creating an image, the vase in your house, the car in your garage, the man or the woman in your room, creating the image and then the whole movement of sorrow begins. I wonder if this is clear? Are you following? Are you getting tired?

So we are asking: what is the relationship between desire, thought and action? Can there be perception, contact, sensation, without the interference of thought, which then creates the image and the pursuing of that image? You get this? I wonder if you get it? The pursuing of that image is your desire to fulfil, and not being able to fulfil, frustrated, anger, jealousy, annoyance, bitterness, cynicism, the whole business of frustrated people, because they cannot fulfil their desire. You are following all this? It is extraordinary, if you observe desire very closely you can see this movement going on.

So desire is seeing, perception, contact, sensation, and can it stop there and not let thought create the image, and the pursuit of that image, and then fulfilment, frustration and all the rest of it? We are asking now: can perception, contact, sensation stop, and no more? Which means, thought has no relationship to desire which creates the image and the pursuit of that image, and fulfilment, frustration, all that follows. Have you understood this? This demands a great deal of attention; when there is this movement of

desire, to be totally aware of all this at one glance. You understand what I am saying? That is, when there is clear insight into this - I am using the word 'insight' in the sense of when you comprehend the whole of it - then desire and will take very little part in life. Then there is something else operates, which is intelligence. You understand? This is perhaps a little bit - I am introducing something else. May I go on with this, or are you surfeit of this?

Desire has not been properly investigated by people, specialists - we are not specialists fortunately, we are ordinary people, laymen, we can investigate it without losing any face or losing money, losing position, or anything, we can just investigate it and see the movement of this whole desire, which is perception, seeing, contact, sensation, thought taking the sensation over and creating the image, pursuing that image and the fulfilment in that image or the frustration. When you look at this whole movement as a whole, holistically, there is an insight into it, you see the inward working of it, which is intelligence. So intelligence then operates, not desire, not mere sensation. You have got it? Have you understood something of this? That is, our action is now based on desire, the image created by thought, acting. Therefore your desire opposed to another desire and so there is conflict between two desires: when you are married, husband, wife, girl, boy, this is the operation that is going on all the time in every way - sexually, in ambition, this thing is moving all your life, which brings great conflict, various forms of neurosis and so on and so on.

So we are saying something entirely different: to have an insight into the whole movement of desire. That is, to look at the whole desire, and say, 'What shall I do without desire, it sounds



silly, if you take away desire I can't act' - we are not taking anything away, we are merely looking at the whole structure and the nature of desire. When you look at it completely without any distortion that very looking is intelligence. You understand? No? This is difficult. Sir, what is intelligence? You say, he is a very intelligent man - I don't mean that, you can be intelligent and rather stupid too. The meaning of that word according to a good dictionary is: to understand, to read between the lines, to be able to comprehend non-verbally, because that is what it means 'between the lines', to understand without gesture, without the word, to grasp the whole significance of something instantly. You understand? That is intelligence. Now to grasp the whole significance of desire instantly, and see the truth of it, and that intelligence then will operate, which doesn't mean that you deny this, intelligence is operating. Right?

So are you now operating with intelligence or with desire with its image and fulfilment? Do you see the difference? When there is intelligence desire has its place, and thought has its place, therefore there is no conflict. This requires a great deal of enquiry into oneself to be so aware, so attentive to the arising of desire, that's perception, contact, sensation arising, and then thought instantly taking over, creating the image and the pursuing of that image - I must be the President, the whole business of it. When you understand this whole movement, have an insight into it, that very insight is intelligence which then functions, intelligence is operating, acting. Right? Have you captured some of this? I think that's enough for today, isn't it?

## OJAI 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 10TH APRIL 1979

Krishnamurti: I believe this is a discussion, rather - I don't like the word 'discussion' - but rather a dialogue. The meaning of that word 'dialogue' means conversation between two people. And it would be good if we could talk over some human problem and go into it very deeply to the very end, and not merely offer opinions, arguments, opposition and so on. Could we have a good dialogue together? So please, you choose the subject you want to talk about, or want to investigate, and let's go into it.

Questioner: Love.

Q: Why do you think that so many people killed themselves in Vienna last autumn because somebody told them to do it?

K: The massacre in Jonestown, why. Are you really interested in that?

Q: Sir, could we see whether it is actually possible for a mind that doesn't see clearly to bring about a transformation in itself?

K: Is it possible for a mind that does not see clearly to bring about not only clarity but a deep mutation, is that possible?

Q: Could we talk about passion in relationship?

K: Could we talk over together passion in relationship.

Q: Why do human beings get caught in various networks of escapes rather than face things out?

Q: Sir, what is the challenge of the man/woman relationship?

K: You should know!

Q: The right place for sex.

Q: Is there such a thing as soul?

Q: Is there such a thing as a soul mate and if so how do you

meet your soul mate?

K: Soul mates? How do you meet a soul mate? I am sorry to laugh but it is quite amusing.

Q: Why is it that even though you have been speaking a very long time, fifty years, it seems to be that so very few people are really understanding deeply what you mean?

K: You have been speaking for over fifty years, why is it so few people throughout the world seem to be transformed? Is that the question?

Q: What is the beginning of division in consciousness?

K: Yes. Now enough questions have been asked so which shall we choose among those questions which will be worthwhile going into? Attachment, whether a mind which is clouded, dull, uncertain, can such a mind transform itself. Now which question do you want to discuss?

Q: The last one.

K: Why a mind that is not clear, uncertain, can such a mind transform itself? That's what you want to discuss, go into.

Sir, when we talk about not having a clear mind what do we mean by that? Do we mean such a mind is conditioned, enclosed, resisting, incapable of being not only free within itself but also go beyond itself? So we must be clear what we are talking about. A mind that is conditioned, can such a mind free itself? I think that would be a simple way of putting it. Would you agree to that, sir?

Do we know, or aware, that our minds are conditioned? And what do we mean by being conditioned? I am not giving a talk, we are two friends talking over together, trying to find out seriously whether a mind that is heavily conditioned can ever be free itself.

We are asking what do we mean by being conditioned.

Q: In order to find that out we must see what is the origin of conditioning.

K: What is the origin, the beginning of conditioning.

Q: A conditioned mind has a pattern to which it always comes back to, and all responses according to that pattern.

K: Yes, that's one aspect of it. What do we mean by being conditioned? And the gentleman asked, what is the origin of our conditioning.

Q: Any memory that is retained, any experience.

K: Would we say that human beings from the very beginning of time are conditioned by their immediate experiences? Immediate experience of danger, of security, of physical uncertainty, of survival, seeking protection, and not completely finding that protection being anxious, afraid, both neurologically and physically. Surely that is the beginning of human conditioning, right from the very beginning.

Q: No.

K: No?

Q: You made a jump there. The primal conditioning, food, clothing and shelter, to be secure physically, this is fairly clear. But when fear comes into that there is another dimension.

K: Physical necessity. Human beings right from the beginning of time have to have food, clothes and shelter. In the very searching of it, in the very hunting of it, in the very demand for food, going through various experiences in acquiring food, there began the conditioning. Conditioning, being hunted and hunting, the experience of fear, the experience of uncertainty, the lack of

safety and so on. That is the beginning obviously of the human mind being conditioned. Physically most of us have this urge to be protected, find safety, security, certainty. Right? Obviously. So that is the beginning of it.

Q: Isn't it healthy to have an urge to live in safety and security?

K: Is it not healthy to have such an urge, to have food, clothes, shelter, that's a natural demand of every human being right through the world, whether rich or poor, that's natural. And that is being prevented by various categories of division: class division, national division, religious division, economic division, and so on and so on. That - please let's go slowly - that is, physical demand for food and clothes, has that-I am asking, please investigate together - spilled over into the psychological field? That is, one has food, clothes, and shelter, one needs that, but also one thinks one needs psychological safety, psychological security, psychological dependency, psychological anxiety and so on and so on. So I am asking - please listen to this - I am asking, I am not stating, I am asking you to find out if the physical needs with all their reactions have not entered into the arena, area of the psychological field.

Q: Yes.

K: Just find out, sir, before you say, yes or no. This is important because if we don't find this out then we mix the two. That is, one needs food, clothes and shelter with all its problems, with all its reactions, the work, the job, and so on. Now I am asking, that very same urge, has that entered into the psychological field, the inward field, inside oneself, which says, `Yes, not only I need protection, physical protection, security, safety, clothes and all that, but also I need somebody on whom I can depend, from whom I can have

protection, security, safety.' You understand, the same movement has entered into the psychological world.

Q: Is not the desire for food and shelter a psychological thing as well as a physical one? Is it separate?

K: We are going to find out but I want to go step by step, sir. One needs food, that's natural, the desire for food, but that same desire might have entered into the psychological field and say, 'I need company, I am afraid to be alone.'

Q: He says the desire for food is itself a psychological device.

K: Is it? Is desire for food, is it psychological desire? I need food. This morning it was very cold one had to put on a coat. So that's not desire.

Q: It is not a psychological desire for you but is it for normal people? For us food becomes a psychological need.

K: Ah, for us food becomes a psychological need - why?

Q: I have had...

K: Just a minute, go into it, don't answer it immediately, find out: why do I psychologically need food. You understand my question?

Q: Something else is missing.

Q: The body needs a certain amount of food but psychologically I want more than it needs.

K: That's it. I need sufficient food, but my tongue dictates what kind of food I need, the most tasty - that becomes psychological. So one has to distinguish-this is very simple all this, I don't know why you are make a fuss about this.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, we are discussing, we are talking over together as

two friends about the problem of being conditioned. Don't forget, please don't go off to something else. Our minds are conditioned by our culture, by our race, by our climate, by our food, by our beliefs, and so on and so on, we are conditioned, our minds are conditioned through education, through experience, through knowledge and so on. And the question is: can such a mind free itself from its conditioning? That's the real central issue. Let's stick to that and not go off about food and something else.

Q: Memory.

K: Memory, that's knowledge. So we are conditioned by knowledge, which is experience, which is stored up in the brain as memory, thought, all that. By all this we are conditioned. The question is: can we go beyond, can the mind go beyond its own conditioning? You understand this question, sir? It is a very serious question because there are those, very scholarly, very well-known people who say that it cannot, you can modify it, you can bring about certain changes within the conditioning, but it is impossible to go beyond, to break through, to be free of one's conditioning. You understand? This is not just a game we are playing, this is a very, very serious question. So we are saying, are you aware that your own mind is conditioned? This is very important, please answer my question. Are you aware that your mind is conditioned?

Q: No.

Q: That is the only mind we know.

K: That is the only mind we know. Now just listen carefully please. When you say, that is the only mind we know, are you different from that mind? You understand my question? Look: suppose my mind is conditioned because I was born in India,

educated abroad in England and in France, in Italy and so on and so on, in the Eastern culture and the Western culture, and partly living in America, the Western vulgarism and so on and so on. So this mind is conditioned. How do I know - please listen - that it is conditioned? Because you tell me? Or I discover - the mind discovers, not 'I discover', but the mind discovers that it is conditioned by the culture of India, of Europe and partly, very lightly by the Americans.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait! Please follow this for two minutes and then you can ask. How do I know that my mind is conditioned? I have accepted it, I have lived that way for twenty, forty, a hundred years. I have lived that way. How do I know that my mind is conditioned?

Q: Unhappiness.

K: Unhappiness? That means if I am happy in my conditioning there is no problem.

Q: But we are not always happy, sorrow is coming always.

K: So you are aware of your conditionings, sometimes being happy, sometimes being unhappy. Is that it? Go into it, sir. Is that it?

Q: I was born in Finland and I may feel homesick, so it tells me that I am conditioned to live in Finland, that sorrow tells me.

K: So you are aware that you are homesick. Is that the indication of your conditioning? That's only a part. Right? You are conditioned by your religion, you are conditioned by your literature, the propaganda that is going on, the books that you read.

Q: Our relationship.

K: All that is your conditioning. You are not answering my



question. Please be patient with me. I am asking you, how do you realize that your mind is conditioned?

Q: By the repetitiveness of it.

Q: If I see that it is conditioned by reflecting on it, and looking at the thought I am conditioned, aren't I looking at a thought which is imagination essentially. But I am not seeing it with any of the senses, or with sense?

K: That is - let me repeat the question, please. What he says, perhaps it is true, we are going to find out. He says, I think I am conditioned, I think. So the thinking is separate from being conditioned. You understand the difference? I wonder if you do.

Q: Thinking is the act of memory.

K: Yes, sir, thinking is the act of memory, is the response of memory. And memory says to me, I am conditioned; but that is not the actual realization that I am conditioned. See the difference? I think I am riding a camel, actually I am sitting here. I think I am conditioned.

Q: Sir, is not the memory itself conditioning?

K: Wait, sir. First see the position we are in, actually, and then we can proceed step by step. I think I am conditioned, but I am not sure. So there is a division between the thinker who says, I am conditioned, and the actual realization that the mind is conditioned. That is, I can think I am hungry but actually I may not be hungry. Make it as simple as that. Is this clear?

Q: If you go on thinking and think hard enough.

K: No, you are missing my point.

Q: Sir, it seems like there is a kind of innate drive to be free.

K: This is very interesting how you cannot see this very simple

point. I think I love you, I may not actually love you. The actual feeling of loving is different from the thought that I love you. Is that simple, clear? Right? Keep to that. Perhaps you will understand this better. So the realization of being conditioned is different from the idea that I am conditioned.

Q: In what way is it different?

K: One is actual, the other is imaginary, maybe, I don't know.

Q: Imagination is all I know.

K: So is the tree imagination?

Q: No.

K: No, it is an actuality, you are sitting there, you can touch it. The idea you cannot touch, it is not as real as the tree. So I am asking, please have patience with this until you find out for yourself that thought imagines or conceives that it is conditioned, but the actual fact of being conditioned is different. Let me put round the other way, perhaps you may get it. Thought is the response of memory. Right? That's fairly simple. Memory itself may be conditioned. You understand? It is, obviously. No? Q: But sir, thought is so devious, so clever that it says...

K: It is not clever. Be simple, sir, begin simply and you can work very, very deeply if you want to go into it. I want to find out if my mind is actually conditioned. And I say, yes it is conditioned because I have lived in India, born in a certain category of social status, educated here, there and so on, so by its very living it has been conditioned. Obviously. Now can the mind - please listen - can the mind realize that it is conditioned, or have I to tell the mind that it is conditioned? You see the point? If I tell the mind that it is conditioned then I am playing with words.

Q: Isn't it the same also if I tell my mind and thought that I am conditioned, that really I am not seeing it directly?

K: That's right. Can you see directly that your mind is conditioned?

Q: Sir, if I watch my actions then I know I am conditioned.

K: That's all, that's all. So you realize through action that your mind is conditioned. That is, you say, I am an American, and you are proud of that, etc., etc., or when the Indian says, I am an Indian, it is part of his conditioning. When a man says, I am Catholic, it is part of his conditioning, two thousand years of propaganda that you are a Christian and all the rest of it, this pressure has been imposed on your brain for two thousand years, and you say, yes, I believe it. So, wait. Look at it, sir, look, look at yourself.

So we are asking, can such a mind free itself from its conditioning? That's the basic question: can the mind, which was born in India, with all the superstitions, you know all that business, can that mind free itself from that? Obviously it can.

Q: I have to actually see the limitations of my conditionings.

K: That's right, that's right.

Q: So I can change it.

K: Of course you can change it.

Q: Yes.

K: The speaker was born in India, with all the conditioning there, I can say, well, nonsense, and drop it.

Q: What is the spiritual world?

K: What is the spiritual world? The spiritual world is beyond all conditioning.

Q: If I think the conditioning is on a spiritual level, if I think

that it is not actually physical, then won't that throw me off?

K: Of course. But, sir, please, you are missing it. Go step by step you will find out for yourself. If you are born in America and you are conditioned to the American pattern of society, you know all that goes on in America, believe in this, and not believe in that, and so on and so on, your mind by your education, by your parents, by your friends, your mind is conditioned by the culture in which you are living. That's simple. Now can you break that down and go beyond? If you want to.

Q: It needs ordinary awareness.

K: That doesn't need great awareness, it needs simple observation.

Q: What am I going to do?

K: What am I going to do with regard to what?

Q: My culture.

K: Sir, I am born in France, the French culture, they think they are the most intelligent race in the world, supreme, la force, la voix, and all the rest of it! And I have been brought up in that. See what happens; I look down upon others, I create a division between myself and others, I have a sense of superiority, I am extraordinarily intellectual because I have passed in lycee and all the rest of it, and I think I am better than anybody else. Now that's my culture, I can break that down.

Q: But sir, that is fairly easy like with nationality.

K: I am going into that. You are all so impossible, you don't want to go step by step. So can I drop my French culture, Indian culture and see what happens.

Q: But there is the conditioning that we have already had.

K: Sir, we are saying, sir, conditioning divides people: you are a Catholic, I am a Protestant, you are a Baptist, I am a Lutheran, you are Buddhist, I am a Hindu. It is so obvious, this division is destroying people. No? Hundred years war, thirty years war, you know, all the rest of history, you can see it. The Jew against the Arab, the Arab against the Jew, they are the same people but one has been conditioned by Islam, the other by Judaism, so they are at it. And you see this phenomenon going on right under your noses and we don't see the absurdity, the cruelty of it, and say, look, for god's sake drop your nationalism, drop your Judaism and Islam and let's talk as human beings. They won't because they are going back to Islamic law, you follow, maintaining this division. So one sees this, at least being intelligent I drop it. So watch it. I drop nationalism, the culture in which I have been born, I don't call myself a Hindu or a Jew or an Arab, I drop that. That's fairly easy. The outward expression of this conditioning is fairly easy to drop, but inwardly it is quite a different matter.

Now if you haven't dropped the outer you can't go to the inner. You can pretend you are going to the inner. I don't know if you see that. Because I must test this, that I have dropped it. You follow? That's the proof of my freedom from that conditioning, I have tested it. I have tested it by saying, I am not a Hindu. I don't go to their temples, to their beliefs, to their books, nonsense, I put it aside. I don't belong to any of that, which is an actual act, not just a theory. Right? Because I don't want to deceive myself therefore I am very clear on that matter. So I now say, I am conditioned, am I conditioned psychologically? You understand? You understand my question? Are you? Go on sirs.

Q: There are patterns of knowledge which we seem to be trapped in.

K: So why have human beings given such extraordinary importance to knowledge? Please listen carefully. Knowledge, which is the accumulation of experience, whether the accumulation of experience of the scientists, or of the businessman, or of the artist, why have human beings - please listen to this, find out - why have human beings given such extraordinary importance to knowledge?

Q: Because we don't know where its place is.

Q: Knowledge works in a physical world. It is useful.

Q: It is necessary in life.

Q: There seems to be security in knowledge.

K: What do you mean by knowledge? I insist on going on slowly, otherwise you will go off. What do you mean by knowledge?

Q: Memory.

K: No, sir, go into it a little bit, don't immediately answer, go into it. To know. What do you know?

Q: I know how to act in certain situations in order to get the result which I want.

K: Yes, so you know how to act in certain situations because you have learnt previously how to act in that particular situation. Right? Right, sir? So what you know is the past. You have experimented, found and remembered and stored up, and that has become your knowledge in that field. Like a technician, a plumber is excellent in that field because he has worked and so on and so on. Right? So that is his knowledge. Which is, through skill,

through practice, through action, he has acquired certain information about that, stored it up and that has become the knowledge. Right? So knowledge is always in the past. You can modify that knowledge, you can enlarge that knowledge, but it is always in the past. Right? Please, careful, go into this very, very carefully because it is really very important for a human being because if we are always living in the past, as we do, which is to act from knowledge - you understand what I am saying? Please follow this for your own sake - if I have skill, if I am skilful in becoming a carpenter, a plumber, or a businessman, or a politician, or a scientist and working along those lines I have acquired certain information, I have learnt certain things and I know now how to be a good plumber, or a good scientist or a good carpenter or a good professor, doctor, surgeon and so on, which is, I have acquired knowledge. From that I act. Right? Right, sir? That's simple. So knowledge is always in the past. Obviously. Right?

Q: Isn't there a form of knowledge, inner knowledge, that goes beyond time, and is actually prior to the conditioning?

K: Yes. Is there knowledge which is not of time. Yes, I will come to that. Unless I understand this knowledge I can't find out the other. You want to jump to the other without knowing this. That's an escape. I refuse to enter into a theoretical world. So I say, now I live my life in the past. See how strange it is. I live in the past and meet the present - right? - the present happening, the present incident, the present event, which modifies my past knowledge and I proceed. So knowledge has always been modifying itself but having always its roots in the past.

Q: When knowledge modifies itself it is in the present.

K: But it is modified. I said that. The past meets the present, the past modifies itself and still it is the past.

Q: Well, it is modifying the past in the present.

K: Modifying itself is progress?

Q: While it is modifying itself it is the past in the present.

K: Of course, it is the same thing we are saying. So one realizes that all our actions come from the past; or the past projecting an idea, ideal, and acting according to that. Obviously. I am married, I am not, but I am married and my knowledge is based on my experience with my wife, sexual, comforting, security and so on and so on, which has become my knowledge, which is my remembrance that she is my wife, or my girl, whatever it is. So please follow all this carefully. That's my conditioning. Right? The past knowledge has conditioned the mind. Now the question is, can the mind be free of the known, knowledge? You understand? It cannot. Please follow this carefully. It cannot free itself from the known because it must know how to get to my home, how to do my job, how to do various necessities of life. So knowledge has its place. Now you say, why is there knowledge continuing psychologically? You follow what I am saying? I wonder if you get this. Wait, wait. I am describing, you are just following, you don't follow the actuality, you are merely following the description - if I may point out.

Q: What is the place of the psychological realm?

K: Without memory? Without remembrance? Please you have asked a question, listen to it. What place has the psychological realm without knowledge? Is that it? No, please you have asked a question, a very good question, you don't stop there, you move.



What place has knowledge in the psychological world? Right?  
Now may I ask you something? Is remembrance of your wife, or your husband or your girl, which is in the psychological field, is that love?

Q: No.

K: How do you know? You see you are so eager to answer.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is an idea still, sir, I am just asking a very simple question. You are not really answering it - not you, sir - we are trying to evade it. You see we say, knowledge is necessary at a certain point, at a certain level - going home, driving a car, doing your job, being a plumber or a cook or a carpenter or a businessman or a scientist, knowledge there, which is partial, is necessary. Right? I am asking, is knowledge necessary in the psychological field at all? I am asking, just listen to the question first before you jump on me.

Q: What do you mean by the psychological field?

K: I am going to tell you. That is, anger. I get angry, at the moment of anger there is no remembrance as being angry. Right? Have you followed this? At the moment of getting violent you don't say, 'I am angry', it's only a second later. Which is, the recognition of that feeling which you have had before. Right? You follow this, sir? So the recognition emphasizes, gives strength to the present response, reaction. I don't know if you are following this? Are you getting tired?

Q: How can you have anger without thought first?

K: Is that so? You call me a fool; I get angry. Which is what? I have an image about myself that I am a great man or that I am not a

fool, and you call me a fool. The image is the response which gets angry. Right? You are not quite sure.

We are asking, what is the content of the psyche? You understand, sir? What is the content of your psyche, that is, your psychological world?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are too quick. Ask yourself, if you will forgive me, ask yourself please, what is the content of your psyche, what is the content of your psychological world.

Q: Conditioning.

K: No, madam.

Q: The problems of the world.

Q: Sorrowful evolution of humanity.

K: Isn't the content of your psyche your belief in god, or your not belief in god? Isn't the content of your psyche that you must be somebody? Isn't the content of your psyche the desire to be happy, the conflicts, the joys, the pleasures, the fears, the anxieties, the greed, the envy, the violence - isn't that the content of your psyche? That you must achieve enlightenment, that you must meditate in a certain way, that you are an American, or that you are black, that you are white, that you are purple-you follow? Isn't that the content of your psyche, the content of your consciousness?

Q: The result of your past experiences again.

K: We have said that. So we are saying, can your psyche, with its content, anger, jealousy, hatred, hurts, envy, greed, you know, all that, can that be free, can that totally be emptied? Right? The content of your psyche is I and you, we and they, I, a Catholic, you, a heathen - this is the whole phenomenon of the world. You

don't see this.

Q: Is the psyche because of the ideas that we have that we separate ourselves?

K: Obviously. Beliefs, your ideals, your concepts, your conclusions, your opinions, all that divides us. So I am asking a very, very serious question. And there are a great many people - please listen to this - a great many scholars, writers, philosophers who have given their life to this, and they say, 'It cannot. Accept this condition, make the best of it, don't be violent, do be kind - you know. But you cannot escape from this prison.'

Q: Sir, when you asked the question can the mind be free of its content, then we are conditioned to think 'how'.

K: The moment you say, 'how', it is part of our conditioning that demands a system.

Q: There is one question along those lines: if it was possible to free oneself would it be done point by point?

K: I am going to come to that, madam. The content of my consciousness, my psyche, is the various divisions in itself, conscious, unconscious, anger, not angry, be good and at the same time be violent, there is contradiction, opposition, resistance, desire to go forward and recoil, hurt, all that is my consciousness, my psyche, that is me. I am that. Now I am asking, is it possible to take one of these, one aspect of me, one aspect of my psyche, one aspect of my consciousness, take that and unravel it and finish it. As there are so many things in my consciousness, in my psyche, in the self I am, is it possible not to go bit by bit, part by part, but totally? You understand my question? Are you interested in all this?

Q: Yes.

K: Please, you understand, great minds have applied to this. We are fortunately laymen, we are simple people, we are not specialists, we are not great authors, well known people, just ordinary people. And the specialists have said, impossible.

Q: Sir...

K: Just listen, sir. They have said, no. And we laymen, ordinary people, say, yes, let's find out. You know what that means? You don't even see the colossal impertinence on our part! The courage, the denial that they may be wrong. You follow? All that is implied. That you are not willing to be subjugated by specialists, that you are not going to be frightened by these great scholars and intellectuals, you are willing to go against the current.

Q: Sir...

K: Sir, did you listen to what I said? Are you in that position?

Q: We are not.

K: The other night on television in an interview of a great writer, of great authority in this country. I won't mention names. And he was ascertaining, `it is so, it must be`, and all the rest of it. And listening to him one says, why do human beings accept authority. You follow, sir? Why do human beings subject themselves to this enormous weight of knowledge? You are not seeing what you are up against when you really go into it. So can you find out in spite of what Freud, Jung and all the scholars, intellectual people say, and say, look, I want to find out if the psyche with its content can be completely ended. Or must this everlastingly go on. You understand? The Hindus have said, life after life it must be gradually wiped away, life after life, you

cannot possibly do this in this life, but you need time, you need many, many lives to do this. And the Christians have also said you cannot do this, only in paradise you will do it, when you are resurrected, when you meet your god or your christ and all the rest of it. It is the same thing.

So we are asking, being laymen, non-specialists, ordinary people, can you, is there a possibility of freeing the psyche completely, putting everything aside, its own content?

Q: That means to end the psyche itself?

K: Yes, sir.

Q: But sir without any system what happens in the consciousness when it comes to an end?

K: What happens to consciousness as we know it when it comes to an end. Right? What happens? Find out! Sir there is a mountain here called Topatopa, six thousand five hundred feet; you sit here and say, what is beyond that.

Q: I don't say that. I mean when my mind is able to come to an end, once it has made it - I am not asking for a system - once it has made it what has been done in my own mind?

K: That's the point, sir. First can you see clearly the facts that your mind is conditioned by your culture? That's a fact. By your religion, by your language, by the food you eat, by your wife or your girl or husband, whatever it is. Can you see that fact?

Q: It seems to be that we see quite a lot of facts, but we don't see the root of all this conditioning.

K: I'll show it to you in a minute. But first do you see these facts in your psyche?

Q: All the time.

K: Some of the facts, many of the facts, as many as you can. Your anger, your jealousies, your hurts, your anxieties, your fears, your pleasures, your beliefs, your opinions, your judgements, your egotism, your violence, your arrogance. You follow, the whole of that.

Q: I want to step out of it.

K: You are that, you can't step out of it. You see, that's just the point.

Q: If you are that how can you...

K: I am going to show you in a minute. You see you are always wanting to go ahead without starting.

Q: But, sir, the difficulty is that I don't know if I see all my conditioning.

K: At least you can see one, sir. Now take one - what? Take one aspect of the content of this psyche, of this consciousness, of this egotism, which is all the same. So take one aspect of it, one quality of it, one reaction of it. Go on, sir, take it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Now just a minute, sir. You get hurt, don't you, not physically, inwardly. Right? Don't you get hurt. No?

Q: Yes.

K: It is a common factor of every human being. Right? You are uncertain about it, sir. You get hurt. You call me a fool and I get hurt. My mother says to me, you are not as good as your brother, you are not as clever as your elder brother, so I get hurt. Right? This is a common factor. Right? Now take that one thing and go into it very, very deeply, and see if you can be free from the past hurts and never to be hurt again, without resistance. Find out. You

see you don't go into this. If you go into this one thing completely you may end the whole thing.

Q: If you go into one thing completely you may wipe it all away?

K: Perhaps.

Q: You need awareness but the attention itself resolves it.

K: Look, sir, may I ask you - forgive me - do you get hurt? You have been hurt, not physically, you have been hurt, haven't you. Yes sir?

Q: Yes.

K: Why? What causes this hurt, and who is hurt?

Q: We have images of ourselves so we get hurt because we are not so good as we thought.

K: No, madam. You get hurt, don't you? We have said, yes. Right? What is it that is hurt?

Q: One's ego.

K: What is this ego? All right, I'll have to tell you and you will agree! Or disagree! You don't investigate, you don't look. One gets hurt because one has an image about oneself. Right? If I have an image about myself as being extraordinary this and that, a great man and a reputation, blah, blah, blah, and you come along and say, 'Don't be a fool', I get hurt. Right? Which is what? I have an image about myself. Right? The image created by all of you, and also created by myself, my image I have about myself and when you call me a fool that image reacts, that image gets hurt. Right? Now listen carefully. Can I live without that image? Can I live without any image? That I am good, that I am happy, that I must find god, that I must be a great success, I must - you follow - no

image at all. Then nobody can hurt you and you can't hurt anybody. Can you? See the logic of it first, the reason. You get hurt because you have an image-the image created by your parents, by your society, by your friends and by yourself, whether the image is small or big is irrelevant. So that image gets hurt when you say something ugly and it builds a wall of resistance round itself, it doesn't want to get hurt more and so there is fear, anxiety, a withdrawal. And you see this logically step by step and the consequences of it, and you say, right, finished, there won't be any image.

Q: Is that an act of will?

K: No, mere perception. The danger.

Q: What if we haven't clear perception?

K: You see it, sir.

Q: Logically you see it.

K: Do it, do it!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, if you see danger you act. If you see a dangerous snake, a rattler, you jump, you do something.

Q: I become aware...

K: No, don't use that word, aware, just see the rattler. And the rattler, which is a danger, and getting hurt, image, and you see it is impossible to live that way, getting hurt, restraining, fighting, quarrelling, so the whole of that you see clearly, it is finished.

Q: But only a very small part of you sees that and sees it clearly. I understand what you say very well, but a great part of me apparently does not understand what I am doing.

K: That's the whole point, sir, why doesn't it? Why doesn't the



whole of you say, 'Yes, that's right, finished', only a part of you.

Q: Well...

K: Just a minute, madam, why?

Q: Only the part that hurts.

K: Sir, when you see the rattler, only part of your acts? Why?

The whole of you acts.

Q: Because...

K: Why? Why, sir? Because you see mortal danger. Right?

Danger. You don't see the danger of having an image about yourself, totally. Why don't you see it? You don't see it because part of you says, I like my image, it's nice to have an image, I am rather a clever chap, I am rather clever, I look rather beautiful, I like that. Part of me, which is not pleasant, I say, yes, I want to get rid of that. Now just a minute, sir. What time is it?

Q: Seven minutes to one.

K: We will stop in a minute. Sir, when you hear a statement like this that the image gets hurt, do you listen to it, or do you make an abstraction of it, an idea of it? When you tell me you get hurt because you think you are a great man, and I listen to you because you have stated something which is very important, you follow, and I listen to you, not only with the hearing of the ear but also hearing inwardly: the actual fact that the image gets hurt. What we do is, we listen, create an idea, and act on that idea and so we have gone away from the fact. The fact is I have an image, and that will always be trodden on by somebody much cleverer than me, so I am always nervous, anxious, fearful, resisting, isolating myself. I see the danger of it, so it's finished. That means I listen with all my heart and mind, with my blood I listen, as you listen to the rattler.

Right, sir? You listen with all your energy otherwise you are going to be killed.

Q: How do you know the rattler will kill you unless you remember the rattler kills?

K: Have you ever met a rattler? I have, high in the mountains. You don't remember it, you see the danger there, instantly. So we had better stop. Sir, we have spent an hour and a half, what have you understood out of this? Are you free from your conditioning? Even the most simple conditioning, smoking, being identified with some belief. It's like a man who wants to climb Everest, he must climb with few things, not carry all his burden. Right.

## OJAI 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 12TH APRIL 1979

Krishnamurti: What shall we have a dialogue about?

Questioner: Psychological pain which goes into physical pain.

K: Psychological pain which goes into physical pain, psychosomatic pain. Q: It seems to me that there must be a contradiction between choice and responsibility, as I don't understand how a person who is conditioned has choice. Or how is there responsibility, and how can a person be good or evil?

K: Isn't there a contradiction between choice and responsibility.

Q: Lack of choice.

K: Lack of choice and responsibility.

Q: Can we have a dialogue about ageing.

K: About getting old. These words, how we avoid that word. 'Ageing', why not say we are getting old.

Q: Let's talk about the images.

K: Image-making. Is it possible to understand the making of images and putting an end to them - is that it?

Q: Can we talk about how it comes to happen that thought went into the wrong place?

K: How does it happen that thought moves over, or enters, or takes over in the psychological field.

Q: How did it begin?

K: The origin of this.

Q: What is meditation and why it is important, what it is?

K: What is meditation. Now which of these would you like to have a dialogue about?

Q: Meditation.

Q: Meditation.

K: Do you want to talk about meditation?

Audience: Yes.

K: Do you really? Or is it just a fanciful introduction to talk about something quite irrelevant, apart from our life? If you really want to talk about meditation let's do it, but we must be very, very serious to go into that question. So which would you like? Do you want to talk about it?

Q: Yes.

Q: No.

K: No!

Q: Krishnamurti, last Tuesday we talked about conditioning and one of the conditionings we have to deal with is the conditioning of authority, and when somebody like me thinks about speaking up here he really gets into an authority problem, such as the authority I give you, out of respect, the authority I give the group, and my own authority, which I am not so sure about. Everybody has to deal with that that sits here.

K: Do you want to speak about authority? The authority of the man sitting on the platform, the authority of the public, the authority of the specialists, the authority of one's own experience which becomes inward authority. Do you want to talk about that?

Q: Yes

Q: No.

Q: Could we talk about meditation at a later meeting. That may be more appropriate.

K: All right.

Q: Let's talk about our ability to experience that about which

you speak? Or our inability to live it?

K: Would you talk, or could we have a dialogue about that which you are talking about! What a strange crowd we are!

Q: Could we talk about what it is that we really want, what is our over-riding interest?

K: Could we discuss that, what is our search, what it is we are seeking and what is the inner urge to find something - could we talk about that? Do you want to talk about it?

Audience: Yes.

K: All right, sir. You know, I do not know if you have not noticed, specially in California which spreads to the East and also further East, that most Americans are seeking something, are experimenting with various religious ideas, psychological pursuits, group therapy, you know, this whole phenomenon of seeking, wanting something. Is that what you want to discuss?

Audience: Yes.

K: You are sure?

Q: Yes.

K: All right, sir.

Q: Could we talk about respectability?

K: Talk about respectability. All right, sir, we will introduce that word, what is the content of that word, in going into this question of what it is that you are all wanting, that we are all seeking, why you all come here and listen to this man. What for? I think this is really a very good question, if we could have a serious dialogue about it.

Q: To distract us from ourselves, that's why we come here.

K: You come here to escape from yourselves, to avoid our own

daily complexities - is that what we are wanting?

Q: I would like to find out about attention, desire and will?

K: We will do that, sir, on Saturday, we will go into the whole question of desire, the implication of desire, the arising of desire and the interference of thought with its image which is pursued through will. So we will discuss that, if you don't mind, on Saturday, the day after tomorrow morning. But let's go into this question: what is it we are all wanting? More money, if you have enough money? Obviously one must have more money if you haven't got it, that gives us food, clothes and shelter. Apart from that, and if it is possible that all human beings right throughout the world have enough food, clothes and shelter, that would be a marvellous world because there is a great deal of poverty, of which you hardly know in this country, where there is degradation, destruction, of absolute hopelessness, not having a job, food, clothes and all that. We can go into that. But apart from that, in an affluent society where most of us have some kind of assurance of food, clothes and shelter, apart from this, what is it we are seeking?

Q: Completeness.

K: It is suggested that we are seeking completeness. Go into it, sir, a little bit, step by step, go into it rather deeply. What is it we want? Happiness? Because most of us are discontented, dissatisfied with things as they are, both in our private life and in public life, and we want to bring about some kind of inward peace, tranquillity, a sense of order, not only in society but in ourselves. What is it one wants? And if one has this social order, which doesn't exist, if one has it, we want something more: we want god, we want enlightenment, we want a kind of mental peace and so on

and so on - what is it each one of us wants, craves after, pursues? I wish we could discuss this.

Q: We don't even know what we want because we give a label to god, or enlightenment.

K: Is that it? We do not know what we want, therefore we go window shopping.

Q: I think we do know what we want. That's why we want it because we know what we want.

K: You know what you want? Then there is no problem.

Q: Not really, there isn't, is there? Probably there isn't.

K: I mean if you know what you want you can get it, only the trouble is getting it. Then there is no problem: you say, look, I want money, I want to be happy, I want some kind of order in my life, then you work for it. That's very simple. But we aren't satisfied with that, we are always wanting more and more and more. What is this `more'?

Q: If we work at it to include a physical security, and I think we have to start out with that, and also include - I don't know if I can call this psychological security but psychological serenity, if there could be that and physical security, because I think the two have to go together.

K: It is suggested that both physical as well as psychological security must be sought out.

Q: Well, it might be that there has to be physical security, we have to want that, and not just want that and in a sense I want physical security...

K: Sir, are you saying for most people in the world, the increasing population, the destruction that is going on of the earth,

the air, everything, to have physical security is becoming more and more difficult. That's one point. Second, psychologically, inwardly we all want some kind of attachment, some kind of comfort, some kind of release from our own daily routine, turmoil. Now are you saying, cannot these two go together? Just enquire into it, sir. You may be well fed, have clothes and all the rest of it; the vast majority of people in the world, specially in Asia, including India, life is becoming enormously difficult, poverty, the degradation of poverty. What is preventing this? What is preventing a human being to live on this earth, having plenty of food, clothes and shelter for all human beings, what is the cause of this prevention? We are enquiring, we are not accepting, we are thinking the problem over together. Q: Is it that some amass such wealth and food and power?

K: Is it that some people amass enormous wealth and are only concerned about themselves? Is that the cause? Or is it also nationalities, economic divisions, political divisions, religious divisions, all these factors and some others prevent human beings coming together, organizing it so that we all have enough food, clothes and shelter? Obviously, because we are not concerned about others, we are only concerned as long as I have my security, leave me alone.

So that's one problem. Most of us here at least are not seeking physical security, otherwise you wouldn't be here. But we want psychological security, we want something inwardly. What is it you want?

Q: When you say psychological security is that the same as spiritual security?



K: Oh, I am not using the word `spiritual' at all, that's rather an over used word, a rather superstitious word and rather a catchy word.

Q: Psychological.

K: I am using the word `psychological' in the sense there is inner demand, I want something, not I, people want something, what is it you want.

Q: We want to realize our potential.

K: You want to realize your potentials. What are your potentials? If you say, I want to realize my potentials, first I must find out what my potentials are and then I can put all my energy into that. But what is my potential?

Q: Happiness.

K: Happiness? Is that a potential, or is that an end, is that a by-product?

Q: Maybe he feels that our potentiality is god because all the religions have told us that.

K: Is that it? Our potential is god. I am lost! We are not clearly thinking about this matter.

Q: We are all seeking eternal life.

K: We are all seeking eternal life - what do you mean by that word `eternal'? Eternal, which is beyond time. Eternal we generally understand to mean a continuous existence, eternal - is that what you want?

Q: Sir, I want to end my wanting.

K: Ah, you want to end your wanting.

Q: I want to end my confused mind.

K: You want to have a clear mind, is that it?

Q: I have a confused mind.

K: Yes, my mind is confused, the questioner says, and I want clarity. Can we discuss that? You are putting so many things in this, can we discuss that, talk it over together? Most of our minds are confused. That's obvious. If your minds were clear you wouldn't be here. You wouldn't attend any meetings, you wouldn't have to go to any guru, to any philosopher, to any recent man who says, 'I know what I am talking about'.

Q: Maybe then we would just come for conversation and friendship, just to know you. You are a very nice person.

K: Maybe, is that what you want? So most of us are confused, why? Please, go into it, put your heart into this to find out. Why are we confused?

Q: Sir, the world demands action, and we don't really know how to respond.

K: The world demands action, and we do not know how to respond. How can one respond at your excellence, at your highest capacity if your mind is confused? Please stick to this. Would you say your minds are confused?

Q: Yes.

K: Right, let's start from there, please. Why is it confused?

Q: We are constantly living in contradiction.

K: We live in constant contradiction, and therefore our minds are confused. That's one reason. Go on, go into step by step, sir.

Q: One reason is that our education has taught us about different religions, and different political ideologies, and that's why there is contradiction.

K: So are you saying, our education?

Q: Our conditioning.

K: Our conditioning, various people saying various different things, one philosopher saying this, the others saying contrary to that, a scientist and so on and so on, and therefore we listen to all these people and we do not know who is speaking the truth. Is that it? Give your thoughts to this a little, please.

Q: How can a confused mind recognize this?

Q: People tell us certain things are good like money, so we get those things and find out it is no good anyway.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: First I have to have the capacity for clarity, we must first see what is the cause of this confusion. Right, sir? What is the cause of it?

Q: Is it not the content of consciousness?

K: Is not the cause of confusion the content of our consciousness. Would we go slowly into this because it is very important for you if you could understand why our minds are confused. Is it because we are unhealthy physically and therefore that psychosomatic reaction makes us confused? That may be one thing. Second we listen, or we are educated and we listen to contradictory opinions, contradictory theories, contradictory religious ideas - you can only be saved through Christ, or you can only be saved through this, that, the other. So we are being pushed in all directions constantly. The latest guru, the latest philosopher, the latest psychologist and we listen to all these people and you say, 'Who is telling the actual fact, who is telling the truth?'

Q: If our minds are confused how can we recognize what is correct?

K: If our minds are confused how can we recognize what truth is in what the other's are saying. One cannot. But we are trying to find out, sir, what is the cause of this confusion, why do men and women live in this confusion. You don't give your minds to this, you just throw off things.

Q: We have been conditioned to seek things we don't really need, that's part of it.

K: Do you really want to find out why your minds are confused? Right? What price are you willing pay for it - not money, I don't want a cent from you, thank god! Please listen, sir, please listen. You have asked a very serious question.

Q: What do you mean by confused?

K: If I may ask, why are you here?

Q: Not to find out about confusion. I'd like to know what is compassion and what is love and how do we do that.

K: You see everybody has different `wantings'. You want to find out what is love, and somebody says something else, and something else.

Q: All these different things make for confusion.

K: Yes, sir. At the end of this meeting, this gathering you will be still left with your confusion. So what is important is, if we can clear up this confusion by really talking about it, going into it, really being clear.

Q: We want somebody to tell us what to do and that is why.

K: We are coming to that, madam.

Q: You asked what is the cause of confusion.

K: I am asking that, sir, you are all pushing in different directions. What is the cause of this confusion that man lives in,

not only during this century it has been like that always?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You don't even listen. Sir, it is an historical fact that man has lived this way, in confusion, and we are asking why is he confused.

Q: I don't know.

K: If you do not know, don't you want to find out?

Q: The question was, what price are we willing to pay.

K: Yes, sir, I asked what price, not financial, what price in the sense what will you give of your energy, your intention, your demand, to find out whether your mind can be clear. Will you give your attention, will you give your energy, will you give your capacity to find out, that means your blood, your heart, your mind to find out.

Q: Yes.

Q: I don't know how to give those things.

Q: We do know, we are giving our attention now.

K: Are you giving your attention to find out, not to what I am saying.

Q: To the process of questioning and trying to find out.

K: Just a minute, sir. Not to what I am saying, that is totally irrelevant. But together to find out if we can clear up this confusion. That means talking it over together, not holding on to your opinion, and my opinion, but I want to find out what is the cause of this. You understand, sir? Is it because each one is so terribly selfish, each one wanting his own expression, his own pleasure and his own - all the rest of it, he is so self-centred - is that it?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I have just asked a question, enquire into that question. You understand in this country, here there is freedom to do what you want. In a totalitarian state you cannot do that, here you can do what you want. And we are doing what we want, each one asserting himself, each one wanting his own success, his own happiness, his own fulfilment of his own ambition and so on and so on. Is that the cause of this extraordinary chaos?

Q: That's a by-product.

K: What is a by-product?

Q: A by-product of some cause, it is not the cause.

K: Selfishness is not the cause?

Q: Maybe selfishness is a by-product of the cause, whatever that is.

K: What is further? Your egotism, your sense of wanting to fulfil your own urges? If you are a Catholic you want that, you can only find grace, salvation through a certain person; if you are not you are something else. Don't you understand my question? Each one of us wanting something for ourselves - is that the cause of it?

Q: A sense of self follows the conditioning, sir?

K: Sir, find out. If we could all put our minds to this to find out.

Q: Sir, when you give yourself attention the unattention goes away.

K: Sir, I want to find out, apart from all of you, I want to find out why human minds are confused, the basic reason, the root of this, not just the expression of this confusion but the root of it. Is it that each one of us thinks that we are extraordinary individuals, separate, and therefore each one wanting to express his own urges, his own reactions, his own demands? Which can all be expressed

in one word, 'self-centredness'.

Q: Yes.

K: Please, don't agree with me, it is not agreement, you have to find out.

Q: It's part of it.

K: All right, part. Now - listen to this for two minutes, sir - the parts don't make the whole. Right? Obviously. But through the part you can find the whole. Right? You understand? I want to find out for myself why my mind is confused. I say is it because I am really so self-centred? I think it is, I am so self-centred - my wife, my house, my ambitions, my god, my beliefs, my experience, I want this and I don't want that - you know self-centred action all the time. And this self-centred action is encouraged by the society I live in, encouraged by the religions - you can only save yourself through - Buddhism and parts of Hinduism deny all that. You follow? So I find by observing in the world very critically, historically, watching all the human activities, political, religious, nonsensical, communism, totalitarianism, communities and so on and so on, they are all in one way or another self-centred. That's a fact. I may be self-centred, but not knowing, but say, 'I am expressing God's wishes, I represent the eternal' - it is still self-centredness. So if that is the cause, and I am pretty sure it is the cause, then what shall I do to clear up that confusion whose cause is this eternal self-centredness?

Q: You said that that is part of the cause, and then through the part we find the whole?

K: Yes, sir. Through the part you can find the whole, but the part isn't the whole.

Q: I am confused because I don't know how the parts relate to the whole.

K: Forgive me for bringing that in. It is self-centredness. So if that is the root of it what am I to do? How deeply do I want to be free of this self-centredness? How deeply am I willing to put aside those things that create self-centredness?

Q: One can see the danger of it.

K: Therefore psychologically, inwardly, unconsciously, one may see the danger of not being self-centred, which may bring about such a deep psychological revolution, unconsciously one may be frightened of it, therefore you say, please, let me remain in my confusion, let me remain in my anxiety, in my uncertainty, I'll go on window shopping for the rest of my life but I see the danger of going very deeply into this. Is that the case with most of us?

Q: We fear the responsibility of clarity.

K: Of course.

Q: To fear the responsibility of clarity is once again to focus the attention on the self. Clarity does not exist in the self, where does it exist?

K: No, I am going to point out a different way of approaching the problem. Q: Ignorance.

K: Ignorance of my own selfishness.

Q: And the lack of love.

K: Why do I talk about love when I am selfish? For god's sake, how can I talk about love of god, or whatever all that stuff is, when my whole life is self-centred.

Q: Isn't that an indication that the completeness of the brain is conditioned and the mind is...



K: Sir, sir. You are moving away from the central fact that we are self-centred. We may move to god but it is still self-centred. The extension from the centre is still self-centred. So I say to myself, is it possible-I am asking, having a dialogue - is it possible not to be self-centred, what are the implications of not being self-centred? Which, if I do it by will, I am still self-centred. If I say, I must not be self-centred, the `must not' is still part of the self. Right? I wonder if you see that. I can renounce - not I - one can renounce property, beliefs, all that, the very renunciation in order to achieve something is part of this self-centredness. Right? So one wants to find out is there a way of living, daily life, not in heaven or in some kind of community, living where we are our daily life without being self-centred. Sir, this is an enormous complex question, you understand. There must be no escape into some kind of illusion, ideologies, into some kind of fanciful living, but actual daily living in which self-centred action doesn't take place.

Q: But if I have perfect attention to the present moment I am not self-centred.

K: Give your complete attention to the present. What do you mean by the word `present'?

Q: Right now.

K: Look, please sir. Right now, what do you mean `right now'?

Q: This very second, instant, now.

K: What do you mean by those words sir - instant, now, the present?

Q: Live right now instead of splitting.

K: No, no, I'm not splitting, I am not splitting words. I am asking a very serious question, when you say `the now', which

means there is neither the past nor the future.

Sir, let's go back: is there a way of living in which this self-centred activity ends?

Q: Is it possible for the self to exist without self-centred activity at all?

K: Is it possible for the self to exist without its activities. Its very activities is the self. If the self has no activity it dies. Obviously. It has no substance. Please.

Q: Sir, the fact is we don't know what it means to live without self-centred activity.

K: We are going to find out.

Q: What is the self-centred activity?

K: You don't know what self-centred activity is?

Q: I mean in reality.

K: I am showing reality. My attachments to my wife, to my husband, to my girl, to my house, to my belief, to my nationalities, to my experience, to my dogmas, to my gods. My belief, my attachments, my activities of ambition, arrogance and so on, all that is self-centred activity. That's obvious, sir.

Q: What is the root of it?

K: The root of it is the energy, this vast energy channelled in a particular direction of ambition, of greed, envy, violence, belief, all that is all this energy channelled through all this. The very centre of this is energy, and this energy is now being used along particular, narrow, limited lines and therefore it is self-centred.

Q: Could we ask where thought comes in.

K: We will come to that. Madam, thought is part of this self-centredness. I identify myself with my group, with my society,

with my wife, with my god, I identify, the identifying process is part of this self-centredness. Sir, I have said this, please I have said this, see if it is the truth, or false, you jump to something else.

Q: Sir, is energy somehow trapped?

K: All right, it is trapped by your desire. Where are you at the end of it?

Q: Sir, isn't part of this that basically you don't want to be alone.

K: Yes, sir. Part of this self-centredness is being afraid to be alone, being afraid of loneliness, therefore gather together, be attached to something, be entertained, television, newspapers, the preachers, you know, entertained, football. They are all the same whether it is the entertainment of the priest or the entertainment of football, they are the same because you all want to be entertained. Please, sir, just listen to what I am saying, for god's sake. Not that you must accept. We have come to a point where we see we are self-centred, and is it possible not to be?

Q: No.

K: You say, no. Then you are blocked, you have blocked yourself from finding out if it is possible. And if a man says, yes, it is possible, then he is also blocked. The man who says, no, and the man who says, yes, are both blocking themselves.

Q: The only way that we can try to understand this process of self-centredness is to go to the suffering process and remain with it, and do nothing about it.

K: Do it, sir. Are you doing it, or is it just talk?

Q: I am doing it.

K: Good luck! Yes, sir, I am glad you are doing it.

Q: You see the process of self-centredness yet you continue.

K: We have come to the next step: which is if you see the cause of this confusion is self-centredness, if you see the self-centredness with all its innumerable activities, then what will you do? If you say, it is not possible not to be self-centred, then you give it up. Right? But if you say, also it is possible, you have also encouraged it. So both are the same. If you discard both and then say, look, I am self-centred, let me find out if one of the expressions which is attachment - attachment to my wife, to my family, to my god, to my belief, to my opinions, to my judgement - you know attachment to something, whether I can be free of that attachment, without conflict, without renunciation, without exercising will, because that is part of the self still.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You haven't listened. Please listen to this. Which means can you observe your attachment of various kinds, not just of the wife or the husband, or the girl, attachment to a particular idea, to a particular opinion, to a particular belief, attached, and that very attachment implies you are that. You understand?

Q: No.

K: Just listen, sir. If I am attached to my furniture I am the furniture. You understand? Do you understand this simple fact? Because without the furniture I am lost. So can I observe this attachment to this or that or the other, and without conflict, without a motive, just drop it?

Q: How?

K: I am showing you, sir. The moment you ask 'how' - see the reason, sir, see the logic of it - the moment I ask 'how' you want a pattern, you want a system, that very system is the expression of

the self. Sir, you understand, I want to understand the cause of this confusion. The cause of this confusion is this self-centredness; one of the aspects of this self-centredness is attachment; I see this very clearly, the logic of it, the rationality of it, I have exercised my reason, not my prejudice, not my callousness, I have examined it, and the very examination brings about a certain quality of intelligence. Right? That intelligence says, finished, I am not attached. It's not your will that says, I am not attached, it's the intelligence that has come into being through observation of being attached, all the implications of it: fear, jealousy, anxiety, and the loss which I call suffering, all that I see and the very perception of that is intelligence.

Q: We understand it.

K: If you like to use the word 'understand'.

Q: I don't see this clearly.

K: If you don't see clearly, madam, why? Which means you are not either hearing, or not following, you are not interested, you are distracted, your attention is not fully in the enquiry.

Q: I don't want to give it all up.

K: Ah, then keep it. Then keep it and live in confusion. Nobody wants to give up anything. I am not asking you to give it up. I say on the contrary, by giving up you haven't solved the problem. You can drop your belief, but you haven't solved the problem. The problem is self-centredness, and one of the expressions of that self-centredness is attachment.

Q: Sir, we come from the past to unravel the awareness of...

K: Don't bring in other factors, madam, just look at the simple factor that one is attached, and see the implications of that

attachment. Suppose one is attached to a woman or a man, they both like being attached to each other, it is part of their sexual, personal, sensational demands. And if anything happens to one or the other, one runs away or chooses after three years another man, then begins the whole problem of jealousy, antagonism, or indifference because you can always pick up another man or another girl. Right?

Q: Sir, we are so secure in psychological terms I understand but in the reality we live not only in the psychological world, we live in the natural world as well. Our daily life has another aspect other than what you call psychological.

K: No, sir, we are not, we are living in both worlds.

Q: We do, agreed. That's what I am saying.

K: We are living both in the psychological world and in the physical world. The psychological world dominates the physical world. The physical world doesn't dominate the psychological world. You can have all the money, all the food, all the cars, everything, but you may be unhappy because your husband or wife has run away, you know, all the rest of it.

Q: I am a painter, when you talk about attachment I understand this in psychological terms but in my work when I try to realize myself on a canvas, to realize myself, to put myself on a canvas, to paint a picture, a painting, I don't see that as an attachment, I try to realize my potential, I try to establish a line of communication. So if I consider that as an attachment - perhaps it is, a sort of attachment in that - but in another sense it is not attachment.

K: Isn't it an attachment? When you say I want to achieve my potential, when I want to be a great success?

Q: No, no. I make a distinction between success and potential.

K: Sir, a distinction between potential and fulfilment.

Q: Yes.

K: Just a minute, sir, careful, careful, go slowly, sir, don't say, yes. You are differentiating between potential and fulfilment. If you have potential then it will operate, you don't search out its fulfilment. If you have a first-class feeling for music, you know, and you go on working, working - the moment you say, I want to fulfil, then the self-centred activity begins. It is like a violinist, sir, who has got great potential, and he uses the instrument to fulfil himself, to become rich, to become famous, to becomes this or that.

Q: Yes, sir, maybe. But we are together this morning talking about confusion, that's how it appears in our daily living. We hear that attachment is the source of our trouble, of our misery, and if we sense that what we are doing is a matter of attachment so we get confused, should we go ahead with what we want to do, or are we serving some kind of attachment in this way?

K: Sir, I said that is only part of it. Sir, self-centredness is also getting hurt. Right? Being psychologically hurt. That's part of self-centredness. Part of self-centredness is being violent. Part of self-centredness is, I must fulfil, I have got capacity, I have a certain potentiality in me and I must express it, and when there is no fulfilment in that expression then there is frustration, disappointment, depression, anger, all that is part of self-centredness.

So I say, when you observe this confusion, and man has accepted this way of living which leads to confusion, which

encourages confusion, and we live with it, we never say, can this end. All we do is, not knowing how to end it, we run away from it - we want to know about meditation, we want to know about god, if there is immorality, if there is anything but this. So we are pointing out in a dialogue, I am not your authority, though I am sitting on a platform that is merely for convenience, so that we can see each other, being raised a little bit higher doesn't give one authority. One year I was in India, a very famous guru sent his disciples, wanting to see me. And the disciples came for three days and said, 'You must come and see our guru'. I said, 'I am sorry, I don't go out searching any guru'. And at last the guru came because he wanted to see me. We were sitting on a little platform, on a mattress about that thick, out of politeness we got up and asked him to sit on the mattress. Immediately he became the guru because he was a little higher! And he began to tell us what to do. You understand this, the absurdity of it. So sitting on a platform, as I am, doesn't give me any authority. But I am just pointing out certain things if you are willing to listen. That our cause of our confusion is this enormous deep-rooted, unconscious as well as conscious, deliberate selfishness, self-centred activity. And can one observe it not only in relationship intimately, but also in our work? One can observe this going on all the time.

Now please just listen, if you are interested. To observe, what does it mean? To observe either as though you are outside of it and looking in-you understand this? - or the observer is that which is observed, there is no division between the observer and the observed.

Q: This is not exactly clear for me, this division.



K: What division? I'll make it clear. What time is it?

Q: Quarter to one.

K: I'll make this very clear. When you observe the mountain, as you can observe it, in what manner do you observe it? Do you see the mountain as it is, or the word `mountain', the word, interferes with the observation? Because when you look at that thing the verbal reaction comes immediately, `that's a mountain'. So when you observe the word interferes with looking at that thing. Right? Do you see that, sir? That's simple. Now in the same way, can you observe your reactions without the past telling you, this is good, bad, this is right, this is wrong, just to observe?

Q: Without thought.

K: That's right.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look what happens. One is greedy, you see something, a dress, a pair of trousers, shoes, whatever it is, car, woman or man, you see it. And can you observe without the past memories interfering with it? When the past interferes you are not actually looking, are you. The past memories are looking, there is no actual looking at that which is happening now. So the observer is the past, the past is looking at what is happening now, so there is a division. You understand, sir?

Q: Is it possible to have that clarity one moment and not the next?

K: If one has clarity one moment and at another moment you have not clarity, it is not clarity. Clarity is clarity. No, please, just finish this. If you once understand the principle of this, not agree with me, but I am pointing out the logic of it, the reason of it,

which is: we are always looking from the past.

Q: Would you say that the man, or the being who is looking, is himself the past?

K: Yes, sir. That's right.

Q: The moment before you named it mountain wasn't that clarity?

K: I named it for you to indicate it, but to look at it without the word.

Q: No, but if I look at it myself...

K: I am going to show you something, sir: can you look at your girl, or your wife, or your husband - please listen - without the past, without the past memories, past sensations, past disagreements, all that piled up, can you look at her or him without a single image you have built about her or about him, can you?

Q: I have never tried.

K: Never tried. Quite right. Never tried it.

Q: What did he say?

K: Just a minute, sir, listen to what that gentleman said just now: he has never tried. What does that mean? He has taken the past as granted: it's my wife, my girl, my husband, with all the past implications involved in it - probably he wasn't - not you, sir, I am just saying - aware of all the past incidents accumulated which has become the image, the picture, and so the picture says, 'I know my wife'. Like the pope saying, 'God exists'. Q: What if your wife is doing the same thing every time you see her?

K: Right, sir, can one observe without the past accumulation? If you cannot observe without the past accumulation it is not possible to observe at all. But with all of us the past is so enormous, our

minds are burdened that we cannot see without the past, see what is actually happening. Find out. If you find this out to be true for yourself, I am not telling you, then there is a totally different relationship taking place. It isn't just routine, it isn't just a mechanical repetition of the past operating all the time.

Q: Sir, when you are asked a question, an answer from memory comes up and you try...

K: Don't. Don't try. Just see how the memory jumps immediately, pops up, so watch it. Sir, this requires a great deal of enquiry and attention, it isn't just, well I'll learn this by heart and something else will happen; you have to be very attentive, watchful. But if you observe the past is always meeting the present, the present happening, modifies itself, goes on; but it is still always the past. So man has lived this way; the great scientists, philosophers, say, knowledge is the only thing that will evolve man, the ascent of man through knowledge - which is, knowledge is always the past. So we are saying, on the contrary, man can only ascend if the past with all the knowledge of the past has its right place and is free of the known, then there is freedom to move.

Q: Sir, I was serious in that comment because it may be that my wife is mechanical and therefore when you look at her you see the same thing because simply the mechanical pattern is the same. Do you understand what I mean?

K: I think I understand, sir. Sir, our minds have become mechanical, haven't they, why? You don't observe all this. Why have our minds become mechanical? Our jobs have become mechanical. Right? Right? Get up in the morning, all the rest of it, office, the routine, the routine, our way of thinking is routine,

always along a particular line, horizontal or vertical, aspiring or floating along. So our minds are caught in a groove of belief and so on and so on, so everything has become mechanical, your sex, your ambitions, your aspirations, your gods, everything. You don't realize this. So there is nothing new. So we are saying something contrary to all that. That is, to observe without the observer, which is the past. Even the quail agrees!

Q: But sir, when I try to observe 'what is' without the past, the past operates.

K: Then go after the past, find out why the past operates. Why the past has become so important in our lives. Sir, look, the past is important when you are driving a car. Right? Because if you are just put in a car, with a wheel, and you didn't know the technique of driving which you have learnt by constant repetition, which becomes the knowledge, you won't be able to drive. You may drive, you will kill yourself or kill somebody else. So knowledge in language, in business, in doing all the necessities of daily life - necessities - knowledge is important. But when the mind, which is the whole movement of thought, is a process of operating from past knowledge, past experience, past memory, then it becomes a dangerous instrument that divides people, that destroys people.

Q: Without meditation life has no meaning.

K: What we are doing now is part of meditation. This is meditation, to clear up one's mind. Sir, look, sir, if I am a Catholic my meditation would be confined to one particular pattern, and that isn't meditation. Meditation is something that has no limitations. I won't go into all that, you will want to escape into that. I won't because to meditate is an extraordinary activity. It can only come

when the mind is completely free from confusion. A man confused meditating, his meditation is still confused, whether it is transcendental, or any other nonsense, it is still confused meditation, which only leads to illusions.

You see, sir, these various gurus have come to see me at one time or another. I am just telling you for the fun of it. The great ones and the little ones. And they all say, 'What you are saying, sir, is the greatest truth, is what you are living, it's a great privilege', and they go on their own way, because they say, 'Sorry, sir, we must help the poor people who don't understand'. You understand the game. Is that enough?

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC TALK 14TH APRIL 1979

I feel a bit shy! May we go on talking about what we were saying last Sunday and Saturday? We were saying, if I remember correctly, that we must see things together; see together the confusion of the world around us, the extraordinary danger, that is all over the world, to human life, how the religions throughout the world are breaking up the coming together of human beings. And seeing this vast confusion, misery, starvation and affluence, and wars, every intelligent man who is at all aware of the present state of the world outside of us must be asking if it is possible for human beings, each one of us, to have this quality of goodness. In the English language, specially in America, they are using words which are now becoming utterly meaningless; like security, like sincerity, they have lost their meaning. Since a man who wants to sell you something is very sincere, a man who is rather demented and does not know that he is somewhat unbalanced, he is very sincere. And a man who believes very strongly in certain conclusions, in certain beliefs, in god and so on, he is also very sincere.

And a word like honesty has lost almost its meaning. Because when we are living in a totalitarian state you cannot be honest, you have to tell lies, you have to be dishonest. But if you said what you wanted to say openly, it would be dangerous to live. So one has to examine all these words and give a different meaning to all of them: like the word 'love', is heavily loaded with all kinds of sensuous, sentimental, romantic nonsense. So one has to re-examine altogether these words. We are using the word 'goodness'

in the sense that there cannot be a society outside of us unless each human being is very honest. I am going to explain what I mean by honesty. There cannot be a good society if it is merely accepting a state which he disapproves of and yet outwardly accepts it, he cannot possibly be good or honest. And the good family, the good earth, the good book, the good idea - we are talking about a goodness that is beyond all this, which we will go into as we go along during these three or four talks.

So we are now using the word 'goodness' in the sense that human beings, can they be totally honest, not only outwardly but especially inwardly so as not to be deceived, not to be caught in an illusion, not to hold on to some decayed belief? Because all these prevent this quality of a deep abiding sense of honesty. We are using the word 'honesty' psychologically in the sense of having no illusion whatever, a make-belief, or accept a concept created by others or by yourself, and if you are living according to a concept, to an ideal, it is divorced from actuality and therefore you cannot be honest, therefore it cannot have this quality of goodness. We are giving this word totally a different meaning. I think it is the right word, because throughout history - not that the speaker is a scholar, but he has observed a great deal - and history, throughout history man has craved to have a society that is peaceful, that is orderly, safe, where everyone is employed, where the tyrant doesn't rule and so on and so on, it has been the craving of man. All the Utopias are based on this, but they never come to fruition because man is so essentially dishonest, deeply, because he lives in a state of illusion, a make-belief.

So we are saying, observing all this, this total chaos in the

world, practically anarchy where even the pope has to be protected when he leaves the Vatican, it is all becoming so silly and dangerous, seeing all this what is the right action for each one of us. Because we contribute to the chaos, there is no question about it, because we have created the society, we are responsible for the society. And if we do not radically, basically, fundamentally bring about psychological revolution, there cannot be a good society. So we are asking: what will make man fundamentally change? You understand my question? Please give some attention to it. We are - the speaker is not giving a talk, we are sharing together the problem - not the way you see it or the speaker sees it, the problems actually as they are, not what you would want them to be, or what I want them to be, but the actual happening in the world, outside of us, and actually what is happening inwardly, psychologically, inside our skin, as it were. Otherwise we cannot possibly communicate with each other. Communication implies sharing, partaking, the same thing together. If the speaker wants to tell you something, and if you are not attentive or if you don't care to listen, then there is no possibility of communication. But since we are all human beings concerned with the world that is degenerating, where there is so much danger, chaos, disorder, it's our human problem to resolve this, not for the leaders because we elect the leaders. If we are confused our leaders will be confused. It's so obvious all this.

So the fundamental question is: what will change human beings, their quality, their behaviour, their deep rooted selfishness and so on, what will change each one? Do we want more shots, more disaster, more wars? You understand, sir? Question all this, think it



over, let's think it over together, let us observe it together, not I observe and tell you, or you observe and tell me, but together observe these facts. And having observed these facts impersonally, objectively, not as an American, as a Hindu, objectively, the question then is: what will change man. They have tried various systems, political, religious, economic - outside, the communist revolution, the French revolution, various other forms of revolution, the revolutions that have been going on in the world have not changed man. They have modified the environment, they have brought about certain conveniences, comforts, but basically man has remained as he was for the last million years or more. So what shall we do? What is man to do? What is his responsibility, what is his action?

Most of our actions are based on our desire. We went into that a little bit last Sunday. We said desire is the seeing, the contact, the sensation, and - please follow this step by step otherwise we shan't be able to communicate with each other - seeing, contact, response of sensation, the senses responding to the contact and so on. Then thought comes into action and says, to have that house, that car, that garden, creates an image, and the pursuit of that image is the activity of will which is desire. Are we going too fast? No, I can go very fast but are we meeting each other, not only verbally but actually, because one must find out together if even a small group, two or three who are serious find out together what is right action, living in this monstrous insane world, what is right action, to find out what is right action one has to find out what our activities spring from, our daily activities, and when you observe it, it is really our desire: I wish to gain, I wish to achieve, I am ambitious,

I am this, that - it is all the activity of desire with its will. Desire is contradictory: I desire one thing one year, later on another year there is opposing, contradictory desires. So our actions are also contradictory, because all our actions, most of our actions are based on desire with its will to succeed, to achieve, to fulfil, to have pleasure and so on. So your desire opposes another person's desire so there is conflict between two people, between two desires. This action born out of this contradictory desire creates confusion. Please, this is obvious, right, can we go on? No, I can go on but will you follow all this, actually doing it, observe it very carefully and find out for oneself what is right action.

We said, desire is the movement of sensation, having a good house, a big lovely garden, nice car, a beautiful person and so on and so on and so on, it is the movement of sensation as desire. Desire arises when thought creates the image and pursues that image. Now is there an action - please listen - which is not the action of desire, but the action of intelligence? I'll explain what I mean. Are we meeting each other, or am I going ahead by myself? All right, sir? You see, as we said the other day, sensations, the movement of senses, with most of us it is a part of the senses; there is no activity of the whole movement of the senses, as a whole, but only partially. And desire equally is partial. Right? So we are asking, if you observe, there is perception, contact, sensation, then thought comes creating the image and the pursuit of it. Now when you see this intelligence is born. All right sirs? All right, I'll go into it.

We observe right throughout the world that every human being is driven by his desires - the politicians, the popes, the religious

people, the economists, everybody is drive by desire. And this energy of desire is opposed to another series of desires - yours and anothers. So this opposition creates contradiction, and therefore in action there must be conflict. That's clear. Now we are asking: is there an action which is not born of desire? Right? And we say, there is, if you observe it closely. Desire is the movement of the senses, which is the observation, contact, sensation, then thought taking over. Now if you can see the consequences of thought taking over the sensations, and the consequences of it are conflict, contradiction, fulfilment, and not being able to fulfil, fear and all the rest of it follows. So to see the sensation, the interference of thought, to see this whole movement is intelligence. And the action of intelligence is not your intelligence or my intelligence, it is intelligence, therefore there is no contradiction in our action. Do you follow? See, if you will kindly, it is logical, first see logically, verbally even. Then perhaps after seeing it logically then you can get the feeling of this quality of intelligence, which is not yours or mine, it is intelligence, therefore it is a common factor, and we are acting together from the common factor. Do you get it? That is the sense of goodness, because there is no contradiction, there is no 'my desire' pushing 'your desire'.

And goodness, which basically has this quality of intelligence, goodness cannot exist as long as there is fear. Do you understand? May I go on? Most of us have peculiar fears. I don't know if you are aware of your own fears. Right? If you are, what is the root of fear? Not how to get rid of fear - for the moment, we will go into it - but what is the root of fear. Most of us are concerned when we have fears, either to suppress it, control it, run away from it, or

invent some rationalization which gradually becomes neurotic. And apparently throughout the ages man has not been able to be free of fear, both outward fears, dangers, accidents and so on, ultimately the fear of death, and we still live with innumerable fears, each one according to his temperament, character, idiosyncrasy, according to his peculiar experience, culture and so on. He is frightened, and not being able to solve this fear he looks to an outside agency, to the analyst, to the professor, to the specialist, or to god - god of course is the ultimate escape. Now we are asking not how to trim the various branches of fear, how to modify fear, or how to develop courage to meet fears - to develop courage is only a form of resistance to one's own fear, it's there, but you use the word courage and develop a form of resistance, but one has not solved the nature of fear.

So we are enquiring together. Please, I am not enquiring and you are listening, but together we are investigating what is the nature, the structure of fear? Can man, ordinary human being, be free of fear totally? You understand my question? Man has not been able to resolve it, so he wants to forget the fear in immolating himself to a certain principle, to a certain idea, Utopia, which is always escaping from the fact. So we are asking, what is the root of fear? If one can find out, discover for oneself what is the cause, the essence of fear then perhaps we can live a different kind of life altogether, which is the life of goodness, because goodness cannot contain fear.

To find out the root of fear one must investigate the whole movement of thought. I'll relate it, you will see it presently. What is the movement of thought, how does thought arise, the origin of

it, the beginning of it, and what is the nature of this whole structure of thought upon which all our civilizations, all our religions, all our economic life and our jobs, everything is based on thought? Right? I wonder if you see that? And thought has created the marvellous cathedrals, great architecture, great poems, literature and so on, marvellous bridges across a vast expanse - thought has created all that. Thought has also created the technological world, the dynamo, electricity and so on and so on. And thought also has brought about division between man and man - my nation opposed to your nation, my god opposed to your god, my belief against yours, and so on. So one must in enquiring into the root of fear one must also go into this question of what is thinking, because if there is no comprehension of the movement of thought and the nature of thought fear may escape us altogether - the understanding of it and going beyond it.

So we are now enquiring into the nature of thought in relation to the question of whether man can ever be free from fear. I'll show you. The two are related, they are not separate. What is thought? What is our thinking process? The very nature of thought, not what I think or don't think, but the very thinking of man. Surely it is the response of memory, the response of experience as knowledge. Right? Man has accumulated vast knowledge, that accumulation has come into being through experience stored up in the brain as memory. And the response of that memory is thought. That's clear, isn't it? If there was no memory there would be no thinking, it would be total amnesia. And thinking based upon knowledge must always be partial, there can be no complete thinking because it is the outcome of knowledge, which is stored up in the brain, and that

knowledge is the past. Right? This is simple. And thought is always limited because it is born from knowledge, and knowledge however extended, however deep, is limited. Right? One cannot have total, whole knowledge of anything, of the universe, you can't.

So thought is the response of memory, and memory is the outcome of knowledge which is the past, stored in the brain. We won't discuss the brain for the moment, I'm not a brain specialist, but I have watched very carefully, and talked to some of the brain specialists. So thought has created not only the marvellous things of the world - the cathedrals, the dynamos, going to the moon and so on, but also it has created wars, it has created divisions in religion, in relationship. So thought, being limited, though it can imagine the limitless but it is still limited because thought then thinks about the limitless and so the very thinking of the limitless is limited. I wonder if you see this. Man has created god - god has not created god, man has created god. Man has said he is omnipotent, universal, ever-loving, merciful - you follow - giving attributes to this thing which he has created, but it is still the movement of thought, whether it is the Hindu, the Islamic, the Christian, or any form of religious organization, it is the movement of thought. Not knowing how to solve the problem of fear I invent - thought invents - an entity which will help me to solve the problem, an outside agency, god, the authority, the specialist, the - are there any psychoanalysts here? - the psychoanalysts, the priests and so on and so on. Now if one understands the nature of thought, the nature, the movement, which is a fact, it is not my invention, it is the common fact, if one investigates into the nature of thought.

Thought is limited and never under any circumstances can it be free because it is born out of the known. The known is always the past and hence confined. Now what is the relationship between thought and fear?

One is afraid of death - I won't go into the question of death because that is very complex, we will go into it. We are asking what is the relationship between these two. Fear is time. Right? Must one explain this, can't we jump into it?

Time is movement, isn't it? Thought is movement. So thought is time. No? Don't agree with me please, just see it for yourself. To do something I have to think about it and then I act. To go from here to there needs time. Time means the movement from here to there, and thought is a movement also: from the known modified by the present, and moving. It is the same movement so it is time. Thought is time, and we are saying fear is essentially time. One is afraid of tomorrow, what might happen; or one is afraid of something that has happened in the past and that might happen again in the future. One has had physical pain last month, last week, it might happen again tomorrow. You are following all this? Are we communicating with each other?

So thought has seen there has been physical pain last week, it has been registered in the brain - please listen carefully to this - one has had pain last week, it has been registered, which is recorded as memory, and then thought says, 'I hope I will not have that pain again tomorrow.' Right? You are following this? This is an everyday occurrence. So the past incident, painful or pleasurable, is registered in the brain, then the memory says, 'I hope I will not have that pain again tomorrow'. Right? Which is, the 'hoping not to

have that pain' is a form of fear. Right? And we are saying, thought and fear are closely related. So the root of fear is the nature of thought. Thought breeds fear. I am sure you have certain fears, I am sure of it. What is the cause of it? Your thinking about the pain of yesterday physically, thinking about not having it, or the psychological pain, inwardly, the fear of losing, the fear of not having security inwardly, the fear of loneliness, fear of isolation, all that is brought about by thinking. So the problem then is, if that is the root of fear, which is time as thought, then in what manner can thought end, or rather, the brain not register an incident which is painful or pleasurable? You understand this? One has been to a dentist - I am sure most of you have - and you have a great deal of pain. That pain is registered, and thought says, I hope it is all right, I hope I won't have any more pain. There is always this apprehension behind that pain, the recurring of it. Can you - please listen to this - can you go to the dentist and have the pain, and end that pain as you leave the office, not carry it over? Have you ever tried this? You understand what I am saying?

Q: More or less.

K: More or less. Are you following this? Because this is very important to understand. Our consciousness is made up of its content - greed, envy, your experience, your name, your form, your memories, your beliefs, your anxieties, your sorrows, your opinions, judgements, values, all that and more is your consciousness. That consciousness is conditioned. And acting from that consciousness must lead to confusion because the content is confused. I wonder if you see all this? I'll come back to this.

There is an art of listening. That is, to listen not only with the



hearing of the ear, but also to listen to the meaning of the word, and go much deeper than the significance of the word, to listen totally. When you listen to music and a particular composer whom you like, you completely listen, your whole brain is in movement, there is no left brain and right brain. I mustn't go into all this. There is a total attention. Now in the same way to listen without creating an idea of what you are listening about, just the art of listening, as there is an art of seeing. To see without the interference of all your memories, of all your prejudices, just to see the beauty of this morning. And there is also the art of learning. I think that's rather complex, let's leave that for a while.

So there is the art of listening with all your attention, in which there is not an interference of your prejudices, your opinion, just to listen what the other person is trying to convey, to listen to your wife, or to your girl, or your husband, to listen - which we never do. Then communication is not only verbal, it is total. If I listen to what you have to tell me and you tell me 'I love you', I listen with all my attention, there is complete communion. So in the same way listen to what is being said, not as you listen make an abstraction of it into an idea and say, 'Well, I will think about that idea, later when I get home', but in the meantime you have gone off. Whereas if you listen completely then you will see that time, which is thought, is the essence of fear.

Then the problem arises: what place has thought? If thought is the root of fear - of course it is - I am afraid what might happen tomorrow, I am afraid of death, I am afraid of darkness, I am afraid of public opinion, I am afraid of my wife, I am afraid of somebody or other, which is, the movement of thought. The moment of fear

there is no thought. At the moment of anger there is no saying 'I have been angry', there is only the state of that response. Then thought says, 'I know what that response is, it has been registered in the past, and I call that anger'. So we are asking, what place has thought, if thought creates fear then what place has thought in action? Of course if we act from fear, as most people do, then that action must create confusion because fear is a dreadful thing: because not only physically there is a withdrawing, shrinking, psychologically there is curling up inwardly. And when there is action from that it must inevitably bring confusion, conflict, misery. So one must absolutely find out if fear can end, absolutely, not occasionally escape from fear, the total absolute ending of psychological fears. Because if psychologically there is freedom from fear then one can deal with the physical pain quite easily. But when the psychological fear is strong and the physical pain also brings its own fear, then I am in total confusion.

So we are saying: what place has thought if fear is the result of thought? You understand? Thought, you know the word 'art' means not painting and all that, it really means to put everything in its right place. So one has to find out what is the right place of thought. Thought is necessary: otherwise couldn't you couldn't talk to each other, you couldn't write a letter, you couldn't go home, you couldn't do anything. So thought is necessary, but it must have its right place, otherwise thought takes all the movement of life over, and creates extraordinary chaos, misery, confusion, division, because thought in itself is limited. So can we find out, not arbitrarily, but absolutely, not relatively, completely, so to find out what place thought has. Has it any place in the psychological field?

Or it has a place only in the daily activities, not in the psychological realm at all? I'll show you something, please follow this. Physically one needs security, clothes, food and shelter, absolutely, for everybody, not for just the affluent people but every human being living on this earth must have food and clothes and shelter. That's prevented by our nationalities, religions, divisions, and so on - that's a different matter. Physically one needs security. Does one need psychological security? You follow what I am saying? Is there psychological security at all? Or the physical security with its movement has entered into the psychological area and taken that over and says, there must be psychological security? You follow what I am saying? Are you all tired?

Audience: No.

K: I am surprised! So we are asking: is there psychological security? Man says there must be because it is terrible to be utterly lonely, utterly empty, psychologically, utterly isolated, therefore one must have psychological security. So he says, there is security in belief - of course - security in some ritual, security in some concept, god, and there must be security in my relationship with another. Follow all this. One needs physical security, and that movement may have entered the psychological realm, so it has created the illusion that it must have security, and so creates the illusory concepts and becomes attached to them. You are following all this?

So we are trying to find out what place thought has. It is necessary. Thought has its place. And has it any place in the psychological field at all? We have assumed that it has a place, which is, thought has assumed it has a place, therefore it creates all

these assurances. And are they illusory or actual? You understand my question? I rely on you as an audience to gratify myself. And somebody else has larger audiences and I feel jealous, and I feel anxious, I am annoyed, and I thought I had security here but I have lost it. I don't know if you are following all this. Or one has found one has security in one's relationship with one's wife, or husband, girl, boy. Is there any security there? Specially not in America. Or anywhere else as a matter of fact. But here every three years or so you change mates. Or you go to divorce and so on and so on. So we are asking - please listen carefully - is there any security in relationship at all? You want it, you crave for it, and so you use another for your satisfaction, to achieve your security; therefore you exploit another, and this exploitation is called love. Please, I am not being cynical, but this is a fact.

So what place has thought, and has thought any place in the psychological world? Or the realization - please listen - the realization it has no place is intelligence. You understand? I have relied - one has relied on psychological security depending on another, and when one finds there is no such security, either in belief, in god, or in this, the very perception of that is intelligence. So intelligence then says, thought has its right place, which is necessary but has no place psychologically. Therefore there is complete and absolute freedom from fear. Don't accept my word for it, please. I am not your authority, I am not your guru, I am not your leader. Thank god! So you have to find this out for yourself, because to live with fear is to create a monstrous world, a monstrous relationship.

And in enquiring into fear and the ending of fear, if you have

gone into it very deeply, which you must, to bring about goodness in one's life, so that there is no senses of anxiety, no sense of loneliness, no sense of dependency on another - except the postman and plumber, and they are rather expensive! To realize this, to see the actuality of it, is intelligence. And that intelligence brings its right action, not your fear, not your desire. Right?

And also in investigating fear one must go into this question of the enormous pursuit of man which is his pleasure. What time is it, sir?

Q: Half past twelve.

K: So I have time. Is pleasure related to fear? What is pleasure? We know, we have gone into this question of fear, anxiety, despair, depression, all those are involved in fear. Being depressed, you know, or being elated, ecstatic - we have gone into this. And we must also find out what is the relationship between fear, pleasure and thought. Because man throughout the world, from the ancient times to the present day, is always seeking pleasure in different forms, under different guise, under different names. He pursues god in the name of pleasure. Of course. He is dissatisfied, discontent, feels hopeless, wanting something extraordinary, the mystic experience. I was looking up that word the other day, 'mysticism', it means mystery. The moment you discover the mystery it is not longer a mystery. And lots of people write a lot of books about mysticism. We won't go into that for the moment. But if you observe we want to be entertained, we want to be amused, we want to be free, we want to goaded, encouraged, all this is the movement of pleasure. Right? What is the relationship of that, this pursuit of pleasure, probably that's why you are here, you are all

gathered here probably for that reason, deeply - and if this doesn't satisfy you, you go somewhere else, which is why it brings satisfaction. Satisfaction being more pleasure, more amusement, avoidance of discontent and so on and so on. So one has to enquire, if you will, together - together - why man pursues this extraordinary thing called pleasure. Not that one is against pleasure, we are investigating, therefore you can't be against or for. What is pleasure? Is it the operation, the movement of the senses? Please we are enquiring, go slowly into this, because it is a very important question. Because man is always seeking happiness in some form or another. Which is, pleasure, be happy, and one has to understand this because it may be related to fear, and it may be the movement of thought that creates pleasure.

So we are asking: is it a particular part of the senses, one of the senses seeking pleasure? Or is pleasure the whole movement of the senses? You understand what I am saying? Sir, when you look at the mountain, or these lovely trees, do you look only with your eyes, or do you look with all your senses in full movement? You understand? First understand my question and then we can perhaps meet each other. Do we function with one or two or three senses, or do we operate, function with all our senses together? Or only partially respond, not total response of the senses? Please carefully go into this, if you will, because in the response of the total senses there is no movement as pleasure. It's only when one of the senses operates then you pursue pleasure. I'll go into this carefully - if you will. Probably you have never thought about all this, you are much too educated, that's why. You have never gone into this question, how to observe the mountain, the trees, your wife, the girl, boy,

observe not partially but totally, with all your senses in full flow. Then there is no centre which is pursuing a particular sense. Are you getting this? Among certain types of monks in India, the sannyasis, when they beg for food they mix all the various types of food together in the bowl so as not to taste one particular type of food, one particular dish, because then that gives a sense of pleasure of a particular taste and the demand for it more. You follow this? So they mix up everything. See the intent of it: to avoid the encouragement of a particular taste. If you encourage a particular state then you pursue it, thought pursues it, which then becomes pleasure. Which then you say, 'I must have more, more, more'. Then that becomes a habit, as sex. You are following all this, it is very curious, go into it. Whereas if you respond with all your senses then thought has no place to enter and say, 'I must have that particular form of pleasure'. Are you doing it as we are talking? To look at those mountains, or those trees, or your girl, your wife, or husband, observe with all your senses, which means with all your attention, care, affection, you know, to look. Then you will see that there is no interference of a fragment which is thought, and that fragment says, 'I must pursue that particular pleasure'. I wonder if you get all this?

So we are asking: what is the place of pleasure? What is the relationship of pleasure to thought, and thought to fear? They are all the same movement. I wonder if you realize that. They are all the same movement. If you pursue pleasure and deny pleasure, then you feel frustrated. Then feeling frustrated you are anxious, fear. So they are the two sides of the same coin. Please realize this. They are two sides of the same human coin. And all religions have

said, don't pursue pleasure, which is, sex, various types of pleasure. I do not know if you have not noticed the robes, the monks with their eyes never looking at anything, it doesn't matter what it is, a lady, because they want to avoid every form of so-called distraction, which might be pleasurable, and therefore to be attentive only to the service of god, which is shut your eyes to everything else and burn inside. You understand 'burn inside'? Your demands, your sex, your pleasure, everything.

So we are saying that thought is the response of pleasure as for pain and fear. So can you observe the beauty of a mountain, the beauty of a lovely tree in a solitary field, just to observe and not register? The moment you register thought takes it over. I wonder if you are following all this? When you look at that mountain with all your senses, that is great delight, there is great joy in looking at something, some marvellous cathedral, marvellous architecture, lovely tree, a person, or the limitless sky, the evening stars, to look at it, great delight. I say, now at the moment thought takes it over, registers it, says, I must have more of it, and that becomes the pleasure. Then you feel when you don't have it you are frustrated.

So our consciousness is made up of all this - immense sense of isolation, loneliness, despair, depression, and exaltation, aspirations, anxiety, fear, pleasure, and the enormous burden of sorrow. This is our life, our consciousness; and out of that consciousness we act. And therefore, as our consciousness is in confusion, is contradictory, always struggling one against the other, all our actions must inevitably create confusion. And that's what we have created in the world around us. And if a group of us, a few of us, feel that, say, look, we will create a different world in



ourselves, we will have a marvellous world. But none of us are willing to go to that extreme extent; you are all compromising, with our desires, not with the world.

So unless you understand all this very clearly, meditation has no meaning - which we will go into. We will also go into the question of sorrow and death. All this is merely to bring about order, not to invent order, not to say, 'I will do this, I won't do that, I will discipline', or 'I won't discipline, I am a free agent, I'll do what I like'. All this investigation into the whole movement of good, the sense of greatness, this real sense of sacredness, all this is to bring order in our life - in our daily life, in our relationship, in our action, all we do. That is absolutely the foundation of our life. From there we can move because then it is solid, firm, it is absolutely indestructible, it is like a tremendous rock in the middle of a vast stream. And that thing is goodness, and from that action springs.

## OJAI 4TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH APRIL 1979

May we go on talking over together what we were discussing, or enquiring yesterday and the last weekend too, may we?

First of all if one may enquire, I wonder why you all come. This is not asked as a flippant question but actually to find out why most of us take the trouble to come here. Is it because we are so used to being told what to do? We are not able to solve our own petty little problems, or great problems, or able to answer our own enquiries and challenges, so we look to others - the analysts, the priests, the specialists, and the gurus - they are always with us? And I'm asking why is it that we are not able to solve our own problems, why we enquire, or ask, or demand, or seek out, various types of analysts and psychologists and specialists and so on and ask them to help us. Is it because we ourselves are indolent, lazy, we haven't the time, and we think we have time when we pay others to tell us what we should do. And we have got into this habit, or into this conditioning that others have gone into the subject, have studied a great deal, know a great deal, and perhaps they will be able to help us. So we are always, it seems to me, relying on others to help us to escape this trap we are in. The religions throughout the world have offered this: organized, excellently put together, with their rituals, dogmas and so on, and we happily slip into that. And we are never able to resolve our own deep problems, we hand ourselves over to another. I wonder why we do this? It's all right physically when the organism is not healthy to go to a doctor, to a surgeon and so on, when you want to build a house, go to an architect. And so perhaps the same concept drives us to go to somebody else to help us. We

are never able to read our own book, our own history, because we are perpetually depending on others - group therapy, the various types of psychosomatic treatments, psychotherapies, you know the multiplication of all that.

And we human beings, wherever we live, in Far East, the Near East and here, we are incapable of reading the whole story of mankind, which is ourselves. And is it possible for us to read this book which has been handed down generation after generation for many, many millennia, to read the story which we are? Not leave one chapter undone, unread, but read from the beginning to the end, the whole movement of mankind, his evolution, both physically and psychologically, inwardly. If we are able to read this book, which is astonishingly entertaining - if I may use that word - fascinating, it opens the door to enormous possibilities. So as we are the rest of mankind psychologically, and if we know how to read this book, then perhaps we shall be able to alter the course of our lives. Because that is what we are concerned with - at least the speaker is concerned about that, to bring about a radical transformation of the human mind and so bring about a good society: a society where there would be order, peace, some kind of security, some kind of happiness, and go beyond all that, enquiring into that which is immeasurable.

So we must first, it seems to us, learn how to read this book. So we must find out how to observe, not only visually but observe the whole movement of our consciousness, of ourselves, with all our complexities, with all our anxieties, fears, pleasures, joys, accumulated superstitions, both the superstitions of the scientists, of the psychologists, of the religious people, the whole thing, to be

able to read very, very, very precisely, clearly and without any mistake. And that's what we are going to do this morning, if we can: learn, not that I am your instructor, we are doing this together, learn how to look in this extraordinary book, which is the self, which is the ego, the personality, the tendency, the characteristics, the impulses, the inhibitions, all that, which is our consciousness, to read that. And to read it one must have eyes and ears which are not dull, which are not blocked, which are not caught up in some kind of fanciful illusions - as most people are.

So one must obviously first enquire - we are doing this together, I am not doing this for you, or you are not doing it for me, we are doing it together, it's a dialogue between two people, there are many people here; it's a dialogue, a conversation between two friends who are concerned with the world, the terrible things that are going on in the world, and their own conflicts, problems of relationship, their sense of lack of love, and their burden of sorrow, and the problem of death. And as one has recently heard this word 'meditation' brought over from the East, though there has been in Christianity another form of contemplation which is totally different from meditation, and to find out if there is something beyond all this, not invented by thought, but something actual, something that is not an imagination, a thing put together by the mind or by the hand. We are going to read all that. And to do that one must have clear eyesight to read this vast book, which is ourselves.

Observation implies that there must be no distortion in our reading. Any form of distorted observation will prevent clarity of reading. So are we distorted? Is our perception, our enquiry, our

observation, is it distorted? Please, we are asking each other this, I am not telling you it is, or it is not, but we are asking, enquiring, exploring, into this question. It is distorted if I have a motive in reading the book and wanting to change what is in the book.

Because if the observation has already come to a conclusion that the end of the book must be this, or that, there are certain chapters which the mind doesn't like in its observation, or that it must go beyond all this, all those factors bring about distortion. Obviously. I hope you are following all this. So before I begin to read the book there must be clarity, and the great energy that puts aside any form of distortion. That is, if one is already caught in an illusion, which most people are, then our concern is not the book but why the mind is caught in an illusion. Because with a mind that is already in illusion it can't read. Therefore my concern then is, why is the mind caught in an illusion. You are following all this? Is it fear? Is it that what I may find I may dislike, I may be disappointed, depressed and therefore I prefer to have my own illusions, my own concepts, my own conclusions about the book, and therefore I am incapable of reading it? So my concern then is to find out why this mind which is enquiring, which demands that it should read the book, why it is caught in an illusion. Is it fear? We went into it yesterday, the question of fear. And we won't go into it now because we have other things to go into. If it is fear, we explained fear is the movement of thought as time. If you have gone into it since yesterday.

And we said, the art of observation consists in giving thought its own place. Therefore the mind can totally, completely, absolutely be free from fear. Don't accept my word for this, but it is so if you

have gone into it, psychologically there is an ending to fear. And there is the fear of pain, physical organic pain, which we also talked about yesterday, which is not to continue when the pain is over, as memory. Which is the registration of the pain of yesterday, and that registration is memory, and that memory hoping that there will not be pain another time. We went into that, and we will go into it much more in detail.

So when the mind is caught in illusion, is it aware that it is an illusion? You follow? Or it doesn't know at all it is an illusion? If the mind doesn't know that it is living in an illusion, in a make-believe world, how is it to become aware of it? You follow? You understand my question? Suppose I am caught in an illusion - the word 'illusion' means illudere, to play, to play with ideas, to play with things that are not actual, which are conceptual, a series of conclusions and beliefs which are not actual. I play with them. If this belief doesn't suit me I take on another belief. I play with beliefs and this playing is illusion, because I cannot face the actuality of what is actually going on. So the mind invents beliefs, dogmas and all the rest of it. Now to be aware of it, to know I am in illusion - when you know you are in illusion it is finished. You understand? It is only when I do not know that I am in illusion then there is no possibility of moving out of it. But the moment I am aware that I am caught in illusion, the very awareness dispels illusion. Obviously. So my mind then is capable of reading this book, because we are concerned with bringing about a radical transformation of the human mind which has lived for millennia, this way we are living - which is the quarrels, the anxieties, the violence, the brutality, all that is going on around us and in us, and

such human beings can only live in disorder, and can never bring about a good society, a good human being, you will never understand what is goodness. So we are doing this, we are enquiring into this.

Then what is this book, which is myself, which is yourself, which is the story of mankind? Not the story of mankind printed in books only, the historical evolution of man, but also much more an unwritten book which nobody can ever describe, or ever print in a book, because this thing, this enormous evolution of man which is the result at present is always moving, changing, modifying itself; it is never static. So my mind - one's mind must be as alert, as clear to read this book. Right? So what does the reading of the book mean - the reading, not the book? You understand? The capacity to read, which is the capacity to observe, the capacity to listen to the story, the capacity to learn what the book is saying. Those three things are involved: that is, the seeing, the hearing what the books says and learning from the book. Right? You are following this? Are we doing this together? That is, are we together observing the book freely? Or we are interpreting the book? You understand this? I read the book but my mind is interpreting what the book says according to my desire, my wishes, my longings, my fears, my loneliness, so I am really not reading the book but telling the book what I am, what I think is. You are following this? So first I must learn the art - one must, sorry to use the word 'I' - one must learn the art of reading, that is the art of observing the book. That is, to observe, to see without the observer. I'll go into it, please have a little patience and go into it slowly. The observer is the past. Right? The observer is the experience, accumulated, the observer is the

result of all the influences, pressures, knowledge, with that knowledge he is reading the book. Have you understood? But to read the book without the past. I wonder if you are following this, or it is too abstract? No, I don't think it is too abstract, it is quite simple. We think we know, we don't come to the book afresh. Like a schoolboy who goes to school for the first time, he doesn't know, he is fresh, he is young, he wants to learn. And one must read the book in the same way, you must come to it with a freshness, not with all the accumulated knowledge that we have acquired, which is the book itself. I wonder if you see that. So if you come to it, if you read it as an observer who already knows the content of the book, then you are incapable of reading what it says. So there must be the absence of the observer; there is only reading. Right? Not translate what you are reading into your own peculiar idiosyncrasies and illusions and desires. This is clear. So there is only reading, which is, only observing the book.

Then also the book is telling you a great deal. Right? And can you hear what the book is saying? You understand what I am saying? Hear the song of the book, it is telling you something, obviously, this enormous story it is telling you. But you must be capable of hearing it, not only reading it but capable of hearing this tremendous song of life that is going on. Right? So I can either hear with the ear, or hear without the noise of the outside. You understand what I am saying? I'll show you, I'm going to go into it a little bit. When you hear music your whole - music which you really love, has meaning, depth, vitality, and beauty, not just modern pop noise, sorry, you may like it, that's a different matter - then you hear it with all your being, absolutely you are with it,



there is not a division between you and it, there is no sense of remembrance of something which you have heard before, you are with the whole movement. Right? When you hear Bach or Beethoven or Mozart, the real beauty of it, move with it. In the same way one must listen to the story that the book is telling you. May we go on? I hope you are following all this. That's why you are here, if you are not listening, don't waste your time. It's a lovely day, go and climb the hills, or play golf, or have a so-called amusing time. But you are here so please give your attention because it's your life.

And also there is the art of learning. This is a little more complex, I'll go into it. When we go to schools and colleges and universities we are learning, we are acquiring information, which is called knowledge, about various subjects in order to have a good career, a good job, or if you fail, you go to... and so on and so on, which is the accumulation of knowledge during a certain period of time, from boyhood until you leave university, which is the accumulation of knowledge, which can be used skilfully or otherwise. If you want to be a plumber, if you want to be a professor, if you want to be a scientist, if you want to be a mathematician, the whole process is the same, to learn. Which is to accumulate knowledge, and from that knowledge act. Right? And there is also act and from that action learn, which is also there. Isn't that clear? Of course. Which is, accumulated knowledge and act; act and learn; after acting, learning, accumulating knowledge, act. Both are the same essentially. But also there is another kind of learning which is a little more difficult. These two we know: accumulate knowledge and act; act and having acted learn from

your action, which becomes the knowledge: so both are the same. We are saying something entirely different because this is mechanical. Are you following all this? Because this is a process of acting from the known - a conductor, a pianist, the plumber, the fiddler, the professor, the scientist, all these have accumulated knowledge and act. Therefore they are moving from the known, to the known, to the known, modifying all the time. Right? Now we are saying there is a different way of learning. I don't know if you are interested in this, because this requires a little more thinking together.

One sees the accumulation of knowledge is necessary, to drive a car and so on and so on; if you want to build a bridge you must know the stresses and the strains and the quality of the earth and so on and so on. That is, our mind has been informed, acquired knowledge and acted from there. This is the everlasting movement of man. You understand? That is, gather information, knowledge, act. So the knowledge is the past. Of course. And from that knowledge you act. This is clear, isn't it? Right? We must meet together otherwise I am talking to myself, which is no good, I can do that in my room. So we are saying there is a different kind of learning which hasn't its root in the known. Right? 'In the known' in the sense, knowledge and then acting. See the difference. I am going to point out carefully this. There is acquiring knowledge and then acting from it; so action modifies the knowledge, the knowledge modifies the action. This is what we are doing all the time, therefore it becomes routine, mechanical, there is never a freedom to enquire into something which is not known, a freedom from the known to observe something you do not know. You

follow? Are we meeting each other, a little bit?

So to the speaker, the ascent of man does not lie in the accumulated knowledge. Right? Listen to it first, don't agree, or disagree, first listen. People, scientists, others have said, man can only evolve by having more, more and more knowledge, climbing, ascent. But knowledge is always the past. And if there is no freedom from the past, his ascent will be always limited. Right? It will always be confined to a particular pattern. So we are saying: look, there is a different way of learning, which is, to see comprehensively, wholly, holistically the whole movement of knowledge, where it is necessary, because otherwise you couldn't live. But the very understanding of its limitation is to have insight into the whole movement of knowledge. I wonder if I have conveyed anything at all. I'll go into it a little bit. Probably most of you have never even thought about this. We have taken knowledge as natural, and live with knowledge and go on functioning with knowledge for the rest of our life. But we have never enquired what is knowledge itself, what is its relationship to freedom, what is its relationship to the actual happening? You understand? We have taken all this for granted, that's part of our education and conditioning.

So we are saying: when you begin to enquire into the whole movement of knowledge, which is time, which is thought, and see the limitations of knowledge, for knowledge is always in the past, and therefore fragmentary. You can add to it, take away from it, enlarge it, but it is always the movement of the past modifying itself. And so in that movement there is never freedom. You may not have gone into this, so this may be new to you, so please kindly

listen to find out, not to agree or disagree, find out. We are saying in that field there is no freedom for man. He may be able to have better bathrooms, better heating systems and so on and so on, but psychologically, inwardly there is no freedom if the mind is constantly being driven, or held, or in bondage to the past.

So is there a way of learning which is not merely acquiring knowledge? You understand my question? I wonder if you see this. Please listen. Is there a way of looking, learning, hearing which is not the constant accumulation of knowledge from which to act? Is there an action which is not bound by the past? I'll put it this way, then perhaps we will understand each other. That is, I have acquired knowledge - there is the acquisition of knowledge and from that knowledge act. And in that action, that very action is limiting itself, it is not holistic, it's not the whole - there are regrets, all kinds of travail in that action come into being. Now we are asking: is there an action which hasn't its roots in the past, because if my action is born of the past it is always limited, it is always broken up, it is never complete, whole. So is there an action which is free from the past? Do you understand my question? Just understand the question then we can go into it. You may say, that question is silly, it has no meaning, but it has meaning when you see the whole complexity of knowledge and its limitation. And the action that is born out of its limitation must be limited and therefore confusing, and therefore out of this knowledge a good society can never come into being. You get it?

So we are saying, asking: is there action without the movement of the past? I say, there is. Which is, to have an insight into the whole structure of knowledge - insight, a deep understanding, a

total comprehension of this whole thing: knowledge, action, limited, no freedom, therefore out of that there can be no good society. To see that, the truth of it, the perception of that truth is the release of a different kind of learning which is holistic. I wonder if you get this? Are you working-are we working together, or are you just listening?

Look, sir: let me put it this way: what is the relationship between man and woman? What is relationship? Generally, as it is generally accepted, relationship means to be together, sexually, in action, you earn a livelihood and the wife remains or goes out to earn a livelihood, cooking, you know relationship implies all that: affection, irritation, nagging, changing if you don't like one girl, or one boy, you go to another. This process is relationship - is called. We are asking what is actual relationship, is there such a thing at all? I am not saying there is, we are enquiring. There's no dogmatic statement in this matter. What is actually our relationship based on? Please enquire into it. You, you are related to somebody, life is relationship, you cannot exist without relationship, but what is that relationship? You say, yes, it's love. One is rather shy of that word because love is loaded with all kinds of idiotic meanings, and generally goes with the word 'sex'. That love becomes mere sexual pleasure. But actually, when you go into the question of relationship, what is it based on? It is based, is it not, on the images that you have built about each other? Obviously. These two images have relationship. You are following this? No? I know perhaps you may not like this idea, or this actual fact, but you have to swallow it, whether you like it or not. The fact is each one creates the image about the other, and these images have some kind of relationship,

because each one goes his own way - ambition, greed, you know, separating all the time, perhaps coming together in bed, but that's not relationship, it is superficial, sensational, pleasure. But actually this image is the divisive factor between the two.

Now the mechanism of this building images is the remembrance - remembrance of what she said, or what you said, the remembrance of your sexual images and so on and so on, the image of being kind, being angry, being nagged and so on, you have built a great image about each other. It is the movement of thought, which is the remembrance. Now we are saying, can there be a relationship without the image? And that is the only relationship. Now to see the truth of this, to see that where there is image there is division, and therefore if you have an image about her, and she has an image about you, these images keep people apart. If you see the full significance of this, which you can, then the mechanism of building images ends. Naturally, because all life is relationship, whether it is nature, with each other, it's a relationship. But if we have an image about the heavens, not the heaven, but heavens, the cosmos, the universe, if you have an image about it you have no relationship with it. You can have an image about nature, the image is more important than the actuality. So when you see the truth of this the image-making comes to an end, then there is a possibility of actual relationship with nature, with the universe, which is love - which we will go into another time.

So we are saying, there is a way of learning which is immediate action, it is not born out of knowledge. Which is not impulsive action, which is not emotional, romantic action, but it is the action

born out of the comprehension of the whole movement of knowledge, which is the truth of the limitation of knowledge. Now my mind - the mind is prepared to read. You follow? Prepared to read the book without any distortion, because there is no illusion, it is able to hear the whole story completely, without saying, I like, or don't like. It reads it like music, there is no part saying, I don't like that part, it's music. And to learn from that book: in the very reading is action, not reading and action. Because if you do that it becomes memory, and limited, and action. I hope you are understanding all this - it's marvellous if you go into it.

So the mind is prepared to read. And it discovers - please listen to this-it discovers the book is the mind. Right? The book is the consciousness. The book isn't out there on a pedestal for me to read, the book is this whole content of my consciousness, of your consciousness - greed, envy, this, the other. So - you are following this? The book is not there, the book is here. Right? Then how will you read the book if it is here? You follow my question? We had thought reading is there, but the book is this, this quality of mind which is capable of such distortion, capable of such great events, technological, capable of disorder, capable of great fears, anxieties, brutalities, violence, affection, joy, all that. So the book is this. Right? So what am I reading? Before - see what has taken place- before I thought the book was out there for me to read, but now I have discovered the book is this thing itself. Therefore it can only read when there is absolute quiet observation in relationship. You understand? You are following this? It is only in relationship the book can be read. The relationship is my actuality - with my wife, my friend, my dog, my nature, the hills, the beauty of this valley

and so on. Right? So there is no conflict. I am not telling the book what it should be, then there is conflict. But if the book is me, there is the end of division. Right? The end of escape, the end of inhibitions, the book is me. So there is no control, there is no desire different from the book itself. I wonder if you are capturing this? Because then the whole movement of conflict, struggle, becoming better, trying to, in a group, understand myself - you follow - all that ends because the thing is there. And then you discover the whole movement in daily relationship. But in that relationship you are observing, there is no conflict. Right? What is the time?

Q: Half past.

K: If this is clear we can go into the question now of something totally different. Which is, why has man throughout the ages, from the ancient of days, suffered? You understand? This is really a very important question. And apparently man has never ended sorrow. Right? Christianity has escaped from it by saying, somebody else suffers for you - the redeemer, you know, the whole business. And the Asiatics have translated it by saying, it is your past karma, which is past action, past life, for which you are paying now. If you behave properly the next life you will live in a palace! Or better, you know instead of becoming black you will become a lawyer, and so on and so on. Which is self-improvement. See the danger of both these tricks we play upon each other: escaping through an ideology, from somebody, through a concept, through an image; and the other explanation of sorrow because of the past. That is, the cause, the event. But the event becomes the cause. Of course. No? Have you understood this? Must everything be explained? Look, there is the cause and the effect; but the effect modifies itself which



then becomes the cause for another effect. So it is a constant cause/ effect, the effect becomes the cause all the time. And man, you, we human beings, whether we live here, or in Asia, or in India, or anywhere else, we have this extraordinary burden of sorrow, not only this so-called personal sorrow, but the collective sorrow of mankind. You understand? The poor man in a little village in India can never have a hot bath, clean clothes, have knowledge, can never ride in an aeroplane, can never see the beauty of the earth because he is toiling, toiling, toiling. And the thousands of people who have been killed in wars, and the mothers, their girl friends, their wives weeping. You follow? There is the sorrow of the world as well as your own little sorrow. I don't know if you have gone into this, or even thought about it. We are only concerned with our own little sorrows, with our own tears - this is hay fever only!

So there is not only personal, immediate sorrow of various kinds, the ultimate sorrow is death, death of someone whom you think you love, on whom you have depended, who has been a companion and so on and so on, but also there is this immense collective sorrow of mankind. So we are asking whether this sorrow can ever end, because if it doesn't end there is no love, you cannot have a good society, there can be no goodness. So one must find out, not only one's own personal sorrow whether it can end, but also not to contribute to the vast collective sorrow. Please, sirs, this is very, very serious, this is not a thing you play with, this is not a thing you argue and have opposing plans about sorrow. Nobody, no redeemer, no saviour has ever helped man to be free from sorrow; they have helped you to escape from sorrow. So we are asking a very, very serious question, and only a very serious

mind, a mind that has gone through all that we have discussed, can find out, or ask the serious question whether sorrow, our own particular, personal, limited sorrow and whether it is possible not to add to the vast stream of sorrow.

So what is sorrow? You understand? Now, sir, in asking a question of this kind, and asking questions which we have asked previously, the question is not, and the enquiry, is not an analytical process. It is not analysis. You understand? I must explain this, a little bit. Analysis implies division, the analyser and the analysed. The analyser is the past. Right? What he has learnt, from childhood, you know, the whole psychological knowledge, and the various divisions in this professional, psychological structure. So the analyser is different from the analysed. Is that so? Or the analyser is the analysed? Please enquire sir. Of course it is. I am examining my inhibition - if I have any - and I am analysing it, go back to my childhood, or something or other, a past incident, and I am analysing it. So there is a division. And we are saying the analyser is the analysed. That is, seeing the truth that the division is illusory: the analyser is the analysed, the experiencer is the experience. Are you following all this? We say, I must have experience. We are searching for bigger, wider, nobler, extensive, godly experience, mystic experiences, which shows that the experiencer is different from that which he is experiencing. In that process the experiencer must recognize the experience, otherwise it wouldn't be experience, so the very recognition is the remembrance of something he has had. So the experiencer is the experience; the thinker is the thought. Thought is not different from the thinker. So the analyser is the analysed. That's good enough for the moment,

discard it or take it, it is a fact, you go into it.

So when we ask a question we are not analysing. We are observing. In the observation there is no analysis because you are observing and the thing is revealing itself. You are not telling it, it is telling you. So there is only pure observation. So in the same way we are asking the question why man, human man, man who is the repository of thousands of years of sorrow, not only personal but this collective burden of sorrow, and why mankind has put up with it. Probably he has not been able to solve it, he hasn't the capacity to say, I don't know what to do with this. I suffer, I cry, I know I am lonely, I wanted success, I have failed, grief, sorrow, this sense of frustration, inhibition - all that is implied in that one word and more. And we are asking, we are observing, not analysing - why has man put up with this, tolerated it? You don't tolerate a toothache, you do something about it immediately. But man has not freed himself from this. Is it because he is incapable? Or he has so accepted it, it has become a habit, and so he says, I can't solve it, I can't free myself from it, as I can't, please help me? He says, god, Christ, Krishna, Buddha, somebody outside, please take away my sorrow. That hasn't worked either. One can escape into it but that is not an actuality - it is there. You may go to church every Saturday, or pray five times a day, but it is there.

So we are now asking why man, you, have not resolved it? What is sorrow? Please answer it, put that question to yourself: what is sorrow? The loss of somebody, the loss of your particular wishes, your desires, loss of somebody on whom you have relied, loss of companionship, is sorrow, this enormous sense of isolation, loneliness. So we are asking, what is the relationship between the

`me' and the `you' in essence? The `me' that sheds tears when you are not there, the `me' that seeks fulfilment in something or other, noble or ignoble, imaginary or reality and the fulfilment is denied and I feel frustrated, inhibited, miserable, depressed. Is that the reason of sorrow? Or one has really never lived with sorrow - lived, not run away from it. You understand my question? Please understand this. One has not rationally explained it away, logically said, yes, that was the cause, this is the effect, therefore I suffer. You follow? We are asking, not analyzing, are all these the reason of sorrow, the cause of sorrow? Or is there something much deeper than the peripheral incidents that bring about sorrow? You understand? Most of us are caught in the peripheral incidents, accidents that bring about grief, and we are trying to resolve those outward incidents, and not being able to resolve them we escape; perhaps we have resolved them but there may be a much deeper cause to this enormous, endless sorrow of man.

What is that deep cause? You see, sir, I am enquiring, the speaker is enquiring, are you enquiring too? You understand my question? Or are you only concerned with the peripheral sorrows of fulfilment, non-fulfilment, I am angry when my wife leaves, when my husband goes away - the petty little sorrows that we have collected and say, that is sorrow, and we want to be free of those. That's very easy, those are petty, rather immature and they can be left aside, one can resolve them quite easily. But we are asking, is there a deep cause for this abiding, everlasting sorrow of man? If the speaker points out the cause, and there is a cause which the speaker has discovered, what value has it to you? This is not a trick I am playing. What will it do to you if I say, this is it, this is the

real, this is the truth why mankind suffers - what will you do with it? You understand? Or will you say, oh, yes, that's a very good idea, I must think about it, it might help me to get rid of my sorrow? You follow? Sir, somebody gives you a precious jewel, what will you do with it? You understand? And what will you pay for it? If you are merely paying with the coin of thought, then it is valueless, it is no longer a jewel. But if you say, the jewel is the most precious thing in my life, I must hold it, I must look at it - then you are giving your heart, your mind, your blood, everything to hold to that.

So what is the deep cause of mankind, the cause that brings such an enormous burden of sorrow, not only the personal but this vast collective burden? Do you want me to tell you? Be clear, please, don't just shake your heads. Be very clear that you have accepted the question, that you have received the question with all your mind, with your heart, with your whole being because that's the most vital question that will totally resolve, not only the petty problems, resolve the conflict of man. If you receive that question completely, the question itself is the answer. Right? I wonder if you see this.

You see, sirs, if you ask a question, either you are expecting someone to answer it, or you are thinking, thinking, thinking, trying to find an answer. But thinking or waiting for somebody else to answer your question is not going to resolve it. Right? So how you receive the question is important, how you approach the question; if your approach is holistic, complete, then the answer is there. But if you say, well, tell me about it, lean back and wait, or ask your priest, or your guru, or your book, to tell you then there is

no meaning. They have told you a thousand times. So it's like, you know, sir, like in a lake, you drop a stone, the lake is so still and you drop a stone and the waves go on, the question is that stone that is dropped in the lake. Do you understand? Right.

There are several things I meant to have talked about this morning, like love and death and meditation. We haven't time now but we will do it next Saturday and Sunday, because those are also very essential questions, questions that demand total answers: the nature of meditation, what is death, what is the movement of life and death, and what is the meaning of love. We will go into that next time.

## OJAI 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 17TH APRIL 1979

Krishnamurti: This is a discussion or a dialogue and what shall we talk about?

Questioner: Last Sunday you talked about the art of observation and the art of learning. It seems to me that if we would find out exactly what that is perhaps we wouldn't have to come back every year and ask you. We could observe things ourselves.

K: If we could find out what you mean by the art of listening, the art of observation, the art of learning, if we could find that out we need not come back every year here.

Q: Would you be kind enough to give us the meaning of psychological registration?

K: Psychological registration, would you go into that.

Q: Sir, is there any relationship between love and freedom?

K: What is the relationship between love and freedom. Is there any relationship at all?

Q: Psychological death.

K: Would you discuss psychological death.

Q: Is silence of the mind possible?

K: Silence of the mind.

Q: The meaning of life.

K: The meaning of life.

Q: Could you talk about peace and order?

Q: Last Saturday you said god did not create man, but man created god. Would you elaborate on that subject?

K: Could we talk over together what you mean by man created god, god has not created man. Now which of these questions do

you want to take up?

Q: Love and freedom.

Q: Could we talk about quietening the mind?

Q: Is there an entity which is responsible?

K: Is there an entity in us which is totally responsible for all our actions. Is that it?

Q: Is there life without an entity that is responsible?

Q: Would you talk about sex?

K: Talk about sex. I don't know what there is to talk about sex.

Q: What is responsibility?

K: Now just a minute, sir, you have asked about a dozen questions.

Q: Sir, what do you mean by the answer to the question is the question itself?

K: I don't know what you would like to talk over together this morning with all these questions: what do you think is the most important one of all these questions?

Q: Sir, freedom, love and responsibility.

K: Freedom, love and responsibility, is that what you want to talk about? I wonder what we mean by responsibility. The word itself means to respond, respond either partially or completely, wholly. That's the meaning of that word, to respond in our relationship adequately, completely, partially, in a limited way. How do we respond in our relationship - relationship being being in contact partially, wholly, objectively, or very narrow, personally, selfishly? That's implied in responsibility. I wonder what we mean, not only by the words but how inwardly we respond in our relationship with another. Do we respond to another



according to our inclination, according to our tendencies, desires, or do we respond to the other's desires, to the other's idiosyncrasies, to the other's partiality, or do we respond totally, wholly, completely without being personal, selfish, narrow, limited? Right? So that is the question when we talk about relationship, responsibility.

And when we talk about freedom, what do we mean by that word? Each one translates that word according to his own opinion, experience, according to his own knowledge, conditioning, pleasure or displeasure. But does all that indicate freedom, I am asking. And also when we talk about love, what do we mean by that word? Love of the country, love of the family, love of the beautiful, love of one's wife, husband, children, the nation, love of god, love of virtue and so on, sexual, sensory, all that's implied. So this is a tremendous question, it is not just a thing to be played around with. What do we mean by these three words: love, freedom and responsibility?

Q: Love is the related to vice, desire, for itself.

K: No, sir, when you say, 'I love you', what do you mean by that word? And what is the relationship of sensory responses, sensuousness, sex to love? You follow? And freedom? That's a tremendous word, the content of that word. Love, freedom, is it possible for man to be free, or is he always free in the limited circle which he has woven round himself? And the word 'responsibility', if you undertake something to do you are responsible for doing it, and if you don't it you feel guilty. All that is implied in that word responsibility and relationship. And are the three of these words, love, freedom, responsibility, are they separate or one whole? Are

they a unitary process, holistic, or they are three separate activities and human beings are trying to integrate the three? I don't know if you are following all this. Which is it you are, in this dialogue, attempting to do?

We are two friends, sitting under a tree on a lovely morning, a cool breeze and we are talking about these three things. We want to find out how serious we are because this is our life: love, freedom, responsibility and a sense of peace in the world, inward as well as outward. Two friends who are committed to the discovery, to the understanding of a way of living these three things separately or as a whole, indivisible. Which is it we are trying to do? You understand, sir? Which is it we are actually doing? Q: Sir, it is always our freedom and our love, it is limited love and we are always asserting instead of getting really out of it.

K: Sir, this question is tremendously complex, you understand, because everywhere throughout the world they talk about individuality; the individual love, the individual expression, the individual freedom, the individual responsibility and so on and so on. The individual has been given enormous importance - to the individual, to the you - and on that our civilization is based: individual freedom, individual expression, individual fulfilment, that's the culture in which we live. And on that all our social responses, economic striving and so on is based. What relationship has this whole individual concept to love, freedom, responsibility? This is a very complex and very serious question if you want to go into it fully. You may not want to, you may want casually to delve into something which demands all your attention and care. So I am just asking, if I may, when our culture is based on individuality -

you understand - the voting, the elections, the whole set-up of governments, freedom of choice, freedom of individual striving, individual ambition, individual competition - all that is our culture, religiously, socially and culturally. Individual painter - the old cathedrals in Europe were not built by individuals, they were built and one doesn't know who built them and so on and so on.

So this question when we want to discuss it as two friends who really want to go into it, where shall we start? You understand?

Q: Let's start by what you would like to say from your heart about it.

K: As two friends.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, madam, this is our question: the individual, freedom and responsibility, love, and the individual, the `you', the `me', is given tremendous importance in the context of all this. And how do you approach this question? As a friend I ask you, I say, look, how do you come to this question, how do you receive this question? Casually, because there is nothing to do, there are too many players on the golf course so you say I must just as well sit under a tree and talk to you instead of playing golf?

Q: How do you approach this question and how is the answer in the question?

K: If you ask me how does the speaker approach the question, is that it?

Q: How is the question the answer to the question?

K: The question is, how do you approach? On that, if you can find out, the response will be right. If I approach it - if one approaches it, not I, if you approach it from a very narrow, selfish

point of view, your approach is limited and therefore your answer will be very, very limited because it is a tremendously complex problem. So is your mind capable of meeting this challenge? Meeting it wholly or partially? Afraid that in answering fully your actions may bring about a radical change and therefore you are afraid and hold back? You follow? It is very important to find out how we approach a question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, I am not describing, that's a fact. That's your culture: the American culture, American civilization, American growth, evolution and so on is based on the individual. The individual achievement, the individual success, the individual competition, the individual creativeness, you follow, all that is there. And what is the relationship, please, between that individual, love, freedom and responsibility?

Q: Sir, the problem is that freedom, love and responsibility is an ideal, I feel that is not an actuality at all.

K: That's right, sir. For most of us freedom, love, responsibility is just an idea, an ideal, it has no value at all, these ideals. What is real in our daily life is our individual desires, individual sexual demands, individual urge for self-fulfilment, and in that desire one must be free to fulfil. That's all we are concerned with, not about love, freedom, responsibility. Those are all just words.

Q: Sir, we cannot answer the question because the question throws us into the distress of relativity and non-meaning, how do we deal with the stress of our incapacity to answer the question?

K: I am doing it, sir, we are trying to find out. Sir, are we really concerned as two friends, talking over this matter, are you really

concerned to find out for oneself, not to be talked at or be preached at or persuaded to believe or not to believe, are we prepared to say, 'Look, let me look at my life first as it is and from there move'?  
You understand my question?

Q: If two friends met and they were friends would they not be sensitive to one another's needs, to the whole of one another?

K: Perhaps. What has that got to do with this question?

Q: That's what love is, as far as we can comprehend it.

K: Sir, you are all offering opinions, judgements; let's find out. Are you responsible in the full meaning of that word to another, to your wife, to your girl, to your boy friend or husband, are you totally responsible? That means care, it means attention, love, in which there is no personal demand.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Yes.

Q: The individual in a group, the individual who is striving cannot have any relationship with the other people.

K: Obviously.

Q: Sir, I am involved in a relationship, and I see pain, and I began to respond to it and then my mind, thought came into my mind and I see that I am not responding fully.

K: First of all, sir, let's be clear, that this is not a group therapy, we are not confessing to each other our sins, our faults, and exposing each other, but we are trying to enquire into ourselves to what are we responsible for. Responsible, that word means to respond, sensuously, intellectually, emotionally, romantically, from your heart, from your mind, sensuously. Now are we aware of our responsibility to another, intimate or not intimate? What does that

responsibility involve? If one has a family, please just go with me for a little, if one has a family, wife, children, are you responsible for those children? That you care, that you have love for them, that you are concerned with their health, with their clothes, with their education, are you concerned that they become healthy good citizens? Or you have no time at all for them because you have to go out and earn money as the man, and the mother, and the father, as they do now and have very little time for the children. So that's a fact. So where is your responsibility? You see, that's why if we don't face that it is no good talking about love, freedom and all the rest of it. The family is breaking up in this country. Right?

Divorce, after two or three years of sexual relationship with a man, or with a boy and a girl, it breaks up, and another relationship is formed, children may be born out of it, but there is a divorce so gradually this word responsibility is losing altogether its meaning. Please do pay attention to what we are saying.

Q: If I have a friend and I perceive a need that I see in this friend, my friend has a need, is this because I myself have a need, or is this responsibility?

K: Suppose, suppose, I am not saying this, suppose, if I need an audience like here for my fulfilment, for my pleasure, would you help me to fulfil my pleasure? My desire to have a large or a small audience to whom I can talk, would you help me, or would you say, don't be a fool? Then I am using you for my satisfaction, for my glory, for my aggrandisement and so on. Look, sir, he asked a question, let's finish it. Please stick to one thing, would you kindly. That is, are we responsible for the earth on which we live? You understand? The trees, the mountains, the waters, the forests and

the beauty of the land, to maintain it, or are we gradually destroying everything because we must have more cars, more pleasure, more, more. Sir, you don't face all these things.

Q: I feel a special responsibility for my wife, for my child, for my piece of land, does that deny my responsibility for the whole?

K: No. On the contrary. There is - would you listen, sir? - there is feeling of responsibility and feeling responsible for. You see the two different things? That is, one feels responsible for this grove, for this beautiful place, or you feel responsible when you are walking down the road, you feel responsible to pick up a piece of paper that has been thrown down, you feel responsible. So wherever you are you are responsible for everything around you. But if you are merely responsible for this one little thing, that responsibility assumes a very narrow, rather shoddy little meaning.

Q: What is the greatest act of love?

K: I am showing it to you, sir. Do you, if I may ask, if one may ask, do you feel responsible that way for the whole of mankind not just your children - if you have children do you feel responsible for those children, to see that they have right education so that they won't be killed in a war, they won't become mediocre. Oh, you are not interested in all this. So one asks, what are you interested in? I think that is a legitimate question. You can talk about love, freedom and the beauty of the sky but it is only an outside interest, but basically what are we interested in?

Q: In ourself.

K: Yes, that's right, you are interested in yourself. Right? Wait, sir, perfectly right, each one is interested in himself. On that our society, culture, religion is based. Right? Each one interested in

himself, his progress, his expression - you know, all the rest of it. Now what relationship has one's self-centred activity to freedom? You understand? I want to be - one wants to be free. Go on, sir, think it out.

Q: The relationship between responsibility to oneself and responsibility for the whole.

K: Responsibility to oneself and responsibility to the whole. What is yourself? Please, let's go into it, that one thing. What is yourself? Are you not the result of your parents, genetically, heredity, are you not the result of your culture, of your religion, of all the literature and so on; and you are that and the European is that, the Indian is that. Right? They are the product of their environment, of their culture, of their religion, of their social condition, economic and so on. And they have produced this society in which we live. Do you, as a human being, realize that we are all one basically, not as an idea, but as a fact. Because when you go to India, you see the misery, the confusion, the anxiety, the despair of people, running to their petty little gods whom they have created; you come to Europe it is exactly the same thing, they have got their Jesus, their Christ - you follow - the economic position, they are starving, they are miserable, unhappy, disorder; you come here it is exactly the same. So if you are responsible you are responsible for all mankind. You understand?

Q: How can you say that humanity is basically one? Do you mean that the condition is basically one? Or that beyond the conditioning we are one?

K: No, I am sticking to the conditioning, not beyond. You can only find out what is beyond when you are free from one's



conditioning. So if one realizes that, that all human beings go through this extraordinary misery, confusion, anxiety, sorrow, right through the world. You understand, sir? Right through the world, not you go through it, but every human being goes through it - Africa, China, Australia, here, everywhere. And you are that also, you, you are part of all that. So if you are responsible you are responsible for all humanity in that sense.

Q: Sir, does irresponsibility relate to striving for individuality?

K: That's right. Is irresponsibility, the questioner asks, striving for individual fulfilment, is that irresponsible. It is, obviously. You understand, sir? First to realize not verbally but in your heart, in your blood, in your whole thinking, that human beings right through the world go through the same agonies that one goes through: the loneliness, the despair, the depressions, the extraordinary uncertainty, insecurity, whether they live ten thousand miles away or two thousand miles or here, they are all psychologically bound together. If one realizes that profoundly in your guts, in your blood, in your heart, in your mind, then you are responsible.

Q: What is it that stands in the way of our seeing our responsibility? Not only seeing responsibility but seeing the whole.

K: Not seeing. First does one realize this tremendous fact? You see, madam, if you realize that then what is your action?

Q: I will know when I realize that.

K: No, no, if you realize that you are not Mrs so-and-so, tremendously individual, but psychologically, inwardly you are like the rest of mankind, you may be blond, you may be white, you may be black, you may be brown, yellow, whatever it is, inwardly

we are all similar though outwardly we may be dissimilar. If one realizes that, what is your action, what will you do? What's your responsibility? Wouldn't you then ask a simple question: is it possible for the person who sees this, is it possible for that person to change, not follow the current? That is the central question, that is the responsibility because if one can fundamentally change then you are no longer contributing to that stream, to that river, to that ocean of confusion, which is self-fulfilment. You follow? I must be better, I must do this, I must earn more money, I must have a swimming pool, I must have, and all the rest of the thing that goes on.

Q: Sir, some of the people here understand maybe intellectually that we have to change because we are the rest of the world. But then at the same time we are continuing our individual desire to change. That's the difficulty.

K: Ah, no, no, sir. It's not individual desire. This is important. Understand, look, sir: verbally, intellectually one may understand that psychologically we are all similar, that can easily be logically, reasonably, verbally clear, but the verbal clarity is not the feeling of it. You understand? The verbal statement, the acceptance after argument, reason, is not the fact or the feeling that you are the world.

Q: What makes one understand it?

K: Wait. First I must realize that. First it must be an absolute, irrevocable truth, then you ask, what is my responsibility.

Q: What is the responsibility if you see what is the entity that is the world? What is the world?

K: That's very simple: what is the world. There is the outer

world and the inward world. Right? The outward world, you know what is happening, I don't have to describe the outward world, with all the confusion, anger, jealousy, arrogance, self-fulfilment, wars, whether you have a war here or in Vietnam, it is war on this earth; and inwardly we are confused, we are unhappy, we are disagreeable, we are selfish, you know. So this inner has created the outer, and the outer then encourages the inner. Right? It is simple, this fact. So I say, seeing all this, what is your responsibility?

Q: There is a transformation in ourselves.

K: Sir, there is no transformation of yourself - you haven't understand this thing.

Q: The anger in my mind looks at anger...

K: Sir, if you realize that you are essentially psychologically like the rest of the unfortunate mankind, what is your response?

Q: I observe it.

K: All right, sir, if you observe that and you realize that you have to bring about a transformation, right, sir, why don't you do it?

Q: I don't stay with it long enough.

K: You stay long enough with your job to earn a livelihood, you spend years and years and years, you get money, all the rest of it, why don't you spend a day with this? You understand what I mean? Give time to find out.

Q: Sir, people have real needs, part of our responsibility is to meet some of those needs.

K: Of course, we are saying that, we agree. But if you spend all your time, as one does, acquiring one's needs and giving perhaps

an occasional glance at this misery of mankind, your occasional glance has very little value.

Q: Can love exist without freedom?

K: Can love exist without freedom - what do you mean by freedom? You have freedom in this country to do what you like. Right? Yes, sir. You have freedom, speech, opportunity to work if you want to, some kind of work, gardener, factory, cook, any kind of work, you have an opportunity. You are free to go from one place to another to get a job. You are free to think what you like and express what you think. People may not listen, that's a different matter, you are free. But go to Russia, you are not. So what do you mean by freedom? Freedom of choice? Freedom to choose what you want to do, which you are doing now. And is that freedom, to choose? If a man who is clear, sees exactly, he doesn't choose, there is no choice, he does it. So choice may be the denial of freedom. You don't see it.

Q: Excuse me, please, I think that we miss the central point of your statement that we are the world, and I think that is the central point.

K: Yes, sir, in this discussion.

Q: It is a verbal understanding.

K: So if it verbal, intellectual, how will you make or find out not to make this truth merely verbal. You follow? Sir, you tell me something very serious, something that is very, very important, and you want to convey it to me, and you express what you have to say in words, clear, precise, actual, the meaning of every word you have employed. I accept that, I say, 'You are perfectly right, I see your reason, your logic, there is clarity, there is sanity behind it',

but it is all up here, I don't feel it. I don't say, 'By Jove, how true this is'. And to me the mere verbal expression and clarity of verbal statements have very little meaning if I don't live it, find out the truth of it. So is it one of our difficulties, amongst others, is it one of our difficulties that we have become so terribly verbal, superficial, intellectual in that sense that I understand words, one understands words very quickly, get on with it. There is no depth in our enquiry, is that it?

Q: There is no depth.

K: Yes, sir. How will you acquire this depth of enquiry?

Q: I am trying to understand what is standing in our way.

Q: We habitually approach the question with conclusions. If we don't find a conclusion on this superficial level then we wait for someone else to answer the question.

K: That's right, sir. You see, I want to tell you a story, will you listen to it? A story, not amusing or serious story, but I want to tell you something, will you listen to it? Listen not only with the hearing of the ear, which is, the meaning of the word, the intent of the expression, the feeling behind it, so that he wants to tell you something and will you listen to it completely with your heart, with your mind? Or will you say, 'Yes, I agree with you, what you have to say, it is a nice morning I am going back to my daily life'? You follow?

That gentleman asked at the beginning of this questioning if we could discuss seriously the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. If we could go into that, desperately, he wants to find out. You understand? If we could go into that, not superficially, to the very depth of it, perhaps it may solve our problems. Because

that involves a great deal of attention, a great deal of comprehension together. I can't listen - one can't listen to one's own voice eternally. So could we go into that before you ask the question what is love, what is freedom, what is responsibility. You may tell me something true but I may not be capable of receiving it. I may not know what you mean by it, I must listen to you with empathy, with sympathy, with affection, with care, with real deep attention to find out what you are saying. You know, if you have a small child who wants to tell you a story or something that has happened to him, would you listen with care? Or you are so busy with your percolator, with your ambition, with your husband's quarrels that you have no time to listen? You understand my question? You'd listen to that child, wouldn't you?

Q: We always listen through conditioning.

K: Find out how to listen, sir. Not conditioning. Will you listen to the child completely? Or you have no time? To your daughter, to your son, he wants to tell you something and will you listen casually - and the child knows that you listen casually, so he loses touch with you immediately, he has no confidence in you because you are concerned about yourself and all the rest of it, so he goes to somebody else, or he runs away from it. You follow, this is happening, for god's sake. So will you learn the art of listening? As we said the other day, art means to give everything its proper place. You understand? Its proper place, everything, the word means that. Then I want to listen, the art of listening. When you want to say something to somebody will you pay complete attention or is it partial attention, disinterested, casual listening? Or do you say, `Please, I want to understand it, for god's sake tell me what you

mean', so that you are fully, completely attentive to what is being said? You follow? Not interpreting, not saying, well, I disagree, you go off and talk about something else when he is telling you, 'I love you'. Will you listen? Or only listen when it gives you satisfaction? Or when something is said that will give you pleasure? You won't listen to a man that wants to hurt you. So listening implies a tremendous attention.

Q: Would you listen to a lot of small talk?

K: That depends, I wouldn't personally, but.

Q: There are two kinds of listening, you have to decide what you want to listen to.

K: Ah! That's just it. If you decide what you want to listen to you shut off listening altogether.

Q: As the man said, small talk is insignificant.

K: You are all talking small talk. Therefore I listen casually; but if you are serious and say, 'Look, I want to understand something completely, tell me', then we can meet each other. That's why, sir, do you remember that fact which is quite extraordinary if you go into it, you have heard of the Buddha, Buddhism? The Buddha, 500 BC, he talked about love and all the rest of it, long before Christ, long before. And he preached for fifty years and he had two disciples amongst many who really understood, not intellectually, understood him, lived with him, comprehended his depth, his beauty, and they came every day to listen to him. They didn't say, 'Well, I'll just listen to you, I've got it', and went away, they came because there was beauty in what he was saying. And these two disciples died before he died. You understand what that means? I wonder if you understand.

So, sirs, and ladies, do you want to learn how to listen? And the art of seeing, seeing something, the trees, the hills, the mountain, your wife, your friend, whatever it is, to see it as though for the first time, not the routine. To look at the familiar face, and look at it as though you are meeting it for the first moment. That can be possible only when all the memories that you have accumulated from that person drop away and you can look. And we went into the question of learning. If you have gone into it you will find out what it means. Learning which is not merely the accumulation of knowledge, and acting from that knowledge, and therefore that action is always, ever incomplete, and therefore it always brings regrets, confusion, misery. And we said there is a different way of learning which is not the action of memory. We went into that a little bit. So if you want to learn these things you become terribly serious, even for an hour.

Q: Would you explain how man created god?

Q: How helpful would the explanation be?

K: What would you say if you were not conditioned by your religion, by your fears, what would you say about god? Of course god is a marvellous investment, you can preach about god and you will make a lot of money - as they are doing. So - please listen to this very carefully - in India they are conditioned one way, you understand, they believe in different gods, you come to Europe, they believe in a certain god and in god's son, absolute, and so on. And there are people who have never, never, never heard of Christ, and they say, 'Who is he?' My god is more important than that man's. So it all depends on your conditioning. Right? One doesn't see this. When the mind is free from that conditioning what is god?



So that's why man out of his fear, out of his loneliness, out of his extraordinary hopeless state says, there must be something that will protect me. Right? The father image, he worships something. So man creates god.

So, sirs, we have come to a point - what time is it?

Q: Twenty five to one.

K: So would you, two friends talking over, are they listening to each other? Are we listening to each other?

Q: How did your question answer your question?

K: You are going back to that. Look, sir, I asked yesterday, no, the day before yesterday, we said what is the root cause of sorrow. You understand? Can sorrow ever end? We put that question, not only personal sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, the collective misery of mankind. And if one answered it, you understand, the root cause, it would become an argument and you would say, how am I to go beyond that. You follow? But if you really asked the question with all your heart and mind, that very question will answer, because in the question is the answer, not outside the question. Look, what is the root cause of sorrow? That's the question. That's the challenge. How do you respond to it? Either you say, 'I don't know', which would be logical, sane, I don't know because you may never have even asked such a question. But if you are here, you are good enough to be here, and you say, 'What is the root cause of it?', I will tell you, I can tell you but it will become intellectual, then you will say, if that is so, then find out how to be free of this thing. Back again. You follow? If you put this question with all your intention, with all your seriousness, the question then begins to reveal.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, questions can be silly, very, very personal, or very superficial, or meaningless questions, but if one asks such a serious question as this, whether mankind, whether you as a human being, related to the rest of the world, whether you as a human being can end your sorrow, which means to discover the root of sorrow, then you have to give your tremendous attention to a very serious question, it isn't a casual superficial question. Mankind has asked this question, you may not have. Men who are very, very serious, who have devoted their life, given up everything, you follow, to find this out. What is the root cause of it?

Q: When I see the problem I am not capable of solving it. What then?

K: I have understood your question. That is, I see - you are saying - I see the problem, I am incapable of solving it. I see the problem very clearly but I am incapable of resolving it. Right? Why? Why is one - please listen to this - why is one incapable of solving a psychological problem, why? Is it that you are educated to rely on another to solve it for you? You understand?

Q: We rely on you.

K: No, just look at it. Why is it that you are incapable of solving your own human anxiety? Let's take anxiety, that's a common problem of all mankind, anxiety, anxious of tomorrow, anxious about, anxiety, you understand that word. Why can't a human being solve it?

Q: Because of its magnitude.

K: No, you have already come to a conclusion that it is enormous. I am asking a question, is it that you have been

educated, conditioned to rely on another, psychologists, psychotherapists, Gestalt, Freudian, the latest and so on, the priest, the pope, the professor, the specialist, so we are always relying on somebody else. If you don't rely on somebody else what will you do, and you have got to solve it. You understand my question? There is nobody on earth who is going to solve for this you. You have tried all these methods, you have been to Japan, Zen, every type of search you have done and you haven't solved your anxiety, so you realize that nobody can possibly help me with this. I have got to solve it.

Q: Beethoven, he had many problems, he didn't solve them, instead he created music.

K: He had a great talent for music, marvellous, I have heard them, marvellous, but his life was like the rest of mankind. So what are you trying to say? Talent is a danger. Right? Because through that you can escape from yourself. So, sir, as nobody can solve your anxiety, group therapy, all the things that mankind has tried, not only this generation, through past history, you understand, for thousand of years they have tried, always saying 'God help me, please help me somebody', and nobody has helped you. They help you to escape, so you are left with this thing, what will you do? You don't say then, 'I have no capacity', you have got to answer it. Or you just carry on, say, 'I am anxious, I can't solve it' and die that way. That's what most people do. But life isn't just anxiety for the rest of my life, I am going to resolve it. Then you begin to find out what anxiety is. The moment you apply you have capacity. But one loses that capacity when one depends on another. That's common wisdom, common sense.

Q: We all have that capacity?

K: Absolutely. Sir, haven't you a capacity to earn a livelihood, money, cars, sex, houses, swimming pools? One has tremendous capacity and energy, only we apply it in one direction and not to this at all.

Q: Shall we give up listening to you?

K: Perhaps we should give up listening to you - perhaps you have already given up! No, sir, just listen, would you go and see something beautiful every day? Wouldn't you? Beautiful trees, the mountains, every day the light changes, different shadows, the wind, the breeze moves through different leaves, you go and see it every day. In the same way, when somebody is telling truth, you go and listen, there is such variety, such shapes.

Q: Maybe we are depending on you.

K: You see I said it carefully, I said when you look at those mountains every day, they are not mountains, they are beauty, the rocks, hills, valleys, shadows, the movement of the clouds over the mountains, the line of the mountains, the depth, the variety of light, all day it is changing. But if we say, 'It is mountains, I have got to go and play golf' - it is finished. But if you are interested in beauty and seeing beauty then you go there every day, or look at it out of the window. In the same way when you are speaking something extraordinarily beautiful, like Beethoven, sir, you hear him every day, every day you hear and every day it is different.

Q: Sir, thank you for sharing your great enlightenment with us. Now what do you say to that?

K: I don't understand. I think we had better stop, we will continue on Thursday.

Q: You spoke of telling a story, is that the story about Buddha?

K: No, just a story. You didn't hear? That child wants to tell you a story, how you listen to that story. That's all.

## **OJAI 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 19TH APRIL 1979 'ON TRANSFORMATION'**

K: Do you think it is worth while to have these discussions?

Q: Yes.

K: Because apparently we never resolve any question or come to the very end of it. We have so many questions, each one saying what he wants to - irrelevant. So could we, as this is the last discussion, could we talk ever together, as two friends, have a dialogue and choose a subject which is common to all of us and go to the very end of it, step by step. Could we do that? Would that be worthwhile? Then please choose your subject.

Q: You have been talking to people for over fifty years, and also there are these schools, this one and those in other countries, in all of this time, out of this talking, out of these schools has there come about the total radical transformation of even one single human being?

K: You have had schools here in this country, Canada, England and five or six schools in India, and you have been talking for over fifty years and has there been one single human being who has been transformed? Do you want to discuss that?

Q: Sir could we have a discussion as to what is impeding this transformation. We are coming here, I think, many of us very serious, who want to transform.

K: Could we discuss seriously what do you mean by transformation.

Q: No. What is it that impedes this transformation?

K: What impedes transformation. What impedes human minds

from really bringing about a mutation in themselves? Do you want to discuss that?

Q: Yes.

K: So do you want to discuss, talk over together, and go step by step if we discuss anything together, to the very end of it: which is: if you want to chose that subject, is it possible to bring about a radical transformation and what are the things that block us?

Q: Yes.

Q: And not only that. Can we talk about observation without the observer?

K: That is a very good question: the art of seeing without the observer. Perhaps we can include that question sir in discussing about is it possible to bring about a change and what is preventing us. Right? Shall we discuss this step by step and go to the very end of it, not stop in the middle of it and talk about something else? Could we do that?

Q: Please.

K: At last. First of all what do we mean by change? What do we mean by bringing about a transformation, a mutation in our consciousness? That is what it means. What does it signify, what is the meaning of change, mutation? They are all the same words - transformation. What do we mean by that? May I proceed a little bit?

Is it change if you know what you are changing into? Do you understand my question? If one knows what you must become, is that change?

Q: No.

K: Go slowly sir. Think it out carefully. If one has an idea, a

concept, a conclusion, an end to which you conform, to which you change to, or from this to that, is that change? Or is it a continuation of the same thing but modified? You have understood my question? One may project what one should be, the projection of that is from one's own desire, from one's own belief, from one's own demands and you project that. And when you want to become that you are becoming what you are, perhaps slightly modified. Is that clear? So when we have an object, or an end in view, projected by our own experience, from our own knowledge, from our own belief and conclusions and opinions, such movement is not change at all. Let's talk that over before we take the next step.

If one says "I must change myself in order to be good" - that goodness is a concept, is an idea, or a series of conclusions to which you are conforming, or to which you think you are changing from this to that. We are asking: is that change at all?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: It is part, is it not sir, of a continuation of what has been? If one desires a new experience - I am taking that as an example - and strives after that experience, and when you do experience that thing after which you are striving, you must be able to recognize it, you must be able to say "This is the something which I am feeling, which I am experiencing," which means that you have already recognized it and therefore recognition means that you recognize again that which you have already experienced. I wonder if you see that. Right? Are we meeting each other there?

Q: It is easy - well I can understand it intellectually and then it is easy to deceive yourself that you are not doing that and go on wasting a lot of time.



K: I quite agree, sir. Therefore, do we see this fact, as a fact, not as an idea? That to change from this to that, that being a projection of this, then it is not change at all. It is like moving always in the direction of north, going further and further and further but in the same direction and therefore it is not change; but it is a change, a mutation when you are going north and you go diametrically opposite, south, or east, or west. You have moved from one direction, from one dimension to totally another direction, another dimension. That is a change. But if you keep on going in the same direction of course there is a modification, there is a change of scenery, change of experience, but it is in the same direction. Is that clear sirs? Can we go on from there?

Let's talk it over.

Q: I know what the mind does project.

K: Of course, of course.

Q: It says, OK, the change I want is to go south.

K: Of course. Therefore find out sir. Look one is going north and you realize going the same direction is no change at all. So you say then change means going quite the opposite, which is south. But if you keep on going south it will be the same thing.

Q: It is no change.

K: Just go slowly, slowly. Right? So one has discovered something very serious, which is to have no direction.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just go step by step sir. The first step is that one desires, one wants to change. That is a fairly intelligent demand if one is at all aware. Then one asks: what do we mean by change? Generally it implies from the known move in the direction of the unknown. I

am using different words. I don't know what the unknown is but I try to move towards it. But it is the same direction. So to discover change implies not having any movement towards any direction. Which doesn't mean you stay in the same place. I wonder if you get this?

Q: You don't stay in the same place but it seems like you have to stop or begin.

K: All right. If you stop - you have been going north - and if you stop, why do you stop? To go in another direction?

Q: Because going north is...

K: Listen. Find out sir. One stops going east and if you stop going in that direction what takes place, actually?

Q: You cast about for another direction.

K: Yes. That is right sir. You are looking for directions, whether it is south, south-east or south-south-west and so on - always moving in a direction. And we are saying such movement doesn't bring about a change at all. See how very complex this is first of all, and requires a little subtlety, which is: the mind has always moved in a lateral, horizontal or vertical, with all the degrees, variable degrees. Right? So it is now conditioned to move within that circumference, horizontal, linear, vertical, and the various degrees between linear, horizontal and vertical. That is what we are used to and that is what we call change, and that is what we call progress. Right? I wonder if you see this?

Q: Does the mind have to move to take care of the biological process?

K: We will come to that sir, we will come to that. First just see this, see the significance of this, the meaning of it, the inwardness

of it.

Q: Is this not our habitual thoughts, the outer and the inner?

K: I know. Of course that is what we said. This is our life, this is where we live. One is pushed in this direction by various influences, desires, purposes, and if that isn't suitable one is driven in another direction. And this constant movement from one degree to another degree is called progress, change and all kinds of things, acquiring knowledge, moving. Right? So we are asking if that is change at all? We are discussing change in the sense of a deep fundamental mutation, transformation, psychological revolution. That is what we are talking about. We must bear that in mind constantly.

Q: The trouble is the idea of not moving, not taking a direction and not standing still.

K: That is just it. Wait sir. Find out. See what is implied in it. You know sir this is a very serious question because - I mustn't go into this too deeply, too quickly - if this is clear that any directional movement is not change, is not mutation, the very word is something totally different. Is this clear? Can we go on from there? Sir, not verbally, for yourself.

Q: Sir, it doesn't seem clear because if we have no direction then don't we become rather apathetic?

K: No. Wait, wait. Listen to this. Isn't apathy going the same direction? See that sir. You asked a question: if you have no direction don't you just collapse, isn't there apathy, no activity. You see? Which means one is really apathetic when you are moving in the same direction. It is routine, mechanical. I have learnt a lesson, one has learnt a lesson and you keep on repeating it. One is a

Freudian, carry on; a Gestalt, or some other latest psychologist and you follow that line, it is much easier. But to say: look, let's find out if there is any possibility of movement - just listen to it - of movement in which there is no direction.

Q: Sir, would enlightenment have anything to do with what you are talking about? That if we are aware that we are already are a part of that which is, there is no direction.

K: There is a danger in that sir. That is what the Hindus have been for three thousand years, or five thousand - we are inwardly Brahman, God, the Highest Principle, and through various lives and experiences we are going to peel off our ignorance until we achieve that ultimate thing. That is a supposition, that is a belief, that is an idea. And also it is directive. Right? This is really rather difficult. You have chosen a very, very difficult subject.

Q: What is the nature of direction?

K: Physical direction is: go towards Ventura, or Santa Barbara or Los Angeles, take a road and go, because your house is there. There is a direction. And if you are educated, have degrees, that is a direction to get a particular job - professor, scientist, psychologist and so on and so on and so on. So please culturally we are conditioned to function in a direction, in a particular, or obscure, or meditative, cosmic direction. Right? You become a first-class engineer and for the rest of your life you pursue that. You are a brilliant physicist and there you are - Nobel prize and all the rest of it. You follow. And the religious groups have certain concepts, follow that. This is a very, very difficult subject you have chosen. If you want to go into it very deeply you have to apply your mind to this, not just romantic entertainment.

K: So we are asking: transformation implies, does it not, uprooting that which has been, not modifying that which has been.

Q: Are you implying that we cannot know change?

K: That's right. The moment you are aware that you have changed you are not changed. That's the beauty of it. If you see this.

Q: There is no pleasure, no fear.

K: Haven't you noticed the moment you say, "I am very happy" - have you not noticed this? Something has escaped from you.

Q: What we call change, what we call growth, dissipates the capacity for transformation.

K: Yes sir. There is biological growth. Right? From the child to adolescence, manhood and dying, the whole process. You see you have got something terribly difficult which you have entered into. Which is: there is biological process of evolution, the cultivation of the mind, the brain. And that perhaps, that idea that man grows from childhood to adolescence and so on, that may be our idea of change too. You follow? Being a child, growing into - psychologically you may have the same idea. And this biological growth and evolution and decay will also have psychologically the same thing. So we are saying: transformation implies non-movement as time and measure.

K: We are always measuring, aren't we? I have been, I shall be. Right? I don't know if you have gone into this. The whole western philosophy and psychology is based on measurement, both technologically - right - if you have no measurement you can't produce a man-of-war, or an aeroplane. You must have the rule, the measurement. Right? The whole of the western civilization is

based on that. Because thought is measurement. Right? Do you see that? Anything that moves from here to there is a measurement. Is this too difficult? Sir this is the real meaning of meditation, to go into it.

So the eastern world has also said in the ancient days, measurement is illusion. To discover the immeasurable there must be no measurement. Naturally. But they employed thought to achieve the immeasurable. You must control, you must meditate, you must sacrifice, you must behave, all the pattern laid down through measurement, which measurement is thought. Are you following all this?

Q: It seems to me sir that a sort of physical measurement is necessary...

K: Of course. Physical measurement is necessary; to build this chair you must have measurement.

Q: When I think I am religious I might quit measuring to build a chair.

K: Oh, no, no, no. The religious man may measure and build a chair. No, you are mixing up so much. That is why sir you are not thinking consecutively. That's the worst of it.

Q: What is the nature of time in its movement from the past to the present?

K: Look sir, we started out asking: what is change? As long as there is the more, which is measurement, the comparison which is measurement, I have been, I shall be - is a measurement. Right? So long as there is this faculty of the mind to move from this to that and to that and to that, which is a continuation of measurement, there cannot be change.

One wants to change because one sees that one is ignorant. You may have a great deal of knowledge of outward things, how to go to the moon and create a bomb and build a man-of-war, or become an excellent plumber, electrician or a physicist - one realizes that must be done. And also one says to oneself: how am I, how is one to change? And what does it mean to change? That is what we are concerned with. What does it mean to change? And we have always changed from this to that, from that to that. In the same direction. That is clear. Right sir? Whether the direction be north, south, east, west or south-south-east or southwest, it is always directional. Right? Now is that change? We think it is change. But is that basic change? Or that is not change, but to have a mind that has no directional movement at all, but has movement.

Sir, look, we expend our energy in a particular way, sexual, ambitious, competitive, greedy, engineering, success. Right? And we are saying all these have not changed man. Right? Would you agree? They have modified - they build better roads, better cars, better aeroplanes, better way to kill and so on and so on and so on. But psychologically, inwardly man has not changed. He has been afraid from the ancient of days until now. He has been violent from the ancient times until now. He has been envious, brutal from immemorial time. So man has not changed deeply. And one asks why? Right? Man being you and I, human beings - why? Is it because he has always considered movement must be directional, growth must be directional. It is biologically. You follow? You plant an acorn it will be an oak. It will take time. So why has not man, human beings, changed fundamentally? I am asking you why?

Q: Because we haven't wanted to.

K: Oh, you have plenty of energy. When you want something you get it, whether it is sex, money, position, anything you want, you have immense energy.

Q: Pardon me. She said, because we haven't wanted to. We haven't changed because we haven't wanted to.

K: If you wanted to, what will you do? It comes to the same thing, you see.

Q: You wouldn't know it if it did happen.

K: Sir look: if you wanted to changed what would you do? I am asking you. You would exercise will. You would say, "Well, I must achieve that" - which means you are already moving in a direction, which you have done for a thousand years.

Q: What we have said is that the only thing we know is that we don't change, what is not changing.

K: Madam, that is what I am asking you: why you, human beings, have not changed? You are not meeting the point. Find out sir, look, look. You may smoke, that has become a habit, nicotine and all the rest of it. And you know it is very harmful to your health, for your brain, for your heart but you still go on. And you don't say, now let me observe why I don't drop it. If you drop it because of your health, because of some other reason, you are not actually dropping it. Right? You may drop it but the motive is not to change radically, just drop the cigarette. You understand what I am trying to convey?

Q: Could you explain that a little better?

K: A little better. All right.

Why do you smoke? It must have tasted for the first time rather



unpleasant. Right? But people around you smoke, it tastes perhaps good - so the commercials say so. So first you smoke and it is unpleasant and then you get in the habit of it. Then doctors come along and say it is very bad for your health, for your lung, cancerous, for your brain, it does, etc., etc. All the doctors are saying this. And for what reason will you drop smoking? You are frightened and so you say, "By Jove, I will have pain therefore I mustn't smoke". But the desire to smoke may be stopped. But you have other desire. Do you follow it? Which has its own habits. So you are always moving - we come back to the same point - you are always dropping one thing and picking up another and this is the modern world. Go from one guru to another, one better guru than the other, or one religion better than the other, one sect is better than the other, and so on and on and on. Which is always from one centre to another centre. Right? Is this clear? Let's move sir.

So we are saying: any movement of thought projected in a particular direction, and achieving that end is not basic transformation of man.

Q: What you are saying is that we mustn't look for gratification.

K: Yes sir. No - you see you have reduced it to some little affair. Gratification. Why do you want to be gratified? Who is to gratify? You follow? Why?

So change implies non-movement of thought. You see. Because thought says, "I want that. I have had that and I have had sufficient, I must have that." And so it is constantly moving from this to this to this. And that is what we call change generally. And we are saying, no, that is not change at all. Change implies when thought has no object towards which it is moving. It has projected

enlightenment. Right? God - whatever it has projected and says it must be achieved, therefore I must sacrifice, I must do this, do that, but it is in the same direction.

Q: One can see that this is what one has done, moved in direction. One can see that movement in direction is all the same and yet...

K: Wait, wait. Is that so? Have you seen it verbally, intellectually or as truth?

Q: Apparently one has not because...

K: That is the point. Let's stick to that. Why? You say - may we talk to each other? You say I see verbally, intellectually clearly this thing.

Q: And I can also see factually that this is what I did do in the past. That is a fact.

K: Yes, that is a fact. And I say why don't you see it as a whole, with your whole being? Why prevents you?

Q: It seems that at the moment of movement there is no awareness of movement.

K: Yes, go on sir, explain a little more.

Q: At the moment that the movement in a direction is taking place there is no awareness that this is movement.

Q: You mean there is no awareness of direction when the direction is taking place.

K: I am not sure.

Q: There is no centre.

K: I am not at all sure what you are saying. I am not saying you are wrong, but I am not sure. Which is I want - one wants to be a congressman and, you know, you work for it. You know the

direction you want to go, you are aware of all the implications, all the mischief, etc., etc., you are going in that direction. You also want to be enlightened and you read books and you study what is implied and you say, to achieve to enlightenment I must do certain things - celibacy, poverty, etc., etc., etc. So you conform to that pattern, if you want that. And you know you are deliberately doing this.

Q: At the very moment of wanting it.

K: You may be unaware of it, because - you have understood his question? - at the moment of wanting enlightenment - I am taking that word, please that word has lost its meaning, every Tom, Dick and Harry of a guru talks about enlightenment, it has lost its vitality, its depth, its beauty. So we will use that word as it is used commonly, enlightenment. Now you seek enlightenment, one seeks enlightenment. What was the cause of the search? You may be conscious of it, or unconscious of it. Right? So before you move towards enlightenment obviously a sane man asks, "Why do I want it?" What is the reason? "Am I bored with life? Am I bored with my job? Am I bored with my wife, my girl friend?" and so on and so on. "And I have experienced so many things but this may be totally different kind of experience, so I would like that." So consciously or unconsciously there is a cognizance of this movement. You may not be actually aware of this whole structure of this movement but obviously, whether one is aware or unaware this movement takes place from being this to that. So, if I may point out, one cannot possibly say one is not aware of it.

Q: We are aware even though we may be unconsciously aware. You see my difficulty?

K: I understand sir. That means you are being driven in a particular direction without knowing it. See the danger. You are being coerced, pressurized, driven, brainwashed in a particular direction.

Q: It is like when we become angry, at the moment of anger you are not aware, it is only after you say, "I was angry".

K: Yes, that is right. But we are talking of something different from that. That is, sir, don't you know when you are greedy?

Q: Afterwards.

K: No, wait. See the reaction. You see something in the window and you want it. What has taken place? The seeing of that dress, that trouser, that coat, that car, that woman, that man, or whatever it is, seeing, the sensation, the contact and say, "I like that, that's exciting." - which is thought creates an image of you sitting in the car and driving. You follow? This whole movement is obviously either it is so quick or you observe as it is arising. That is seeing, contact, sensation, thought creating the image of you in the car and driving it - all that is so quick.

Q: One can see that.

K: Yes if you observe. If you are very aware of this movement, then you can see how it arises. And also you can see that the moment that thought comes in with the image the trouble begins.

Q: Further than that - there is nothing further than that.

K: Than?

Q: The seeing.

K: I am only saying the seeing, the contact, sensation, if that is all then it is very simple. But the moment thought takes over and creates the image then you want it.

Q: I understand that. You said before we may be unconsciously aware. Could you just describe...

K: Unconsciously aware in the sense one is not aware of the quickness of this movement. It takes over so quickly, in a second it is there. But if you slow down the process...

Q: Having the energy.

K: ...slow down the whole process, then you see like a cinema at the movie, the film, you can turn it very fast or very slowly, then you will see everything in action. That is all I am pointing out.

Q: In slowing down does the thing that moves become aware of its own movement?

K: Yes sir.

Q: How do you slow it down?

K: Sir, look, there is no 'how', because the moment you have a 'how' you have fallen into a system, you have fallen into a direction, you are lost. You have begun the same game again. But see, sir - look, I want to see something - one wants to see a picture of a painting. One goes to a museum and sees some painting and you want to see the whole of it so you look very, very carefully don't you? Every part of it, detail, different depths, different quality of colour and the movement of colour, you watch it slowly, you watch it and then you go further back and see the whole thing. There is no slowing down because you want to see the details. You understand? Therefore there is no effort made to slow down, you want to see it clearly, that is all.

So we are talking about change: why haven't you changed? What is the block, blockage, the impediment that prevents you from changing? That is the question we are asking, let's stick to it.

Is it fear?

Q: Partly the unknown.

K: Is it laziness? Is it the mind has so conformed to a pattern of living that it refuses, and says, "This is all right, why do you want to change it?" Because change might imply insecurity. Therefore you say, "Look, sorry I can't be insecure." Do you follow? There may be many, several reasons for not changing. And the reasons are fairly logical, fairly clear and so you say, "Please, what is wrong?"

Q: Does that mean that we don't actually see the danger of it? The danger that if we dared to change...

K: Sir, isn't it very dangerous, the way we are living? To the things of the earth, to the things of the air, to the things of the sea, isn't it dangerous the way we are living?

Q: Are we afraid of dissolving ourselves and losing ourselves?

K: Yes, sir. We are so selfish that we don't want to change. That is the basic reason. You see if you go into this very carefully a great many things are involved in this, extraordinary things if you go into it. Which is, first of all to live without any comparison. Right? Can you live without any comparison, both physically as well as psychologically? Find out what it means to compare. Which is, one is this, the example is perfect, I must become that. Or, compare oneself with something higher, both economically, socially, physically. Right? This comparison is measurement, isn't it? So stop measuring. Can you? Never to compare. See what happens to a mind...

Q: The 'never' is here. When you say 'never', the 'never', is here happening now.

K: Don't compare. Finish.

Q: No direction.

K: No, no direction, don't compare. I am taking that example. See what that means. What is implied, what a mind is that has no sense of comparison. We think through comparison is evolution, growth, progress, change. We say, on the contrary, comparison is merely a projection in the same direction. I am this, I must become that. Right? The example of nobility, greatness, spiritual and all the rest of that - to have no sense of comparison. Doesn't that bring a tremendous freedom?

Sir, look, in a school when you compare A with B what happens to A ? You destroy A , don't you? You are always telling him, "You must be more clever, you must be like B who is clever, who is bright and active, and you are lazy." Fight, compare, competition. So if you don't compare what takes place? You have never tried these things.

Q: The mind doesn't move in that direction anymore.

K: So what takes place?

Q: There is a change.

K: No, no. You are too quick. You don't investigate. You compare, don't you sirs? Don't you? No? You are all so silent. Obviously. Now if you don't compare, what takes place?

Q: Nothing.

Q: Confusion.

Q: We have to look at everything by itself.

K: Sirs, look, if you don't compare, that is a change, isn't it?

Q: There is space.

K: Don't compare. That is an absolute change, because your

minds have been comparing, comparing, comparing. And knowledge is comparison too; more knowledge, less knowledge - the professors with their immense knowledge, history, physicists, biology and so on, great knowledge. Knowledge is progressively comparative.

Q: We compare 'what is' with our knowledge.

K: Yes. But you compare one material with another material. Quite right, you should, one is poorer than the other. For the money you choose the better and so on. But we are talking psychologically, not to have this burden of comparison.

So when you don't compare you have stopped wasting your energy in a particular direction - haven't you? Right? You have that energy. So what takes place? So you have discovered that when you drop completely comparison you have this immense energy, quick, alive.

Q: If we don't take that energy and waste it.

K: Wait, wait Madam, you are too quick, you don't do the thing step by step. As we said, go slowly, you will discover things for yourself, which is important. Not what I have discovered and tell you, that is silly. But to discover all these things for oneself, first hand.

Q: The moment the idea of non-comparison comes in it sets up a whole new chain of comparison. The mind is comparing that which is suggested by you.

Q: He says we make an idea of non-comparison.

K: Of course, of course. Sir when you go to a museum and watch several pictures - Picasso, Michelangelo - I withdraw Picasso (Laughter) - Michelangelo and so on and so on. When you



are all the time comparing you never observe one completely. Because in comparison when you are comparing, somebody has told you this is a better painter than that and you want to accommodate yourself to the better, to the man who specializes in pictures he says, "This is the best picture" - so you are conditioned - you follow? By propaganda, by other people and so on and so on. So you never look at a picture completely, forgetting who has painted it. In the same way if you are always comparing you never look at yourself completely. Right? You understand sir?

Q: Are you saying that as long as there is comparison there is division?

K: No, not only division but there is never total observation of the thing which you are looking at.

So, let's proceed. What is blocking you, each one of us, from change? Radical change. Is it we are always dealing with parts - you understand sir? Or, taking the whole structure of our psychology and ending it, not bit by bit by bit, taking one part after another. Is that one of our difficulties?

Q: It seems that the self can take refuge anywhere and that as one moves step by step, dealing with an aspect here, an aspect there, the self will take refuge somewhere else.

K: Yes sir, so it will take the rest of our life.

Q: In fact it will never take place.

K: That's right.

Q. So how can we move to the centre.

K: I am going to show you, sir.

Q: Relationships are a...

K: In relationship, sir, what is your relationship with another?

Intimate or not intimate. Be actual. Put your teeth into it and find out. Is it sexual? Is it comfortable? Is it convenience? Is it that you are using another for your own benefit? Is it that it gives you satisfaction? Fulfillment? A sense of well being because being together and so on and so on? Which is, we are exploiting each other. Is that it? See, you are all too frightened to go into this.

Q: No.

Q: We are not afraid, sir.

K: Wait sir, I am going to show you something. That is only part, isn't it? Just look. Observe the part and go through the part completely to the end and then you will cover the whole. Look I will go into it. Take relationship, go into it thoroughly.

One is related to another through attraction, sex, convenience, comfort, encouragement, escape from loneliness. So all these and other reasons make you attached to a person, or to a thing. That is, you have a great longing because you feel lonely, desperately depressed by yourself. And you do not know how to solve that, so you accept another to escape from this. Right? That is, you are the centre always from which you are moving. Right? That is clear, isn't it? Are we meeting? That is, you have an image of your own loneliness, your own anxiety, your own sense of importance, your own impediments, your own inhibitions and so on and so on and so on. And you do not know how to solve this inside you, so you either go off to somebody to solve it - psychologists and so on and so on - or you get attached to somebody to escape from this.

Now we are saying, go through the part - this is only a part, relationship - go through a part completely to the very end, that means not theoretically, not verbally but actually end your

attachment, completely. You follow? Completely end it. Face wholly your loneliness. That may be why you got into sexual habits and to escape from the loneliness that becomes the pattern, mechanical. So face this extraordinary sense of loneliness.

Q: I think most people encourage it.

K: Yes, sir.

Q: You say go slow.

K: I am doing it. I have taken one part, relationship - right? I am going through that part. I am related, is it because I am lonely, I am frightened to be, I want comfort, I want somebody to help me. You follow? Psychologically, all this. I need a postman, I need a plumber - that is not what we are talking about.

So through the part I can go step by step and drop it as I go along, not just theoretically, play with it and carry on. Drop it, seeing I am lonely. I am going to understand what this thing is, to be lonely. Why am I lonely? Is it all my activities are self-centred? My seeking god, my seeking a position, power, my seeking clairvoyance, my desire to heal others. You understand? Is this all a means of avoiding actually what I am? Which is my extraordinary sense of idiocy - I am taking that. My vanity. So if you can drop those things actually, then what? Then I have discovered a state in which there is no direction at all. There is only dropping away of everything that I have held. You understand what I am talking about? Can you do this?

One holds furniture, a piece of furniture and you identify with that piece of furniture and you are that furniture. I was told by a lawyer once, a man and a woman were seeking a divorce and they had been wrangling about this and that, this property, that property

- you know - they go through all that mess - and they had settled most things and the last day the woman said, "I must have that" - it was an ashtray! And they fought over it and the woman wanting it and the man wanting the ashtray. It was an ashtray - you understand - nothing important. So the lawyer took the ashtray and broke it. You understand all this?

Q: How petty.

K: We are petty sir. So we are saying, change implies a state of mind that is not moving from a centre to another centre. Right? Can you do it? That is a centre which is lonely and moving to a centre which is not lonely. Right? Do you understand this? The centre is lonely and to move to a centre which is not lonely is still the movement of loneliness. Just see that. See the truth of it. If you see that then you enquire why this loneliness. Is it that my actions are self-centred which are isolating me all the time? You understand sir? Do you follow all this? I am ambitious, I am greedy, I am this, I want that, I must have this - all that. In the world outwardly and inwardly. So the essence of loneliness is this movement of isolation. Right? So is there an action which is not self-centred? Right?

Q: Are you asking that now?

K: Yes sir.

Q: One of the things that slows us down is our need for security, is it not that that slows us down.

K: Now wait a minute sir, this is an important question again. You must have physical security, obviously, clothes, food, shelter. But security we mean not only that but inwardly we want security. And we never question whether inwardly there is security at all.

Inwardly one has found security in a belief. Right? In god, in some fanciful idea. Is that security? You may find security in your wife, in your girl friend, husband, boy, is that security? And when you have security in a person see how dangerous it is. If you have sought security in that woman, or in that man, then you become attached, jealous, angry, you follow? The whole agony begins. Don't you know all this?

Q: If there is no security then there is no need for security.

K; That's right sir. When you see psychologically there is no security, the very seeing is intelligence. Right? Obviously. In that intelligence there is tremendous security.

Q: Sir, you asked if there is an action that is not self-centred. Could we return to that question? The only action I know that is not self-centred, is surrender.

K: Now, just a minute sir. The only action which is not self-centred is to surrender. Surrender to what?

Q: To everything.

K: Wait sir, look carefully. Go into it slowly sir. The Christian world has said, surrender to God. See the danger. Which is, surrender to the idea of God, surrender to what people have said about God, Christ - you follow? - surrender. So I am asking: to whom are you surrendering?

Q: The higher being within you.

K: The higher being - you see, that is you have created the higher being.

Q: What about to 'what is'?

K: I am concerned at 'what is' - it is there. You don't surrender to the sunshine. Marvellous. You see we use words that are so

meaningless when you examine it.

Q: Perhaps we should discuss this in terms of psychological pressure.

K: Are we, in discussing the psychological pressures, are we having a dialogue about why human beings don't change? Sir, all right, take that one fact of pressure. Are you being pressurized by the speaker here?

Q: No.

K: Go carefully sir. Are you being pressurized? Are you under pressure by the government, by institutions, by your education, by your priests, by your gods, by your beliefs? By the newspapers? So can you be free of pressure?

Q: You will be pressurized by external circumstances, they won't go away.

K: No, wait. Yes maybe you may have pressure because you are in a crowded city, underground tube or whatever it is called. So physically, but psychologically. Come sir, can you be free of pressure? From your wife, from your husband, from your girl, from your own urges? After all your own desire is a tremendous pressure.

Q: Yes. You can be freed of that pressure psychologically.

K: Are you saying you are free from psychological pressures?

Q: No, that is why I am here.

K: Therefore what will you do when you realize - please just take that - when you realize that you are under pressure by your wife or girl friend? Will you stop that pressure? Your own sexual demands, your own loneliness and say, "Well, I can't".

K: You see sir, we never - if I may point out sir, I hope you

don't mind - if I may point out we never look at a thing, at ourselves without saying "I am...", just to look. You follow? I am attached. All right. Let me look at it. Let me find out what it means. You say, "No, I mustn't be attached, I mustn't". You understand. We are always moving away from that thing.

Q: But when I look I don't see anything. There is nothing there.

K: Find out, is that so?

You see sir. Mutation implies non-movement of the activities of the self. Which means all measurement as comparison, measurement of the more, you understand, the more, the less, the desire to fulfil, all that is movement in measurement. So a mind that has no measurement of any kind, that doesn't say I am ignorant, I am going to be enlightened. Find out sir, slow down the whole mechanism of thinking, and observe.

Q: One would easily end up with pressure.

K: Observe. Observe.

Q: Which means that all our activity ceases.

K: Oh no. Then activity may begin. Our activity is completely destructive when it is self-centred - obviously. Look what is happening all over the world.

Q: At the moment of observation, doesn't the activity of the mind...

K: Activity, sir that again is very difficult - we must first find out what action is. What is action? Do we act from a centre? From a belief? From a concept? From a principle? From an ideal? Which is always a centre. Right? Do we act from that? And the nobler the principle - which is still the centre - we think that is extraordinary. So there is action without the centre.

You see sir, let me put it differently, if you don't mind listening. We consider all self-centred action positive. Right? Achievement is a positive thing. We create a dynamo which is very positive. And to be psychologically active and act from a centre, to be a businessman, to be this or that, is very active, positive action, which has resulted in chaos in the world. Right? In misery, confusion. So there is an action which is non-positive. I wonder if you see this.

Q: Is observation part of this?

K: Pure observation without any movement is action. Observation is action. If one observes very clearly attachment, watch it, not do positive action about it, through negation, negation is the most positive, not the other.

Q: When one is observing, totally observing the action, is that the end of all that activity?

K: Yes. So: have you changed? At the end of an hour, is it?

Q: One o'clock.

K: After an hour and a half have you caught the truth that change is non-movement in any direction? Right sirs. Even intellectually grasped it. That means, change implies absolute observing 'what is'. You understand? Observing one's greed, one's loneliness, despair, depression, watching it without any desire to change this or that, just watch it. Sirs, you are watching this shade. You can't change the shade. You can't change that shadow. But we want to change the shadow which is ourselves. Just to watch it, and the very watching of it is the ending of it.



## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST APRIL 1979

In India instead of having a loudspeaker we just wear garlands!  
May we continue with what we were talking about last weekend? I hope some of you who were here will tolerate certain repetition, a resume of what we were talking over together. And I hope seriously, most earnestly, that some of you are really serious and do not make these meetings into a kind of entertainment, a picnic place, an intellectual amusement.

We were saying the last two weekends that we must have a different kind of society, a totally different religion - if I may use that word `religion' which is for a great many people an anathema - a totally different kind of religion and a society that is essentially good. The word `good' is rather shy-making, and an old fashioned word, but as we explained very carefully during the last four talks and discussions, good, or goodness, is absolutely essential to create a new society. Goodness in the sense that we live together in a world which is ours, this earth is ours, not the American, or the Russian, or the Indian, or the European, it is ours, to be lived in, happily, without violence, without the contradictions of various beliefs, dogmas, rituals, gods, without the national economic divisions, and a good man, a human being can only create a good society. A good society is not born out of theories, either the Marxist or Mao or some other theories; it comes into being only when human beings are essentially good, orderly, peaceful, honest in themselves. It is only then you can have an extraordinary just society. A good man needs no - goodness needs no justice because justice is good. It is only the dishonest people, the criminals, the

terrorists that need laws, controls. So we were talking about that.

And this morning we must go into, as we have done in previous talks, fear, pleasure, and other things. So this morning if you will we will go together into the question of what is order, not only outside, external to us, but also what is order inwardly. And also we must go into the question of what is love and we must enquire together into the whole structure and nature of death. And when we are investigating together we must have one mind. Our minds must be together, that is, one must have certain quality of seriousness, willing to listen to another, not projecting one's own opinions, judgements and prejudices, one must be willing to listen so that we can both together investigate these enormous problems of our daily life. And perhaps if there is time we can go also into the question of what is meditation.

So first can we have during this hour, perhaps more than an hour, one mind, a mind that thinks together, that enquires together, that explores and sees the same thing together, not you see something different and the speaker sees something different, but together see what is actually going on, what is happening and whether it can be transformed, whether it can be brought about, a radical psychological revolution. So it must be, if one may point out and ask if we can, whether it is possible to have one mind, because when you have one mind thinking together we can go very, very far. But if there are different opinions, judgements and distractions then our minds don't meet. What we are trying - what we are actually doing is that we investigate together, not I investigate and you listen, but you and the speaker together investigate into this problem of order, disorder and the whole

complex problem of love and the full significance of the meaning of the word 'death'. And if there is time we can also go into the question of what is meditation. Perhaps we can deal with that tomorrow. So please bear in mind, if you will, that we are investigating, therefore we have one mind so that we both of us seriously, precisely, very, very carefully investigate, explore what is order.

In a world that is so utterly disorderly - we mean by that word 'disorder' contradiction, dishonesty, lies, each one pursuing his own pleasure, his own fulfilment, ambition, seeking success for himself, or for his family, or for his nation, or for his particular psychological belief, or as many are doing now, the psychologists and so on, the therapists, they learn from a particular - they follow a particular line and accept it, and for the rest of their life they follow it because their whole investment is involved in it, including cars and swimming pools and all the rest of it. So each one, as you will observe, is pursuing his own particular limited demands, desires and that is creating chaos in the world, whether it is a religious pursuit or the pursuit of a particular guru with all his absurdities, with his traditions, with his disciplines. So there is this vast splitting up of our human endeavour to bring about a world in which we can all live in order, without violence, without this terrible sense of insecurity and danger. So can we together have one mind, not that you agree with the speaker because when you investigate there is no agreement; it's only when you are investigating, exploring, your personal desires, your personal activities, all those are affected then you stop investigating. Then we break away. But if we are both interested, as we must be, living

in this insane world, it is quite insane, we must be able to think together, have one mind to find out if we can live in this world with great order, peaceful, without any sense of violence. So that's what we are going to do together.

The speaker is not investigating but you and the speaker together are walking the same path, the same road, you are not going south and the speaker is not going north, we are both of us going together, we must both observe the same thing together. Do you understand this? So please, if you are at all serious and are concerned with the world and one's own life, please give some serious attention to what is being said.

What is order? It is very important to find this out. The army with their extraordinary discipline has certain order. The priests, the monks, the so-called religious sects with their discipline, if you are practising those, brings about a certain order within their group. And every activity demands its own discipline: if you are a plumber it has its own discipline, if you are a scientist it has its own discipline, if you are an artist it has its own, and so on and so on. And the word `discipline' means to learn, not to conform, not to conform to a pattern set by society, or set by yourself, or set by the pope, or by some religious group or some other person. The word `discipline' means the disciple who learns, who does not merely follow, imitate, conform. But that word `discipline' has become rather an ugly word, specially in this country where you have no sense of discipline, you want to do whatever each one wants to do, from the age of five until you are ready to die.

So order according to various groups and types and characteristics has its own meaning. To find out what is true order,

actually in one's life, we must find out not what is order, but what is disorder. Because if one understands the nature of disorder really, from that comprehension, from that insight, from the total holistic view of disorder, then from that arises order. You understand? It is not that one seeks order, then you follow a blue print, then you look to somebody else to tell you what you should do - that is again what is happening in this country, also in the rest of the world, the priests, the scholars, the psychologists, the psychotherapists, all of them tell you what to do. Instinctively you say, 'They know better than I do' and you follow and thereby bring about what you consider order. Whereas that acceptance of authority, acceptance of a certain type of psychology and so on and so on, is bringing about disorder. The very following of another is disorder. Whereas if we can enquire together seriously, find out what is the nature and the structure of disorder, not in the world but in us, because we have created the world, we have created society, there is no such thing as the society independent of us, we are responsible for it, we have created it - 'we' in the sense all human beings with their many, many ancestors and so on, generation after generation, we have created this society. And in this society, if one observes very carefully, there is not only immorality in the sense of doing exactly what each one wants to do; most people are pursuing pleasure, hooked on pleasure.

So we must enquire into what is disorder. From the negating of disorder you come to the positive which is order, not the other way round. Is that clear? Am I making this clear? That is, we want rules and regulations, a set pattern, or we rebel against that set pattern and create our own pattern. And if everyone creates his own

pattern, his own way of living naturally there must be disorder, each person must be in opposition to another. So what is disorder? Do you understand? Please understand this. From investigating the nature of disorder, not only verbally, intellectually, but deeply, actually in one's life from enquiring into disorder and bringing about an understanding and therefore from disorder order, then that order is living. I hope you understand this. It is dynamic, it is actual in one's life.

So what is disorder? You are following all this I hope. What is disorder in one's life? May one ask, is your life in perfect order? If you are asked that question seriously by a good friend of yours, what would you answer if you were at all thoughtful, if you are not all concerned with this mad world, what would your answer be? If you were honest one would say, our own lives are in disorder: disorder being contradiction, say one thing and do another, think one thing and conceal what you think in order to conform, imitate, compare, all this brings about disorder, obviously. The very nature of desire is disorder. Are we all following this? We went into the question of what is desire. It is important to come back to that because desire may be the cause of this disorder, which doesn't mean we must suppress desire, we must understand the nature of it, how it is built up, what is its movement. The word 'structure' means movement. So we must understand the nature of desire then we may find in the very root of desire there may be disorder.

So we must again go into that question: what is desire which drives most of us, which is canalized in some form of fulfilment, which is our very nature, drive, the desire - what is desire? We said during the last talks that desire comes into being when there is

perception, the seeing, contact, sensation. Right? Then thought comes into that field, into that movement of sensation, with its image, and then begins the urge of desire. I'll show it to you. You see a beautiful car, or a beautiful woman or a man, or a beautiful house, with a lovely shady garden full of perfume, a sense of great beauty and peace. You see it: the seeing, visual, optical, then the very smelling, the very touching, creates the sensation - I hope you are following all this - then thought says, I wish I was living in that house and thought then creates the image of you living in that house and enjoying yourself, having parties, whatever you have, good meals, good dishes, lovely furniture, beautiful curtains, the whole movement of thought enters into the field of sensation, then desire is born from that. You understand? That is, seeing a beautiful lovely architecture, beautifully built, good space and proportion, and lovely garden. The perception, the contact, the sensation. Then thought comes in creating the image, you in the house, and then desire to have that house. You have understood this? This is very simple. We must understand this because the monks throughout the world have denied desire, they have suppressed it, desire for a woman, desire for man, they say if you come to serve god you must give all your energy to god - and you know all the things they have said, rather absurd, unrealistic, because when you do accept that then you burn with your desires inside. Outwardly you may be very peaceful, quiet, but inside you are boiling. The speaker knows many monks throughout the world and they have talked.

So it is very important to find out whether desire is not the root of this disorder, which doesn't mean that one suppresses desire, but

if one understands the relationship between sensation and the activity of thought capturing that sensation then one can have the sensation but not let thought create the desire. I wonder if you follow this? One can see the house, well kept, clean, very dignified proportioned house. The seeing-please listen - the seeing, contact, sensation, and not let thought come into it. One can see a beautiful garden, that's the end of it; but the moment thought comes in and says, I must have it, then desire begins. If one sees the truth of that, the inward nature of that, then perhaps that is the beginning of order. Are we following each other? You may not be able to do this because we never observe very carefully, slowly, precisely the movement of this whole structure of desire. You see it and you want it instantly, there is no interval between the seeing, contact, sensation, an interval between thought. You follow? So that in the holistic observation then desire has its minute place. You understand? One needs food and clothes and shelter, that is essential. Right? You are following all this? But we are saying when the contradictory desires - desire for pleasure, desire for your particular experience, desire for god, desire for various gods, and various beliefs and so on, that is the very nature of contradiction. Are you following? That is, if we both of us have one mind, if we both of us see the actual fact that we are driven by desire, each one of us, whether the desire for pleasure, desire for success, desire for various forms of fulfilment, which are all born out of desire, then if you see actually how desire comes into being then you are concerned then with the movement of thought. You understand this? Are we following this together? Yes, or no?

Then we are saying that thought also may be one of the factors



that contributes to disorder. We are saying something so totally contradictory to everything you have heard, so please give your mind to this. We are saying, thought, the whole thinking process, may be the cause of disorder. I am going to go into it. We pointed out how desire may be one of the factors of disorder because contradictory desires in our life, opposing desires, one desire fighting another desire, struggling, you know all that, and also we are saying thought may be in itself the cause of great disorder. We are going to go into it, don't accept what the speaker is saying, we are investigating together. That is we have one mind to investigate, not saying, you are wrong, you are right, but together we are having one mind, investigating, looking into this nature and the structure of thinking.

Thought arises only out of memory. If you had no memory there is no thought. Memory is the residue of experience which has knowledge. Right? Knowledge, accumulated knowledge of the plumber, the accumulated knowledge of the scientist, the accumulated knowledge of the various forms of disciplines and scholars, and also one's own accumulated knowledge of various experiences, so we are the result of the collective experience, knowledge and added to that our own particular knowledge. So knowledge is that which has been accumulated through various skills, through various disciplines, through various studies and so on and so on. So this knowledge is stored up in the brain, obviously. And with that knowledge we act, we think, we operate. So all our activities, all our architecture, everything that we have done is based on thought. Right? Please this is very important because we are going to enquire after we have done this, what is

the nature of love. Please together find out, give some time and your energy and your earnestness to go into this because it affects one's life seriously if you go into it, and therefore it may bring an extraordinary sense of order, and therefore where there is order there is freedom, where there is order there is peace. It is only the disordered man that has no peace. The man who is neurotic, who thinks this, or who is selfish, utterly concerned with himself, he is not living in order.

So we are saying that one of the factors of this disorder may be desire, and the other factor may be the very movement of thought because thought, as we pointed out, is born out of knowledge. The primitive man has knowledge, it may be very, very limited, and the most sophisticated person has also a great deal of knowledge and his memory is still born out of knowledge, whether a little knowledge or great knowledge it is still born out of knowledge therefore out of the past. Please follow this. Out of the past, therefore thought is limited, therefore its actions are limited. It may imagine that its actions are complete, whole, but it is actually limited because it is based on knowledge, and knowledge is never complete, whole. Of course not, you see that, right? Therefore all our activities which are based on thought and therefore limited, incomplete, partial, must create disorder. You understand? Must inevitably. I must be quiet, I am putting too much energy into all this.

So if you see the truth of this then one comes to ask: what place has thought? If thought is limited and therefore creates disorder, anything that is limited must create disorder. Right? If I am a limited Hindu, with my beliefs, with my dogmas, with my little

rituals, with my little gods, I must create disorder round me. But I may have a great deal of knowledge about architecture and the way to build but that knowledge is not limited. You understand, I use it to build. But when I use psychological knowledge - I don't know if you are following all this - then it is inevitably limited. You understand this? I wonder if you do. I am afraid you don't.

Let's go into it. An excellent architect has a great deal of knowledge, he has acquired it, he has built many houses, cathedrals, halls and so on, that knowledge has been accumulated, he has read, he has worked at it, he has had experiences of various types of houses, halls, and so on. So with that knowledge he builds houses, there knowledge is necessary, obviously. But psychological knowledge, you follow, the knowledge that I want this, that I have experienced this, I believe this, this is my opinion, all that, the psychological residue of one's experiences, and the experiences of mankind stored up in the brain, from that there is thought and that thought is always ever limited, and any action born from that must inevitably be limited and therefore not harmonious, contradictory, divisive, conflicting and so on. Right?

So thought itself may be the root of disorder, psychologically. You understand the beauty of it, the fun of it, and also the logic of it, if you are willing? So then one asks: has thought any place in relationship? You understand? Relationship being intimacy with another, or superficial, be in contact with another physically, emotionally, intellectually. Right? Is our relationship with each other based on thought? We are asking this question, we are together exploring this, with the same mind to find out. If our relationship is based on thought, which is on remembrance, then

our relationship must be limited. Obviously. Therefore in that limitation there is contradiction, you and I, me and you, my opinion, my ambition, you are not treating me - you follow - my sexual demands, and you opposing and so on. So we are asking - please, this is serious because we are going to enquire, what is the nature of love. You understand? Because if you don't understand this basic thing, which is, desire, thought, then order - the very essence of love is order. We will go into it in a minute. Why am I putting so much energy into all this?

So if thought being limited creates disorder, as desire does, then what place has thought in our relationship, not in walking, talking, driving a car, building a house, earning money, shelter, clothes, but in our relationship, man, woman, what place has thought? Please enquire, go into with me, together, don't wait for me to tell you. If thought is the ruling factor in our relationship then thought being limited, our relationship must be very, very limited and therefore contradictory, opposing, destructive. So is our relationship based on thought, on remembrance? Of course it is, if you are honest. So then one asks: is love merely a remembrance? A sexual remembrance? Is love the remembrance of a pleasure? For god's sake please pay attention to all this, it's your life. When here, in this country, one uses the word `love' it is so meaningless.

So I am asking - we are asking together because we are having the same mind to find out, because this may bring about order in our lives, then one may be able to live with an extraordinary sense of happiness - happiness is not pleasure, it is order, therefore with order comes freedom, and with order, freedom there is responsibility. So we are asking: is love a remembrance, is love

desire, is love pleasure? Is love attachment? Please, sir, ask. And if it is a remembrance in which there is attachment, then there is anxiety, conflict, jealousy, anger, hatred. Right? And all this you call love. Right?

So love may be - the word `love', the word isn't the actual; the word `tree' is not the tree. You understand? So the word `love' is not the actual reality of it, which is, a relationship which is not based on remembrance. Is that possible? You may have a relationship with another, apparently in this country, for a couple of years, or three years, and drop it and have another relationship. You know, this extraordinary change of wives and husbands, or girls and boys. So I am asking, we are asking together: is love merely a fulfilment of desire? You understand? Desire we explained very carefully. Is love the pursuit of pleasure? Which is what you all want. And if it is based on remembrance then there is a contradiction, it is limited, therefore it is disastrous in our relationship and therefore we will create a society which is utterly destructive. You see, sir. So we are saying love is not desire, love is not the pursuit of pleasure, love is not a remembrance, it is something entirely, totally different. That sense of love, which is one of the factors of compassion, comes only when you begin to understand the whole movement of desire, the whole movement of thought. Then out of that depth of understanding, feeling, a totally different thing called love comes into being. It may not be the thing which we call love, it is totally a different dimension.

What time is it, sirs?

Q: Twenty five minutes after twelve.

K: We have talked for one hour. I am sorry, there is so much to

talk about. You are not tired?

We were also talking the other day of the nature of suffering, grief, pain. What is the relationship of love to sorrow? You understand? How can a man who is suffering for himself, for his wife, for his family, psychologically suffering, going through agony, how can he have love? It's only when sorrow ends there can be the beginning of love. You don't understand all this. And we went into the question of sorrow, we won't go into it now because we want to deal with something else, which is death. You understand, this morning we were talking about desire, order and disorder, disorder may be - is one of the factors of desire, and thought, and what we call love. You understand? What we generally, commonly, use that word love. So these three factors may be the cause of our deep disorder. In the understanding of that, seeing the truth of this, then out of that comes love and compassion. And that compassion can only come into being when there is no sorrow.

Then we must go into the question of what is death. Are you all tired? What is death? I wonder why we human beings are so interested in death. You understand? Or are you not interested in death? Only old people are interested in death? And one must go into this very carefully, not only to find out whether human beings can be free from the fear of death, but what is implied deeply in ending, which is death, ending. Right? Have you ever ended anything, without motive, without coercion, without pressure, without giving up something in order to have something else? You understand? Ending. Have you ever ended a particular form of pleasure without any motive, without any suggestion, demands?

Just take for instance, attachment - attachment to a friend, to a family, to an idea, to a belief, to something or other. Can you end attachment completely? That is what death is, part of it. Right? Do you understand all this? Are you following? Can you end it without arguing? You can't argue with death? Doctors may prolong your life, I don't know why but they want to prolong it, they want to help you to live longer. You have never asked, what for. So we must first find out, not what is death, but what is before death. Right? You understand? What is before, not after, or during, because what is before is more important than what is after. Right? I wonder if you see? Can we go on with this together?

So what is your life? Actually? If you look into it very carefully, if you have ever done, what is your life? Not the American way of life, but your daily life of a human being living in this part of the world, what is that life? Is it not one of travail, labour, struggle, conflict, anxiety, fear, guilt, holding on to your own little experience, to your own little knowledge, and exploiting that knowledge for your own selfishness? The sense of frustration, unhappiness, great sense of guilt, anxiety, and so on, isn't that your daily life? To escape from that you go to analysts, psychologists, therapists, or gurus, or take drugs and whisky, you know, escape, escape from this. Or you have a little experience and go round preaching. You become a little guru. You might well say, 'That's what you are doing' - you must have a sense of humour, that is, one must have the capacity to laugh at oneself occasionally, or very often! So when one observes what actually is going on with one's life, look at it, how full of shadows, light and misery, confusion, uncertainty, tears, you know this, and what is it that we are ending?

You understand?

And there are those who say, 'This is merely a peripheral existence, deep down in oneself there is divinity, there is the essence of all mankind which is far beyond this petty consciousness.' I do not know if you know all these various explanations, which I am not going to go into. So we are asking, is this what we are afraid of ending? You understand my question, sirs? And if one doesn't end this - please follow this carefully, slowly, I am going into the whole thing very carefully - if one doesn't end all this pettiness, shallowness, meaningless life both outwardly and inwardly, if one doesn't understand it, resolve all the things one is caught up in psychologically, then what is death? You follow? Sir, this is a complex problem let me go into it a little bit carefully.

As we pointed out earlier in these talks, you as a human being psychologically are similar to other human beings. Right? Psychologically, because every human being goes through this sorrow, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair, depression, guilt, violence, whether they live in the most extreme Orient and as you come to the extreme West every human being has this burning inside them, so we are similar. There is this vast movement of energy. Right? Which is like a vast stream, river. And either you contribute to that energy, to that stream, which is, you contribute if you don't end your attachments, your fears, your anxieties, guilt, violence, end it, if you don't end it you are contributing to this vast stream of energy. Right? That's clear. Obviously. But if you are not ending you are contributing to it, so this vast energy of the stream goes on, the river. See the logic of it. Please apply your mind to it.



We are not talking of beliefs, comforts, we are not doing anything of that kind, we are observing very closely, we are not offering comforts because that leads to illusion, that's meaningless. Every religion has given comfort to human minds and therefore they have not penetrated deeply into this problem.

So there is this collective human river of confusion and sorrow. And when you have not ended it, your own sorrow and all the rest of it, you are part of that stream. When there is an ending of all that, the consciousness that we know of as it is - you are following this - the consciousness is its content. Right? Are you following this? One's consciousness is your anxiety, your grumbling, your guilt, your - all this is you, your consciousness. The content of that consciousness makes it; without this content the consciousness as we know it is totally different. You understand? Not being able to empty our consciousness of its content we then begin to invent a super consciousness, higher consciousness, subliminal consciousness and so on and so on. It is still the movement of thought. So we are saying that as long as human beings don't end their confusion, and go into it and resolve it and end it, that is, if you are attached to your pain, anxiety and so on, the fear of losing and so on, psychologically, if you don't end it you contribute to that stream. And when you do die - not you, please - when one dies that's the ending of not only your organism and the brain with all its content, the stream goes on because you are part of that stream. You are following all this? You are part of that stream, therefore that stream manifests itself in the baby, in the man, in the adolescent with varieties of names and characteristics - you are following all this? I wonder if you are. Careful, please. You must

apply your mind to this. So that stream is enduring, and in that stream there is manifestation. When you have a baby that's manifestation. And in that baby as it grows older all the human collected misery, confusion, begins. Obviously, you can see it in each one, through education, conformity, society, all that. So we are asking, can you, as a human being, be aware of the stream, of which you are, and not contribute one iota to that stream? You understand the question? If you contribute you are part of it, if you don't contribute, not one single movement of-you follow - your problems, sorrows, anxieties, loneliness, none of that, that means you are out of that stream. Then death is merely the ending of the varieties and the peripheral activities. You understand all this?

So can a mind, realizing all this, seeing the depth of this, seeing the implications of death, the ending, and while living, which is the period of time from adolescent, from baby to adulthood, during that given life end every day as the problem arises. You follow? Psychologically end everything every day. Because it is very important. As we grow older our brains get worn out. Obviously, you can see it. Right? Haven't you noticed in yourself as you get older your capacity to think clearly, to be aware, to attend, the sharpness has gone. So one of the problems, if you go into it, is, is it possible to keep the brain young? You understand? Not get old, worn out. Are you following all this? Ask yourself: is it possible for a brain not to get damaged, first - through drink, alcohol, you know, smoking, you know all that is going on with your lives, not to have friction, because that's wears it out. To resolve a psychological problem immediately, not to let it go over to the next day. You are following all this? So that this constant movement of

a psychological problem, or even mathematical or any other problem, this constant usage wears the brain out. We won't go into the question of what the brain is, because it is very interesting. I am not a great specialist or I am not a brain specialist, I have talked with them, enquired a great deal into myself and also talked to others who are specialists. So we are asking, can the brain from the moment it is born until it dies be totally fresh, young, undamaged, unhurt? And it is possible only when every issue is resolved instantly. You understand this? Every issue: your sexual problems, your anxiety, your guilt, your inhibitions, your this and that, end it, not go to a specialist to make you end it, they don't end it because they themselves are blind. Right? It is like a confused person helping others to be unconfused. It's a lovely game you are all playing! So we are saying something, which is, death and living are very close, they are not fifty years ahead, but together. You understand? Live with death, that is the ending of everything that you hold psychologically dear, or every problem that you have, psychologically. Then you will see your brain and your mind - no, sorry - your mind has a totally different quality, there is a totally different dimension, which is the dimension of truth, it is not your personal truth, but it is absolute truth. Which we will go into when we talk about meditation. I think that's enough, don't you.

## OJAI 6TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND APRIL 1979

This is the last talk.

We have been talking over together during the last five gatherings here, apart from the discussions, whether it is at all possible to bring about a good society. That has been our chief concern in our talks, whether the human mind which is very old, which is so heavily conditioned, whether it is possible for it to radically undergo a transformation, a change, a mutation. Because the society in which we live is so frighteningly destructive, it is becoming degenerate, if one is at all mature one wonders if one is at all serious, and one must be serious under the present psychological crisis, whether it is possible to be a totally good human being. Because a good human being creates a good society; society isn't created by itself, it comes into being through the activities of the human mind. And we have been talking over together during the last three weekends - and this is the last one - about many things which affect our daily life: fear, pleasure, and anxiety, loneliness and a sense of great depression, sorrow, which we all know. And yesterday morning we talked about order, love, compassion, and the very complex problem of death. And we said this morning that we would go into the question of what is truth, if there is anything that is absolute truth, and what is the nature and the movement of meditation.

We are apt to think that meditation is something apart from our daily life - give twenty minutes during the day to sit quietly, or whatever one does, and the rest of the day do all the mischief you can. But meditation, I think, is something entirely different which

we shall go into presently. But one cannot fully comprehend the deep significance of meditation unless one has within oneself complete absolute order, in our relationship, in our activity. We went yesterday morning into the question of what is order, and what bring about disorder. When there is the ending of disorder then there is naturally the flowering of order. We said that there are two major causes of disorder: desire, which we went into very carefully not only yesterday morning but the previous mornings, and also the very structure, the nature of thought, we also went into that. And without this order, which has its quality in its expansiveness, it is not an order within a certain area, order throughout our whole life in all our activities. And order is not only personal, but also it becomes social, and out of that order comes goodness. Therefore such human beings who are capable, aware of the present world misery, confusion, uncertainty, insecurity, such serious human beings must inevitably enquire into this order which must not be merely relative, circumstantial, environmental, but absolute order. There is such a thing as absolute order, like the universe. There is order. And if our consciousness is in disorder, which it is at present, however much one may investigate the order of the universe we have very little relationship with that universe. Are you following all this?

If I may again point out that we are thinking together, that one is not listening merely to a speaker, but together with the speaker we are exploring into the nature of order, which we did yesterday morning, and the futility of enquiring into the universal order, cosmic order, it merely becomes theoretical, telescopic and not actual. But if one has this absolute order in one's life then one has a

relationship with the cosmic order. One can see that logically. But most of us, though we may intellectually comprehend the meaning of the word, the clarity of the statement, but to bring about such order in our lives seems almost impossible because we are not concerned with the mutation of our consciousness, of our minds.

So this morning we are going to enquire together the question of time, space, and whether there is anything which thought has not touched upon. Time, space and whether there is a state of mind, a state of consciousness other than this which is not put together by thought. We will go into that, I'll explain as we go along.

Because meditation is not merely repeating a certain formula, taking a certain posture, breathing properly, or repeating for twenty minutes in the morning, or afternoon and evening a mantra. You have heard that word, haven't you? Do you know what that word means in Sanskrit? Probably you do not. It means actually, ponder or meditate upon not becoming, and put away altogether self-centred activity. That's the meaning of that word, 'mantra'. But the racketeers have used that word to capture the gullible mind of this country and also in India, and it is taking place in Europe too, unfortunately. Those people have made a lot of money out of it, and that is now going out of fashion. They will introduce something else and you will follow that too because we do not understand, I think, the fundamental nature of meditation. Without laying the foundation of right relationship between human beings mere meditation, or contemplation, or handing yourself over to some idea, or ideal, or some projected image as god and so on, only leads to various forms of illusion - which is obvious. So it behoves us if we would meditate seriously we must lay down in

our lives a foundation that is not broken down or shaken but a foundation that is lasting, enduring. The foundation is right relationship between human beings. That's clear. If that is not established then you might sit everlastingly in a certain posture and think you are meditating but you are merely pursuing an illusion, or your own desirous projections and so on. But that is obviously a childish game.

So if you would understand what is meditation, and the depth of it, and the seriousness of it, one must establish naturally the order of right relationship. That's natural, isn't it. And we went into that question of what is right relationship. We said as our present relationship is based on pleasure, sexual, a relationship of comfort, dependency, attachment, born out of this great sense of loneliness, and without grasping the full meaning of this loneliness we escape from it through various forms and thereby bring about a relationship in which there is always division, contradiction, jealousy, anxiety, inhibitions and the desire to run away from what we have. This again is obvious, what is going on. So unless a human being, you, establish this order in relationship, right order, do what you will, stand on your head, or retire into a monastery, meditation has no meaning whatsoever because you must have solidity, there must be firmness, there must be a sense of endurance in a relationship.

If that is clearly grasped, and you see the truth of it, then we can go into this question of all the various forms of meditation: the Tibetan, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the - what are the other forms - all the latest gurus with their little gadgets of meditation. I think one can brush those aside because they have very little meaning. A

man gets up and says, 'I have a certain experience, I'll tell you about it', you get excited, he gives you a formula and you practise this. And the very practice of it makes your mind more mechanical than it is, more narrow, more sectarian, more limited. We can brush aside all such forms of meditation, because they lead nowhere, because they are not based fundamentally on right relationship between human beings in which there is no jealousy, anxiety, fear and the desire which becomes pleasure.

And also we can brush aside the whole occult phenomena that is going on in this world, the search for it. You know about it, don't you? That is, having certain powers, in Sanskrit it's called siddhis, capable of reading other people's thoughts, seeing through various - you know all that stuff. Because the speaker has been involved in all that, he knows something about all that. But a man who is very, very sensitive, a human being who is sensitive, not self-centred, egotistic, has certain quality of sensitivity, and that sensitivity can apprehend, can see, can read, can do certain forms of healing and so on, but they are all irrelevant and dangerous because they emphasize and give importance to the self. Right? I wonder if you understand all this. One may be able to read other people's thoughts, and what of it? One may be able to see beyond the material, that is, thought forms, various kinds of - you know all that - I won't go into all that, it is not important - but such human beings, though they have gone into this fairly seriously, do not radically change society, they are not necessarily good people, they are really pursuing a form of materialism. I mean by 'materialism' the cultivation of the process of thought because thought is a material process. I don't know if you are following this. We are



investigating together, you are not listening to me, the speaker, the speaker is not important. And the speaker really means this. The speaker as a person is totally irrelevant. What is important is that you and the speaker investigate together, think together, have one mind together, then if we have one mind we can act together. We can bring about a different society together. So the speaker is totally irrelevant.

So having put aside all these trivialities - they are trivial - then we can proceed to enquire into the nature of time, because to us time is very important. Time by the watch, time as yesterday, today and tomorrow, time as achieving a result, acquiring a technique, learning a language, going from here to there physically needs time. Right? That is chronological time on which we must depend, it is necessary, otherwise you and I wouldn't be sitting here. And we have cultivated also psychological time; that is, one is this, one needs time to become that; one has not knowledge and you require time to have information, to gather information; one is angry, lonely, anxious, to get over that we think psychological time is necessary. You are following this? That is, one is ignorant of oneself, the very movement of the egotistic, central movement and being ignorant of all that, self-knowing, one thinks one requires time to understand oneself. So there is the actual need of time to learn a language, to learn how to drive a car, to learn any skill, you must have time, days, years. If you want to be a first-class physicist you devote your time to it, days, years. But we are asking: is there psychological time at all? You understand? Please this is very important to understand if you want to go into things seriously; if you don't it's all right too. If you want to go into this question

whether this idea that one needs time to evolve, evolution is based on time, evolution of the acorn into an oak tree needs time, it will take many years. And perhaps that same concept, concept made out of a fact, an acorn needs time to become a full grown tree, that concept, the fact made into a concept, then psychologically one accepts that fact, then says, 'I must have time to understand, to change, to become'. You are following all this? Are we meeting each other? We are moving together, are we? I hope so.

Now we are questioning, asking together whether there is psychological time at all. Or it is an illusion which has become almost a reality for all of us. You understand? Are we together in this? That is, our idea of hope is based on that. That is, I am hoping - one is hoping to arrive, to be happy, to have enlightenment, to be good, in the future, and so one has thought time is necessary. Right? You are following this? So we are questioning that very thing. And if one has the courage, in the sense real serious enquiry into it, it may be merely a projection of thought which has realized that to learn a skill you need time, and so thought says, perhaps it is the same process psychologically. You are following? Are we together? But it may be totally unreal. I am going to go into it.

That is, to be aware of 'what is' in oneself. Right? One may be conscious that one is envious, or violent, and to change, to bring about a change in that violence you need time. Is that so? You are following this? Please, are you? Is there somebody to whom I can talk and they can tell me they understand? One is violent, which is a psychological urge from various forms of inhibitions, frustrations and also the observation of a rotten society desirous of changing, changing through blood, which is obviously impossible and cruel.

And so being violent one says, one needs time, is time necessary? You follow? We are pointing out when one is violent can you observe that violence without the idea of changing it to something else? You understand? That is, to observe actually `what is' without any movement of change, resistance, denial, acceptance, just to observe `what is', that doesn't need time. But the moment you want to change it to something else that requires time. Whereas if you observe closely without any movement away from it, the very observation of `what is' undergoes a radical change, which denies time altogether. I wonder if I am conveying this. Have we understood, some of you?

That is - I will put it in another example and perhaps you will see it. We compare ourselves with somebody else; that has been our tradition, our education, our conditioning, this comparative observation, comparative effort. Comparison implies measurement. Right? The more, or the less. Now can you see the consequences of comparison, logically, which is, you are comparing yourself with somebody, therefore you are not important, somebody else is important, so you are always imitating that and therefore there is frustration, anxiety, jealousy and so on. Now can you observe comparison, the whole movement of comparison, and end it instantly, not let it carry on. The carrying on of comparison needs time, implies time. Right? Are you seeing this? I wonder, you don't. Right, let me take another example, which is, human beings right throughout the world are attached, dependent, attached to another human being, the consequences of that attachment are misery, anxiety, jealousy, hatred, anger and division. Now to be free of these consequences, which are dangerous in human

relationship, to see the total implication of attachment and to not allow time for the mind to say 'I will get over it'. But the very observation of that attachment, which is 'what is', without any movement away from it, then 'what is' undergoes a deep change. You observe it. Because when you observe 'what is' you are giving your whole attention. Right? Are you doing it now? You are giving your whole attention, and that very attention is light, and that light dissipates what is being observed. Have you understood this?

Sir, you see we are enquiring into the nature of attention. I will put it that way. Because that is part of meditation. We are enquiring into the nature of attention. And to attend now, attend to 'what is'. Right? The 'what is' is your problem. Right? Emotional, sexual, intellectual, mathematical, whatever the problem is. To attend to it totally, and not allow the problem to go on until the next day, which is time. You follow? I wonder if you see this. So when you attend completely to the problem, psychological problem, completely, then you will see that all that energy which has been dissipated by time, which is, I must get over it, I must suppress it, I must run away from it and so on and so on, all that energy is now concentrated in that attention. And when you attend - when there is this energy totally in attention, then that which is being observed explodes, it reveals all its contents and therefore dissipates. I can't put it any more.

Are you doing it as we are talking, or is just it an idea? Because this is your problem. We are saying psychologically there is no time at all. Which is a tremendous discovery. You understand? Because to us tomorrow is all important, sexually, the desire, the desire that you must be a success tomorrow. You follow?

Tomorrow becomes fascinating, important, all consuming. And so psychologically we are saying there is no time at all. Can you face that? We were discussing this with some friends some time ago, last year, and the person said to me, 'My god, if there is no tomorrow how am I going to meet my husband?' Which is - watch the whole phenomenon, you understand. Do you understand? Need I explain that statement? Physically, psychologically if there is no tomorrow what am I. You understand?

So we are saying that time is necessary at a certain level, and at the psychological dimension there is no time at all. Time is necessary to learn a skill and there is no time at all when you observe 'what is', that is what is going on, happening in yourself. And to attend to that completely is to dissipate 'what is', that needs no time. This is a little more complex because time is movement. Right? Time, going from here to your house needs time, ten minutes, an hour, two hours, time. And also we think we need time to become happy. We are saying there is no such thing as time. Time as movement must end psychologically. That's part of meditation.

And also time involves registration. I'll explain this. Our brains are registering all the time, aren't they? You have an incident, a happening, and the brain registers what is happening. Right? Can we go on with this? You are following this? Like a computer you programme it and it will tell you what you have told it and you can switch it off any time you want; but our brains are not quite like that. It registers and you can't turn it off because the whole mechanism is to keep on registering, which is to remember, to register that which has happened, pain, pleasure, an incident which

is exciting and so on and so on. As long as the brain is registering that implies time, doesn't it. You are following this? Now we are asking, please, whether it is possible to register only what is necessary and not register anything else. You understand? Are you following all this? We are enquiring together, please. Say for example, someone psychologically hurts you. You know that, most people do. So that hurt is registered in the brain. Thought has created the image of you being important and then one says something derogatory to that image, that image gets hurt. That hurt is registered. You are following? Like a person whom I know, has held for sixty years he has held a particular hurt, like most of you do. It may not be sixty years, it may be ten days, it is the same thing. Now not to register that hurt at all. You understand? First the question, that is, your being hurt by an incident, by a statement, somebody calling you not a nice person, or this or that, and the image which you have created about yourself gets hurt, that hurt is part of the brain, part of the thought which says, 'I am hurt'. Right? So there is this registration of an incident in time in the brain. Got it?

Now we are asking: is it possible not to register that hurt at all. But one needs to register how to drive a car. You understand? To learn a language, but why should there be registration of your hurt? You follow? Is it possible not to register the hurt at all, any more than you would register flattery? Right, you are following this? Is that possible? Because if it is not possible then the brain is merely a constant mechanism which is registering all the time, and therefore it has no tranquillity, which has no sense of elasticity, then it becomes merely mechanical. The brain is partly mechanical

but psychologically the brain must be free of this registration of hurts, of flattery, of this or that. Now we are asking is that possible? You understand? See the consequences of being hurt psychologically. You have been hurt, you resist further hurts, you are afraid of being more hurt so you build a wall round yourself, isolate yourself, and from that isolation act which brings more hurts, more anxiety, so you become more and more and more withdrawing from the world, from my relationship. You know all this. Until you become a neurotic and then you go to a psychologist and he hopes he will cure you; probably he is also hurt. So the blind leading the blind! Whereas we are asking: is it possible not to registers that hurt at all? See the importance. So that the brain is free to have its own rhythm, not the rhythm of the hurt, the memory. You follow? You don't know all this.

We are saying, it is possible. Because we are investigating, and I am showing it to you, it is possible. Because one has been flattered up to the skies, or one has been insulted, the speaker has had both. So not to register either, which means not to have an image about yourself. You understand this? Right? Now to be free of that image one says, 'I must have time'. Whereas if you see the fact that you have the image, and the consequences of that image, and the result of that image, when you see the whole of that, give your whole attention to that, it dissipates. You understand? Do it and you will discover for yourself psychologically the brain need not register but only register what is physically necessary. Right? So that the brain - I mustn't go into this - so that the brain is not under constant pressure of the past. You know they are saying now the brain has the left side of the brain and the right side of the

brain, they have divided the brain, the left side, the right side. I have been told this, I am not an expert, I don't read these things. And one side has skill, memory and on the other side appreciates music and all that. Again division. Whereas we are saying the brain, when it is not recording, lives as a whole, has its own extraordinary rhythm. That you will explore and find out.

So that's one thing. Then we must enquire also into what is space, because it is important to find out what is space. For us space is from the centre to the periphery. Right? You understand? Am I using the English language all right, we are understanding each other? You have a centre, which is you, your ego, your conclusion, your belief, the centre, and from that centre to the periphery there is space, which thought has created. Right? And we live in that, that's our life. And so that space is very limited. Right? As long as there is a border, a frontier, there must be space and therefore always limited. You are following this? Please follow this a little bit, this is important because it is part of meditation, what we are doing is part of meditation. The speaker is not going to say at the end 'meditation', this is part of mediation because we said right relationship, time and now we are enquiring into time which is part of registration, the capacity of the brain to be free from the psychological pressure of time. And therefore, still talking of the brain, most of us have dreams. Right? Why? The experts say you must dream, but why do we dream, what are dreams, apart from what the specialists talk about dreams, and the psychologist's interpretation of dreams and so on, you and I, the speaker and you are laymen, not specialists, thank god, and we can then enquire without any commitment into what are dreams, why do we dream.



Because this constant activity of the brain must be very, very destructive to the brain. It must have some quiet, it must have its own rhythm, its own way of action, but if there is constant dream activity during the day and during the night the brain has now rest at all. You are following? So is it possible not to dream at all? I am asking the question please explore it. Apart from the rhythm of the brain itself, which it has, and I am sure the experts would agree to that too, but we are asking, apart from that why do we have to have dreams at all? Is it possible not to have this constant movement? Right? Constant activity during the day, during the night, the brain has no rest. So we are saying it is perhaps possible. Which is, if one is aware, attentive during the day, that is, attentive to the problems and the ending of the problems as they arise every day, then when you go to sleep the problems which have not been solved the brain tries to solve them, and when you wake up you find your problems have been either solved or are going to be solved. You understand? Are you following all this?

So we are saying, solve every psychological problem, and perhaps other problems as they arise, and end it, and not take it over, not allow the brain taking it over while you are asleep. So the brain is free, so that it can become young, fresh, you understand, active in a different sense. So we are enquiring into space. Because one must have space. When you are crowded in a city, as most people are, living in a small flat, having not enough physical space, part of our violence is that. And if there is no space in our mind, in our heart, space, then being crowded with so many other factors, then from that lack of space you have violence, psychologically. Lack of space brings about various forms of inhibitions and

anxieties and so on. So it is important to find out if we can have space without the centre. You understand my point? Am I talking to myself? Look: isn't your mind occupied all the time with something or other? Yes? See the tragedy of it. If you are a housewife you are occupied, a businessman occupied, a physicist occupied, personal problems, political problems, it constantly has no space but occupied. You understand? Now can the mind not be occupied? And that is only possible when you end the problems. Most people are occupied because if they are not occupied what will they do. Either they want to be entertained, or they see themselves being so hopelessly lost and they get depressed, or they say, 'Well, as I am not occupied I will go and gossip with somebody' - you follow - this constant occupation with something or other. Are you aware of this fact? Therefore when a mind which is your consciousness, is occupied there is no space and therefore it is only in space something new can come into being. You understand? And that space cannot be created by thought. But seeing the truth that occupation denies space, and being occupied implies constant mechanical movement which is very destructive to the whole human nature and the brain, seeing the truth of it you will end it. So you are not occupied except when it is necessary, otherwise space. You understand? I don't think you do. Because then in that space you have enormous sense of energy. That energy is not the energy of self-centred activity. Right? So now we have gone into this question, relationship, time, not registering and space. The next question is: why has man, human beings, always talked about religion? You know I must tell you something: two friends were walking one day in a nice street, and one of them sees

something, picks it up from the pavement. And the moment he looks at it his face lights up, he is delighted, something extraordinary takes place in his eyes, and puts it in his pocket. And his friend says to him, 'What did you pick up? And why did your face become so marvellously beautiful?' And the friend says, 'Ah, that was truth I picked up and put it in my pocket. I am going to keep it, it is a marvellous thing.' And the friend says, 'Let us organize it'. That's what religions have become. Right? And therefore religions have become an anathema to most intelligent people. But beyond that word, beyond all the ritualism, and all the crosses and all the circus that goes in religions, is there anything untouched by thought - thought being a material process - is there anything which is timeless, is there anything which is absolute truth, something which is wholly sacred? You understand? Human beings have sought this at all times, they want to enquire, they want to find out but they get trapped into something or other - into Catholicism, into Protestantism, into Buddhism, into some 'ism', and then they are lost. But if one puts aside all that and one begins to enquire if there is, or if there is not, to find out one must have a mind that is absolutely silent. Right? It must be under no pressure, under no motive, without any direction, otherwise you can't explore, otherwise your mind is incapable of discovering something totally timeless - if there is.

So to find out, for that extraordinary thing, if it is, to happen, the mind must be in a state of complete absolute silence. Obviously. Is that possible? Man throughout the ages has tried this, he said, 'You must control thought, you must control all your emotional responses, your desires, control, so as to bring about a mind that is

without a sense of struggle, a sense of effort, and perhaps out of that you can have an absolute silence.' You are following all this? Man has tried this, you may not have. This is part of the old tradition that to find out something that is immeasurable all measure, which is the movement of thought, must end.

Now we are asking: can time, thought come to an end, not science fiction time and space, but time as we have explained, which is the movement of thought, can thought come to an end, or must thought keep everlastingly moving, moving? You understand? To find that out you must understand, as we did, went into, the nature of thought, which we did. So can thought, which has built up our world, outward world and also the inward world, thought has been responsible for it, thought is a material process, thought is the result of all the knowledge, etc., stored up in the brain, which is matter, therefore thought is a material process. Anything that thought tries to discover which is beyond itself, thought itself must come to an end. You understand? This is logic. You understand, sir? So can one find out if thought can completely end, except where it is necessary? That is, learning a language, talking, and so on. How will you find out? How will you enquire if there is something beyond all this confusion, misery, sorrow, this travail of humanity, of which one is, find out if there is something that thought has never, never touched? How will you find out? That's part of meditation, not only to have the body absolutely quiet, absolutely, and also to have a mind that is not occupied with anything, with your personal problems, with world problems, because you are the world, the world is not separate from you. So to find that out, if there is or if there is not something beyond all

this, that's part of meditation. It is not part of search; if you search, then you are searching with a motive and a desire. And what you will find is what you have already found.

So meditation is the ending of all the content of one's consciousness-anger, jealousy, anxiety. You follow? Which is our consciousness. The freeing of the mind of all its content, then only there is that absolute silence, not brought about by will, by desire, by thought, then only it is possible for something, that which has not been put together by thought, can come into being.

## SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 8TH JULY 1979

I didn't expect so many people. I wonder what we shall talk about!

It seems to me that our self-centred problems and the problems that lie beyond our own personal crises, disturbances and miseries, the world about us is more or less in chaos, in great confusion. I think everybody will admit that without a great deal of trouble, with a great deal of investigation. And nobody apparently sees a solution for this, neither politically, nor religiously, nor economically. That again is an obvious fact. And nobody asks if there is a way out of all this, the trap in which human beings have been caught for millenia, if there is any way out of this mess, confusion, turmoil, terror. Not finding an answer many people resort to the old traditions, join old religions, or form a small community hoping thereby to solve their own particular problems. And if I may suggest, there is a way out of all this, out of our present continuous misery, conflict, strife, various forms of terror and the threatening wars, not only near but far. So to investigate all this and find out if there is a solution, a way out without suppression, without escape, without any kind of illusion. And if you will have the patience, energy and the serious responsibility that is involved we can think together. I hope you are prepared for that - thinking together.

There are two different kinds of thinking: one, thinking about something, about the problem, about a personal issue, or about the world and so on. That is, thinking about something. And is there another kind of thinking which is not about something? Please, carefully - I will go into this widely and deeply if I may.

So we are asking: our minds are accustomed to think about something, about a problem out of our personal desires, fulfilments, sorrow, anxiety and so on, about something. And we are accustomed to that, 'thinking about'. We are asking not about something but thinking itself. If this issue is clear, not about something which will come later on, but thinking together. Please see the difference: thinking together does not mean that you agree or disagree, accept or reject, defend or offend, but together find out if it is possible by thinking together we can act together, not about something - please apply your minds to this a little bit - not about something which we can more or less do. We can agree to act in a certain way, we can put our minds together to investigate a certain problem but we are not going into that for the present. But we are asking: thinking together without any barriers, without any inhibitions, without any prejudice, letting go your personal experiences, your personal urge to fulfil. Which means you and the speaker together be free to think. Is this somewhat clear?

Please this needs a great deal of investigation because we are conditioned to think together about certain ideas, about certain conclusions, philosophical, historical, and so on. Then there are those who agree, and those who disagree. They form two camps, each opposing the other, which is what is happening in the world. The Totalitarian, the so-called Democratic, the Capitalists and the Marxists and so on agreeing and disagreeing, opposing and defending. Whereas we are asking if we could think together freely, you letting go all your experiences, your conclusions, your desires, prejudices and so on, putting them aside so that together we can think. Will you do that? You and the speaker putting aside

his beliefs, his opinions and judgements and evaluations, his hopes and so on, and together think, not about something but think. Shall we do it? Which means that being free of our own personal problems, urges, demands, fulfilments and so on, being free to investigate together, not investigate into something but the capacity, the spirit of investigation. Is this somewhat clear? Which requires not only that you listen, not to what is being said but to listen to the quality of a mind that is thinking, not with regard to something but listening to the whole quality of thinking, which requires certain awareness and attention. Right?

Where there is attention there is no centre from which you are attending. I wonder if you are doing it as we are talking. That is, when you attend, in which there is no division, then in that attention thought is not your thought or my thought, it is thinking. Can we proceed along these lines? Are we following each other?

When you give your attention, which means to give all your mind, your heart, your nerves, to completely give attention, do you find that there is a centre from which you are attending? So in that attention there is not you are thinking and the speaker thinking, there is only a quality of total attention - right? Don't look so mystified it is really quite simple!

You see our thinking, ordinary everyday thinking, is with regard to a certain subject, to a certain action, to a certain problem, thinking about something - right? That thinking is from an experience, from a memory, from a knowledge, therefore it is your experience opposed to another's experience. So there is always division - right? Please follow this. You have your opinion and another has his opinion and the two divisive opinions, dividing



opinions can never come together. If you believe in something and another believes in something else strongly, then there is wide cleavage. To that way of thinking we are accustomed - right? Now we are asking: that thinking can never be together because it is always either opposing, defending or accepting. Whereas we are saying something entirely different. Thinking together implies that you and the other have let go all their prejudices and all their thinking together because in that thinking together there is no your thinking and my thinking separate, it is together thinking - right? Have you understood this?

Now please this is very serious because it is either you accept it as an intellectual concept, which then becomes your concept and his concept. If you merely accept the verbal explanation and draw from that explanation a conclusion according to your experience, knowledge, prejudices, and the other does the same, there is no coming together. You are following all this? It is important that we come together in our thinking so that there is no barrier between your thinking and my thinking, his or hers. Can we do this together? Because from this we can proceed because your mind then has a totally different quality. It is entirely objective, nothing personal. The self-centred problems with which we are burdened can never be solved unless there is a different quality of thinking or a different quality of perception, a different quality of insight into the problem - right? I wonder if you are following all this?

So our question then is: is it possible that two people, a group of people, undertake this responsibility? That putting aside your anxiety, attachment and so on, and the other meet so that there is never a question of division, opinion opposing opinion, knowledge

opposing knowledge, experience contradicting another experience - you are following this? So that our minds are together. The Totalitarian States want this, they are the authority and they lay down what people should think, act and so on. That is what is happening. If you disagree you are shot, sent to a concentration camp, or exiled. We are not saying that at all. On the contrary. Two minds educated, concerned with the world and are committed to find out whether there is a way out of this, out of the trap, out of this terrible mess that man has created for himself and for others. Can we do this together? You understand the question now? Together our minds are equal so the speaker is not telling you what to do and you obey, or disregard, or accept, but our minds are together being free to solve our problems. Right? Can we do this? Will you give up your Zen meditation? Give up your particular guru? Give up your belief, your own experience to which you cling to, your own personal self-interested problems, let go and then meet together.

Do you see what takes place when you do this? Then we can investigate together every problem very simply and clearly and directly and act. That is clarity, to observe, to see without any distortion, to listen completely without making an abstraction of what you are listening to into an idea. Therefore there is only listening, there is only then seeing, not you see and I see differently, there is only seeing together. Right?

You see we have instantly moved away from our own little sphere, from our own backyard, from our own self-concerned innumerable problems. Have you? Please this is serious, we want to talk together, this is really important. Or do you carry the burden

of all the troubles, anxieties, griefs and sorrows, and try to listen to another fellow, to what he is talking about? If you do that then you are trying to conform to the pattern set by another, obviously and so there is always division - right?

So we are asking something very serious and as you have taken the trouble to come into this tent, expenditure, energy, petrol and all the rest of it, are we together thinking? Not you think and I think, thinking together. Then we can go into this question of time, thinking together, not your time, or my time. It is very important because we are going to find out if we think together whether there is psychologically tomorrow at all, because that may be either an illusion, or a reality: if there is psychologically tomorrow - tomorrow means many, many, many tomorrows. Either that may be an illusion and so being an illusion we can put that aside and face this question whether there is psychologically a progressive evolutionary movement, which is time. I wonder if you follow all this?

Are you used to my language and therefore you can go to sleep? You might say, "Oh yes I have heard all this before." If you so think then you are not discovering for yourself, you are not thinking together. You have already stopped thinking together and say "I have heard it before." Because we are going very, very deeply into this therefore it is the first time you hear it. The speaker has been talking in this tent for the last nineteen years, next year it will be twenty years. And probably you will all turn up and say, "Oh, lord, he is back again, caught in a rut." We are not caught in a rut. We are free to listen, to observe and that very observation, listening reveals the truth, not the idea about truth. So we are

asking a very serious question because all our conditioning, all our education, both religious, personal and worldly is allowing or giving time to achieve something; one needs time to learn a language, one needs time to learn how to drive a car, time is necessary for acquiring skill, technological skill. To be a good carpenter you need time. But we are asking something entirely different. There time is necessary. Psychologically, please bear in mind we are thinking together, not what you think, time is necessary or not, we are investigating together, therefore you are free to look, to question, ask. You cannot enquire, demand, be sceptical if you just say, "I'll hold on to my knowledge, I think time is necessary" and so on - then we don't meet together. We are thinking together about the whole question of psychological evolution. Because man throughout the millenia, has been accustomed, is used, conditioned to think that he will evolve. "I am this today. Give me time to change. I am envious, frightened, burdened with enormous sorrow and I must have time to get over it, to go beyond it." This is what we are used to. So the speaker is saying whether such psychological evolution exists at all. Or it is the invention of thought because it says, "I cannot change today, give me time for god's sake, tomorrow." The everlasting becoming. "I will be successful as an executive, as a first-class engineer, or a first-class carpenter." All this needs skill and you need time. But we are asking: is there psychological evolution at all, the 'me' becoming something? You understand? We are thinking together, not about whether time exists psychologically or not. We are thinking together, therefore there is no opposition - right?

So let us examine the whole conditioning of becoming,

together, you understand, don't come to any conclusion. Or if you have conclusions let go and find out. You see the problem. If one's conditioning allows time then you are caught in the whole movement of becoming. That is, I am angry, one is angry, allow time to dissolve that anger. That is one's conditioning, one's habit. And if you cling to that we cannot think together. Therefore it is important to find out if you are clinging to something and at the same time trying to think together - right? If I cling to my belief, to my experience according to that belief, and you likewise, we can never think together, we can never co-operate together, there is no action which is not divisive. You are following? So are we prepared to investigate together - investigate implies looking, observing, thinking, rationally, sanely, patiently, deeply. Is one free to enquire into this question: the me, the self-centred activity, the constant movement, whether you are asleep, awake, walking, talking, it is this constant central activity of me? Has that a tomorrow, a progressive ending of it? Or a progressive continuity of it, a refinement of it? All that demands tomorrow.

Now psychologically, is there a tomorrow? Please this is a very serious question. The speaker put this question to somebody some time ago and the person said, "Oh, lord, I am going to meet my husband tomorrow." You understand? Oh come on, don't be puzzled! All hope, pleasure, you follow, the whole memory of the husband, and if there is no tomorrow what is my husband? Right? Please together. We are free together to enquire into this question. The speaker is not imposing a thing on you. But it is very important to find out if there is a tomorrow. If there is no tomorrow what takes place? We know what takes place when we have

allowed multiple tomorrows: postponement, laziness, indolence, gradually achieving something, enlightenment. You understand? Nirvana and all the rest of it. Through many lives progress - do you follow? I wonder if you follow all this? The seriousness of this investigation. If there is no tomorrow psychologically then what happens to the quality of your mind? The mind that is thinking together, what is the quality of the mind - the mind, not your mind, my mind, but the mind - that has seen the whole progressive movement of the 'me' becoming, that has seen what is involved in this self-achieving, self-becoming and what is involved when psychologically there is no tomorrow, no future. Do you understand sirs?

Psychologically then there is a tremendous revolution - right? Is this taking place with you, that is what is important, not the words, not what the speaker is saying, but actually - actual means that which is happening now, the actuality - is the actuality that in investigating together the mind has discovered the truth that there is no tomorrow psychologically? Then what takes place with the quality of one's mind? You understand what I am saying?

All religions, the Christian, the Catholic and all the rest of it, have all said tomorrow is important. Tomorrow in the Christian world, one life. When you die one life only. The Asiatic world says multiple lives. Probably you neither believe or accept either of those two - I don't know. But when you begin to investigate the whole psychological movement the me, the 'X' becoming, becoming - you follow? - what is involved? Gradually you suffer and go on gradually lessening suffering until ultimately you are free, either in this life or in successive lives. The Christians accept

this life, one life and the Asiatics accept many, many lives - you follow? That is psychologically one life and psychologically multiple lives. And together you and I have looked at it without any prejudice, without any conclusion, we are observing the fact, how people are caught in this.

And also we are asking: if there is no tomorrow psychologically what has happened to your mind, to your action, to your behaviour, to your responsibility? Do you understand my question? Have you understood the question? What is your conduct if there is no tomorrow? Conduct implying responsibility with regard to another in action. Do you understand sirs? Then what is your relationship to another? Please together we are investigating, don't look at me and say "Please tell me". Because there is no you and I in this thinking, in this observation, in this quality of listening. What is your relationship with another when there is no tomorrow psychologically? Either you despair, because this is a shock to one, do you understand, either you despair or you give up and say "I don't know," and throw it out. But if you are committed to this thinking together and enquiring into the progressive business and ending of today psychologically, then what takes place actually - actually in the sense of that which is happening now in your relationship with another? Relationship being not only physical contact, sex and all the rest of it, but also the psychological relationship of dependence, attachment, comfort, loneliness and all the rest of it, what takes place? Would you tell me? Or is this totally new to you? You are listening for the first time and therefore there is no immediate response - right? And why not? You are following all this? I wonder if you are?

If there is no future, no future, the future to which you are accustomed, we know very well, the picture, the image, the pleasure, desire for success, spiritual and worldly, the priest wanting to become bishop, bishop wanting to become the cardinal, the cardinal becoming the pope, the whole racket of it, and in the world too, then if you see that implies constant strife, constant battle, a ruthless sense of me aggressively pushing, pushing, pushing. And so in that aggressive achievement there is security, hoping to have security. And in relationship also security in another, with all its implications; anxiety, jealousy, displeasure, tears - we know all that very well. But if there are no progressive tomorrows, what is one's relationship to another, intimate or not? Go on sirs, find out.

You see if you have understood the quality of thinking together - thinking together, not about something, but thinking together, you and I - then where does that thinking together lead in my relationship to another? You are following? The other doesn't know anything about all this, suppose. The other is attached and all the rest of it, what is your relationship to the other if there is this quality of thinking, which is absolutely together, which is not divisive? Do you want me to tell you?

Questioner: No sir.

K: Quite right sir. When you said "No sir", then we are together.

Q: Not quite sir.

K: You see that is our difficulty. You want to think together with me, and I can't let go my ambition, my vanity, my prejudice. I can't let go because you say, "Look, let's think together so that we have this quality, this spirit of actual co-operation in thinking".



And I can't because I am attached to my thinking, to my memories, to my experience, to my accumulated knowledge. So it is I who have created the division, not you. You understand? You understand this? Are you doing that? Because if you are thinking, having that spirit, then if there is no tomorrow, what? You are missing the whole thing, come on sirs.

This is exactly what is going on between you and the speaker. The speaker says, "I have no personal problems", which is a fact. "I have no belief", which is fact. "I have no experience." I have had a great many but I don't carry them, they have gone. I am not entrenched in my particular opinion, prejudice, evaluations - right? Which is a fact. I would be a hypocrite if I said something else. So I say let's think together and see the beauty of thinking together. And you say, "How can I let go my knowledge, my experience, I can't, I love them. This is my life." So you create a division in the world - German, national - you follow? Both outwardly and inwardly. And where there is division there must be conflict, that is a law: the Catholic, the Protestant, the Communist, the Totalitarian. So the speaker says, please my friends let's think together. You understand sirs what has happened? When we think together you have lost all your personality. Ah, you don't see it. You follow? You are no longer Mr.Smith and Mr.K. Oh, come on sirs. What time is it sir?

This is the purpose of these talks and dialogues, that we together dissolve all our problems because the self-centred problem is greater than the problems of the world, political, energy, various countries divided, that is nothing compared to this. Because once you have resolved this you are master of the world. You

understand? Master. Don't go off into some...!

I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it?

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1979

May we continue with what we were talking about on Sunday morning? Would that be all right?

I wonder if you have thought any more about what we were talking of on Sunday morning? Whether you have gone into it deeply by yourselves and have come to a certain point beyond perhaps which you may not be able to go, and if so we could go into it much further. What we were saying on Sunday morning was that we must have the capacity to think together. The capacity comes naturally and inevitably if one sees the importance and the necessity in a corrupting world, that to think together does not imply agreement or disagreement, but putting aside one's own particular point of view, one's own particular prejudice, opinion, judgement and having the capacity thus to think together. Because when we think together there is no division, you are not thinking separately from the speaker. If we are able to think together, the division between you and another comes to an end. There is only thinking, not your way of thinking or another way of thinking, just the capacity to think together. But that is not possible if you don't put aside your own particular conclusions, your own vanity, your own personal demands, otherwise there is no coming together.

The word 'together' means walking together, being together all the time, not you walk ahead and the other walks behind, but walking together means we are both going along the same way, not thinking different things, observing the same thing, not translating what you observe in your own particular inclination or prejudice, but observing together, listening together, walking together.

I wonder if you realize, when that takes place, what happens between two human beings? There is great demand, a great urge in this present permissive society that each one of us must fulfil, sexually, emotionally and so on - the desire to fulfil. And with it goes naturally the whole problem of frustration. Please listen carefully to what I am pointing out. Don't accept or deny what we are talking about but we are thinking together, and I mean thinking together.

When one is seeking fulfilment in another or desiring to be and become and therefore act, which is a form of fulfilment, then in that movement there is frustration, all kinds of neurotic ideas, neurosis and so on and so on. But when we think together, that is, you have dropped your particular opinion, judgement and so on, and the other has also dropped his, there is no division and therefore there is no sense of fulfilment. I wonder if you get this? And therefore no sense of frustration. Please this is not a verbal conclusion, an idealistic concept, something to be achieved, but the realization of the actual fact that as long as we are not thinking together about everything, politics, religion, economics, personal relationships, and so on, thinking together, there must be division and out of that division there arises the desire to fulfil, and the inevitable sequence of that is frustration with all its neurosis and all the inevitable reactions. When we think together all that comes to an end. I wonder if you are following this?

If one may ask: you have, perhaps some of you, listened to Sunday morning's talk and have you inwardly dropped your personal opinions, your conclusions, your experiences? Or you hold on to them consciously, or unconsciously, and make an effort

to think together? And of course that is rather childish, which only maintains a certain verbal communication, but in actuality there is division and therefore there is conflict. When we think together conflict comes to an end. I wonder if you see this? Please you must get this, because we human beings for millenia upon millenia have lived with conflict, struggle, strife of various kinds, physical, psychological, emotional, exploiting each other; the whole human relationship is based on that. And in thinking together relationship undergoes a fundamental change because there is no division. If you are ambitious and another is not ambitious, there is division. If you believe in god or in Jesus or Krishna, or whatever it is, and the other doesn't there is division, and therefore there is conflict. You may tolerate each other, that is what is happening now, but division exists - nationalism and so on. So if we could during these talks - I don't know how many of them there are, ten or so - if we could, a group of us, all of us if we can, at least a few of us, apply our minds to find out if we can absolutely think together. Therefore when we do that the relationship between us completely undergoes a change - right? I wonder if you see this?

And also we were saying on Sunday, psychologically thought has accepted the progressive evolutionary process and therefore it is always trying to become something, or be something. And we talked about time, if there is - please listen, play with it - if there is psychological time at all tomorrow, if there is psychologically the future. If there is not then what is the relationship between two human beings who have no future? You understand? You are following my question? - not my question, it is your question. You may not have put it to yourself but it is being put forward. So you

have to look at it.

We have, throughout the centuries, religiously, politically, and in different ways, accepted this idea of gradualness - right? That is obvious. Gradually I will become perfect, gradually I will be less this and more that. In this gradational conclusion and evolution measurement has become important. Naturally - you follow all this? That is measurement, what one was, what one is and what one will be - which is a measurement. Measurement is time and we are questioning, questioning together, if there is psychological time at all. There is chronological time obviously because we are going to meet, if you want to, the day after tomorrow morning, that is obvious. If you want to go and play golf or go to the cinema, or whatever it is, there is the day after tomorrow. But psychologically, inwardly, is there time? Or thought has invented time, psychologically, because it is too lazy, indolent and also because it doesn't know how to deal with what is actually happening.

Therefore it says give me time. One does not know how to be free of envy, but I will think about it and work at it and gradually get rid of it - if you want to. But if you like to keep it that is all right.

So this has been our conditioning - right? You are following this? Not verbally, please watch it in your own self. This has been your conditioning, and somebody comes along like the speaker and says, "Is this so?" You have accepted it, this has been the tradition, educated tradition, not a superstition, because all people, scientists and others have talked about the ascent of man through accumulation of knowledge, which is time, and so on. You have accepted it. And the speaker comes along and says, "Look, you may be all wrong, question it?" So he says perhaps there is no

psychological tomorrow. You understand this? No, see the importance of this question. What happens to you if you put that question very seriously, not as an idea but as an actuality? Actuality means that which is happening now - right? If you put that question to yourself then what is the quality of the mind that does not think of tomorrow psychologically? You follow? You have got my question? Right? What happens if there is no future psychologically - there is a future, you have to go and have your lunch, you have to sleep, you have to do this and that but psychologically there is no future - what is your relationship with another? You have got this? You have understood this? Have you solved this question which was put forward yesterday? What is your relationship with your wife, or girl-friend, or etc., if there is no tomorrow? If you have tomorrow psychologically, then you create the image, you pursue that image about her or him, you have a memory cultivated in relation to that person, and you act according to that memory, to that experience. You pursue that - right? So when there is psychologically a future then it becomes mechanistic. You follow what I mean by mechanistic? - routine, repetition, acting on remembrance. Now if there is no psychological tomorrow, what has taken place in your relationship? - in your relationship, not as an idea, in your actual relationship to your wife, to your husband, to your friend, to your boy, to your girl, what actually takes place? You understand this? Are you interested in this? Which means you have not only investigated the concept, the conditioning of psychological future and have understood the whole significance of it, rationally, sanely, logically and said, "That may not be". So you have hesitantly

moved away from your conditioning. And when you put this question your mind is free to observe, is no longer tethered to your conditioning that there is a future. You have got it?

What is your relationship to another when tomorrow psychologically is not there? Perhaps we could approach - I don't want to answer this question, we'll find out for ourselves as we go along. I know you are waiting for me to answer it, there is no point, it would become verbal, rather silly. But if you could pursue that thing in a different direction perhaps we will catch the inward significance and the beauty and the truth of it.

The ancient Hindus and the Greeks formulated a concept of a good society. Don't get bored with this. They said a good society is this, this, this. The Greeks said a good society is justice and so on and so on. The ancient Hindus said a good society is only possible if there are a group of people who have renounced the world - please, careful, I am not asking you to do anything, I am pointing out - who do not own property, who are outside society, and being outside society they are responsible to the activities of the society - do you follow? Not that they withdraw, but being outside society they are morally incorruptible, because they didn't own property of any kind. And they were morally, ethically, religiously clear. They would not kill and so on and so on. And for a certain time probably that existed. Then it, like everything else, it degenerated into what the world knows as a Brahmin.

The Greeks had the same idea: that a good society must exist in the world. And it was an idealistic, formulated, ideological society. Ideas - you understand? - ideals and according to them they formulated very carefully, the Aristotelian and so on and so on,



society, that never existed.

Now we are saying - please listen - can we bring about a good society, not ideologically, not as a Utopia, not as something to be done, achieved, but a society, which means a relationship between two people is society - you are following all this? Can we as a group create such a good society? Now wait a minute. The Greeks formulated, the Hindus formulated and probably the Chinese, but we are not formulating anything. We are not saying the ideal - society must be this, this this. We are not saying that because that becomes a Utopia, an ideal to be pursued - you are following all this - something to be done. We are talking about a good society which can only come into being when you as a human being, representative of all mankind - I will come to that, hold on to it - are responsible to another human being. When we say you are the whole of mankind, psychologically you are - right? You may have a different shape of head, lighter skin or darker skin, better food therefore you are taller, in a temperate climate, your name may be different but psychologically we live at the same level - sorrow, pain, anxiety, frustration, a sense of hopeless loneliness, great sorrow, you follow? This exists right through the world. This is a fact, it is not an idea which you accept. If you go to India you see the same phenomena there as here. They are darker people, over populated, poverty but psychologically they are anxious, insecure, confused, miserable, worship something which they imagine, just like here. So there is great similarity. And psychologically it is the same movement, varied, modified but the source of this movement is the same for all mankind - right? Do you see this? - not as an idea but as an actuality, that is, what is happening - right? So you

are the rest of mankind. If you see that you won't give such tremendous importance to yourself, your personal anxieties, your personal fulfilment, you know all the self-centred egotistic problems, because you are like everybody else. But you have to solve it. Right?

So, we are saying - I am getting rather tired, are you? - we are saying a good society can come into being immediately, not something to be achieved in the future. That good society can come into being only when we think together, which means no division between you and another. Then our whole conduct changes - right? Do you see that? Then one does not exploit the other, either sexually, or in various psychological subtle ways. Right? At least verbally follow this: but verbally means nothing, it is like following empty air, holding empty ashes in your empty hand.

So we are saying: a good society, which must exist in this world, in this murderous world, immoral society, if a group of us can think together, therefore I ask: what is the relationship of you to another if there is no psychological future? You see, you understand what has happened? What has happened to a mind - please listen - what has happened to a mind that has been accustomed, trained, educated, conditioned, to accept the whole pattern of a life which is based on the future? That has been your way of life. In that is involved the constant effort to become, to achieve, competition, comparison, imitation, the struggle. If intelligently you don't accept that way of living, which means that you do not accept in your relationship with another the future, then what takes place in your mind? What has happened to your mind? This is an important question if you can solve it for yourself - not

solve it. If your mind has that quality that is not acting - please listen - from an ideological point of view, having an ideal and acting according to that ideal which means division, therefore no ideals whatever, and therefore no attempt to achieve something other than understand what is actually happening. Have you understood this? Are you all asleep?

You come and tell me that there is no tomorrow. I listen very carefully to what you say because perhaps you have something, a way of living in which there is no conflict. You come and tell me that. First I ask myself: am I listening to you? Am I actually observing what you are saying? Or am I translating what you are saying into an idea and accepting the idea - follow it carefully - and rejecting or accepting that idea and then say: how am I to live according to that idea? You follow? That is what you are all doing. Whereas the man says: don't do that, but just listen. Listen to the fact that you have lived this way, see all the consequences of living that way, what are the implications, logically, step by step. You have lived that way and therefore you have become, your mind has become completely mechanistic, routine, repeat, repetition, following. If you see that very carefully, he says to me, find out for yourself what happens if you do not think in terms of the future. What happens to you in your relationship with another? When the other is equally thinking with you? You understand? He also says, "Yes, I see that." So let both of us think together. I drop my opinions, drop my prejudices and so on, so we are together thinking. Do you follow? Then what happens? Because all of us want, desire, long for a good society, where we don't hurt each other, kill each other, maim each other, go to war against each

other, live in perpetual insecurity, frightened. We all want a society of a different kind. Some have said - please listen - some have said you can have such a good society if you alter the circumstances, the environment. The Communists, the Socialists, all the rest of the world, says: change all that through law, democratically if you can, if you cannot be Totalitarian and suppress, conform, force, but change the environment. They have tried it in ten different ways and it has never happened. Man has not changed, either as a Christian human being, or a Hindu, he has not changed radically. Why? Is it an economic reason? Is it a matter of belief? You believe in Jesus and another doesn't. Why? Why has there been in the world thousands and thousands of years this constant division? The Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Persians - you know, the whole division. Why? Is it because no two human beings have ever found out how to think together? You understand my point? You and I can't think together. I want to. The speaker says, "For god's sake let's think together, because we will create a different world altogether." But you say, "Sorry I want my opinions, I like my opinions, I cannot let go my experiences, my pleasures." So it keeps that division going.

Now we are saying: can you put aside all your stupid, you know, worthless things, opinions, experiences, they are dead, gone, finished, and say, "Let's think together." So our minds, not your mind is different from mine, there is only one mind when we are together - do you understand this? - then what is the relationship of that mind to another mind in daily life? Go on sirs.

Questioner: Is that a rhetorical question? If not I would like to reply but I don't want to interrupt your talk.

K: No it is not a rhetorical question.

Q: So you want to get an answer from the audience, not from yourself?

K: That is why I am waiting sir.

Q: I will give you one now sir.

K: Oh no. Not one answer.

Q: I can only give you my answer. I can't answer for anybody else.

K: Ah! Then we are not thinking together. No, no, that is the whole point sir. Please forgive me. There is no your point of view and my point of view.

Q: I never said point of view.

K: Your way of expressing it.

Q: What I wanted to say was just this. You said if there was no psychological time what is your relationship with another? My answer to that is: wait until Thursday and I will tell you because right now I can't tell you. I have quarrelled with my wife for twenty years.

K: Sir, are you saying sir that I cannot tell you about it now. I have done this for twenty years, I cannot tell you now but perhaps later on in the future?

Q: On Thursday sir. In the past I have listened to you in a way that is not listening at all. Right now I feel maybe I am on your wavelength, but I need a little bit of time to experiment with this. I cannot give you the answer immediately and tell you what is my relationship with another when I have not had the opportunity to observe what is happening in daily life.

K: That is what I am saying sir. Yes sir, I have understood your

question. I haven't had the opportunity to put this question to myself, I must have time and then I will answer you. I say you are wrong. I say you are then not meeting. I love you. And what happens to the mind that says, I have no division? Now, not I will think it over, I will work at it - then you are not meeting my point sir.

Q: I don't know what my relationship is.

K: Do you know what your relationship is with another now?

Q: No.

K: You don't know what your relationship with another is now? - with your wife, your friend, your girl or boy, do you know what it is now? You don't know?

Q: We know but you mean in a different way.

K: I am asking you, so you know it.

Q: I don't know.

K: The lady says she doesn't know. Will your boyfriend and husband accept that? (Laughter). You are playing games.

Let's put the question differently. What shall we do together to bring about a change in the world? We all say change is necessary. We see things are degenerating, you know what is happening in the world, terrible things are happening in the world. And what shall we do together - please listen - to change this?

Q: We have to change ourselves.

K: No, wait, wait. I am coming to that. Don't say change ourselves. You have had fifty years.

Q: Fifty two.

K: Fifty two! (Laughter). You have had fifty two years, why in the name of heaven haven't you changed? So it means you are

accepting the future. Something will happen to make you change. My question then is sir: what shall we do together - please listen. Though we have listened to the speaker for fifty two years or ten years, or five years, what shall we do together to bring about a new society?

The Catholics at one time in history, they were terribly united. Anybody who disagreed was tortured, inquisitioned, burnt. But for a time they held it, because they had the same belief, same - you know all the rest of it. Now all that is gone, nobody believes in anything. And we see the society as it is. What shall we do together? When one is put that question, each one has different plans - right? Different ideas, different concepts, do this, don't do that, we must all join together to elect a new president, new politician - you follow?

So I am asking: will a belief bring us together? Right?

Q: No.

K: It can't. Wait. Will authority bring us together?

Q: No.

K: I promise you a reward?

Q: No.

K: You will reach Nirvana if you do this. Or if you don't do this you will go to hell. Reward and Punishment, on which we have lived.

So what will bring us together? Belief won't, authority of any kind is rejected, the reward by another as a means for you to change is also rejected. And if you say you are going to be punished in heaven for not obeying, you say "Go away, don't be silly". So what will make us come together?

Q: Right listening.

K: But you won't listen if you are prejudiced - right? So will you drop your prejudice? You have come back to the same thing. Will you drop your personal desire for some extraordinary evolutionary Utopia? Enlightenment? Drop your idea of what meditation must be? Can you let go of all that? And will it take another fifty two years and you say, "Yes, at the end of it I will be dying but I hope I will give it up." You follow? Sirs, what will bring us together. Put that question.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Only when we are able to think together. Right sirs? When you and I see the same thing. Not you see the thing differently and I see it differently. When both of us see something actually happening as it is then we can both look at it. But if you say that is not happening, only it is imagination, or it is this, that or the other - you follow what I am saying? So what will make us come together? I am not talking sexually, in this permissive world that is the most silly obvious thing, and we think that is being together.

Let's put the question differently: if there is no tomorrow psychologically, in the future, what is my action towards another? The future implies no ideals, and no past either. You understand this? If the future you deny psychologically, you also must deny the past. I don't know if you follow this? Gosh! Will you let your past go? Your hurts, the wounds that you have received, the unfulfilled desires, the anxieties - which is the past. Psychologically if there is no future, it implies psychologically there is no past. I wonder if you see this? You can't have one and reject the other, they are the same movement. And that is our



difficulty. Our difficulty is to let go, either the past or the future, because we are frightened. I won't go into that now but look at it, what we are doing. We want to change the world. It is necessary for our grandchildren. You know sirs, if you love somebody with your heart, with your blood, with your whole being, love somebody and you have a small child whom you love do you want him to enter into this world? So what shall we do? But you are not interested in this.

Q: But do you think it is really possible to do it totally? Is there someone you know who has done it?

K: Is this possible to do this totally, the gentleman asks who has heard me for fifty two years. And do you know anybody who has done this. It would be impudent on my part - please listen - impudent, impolite, incorrect to say I know somebody. What is important is: are you now? Not do you know somebody. That is escaping from yourself when you say, "Well show me somebody, a result." And the speaker is not interested in results. If he is then he will be disappointed, he will be exploiting, he will enter into quite a different world.

So what shall we do together? You see if you understood that word 'together'. You know when you hold your hand with another whom you like, you may be holding hands and each person thinking differently - right? But they are not together. Together means having the same quality of mind. When they love each other it is the same quality. You understand? To love somebody so completely - oh, you don't know. In that there is no future is there? You don't say "I will love you tomorrow".

So what shall we do to bring about a feeling that we are not

separate, we are together, the feeling, the quality, the feeling of it - you understand? It is quite phenomenal that this gentleman has heard me for fifty two years, and another gentleman over there for twenty years and some of you have heard me for ten, five or for the first time, what will make you change? Being hit on the head? Offering you a reward? What will make you change so that you say, "Look, it is the greatest importance in life to be together"?

Q: Letting go of fear.

K: No fear. Is that it? Or is it - please listen - or is it we think we are secure in our separateness? Just listen madam to what I have said. Each one of us thinks, because we have a particular name, a form, a job, a bank account, belong to a particular nation, particular group, we are safe, secure. And I say: are you secure? Obviously you are not. So you follow? You want to be secure completely in your isolation, and the moment you are isolated you cannot be secure. That is what each nation is saying, we must be secure, we must build up arms, we must protect ourselves against you. So each human being wants to be secure in his isolation. Oh for god's sake! And when you are isolated you can never be secure.

Isn't that a fact? Therefore, if it is a fact, don't be isolated. You see you won't accept the fact and say it is so and yet you keep to the fact, hold on. It is a hopeless generation, is that it? No sir.

So we are pointing out there is complete, total security when we are together. You understand? When we are thinking together. And only out of that can come a good society, which is righteous, which is moral, which will have peace - you know. In that there is security, not in what you have now.

We will meet the day after tomorrow, I believe, don't we?

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 12TH JULY 1979

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? Shall we? It seems to me that we never seriously think things through. We go half way and give it up. And I think we are not sufficiently serious enough to go into this. I would like to discuss or talk over with you, if I may, not only what we have been talking about, thinking together, but the problem of security, why human beings throughout the world seek psychological security. One needs physical security. One must have food, clothes and shelter. And apparently throughout the millenia man has not been able to organize a society so that everybody could have enough food, clothes and shelter. There have been many, many revolutions to bring this about, Totalitarian, this and the other but apparently they have not been able to succeed. And is it because we seek physical security, and that desire for physical security has psychologically taken over the physical demands? You understand my question? One needs physical security and that is the function of a good society. Which we will go into presently: what is a good society. And why have not human beings been able to arrange, they have capacity to organize, enough energy to see that all human beings have enough food, clothes and shelter. That is one problem.

And the other is: each human being seeks psychological security, inward security, relying on belief, holding on, hoping thereby in a belief to find security, in an ideal, in a person, in a concept, in an experience and does he ever find security in any of this? Do you understand my question? And if he doesn't why does

he hold on to that? You understand my question?

If one may, let us think over together this question, that is, if you are willing, put aside your particular vanity, your particular prejudice, your own conclusions and let's think over this problem together. Which means you are not accepting what the speaker is saying, nor are you accepting your own conclusions because you have none, you have put them aside. So let us think this over very carefully, and this may be one of the factors, that human beings are so frightened. Why does the mind cling to a particular memory, to a particular experience, hold on to a belief which has lost all meaning, why? Let's talk it over together.

Either he is incapable of seeing the facts, or he likes to live in an illusion, in a make-belief which has nothing whatsoever to do with actuality: the actuality being what is taking place now. Or he separates the experience, the idea, the ideal, the belief, as being not accurate but holds on to them because intellectually he is incapable of investigating. You follow? Now if we may proceed step by step.

Have you any belief that you hold on to? And if you hold on to a belief, what is that belief? How does it come into being? Either through centuries of propaganda, as most religions have done, that is their metier, that is their investment. For centuries a belief has been created and one accepts it naturally from childhood, and it is easier to follow what has been the tradition rather than to break away from it. You are following all this? If you have no particular beliefs, then ideas. The word 'idea' I believe comes from the Greek, which means to see, to observe. You understand? Not observe and then from it a conclusion, which becomes an idea. The word 'idea' actually means to observe. Now have we ideals, which is the

future? The future which is going to be achieved. The ideal has been projected from the experiences of the past, from certain conclusions which have been gathered and from that you project an idea, historical, worldly, or personal - right? That is the past projecting a concept as an ideal, which is in the future, and conforming to the future, to that ideal. It is the same movement from the past, modified through the present, and the future. Right, that is clear, isn't it? Now if you see that, that when you have an ideal there must be a contradiction in your daily life because that ideal is something non real - right? Non factual. But the factual is what is happening and hence a conflict, an adjustment, an imitation, a division. So there is constantly approximating one's actions to something which is not factual. I wonder if you see? That is illusory, this is actual.

Now after explaining that very carefully we can go much more into details. Do you actually see this fact? Or are you already translating it into an idea? You are following? Please observe yourself. That is, if one has a belief, an ideal, and you see the nature of the ideal, how the ideal comes into being. Lenin, all the Marxists, have their ideals, after studying history and coming to their own particular conclusions about history and then projecting the ideas, and then making human beings conform to that ideal. So have you, as a human being, thinking this out very carefully, do you see the falseness of it and therefore letting it go? Or you feel if you have an ideal you are doing something, you are active, you are accomplishing, fulfilling your ideals. And that gives one a great satisfaction, vanity, a sense of purpose. You are following all this?

So after talking over together, together, does one put aside

ideals? If you do, then you say, is it possible then to face actually what is happening? Not in contrast to the ideal and measuring what is happening according to the ideal, but have the capacity to face what is actually going on? In that observation of what is actually taking place there is no conflict, you are watching. I wonder if you see this? Are we together in this or am I? Please bear in mind we are thinking this out together.

It is very important that we not only learn to listen properly, but also have the capacity which comes naturally if you are interested, in being able to see that is false and it is finished. I will put aside my opinion, I won't let that interfere and can we together put aside all our ideals? Because we are thinking this out together, because we are enquiring into the question of security. We think we are secure when we pursue an ideal, however false it is, however unreal it is, which has no validity, it gives a certain sense of purpose. And that sense of purpose gives a certain quality of assurance, satisfaction, security. Right? Can we go along? Not go along verbally but actually you have to put aside your ideals.

So now we are enquiring into the question of security. And why do human beings, right throughout the world, hold on to experience? Please ask yourself. Not only sexual physical experiences but also so-called spiritual experiences, which are much more dangerous. You walk along by yourself or with others, you suddenly have some kind of ecstasy, some kind of delight and that experience you store it, hold on to it. The thing is over - right? There is the memory of it and one holds on to that memory, which is called experience. The actual word 'experience' means to go through. To go through and finish with it, not carry on in your

memory that which has happened. Now specially in so-called psychological experiences, or religious experiences which are very, very subtle in their happenings, the human mind takes delight in something which is not ordinary. Ordinary being that which is happening everyday. And that which has happened suddenly, or which has happened after unconsciously working at it and then happening - I hope you are following all this - and holding on to it - why? Does that give one a certain sense of having experiences, known? That which is something not ordinary and that gives one a delight, a great pleasure, and in that experience there is a certain quality of security because you have experienced something totally other than 'what is'. Right, are you following all this?

And does belief, ideal, experience, remembrances, do they give security? Actual security, as physical security - you are following all this? Or does the mind like to live in a certain area of illusion? Please we are thinking over together, we are not doing propaganda or trying to convince you of anything. But we are trying together to find out why human beings hold on to illusions, which are obvious to another. Now is it, as we said, it gives them a great sense of superiority? I have had something which you fellows haven't had. That is the whole gamut of the gurus, you know, all this. "I know, you don't know." And why do human beings live in this way? Why do you or 'X' live this way? Please think it out. Let's think it over together because your experience is personal, enclosing, self-centred and the other is the same. So there is always your experience is different from mine or another, and mine is better than yours so there is always this division going on. So are we, in thinking this out together, holding on to our experiences, our

beliefs, our ideals, our conclusions, knowing that they are merely verbal structures, knowing that they are merely a thing that is gone, finished, in the past? Why do we hold on? Is it we want to live with certain illusions in which we take delight? So does security lie in illusions? Apparently a vast majority of people in the world like to live in illusions, whether it is scientific illusions or the religious illusions, or economic illusions, or national illusions. They seem to like it. And perhaps we are serious, not wanting mere entertainment, we are deeply concerned with the social structure which is destructive, dangerous, and we human beings say we must bring about a different quality of mind and a different society.

So we are asking: why do we find security in illusions? Please find out. And why is it that we cannot possibly face facts? Say for instance, envy is the common lot of all mankind - right? Envy being comparison, measurement from what I am to what you are. This measurement. Now in thinking over together why is it not possible to end that completely? I am asking. I am not saying it should or should not. The fact is the reaction which we call envy. That is the fact. But the non-fact is I should not be envious - right? Do we meet this? The fact of this reaction which we call envy is what is happening, but the mind has projected the concept that one should not be, which is unreal. So you are struggling to move from the fact into non-fact. I wonder if you see all this? Right sirs? Are we meeting each other? Whereas to face the fact without the non-fact. Are we meeting? I don't know. Are you all tired?

So we have been so trained, educated to accept non-facts as being far more important than the actual. And in the non-fact we think we shall have found security. Right? Now when you hear



that, is it an idea, a concept, or you are really listening and therefore you see the non-fact and finish with it? I wonder if you see this? Right?

So we have to go into the question: what does it mean to listen? You have listened now for nearly half an hour. Have you listened actually for half an hour to what is being said, which is what you are saying to yourself, not what another is saying - right? Are you listening so completely you see the illusion actually and see the absurdity of living in an illusion and finish with it? Which means can we stay with the fact and have no relationship to non-fact? Because our minds, as we said, are conditioned to non-facts. Just see what we have done.

The other day a man said to me: "I can't bury my son in the cemetery because he is not baptized". You understand? Do you understand what I am saying? Not baptized, you know going through all that nonsense. And he was horrified, miserable, unhappy that his son couldn't be buried there, in the holy ground as he called it. You follow? Please sirs, this is very serious. You may laugh at it, you may set it aside because you say it is nonsense, but you have your own nonsense.

So can we hear, observe so closely, so attentively, give all our attention to this and therefore all illusion has gone? And this illusion is part of our conditioning. If you are a Catholic, look at the illusions you have. Or a Hindu and so on and so on. We don't have to go into all that. Now a mind that has sought security in non-fact has dropped that, has discovered that there is no security there, then - please follow this - what is the state of the mind that is observing what is happening, the actual? You understand my

question? Have I made my question clear?

All right. Suppose I - not suppose - it is finished, I have no illusions. Which doesn't mean I am cynical, which doesn't mean I am indifferent, or I have become bitter, but illusions no longer play a part in my life. Then I ask myself: what is the quality of the mind, your mind, together, what is the quality of our mind which is facing that which is happening? You understand my question? Do you understand my question sir? What is the state of your mind that is free from all kinds of illusion? National illusion, scientific illusions, of course all the absurd illusions of religions, and the illusion that you have been carrying as your own experience - right? What is the quality of a mind that is free? It is only such a mind that can observe what is happening, naturally. You follow this?

Now the question is: the mind is seeking security - right - it wants security, it has not found security in any illusion - right? - but yet it says "I must have security." I wonder if you are following all this? So it says, "I must find security in my relationship." Obviously. "I have let go of beliefs, ideals, the experiences, the remembrances, all the nationalistic nonsense, they are all gone". But one's mind is not free from the idea of security. And from that may be the beginning of all fear. So it says, "Is there security in my relationship with another?" Go on, you are the people who are caught in this. Is there security in the image I have created about my wife? Or my husband, my girl? Obviously not. Because that image is the projection of past experience - right? And the past experience has brought about this image, and according to that image I act, which is the future. Right? Am I making this awfully

difficult? So the mind is now saying: there is no security in any form of image - right? Not in relationship but in any form of having an image which thought has created from the past experience. Right?

So if you have not an image, then what is relationship in which the mind is still seeking security - right? Come on sirs. Is there a relationship between two people when they are not absolutely thinking together? In thinking together there is complete security - right? That is, one has let go all his opinions, judgements, experiences and all that, and the other has also, so they can think together - right? That is the actual relationship in which there is no division as my personal thinking and yours. Right? So we are saying: there is security psychologically, total security when the mind is freed from all illusions, and doesn't seek security in any form of relationship as attachment - right? Because attachment is one of the illusions in which we think we will find security. I am attached to you. I am attached to this audience. I come here, the speaker comes here and wants to talk, express himself, fulfil himself, and therefore finds a certain security in that. Which is, the speaker is exploiting you for his own security. And when the speaker is honest and fairly decent he says what rot it is and he moves away from that kind of nonsense.

So in attachment we want to find security. And when you don't find it in a particular attachment you try to find it in another attachment. One is married to one person for twenty years and you are bored and you suddenly run off with somebody else which is what is happening in society, and there you are hoping to find some kind of security, excitement, sex and all the rest of it. See

what we are doing sirs. Or you are attached to your present lady or man and are satisfied - right? - which is another security. I wonder if you see all this? I wonder if you see how your mind is playing tricks on yourself all the time. This is called love.

So we are saying: is there security at all psychologically? Think it out. One has invested the desire for psychological security in belief, in ideals, in experience, in remembrances, in attachment, in god and so on and so on, and is there security? Or it is all illusion? And one can have tremendous comfort in any kind of illusion: that Jesus is going to save you, marvellous! Comfort, save you from what, god knows, but it doesn't matter! And so on and on and on. The Hindus have it, the Buddhists, the same pattern is repeated throughout the world. Which means we never face the fact but would rather live in non-fact.

And when we do that our minds are torn apart - right? We become very cruel, we think conflict is inevitable, it is part of life. When you put aside all that, now how do you put aside all that? That is the point. You understand? You have listened to this for three quarters of an hour, and in what manner, if you have discovered your particular illusion, in what manner have you set it aside? You understand? Please follow this. Is it an act of determination? Is it an act of choice, seeing this is illusion, I prefer that? Is it an outcome of somebody else's concept imposed upon you? Is it your own clarity of observation? That is, you yourself see it?

Then the question arises: How do you see it? You are following all this? You are not getting tired? One sees one is caught in an illusion, an ideal. How do you see this phenomena? Is it a reasoned

out conclusion? A clarity of verbal explanation? Is it that you are being skilfully persuaded? Or you yourself see this fact? Now we are asking: how do you see it? Do you see it merely as visual perception, the facts in the world, and therefore from visual perception, reading books, newspapers, magazines, discussing, you have come to the realization that ideals are rubbish? That is merely an intellectual process and therefore you are merely living in a concept and therefore non-fact, however logically, sanely, rationally you may observe it and then say: "I will drop it". But the dropping of it is not actual because you have other illusions around the corner. But whereas we are saying - please listen to this - if you observe without any remembrance in your observation - I must make this clear otherwise you will think I am crazy. We are talking over together the question of seeing, whether you have come to the conclusion that illusions are nonsensical and therefore you won't be involved in them. Or do you have an insight to the whole movement of illusion? You understand my question? I can take - one can take one kind of illusion, belief, investigate it, go into it, and say, "Well, it is finished." And investigate your ideals and so on. That doesn't really free you, does it? Investigate it. Does it really free you when you have rationally, logically, sanely investigated into the various forms of illusions? Which means, how do you investigate? You investigate through thought? Right? Thought has created these illusions and with thought you are examining these illusions, which again is a trick you are playing. So thought can again create other illusions and say, "I won't have these illusions". But thought has not understood the very nature of illusion and creator of illusions.

Now if you see thought itself is the creator of illusions - you are following all this? - then when the mind itself sees that thought is the creator of illusions then you have an insight into the whole nature of illusions. It is that insight that is going to dissolve all illusions. I wonder if you have got it? Should we discuss, or go into the question of insight? We have got seven minutes.

Sirs, insight is not intuition. Intuition may be a refined form of desire. Don't accept what the speaker is saying, investigate it. Intuition or apprehension may be the unconscious projection, which is taken as something extraordinarily real - right? So we are saying insight is not related to any form of desire. "I want to understand. I must go into it." The motive behind is desire wanting to comprehend - right? Desire saying, "I must find this out." So if you want to go into it very carefully, insight is not the activity of desire. Insight is not the projection of past experience. Insight is not a remembered action. That is, I am going to show you something. That is: when instantly you see that all the religious organizations, not logically, step by step, which you can do afterwards, if you see that all religious organizations are based upon thought and therefore have nothing whatsoever to do with actual, the sacredness of religion, you have an insight into it. You understand what I am saying?

Now is your action with regard to illusion the action of insight? You understand my question? Or you are still analysing it? You are still mentally active in exploration? Or you see instantly the nature of illusion and finished? You are following the difference? One is determination, choice, a subtle form of conclusion and action. So action takes an interval, there is a time interval. We are saying: in

insight there is immediate perception and action, in which there is no regret, no turning back, it is so. Have you got this? Sir, if you want to go into this, one has to be very careful not to deceive yourself, because our minds are so quick in their capacity to deceive. I can say, "Yes, I have got insight into this."

And out of that insight you act, and then you find "I wish I hadn't done that." Regrets - you follow? - all the sequence follows. But insight is something entirely different. There is no time interval between insight and action, they are both together.

Now after explaining all this, which is a verbal form of communication, have you listened so carefully that you see instantly the whole structure of illusion? That is wisdom. Right sirs. May we go?

Sirs, when we sit together like this, fairly quietly and silently, listening, is the silence contrived? Or you are so concerned, not to solve your own personal problems which will inevitably finish when you have understood the act of listening, the act of observation; the act of listening, in that there is no desire, just you listen. But if you listen to Mozart and say, "By Jove, I had a lovely evening the other day listening to that music and I want to play it again," you have lost something. And if you listen so completely, then the thing itself is like a seed dropped into the earth, it flourishes, you don't have to do a thing about it. In the same way if you observe closely, in which there is only observation, only observation, not the observer saying "I will observe", then in that observation and listening there is a strange quality of attention which is insight. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 15TH JULY 1979

We should go on, I think, with what we were talking about the last three meetings here.

Each trade, each skill, has its own discipline. If you are a carpenter it has a particular discipline, scientist, architect and so on, each function has its own discipline. And human beings throughout the world are used to this idea of discipline, not only in the technological field but also in the psychological realm. And we are, through education, through our culture, in every form of relationship there is, as we have accepted, a certain discipline. I would like, if I may, to go into this question rather deeply: why human beings need discipline at all. Please carefully listen. Don't jump to any conclusion and say there must be no discipline, we must live in a permissive society as we are now, and any form of restraint, any form of holding, is inhuman and therefore the other extreme.

As we were saying the other day, we must all have the capacity not only to be able to listen, to observe together, but also think together, which apparently is much more difficult because we are so trained through our religion, through our culture, to think individually, separately. And so there is always diversity of opinion, judgement, evaluation - your belief opposed to another belief, ideals opposed to other ideals and so on. These differences, contradictory, opposing, keep the individual separate and when there is separation there must be conflict, which is so obvious: national conflicts, racial conflicts, class conflicts, ideological conflicts and so on and so on.



Now we are asking, we are thinking together if that is possible - I think it is possible when you put aside your own particular opinion, your particular evaluation, experience, conclusion and feel the necessity of thinking together - right? Please do this as we are talking, not when you go home, or later on, but now as we are sitting together let's find out if it is possible that we can communicate with each other so that there are no barriers. The speaker is only sitting on the platform not to assume any authority but it is convenient because you can all see the man. That is the only reason he is sitting on the platform. And is it possible to think together about this whole question of discipline, effort, and whether it is possible at all in life to live without a single effort? Effort means strife, struggle to become something, to achieve something, not only in the psychological realm, but also in the physical realm. Is it possible to act without effort, to have a relationship with each other in which there is no strife whatsoever between two people, and no conflict within oneself, to think clearly without the determination to think clearly? All that implies conflict. Can we together think out this question, and as we are thinking it out eliminate as we are going, so that we can together put aside through our clarity of perception, clarity of hearing, clarity of thinking, that very movement sets aside the contradictory elements. That's what we are going to discuss this morning, if we may.

Like the soldiers throughout the world are highly disciplined people. And that very discipline encourages violence. I don't know if you have thought about this? A soldier is trained, day after day, month after month, suppressing his personality, suppressing his

desires, conforming to a pattern, and there is this very, very strict discipline. And that discipline when it is in action against somebody it is violent, that is war. Obviously. The word 'discipline' means to learn, not to conform, not to suppress, not to imitate but to learn.

Now in our thinking together we are going to observe whether there can be an action in our daily life without this quality of conformity, without this quality of imitation to a pattern, to an idea, to a nationalism, and so on and so on. I hope you are following all this. For some this may be totally new so please have the goodness to listen. To listen implies that you are interested in trying to find out. You know you have listened to yourself probably many times. You have listened to others but one always listens partially. And when you listen partially you don't listen at all. When you listen, you listen - right?

Now we are going to find out why man has submitted himself to a series of disciplines, not only in the physical world, technological world, but also psychologically. And is this discipline helping man to free himself from his idiosyncrasies, his conflicts, his problems, his relationship and so on? Do you understand my question? Right? Are you all very hot?

Can one listen without effort, first? Not to the speaker only but to learn the art of listening, which means not creating an image about the speaker, about the person who is speaking, your wife, your husband, and so on, not to have an image when you are listening - right? Not to have a concept, not to hold on to one's own knowledge and as you are listening interpret what is being said according to your knowledge. All this denies actual listening. If

you want to see something very clearly you must give your attention. Attention implies not concentration, just observation, to see what is actually happening. Like a good scientist looking through a microscope, he must look at what is actually taking place. But if he has a hypothesis, a conclusion and with that he is looking, then he is incapable of pure observation of what is going on - right? Please. Therefore there is the art of listening, the art of observing, seeing, then there is the art of thinking together. From that arises the art of learning. We will go into all this presently.

We are now going into the art of thinking together. You and the speaker having put aside their personal problems, issues and all the rest of it, so that we can think together, to observe our problems. Not the problems that the speaker imposes but the human problems. Right? So we are saying: why has man throughout the ages lived in a constant state of conflict? Whether he is seeking god, whether he is seeking heaven, whatever he does, both in our relationships outwardly and inwardly with each other, there is this constant struggle, strife. How has this come about? Why can't we live completely without a single shadow of strife? You understand my question? Please put that question to yourself. And let's find out the true cause of it, together.

Strife must exist where there is division. That is obvious. Division between the guru and the disciple, between our nationalities, as long as there is a division of any kind there must be conflict. This is obvious - right? Do we see that? As long as one thinks one is superior to another there must be conflict. As long as one asserts one's opinions, judgements as opposed to another's opinions, another's judgements, there must be division and conflict.

In relationship between two people, each pursuing his own ambitions, his own fulfilments, his own desires, division exists and therefore there is conflict - right? I hope you are following. You are observing it not verbally, not intellectually but actually as it is taking place in your daily life - right?

Now we are asking: why has this division come into being? There is the sunset and sunrise, darkness and light, the stars in their great brilliancy and beauty and the dark earth, there is the man and a woman, there is nature and technological improvement. All at that level, which is actual. And inwardly, if you observe carefully, inwardly there is also division. "I must", "I must not", "I have been", "I shall be", "I shall achieve", "I may not achieve". So there is always this inward division as well as outward division - right? Right sirs? Some of you at least agree or disagree with me.

We are asking why? How has this come about? Is this the normal state, natural healthy state? Or it is really abnormal? Really non-existent? This is what we are going to find out. You are following all this? First of all we are asking: is this normal? - this division. Why does this division exist between god and man, the good and the bad, the better and so on, this constant division, comparison, conformity to a pattern, and so on and so on? Is this normal? We have accepted it as normal. Like war - please follow - like war, like the man who says, "I know, you don't know", "I interpret god and you listen". We have accepted nationalism, division of classes, hierarchical outlook, as being normal, healthy, necessary because we think that is progress. Right? That is evolution, that is achieving the good - right?

Now we are saying is this normal? We are questioning to find

out together - together, not the speaker says something and you accept or reject, but together we are investigating into this question, which means we are thinking together, not you think and I accept, or I think and you accept, or you reject or I reject, but together we are thinking and exploring - right? Please. Because we want to point out that there is a way of living without a single effort, both physically as well as psychologically - right? So is this normal? We say, "Yes, it is normal because everything struggles to exist. Nature is in constant battle for survival, the tiger killing the deer and so on and so on. That struggle, strife is normal. Because it exists there it must exist naturally here. And without struggle, without comparison, without competition, you cannot progress." Perhaps that may be so in the technological world but we have accepted it also psychologically - right? That the more knowledge we have the greater the ascent of man - right? The more one knows about the universe, about the environment, the more and more, the more cultivated, the more educated, the more enlightened the human being becomes.

All that implies struggle. Why is there this division? Have we taken it over from the actual fact that I must struggle with the earth and cultivate it to produce what one can eat? Is it the struggle in the outward world for sheer existence, has that concept, or that actuality slipped into the psychological world? You are following all this? Or is this too brainy, all this? I don't think it is too brainy, just clarity of explanation, verbal clarity. We must begin with verbal clarity otherwise we cannot communicate with each other. If you say that is all too complicated for me, too highbrow, too intellectual, you stop investigating, finding out for yourself why

human beings have lived like this, through millenia, struggling. Is that the reason? We see nature in struggle, in conflict, we see to learn a new language implies a certain amount of strain, conflict, attention, to learn a skill requires effort, so perhaps that movement has been accepted in the psychological field. That is one fact. We are asking that.

Or is it that human beings throughout the world have emphasized in their culture, in their religion, in their activity, the ego, the me, separate from you? Do you follow? So culture, religion, economics, politics, everything has educated man to the idea, to the concept of the me and the you, therefore there is a division. And in the me there are innumerable divisions - right? The 'me' not wanting and wanting. The 'me' that says, "I shall be, I have been, I must be in the future." So is that the reason why, is that the cause of this division which is brought about by culture, religion, and so on and so on? That is second.

Or is it that each human being is seeking salvation individually, seeking security individually, seeking Nirvana, Heaven, Illumination, by himself? And the idea that when you reach that then you are all one? You follow?

So this has been what we have been taught, encouraged, learnt, conditioned - right? And a man, or rather when I say a man there might be ladies as opposed to man and all the rest of it - why has a human being not gone into this question? No saint has gone into it. No religious teacher has gone into it, they say ultimately you will be without effort, but you must make effort to reach the ultimate, therefore you must struggle, you must conform, you must discipline, you must starve, you must fast - you know, all the rest

of it. You must follow, accept authority. Seeing that, one begins to question it. One asks: is it possible? One sees the causes of this division, political, religious, national, the Arab, the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim - you follow? - all that, the Totalitarian, the Capitalist, they are all the same!

So is this normal? Or we have so given to this individual, isolated, self-centred problem, seeking security there and never finding it because when one is isolated one can never be secure. Right? I wonder if you see that? Now when one country is isolating itself from another country how, can they co-exist? There must be war, you know, the whole thing that is going on. But yet we, as human beings, are isolating ourselves in all our activities, and trying to find in that isolation, security, and have a relationship with another who is also seeking, isolating himself, there must be inevitably conflict. And therefore no security - right? Security implies a state of mind in which there is no conflict. Are you following all this? Right sirs?

Is this an illusion, this division, a delusion that man, thought has invented? Or is it an actuality in the sense real, true? Right? Is it the result of thought? You understand? We have the capacity to think, at least most people have, to a limited or to a wide extent. To think clearly. Or think in illusion created by thought - right? Are you following all this? Thought, as we have been saying, is the response of memory, experience, knowledge - right? You have stored up through experience certain knowledge, that knowledge has become memory and that memory responds as thought. This is obvious, we don't have to discuss this point. Which is, knowledge is the past, experience is the past, memory is in the realm of the

past, and so thought being in the past is limited - right? I wonder if you see all this? Yes sir? Please don't agree. Watch it. It is so obvious. So thought is the movement of the past, movement modifying itself in the present, going on, but always rooted in the past. Therefore it is limited - right? Isn't that so? Please, come on.

So has thought invented this idea as the 'me' separate from you? You are following all this? Has not thought created nationalities? Has not thought created the Catholic and the Protestant? Has not thought created the Jew and the Arab, the Muslim and the Hindu and so on? Has not thought divided this? Right? It is obvious. So in this division thought hopes to find security - right? Of course. If you found no security in isolation you would have some other quality. You are following? So I am asking: as thought is limited because it is the response of the past and therefore it must always, under all circumstances, be limited, has thought brought about this isolating existence of each one separate, in order to be secure in this isolation? You are following all this? Are we following this?

And what thought has created is also actual: the tent, the electric light, the whole technological field, that is actual, real. And is the 'me', the ego, real? You understand? Thought has created the world of technology, architecture, poems, statues, beautiful gardens, excellent carpentry, great cathedrals, and also thought has created the things in the cathedrals - right? I wonder if you see? Obviously. All the rituals, dogmas, the whole circus that goes on in every church, in every temple, in every mosque, this is the whole process of the movement of thought. Right?

So I am asking, we are asking: is the 'me', the ego actual? Or is it an illusion? A delusion that has been brought about by thought,



thought being limited? You understand? In its limitation it has created the thing which is limited. Do you see this? Or you are rejecting this? Because we are thinking together. And we are saying: where there is division there must be conflict, there must be strife, there must be this constant battle going on outwardly and inwardly - right? Take a very simple example: man and woman. In all relationships, as it exists now, there is conflict - right? Would you agree to that? At last! (Laughter) At last everybody agrees about something!

You have accepted that conflict, that strife in relationship and you either escape from it through entertainment, drugs, various forms of fulfilments and all the rest of it, run off to a monastery, to gurus and all that - you know all that is happening. And one has never asked in that relationship whether you can live with another perfectly peacefully, not indifferently, not callously, but caring for each other, being tremendously affectionate, being responsible but without a sense of conflict. Right? Now can we think this out together now? Not go home and think it out, now sitting here, can we together think it out so that you can totally end this conflict in relationship?

Questioner: It could depend,...

K: Wait, wait.

Q: Only for me and also for the other one.

K: I am going to go into that. A moment. We will go into it.

First of all do we see actually, not verbally, actually that which is happening in our relationship? Right? That is obvious. Go slowly, go slowly. Why has this division in relationship taken place? Go on. Don't say, "If we loved each other it would be all

right". But we don't love each other. That is obvious. So don't bring that in, it has no meaning. But the actual fact is conflict. I am saying why? Isn't it fairly obvious that each one, man, woman, each one is exploiting each other, each one using each other, trying to fulfil sexually, non sexually in each other, and each one being ambitious in different directions, pulling away all the time from each other and meeting perhaps in bed and thinking they love each other. Now I say: what is the root of all this? Ask yourselves: what is the root of all this? Apart from man, woman, nature, you know the difference in sexes, apart from that why is there this division between you and me? Between the woman and man, in their relationship? Is it - we are asking, please enquire with me - is it our culture, our education, which has so emphasized the 'me', so strongly, and the 'you' equally strongly? You follow? That is, my ego and your ego - right? The ego being created by thought, thought which is limited.

Now when you look at yourself as an ego, the self, the self-centred entity, what is it? Actually, what is it? Is it the name, the form, the shape, the idea, the concept, the image - right? That is the 'me', with all the tendencies and all the rest of it. Essentially it is the product of thought. Do you see that? Or do you say, "No, no, that is not it. It is god in me, and god in you"? That is too silly. To maintain this division man has invented so many concepts - the Hindus have extraordinary concepts, the Atman and so on - I won't go into all that. You follow? To maintain this division and to continue in the strife and no way out of it, man has invented gods and all the rest of it, the saviours, all that nonsense to me.

So can you observe this 'me', which is created by thought,

observe it without introducing the movement of thought in that observation? Have you got it? Please see first of all the logic of it. The logic. Thought is the response of knowledge and memory, which is the past. So thought is the past, modifying itself all the time, but it is rooted in the past. And therefore it must always be limited, narrow, can never be whole - right? And thought has created the division in its action, the 'me' and the 'not me', the 'you' and I, we and they. And has also created various kinds of divisions: the technological action, the personal action, the ideological action, the supreme action and so on and so on. Right? That is a fact. Now can you observe that fact - please listen carefully - can you observe that fact without thought entering into that observation?

Q: It is the only instrument I have.

K: One moment sir. I am coming to that. First go slowly. The gentleman says it is the only instrument that I have and therefore how can I look without employing that instrument? You have understood? Right? That is a wrong question you have put. Because we have not clearly understood the limitation of thought. If you see clearly the limitation of thought, you recognize the instrument is itself limited - right? And is it possible not to employ that instrument? If you find a particular drill cannot dig a hole, you find other means to dig a hole. But if you say, "I have only this instrument" - then you cannot dig a hole. You understand? So do we realize the instrument itself is useless to investigate into this question of conflict? That is the whole point. You understand? I wonder if you understand this?

Sir, you see we are so used to a particular form of action, which has not produced results but we hold on to it. We don't say as it has

not produced results I will put it away, throw it out, let me find out another. You follow? That is our struggle. You want to employ the instrument of thought, and through thought you hope to resolve the problem, but thought itself is limited and therefore it is not the instrument. Right? Do we see that? Do we see in our relationship that there is conflict, each one having his own image and therefore division, and these images have been created by thought and thought is limited and cannot solve the problem.

So we are acquiring a new instrument, which is to observe without the old instrument interfering. You have got this? You see you won't let go of the old instrument. You think that old instrument will help you, but you don't see that old instrument has created such tremendous problems in life and you keep on employing that instrument. Once you see that then you are looking in other directions - right? It is like a good carpenter, the chisel doesn't work so he either throws it away or buys a new one, or sharpens it, but he is rejecting it. But you won't, because we are not clear, we don't think clearly. Or we are afraid if the new instrument comes things might break up: frightened. Which means you have already projected, thought has already projected an idea that it might not. You are following all this?

So can you, after this, can you observe without the old instrument of thought the actual relationship of two images, between two people and the division that exists? Look at it, observe it, see it. Then what takes place? You can only do that when you have put aside the old instrument. Look sirs, if I want to understand what you are saying I must listen to you, I must listen to you with affection, with care, with attention, because I want to

find out what you are saying. But if I say, "Yes, I agree with you. I have heard this before." Or, "You are saying something new which is impossible." - you are not listening. So listening implies sir, a great sense of attention, love, care. But if you haven't got that your old instrument is in operation. And then you say, "How am I to pay attention? Tell me the method, the system". Then thought invents the system, then you become a prisoner to the system and you go on with that. Whereas if you see the importance, the danger of separation in relationship, the real danger, we are destroying each other - right? The terrorists, the Capitalists, all the rest of it - we are destroying each other because each one of us feels he is separate. And if you see the danger then you will listen, you are already in a state of acute listening to find out if there is a way out of this. Right?

Are you listening that way? That means to observe silently. Silence means not just going off to sleep or this or that. Silence is tremendous attention. That attention is complete energy. All the energy that you have, with all your mind and heart. That is attention. Then you listen, and that very listening, that very observation dissolves the limitation of the instrument.

But we have not touched upon this question of discipline because if one understands the nature of discipline, the 'me' and the thing to be achieved - you understand? To achieve that I must discipline myself. If I am to reach god, whatever god may be, which again is the invention of thought - do you accept all this? (Laughter). You see, we discipline ourselves to be good. You tell the child, "Be good. Don't do this, do that". Is goodness born out of discipline? Have you ever asked that? Is love born out of

discipline? Is charity, humility, generosity born out of discipline? And is truth to be found by discipline? Enlightenment through discipline? - which means conformity to a pattern, which is conforming, the ego, the 'me', to another pattern, that pattern invented by another ego. Are you following all this?

So when you see all this, the basic question is: can one live in this world without the 'me', without the ego, without all the things thought has created, the gods, you know, psychologically? Thought has created the postman - right? The engineer - you need the postman, you need the engineer, but you don't need the things that thought has created in its desire to be secure psychologically. And in that there is no security. Security exists only when there is no division - right?

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1979

Before we go on with what we were talking about at the last four talks, one has been wondering, and you must also have been asking yourself, why we, who have gathered here, who have listened for so many years, why don't we change? What is the root cause of it? Is there one cause? Or many causes? We know what the world has become outwardly, more and more fragmented, more and more violent, more insane, one group fighting another group, where one cannot share all the energy of the world for all people - you know what is happening. And what is our relationship to that, to the world and to oneself? Are we separate from all that? If we are, which I question, if we are, are we so very radically different from the world about us? The competing gurus, the competing religions, the contradictory opposing ideas and so on, what shall we do together to change ourselves? I am asking this in all seriousness: why we lead our lives as we live, our petty little ideals, vanities, and all the stupidities that we have accumulated, why is it that we go on in this way?

Is it we are frightened to change? Is it we have no desire or intention or urge to find a different way of living? Please ask yourself these questions. I am asking these questions for you, I am not asking for myself. Why? What is the essence of this deterioration of the human mind, and therefore the disintegration in action? You understand? Why is there this mind that has become so small, inclusive, not bringing everything and operating from the whole, but living in a small little courtyard? What is the root of it? Go on sirs, let us talk it over a little bit.

The other day you were asking: why is it that I have heard you for fifty two or forty years and I have not changed at all? There have been little changes, modifications, perhaps I am no longer a nationalist, no longer belong to any particular organized group of religious thinking, don't superficially belong to any sect or to any guru - to all that circus that goes on. But deeply one remains more or less the same. Perhaps more refined, the self-centredness is a little less active, less aggressive, more refined, more yielding, a little more considerate, but the root remains. Have you noticed this? Why? We are talking about the eradication of that root, not the peripheral frills and the peripheral clipping. We are talking about the very root of one's active conscious, or unconscious, egocentricism.

Is it because we need time? Please go into it. Time. Give me time. Man has existed for millions and millions of years, that root has not been uprooted and put aside. Time has not solved it. Right? Please give your mind to this. Evolution, which is the movement of time, has not solved this. We have better bathrooms, better communications and so on and so on, but man, the human being is essentially what he has been a million years ago. It is a tragic thing if one realizes it. And if one is serious, not just while you are here in this tent, serious right through your daily life, don't you ever ask: can this self-centred activity with all its problems, can it ever end? If you asked it seriously, as if one realizes time, thought - we went into it the other day - time and thought are similar, they are the same movement, and thought and time have not solved this problem. And that is the only instrument we have. And we never seem to realize that instrument, which is the movement of thought,



however limited, that movement cannot solve the problems. And yet we hold on to that. We hold on to the old instrument - right?

Thought has created all these problems - right? That is obvious. The problems of nationality, problems which war creates, problems of religions, all that is the movement of thought which is limited. And that very thought has created this centre - right? Obviously. And yet we don't seem to be able to find a new instrument - right? We don't find a new instrument but as we cannot let go the old instrument, and holding on to it we hope to find the new. You follow? You must let go something to find the new - right? If you see a path leading up to the top of the mountain and it doesn't lead you up there, you investigate. You don't stick to that path. So one asks: what is it, why is it that human beings are so incredibly stupid? They have wars, they have this fragmentation of nationalities, of religions, all the rest of it, and yet they live in this miserably, unhappy, quarrelling, conflicts, strife - you follow?

Now what will make a human being let go the old instrument and look for the new? You understand? Look for the new. Is it that we are lazy? Is it that we are frightened? Is it, if I let go of this will you guarantee the other? You understand? Which means one has lived with this limited thought and one thinks one has found security in that, and is afraid to let that go, and it is only when there is abandonment of the old you can find the new. Obviously.

So is it, we are asking, is it fear? Because you observe the multiplication of gurus all over the world guaranteeing security; "Do this, follow this, practise this, and you will have something at the end of it". That is, reward. The promise of a reward has a certain fascination and you hope you will find in that security. But

when you examine it a little more closely and are not so gullible, not swallow the whole thing the other fellow says, then you find very clearly that the reward is the reaction of punishment. Because we are trained to the idea of reward and punishment - right? This is obvious. So to escape from punishment, which means pain, grief and all that, we search for a reward and hope thereby in that to find some kind of security, some kind of peace, some kind of happiness. But when you go into it you don't find it. The gurus and the priests may promise it but they are just words - right?

So how do we, human beings, go into this question together as to whether it is possible to eradicate totally this poisonous self-interest, self-centred activity? Right? I do not know if you have ever asked even that question? When you do ask that question you have already begun to be a little more intelligent. Naturally. So we are going this morning together to think this problem over, together. Thinking together, not I tell you and you accept, or reject, but together find out if this movement of the ego, the self, can ever end. Right? Are you interested in this? No, no, don't nod your heads. This is a very serious problem. You may be stimulated while you are in the tent by the speaker - and I hope you are not. But you may be stimulated and therefore rather excited and say, "Yes, I agree with you. We must do this," - and when you leave the tent you forget all about it and carry on in your old ways. So together, you putting aside your particular prejudice, your particular gurus, your particular conclusions, together we are going to investigate this question.

To investigate you must be free - right? It is obvious, isn't it? You must be free to examine, you must be free from those blocks

which impede your examination. The impediments are your prejudices, your experience, your own knowledge, or other people's knowledge, all those act as impediments and then you cannot possibly have the capacity to examine or think together. Right? At least intellectually see this. The speaker has none of these problems: he has no prejudices, no beliefs either. Finished. Only then we can meet together if you are also in that same position.

So let us examine, think over, think together. To think together over the question why human beings, right throughout the world, have remained self-centred. Knowing all the problems it entails, knowing all the confusion, misery, sorrow it involves, they hold on to it - right? Now we are asking: is it desire? You know what desire is? We are asking is it, the root of this self-centred activity, desire? What is desire? You all desire so many things: desire for enlightenment, desire for happiness, desire for good looks, desire for what - a world that will be peaceful, desire to fulfil and avoid frustration - you understand? - desire by which all human beings are driven. Do you follow this? We are asking, is that one of the root causes of this self-centred existence with all its confusion and misery?

And religions throughout the world have said you must suppress desire - right? You must become a monk, in the service of god, and to attain that supreme thing you must have no desire. You understand? This has been the constant repetition of all the so-called religious people in the world. And without understanding what is the structure and the nature of desire, they have had this ideal that to serve the highest principle, Brahman, in India, god or

Christ in the Christian world, or other forms of religious sectarian nonsense, suppress, control, dominate desire - right?

Now we together are going to look into what is desire. Now when you examine what is desire, please listen carefully, when you examine what is desire or analyse, you are using thought as a means of analysis. That is, going into the past. You are following this? And so you are using the old instrument, which is limited thought, and looking into the past, step by step, which is the whole psychoanalytical process. You are following all this? But to examine desire you must see the actuality of it, not step it back. You understand what I am saying? Please come with me a little bit. You must be very clear on this point. The psychoanalytical introspective self examination process is going backwards, and thereby hoping to find the cause - right? To do that you employ thought - right? And thought is limited, the old instrument, you are using the old instrument to find the root of desire.

Now we are saying something entirely different. Please give a little attention to it. We are saying analysis by oneself, or by the professional, doesn't lead anywhere, unless you are slightly neurotic and all the rest of it, then it may be a little helpful. Perhaps we are all slightly neurotic! We are saying: observe the nature of desire. Don't analyse, just observe. You understand the difference? Is this clear? I am going to show it to you. Must everything be explained, which is too bad. You don't jump to it and say, "Yes, I have got it". All that you say is, "Explain, and I will get it. Explain the whole movement of desire, employ the words, correct words, describe it precisely and I'll get it". What you get is the clarity of explanation, clarity of words, but that doesn't give you the total

observation of the movement of desire. You have got this?

So can you stop analysing but just observe? Have you got it? Are we meeting each other? One can describe the beauty of the mountain, the white snow, the blue sky, the marvellous dignity and the glory of it, the valleys, the rivers, the streams, the flowers, and most of us are satisfied with the explanations. We don't say, "I'll go, get up and climb and find out".

We are going into this question of desire very carefully, not the movement of tracing it back and thereby hoping to find the nature of desire. You understand? But actively together look at it. What is desire? Look at it yourself. Together we are doing it. What is desire? You desire a dress, which you see in the window, and there is the response. You like the colour, the shape, the fashion, and desire says, "Let me go and buy it". So what has taken place actually at that moment? Which is not analysis, but actually observing the reaction to the seeing of that dress in the window, and the response to that. You are following this? Yes? You are following this? Don't go to sleep please. You see that dress, you like the colour, you like the fashion - what has taken place there? You observe, there is the sensation - right? There is contact, you touch it, then desire arises through the image which thought has built, you putting on that dress. Do you understand this? Seeing, sensation, contact, then thought imagining that dress on you and then desire. You follow this? No, not follow me, the fact of it. I have only given an explanation, the words, but the actual response, we are talking of the actual response; the seeing, contact, sensation, thought imagining that dress on you and desire is born. You understand? Have you got this? No, no, yours, not mine.

Now wait, follow this carefully. The moment thought creates the image, from that image desire is born - right? You understand this? Please understand this. I am bored with explanations! I will stick to that dress, or the shirt. You see there is perception of that in the window, the seeing, the visual optic response, then go inside, touch the material, then thought says, "How nice it would be if I had it". And imagine that you are wearing it. That is the moment of desire - right? Do you see this, actually, not my explanation and through the explanations you see? Is that clear, that you yourself observe the happening?

Now the question is - please go into it carefully - why does thought create the image of you having that shirt, that dress, and then pursuing it? Watch it. Think it out. Go into it. Exercise your brains. One sees a blue shirt. Then you see it, go and touch it, feel the material, then thought comes and says, "How nice". Then the question is: can thought abstain itself from creating the image? You understand my question? I will explain, take time, I will go into it.

We are examining the whole movement of desire because we are asking: is desire the very root of this self-centred, egotistic existence? And from that we are asking: is it desire? And then we say: what is desire? And the speaker is totally opposed to suppression because that doesn't solve the problem, totally he says don't run away from it into a monastery, into taking vows and all kinds of things - that is merely avoidance. But what we are saying is: examine it, look at it, not analytically but as it is taking place, observe. The observation shows, the optic response to the blue dress, blue shirt, the contact inside, going into the shop, touching

the material, then thought creates the image and desire is born. It is only when thought creates the image, desire comes into being.

Otherwise it does not. Are you now together in this? Right?

So desire comes into being and flowers the moment you create the image, thought creates the image. You have had a pleasant experience, sexual or whatever you have. And it has created an image, a picture and you pursue it. One is a form of pleasure, the other is the movement of contradictory desires - right? You desire that dress - or desire great success and so on and on and on. Now can you observe this fact that the moment when thought creates the image, desire is born? Are you aware of this? Do you see actually as it happens how thought creates through its imagination the desire to pursue the very end - right? Do you actually now sitting there, observe this fact for yourself? Obviously. It is very simple. Right?

The question arises then: can thought not create the image? That is the whole point. Do you understand? Am I making this terribly difficult?

Questioner: May I suggest that the new instrument is the object?

K: Just a minute sir, let me finish then we can carry on. May I finish? May I finish what I am saying? And then you can ask questions if there is time, and we have five discussions after the talks are over. Then you can bully me! So till then have patience.

We have come to the point when you yourself observe the springing of desire - right? Perception, seeing, contact, sensation. Up to there there is no desire. It is just reaction. You follow? But the moment thought creates the image the whole cycle begins. Do you see this? If you see it clearly then the question arises: why

does thought always create this image? Do you understand my question? Why? You see a shirt, red, blue, white, whatever it is, instantly like and dislike, which is, thought has its previous experiences, liking and so on. So can you observe the blue shirt, dress in the window, and realize the nature of thought and see that the moment when thought comes in the problem begins? Not only the blue shirt or dress, your sex, your sexual experiences, the image, the pictures, the thinking over. Or the image that you have of a position, a status, a function. Do you follow? So desire is that. So can you observe without the inflaming desire coming into being? You understand my question? Go into it, you will see it. You can do it. That is the new instrument, which is to observe.

Then does desire for security - they are the same thing, security in terms of big house, little house, bank account, which may be necessary, and also security, desire has created about oneself, the image that you have about yourself, and the fulfilment of that image in action, in that is involved many kinds of frustration and in spite of the frustrations, in spite of conflicts, misery, desire pursues, because thought is always creating the image where there is sensation involved - right? I wonder if you see this?

So we are asking then, the next question is: is desire responsible for fear? We have sought security through desire and the fulfilment of that desire, in god - psychologically, I don't want to go on and on about this beastly stuff - and unconsciously, deeply one may be aware that the things in which you have invested, desire has invested have no value at all. And having no value, you are frightened. You understand? Are you following this, because again we are not analysing fear. That is a stupid old game. We are



observing the actual fact of fear. And as it arises, to observe, ask, what is the root of it? Not analytically discover the root of it, but in the very observation of it you discover the root. You get it? Are you following all this? You seem rather doubtful. I am going to go into this.

Man has accepted and lived with fear, both outwardly and inwardly: fear of violence, fear of physically getting hurt and so on, outwardly. Psychologically, fear of not conforming to a pattern, fear of public opinion, fear of not achieving, not fulfilling and so on, you know, psychologically. We are asking, which is a fact, can you observe that fact without the analytical mind operating on the fact and observe the whole movement of fear as it exists? You understand?

(Are you getting tired? Ten minutes more. Bear up with it!) Because you see it is possible to be absolutely psychologically free of fear, absolutely. Don't accept my word for it, it is your life, not mine, it is yours, you have to find this out.

So you have to ask: what is fear? Has it roots in desire? Go into it slowly, don't say no. Go into it. Desire being what we have said: thought creating the image and then pursuing that image that it might fulfil, and might not. You follow? If it fulfils there is no fear, or at least there are other calamities involved in it. But when there is no fulfilment there is frustration and the fear of not being able to fulfil - you understand? This whole complex sexual fulfilment, which apparently the world is now just discovering, and making a lot of noise about it - promiscuous and all the rest of it. So we are asking: is fear the product of desire? Desire being the image formation and the fulfilment of that image in action. Right? Or is

fear - please follow this carefully - part of time? You understand? Is fear the movement of time? So are desire and time responsible for fear? You understand? Oh, my Lord! I will explain. I will explain. Go slowly.

Desire is the movement of thought with its imagery. That is, the movement of thought creating the image and the movement of that image, which is time - right? No? Not chronological time, psychological time. And we are asking: is time responsible also for fear? The time of desire - ah, I am getting it. You get it? The time which desire creates and thought, which has created the desire, and thought being also time, so thought and desire are responsible for fear. You see that? I am afraid what you might do to me. I am afraid you might hurt me psychologically. I am afraid that dog will bite me. But at the moment of biting, time has come to an end. You understand? It is only the dog might bite me. I have created the image, thought has created the image, that dog biting, which is time, in the future. You are following all this? So desire has its future and time is naturally future, the past, present and future.

So the question is: can thought realize its own movement creating fear? You understand? Thought realizing its own nature. When it realizes its own nature, as the active principle in fear, what takes place? There is only then what is actually happening. I wonder if you see that? Do please, come. Because it would be worthwhile if we could think together about this matter. Then you will leave the tent having understood the movement of fear and realizing the nature of desire and the nature of limited thought creating time, which is fear. You understand? Do you realize it? Or have you merely accepted the words? You understand? If you

realize it the thing is over. There are no gurus, no gods, all that nonsense.

Q: My thought does not stop.

K: No, no. It is not a question of thought stopping. No, no, don't say thought - we will discuss that a little later when we talk about meditation, if you are interested. But that is not the point. I am saying: does thought itself realize what it is doing? That it has created the desire and the fulfilment of that desire is time. And in that is involved fear. And also thought has created what might happen. There has been pain, I hope there won't be pain again, which is in the future. So thought has created the future - right? And the future is the very nature of fear. I wonder if you get it?

Look sirs: if I die instantly there is no fear. If I have an immediate heart attack - phst, gone, there is no fear. But my heart is weak, I might die, which is the future. The future is the movement of fear. Get it? See the truth of it, not your conclusion. Not your saying, "Yes, I see it". - the truth of it.

Then that very truth operates. You don't have to do a thing. If you see that truth and that truth being the fact, then thought says, "All right, I have finished". Thought cannot operate on a fact. It can operate on something which is non-fact. So can you after having listened to this verbiage, have you realized the nature of fear? See the truth of it. If you really see the truth of it, fear has gone. It is not that you control thought. You are the thought. You understand? This is one of our peculiar conditioning that you are different from thought, and therefore you say, "I will control thought". But when you realize that thought itself is the 'me' and that thought has created this future, which is fear, and see the truth

of it, not intellectually see the truth, you can't see the truth intellectually, you can see intellectually the clear, verbal explanation, but that is not the truth. The truth is the fact that the future, the whole movement of the future is giving birth to fear.

Now you have listened to this, perhaps in different ways, and different explanations on different occasions, and you are gathered here again, and you have listened this morning to a very clear explanation, which is not analysis, and are you free of fear? That is the test. If you are still carrying on, you say, "I am afraid of..." - you know, all the rest of that business, then you haven't really listened.

## SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1979

I wonder if we could forget all that we have been talking about during the last five gatherings here and begin as though we are meeting for the first time. And not having heard what has been said, start anew, start afresh so that perhaps we may be able to find some abiding truthful solution to all our complexities and problems.

What is the central issue that we would, if we went into it carefully, diligently, hesitantly, come upon, which may resolve all our sorrows, griefs, anxieties, the depressions, the failures, the fulfilments, the frustrations and all that? Is there one solution, or one observation, one insight, one comprehension that will bring about a total revolution psychologically in each one of us? You understand my question? One answer, absolute, irrevocable, not relative, but complete, whole, lasting, and yet timeless. Is there such a solution?

If each one of us put that question to ourselves, would we answer it according to our particular pleasure, to our particular experience, to our own knowledge? Or would we, if we are at all serious and not too flippant, investigate together to find out a remedy that will enlighten our hearts and minds? Can we look at the whole of life, not one particular segment, one particular part, one idiosyncrasy, try to find an answer politically, religiously - I am using the word 'religiously' rather sceptically - economically, and so on? Can we look at all these divisions which man has brought about as a whole? To look at this world outside of us with all its innumerable divisions, and inwardly, psychologically we are

fragmented, broken up. And one asks oneself if it is possible to see the whole of this outer and inner as a total movement, indivisible, as a whole structural movement of thought? Is that possible? Or our minds are so broken up, so fragmented, so divided, that we are incapable of seeing the whole movement of life as one unitary movement. You understand?

Please, as we said the other day, and if I may repeat: we are thinking over together this question, together, not that the speaker investigates and you listen, but rather together you and the speaker find out for yourself if there is a way of living which is comprehensive, which is whole, which is not yours or mine, but a life that is a movement without a beginning and without an end? To find that out, I think it is important, if one may point out, to be aware of one's own fragmentary outlook. You are either a psychologist, psychotherapist, and you are trained along that particular line, and so one's brain, one's conditioning, is already established, and therefore one cannot see the whole. Or you may be a businessman, again the same phenomena takes place. Or if you are a politician then you are doomed. Or if you are a religious man, inclined to be religious, not accepting any particular dogma, creed, ritual, and all that. Or an ordinary human being, of which you are all part of this, with all his anxieties, with his sorrows and pleasures, and fears, competition, comparison, measuring himself against others, and always trying to reach something which he has projected, and hopes to find.

So are we together aware of our fragmentation? Actually aware of it? Not imagine that you are fragmented and then think that you are? You follow? Either the idea of fragmentation is so strong, and

that idea shapes our thinking, then you think that I am fragmented. Or one observes the actual state of the mind which is fragmented, broken up, shrivelled. Can such a mind observe this extraordinary complex movement, with its great beauty, subtlety, can one observe this totally? You understand my question?

Please, you are not listening to me. I only happen to be sitting on the platform for the convenience of you all so that you can see the speaker, but the speaker is not the authority. In spiritual matters, in the matters of the spirit, in the matters of the investigation, there is no authority, no guru, which is obvious. That is, if you carry the knowledge of the others - and perhaps all knowledge is the result of others - and add your own particular knowledge to the accumulated knowledge there already in your brain, then to find out if there is one act, one state of mind that will solve all our problems. Do you understand what we are talking about? Are we meeting each other about the question itself?

Ignorance is part of knowledge - right? I wonder if you see that? You know the whole concept of a priest, the guru, the one who knows, in that concept, in that conviction, there is the one who is enlightened, clear, and helps the other to free himself from his own ignorance. And generally, and often, and very, very, very rarely, the authority who has knowledge tries to dispel the ignorance of the other but his knowledge is still part of ignorance. Are you following all this? And here, in these gatherings that we have had for the last nearly twenty years, there is no authority whatsoever. Because authority of any kind in spiritual matters makes you a prisoner to another system, conviction, ideas, knowledge. In that there is no freedom. And to find out if there is a solution to all our

complex innumerable problems, is there one seeing, one perception, one observation that frees completely the whole of this structure which man has put together, psychologically? You understand? Are we meeting each other?

You see to go into this one must have great humility; not humbleness, not psycho-phantasm, not searching somebody's robes and saying "I am very humble". That quality of humility that has had no vanity, that has never known vanity. You understand? Otherwise it is not humility. Go into this carefully. Those who are vain, arrogant, full of their own importance and their own knowledge, their own realization, and all that business, in that there is a sense of self-importance. And that state of mind then cultivates humility. Haven't you known all this? So a mind that has known vanity in any direction - scientifically, religiously, politically, the sense of achievement which gives one a great self-importance and arrogance - such a mind can never comprehend a quality which is totally free of vanity. We are meeting all this?

And people have also tried, for millenia upon millenia, to find that absolute solution to their lives through austerity. Austerity is harsh, strict, severe, stridently noisy, stridently strict: putting on robes - sorry, I am not talking of those gentlemen here - putting on robes of different colours all over the world and imagine that they are stridently simple. It is only the noise of their simplicity that prevents them from being simple. Because when you are simple it doesn't matter what clothes you have on. But clothes have become extraordinarily important in the world, in the religious world, indicating a tradition which you accept and thereby hope to lead a simple life. Man has tried several things, played so many tricks



upon himself, and those of us, if we are at all serious, are efficiently, honestly trying to find out a way of life and therefore a way of action, which comes from the comprehension, from the perception of that one solution - right? Are we meeting each other? Don't be angry with me please, those of you who have got this, different robes and so on, we have been through all that. It doesn't mean a thing.

I once followed in the Himalayas a group of monks. It was a beautiful country, wild rhododendrons, lilies, the flowers of the alps of that altitude, and the great pine trees shooting into the heavens, blue skies and the birds were singing. It was a lovely day. And these monks never looked up, never looked at the trees, the flowers, the skies and the wonder of the world because they were concerned about their own ritual, about their own mantras repeating. And they think through that way they will find the heavens.

Here, if one may point out, the meaning of the word 'mantra'; probably you all know about it. It is a Sanskrit word which means - please listen - which means consider, meditate, ponder over not becoming, and also put aside all self-centred activity. That word mantra means that. Consider, go into your own becoming and put aside every form of selfish activity - that is the real meaning of that word. And look what these yogis have done to that word! You understand?

So seeing all this, the various forms of physical torture in order to find enlightenment, the various forms of rituals, robes, repetitions, and these have not in any way changed human beings and their relationship so that there is a new good society. We mean

by that word 'good' not the nursery meaning, "Be a good boy", it is not a respectable word, it is not a word that you can say, "Well it is old fashioned, throw it out," but that word 'good' has an excellent meaning, significance. And man through all these endeavours has never brought about a good society where people live happily, without conflict, without violence, with a great sense of responsibility, with care, with affection. That is what we mean by that word good. Man has not been able to achieve it. One of the main reasons for this ugliness in the world is that all of us, most human beings, probably 99%, are fragmented, broken up. And when one realizes this, that one is in a state of fragmentation, one is cognizant, aware without any choice, it is so. It is not that the speaker is imposing this on you, but it is a fact. And can that mind which is fragmented, can that heart which is also caught up in various romantic, emotional, sentimental, illusory nonsense, can that mind ever come to this, to find a solution that is everlasting? You understand my question? Right?

How shall we find out? Is it dependent on another? Follow this carefully. Can another, however much he may think he is lord, and this and the other, can another lead you or help you to that? Right? Please ask this question? Can a group, can a community, can a series of ideas, conclusions, help you to that? Or one must be a light to oneself, not the light which has been kindled at the other's lamp or candle, or fire. You are following this? Please give your heart to understand all this. Which means not only your heart, your mind, your brain. Freedom is not acting according to whatever you like. That is too childish, which is what is happening in the world, everybody is doing what they want. And any prevention, any

restraint on that is considered lack of fulfilment. Therefore permissiveness in every direction, religiously, socially, morally, is encouraged. And this permissiveness, that is doing exactly what one likes, or saying "It appeals to me, I feel good in that", denies freedom - we are talking psychologically not freedom from war, from the policeman, from taxes - but freedom from the dependence on another psychologically, because the other, when he instructs you from his knowledge, from his position, from his status, that knowledge is still part of ignorance, because knowledge can never be complete, therefore it is always part of ignorance. Right? I wonder if you see that? Of course.

Knowledge can never be whole, can never be complete, total. And therefore in it there is ignorance. When you realize that, when you see that, that you cannot possibly have an authority in matters of the spirit, in matters of the psyche, in the matters of deep religious enquiry, there is no dependence completely on anybody. That is freedom, with its responsibility to be a light to oneself. Are you following all this? Are we like that? Because we are going together to find out, please find out for ourselves, not at the behest of another, not stimulated by another, not encouraged by another, but find out for oneself totally, completely, which is not egotistic, so that one can be a light to oneself - right?

Are we together in this? - not agreeing, not being cornered in a tent and therefore you are forced to agree, or stimulated by the speaker with his intensity. If you are, then it is just a flame that can be blown out by the next wind.

So having said all this, is your mind - your mind being your brain, your senses, the quality of your thinking, knowing its

limitation, being prepared - not prepared, I won't use that word 'prepared', preparation implies time, that is one of our pet theories that we need time to be a light to oneself - are our minds after listening to all this, even though you are listening for the first time, and it is only if you are actually listening for the first time that you are really paying attention. You know it is like looking at the sunset or the sunrise, the beauty and the extraordinary light is never the same. You can see it day after day, day after day, month after month, you never say, "I have seen it once, it is enough". If we have paid attention to what is being said, and what is being said is not a repetition, beauty is never that which is constantly happening, it is always new. A marvellous classical painting, or if you listen to music, it is new all the time. But our minds get so dulled by words and by the repetition of words you say, "I am bored with it. You have said all that before". But if you listen there is always something new, like the sunset, like the evening star, like the waters of a river. (We have still time!)

We are asking you together if our minds and therefore our hearts, our whole being, senses, the quality of the senses which are not divided - you understand? - which are together, and a thought and thinking, knowing that it is limited, fragmented, always of time, and a brain that is the result of millenia, conditioned, full of memories, knowledge, experience, like a computer - of course it is much more capable than a computer, the brain has invented the computer, but the brain also is active as a computer. So we are saying the whole of this, can we enquire with this quality of mind? Or just be in a state of observation, just to observe without the observer? Because the observer is the past, the observer is the

result of all the experience, senses, responses, reactions, memories, he is that. To observe without the observer, so that there is only pure observation, not distorted, not broken up, not the result of choice, like and - you know, just to observe.

Then in that state of pure observation is there one act, one insight, one total perception of something that will resolve all these problems? You have understood? There is. Be careful! The speaker says there is. You know nothing about it, naturally. If you are aware of it you wouldn't be here. The speaker says - and please listen carefully - it is not authority, it is not the result of experience, it is not the result of accumulated knowledge, it is none of that. The speaker says there is a solution, a way out of all this terrible confusion and misery and fear, torture and terror. Right? So don't accept it. Where are you at the end of this? Please I am asking this - the speaker is asking this very seriously. We have talked for fifty minutes; at the end of it what is the quality of your mind that is capable - please listen - capable of receiving something and you say, "Yes", and the 'yes' is your own discovery, your own light, your own total attention which you have given to find this out.

Let me go into it carefully. One must have intelligence. Intelligence different from knowledge. In knowledge, as we pointed out earlier, there is ignorance - right? Whereas intelligence is free from ignorance and therefore free from illusion, and it is not the result of accumulated knowledge - right? - intelligence. The quality of intelligence comes when there is perception and action. That is, perception and no interval between perception and action. You see/act. I wonder if you understand this? Are you following this? You see danger - right? - like a precipice. And the very

perception is action, you move away instantly. That is intelligence. That is part of that intelligence. You see a dangerous snake and instant action - right? That's fairly simple because there it is a physical response. And the physical reaction is self preservation, which is intelligence. It is the unintelligent that sees the danger and pursues it. You understand? Intelligence is the perception of that which is psychologically dangerous and acting instantly. That is intelligence. Psychologically it is dangerous to depend on another: for affection, for love, for comfort, for enlightenment, that is dangerous because you are not free. And therefore the very perception of that danger and the acting is intelligence. Right?

One must have that quality of intelligence. That intelligence is denied when you are conforming to a pattern laid down by the gurus, by - it doesn't matter who - some idiotic person, or conforming, imitating, following. Therefore there is the ideal and the action which is different from the ideal, or conforming, or adjusting to the ideal - which is lack of perception - right? Lack of seeing the actual movement of this. And when there is perception, the ideal, the imitation, the conformity, following, totally ends and that is intelligence. You are following all this? I am not defining intelligence. It is so. It is only the neurotic that sees the danger and continues. The neurotic, the stupid, the thoughtless, the man who just follows his own particular idiosyncrasy, pleasure, and gives it a rational meaning and so on.

So one must have this quality of intelligence. Then with that intelligence is there a state, a movement or whatever you like to call it, which can solve all these innumerable conflicts and miseries? You are following all this? The mind that is totally

intelligent. And that mind is enquiring.

Questioner: The quality of the mind is not violent.

K: Sir, if I may point out most respectfully...

Q: You cannot define intelligence in such a violent manner.

Violence towards yourself, violence towards others. Honestly.

K: Sir, there are going to be five days of dialogue. Then please raise this question. The speaker is not preventing you from asking questions, from doubting what he says, from questioning everything that he has said. But this is not the occasion. So please have patience and consideration.

With that intelligence we are enquiring to find out if there is, there may not be, if there is an act, a state, a quality that resolves every issue of our life. Surely - I am hesitant because one has to use words that have been spoiled, one has to use a word that has lost all its meaning. A word like love has become sexual, sensory, sensuous, with it goes pleasure, fear, anxiety, dependence and all the ugliness that takes place in the so-called relationship. So one uses that word very, very hesitantly. It is in no way related to jealousy, fear, or sorrow. It is total responsibility, not only to your immediate person but the total responsibility to the whole of life, not only your life but the other life. I say that love is the total answer. Without that, do what you will, stand on your head for the rest of your life, sit in a position, lotus, or whatever you do. So with that intelligence goes the other. You understand? Without intelligence you cannot have the other. They are inseparable. And that is why compassion has this quality of great intelligence. And that is the solution which will solve all our problems. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 22ND JULY 1979

I believe this is the last talk. On Wednesday we will have some dialogues for five days. Why are you all sitting so quietly?

I wonder if you have ever noticed our minds are very rarely quiet, silent, having no problems, or having problems putting them aside for a while, and having a free mind, a mind that is not cluttered, a mind that is not stretching out, not seeking anything; but absolutely quiet, silent, and perhaps observing, not only what is happening in the world but also what is happening in the inner world, in the world of one's own existence, one's own attitudes, travails, just to observe. I wonder if one has ever done this kind of thing. Or, are we always seeking, searching, asking, analysing, demanding, trying to fulfil, trying to follow somebody, some ideal and so on, or trying to establish a good relationship with another? I wonder why there is this constant struggle and strife and seeking? One goes to India, I don't know why, seeking something extraordinary that is going to happen when you go to that country, follow somebody who tells you to dance, to sing, to do whatever you want. And there are those who try to force you to meditate in a certain fashion, accept authority, do certain rituals, shout when you like and so on. Why are we all doing this? What is our everlasting thirst? What is it that we are seeking? If we could go into that a little bit, try to find out for ourselves what it is that we are longing, searching, seeking, trying to fulfil, trying to become something.

Apart from the religious beliefs and dogmas and rituals, which fairly intelligent people have put aside, and not going to Tibet or to Japan, or trying to do Zen Buddhism, you know the whole business



of it, but remaining quietly at one's own home, or taking a solitary walk, can one ask why there is this everlasting thirst? Could we go into that a little? Because we have talked about most things during the last six talks. We have talked about fear, thinking together; we have talked about sorrow, pleasure; and we have also talked about intelligence and love and compassion. As we pointed out, without intelligence, which we carefully went into, there cannot be love, or compassion. They go together. Not the intelligence of books and cunning contrivance of thought, nor the intelligence of the very clever, subtle mind; but the intelligence that perceives directly what is not true and what is false, what is dangerous and immediately lets it go, such a quality of mind is intelligent. And if we could go into that this morning, not only into what is it that we are all seeking, longing, but also perhaps as we go along find out for ourselves what is the quality of a mind - mind being all our senses, all our reactions, all our emotions and the capacity to think very clearly, all that is the mind, the essence of which is thought. And perhaps we could talk over together what is the nature of meditation, and if there is anything in life, in our daily existence, not only material activities and material possessions, money, sex, sensations, but also beyond all that, if there is something really sacred, not put together by thought, not the images that thought has created in various forms, in various cathedrals, temples and so on, but actually, for ourselves, find out, perhaps through meditation, being free of all illusion, deceit and thinking very honestly, if there is something that is really sacred, which is the movement of meditation.

So first let us enquire, if we may, think together, what is it that

we are hungering after? Most people have had various types and varieties of experiences, not only sensual experiences but incidents that have brought about various emotional, sensational and romantic movements, but also these experiences that one has had are rather trivial; and perhaps all experiences are rather trivial. And when we begin to enquire what it is that we are all seeking, wanting, longing, is it a superficial, mere sensory experience, or something which desire seeks, which must obviously be rather superficial? And can we in thinking over together move from the superficiality to a deeper, wider enquiry? Right? That is, we are, you and the speaker, are thinking out together if all our longings are merely superficial, sensory demands, or is the longing, the searching, the thirst for something far beyond all that? You understand my question?

How do you enquire into this? When you have put this question, whether your enquiry, your longing is merely superficial, such as wanting more money, better relationship, trying to fulfil, trying to become happy, you know, superficially, on the surface - how do you enquire into that? Through analysis? Analysis is still the same movement of thought, looking back. And analytically thought examining itself with its accidents, its experiences, its examination will still be limited because thought is limited. That is clear. But that is the only instrument we have, and so we keep on repeating, using the same instrument, knowing that it is limited, and knowing that it cannot solve the problem, or have the capacity to enquire very deeply, and yet we keep on doing this - right? We never realize, I think, that this instrument however blunt, however used up, cannot solve the problem and therefore put it aside. We don't

seem to be capable of doing that - why? Please enquire with me. You understand my question?

Thought has created the technological world - right? Thought has created all the divisions in the world. Thought has created not only national divisions, but religious divisions, ideological divisions, every form of division between two people, however much they may think they love each other, there is still this division, and thought is responsible for that, which is obvious. Would we accept that - that thought in its activity will inevitably, being limited, being the result of the past, must inevitably bring about a division and therefore limited. Thought can never see the whole - right?

Now can we ask is such activity superficial? Or can thought with its limitation enquire more deeply? You follow what I am saying? Have we understood each other? Can we go on? Please it is not verbal explanation, it is not that verbally we are clear, but rather together find out for ourselves what is the root of this hunger, great desire to search, to find, you know this constant movement out and in. This is obvious, right?

Is observation, to observe, the instrument of thought? You follow? Please go into this a little bit with me. To observe: does that involve the movement of thought? You may observe, then conclude, conceive, create through that observation. The creation, the activity through that observation is the movement of thought. That is what we generally do. I see that colour, one sees that colour, there is the observation of it, then like and dislike, prejudices, all those are the movement of thought. Right? Can one observe without any of the movement of thought? Does that

require a kind of discipline? Discipline, the root of it, is to learn. To learn, not to conform, not to imitate, not to make the mind dull, routine - all that. But to learn. Now can one learn that the activity of observation, without the thought creating the image out of that observation, and acting according to that image - right? Can one merely observe? Which is to learn, to observe and to learn or to be aware of the movement of thought interfering with that observation? To learn about it. Which is, actual discipline, to learn. I wonder if you have got this? Are we following each other? Are we doing it as we are talking, or you are going to think it over? Please we are all doing it together, thinking it out together.

So we are saying: when there is observation into say, our longing, our thirst for something, can you observe without any motive - motive being the past, which may be the desire, the conclusion of thought - without the past interfering with the actual observation? Can you do that? That is to learn. This whole movement, the observation, the interference of thought, and what the result and the effect of all this movement is, just to observe. One wants to learn. Learning is the accumulation of knowledge, generally - right? School, college, university - or learning about relationship and so on, learning. Having accumulated knowledge then act - right? The purpose of learning is to accumulate knowledge, and from that act skilfully, or unskillfully, it depends. Or you act and then learn, which is from action accumulate knowledge. You have understood? You are following all this? So our action is always based on the accumulation of knowledge - right? Acting and learning from acting, and accumulating. Accumulating knowledge and acting - right? So our actions are

always based upon the past, or the past projecting the future, and acting according to the future. It is the same movement, modified but it is still the same movement - right? I wonder if you are following all this? You are doing it sirs?

We are pointing out something entirely different - you understand? Accumulating knowledge and then acting. Accumulating knowledge and projecting from that knowledge the future and acting from the future. So our actions are invariably the result of the past or the future; that is, action based on time, yesterday, today and tomorrow. Yesterday meeting the present, which is today, modifying itself and proceeding - right? Our action is based on that. So our actions are always incomplete, obviously. Because in that there are regrets, a sense of frustration, they are never complete, obviously - right?

Now we are pointing out something else, totally different. Which is, an observation in which the past and the future doesn't exist. Just to observe. As one observes if one is a good scientist through a microscope, observing what is actually going on. Right? When he observes what is actually going on, the thing which he is observing undergoes a change, undergoes a movement - right? Please listen to this. Can one observe the longing, the seeking, the urge, the intense energy that is demanded, just to observe that without the movement of the past? You have got it? Are you following all this? It is not terribly intellectual, please. It is merely logical, merely reasonable, and therefore rather sane. Sane, which means healthy. So can one do that? To observe our longing, what it is we want out of life, what it is we are seeking, hunting - most of us are, otherwise you all wouldn't be here. That is - please go into it

a little more - you read books, philosophy, psychology, doctorate in this and that, or so-called religious books. In those they are always pointing out that there is something beyond, parapsychology - you understand? - more, something more and more, deeper and deeper and deeper. And having read those one would say, "Perhaps there is, I am going after that". And then one gets caught by the priests, by the gurus, by the latest fashion and so on, till you think you have found something which is satisfying and you say "I am perfectly happy, I don't have to seek any more". Which may perhaps be an illusion. And most people like to live in illusions.

And all your search and your demands, your hunger has not solved or brought about a good society - you understand - a good society, a society that is based on peace, there is no violence, there is no each one trying to fulfil his own ambitions and all the rest of the violence. The purpose of our enquiry into all this is to bring about a good society in which we human beings can live happily without fear, without conflict, without all this striving, struggling, all the brutality and all the rest of it, because that is the intention of enquiry, because a society is built out of the relationship of people. If our relationship is not correct, precise, actual, then we create a society which is as it is now, which is what is happening in the world - right?

So our enquiry into this: which is, why human beings separate, you are seeking something, another is seeking totally different, each one is asking something different - right? And therefore there is always this self-centred movement. And the society which we have created is based on these self-centred problems, self-centred

ambitions, fulfilment and self-centred discipline which says, 'I must', which brings about violence. We are enquiring into all that, which we have, and also we are enquiring into a mind - your mind - mind - you understand? When we use the word 'mind', it is not your mind, or my mind, but mind. Because your mind is like the mind of thousands and millions of people - right? Striving, struggling, demanding, following, accepting, obeying, idealizing, belonging to some religion, sorrow, pain, anxiety, your mind is that and the other minds are like that - right? So your mind is not yours. It is the mind. I don't know if you see this? You may not see this because your vanity, your sense of individual importance may prevent this observation, which is actual. Right? I wonder if you see this? That is why, until we really understand this, that we human beings are so similar psychologically, we human beings right throughout the world are so unhappy. They all pray, but prayer doesn't answer this problem. They are still unhappy, still striving still despairing. This is the common mind. And so when we are enquiring we are enquiring into the human being, not me and you. We are human beings. I wonder if you see all this?

And enquiring into that, can one observe the outward world, the divisions and all the rest of it, the terror, the danger, the politicians with their criminalities - can we observe all that, just to observe, not draw a conclusion? If we observe what is happening out there, and equally observe what is happening inwardly, then our actions are not your action and my action. I don't know if you follow all this. We are then acting together - do you understand? - because we have observed the same thing together.

Now we are asking what it is that we are seeking? You

understand? If you ask yourself what is it you are seeking, is it money, is it security, is it to be free from fear so that you can have everlasting pleasure, is it that you are seeking to be free from the burden of sorrow - not only your burden but the world's burden of sorrow? Or are you seeking - apart from all the religious nonsense - or are you seeking something which is timeless, something that thought has not touched at all? You understand? Something essentially original? Something that is absolutely incorruptible? So find out for yourself, as a human being, like the rest of the other human beings in the world, what is it one is longing, seeking, hungering after.

If one is wanting experience because one has had sensory experiences, sexual experiences, the experiences of various kinds, and one has said, "That is enough, I have had all those but I want some other kind" - you follow? Some more. Is that what you are seeking? Some experience which will give you great delight, great understanding, an illumination, a transformation. How will you find out?

First of all to find out one must be free of all illusions - right? Which means terrible honesty so that your mind doesn't deceive itself - right? Not to deceive itself one must understand the whole nature of desire - right? Because it is desire that creates illusion, through desire one wants fulfilment, one hopes for something more. So unless you comprehend the whole nature and the structure of desire it will inevitably create illusion. And we went into the question of desire. So can your mind, having understood the activity of desire, know its relative value and therefore be free to observe? Which means you observe without any kind of illusion.



Nationalism is an illusion - right? Obviously. That is very easy. The illusions that thought has created - right? Is one aware of illusions? Come on sirs. And when the mind is free of illusions, and so being absolutely without any hypocrisy, being clear, honest, then you can begin to enquire: enquire into something, asking whether there is a timeless existence. You understand? A timeless truth. That is, this is where meditation comes into being - right? You are following all this?

Have any of you done meditation? Probably not, or probably have - transcendental meditation, Tibetan meditation, the Hindu meditation, the Buddhist meditation, the Zen meditation. Probably you have played with all those. Seriously or flippantly. All those, as far as one can understand, and the speaker has discussed this question with all the scholars of all the various circuses, and their whole concept is: that thought must be controlled, that one must have discipline, one must subjugate one's own feeling to something other than 'what is', through awareness, through control, through constant alertness - you know all this, don't you ? And repeat certain mantras, slogans: you can repeat 'amen' or 'coca-cola' or what you like (Laughter) - don't laugh, they are all similar. So what we are saying is: meditation has been accepted to be all this.

Now if you want to find out what is meditation, not just accept what somebody says, if you want to find out certain obvious things are necessary. There must be no authority, because then you depend on that - right? Obviously. Therefore you are struggling, you are imitating, conforming. And one must understand the nature of control. Who is the controller? You understand? Do you understand this? I wonder if you understand all this? No? Are you

interested in all this? Because it is your life, not my life. It is your everyday life we are talking about. What is involved in it, whether one can be free of all this chaos, confusion and misery. And this is the enquiry, you are enquiring, not me enquiring and you accepting; we are together enquiring, we are together taking the journey.

So first, as we said, no authority, which means cease to be secondhand. You understand? We are all secondhand people, because secondhand is tradition. We never say, "Look, I have put away all that, let me look."

The next question is control: from childhood we are trained, educated to control, to suppress; or the other extreme, which is what is happening now, do what you like, do your own thing! Which is the opposite of the other. So one must understand the whole movement of control. Is there a way of living - please listen to this - is there a way of living without any form of control? Which doesn't mean doing what you like, either permissiveness or the other, indulgence. Is there a way of living - please enquire into this, perhaps this is something new to you - in which there is not a shadow of control? So to find that out one has to ask: who is the controller? Right? We are enquiring into what is meditation, because perhaps if one can understand the nature of meditation, not the meaning of the word, the meaning of the word is very simple - to ponder, to think over, to enquire and so on and so on - but apart from the word, to find out what is meditation. It may, in this enquiry, resolve, bring about a life which is extraordinarily sane, extraordinarily rational, and you may be able to find out something that is nameless, timeless. We are leading to that.

So who is the controller who says, "I must control my feelings," or "I must allow my feelings to flow" and so on, who is that entity that says, "I must control"? You understand? Control and the controlled. The controller and the thing to be controlled. Therefore there is a division. Who is this controller? Is it not still the movement of thought? Thought has said - please follow this - thought has said, "I have experienced this, I have learned this" and all the rest of it, which is the past, so the past is the controller - right? And that which is happening now has to be controlled by the controller - right? You understand? Are you following all this? Or are you just going to sleep?

Questioner: Following.

K: Actually doing it sir. I am not talking for my benefit - right? I have talked for fifty two years - 'basta' for me. I am not interested in talking. But I am interested to find out if you can also discover the same thing so that your own life will be totally different, transformed, so that you have no problems, no complexities, no strife, longings, and all the rest of it. That is the reason the speaker is talking, not for his own gratification, not for his own enjoyment, not for his own fulfilment - all that nonsense.

So the controller is the result of thought, thought based upon knowledge, which is the past. And that thought says, "I must control that which is happening now" - right? The actual. The actual is being, say for example, envy or jealousy, which you all know. And thought says, "I must control. I must analyse. I must suppress it, or fulfil it". So there is a division - right? The division created by thought. Are you following? So in this there is deception - right? The deception lies in the idea that the controller

is different from that which is to be controlled. Both are created by thought - right? So the controller is the controlled. I wonder if you see this? Right? So if you really understand this, go into this very seriously for yourself, you will see that the controller is unnecessary, only observation is necessary. You understand?

When you observe, there is no controller or the controlled, just observing. Observing your envy, say for example, envy, observe it, without naming it, without denying it or accepting it, just see the sensation, this reaction, which arises, which has been called envy, and to look at it without the word. You are following all this?

Then when there is no word, because the word represents the past - you are following all this? - and when you use the word 'envy' it strengthens the past. Right? So there is a possibility of living without any sense of control. I am saying this not as a theory but actually. The speaker says what he has done, not what he invents, that there is a life without any sense of control and therefore no sense of conflict, no sense of division. That can only come into being when there is only pure observation. Got it? Do it and you will see. Do it. Test it out.

When there is no conflict whatsoever what takes place in the mind? You understand? Conflict implies movement - right? Movement is time - right? Time being from here to there, both physically and psychologically. That is, the movement from the centre to another centre, or the movement from the periphery to another - you follow? There is this constant movement in our lives. Now if you observe this movement very carefully, and as you observe what takes place in the mind? You are following all this?

First you have understood no authority, the nature of thought,

thought being limited, and knowledge which is stored up in the brain as memory, and that memory acting as thought in action. So knowledge is always part of ignorance - right? We went into that. So what takes place in the mind? You understand? The mind as we have gone into it is not only the capacity to think clearly, objectively, impersonally, and the things that thought has created, technologically and all the rest of it in the world, and thought has also created all the inward problems - right? When one observes all this, the mind has the capacity to act not from thought but from pure observation. Do you get this? I wonder if you understand? Please sirs, all this is logical, there is nothing sectarian, nothing of Eastern philosophy - none of that. Though the speaker is born in that country called India, he is not an Indian. He has got a passport, that is all. So he is not involved in exotic, romantic, nonsense, or some strange philosophy. We are only examining what is actually taking place. And to observe what is actually taking place one must look, without the response of the past shaping it. From that pure observation there is action. That is intelligence. And that is also the extraordinary thing called love and compassion.

So the mind has this quality of intelligence and naturally with that intelligence goes compassion, love. Love is not mere sex, for god's sake brush all that aside. Love is something other than mere sensation, totally unrelated to our demands and fulfilments and all the rest of it. So the mind now has this quality, this stability. It is like a rock in the midst of a stream, in the midst of a river, immovable - you follow? So such a mind, because it has understood relationship with each other, we went into that - relationship is not based on image, you have an image about me

and I have an image about her, and our relationship is that, from image to image. You know all this, don't you? And therefore there is no actual relationship. There may be the relationship of touch, of the senses, but that is not actual deep, profound relationship with another. If there is not that profound relationship there is conflict, and out of that conflict we create this society which is utterly immoral, violent, murderous.

So the mind now has this quality of great stability. And that which is stable is silent - right? Are you following all this? Have you gone into this? Do you understand? To be absolutely clear, to have clarity which can then examine any problem. That clarity is stability. You understand? It is only the mind that is confused, contradictory, broken up that is unstable, neurotic, seeking, striving, struggling. So we come to a point where the mind is totally clear and therefore completely immovable. You understand? Immovable not in the sense of a mountain, but immovable in the sense that it has no problem, all that, therefore it is extraordinarily stable and therefore pliable. Right?

Now: such a mind is quiet. And you need to have a mind that is absolutely silent, absolutely, not relatively - there is the silence when you go of an evening in the woods, there is great silence, all the birds have gone to bed, the wind, the whisper of the leaves has ended, there is great stillness, there is the outward stillness. And people observe that stillness and say, "I must have that stillness", and therefore depend on the stillness of being alone - you understand? - being in solitude. That is not stillness. And there is the stillness created by thought. Which is, thought says, "I must be still, I must be quiet, I mustn't chatter," and gradually it produces a

stillness. But that is not it, because it is the result of thought operating on noise - right? So we are talking of a stillness which is not dependent on anything. And it is only that quality of stillness, that absolute silence of the mind that can see that which is eternal, timeless, nameless. This is meditation - right? Right sirs. Finished.

# SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC DIALOGUE 25TH JULY 1979

For the next five days, every morning here, we are going to have a dialogue. A dialogue means conversation between two people. Two people who are concerned about their life, about their way of living, the world about us and serious enough to resolve their problems, and so they are investigating together through a dialogue. Dialecticism is the art of investigation, the truth, of opinions. The truth of opinions, that is called dialectics. And opinions, our judgements, personal evaluations, points of views and I don't think you can find truth through those means. But perhaps if we are serious enough and concerned and committed to the investigation of our own problems, not theoretically, not in abstraction but actually that which is happening. And two friends are talking over together about their problems, investigating and hoping thereby to resolve their problems. I hope that is clear. This is not a talk by the speaker but together have a conversation, a friendly, not antagonistic, not opposing points of view but together go into our problems. So that is the intention of these morning meetings here for the next five mornings. And I hope we will do that.

Now what shall we talk over together this morning?

Questioner: Sir, is it possible to observe thought as it occurs in the present, or when there is observation the thought is already past?

K: Is it possible to observe thought as it is happening, or to observe thought as it has past? To observe what is thinking as



thought arises, and observe that; or investigate thought which has already happened?

Any others? Please, let's put lots of questions and see which is the best of them and take one and work it out completely together. Go to the very end of it. So that is the first question.

Q: I was struck by an automobile when I was seventeen years old and I have had a great deal of difficulty with energy. And I have listened to you for quite a few years and understand about not identifying with the problem. I wonder if you could go into personal mental cripples, like me.

K: Could you discuss, have a conversation about physically being incapable, or having pain and does that affect the mind. Does that affect the quality of thinking, quality of feeling, quality of affection?

That is two questions. Go on sirs.

Q: (Inaudible - about the psyche.)

K: The psyche of the mind and universal psyche. Is that it?

Q: The difference between the 'me' and the individuality.

K: All right sir. The me and individuality.

Q: Would you speak a little bit more about action which is not based on recording?

K: Would you talk, or discuss, have a conversation about what is action, whether there is an action which is precise, accurate, and does not bring about further actions which will demand greater sorrow, greater problems and so on.

Q: What is the relationship between love and death?

K: What is the relationship between love and death. Now just a minute, just a minute!

Q: Could you speak more about the relationship between fear and dependence? I am concerned about dependence in my own life and my relationship with my girl-friend. Sometimes I see it and yet it still continues. Somehow I don't become free of it. Many times I think of just leaving and going away to live on my own. Yet somehow I sense that is not the answer. And yet there are other times when I see my own dependence and yet I am not free of it. And there is tremendous fear.

K: You must make the question, please, short.

Q: The relation between fear and dependence.

K: Fear and dependence. What is the relationship between fear and dependence.

Q: Ambition and why we are so insensitive in our daily life.

K: Ambition and insensitivity in our daily life.

Now just a minute. Which of these questions shall we talk over together? That gentleman asked, is it possible to observe thought as it is taking place, or observe thought as it is over? The other question is, one is physically affected through an accident, a disease, certain forms of illness and does that affect the mind? And the other questions is, what is the relationship between love and death? And you said, is the personal psyche, or the universal psyche? And that gentleman asked, what is the relationship between fear and dependence? And your question sir, which was action, is there an action which is so totally complete that doesn't leave regrets, anxiety, pain and sorrow and all that. Now which of these questions would you like to talk about?

Q: If we discussed dependence would that cover many of the questions?

K: If we discussed dependence would that answer many of the questions. Or would you discuss action, action in daily life, the doing, the way of behaviour, the way of conduct, the way of a relationship in which all action takes place, is there an action that is so totally complete that it doesn't leave a sad remembrance? Is that the question? Shall we discuss that, or do you want to discuss something else? Would you like to discuss action?

Q: Yes.

K: It is whatever you want. All right, let's talk about action. Perhaps in that we will include thought, what is the relationship between love and death, fear and dependence, and physical illness affecting the mind, and the psyche and universal. Can we do this? Do you want to do this?

Q: Yes.

K: Right. What do you mean by action? What do we mean - please, this is a conversation, don't go to sleep, this is a conversation between you and the speaker together. I am not investigating and you are just listening; together we are going to find out if there is an action which is so whole, complete, total that it doesn't leave a single shadow of pain, regret, grief, hurt and all that - right? So what do we mean by action? Please sirs, join with me.

Q: Action must be a creation.

K: Action must be a creation? You see you are now making a statement like, action must be creation, and it is finished. There is no dialogue. But if you say - that is why I am asking please don't offer opinions right off, what you think is action and hold on to it. Let us take it, examine it together - right sirs.

So the first thing is to find out what we mean by that word action. The doing. Do we mean that which has been done, or that which will be done, the action in the past, or the action in the future, or the action which is now taking place. This is action. Action isn't moving from here to there physically, or taking a hammer and a nail and putting it in a wall, or driving a car. Actually action means that which is happening - right sir? Not the action which has happened, or the action which is going to happen. All this is also action: that which has happened, that which is happening, and that which will happen - right? Do we agree to this, please? So what is the action that has happened? What is it the result of? What is the motive of that action? What is the impetus? What is the conclusion from which an action takes place? You are following all this, or are you getting tired already?

Action has some kind of motive, pleasant or unpleasant, rewarding or painful, or under pressure, driven by various influences. So one has to find out what we mean by action. Is there an action which has no motive, which is not under pressure, which is not frightened and therefore act, which is not rewarding and therefore painful? So one has to look at the word very, very carefully, if you are willing. This is a conversation - right?

Most of our actions, as one observes, are based on a remembrance - right? Or on a desire, or on personal reward, or punishment, or an action based on an ideal, or on a belief, and so on. Right? So please watch this, let's examine it together. If an action is based on an ideal, on the future, that action is conforming, adjusting, or imitating the ideal - right? Therefore is that an action which is whole, complete, without leaving any mark of hurt, regret,

and so on? You follow? So what is our action, yours and mine, the speaker's, in investigating, what is our action based on? Pleasure, fear? Go on sirs, examine it. I am investigating, you are all silent.

Q: It is based on necessity.

K: Necessity. That is sir, I need food so I go to the market, if I have money, buy it, that is an action. I need clothes, if I have money I go and buy them. Shelter and so on. So on necessity, the needs, physical needs, and then psychological needs - right? Right sir?

Q: Do psychological needs exist?

K: That is the question which we are going to find out. There are physical needs and actions, and actions based on what we consider psychological needs. One needs somebody to give one comfort, therefore dependence and action based on that dependence - right? I need somebody to tell me how to live a different life and I depend on that person.

Q: Is it possible for an action not to have a cause?

K: Is it possible for an action not to have a cause - we are going to go into all this. Go step by step please. You see when you make a statement like that: is there an action without cause, you are asking a question which is hypothetical, and the answer must also be hypothetical. But if we go step by step, slowly, examining, and doing it as we are going along, then there will be no theoretical problems at all. Right? So please in discussion, in dialogue, don't jump to something. See what our actions are based on first, what is actually going on; either physical needs, food, clothes, shelter and the labour required to earn the money to have those, and psychological needs. It is a fact. This is what we have, physical as

well as psychological and our actions are based on these two. One recognizes physical needs are absolutely necessary, either you work - factory, digging in a ditch, teaching, carpentry, science, business, doctors, not politicians!, and so on, and that is necessary. As society now is organized we all have to work from morning until night for years and years and years. Just look at the tragedy of it. You may not like it but it is a fact. One goes to the office, factory, whatever one is doing physically to earn money, from the age of twenty, fifteen, until you are almost dying, day after day to the office, and so on and so on. That is how our society is organized. That is a fact.

Q: Do you call that action or is it reaction?

K: Do you call that action or reaction. It is both because I need food and if I don't get proper amount of money, labour, I am jealous, anxious, and all the rest of it begins. Therefore it is a reaction. So there is the physical need. Then one's actions are based on psychological needs. Please go into it.

Q: Psychological needs are different from desire?

K: We are coming to that sir. Are psychological needs different from desire? Perhaps not. Or they are. Let's examine it. Let us first see, or recognize and accept as a fact that we need, apparently man needs, human beings need - the need may be false, we will find out - the need for action based on psychological needs. That is, one needs belief, one needs certain forms of conclusions, certain opinions, points of view. You need nationalities, hierarchical approach. You need all this. Please don't deny it, it is a fact for most people. You may not, and say, "I have no psychological necessities", that would be a most rare thing to say. Right?

So we must find out for ourselves: do we have these things as a need? Belief, opinions, judgements, conclusions, images, religious and otherwise, religious and images created by the hand and by the mind - you follow? Are these needs?

Q: What about despair? Does action come from despair?

K: What about an action that comes from despair? Sir, look, first let's look at ourselves sir. What are our psychological needs, and are there actions born of those needs?

Q: Sir, I think from what I have heard so far it seems that the necessity has to be there for an action. There is always a necessity for action in some way or another.

K: You are saying there must be some kind of necessity, need, for action. We said for physical needs there must be. But we are questioning whether we need, or are there necessities, psychologically, for action. I question it. I am not saying you must accept it. I say I doubt it. I am not sure. You understand? I am examining it. One is not dogmatic, I don't take a position, I don't refuse to move from one conclusion.

What we are trying to find out is, what is action. You see action in the physical needs, and action based on various forms of opinions, judgements, conclusions, convictions, experiences, beliefs, dogmas, dependence and so on and so on, psychologically. And the speaker says he questions it, you understand?

Q: First of all if action is not based on these and it were based on true observation then there may not be so many problems. But most action is based on desires, on our conditioning, and on our needs. So what is the right means to base on action on?

K: You are asking, are you sir, please if I am putting your

question wrongly please correct it - are you saying that we need psychological...

Q: No, I am saying that all action is not based on needs. What would determine what is a correct need, instead of desire and so on?

K: Yes what is the correct need. Just wait a minute please. What is one's correct need physically - right?

Q: In other words, is there a strict separation between the one and the other? Is there a right separation between the two or...

K: Is there a strict division between the psychological needs and the physical needs. Now to answer that question, do physical needs go over to the psychological needs? I need a house - one needs a house, or a room to stay in, then in that room one gets attached to the furniture, the attachment to the furniture is a psychological need - right? Because without that furniture I feel a bit uncomfortable. So is there demarcation at all? You see unless you please go into this step by step you won't answer this question so quickly.

We are talking over together as two friends, investigating together, as a dialogue, as a conversation, what is action. We have said so far there are the actions based on the needs, on physical needs. One needs a shirt, a pair of trousers or a dress, one needs that, unless you are a nudist, then it's all right! You need to have food, and to have food you have to work, have enough money to go to the market and so on. And you need a roof, a house, but the need for a house becomes very important. One isn't satisfied with a room, one wants a beautiful room, one wants pictures in it and old antique furniture, if you can afford it. Then as you have invested



money in the antique furniture, in a lovely room, with a lovely vase and pictures, you are attached to it. And then you say, "I need those." Right? "I can't live without a picture in the room" - and it must be either a copy, an original and so on and so on. That is, gradually I begin to depend on those things. So the furniture is me - right? Do you question that? I am attached to the furniture and I don't want you to spoil it - don't put it in the sun, don't scratch on it, I hold it dear. And that furniture has become me. Right? And I act from that.

So we are going the next step: is there a necessity for psychology to exist? Are there psychological necessities? We say, yes, it is a fact. The necessity of a belief, the necessity of dependence, the necessity of sex, the necessity of ambition, achievement, success - right? And on all that my actions are based. That's obvious, isn't it - right? Is this all wrong? Please look at it in yourself. One goes to India - sorry! - because one feels the need for instruction, for wisdom, for knowledge, for enlightenment, because the western world is too worldly, not interested in religion, and they go to India where there is dirt, romance, and squalor and gurus. Then you say, "I need those". You follow? This is actually what is going on.

So we are now questioning why we consider that psychologically we need things. Right? That is what we are investigating. Don't go back to the physical needs, we have finished with them. Now do we need beliefs?

Q: No.

K: The gentleman says, no. That means you are free of beliefs. Now see what we mean by belief. Belief in something that cannot

be proved. I believe - one believes in god - it can't be proved. One believes in heaven - it can't be proved. One believes that there are people living on the Moon - not on the Moon, somewhere else, one believes that, it can't be proved. So we believe in nationality - right? No? You are French, German, English, Indian, and god knows what else. Follow it step by step. Either you relinquish all this as you go along and say, "Sorry, I am not a nationalist" - finished.

Q: May I ask a question? Don't we have to ask ourselves first where those needs come from?

K: We are going to find out, we are going to go into that. How do these needs arise, what is the cause of them? We are going to find out in a minute if you have patience. So beliefs have become necessities. Talk to the Catholics, to the Protestants, to the Christian world that believe in Jesus, a saviour and all the rest of it, they believe. Right? And you go to India, they also have their gods, they believe. So why do they believe in something that cannot be proved - you understand? - that has no validity. Why do they believe?

Q: Because they love that form of action.

K: The gentleman says because they love that kind of action. Why do they love that kind of action?

Q: It gives them security.

K: Go into it please. Enquire into yourself. You believe, don't you, if you are honest, in something or other. Or you don't believe and you go to the other extreme, which is the same. You understand? "I don't believe in god, I am an atheist". And both take a stand. You understand? You know what I mean, 'take a stand'?

That is, both remain convinced of their conclusions.

Q: Sir, belief in oneself is the same thing.

K: Belief in oneself. All right, let's take that, belief in oneself.

What is oneself? What is oneself?

Q: My contents.

K: No, investigate it, please talk it over with me.

Q: We try to find security in something else, like a belief.

K: Sir, the gentleman says, "I believe in myself", so what is the thing you believe in?

Q: My fear.

K: Just look at it sir, look at it, examine it. Do you believe you exist because you have a body?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes. Do you believe in yourself because you have certain emotions, certain conclusions, certain points of view, certain way of behaving, certain idiosyncratic activities, name, form, bank account, or no bank account? All that you believe in? You don't even... please examine it. When you say, "I believe in myself", I say it is a strange thing to say, what do you believe in? In the knowledge that you have acquired?

Q: Which is myself.

K: That is what I am examining madam.

Q: May I suggest that we take an actual example. Most of the people who are present in this tent believe that you are enlightened.

Q: How do you know?

K: Sir, we are not talking who is enlightened, who is not enlightened and how do you know. But we are talking about a man who says, "I believe in myself", I say, what is this strange

conclusion? Then I say, who is yourself in whom you believe?

Q: Let's us say that I believe that you are enlightened.

Q: All right, sit down again!

Q: Let us say, I don't believe you are enlightened. I don't believe that you are going to help me. I don't have to believe that you will in any way help me.

Q: Why are you here?

K: I am sorry sir, I don't quite understand.

Q: I would suggest that I, being this person, am the only one who can find out. I don't think any of this is very important.

K: Sir, one has to find out for oneself who he is. Now, two friends are meeting and talking over, and say, look, who am I, in whom I believe so strongly? Right? He says, let's investigate it. Don't say, I am god, and stick to it, or I am the environmental reactions, or this or that. Don't hold on, or take a position, let's enquire into it, let's go into it. Not that I am superior, you are inferior, or you are superior, or I am inferior. Two friends. So I say, I am asking, who is this entity, myself, in whom you believe?

Q: A piece of the absolute truth.

K: Oh, a piece of the absolute truth. You see, and then you are finished. There is no discussion possible.

Q: Well if you say you believe in yourself, doesn't that generally mean that a person lives life, he has certain challenges in life, he has overcome some of these challenges. And from overcoming these challenges or whatever the experience was he forms a certain image of himself and when says he believes in himself, or she believes in herself, it is that image that they believe in.

K: Is this dialogue worthwhile?

Q: If we could go on.

K: As we are going on, is it worthwhile? It is a lovely morning, you could go out for a walk. So I am asking you please, is it worthwhile going on with this dialogue?

Q: Yes.

Q: I don't know.

K: You are quite right sir.

Q: Let us go back to action.

K: I am coming to it.

Q: What is oneself, that is the real question, I think it is worthwhile.

K: That gentleman asked, amongst other questions, what is action? Is there an action that doesn't bring sorrow? Is there an action that doesn't breed contradictions? Is there an action that is so complete, so whole, that it is finished without leaving nay shadow of regret, of saying to oneself "I wish I hadn't done it", and so on? That is the question two people are discussing, you are the one and the speaker is the other. We are having a dialogue about it.

Q: Action issues from spontaneity.

K: Action is born out of spontaneity. Are we ever spontaneous? You see!

Q: Sir, this is my action: what am I to do?

K: I am going into it sir, that is just simple. The gentleman asks, I have had an accident, a car accident, my body is affected, and it is affecting my mind, what am I to do? Right? He is asking that question because he has to find out, because he is in pain, he is confused, he says, "Tell me what to do". Right? Are we in that

position, any of you? Or is it all so casual a dialogue that you will listen and you will do nothing about what you have listened to?

You know we have spent fifty minutes and we haven't come to any point. So I am asking, is it worth going on like this? So what shall we do?

Q: Let's investigate the point that we arrived at when we discovered something instead of going to something else.

K: Sir, that gentleman is concerned about himself, his pain, his anxiety, his nervous reactions from this motor accident. He is concerned. He doesn't want theories, he doesn't want about enlightenment, all that business. He says, tell me. Right? And are you in that position? I hope you have not had an accident, but are you in that position and say, "Look, I want to find out. I want to give my life to find out if there is an action which is really whole" - right sir? Are you giving your life to it? Or you are just sitting on the river bank and looking at the waters go by, never entering in the stream?

Q: There is no complete action.

K: Very few are concerned really about it. I am just questioning whether these dialogues are worth it at all.

Q: Why don't we change from discussions. You are one and we are a thousand. So technically discussion is not really possible. Perhaps you have to announce them in another way.

K: The gentleman says, you are one and we are a thousand, and you can't really have a conversation with a thousand people. Just listen. You can't have a conversation with a thousand people because there are a thousand opinions, a thousand ways. That is why I said at the beginning sir, please let's think together. Let's us

put aside our problems, our opinions, our judgements, our way of thinking, our conclusions, put all those aside and let's think together. You won't even do that. And when we meet two, or half a dozen, it will be the same problem. We have done all this; in India, in Holland, in America, small groups, big groups, but nobody gives his life to find out.

Q: Can you not just discuss one problem?

K: I am doing one problem.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is the one problem I am discussing still. That is, when a body is affected by an accident, why does it enter into the psychological mental state - right sir?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Haven't you such problems?

Q: Is it a false means of protection from facing?

K: Look: my nerves have been shattered through an accident - right? A car has run over my leg and that leg is paralysed, I can't walk properly. And that affects my thinking because I can't get a proper job - right? You don't see all this. I depend on somebody to help me, so gradually I become anxious, I become frightened, I develop nervous ticks, and what am I to do?

Q: The question is, is my body myself?

K: That is what we are discussing madam. We talked about it, but you all refused, you want to go off in different directions.

Q: Sir, I would like to suggest that there are a lot of us here who are in the same situation as the gentleman, but not physically, but in other ways also.

K: Yes, sir. The gentleman says there are a lot of us here in that

position, but not physically - right? Now how will you talk over it, have a dialogue?

Q: The conversation is very useful for me.

K: Look sir, one's problem is both psychological and physical - right? One is affected physically and therefore the nervous organism has been upset, crippled and it affects one's thinking, one's feeling, and one is frightened. That is one problem, which is the result of a physical accident. And the other is, equally one is crippled psychologically - right? Psychologically one is crippled by belief, dogmas, and all the rest of it, dependence, attachment, fear and so on. Now can we see these two facts first, not move away from that? The fact one is physically crippled and the other psychologically blunted, crippled. Now what shall we do? Or you say, I am perfectly healthy, therefore I will walk out. That's all right too, you understand? You understand what I am saying? Are you in that position, and say, "Sorry I am not crippled physically, I am not mentally, psychologically, there is no ugliness, there is nothing crippled, and therefore I am perfectly healthy" - right? That is a very rare person.

So we have got these two questions. What is the action - please follow it - what is the action with regard to the one who has had physical calamity, which is affecting his nerves and therefore his brain, his thoughts, his emotions and all the rest of it, a result of an accident. And the other psychologically crippled and equally frightened, equally nervous, equally inhibited, equally anxious and developing neurotic attitudes - right? Both are similar. One you think is physical, the other is psychological, but both are similar. Right sir?



Now what is the action with regard to this one thing? Physically affecting the nerves and the brain, and the other, crippled by tradition, crippled by belief, crippled by attachment, crippled by various pressures, job, you follow, they both come to the same thing. Right? Do you see that, please? These two are not separate, they are one. Right? One is physical, one is psychological. The physical brings about the psychological results, which is what has happened to most of us, which is psychologically we are crippled. Now what is the action? Right sirs? Shall I go on with it?

Audience: Yes, yes.

K: Ah, you see. Conversation, you and I are together sharing it.

Q: Sir, from this would I have an insight?

K: Just a minute madam. Look, I will go into it. But we are going into it together. Not I go into it, you listen, then make an idea of it and then pursue it. We are doing it together now - right?

Shall we go into it. That is, we are having a conversation between you and me. Don't bother about that gentleman, please. He is tired, he has had an accident, he is in pain, he must be quiet, leave him alone, don't project your ideas onto him. Gosh!

So what is action with regard to this one thing? Human beings are crippled - right - both psychologically and physically. Some are extravagantly crippled in both ways, others are medium, partially, and what is the action which will correct this thing? Is this clear?

Q: Yes.

K: Now let's talk it over together. Why do we - no, wait a minute. Which is most important, this psychological aspect of this, or the physical aspect of this?

Q: Psychological.

K: If I know, or am aware, that I am psychologically crippled, and because I am psychologically crippled it gradually affects my body. I have nervous responses, my nerves are on edge, I gradually develop a sense of isolation - you follow? And all the rest of it follows. If I am physically, it is the same thing. So I am saying which is more important to consider first? The psychological state of being crippled, or the physical state of being crippled? You understand? To which do we give importance? I know the man who has had an accident, he says, for god's sake don't talk to me about psychology, I am in pain, I have had an accident.

Q: I am psychologically aware.

K: I am asking you sirs, and ladies, to which do you give importance? To the physical or psychological?

Q: Both of them.

Q: Psychological.

K: Careful, careful. If I am physically affected would I consider psychology? See the difficulty. I have been run over, I am crippled and it is affecting my mind. My mind has already been affected by society, by my parents - you follow? Only this incident has added more to it.

So which is more important? I don't neglect the physical - right? I say I will go into it. I will go into after I have understood whether I am crippled psychologically, or the physical is making me crippled, psychologically. So I am investigating being psychologically crippled, the result of a physical accident, the result of living in a monstrous society, the wrong kind of education, wrong kind of acquiring knowledge and so on and so on, that has crippled my mind. So I see psychologically if I can

understand the whole structure of the psyche then I can attend to the physical. But the man who is in pain, he says, "No please give me some kind of drug, some kind of opiate, some kind of thing that will quieten me down" - right? Then the doctor is important, not me - right? But if his psychological state, psychological crookedness, unclarity, crippledness, I think that can be cleared - you follow? That can be completely made whole. Then with that clarity of mind I can attend to my physical ailments. Do we agree to this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam I can't hear. Perhaps somebody who has heard, sitting near to you, can explain what you have said. (Pause)  
Nobody is willing to translate so I can't help you.

So I am saying myself, being crippled psychologically can they be made whole? That is the question, which needs action. I can't sit down and say I will make it whole. Or go off into a monastery. It can't be down. It needs action, I have to do something. Right?

Q: Sir, I am sorry to interrupt but I feel that now we are putting our foot into an old, old trap. And the trap is that we sit here and watch you perform. We are perfectly sure we know it, we have seen you do it a hundred times. We know that in half an hour you can totally break out of all psychological problems, and probably physical and spiritual and everything else. Unfortunately sir, maybe I am odd man out, if so I may sense a certain hostility on the part of some members of the audience, who may feel that I am throwing a spanner in the works. They want to watch you break out onto 'Cloud 9' - if so I don't want to interfere with them, I am happy to leave.

K: Go on sir. I am listening to you.

Q: I can leave immediately.

K: Come on sir.

Q: Ten minutes ago, after having spent fifty minutes, you came to a point where you felt that we were all just pussy-footing around with the thing, talking theoretically, not really having the least bit of gumption to get into this thing. All we wanted to do was to take a ride and watch you do the trick. Then in despair perhaps you seemed to have washed your hands of the whole thing, resigned yourself to the fact that we were a lot of useless nincompoops, and decided to have a dialogue with yourself, which is what you have been doing for a long time. If so it seems to me that it can only harm me because watching you have a dialogue with yourself is very entertaining, may be a bit instructive, I have seen you do it a lot of times, but it is not going to get me anywhere.

K: No, sir. Quite right.

Q: Since it seems this is the only choice: either we have got to have the gumption...

K: ...guts.

Q: ...guts to have a dialogue with you, which means we have got to care about this thing. It means we have to stop saying how much benefit we are getting and please go along and carry on and nobody should interrupt and so forth. I mean even when our friend interrupted and said that he feels that most people here look on you as an enlightened person, you didn't want to go into all that, but it is perfectly true. We do look on you as an enlightened person. Unfortunately the fact that we do so means that we can't listen to you at all. And I don't think we are listening to you.

K: That's all. Yes sir, I know this.

Q: So now just tell me what I should do, put me out of my problem because to carry on sitting here, I feel I just have to listen while you do your act, it is a marvellous act, I want to be in that chair, I don't want to listen to you do it, I know you can.

K: Sir. I have made it perfectly clear, all along I have said please, there is no authority, don't say the other is enlightened, and all the rest of that business. I say, look at yourself, be serious, be committed, put your whole mind into it - right?

Q: Quite right sir.

K: I have been saying this at every meeting.

Q: I don't blame you at all sir.

K: I have been saying there is no authority. I have been saying, please, the speaker is not at all important. You are important as a human being, let us talk about that. But apparently we don't do that. So what shall we do?

Q: I don't know.

K: I do know.

Q: You do? What is it sir? Give me any answer other than having a dialogue with yourself.

K: No, I don't want to have a dialogue with myself. I can in my room, or on my walks, or with some few people, I can have that dialogue. That is not the kind of dialogue one wants. What is important, what is necessary, is that you, all of you, put your mind, your heart into this, not say, you are enlightened, we will listen to you. Wipe all that out. Right sir?

Q: Quite right sir.

K: Sir look at it. I keep on, the speaker keeps on insisting on

this, every day of his life: don't follow, don't imitate, don't conform, think it out, observe. But our whole conditioning is the other - right?

Q: We have to an authority, there are too many people here.

K: Is it a question of too many people? Sir there are not too many people if you really want to find out for yourself, then your whole attention is drawn and you are examining.

Q: Somebody must be in charge, so it stops us from really listening.

K: I am not the chairman. I am not taking the chair for each of the audience. I say, please let's work together, I say, let's think together. Putting the speaker on a platform has no meaning because it is only for convenience, forget all that and let's think together. But you won't even do that. What am I going to do?

Q: I experience you are doing it again. You are expressing your frustration, expressing perhaps your disappointment about the audience as it has been for years and years and years. I think the same thing will probably happen tomorrow and the day after. I will be finished quickly. I have been waiting to meet you, in person for quite a while. I have read a book written by ? about his meeting with you maybe forty or fifty years ago, the same frustration, the same anxiety, the same disappointment you expressed to him then that you are expressing now. What I experienced in the book was a man of real love, of real humanitarian concern. What I experience now is an older man who makes side comments, who is frustrated, who says what is going on. I think that we can continue but it is not going to change. There has to be a different format. The question has to become more pertinent, more vital.

K: Right sir. You say the question should become more vital, more personal, more intense, I will do it.

Q: Why don't you stop speaking and leave us to it?

K: Delighted! Why don't you stop speaking and leave us in the tent. Is that what you want?

Q: Yes.

Q: I think a few minutes ago we were talking about psychological and physical division and how they were both a kind of... the psychological was a form of the physical process. The first point that I thought was important was that everybody had realized that they had this psychological incapability. How many people realized or even looked at our psychological shortcomings. How many people realize exactly what that all involves? That is the point.

Q: How can they acknowledge the fact that they are psychological cripples?

K: You can't. Unless I say I am blind, please help me, then I can do something. But if you say, no I am sorry I see quite clearly, there is no point.

Q: Most people were saying that they realized they were psychologically crippled but at the time I felt the question was what to do, how to get over it.

K: I will point it out to you and you will have to do it yourself. Is that right? Will you listen then and do it?

Q: What happens?

Q: How do you know?

K: What am I to do?

Q: Just leave it now.

K: No, please, this is a serious question. You won't even have the courtesy to listen, to find out what the man is saying. And then see if it applies to you. If it applies to you then say let me put my energy, my guts, my whole heart into it to be free of it. You don't do that. What am I to do?

Q: Some of us do that Krishnaji. I have done it.

K: If you do it so much the better.

Q: We can't.

K: I can't do what you are saying?

Q: Can we ask why the people who cannot do that and keep on coming here year after year, they come here to say they cannot do it, but why can't they do it? Can they tell us why they can't do it.

K: Sir. It will be another dialogue with myself. Will you listen why you cannot go into it yourself, go into the cause, break the cause and move out of that? If it is pointed out will you do it?

Q: Yes.

Q: It won't work.

Q: No.

K: I don't know but will you do it? I want to be a good carpenter and I go to the man who is an expert, a master carpenter, or I learn from a scientist because I want to be a scientist, I want to learn, I want to have a clear mind. But apparently you don't. Or you go half way and stop. Will suffering help you? Will somebody hitting you on the head? Offering you a reward of heaven if you do this, this, this?

So one says to oneself perhaps somebody amongst you will catch this - right? Like grain thrown out, it might fall on the rocks, or on a fertile field, or just die by itself, but the man who is



throwing out the grain he can't help it. You understand, he does it. He does it, maybe out of affection, compassion, love and all the rest of that business. And so he is not concerned where the seed drops - right?

Q: We must put some fertilizer on ourselves.

K: I am doing it sir. I am doing that. Will you listen? Will you say it is my problem, I have got to solve it? I will put my life into it, my energy into it, my guts, my feelings to find out. Will you do it?

Q: Yes.

Q: Sir, I would like to ask the gentleman a question: why does it not work? Could you answer that question?

K: Please sir let's get on with what I am saying. You expect your energy to change somebody else, it can't. Will you, as a human being, listen and put your whole energy into this, as you put your energy into earning a livelihood, when you want sex, when you want this, or that, you put your guts into it. Why don't you do it?

You see at the end of nearly two hours, an hour and a half, we haven't even discovered for ourselves, not I have a dialogue with myself and give a performance like an actor, I am not that. I would walk out of this tent if I felt it was hopeless and you will never see me again. I mean it. But I feel somebody amongst you will take the coin, somebody will say, yes, I have got it, let me go with you. And I will go on doing this all my life. Somebody will catch some fire. If you don't, you don't. That is not my business.

Look sir, an hour and a half. What have we done? You, not me. I am very clear what I am doing. Whether there are two people

listening, or a thousand listen, I will go on, or nobody listens, it doesn't matter, I will go on. So leave me out of it. But if you are willing to listen, go into it, we will go together into the very depth of it. But you must give your energy. It is like those people, having their own particular guru and coming here, and saying, yes I will listen to you. Or having their own opinions, conclusions and not letting them go. Our relationship is together - you understand? You and the speaker together take a walk into the whole psychological world. It is not my performance, it is you have to act. Right?

So shall we go on tomorrow? If we go on tomorrow let's do it properly: that you are really serious and want to go into it to the very depths, you, not me. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE 26TH JULY 1979

Before we begin our dialogue I think we ought to clear up some points that arose yesterday towards the end of the meeting.

We seem to be blocking ourselves. Some say it is not possible, what you are talking about can never be put in daily life. "I have listened to you for twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years and nothing has happened, I am just the same as before". That is a block that prevents each one, or the person who says these things, it prevents him from investigating himself, he has blocked himself, saying, "It is not possible". That's obvious.

And also there are those who say, "I understand partially, I want to understand the whole before I can do something about it." - again that is a block. Again that prevents your own investigation of yourselves, you are blocking yourself.

And there are those who say, "What you are saying is totally impractical, why don't you stop talking and go away?" Such people, and I have heard this very often, not only prevent their own investigation of themselves, but also because one person can't do it himself he condemns the rest of the world - "If I can't do it, you can't do it". And so this goes on.

Let me talk a little and then we will have a dialogue. If we could this morning, and the next four mornings, realize, if I may point out, that we are not a whole thousand or two thousand people in the tent but we are talking to each other, a single person - you understand? You and the speaker are talking together. When we two talk together it includes all the others, it is bound to. And I

would like to point out, if I may again, please don't hinder yourself by blocking yourself, by saying, "I can't do this, it is impossible. You are a biological freak and this is not applicable to ordinary people". Or, "You have to have special genes to understand all this". One finds innumerable excuses, one finds every form of avoidance of looking into one's own hindrances, observing them closing, understanding them and trying to put them aside. If we could do that then perhaps we could have better communication with each other. Please.

And also I would like to point out: I think we don't listen, we don't really try to find out what the other person is trying to say. And listening requires certain attention, care, affection, if I want to understand what you are saying I must listen to you, not block myself all the way, all the time. I must care for what you are saying, I must have respect, I must have affection, love, otherwise we can't communicate certain things which are really very, very serious and require a great deal of enquiry. So if I may suggest that we listen with affection, with care. All these dialogues, and what happened yesterday, indicated that we have very little love for each other - right? We want to assert our own points of view. We want to exercise our own opinions and dominate others by our judgements, by our conclusions, by our asserting that we have to listened to you for so long, why haven't we changed. All that indicates, it seems to me and I may be wrong, that there is no real love. I am not blaming anybody, I am just stating this. Don't get angry. Don't ride the high horse!

And I think we should go into this question very deeply, why we don't listen. Or we say, "Yes, I have listened" - finished. "I have

already listened to you for twenty years, it is all over. I am not going to listen to you any more". You don't say that to a child, do you, whom you love? He wants to tell you something. He may be telling it to you ten times, he has already told you, but the next time he says something you listen. You don't brush him aside. You are not impatient. You love that child. And I think in all these discussions and dialogues and talks we are missing that essential perfume. I don't think we know what it is to listen with love, which doesn't mean that we shouldn't be critical, which doesn't mean that we should accept everything that is said. It doesn't also mean that we agree or disagree. You listen, listen with care, with affection, with a sense of communication with each other. And for that one must have love. And probably that is what is missing. We are all too terribly intellectual, or too romantic, or too sentimental. All that denies love.

So perhaps, if we could this morning have a dialogue of whatever you want, whatever subject you want, bearing in mind that without this quality of affection, care, love and compassion, we merely play with words, remain superficial, antagonistic, assertive, dogmatic and so on. It remains merely verbal, it has no depth, no quality, no perfume. So bearing that in mind, what subject would you like to talk about this morning?

Questioner: Sir, could we continue with our discussion of yesterday, of action, and how to deal with mental and physical disability?

K: Could you go into again, as we began yesterday, when a questioner asked, could we discuss action?

Q: Is it possible to have thinking together if only one person

wants to have it?

K: Is it possible to think together if the other person refuses to think together?

Q: I have difficulty in understanding what you mean by registration. In English we use the word meaning to become aware of something, to register an impression, register discomforts. But you seem to use, or classify this recording. Would you go into that?

K: Would you go into the question of what you mean by registration? To register something, to remember something, to acknowledge, like a tape on which you register - right? Could we go into that?

Q: Why are we satisfied with the way we are living?

K: Why are we satisfied in the way we are living.

Q: What is the relationship, or the difference, between the nature of thought and the mechanics of thinking? One thought appears to follow another even for no special reason, and the movement of thought can be violent even if the content of the thought, you thought was positive.

K: I have not quite understood it, sir.

Q: I am interested in the mechanics of thinking, and the difference or the relationship between the mechanics and thought itself.

K: You would like to examine the whole structure of thought.

Q: Not the structure of thought itself but the mechanics of thinking.

K: We are using the word perhaps differently. We will use the word, the mechanics of thinking.

Q: Because I notice that it is possible to have neutral or positive

thoughts but the mechanics of this thinking is...

K: I am not quite sure I understand it, sir.

Q: I think he is saying that there is difference, inside the thought could be positive but in the way it expresses itself negative.

Q: Yes. Maybe thought is fighting like animals in the jungle, even though the content of the thought is positive.

K: Ah! Is thinking always mechanical, or is there a different kind of thinking which is non-mechanical.

Q: No. That is not the same. My thinking often doesn't flow very well. There is violence in the thoughts, in the mechanics but not in the content of the thought. Positive thought can be violent.

K: Positive thought is violence too. All right sir. I think we see.

Q: Why is love missing? Why don't we love?

K: Sir, when you put a question like that, are you saying, why don't I love? Not why don't we love? Why isn't there love in my heart, or in my being? Would that be right sir?

Any other questions?

Q: You said that thought is limited and yet if we look around thought has contributed to humanity.

K: You say thought is limited but every action is based on thought, all the activities, social, economic, religious, personal, are based on thought.

Q: And it is the common factor of all humanity.

K: And it is a common factor of all humanity.

Q: It has conquered the whole of humanity.

K: It has conquered the whole world. All right, sir.

Q: Could you go into how one is blocking oneself?

K: Yes sir. The gentleman he is still interested in that question,

where he has had an accident, it has affected his whole nervous system, and therefore his brain and his activity in life.

Q: Is it possible to know something without having to show something?

K: Is it possible to know something without having to demonstrate it?

So out of these questions which shall we take? Action, why isn't there love in my heart, what is the meaning of registration, the significance of registration and is thought everlastingly mechanical and is there something non-mechanical. So which of these questions? If we take them all together which is the central question in all these?

Q: The question of love, sir, it would answer the others, I think.

K: Could we go into this question, why is it that we human beings have no sense of love? Perhaps if we could go into that very deeply - again together please, not I talk and you listen, but together - then perhaps in the investigation of that we will be able to find out what is thinking, what place has thinking, whether it is mechanical, or non-mechanical, and why the mind is always registering incidents, accidents, hurts, all the experiences of man stored up, and what is action that will be so complete it won't leave a mark of misery, confusion. Could we take this one question, which is, what is love, why don't we love? Would that be all right?

Q: Yes.

K: Please, I don't mind. Do you want to discuss that?

Q: Yes.

K: Yes? I wonder how we approach this question. What is your approach to it? You understand? How do you come to find out



what is the meaning of love, why you, as a human being, have not this perfume, this quality that perhaps may answer all the other questions in life? Now what is your approach to it? How do you come to investigate that problem? Or it may not be possible to investigate that, but one can find out what may hinder it - you understand? What may prevent this extraordinary thing that man seems to be longing for and doesn't seem to have it. Could we do that?

So what is your approach to it? You understand my question? Because how you approach a problem is really important. Not the problem itself so much but how you come to it, how you look at it, what is your intention and all that. So please find out, if I may request, what is your approach, how you receive that question, whether your mind is romantic, sentimental, whether it is born out of desire. So you have to go into this very carefully if you want to go very deeply into this question because one may in going into this perhaps we will be able to answer the whole nature of thinking. Right? So are we clear how you approach it, each one of us? Or have you certain conclusions already about it? Certain opinions and your experiences, will they block you, will they prevent you from going into it very, very deeply? Right? So please we are talking together, not to each one, together. You understand? The speaker is talking to you personally, you. So what is your approach? Are you aware of your approach and how you approach it? Are you aware of your prejudice, your images about it, your conclusions about it, or what people have said about it? Can you put all that aside and try to find out?

Q: What is love?

K: What is love. That we are going to find out sir, that is what we are doing. You know sir, first the word - let's be clear that we both have the same meaning about that word, not that you may have a different meaning from the speaker, or the speaker different from you - you understand? So we must be clear about the word itself - right? Generally in a good dictionary the origin of it is desire. In Sanskrit it is, he desires. You follow? Love is associated with desire. Please I am explaining the dictionary meaning of that word. It is not my concept or your concept, but what is the common usage of that word. So if we are clear that we both recognize that the word is not the thing - you understand? You understand what I am saying? The word is not the thing. The word 'microphone' is not the actual microphone - right? So we must be clear always through our discussions, if I may point out, that the word is not the actual fact. Right? So we are enquiring into what is love.

Q: You say that a child, a baby loves its mother because it needs its meals. So in this case we say love is a fact of necessity.

K: The mother loves her baby and the baby loves his mother and that is a necessity so the baby can eat. Is that so? You make a statement, you don't investigate it. Is that so? The animals love their babies. The lowest form of life, manifestation of life, loves its young. And this is a movement from the animal to the man. And is that love? I am not saying it is not, or it is. Or is it the instinct from the animal carried on through the human and - please follow this step by step - and attachment, the animal brings up the cubs up to a certain age and then forgets about them. Right? They have gone from the nest. With a human there is tremendous care until they are

three, four, five, nursing them, looking after them, cleaning them, cuddling them, holding them, that is if you love the baby, which most people don't - it becomes a plaything. Or they have not the occasion, not the time. After that they send them off to school, to a boarding school and so on, gradually push them away - right? And we are asking, we are not saying it is, or it is not, is that love? I know the mothers will say, "How can you say such a thing?" And we are questioning, we are enquiring, we are not saying yes, or no. Because we are thinking, observing together to find out for ourselves what is this nature, the beauty, the quality, the extraordinary thing called love. If a mother and the parents loved their baby, looked after them, there would be no wars - right? There would be the right kind of education. There would be the right kind of society. So we are asking when a mother, when the parents love their baby, is it just for a short period? Or right through life? Which means that they must have right education, bring them up with right behaviour, without violence, without conflict, not train them to kill each other, organized war, which is respectable, accepted - you understand? Would a parent who really loved his children do this? Go on sir, you are parents, think it out.

Q: There is a moment where separation comes in.

K: At the moment there is separation. The mother, the father separate themselves from their children - right? And the children go off. They are attached to the children. Is attachment love? Don't please, go into it.

Q: The parents get something from their children, and the children get something from their parents, so...

K: Yes sir, I know all that. The baby needs a great deal of

affection, care, if the parents don't give affection, care, love to the child, the child withers. It is a well known fact. But generally the parents have their own problems, their own anxieties, fears, sorrows and business worries - you know, all that. And they give the child a little of what they can when they have time. You understand all this, this is happening in the world. And so is all that love?

Q: No.

K: Don't say no, madam. But will you do something about it, test it?

Q: I think we should approach it a little bit negatively, like love is not that.

K: We are doing that. We have just done it.

Q: Well to look at this kind of thing that is one of the ways of approaching it. Time, space, and the whole human and animal race...

K: We are coming to it sir, slowly, slowly.

Q: I think the parents even defend themselves against the child.

K: Of course, that always happens. You follow? The parents are against the child, and the child becomes... you know what is happening in the world. For god's sake, look at it.

So from that arises the question: is attachment love?

Q: Many people think so.

K: I know, many people think that without jealousy there is no love. If you don't struggle, fight, if there is no conflict, if there is no jealousy, a sense of each one asserting, people imagine that there is love, that this state is love. Right? So I am asking from that: is attachment love? We are thinking over together, you and I. So are

you attached to your children?

Q: Is there a care and affection that makes you attractive to somebody else at a neutral level as opposed to an attachment that...

K: When you dominate your children, or your wife, or your husband, or your girl, or boy when you possess them, all that, say, "They are mine" - is that love?

Q: No.

K: Sir, when you ask that question, is that love, when you say, "No, it is not", do you mean it is not in you - you understand? You are free of it, not just verbally say, "Yes, I am not". So that is why I asked at the beginning, if I may point out, unless we do this actively, see, aware that it is so in us, and being aware look at it, go into it, search out why human beings hold on to this attachment. Why you are attached as husband, wife, furniture, book, belief, it doesn't matter what, attachment. And if you are attached to one thing and another is attached to another, there is division - you understand? And is this division love? Please go into it.

Q: I said they even defend themselves against their own children.

K: Madam if you read the newspapers and magazines, and social workers and all those are saying, after a great deal of attention, after a great deal of study, that unless parents really love their children, really love them, have time with them, spend their energy with them, the children either generally die, the babies, or mentally psychologically they are warped. And you see this lady was pointing out that some parents are opposed to their children. They are, they beat them, they force them, they do all kinds of things to them. That is what she was pointing out.

Q: From what you are saying I think we might get the idea that we should love. I think most of us have the idea very strongly that we should love. And most of us are very afraid that we don't love. Perhaps that is the barrier.

K: Yes, sir. The speaker is not saying that you should love. That would be silly because it has no meaning. And because we see that we should love we feel guilty. And being guilty we force ourselves - right? So please. I hear you telling me, love is not attachment. I hear you. And because I really am in earnest, serious, I want to find out. I really want to find out. So I give attention to what you are saying. And when you say, is attachment love, I say, am I attached to my daughter, to my wife? I investigate in myself - you understand? I say, am I? And if I am not attached will I become irresponsible? You understand? I have so far said, as long as I am attached to this person I am responsible, I have to look after her, I have to care, I have to earn money, you know, together because I am attached to her, she is mine, I must protect her. And you are telling me, asking me, is that love. And I begin to enquire and I say, if I am detached will I neglect my responsibility - you understand? Will I be indifferent, will I get bored and chase another person? You follow? So I am looking at both, whether attachment is love, in attachment there is fear - I know, I feel it. In attachment I must possess, I can't let her go, or him, because in attachment I find security. And you come and tell me, or ask me, because I am listening to you, I care for what you say, you have gone into it, you have searched out, you may be wrong, you may be right, but I want to find out, so I examine, and I say, what happens if I am not attached. I get frightened - aren't you? I get

frightened, and that very fear makes me more attached. So I have to face the fear and see if I can go into it and see what is implied in it and then I can say, "Well all right, I see the danger of attachment, but what then?" You follow? I am not attached. Do I live in a vacuum, when all people around me are attached? Am I antisocial? You understand? Go into it with me as I am doing it.

So my enquiry in listening to you is, I want to find out what love is. To me that is very important to find out because that may solve all my problems if I know how to love - right? It may. Everything has failed: I have tried gurus, I have tried everything but nothing has come, nothing has resolved, nothing has created something new in my life. So I am listening to you very earnestly, carefully, with affection. So I say, I understand that love is not attachment. Understand in the sense I have seen it, not verbally, in action. I say, "All right, my girl, I am not attached to you". I am watching it - you understand? I see the danger and therefore I am holding it - you understand? Keeping a watchful eye. Are you doing all this?

Q: Can we determinate what is not love?

K: I am doing that sir, please. You are finding out what is not love. Attachment is not love. I have just discovered that. It is a tremendous discovery for me. Because I have so far accepted attachment as love, and you come and say, "Find out, look at it". I look and I find yes, you are perfectly right because in attachment there is fear, and fear cannot go with love. So I have discovered this. I haven't been told by you, it is part of my blood now. Right? Are you doing this with me, or are you just verbally playing around?

Q: You are going over a very serious problem with these people. Have you ever really considered that there is a very simple statement which tells you all about love, and that is found in the bible. And the simple statement is, that god is love.

K: Madam, please.

Q: And there is no love to be found in man himself. God loves man. And man can look outwards to god, not inwards and then find love.

K: Madam. If you make your question very short then it will be possible to answer it. But if you make a long speech it is impossible to understand even verbally.

So we are through the negation of what is not love finding it out. Do you understand? Negation, attachment is not. But with attachment I have felt responsible, but also if I am not attached will I be irresponsible - you understand? So I have to find out in action, not just verbally. I see I am attached, I see the dangers of attachment, like fear, and I understand the nature of fear and I say, all right. Now am I responsible being free from attachment? Is then, I am asking, is responsibility necessary to love? You understand? Through negation of denying attachment, and I have found responsibility, and is responsibility part of this strange thing called love? You understand? Being responsible, not only to my wife, to my children, having the feeling of responsibility. You understand what I am talking about?

Q: You make it sound like an obligation.

K: Responsibility is not obligation. Obligation is gone. If I am obliged to you, I can't love you. I am obliged to you because you give me money, you give me sex, you give me comfort - you know



- then where is this thing? It is a merchandise. Right?

Q: I think there is another danger: are we becoming indifferent, you know, to become casual? If you see the attachment you can begin to become indifferent. And that is another trap.

K: Oh yes, sir. That's is why I am examining all the traps. So I have realized love implies responsibility. Go a little further.

Q: It means to respond.

K: Responsibility as you say, comes from the word to respond. Now in that responsibility, is the response sensuous, sensory - you understand? Does this responsibility contain desire - you are following all this? Please, I am talking. I am not talking to myself. We are doing it together, you and I. You and I may be all of you. So I am asking, in that responsibility is that responsibility limited to my girl, wife, husband, or the feeling of responsibility - you understand?

Q: There is a centre from which responsibility comes into being.

K: I examined it sir. I am attached. In that attachment I have felt responsible. I go out, earn a livelihood, earn money, come back and I feel responsible for the woman, or the man. And in that responsibility there is attachment, fear, and you point out to me fear and love can't go together. You see it. It is so clear. And I say, quite right. So I am saying, is responsibility just to those few, or responsible for all human beings - you understand? Is love - follow this - is love this total feeling of responsibility?

Q: I see that if you are attached to somebody...

K: Sir, unless you go through this in yourself, work it out, test it.

Q: I test it every day and I think I test it too much sometimes. I

think that attachment, as long as I experience attachment I am not able to be responsible to the rest of the human beings in the world.

K: Yes sir. So I have gone much further in my investigation with myself. I hope you are doing the same thing. Which is, do I feel responsible not only for the few, with whom I am associated, or is there the feeling of total responsibility for the earth, for the trees, for the mountains, for the water, for other human beings - you follow? Total feeling. And is that love? Don't say, yes, or no, unless you do it.

And also I find in my investigation that I like to possess. I like to belong to somebody. Don't you know all this? So belonging, which is to be identified with something, - you understand? - identified with the nation, with the group, with a person, with an idea. So as I have lost every form of identification I feel I must be identified. Don't you know this? And in that identification I must possess. I can't identify myself with the wind.

Q: We are brought up in this way.

K: Yes sir I know. I am breaking my conditioning. I am breaking down what I have been brought up to.

Q: Sometimes your conditioning is that you are able to watch it, the conditioning, you can listen. The conditioning is sometimes very strong. You are able to watch it, you are able to be aware of it, but the conditioning is very, very strong.

K: Yes. I am aware that I want to possess. And in that possession there is domination. And possession and domination, does that contain love - you understand? So I discover it does not. So I will not possess. You understand? I can't possess, because my interest, my pride, my intensity to find out this thing called love.

So I have found attachment is not love, possession is not love, nor the instinct which has been derived from the animal to the humans, the mother, the parents saying, "I love my baby" and then neglect them for the rest of their life - right? That is not love. So I have out for myself these things are not love.

Then I want also to enquire - I hope we are doing it together. I am not talking to myself. If I am, stop it.

Q: What about attachment to the idea of independence, which is the other side of the coin? Aren't we often attached to the idea that we should be independent? This creates a problem also.

K: Yes sir. That means attached to the image you have about dependence. So is jealousy love? You understand? Or you say, "It is not, but I am jealous". So my saying, it is not, has no meaning. So I have to say, "Why, why am I jealous?" Go into it, look at it. Why am I jealous?

Q: Because I am frightened.

K: Because I possess. Why do I possess her, or him, why do I hold on? Is it that I am lonely - you understand? Desperately, deeply lonely, separate?

Q: I think love is a sort of... of life. For example, now at this moment together, and the sounds outside playing on the tent, the water on the roof, the whole of life, that is love. I think so.

K: You have described what love is - right?

Q: Like for example, I think love is an instant internal perception of life.

K: But you haven't got that intense perception of life. Yes, madam, I understand that, but I haven't got it. You people make a statement and let it go at that. I don't know what you mean by

'intense perception of life'. I am caught in this thing. You are giving some description what life should be. I am not going to be caught in that trap of descriptions.

So is jealousy love? And I am jealous, so I become aware of it. You understand? I go into it, I don't just say, what am I to do, tell me. I am seeing jealousy is not love and I am jealous, so I go into it, work it out, think it out. Which means I am attached to her, or him. So I have not escaped from attachment, I have not really resolved it. So I must go into again, look at it carefully because my intention, my whole search is find out this perfume. So I have put that aside.

Then I see that I have my ambitions, my beliefs, my dogmatism, me first and her second - right? Or she first and me second. And I say, is that love? Which means when there is separation between that and this, is that love? Sir, don't say, no. Go into it, look at it. Because if you don't, you will say at the end of twenty years, "I have done nothing". At the end of ten years you will say, "You have talked enough, get away from here. Stop talking". Because you don't apply.

Q: This is the only difficulty: we don't apply.

K: Apply. I am doing it.

Q: But I have the intention to apply myself but there is something else that I don't know that prevents me to deeply see all these things and not develop annoyance.

K: Then find out what is impeding you. Go into it. Don't say, "I don't know, I am going to give it up". Find out what is the barrier. Is it laziness, is it acceptance of things as they are, not to be disturbed? Sir, go into it. Test it out. Break down, cry, do

something to find out. At the end of it don't say, "I have listened to you for twenty years, or fifty-two years, and I haven't changed". It is not my fault, it is your fault. Don't put the blame on me.

Q: Sir.

K: Just a minute sir. I am answering your question sir. So I have discovered attachment in any form is not love. Jealousy is not love. Possession is not love, me and her, fulfilling my desires in her, or she in me. So desire - go into it carefully - desire is not love. Right? You don't accept it, you won't see this. Desire, sexual desires, desire for comfort, desire for various forms of encouragement, you know, desire. Is desire love? Don't say, no. Because I am desiring that woman, or that man. I desire to be a big politician, or a guru, or I desire enlightenment. I desire to become better. I desire to overcome this and enter into something else. All this movement of desire, the becoming, the fulfilling, is that love?

Q: What shall we do with it?

K: I am telling you, sir. Look at it, investigate desire. Desire. Why is the mind, which is the result of the sense, you follow, you understand this, the senses, so the response of the senses with its desires, is that love? You follow?

Please follow all this. I am investigating all this so that towards the end I begin to see that everything that thought has created, or desired, around this word, is not love. And in the perception of that intelligence is taking place - right? Right, sir?

Q: Is love the same as understanding?

K: No, sir. Love is not the same as understanding. Love is something totally different. You see I am describing it. I can use a Greek word, agape, or French word, or Sanskrit word, but it won't

convey the thing. The description in Sanskrit I can tell you, it won't. Or in Italian, or French, it is not that. So please sir, do it.

Q: Sir, you talked about love.

K: I don't talk about love. I am talking about the barriers, the things that prevent this thing taking place.

Q: Well I am blocking it.

K: You told me that sir.

Q: What shall I do? I mean, I want to love.

K: That's just it. I want to love. The very desire of wanting to love is the denial of love.

Q: Well how shall I get rid of that desire?

K: I am not saying you should get rid of anything. I am just pointing out how to investigate desire, to look at it. All right, I will show it to you sir. I have desire. I desire that woman, or that man, I desire to become something, I desire to be very healthy, I desire a better life, more money, I desire. And what is this constant urge - right? - for nirvana, for enlightenment, better life, what is this desire? Please I am not talking to myself. I can do this anywhere.

Q: In order for the desire to transform into the passion to investigate, something has to take place.

K: Is there desire for something? Desire can not be transmuted into something else, it has to be understood. It has to be exposed to the light of investigation.

Q: How do you expose it?

K: I am doing it. I am doing it. I went into carefully the other day, what is the movement of desire. The response of the senses - right? The response, I see something, a blue shirt, I want that blue shirt. The response of seeing, the response, contact, sensation, then

thought comes in and says, "I would like to have that shirt". So thought when it takes over the response of the senses creates desire. Test it out.

Q: I want the tension that you have sir to see that desire.

K: So I am left with this sir: I see love is not desire. It is a great thing to find out for oneself and if love is not desire then what is love? You understand? Love is not mere attachment to the baby, love is not attachment to any form, love is not jealousy, love is not me and my ambition, my fulfilment, my becoming, and you also becoming, this constant division, that is not love, nor desire, nor pleasure - right? The fulfilment of desire, which is pleasure, that is not love. So I have found out what love is. It is none of these things. And have I understood these elements and am free of them. Or just say, "I understand intellectually, I understand verbally, but help me to go deeper", I can't. You have to do it yourself.

Q: How do you do it, sir.

K: I am doing it sir. So in this investigation, in examining all these things quite impersonally, objectively as they are, I have got that quality of intelligence now. You understand? It is born out of this investigation, it is born out of this seeing the truth of each thing - right? And therefore out of that there is intelligence.

So I am asking, is this intelligence necessary for love? I am using the word intelligence, not intellect, not the cunning, twisting subtleties of the intellect, the verbal play, but totally different. The seeing and the doing; the seeing attachment is dangerous and the doing of it, which is the ending of it, that is intelligence. So there is intelligence and therefore it is love, that quality of love, which is compassion. Not compassion as an idea, a thing that is in one's

heart, burning, alive. And compassion, love and intelligence go together. Without intelligence you can't have compassion, this intelligence of which I am talking.

Now we have talked for an hour and twenty seven minutes, have you tested it out? Have you freed yourself from this attachment and therefore total freedom of immense responsibility? Or will you say the day after tomorrow, "I listened to you, nothing else happened"? That very statement indicates that you have not investigated yourself, gone into yourself. You expect somebody to do something for you.

Q: Krishnaji, that may not be quite fair. I have listened to what you are saying and feel now I must test it out.

K: Test it out. No, do it as we are talking, don't wait until the day after tomorrow.

Q: Sir, as I reject every attachment, or desire, I feel tremendously empty in myself, so I can't see intelligence.

K: Sir, emptiness, what does that mean? Lonely, separate, isolated, a sense of being cut off, not having any kind of relationship with another, is it the result of drugs, is it the result of various forms of marijuana, grass, weed, and all the rest of it? And also is it the result of your vows, your meditation, your acceptance of authority? You follow? Has made you the sense of absolutely worthless, empty, lonely. So at the end of an hour and a half nearly, have you got this quality of love and compassion? If not let us tomorrow talk about it, investigate it, go into it much more deeply. But don't say ever, "I have listened for so long and I haven't got it". You can listen to that river endlessly, but the waters are not what you listen to.



## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 27TH JULY 1979.**

We are having a dialogue, that is, a conversation between two people, friendly, serious and wanting to solve their own intimate personal problems. And so they go for a walk in the woods and talk over things together. And we are in that position, you and I, the speaker and you, we are out for a walk, lovely stream, marvellous pine woods full of morning scent, and we are talking over together. And each one of us know that words have a particular definite meaning, and that each one of us understands the meaning of the words they use. They know the words and the content of the word, the meaning of the word, the significance of the word, so they use the word which is common to both of them. And they also know that the word is not the thing and the words do not actually convey the deep inner feelings. They are feeling it out together because they are good friends, they are not opposed to each other, they are not trying to trick each other, they have known each other for long years and they have often talked about these things and so they are willing to expose themselves to each other; point out their difficulties, their problems, and each one is trying to understand the other, and hoping to help each other. That is really a dialogue. They have established a good relationship between them. So can we this morning have such a dialogue?

And we talked about yesterday, the nature of attention, care and love. So what shall we talk over together this morning?

Questioner: Could we investigate why it is so difficult for us to actually experience here and now all the psychological inhibitions

we have that block us from loving?

K: Could we investigate together our psychological inhibitions, our psychological barriers now. Talk it over together, the gentleman asks.

Q: How can the mind be free of cunning intelligence which society pushes on us?

K: How can the mind be free from the cunning which thought has put together there?

Q: What is the quality of the mind that observes silently? Is it something probably new to us, or is it something that we possess already but we have forgotten?

Q: Could you say what is intelligence?

K: Could you discuss what is intelligence.

Q: Is there a difference between voluntary isolation which obviously creates conflict and the involuntary isolation, such as being blind?

K: Isolation through some kind of illness, which is forced, and voluntary, willing isolation. Is that it?

Q: Could we discuss the mechanical activity of the brain, it is shouting all the time?

K: Why does thought always occur, why is there not a freedom at any time from the movement of thought?

Q: You often tell us that fear is produced by thought but I myself have experienced that fear manifests itself with thought and it wants to structure and limit itself, and escape from itself, by thinking.

K: You say fear is the result of thought, produced by thought...

Q: No, thought is the result of fear.

K: Thought is the result of fear - you follow? He is putting fear first and thought afterwards - right?

Q: Could we talk about identification?

K: Could we discuss why the mind seeks identification, why we seek identification.

Q: I find it extremely difficult to take part in these discussions because I am always in doubt whether it is a right or a wrong question. How can I find out myself, are there any guidelines?

K: How can one find out for oneself what is a right question, and a wrong question. Is that is sir?

Q: Sir, I asked why do you call the usual meditation which is sitting down with closed eyes, self-hypnosis? I asked this question because I have the feeling that it is through that that I can understand when you say beauty is something entirely different, love is something entirely different.

K: Why are you saying that sitting down quietly, crossed legs, closed eyes and going through all that is self-hypnosis. I somehow feel that I am very close to what you are saying, why are you saying that is not meditation? Why do you say that is self-hypnosis?

Now which of these shall we take up? They are all connected with the mind. All these questions, I don't know if you have observed, listened, are dealing with the nature of thought, the nature of the mind. What is intelligence, and what is meditation - right? Now which of these shall we take?

Q: Can we go on with yesterday's talk. I had the feeling we didn't go over it completely?

K: Could we go on discussing, talking over together, yesterday's

meeting because the questioner says, "I don't feel we have gone through completely to the end of it".

So we have got two questions, fundamental questions: thought with all its complexities, its mechanical habits, its constant activity, never a moment that it is quiet, meditation, and what we talked about yesterday, love, intelligence, compassion. Now which of these do you want?

Q: Love.

K: One is rather shy of that word because it is so spoilt - love of god, love of my family, love of poems, go for a lovely walk - you follow? Sex, the politicians use, the love of the country, love of god, love of Jesus, love of Krishna and so on and so on. So one is hesitant to use that word. So perhaps, if I may suggest, we will talk about that question which you have asked by enquiring first - we are discussing, we are talking over together, it is not a solitary conversation with oneself - if we could go into this question of meditation, then we may be able to understand whether it is possible for thought to be absolutely quiet, and not compelled, coerced, forced and all the rest of it. And perhaps we could take that question and go into it very, very deeply then perhaps we can also enter into the field of what is intelligence, love, compassion. And without those, which is the essence of that love, the mind can never be totally free from all its manifestations, its trickery, its deceits and dishonesty. So would it be all right if we talked about that?

Q: Yes.

K: You are not pleasing me, I don't care, if you want to talk about something else we will. All right.

The first question, if I may ask: is it possible to have a brain that is not twisted, that is not neurotic, that is very healthy, young? I am asking that as the first question. Do you understand? I am asking, to put it very simply: can the mind remain young, and not grow old, decay, corrupt, but keep its quality of youth? - youth being decision, action and vitality. Right? That is generally accepted as the meaning of youth, to have an enormous amount of energy, decision, action, and that sense of freedom. That, I think, would more or less describe what is a young mind. Would you agree to that? A definition, we can change it, I am not sticking to those words, but to have a mind that is extraordinarily clear, simple, having great energy, vitality and capable of instant decision and action. Right? Would you agree to that?

Q: Yes.

K: That is only a definition, you can change the definition, change it how you like, but let's all agree, if you accept that, that is the quality of a mind that is young, that is not hurt, that has no problems, that is living, living not in the future or in the past, but actually living in the present. That is, again I said one is using words to convey a quality of a mind that is youthful. If we agree to that definition, that definition can be changed as you like.

Now how can that mind come into being? That is the first thing. You are following?

Q: Wouldn't you need to use your body intelligence and not your mind?

K: There is the intelligence of the body, the intelligence which has been spoilt by indulgence, by drugs, by drink, alcohol, all that extravagance. Also the intelligence of the body, the body has its

own intelligence if left alone, not destroyed, not corrupted by taste, by desire and all the rest of it. The body has its own intelligence, if you have observed it. So we'll leave that for the moment. All right, we must go into it much deeper, we will.

Our mind is the result of our senses - right? Isn't that so? This is science, this is just natural. And we don't exercise all the senses together - right? Are you following this? But exaggerate one or two of the senses and so there is never a balance. I don't know if you have experimented, or watched this, or are aware of your senses. Either one or two senses dominate and the other senses are in abeyance, or not totally functioning, and so there is always inequality, always imbalance in the activity of our senses - right? You are following all this, please do follow this. Don't go to sleep because we are coming into it.

So is it possible that all our senses work together totally, harmoniously? That is the first question, because our whole structure is based on senses, perception, taste, touch and all that. Now if there is imbalance in our senses, our brain, our mind is affected naturally. And from this imbalance there is neurotic activity. So is it possible - please go into it with me, it is a dialogue, I am not giving a speech - can we see the movement of the sky, the clouds, the shadows on the mountains with all our senses together? You understand my question? Will you do it as you are sitting there, observing yourself? Please, as I said yesterday, unless you apply, actually apply, do it, you can sit there for the next fifty years you will do nothing. But if you apply, actually work it out, then you will see for yourself that as long as there is imbalance in the senses the mind, which is also part of the

senses, part of thought, then that imbalance invariably creates disharmony - right? Do it please, as you are sitting there, observe it, actually apply.

Q: Could you give a concrete example of what you mean by the imbalance of the senses?

K: Concrete example of imbalance of the senses. I am not good at giving examples. I think examples are wrong because you have to find out. If one gives an example that becomes the pattern. You follow? And then you say, "I must conform to that", or "No that example is not good, a better example" and so on, we battle with examples. I hope you understand this. I can think out an example: sex, drugs, various forms of sensory entertainments, where only the eye or the ear functions, not the totality of all the senses. You understand all this?

So the mind - am I, as the gentleman pointed out the other day, I am performing. He said that, I am performing and doing an excellence performance, it is a rather unpleasant word but there it is. And this is a dialogue between you and me, so don't please become quiet and just listen. So that is part of the mind.

Q: Can we explain the brain when we talk about the mind?

K: When we use the word 'mind', sir, we are including in the mind all the activity of the senses, all the activities of thought, all the activities of emotions, whether imagined or real, romantic, sentimental, all that, the whole of human activity is the mind. At least I look at it that way. You may look at it differently, but as we are two friends talking over together I change my vocabulary, you change your word, but we mean the same thing. That is, the mind contains, holds, all the senses, all the emotions, all the romantic,

sentimental attitudes, values, and also the enormous complexity of thought, the memories, the experiences, the hurts, the wounds that one has received from childhood, psychologically, inwardly, and the intention, the motive, the drive, the desires, all that is the mind.

Q: Is love part of the mind?

K: We are coming to that: is love part of the mind? Do you understand the question? Is love contained in the mind? What do you say? A dialogue please.

Q: No.

K: No?

Q: It is not in the mind.

K: The lady says, it is not in the mind. Then is it outside the mind? Sir go into it for yourself, it is a dialogue.

Q: Perhaps the mind is part of love.

K: The mind is part of love? Go very carefully into this please. You think it out sir, go into it, dialogue.

Is love remembrance? Go into it madam, just look at it. I am asking you. Is love something that has happened and you remember it? Therefore I am asking, is love part of remembrance? You have been kind to me, I remember it and therefore I have affection for you. You know, remembering. Is love a remembrance? If it is not, is it then within the structure and nature of the mind? This is a very difficult question, please don't just slip it by. That is why I want to go into this carefully.

We have defined more or less, that definition can be changed, the nature of the mind, with all the senses and so on and so on. And all this is predominated by thought - right? That is the central activity - right? - that controls the senses, exaggerates the senses,



gives importance to a certain sense and not to the others, that creates images, conclusions, aggressiveness, assertiveness. All that is the activity of thought - right? So thought predominates all our activity, including the senses, dominating the intelligence of the body - you are following all this? So thought is the central factor that is constantly operating, controlling, deciding, changing, modifying, pursuing, establishing a goal and driving towards that, and the past, with all its memories, anxieties, all that, the whole of that is the activity of the mind, which is thought - right? You are quite sure? Please discuss with me. Please.

Q: All the senses are the same.

K: All the senses in the mind are equal.

Q: The same value.

K: Same value?

Q: Yes.

K: To the mind, but the thought says this is better than that.

That is all, we are saying that.

Q: When thought is dominating the senses, the senses become dull.

K: When thought exercises, dominates, the senses become dull.

Could we move from this - right sir? Can we go on?

Now meditation is part of thinking, otherwise you wouldn't meditate - right? Would you? No?

Q: Is meditation the activity of thought?

K: We are going to go into it. But first see when you start meditating, sitting quietly, closing your eyes, it is the activity of thought. First because you want to achieve, or feel good in that position, doing something. So thought has brought this about

through desire. No? Please this is not very complex. I am sitting in that position, cross-legged, or whatever it is, in the lotus position, close my eyes because I have been taught, or I have read, or I have heard somebody that if you do this, you will have a marvellous experience.

Q: No sir. I do it in order to watch my thoughts.

K: Wait. That is a different matter sir. You see the difference? I do it because I want to achieve certain experiences, because I have read about it, or have been told about it, and it gives you certain pleasure, you feel rather relieved, relaxed - right? And I maintain that, giving more and more importance to my feeling of certain pleasure, certain experience, certain state of mind. And I go on doing it. But the origin of that is the movement of thought - right?

Q: What you are talking about is the practice of meditation, but within this practice meditation can come about. But there is a difference, suddenly something else could happen.

K: Yes, this is the practise of meditation and in that something else can suddenly happen. Right sir?

Q: Yes. What happens is real meditation. I mean it is just a question of words.

K: Sir, we are investigating. You are jumping to conclusions, you are saying it happens. I question the whole thing.

Q: Sir, when we sit quietly to watch our minds, our eyes get naturally shut and we are quiet. We don't sit with our eyes permanently shut so as to come quiet.

K: Sir, the speaker has played with all this. Right? This is not something new you are telling me. So have patience. I have been through all this: sitting quietly, breathing, repeating, hoping for

something to happen! Nonsense.

You are not meeting my point: why do I meditate? Why does one meditate?

Q: Because we are agitated.

K: When you are agitated, nervous, anxious, crowded with innumerable problems, by sitting quietly you hope to get away slightly from that.

Q: Not forced sir, just quietly.

K: Yes, just relaxed until you are overcome again. But - forgive me - you are missing my point of view, what I am saying, which is, all this is the origin of thought, origin of desire. No? Right sir? Why are you hesitant? What's wrong with it?

Q: Yes.

Q: Can thought not see without doing it and stop because it sees it is stupid?

K: You seem to think madam, and the others, that I am opposed to meditation. I am totally, completely opposed to the meditation that you are all doing because that is not meditation, because I have been through all this.

Q: Maybe we must investigate what you mean by meditation.

K: We explained what the word means, madam. The word means to think over, to ponder, to investigate, to concentrate in order to look at your problems, and all that is involved in that one word.

Q: Sir, if you are opposed to our meditation are you not creating a division?

K: Excuse me, I withdraw that word 'oppose'. What you are doing, what is called meditation is not meditation. All right. It is

the same thing sir. I am not opposed to it. I am just saying what one considers meditation, if you willing to examine what the other person has to say, he says that is not meditation. Meditation is something much more complex, more etc. So we are two friends talking over, I am not opposing you. We are talking this over. We say meditation begins with desire, with thought - right? You hear somebody from Tibet, from India, from Zen, from god knows whatever place, and he expounds what meditation is. He says, "Sit down quietly, I will give you a system to make you calm, restful, relaxed". So your thought accepts it, desires to achieve it, and you sit in that position - right? This is so obvious, what are you objecting to?

Q: Would you say because an idea started a meditation, all meditation is your own ideas?

K: That's right. That's what I am saying differently. So meditation begins with thought - right? And desire says, "I must achieve that something which I experienced yesterday when I was sitting quietly, and I want that, I want it to continue". I practise, I force, I follow a system, all the activity of thought. That's all. What are you. objecting to?

Q: Sometimes I meditate to go out from identification.

K: I have meditated for a couple of hours, the questioner says, to get away from myself - right? Is meditation an escape?

Q: A temporary relief.

K: Then take a drug, take a thing that quietens your nerves. You see you are not following all this, you are wasting time. Temporary relief, temporary excitement, temporary experience, temporary quietness, all that you call meditation. My lord, how that word has

been misused. Could we get on with it a little bit?

Q: It could be you that force meditation because you say that you want to be free and therefore you look at your problems.

K: I am not sir. I am sorry you have misunderstood. I am not doing that.

Q: Could it be that one cannot force meditation, but it is automatic?

K: Sir, could we stick to one thing? We are saying, we are asking, we have gone to far, which is, what is the nature of the mind? We talked about that. And that mind is dominated by thought. Thought is perpetually in activity, when you are sleeping, when you are awake, when you are walking, when you are by yourself, it is constantly moving. And that becomes a strain - right? That becomes nervous, anxious to bring about a quietness, a relief, a sense of peace you try to meditate - quotes meditation. And achieve a little bit of that, and you practise it, and you call that meditation. I say please that is not meditation, it is something much wider, deeper, that requires a great deal of enquiry, so please listen, exchange, not say, meditation is this, meditation is that, it appeals to me, it doesn't appeal to me. Then we stop discussing. Whereas if we say, look, let's find out - right?

Q: Krishnaji, I don't know what meditation is. Could we come to what meditation is?

K: I am doing it sir.

Q: Is it possible to know what meditation is at all?

K: Is it possible to know what meditation is at all.

Q: Know it all.

K: That is what I am saying. Could we put it this way: when

you deliberately set about to meditate, it is not meditation - right? Because behind that deliberate act is desire, behind that is thought having come to a conclusion, pursuing that conclusion. We say that is not meditation. You may say, you are wrong. I say, all right, let's talk it over. So thought dominates - right? That's simple and clear. No? All our activities, whether you meditate, whether you sit down, you practise, you try to force the mind to be quiet, all that is still the activity of thought.

And is love the activity of thought? Right? Go on sir. Let's talk it over. Does the activity of thought bring about right relationship between two people? Because if you haven't established right relationship with one another you can sit on your legs crossed for the rest of your life. Unless you lay the foundation of relationship, having no conflict and so on and so on, any form of meditation is just an escape into another series of illusions.

So is love the activity of thought? I love you. I really do. Isn't it strange!

Q: ...some of us do not know love.

K: How sad it is. Somebody, sir, somebody comes and tells you "I love you, old boy, I love you", you don't go on with your thinking do you? You just listen to him. You don't.

Q: Isn't that...

K: You are all so infantile.

And we are asking, is love the activity of thought? Is love the activity of the senses? Is love the activity of desire? Please find out, investigate in your life. When you are controlled, when your sex becomes all important, which is the activity of the senses.

Q: We have to be aware of this activity then.

K: One has to be aware sir, but first know the nature of one's mind. Through awareness one discovers this, that means you have to look at it, look at your desires, the sensory desires. Wanting food, the taste of food, compulsive eating food of a certain kind because it tastes nice, exercising a certain capacity of the eyes, optical, seeing something always, or the sensory responses of sex. These are the dominant factors in our life and you are trying to move away from that.

Q: Love for me can only be without thought.

K: Are you saying sir, thought is part of love?

Q: No, I am saying love is the product of thought.

K: Love is the product of thought. Sir, when you say, it can only be, it must be, you have already come to a conclusion, you have stopped investigating.

Q: You asked the question, is love part of thought?

K: Yes, is love part of thought? Which means does love contain the whole movement and the complexity of thought? You understand? If it contains thought, is that love? You don't even go into it, look at it.

Q: It is a state of being. Anicca.

K: Steady, you are using Sanskrit. Careful! I am also pretty good on languages sir, don't play. You are all so... We have gone beyond this madam. Please go on.

Q: I just wanted to ask you a question about meditation, if I may. I seem to have been under the illusion, the delusion, that the best things of which I do has effortless meditation. Now is this my illusion completely?

K: We must understand when you say, "I meditate effortlessly",

what do you mean by that word 'effort'.

Q: The mind now begins and ends with a process, in which all I need do is release the mind, my thinking process to it. I don't make any effort to release, it just happens.

K: Sir, when you know you are meditating, it is not meditation.

Q: I don't know I am meditating.

K: Have you listened to what I said sir?

Q: Yes sir.

K: When you know you are meditating, it is not meditation. Oh, you don't know. You don't see the beauty of all this. You are just going on and on and on.

Q: I am trying to find out, sir.

K: Why do you meditate at all? You have never even asked that question. What you call meditation, why do you do it? Is it that they have brought it from India, from Tibet, from Japan and you like to play with it?

Q: Sir, when one is angry, for example, when I have been angry, or I have a problem, I am in conflict. If I do, we are both agreed it is not meditation, but just sitting down quietly to watch my thoughts.

K: Yes sir, that is just when you are angry, to examine it, to go into it, it is not meditation.

Q: It is not meditation, but it is useful.

K: Yes, sir, yes sir. I agree. To be aware that you have been angry, to go into the whole question of anger, that is not meditation.

Q: But is that useful Krishnaji?

K: Not the meditation that you are talking about. I said when



you know you are meditating, it is not meditation. Swallow that pill and look at it!

Q: Cannot it take me away from the realm of thought?

K: Meditation helps me to get away from myself, from my thoughts. Then go to a cinema.

Q: That can block me, not help me.

Q: Can love take him away from the realm of thought?

K: Can love take him away from the realm of thought - you understand the question? Can love bring about freedom from the realm of thought? Can love free the mind from the activities of thought? What do you say? Don't look at me. What do you say?

Q: Sir, thought itself...

K: It is a very good question. The mind is incessantly active, sleeping, waking, day dreaming, sitting quietly, when it is not under control up pops the thought. So does love free the mind from the activities of thought? No. You see what you have done? You are using love as a means of escape from thought. But if you have understood the nature of thought - please follow this - and thought gives its own right place, then you don't have to move away from it, thought has established itself in its right place. You understand this? Love is not an escape, or an avoidance, or moving away from thought.

Q: Is that meditation?

K: Sir, as I said, when you know you are meditating, sitting in that position, breathing, repeating a mantra, and all that, when there is that activity, it is not meditation. I will tell you why, if you will listen. All that is the activity of desire and thought. Obviously. A guru comes along, I don't know why they do, unfortunately they

do, comes along and he says, "Do this and you will have the most marvellous experience of god", or of enlightenment. "You will have extraordinary experience". And he lays down certain systems, methods, practices, and we being gullible, not having the quality of scepticism to question him, we say, "All right Swami," - or Lord, or whatever you call him and we practice it. And in the very practising of it you have certain quietness, certain experience and that delights you. You say, "At last I have got something". Right? And I say that is the activity of desire, activity of thought, which has projected an image of something to be experienced. And that image can be experienced only through certain practices, certain repetition of words, especially in Sanskrit, that sounds far better! So we repeat it. But it is still the activity of thought and desire. So unless you understand this, what is the nature of thought, what is the nature of desire, and thought gives itself its right place, then you will be everlastingly battling with thought, with all the images that it has created. That is very simple. No?

Q: Is love denied by thought?

K: He asked, when there is thought is there love? No. But if there is no thought you can be in a state of amnesia.

Q: Is psychoanalysis a form of meditation?

K: This is getting worse and worse! Is psychoanalysis a form of meditation? Do you know what psychoanalysis is? Investigating into the past. Psychoanalysis, analysing oneself, either by the professional, psychotherapist, psychologist, psychoanalyst, Freudian, Jungian, Adlerian and innumerable names, or you investigate yourself, analyse yourself. Who is the analyser and what is he analysing? Is not the analyser the analysed? So he is

playing a trick upon himself. You don't see all this. So analysis, and the psycho-therapeutics of various group therapies, you know all that is going on, various forms of psychotherapy, is not meditation. Good lord! Think what we have reduced meditation to.

Q: Sir, isn't this process of observation which you have been talking about for the last ten days, is that not also thought?

K: As we explained earlier in these talks, there is only observation, not the observer - right? You are agreed to that? You know what that means madam? The absence of me. The absence of all the past, just to observe without the word, without the name, without association, without remembrance, just to observe.

Q: Meditation is a sort of process.

K: Look sir, there is no process - you see that is what I am pointing out, sir. The moment there is a process for meditation that process is the result of thought. And thought has laid down the process in order to achieve something. You people don't listen.

Q: You never decide to start meditating? How do you start meditating?

K: Does the speaker decide to meditate? I have answered the question. We have said, sir, that when you decide to start meditation, it is not meditation. When you put yourself in the hands of another who will teach you how to meditate, it is not meditation. When you follow a system, it is not meditation. When you accept the authority of another who says, "I know, you don't know, I will tell you what to do", it is not meditation. And so on and so on and so on.

Q: Please when you go out walking you don't think about meditation, but when you see something very beautiful you have

the feeling...

K: That's right. The lady says as you are walking in the wood, quietly not carrying all the burdens of your problems, suddenly you have a certain sensation, feeling, and you are watching, and thought comes over and takes charge and makes it into a memory, and wanting it more. All that is not meditation.

Q: Is it not love just to observe?

K: Is pure observation love? You see. Look sir, have you observed that way, pure observation? To observe without remembrance, without naming, without a conclusion, just to observe.

We have spent an hour and a quarter nearly, discussing verbally what is mediation, what is love. We haven't come to anything.

Q: Are we trying to get somewhere?

K: I am not.

Q: May I say something?

K: Delighted!

Q: (Mostly inaudible, but the essence seems to be: that there is a thought that is unconditioned)

K: The gentleman says, in essence, that there is a thought which is unconditioned. There is a thought, or there is thinking which is unconditioned. I don't know anything about it.

Q: Sir, but thought must find its own place.

K: Thought has its own place. Not what you said sir, the lady says that. Is there a thought which is not conditioned, is there a thought which is not limited? There may be, but I wouldn't call it thought. Thought, as generally understood, is the process of thinking. Thinking is the movement of memory, movement of

experience, movement of knowledge. The whole process of that is thinking.

Q: I don't use thought as you describe it.

K: Right sir.

Q: I would ask what does intuition mean to you?

K: Intuition can be projected by desire.

Q: Not only.

K: You don't even listen. It is so impossible to discuss when you are so definite about your point of view, then I am afraid that becomes a barrier and one doesn't investigate the other.

May I finish this strange dialogue that we have had up to now?

Q: Yes.

K: We started out by asking: what is the relationship of thought to meditation and to love? We went into the question that our mind contains, or is the result, of the senses, the emotions, crooked, sane, irrational, illusory and so on, the sentiments, the judgements, the evaluations, the memories, the hurts, the anxieties, all that, which is under the umbrella of thought. Thought is the central factor. And as thought is the result of knowledge, and knowledge is always limited and therefore with knowledge goes ignorance, thought is fragmented, broken up, limited. And when thought says, "I must meditate, I must find out truth, I must achieve enlightenment", thought is playing games with itself. That is obvious. So meditation has nothing to do with thought. When you sit down and deliberately meditate, it may be pleasant, it may give you certain relaxation, you may have certain pleasurable experience, but all that is a deliberate action by thought and desire to achieve a certain result. Therefore that is not meditation.

And what is the relationship of thought to love? That is what you were asking madam. Love - this becomes rather difficult - love is free from thought. Love is not the product of thought. If it is, it is still part of desire, obviously. So love is independent, is free from all the activities, and chicanery, dishonesty, desires, sensations, sex. That is not love. Where love is the 'me' is not. Obviously. The 'me', the ego, with all its arrogance, conceits, aggressiveness, humility, pretension to humility, rather, all that is the ego. What has that got to do with love - you understand?

So love is beyond thought. Then what is the relationship between meditation and love? When one deliberately, purposefully, actively participates in so-called meditation, that meditation leads to illusion, and that illusion has no relationship with love.

But there is a meditation, if you are interested in it, which is not deliberate, which has nothing whatsoever to do with desire. There is a meditation which must be totally undesired, totally free of thought. And to find that meditation - I am not offering it as a reward - if you are interested in it you have to go into the question of desire, give it its right place, whether desire has any place at all, and also thought has to find its own place and remain there. Then meditation becomes something totally different from what you are doing.

That is, one has to find out what is reality and what is truth. Reality is also an illusion - do you understand? The reality of these mountains, the hills, the groves, the meadows, the river, that is reality, you can see it. And also reality is all the illusions, like nationality, like your beliefs, your dogmas, your rituals, your

saviours, your Krishnas, all that, those are all illusions. They might have existed - might - but what we have made of them is illusion. That's a reality. Go into a church, into a temple, into a mosque, that is a reality. That is all the product of thought. Right? Of course. So reality has to be understood, seen. Reality, everything that thought has created, the atom bomb, the atom existed before thought investigated and created the bomb. Thought did not create nature, but thought has used nature. The chair that one is sitting on is made by thought out of wood. And truth has nothing whatsoever to do with reality. To find that is meditation. To begin to establish right relationship with human beings, not the everlasting battle between sexes, between human beings, killing each others, terrorizing each other, destroying the earth and so on. If we don't stop that, what is the good of your meditation?

Sir, first you have to be good, by your goodness you can bring about a good society. And if you are not good inside, good, I am using that words specifically because it is not the goodness, "Be a good child", I don't mean that. We will go into that perhaps tomorrow, another day. But if there is not goodness in you, you cannot produce a good society. And without goodness in you, you can meditate until Doomsday, go to India, go to Tibet, where you visit various monasteries, and attend various gurus who say this, and deny that, you know play that game. It amuses you but don't deceive yourself saying "That is meditation, I have meditated". Right? So if you have no love in your heart, your meditation will be destructive.

## SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 28TH JULY 1979

We are still continuing with our dialogues. Unfortunately it seems to me that I am talking most of the time, that you are not sharing, or having a conversation with the speaker. If I may, I would like to suggest something: we have been talking about meditation, love, thought and other things, but it seems to me that we are not talking about our daily life, our relationship with others, our relationship to the world, our relationship to the whole of humanity. And we seem to be wandering away from the central issue all the time, which is our daily life, the way we live, and if we are at all aware of our daily turmoil, daily anxieties, daily insecurity, daily depressions, the constant demand of our daily existence. Shouldn't we, I am just asking, be concerned with that this morning and tomorrow morning, and not go off into all kinds of vague, idealistic, theoretical pursuits? Could we, I am just asking, perhaps you would not like that, I am just asking whether we could not this morning talk over together as friends about our daily life, what we do, what we eat, what our relationships are, why we get so bored with our existence, why our minds are so mechanical, and so on, our daily existence. Could we talk about that? And restrict ourselves to that only. Could we?

Questioner: Yes.

K: At last!

What is our daily life, if you are aware of it? Not escape into some fantasies, cut all that out, what is our daily life? Getting up, exercise, if you are inclined, eating, going off to the office, or to



the factory, or some business or other, and our ambitions, fulfilments, our relationship with another, intimate, or not intimate, sexual or not sexual and so on. What is the central issue of our life? Is it money? Central issue, not the peripheral issues, not the superficial issues, but the deep demand. Please look at it yourself. What is it we demand, we ask? Is it we want money? Don't say, no, we need money. Is money the central issue? Or to have a position? You understand? To be secure, financially, psychologically, to be completely certain, unconfused? What is the main urge, demand, desire of our life? Right? Go on sirs.

Q: Joy of work.

K: Joy of work. Would you say that to the man who is turning the screw day after day, day after day, on a moving belt - joy of work? Or to a man that has to go to the office every morning, be told what to do, typing, every day of one's life? Please face it. That is what we are asking: is it money? Is it security? Is it lack of work? And having work, then the routine of work, the boredom of it, and the escape of it through entertainment, night clubs, jazz - you follow? Anything away from our central existence. Because the world - I am not preaching, you must know all this - the world is in a horrible condition. You must know all this. So as fairly intelligent, serious, human beings, what is our relationship to all that? The moral deterioration, the intellectual dishonesty, the class prejudices and so on. You know all this. The mess that the politicians are making. The endless preparation for war. What is our relationship to all this? Please let's have a dialogue about it, a conversation. You see when we come to that point we are all silent.

Q: We are all part of it.

K: We are all part of it. I quite agree. Do we know we are part of it? Aware of it, that our daily life, you understand, daily life, contributes to all this? And if it does, what shall we do? Take drugs? Get drunk? Join some community? Go off to a monastery? Or put on yellow, purple, bright colours? Would that solve all this? So please I would like to discuss. What shall we do? What is our daily life, of which the society is made, the politicians are thoughtlessly using us for their own power, for their own position? So being aware of all this, what is our relationship to that, and what is our life, which obviously is contributing to that? Right? Am I saying something extravagant?

Q: We would like to change it, but we don't know how.

K: We'd like to change it but we don't know how. What is the it?

Q: The way of living as we do now.

K: The way we are living now, we don't know how to change it. Therefore we accept it - right? Why is it that we can't change it?

Q: Perhaps we wait for someone else to tell us.

K: Are you waiting for some miracle to happen? Are we waiting for some authority to tell us what to do? The priest, the guru, the whole racket of that? Or go back to the bible? There are people are doing it; the so-called intellectuals, having written something anti, or pro communism, totalitarianism, are going back to god. You follow? Because they can't find an answer to all this, and they think through tradition it will all be solved. You know all this.

Now why can't we in our daily life change what we are doing? Let's come back: what is our daily life? Please investigate, this is a conversation, I am not the only speaker.

Q: It is not only we are contributing, but also we are active in what we contribute.

K: Yes. So I am going back, madam. I am asking if we are part of society, and society is becoming more and more horrible, more and more intolerable, ugly, destructive, degenerating, as a human being is one also deteriorating? You follow?

Q: I think we don't see it.

K: The lady says, we don't see it. Why? Don't we know our own daily life?

Q: No.

Q: Yes, because our daily life is a kind of self-centred activity.

K: I know. Our inner life, our life is self-centred activity, he says. And if that is so, and if that is contributing to the monstrous society in which we live, why can't we change that central activity, egotistic activity - right? Why can't we?

Q: We are unconscious of our own lives. Until we become conscious of everything that we are doing we can't change it.

K: I understand. That is what I am asking sir: can we become conscious, aware, know the activities of our daily life, what we are doing?

Q: Being a mother, and having children, it is very difficult.

K: All right. Being a mother and having children it is a very difficult life. Is that one of our problems? You see, come and join in the game sir, don't just... I am a mother. I have children, and are they growing up into monsters, like the rest of the world? Do you understand? Like all the rest of you: ugly, violent, self-centred, acquisitive, you know what we are. Do I want my children to be like that?

Q: You cannot isolate children but you have to face that you are like that and you cannot change...

K: I know all that.

Q: Could we at least try perhaps to short circuit the negation of our past conditioning which we should know in its entirety by now, not fragmentarily, and think how in our everyday lives each one of us can put a sort of universal love into service without any motives, to our fellow human beings.

Q: I would say it is not jobs in the big cities that are the problem, but I think my problem, because I have this problem with my children, for me it seems that I have to wake up to the quality of my conditioning in relationship with my children and everything around me. This seems to be my problem, not the outside conditions.

K: What shall we do together?

Q: Can we look at fear?

K: We can look at fear. Sir, if you loved your children, loved them, you understand, not just they are born, and sent off to school, they must be conditioned this way, if you really loved them, what shall we do? Apparently it is not a problem to you. You talk about it, but it isn't a biting, demanding, urgent problem.

Q: Sir, to go to work everyday, most people just go to work and they don't carry on when they get out of work. In other words there is no blending of their work and their recreation. In other words they go to work, it is learning all the time and when the bell rings and you are free to leave you can still learn. You may adapt your job to your recreation, you can adapt your recreation to your job, but there is always a learning process going on, which doesn't seem

to be happening at all. It is not just going to work and doing a job, it is going to work and learning. Then when you are out of work you continue this learning. You can adapt your free time to your work time. How many people go home and consider their jobs when they are not at their office. How many people go home and try to learn more about their lives whether they are at work or whether they are at home.

K: Having said that, where am I? Where are you? Are we still dealing with what might be, what should be, what ought to be, or are we facing the fact? You understand? Facing the fact.

Q: We are facing the fact there is a big separation between our work lives and our free time.

K: Sir, do I face the fact, please kindly listen, do I face the fact, you and I, that we are part of this society? We have contributed to it, our parents have contributed to it, our grandparents and so on, they have contributed to this, and one is contributing. Is that a fact? Do I realize that?

Q: It is very, very clear that that is so.

K: Let us take that one point and work that out slowly, please. Do you and we together realize, in the sense as you realize pain, as you realize a toothache, do we realize that we are contributing to it? Right? Do we?

Q: Yes, we do.

Q: Yes, we are contributing to it with eyes of our own past conditioning if we are still involved in it and don't see what is not right for now, for our present position. Yes, we are in that case.

Q: No, I don't see. If...

K: That's if, ought, might.

Q: Sir, we must know how we are contributing to it, why we are contributing to it, the whole effort of what that contribution involves. How do we contribute to it?

Q: If you analyse it, you must look at it, understand it, and say, "Look, I understand it, I won't contribute to it and I am going to go out of it." You can do it in an instant.

Q: Sir, I cannot see the fact because thought intervenes.

K: Can't you face the fact? When we say, "I am part of that society", what do we mean by that?

Q: I don't see it at all. I am facing the fact.

K: Sir, how are we going to talk over together when each one of us is pulling in different directions? Can't we think together about this one thing: that is, we human beings have created this society, not gods, not angels, nobody but human beings have created this terrible, violent, destructive society. And we are part of that. When we say we are part of it, what do we mean by that word 'part'? You understand my question? Just begin slowly, please. What do I mean when I say I am part of that?

Q: Sir, isn't the approach you are taking already setting up a division between me and society? In other words is there such a thing as society, or is this here society, and not I and you society? When you set up this monstrous, horrible society it is an abstraction that is different from the people in this room.

K: No, sir, I am saying that. I am exactly saying that: society is not out there, society is here.

Q: Right here.

K: Yes sir, right here.

Q: Well then can't we all work together and lose our past

conditioning of these words that you have been saying to us for all of these years, and begin to act on sample, in some form or other that is new and creative?

K: Madam, we can't work together. That is a fact. We can't think together, but we don't seem to be able to do anything together, unless we are forced, unless there is a tremendous crisis, like war, then we all come together. If there is an earthquake we are all involved in it. But remove the earthquakes, the great crises of war, we are back to our separative little selves, fighting each other. This is so obvious. I saw a woman some years ago, who was English, aristocratic, and all the rest of it, during the war they all lived in the underground, you know the Tube, and she said it was marvellous, "We were all together, we supported each other". When the war was over she went back to her castle and finished!

Can we just look at this for a minute. When we say we are part of that, is it an idea, or an actuality? - idea, I mean by that, a concept, a picture, a conclusion. Or is it a fact, like having a toothache, it is a fact?

Q: No.

K: No? Right? Is it a fact to us that I am part of this society?

Q: I am that society.

K: I am that society. Then what is happening out there to which I am contributing? Am I seeking my own security, my own experiences, involved in my own problems, concerned with my own ambitions - right? So each one is striving, for himself - right? - as society exists now. And probably that has been the historical process right from the beginning, each one struggling for himself. Right? And therefore each one opposed to another. Now, do we

realize that?

Q: Yes.

Q: We don't know what to do, but most of the time...

K: We'll find out what to do, madam, first start from that which is very near, and then we can go on - right? We are talking about our daily life. And our daily life apparently, or is, not only part of the society, but also we are encouraging this society by our activities - right? Do we know this, do we say, "Yes, by Jove it is so". Then what shall I do as a human being, being part of this society, what shall I do, what is my responsibility? Take drugs? Grow a beard? Run off? What is my responsibility? Yours? You don't answer.

Q: To do something about it.

K: What?

Q: First to see. I see...

K: I can only do something about it when I am clear in myself - right?

Q: Is it not astonishing if we are clear and logical about it, we can be excluded from the society.

K: All right. So let's find out how to be clear in oneself. How to be certain about things. Let's find out if one can have security - right? Both psychological and physical. So how does a mind which is confused, as most people's are, how is that confusion to be wiped away so that there is clarity - right? If there is clarity from there I can act. Right? Is that clear?

Q: Yes.

K: Now how am I, a human being, to have clarity about politics, about work, about my relationship with my wife, husband, girl and



all the rest of it, relationship to the world, how am I to be clear when I am so confused? The gurus say one thing, the priests say something else, the economist says something else, the philosophers say something else - you follow? The analysts say something else, primordial pain, or whatever it is. So they are all shouting, shouting, writing, explaining. And I am caught in that and I get more and more confused. I don't know who to take to be clear, who is right, who is wrong - right? That is our position, isn't it? No?

Q: Yes.

K: So I say to myself, I am confused, out with all these people. Right?

Q: And then you become alone.

K: Look, I want to clear up the confusion - right? That confusion has been caused by all these people, each one saying different things - right? So I am confused. So I say, please, I am not going to listen to any of you, I am going to see why I am confused. Let's start from there - right?

Why am I confused? Why are you confused?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, stick to one thing sir. Why are you, as a human being, confused?

Q: Because I accept.

K: No, look into yourself madam. Don't just throw out some word. Why am I confused? What is confusion? Let's begin with that. What is confusion?

Q: Contradiction.

K: You say, confusion arises when there is contradiction, not

only out there, right in the world, but also in me. The world is me, therefore there is in me contradiction. Now please go slowly. What do we mean by contradiction? Go into sir, look at it, take time. Why am I confused? You say because there is contradiction. I say, what do you mean by that word 'contradiction'? To contradict, to say something opposite. Right? That is, I say something and do the opposite. Right? I think something and act contrary to what I think. That is one part of contradiction. I imitate because I am not sure about myself. There is a contradiction. I follow because I am uncertain. I conform, both psychologically and environmentally because that has been my condition. So I realize contradiction means conformity, imitation, saying one thing and doing another, thinking one thing and quite the opposite. I believe in god, and I chop off everybody's head. Right? So this is what we mean by contradiction - contra dicere, to say something opposite to what is.

Now are we aware of this? Let us start with this: are we aware of this? In ourselves we are contradicting all the time. Now wait a minute. If you are aware of it, then what shall we do? You understand my question? I am aware that I am contradictory: say one thing on the platform, go home and do quite the opposite. (Personally I don't, if I did I would never appear on the platform). So I do something quite different. And I say, why am I doing this - you understand? I say one thing and do quite the opposite, why? No, find out madam, go into yourself, find out. Is it, I say one thing to please you, to make myself popular, to have a reputation of having immense knowledge, and go home and do everything contrary to that? Because I want to impress you, I want to show I am much bigger than you, I know much more than you, and go

home and behave like a child. Now why do I do this? Not I, why do you do it?

Q: Can I become aware of my conditioning while speaking about my conditioning, is it possible not to verbalize it. Because you are all saying, go into yourself, and I try to do that, and I seem to have a great need to speak and to try to discover myself while there is a listening, and I am listening myself. Is this correct, or is this an illusion?

K: When I ask, why do I do it, please listen for two minutes - am I looking for a cause? You understand my question? I say, why am I contradicting myself in my life, one thing and another. And so I say, when I ask the question why, my desire is to find a cause - right? Please listen for a few minutes. I discover the cause through analysis, and will that discovery of the cause finish the contradiction? You understand my question? I have discovered the cause, why I contradict, because I am frightened, because I want to be popular, because I want to be well regarded, I want public approval, and inwardly I do something else. The cause is, perhaps, that in myself I am uncertain, I depend on you, or on something else, so in myself I am absolutely uncertain. So I say one thing and contradict myself - right? Take it from me madam, step by step, for god's sake. And I discover the cause and the cause is not going to finish the contradiction. Would you follow something? The cause and the effect are never the same, because the cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause. It is a change. I wonder if you see that. So I find it is futile to find the cause. The fact is I am uncertain, and therefore there is a contradiction, wanting to be certain. Inwardly I am uncertain, and wanting to be certain, which

is a contradiction. Right? So why am I uncertain? Uncertain about what?

Q: Have you not contradicted yourself? Looking for a cause is running away.

K: The gentleman says I have contradicted myself, which is where? I'd like it to be pointed out. Don't just say you have contradicted yourself. I'd like to find out where I have contradicted myself. It is so hopeless. I am uncertain.

Q: Perhaps I may say something?

K: Delighted sir.

Q: I don't know why I reacted to it but you said looking for a cause is running away from the fact, the fact of whatever you are looking at.

K: Quite right, sir. Looking for a cause is running away from the actual.

Q: But then the next thing you say, is why. Looking for a cause!

K: I have explained very carefully that I am not looking for a cause.

Q: But you said why.

K: I explained that. I am not dumb! I know what he says. I purposefully put that question, why? When you use that word 'why', you are looking for a cause. Please don't nod your head, madam.

Q: Sir, if we are not looking for a cause, why are we in the tent?

K: I explained, sir, when we ask the question, why, we generally enquire into the cause. And I explained the cause and the effect are never the same, because the cause brings about an effect, and the effect becomes the cause. So to enquire into that change is

useless. But when we use the word 'why' I am using it in a special way, which is I am enquiring, not seeking the cause. See the difference, please, if you will be good enough. If you don't like the word 'why', just say, "How has this happened?"

Q: Sir is it possible to enquire verbally? I really would like an answer to this. I keep asking and you don't answer, and I feel it is because you want me to find my own answer. What I am really thinking is, is it possible to enquire into the problem, while expressing the problem?

K: No, first of all understand we are using words verbally. Sir, please don't go off like this. We have spent forty five minutes. We haven't even touched and gone into the way of our daily life. We are again going off. So please hold on to this. I am asking myself, what am I uncertain about? You, what are you uncertain about? Or, are you completely certain?

Q: I find myself listening to many people, and this must bring confusion in myself. So I know that all I have to do is to listen to myself. But what I am saying is, how can I listen to myself. I am making a law. I must listen to my parents, everybody else, and so there is my problem. Who should I listen to?

K: You are saying, are you sir, that by enquiring into uncertainty, you have found certainty?

Q: No. Who shall I listen to, my parents say one thing, you say another thing.

K: That is what I said. The parents say one thing, you say something, the philosophers say something else, the politicians - right? They are all saying something different, each one. Each guru is competing with the other guru, saying something entirely

different. Now - must I go back to that? - this is brought about by the constant pressure of other people - right? The pressure of the politician, the economist, the philosopher, the guru, the priest, the parent, the grandparent, and your own - right? So please proceed. What am I confused about?

Q: About the future.

K: About the future. I am uncertain about the future, the future being what I have been, what I am now, what I might be - right? That is the future. The future is physically uncertain, psychologically uncertain. So my mind is seeking certainty - right? Being uncertain it wants to be certain - right?

Q: We are not aware of what we are in the moment, otherwise the question about the future wouldn't have come, I think.

K: I wonder what is the point of this discussion. What is the point of our having a conversation, which we are not. We are saying it must be, it is so, it is not so.

Q: We might have seen a way of living now.

K: I am doing it. Each is interrupting according to his own way. We are not thinking together.

Q: You asked, what are we uncertain about. At one point I thought we were uncertain about different things, then the problem is not to ascertain what we are uncertain about but the fact of that, which I think arises from our unclearness about the composition. And if we look at it and see the composition, then the uncertainty would disappear.

K: We are doing that, sir. I see it is impossible to have a conversation with anybody.

Let's begin this way: are we certain in our relationship with each

other? Certain in one's relationship to one's husband, wife, girl, boy? I am asking you please.

Q: No, no.

Q: Uncertain in our relationship?

K: Yes, uncertain in our relationship with each other.

Q: And society.

K: Our relationship with each other creates the society - no? Of course, obviously. If I am against you, then I create a society which is divisive. It is so obvious this. So what is our relationship with each other? You and the speaker. Let's take that. Very simple. Or what is your relationship with your neighbour, with your wife, or with your husband, girl and so on? What is your relationship? I presume you all have a husband or a wife, haven't you?

Q: What about children?

K: Or a girl or a boy.

Q: And children.

K: Sir, please answer this: what is your relationship with another?

Q: Very poor.

K: Poor? What does that mean? You want to exploit the other one, and he wants to exploit you, is that it?

Sir, look, when you look at one's relationship with another, is there any quality of certainty in it? Therefore in that there is no certainty in it. You might think at the beginning of that relationship there is certainty but gradually that certainty peters out. So in relationship there is no certainty. Why? Not because. I am asking the 'why' in the sense, how does this come about? Why is there uncertainty in our relationships? Pursue that, please stick to that

one thing and work it out.

Q: Lack of engagement.

K: Lack of communication?

Q: Lack of engagement.

K: Lack of engagement.

Q: We are selfish.

Q: We do not know what we really want.

K: What shall we do? I can explain it. What is the point of it?

Will you see the actuality of it? That is, sexually one is attracted to the opposite sex. Then gradually the fascination of sex, the excitement, and all that, peters out. But there is an attachment formed. And the attachment causes fear - right? And when there is fear love has gone overboard - right? So there is constant division between you and the other, constant division. You are asserting, and he is asserting. You dominate or he yields, or the other way round. So there is always this contradiction in our relationship, which is a daily fact.

And how is it that this comes about? You understand, that is the next question. Is it because each one is concerned about himself - right? Why is each one concerned about himself? How? You understand my question? What is the importance of being concerned about oneself? Is it because we are conditioned that way, we are educated that way, our whole environmental, social pressure is that way - you understand? So then, can one break away from that? Break away from the self-centred relationship. You are following? Can one end this self-centred relationship? Now how is that to be done - right? Now let's stick to that.

That is our daily life, and therefore why is one, one human



being, so terribly self-concerned? Is it his nature? Is it his biological necessity? Because when one is primitive one has to look after oneself, or one has to look after the few. And from that one may be so conditioned one is carrying on right? Can that condition be broken, finished? Right?

Q: We have projected the animal instinct into the psychological field, and that has created the 'me'.

K: Yes, sir I know that. We have said that before. Now one has come to the point that in our relationship, each one is concerned with himself. And this conditioning, can that be broken down, changed?

Q: We have to understand it.

K: No, madam, not understand it. All right - what do you mean by understand it?

Q: See the whole thing.

K: I can't see the whole thing because my mind is conditioned. That is just an idea. You are off on your own, you see. So I am conditioned because I have been brought up that way - right? My parents, my society, my gods, my priests, all have said, "You first", your success, your business, your happiness, your salvation, you. Now, can that conditioning be broken, changed? Just a minute, I want to go into it, please follow this, step by step.

Will you do it as I am talking? How do I know that I am conditioned, first? Is it that I am accepting the word and then imagining I am conditioned? You follow what I am saying? Or is it a fact? Is it an idea? Or is it a fact? You understand?

Q: Accepting the word and imaging our own conditioning - is that correct?

K: Look sir, I think I am conditioned. I think. But I don't think I have pain when somebody hits me. See the difference? When somebody hits me and there is pain, I don't think there is pain, there is pain. Right? Do I similarly see that I am conditioned? First listen to this. Or do I think I am conditioned? The thinking "I am conditioned" is not a fact. But the conditioning is a fact. Right?

Q: Yes sir.

K: I am going on. So I am only dealing with facts, not with the idea. The fact is I am conditioned. Now, go slowly. In what manner do I look at the fact? That is very important - right? You are following this? In what manner do I observe the fact? In observing the fact do I say, "I must get rid of it"? Or do I say, "I must conquer it, I must suppress it" and so on? In what manner do I look at the fact? You have understood? How do you look at it?

Q: With fear.

Q: I am it, sir.

K: Is the fact, please follow this, separate from me who is observing the fact? Have you understood my question?

Q: No.

K: The fact is I am conditioned. I am saying, how do I look at the fact, in what manner do I look at it? Do I look at it, the fact, as something different from me? Or that conditioning is me? Please go slowly. Right? How do you look at it? Do you look at it as though you were separate from the fact? Or you say, "Yes, that fact is me"?

Q: At first you are involved in it.

K: Look, madam, is anger different from you? Obviously not. So is your conditioning different from you?

Q: No.

K: That's it. Now you are getting it. So you are now observing the fact as though it was you, you are the fact. Now wait a minute. So what happens?

Q: We observe the fact that we are living in the field of ideas.

K: Sir, your minds are not trained. Your minds are vague, you know, moving all over the place. Here is a problem, look at it. That is, anger is you. You are not different from the anger. Wait. Wait. When you are angry, you are that, then thought comes along and says, "I have been angry". So thought separates anger from you. You understand? So similarly, you are conditioned, and that conditioning is you. Wait. What can you do, please you. Watch it. The speaker's skin is a little brown - right? That's brown. But when he says, "I must change it to something else because white people are better", then I am in conflict. But when I say, "It is so", what has happened to my mind?

Q: Thought has...

K: Sir, don't jump into it yet, enquire. What has happened to the mind that has said before, "Anger is different from me", but now the mind says, "That is silly, anger is me". Now similarly the mind has said, "Conditioning is different from me", and realizes the conditioning is me - right? So what has happened to the mind?

Q: It is clear.

K: Please don't jump to things which you don't see actually. Don't repeat anything, don't say anything which you yourself have not seen.

The mind now is not in contradiction. That is all I am pointing out. It is no longer saying, "I must do something about it". Get it?

Q: Yes.

K: So the mind now is free from the idea, from the concept, from the condition that I must act upon it. Right? So the mind is now free to look. Are you following this? Just to look. What is that? The mind says, "I am conditioned", not the mind is conditioned, but the whole thing is conditioned. Now it says, "Observe that conditioning". What takes place when you observe? There is no observer because the observer is not different from the thing observed, there is only observation. Right?

Q: Yes, sir.

K: Are you following this? No, not verbally, actually. Then what takes place when you observe? Observe purely, not give it a distortion. Distortion takes place when you say, "I must change it". Or, "I must suppress it, I must go beyond it". All that has ended because you are merely observing the fact that the mind is conditioned. There is pure observation. Right? There is no effort made. Then what takes place? The thing that is observed purely undergoes a change. Right? You follow this? You won't, unless you do it you won't. Unless you apply, do it, you will say, "I don't see it."

Look, under a microscope you can watch the cell. If you watch it carefully, without saying, "It is a cell, it must not be this, it is that", you will see then the cell undergoing change. But if you come to it with an idea the thing is not moving. You understand? The moment you come to it fresh and looking through the microscope at the cell, the cell is itself moving, so the conditioning is changing. You get it? If you observe purely.

Now to come back: I observe, one observes one's relationship

which is in daily life, to observe it purely. Can you observe your relationship with your wife, husband, whatever it is, without the image, without the idea that it is my husband, my wife, and all the rest of it, without the remembrance of sex, and all the rest of that, just to observe your relationship with another? Will you do it? Or your attraction to the other is so strong that it is impossible to look. I see what is happening here: holding hands, hugging each other, all that is going on. So those people cannot obviously observe. So if you observe very closely, without the observer, who is the thinker and all the rest of it, the thing itself changes. My relationship with you, or with another, husband, wife, if I observe it quietly, without any pressure, direction, the thing itself changes, and out of that love is. You understand? Love is not the product of thought.

Q: What is wrong with holding hands sir?

K: Oh, for god's sake! What is wrong with holding hands with another. You have such infantile minds.

Q: When you look at this thing under the microscope, without thought, the thing is changing, but the thing is changing even when you are not looking.

K: Of course. Of course. You see what you have done sir. You are not applying. You have gone off to the self. You don't say, "Look, I am going to apply this. I am going to watch this. I am going to watch my relationship with my wife" - or husband. The fact is we are separate. He is ambitious, I am ambitious, he wants this, and all the rest, separate. I am watching this separation. I don't want to change it, I don't want to modify it, I don't want to push it aside because I don't know what is going to happen. So I observe.

Not I observe, there is observation. Do it, sir.

Q: Sir, the problem is when I want to observe, the thought is there.

K: No, sir, I have explained it. I can't go back to it sir.

Q: But it is a problem for us.

K: What sir?

Q: That is a problem for us.

K: What is the problem?

Q: That we can't observe, we don't know how to do it.

K: I am showing it to you.

Q: We don't live it.

K: Then you are not listening.

Q: I am listening.

K: Sir, food is put before you. Either you eat it, or don't eat it. If you are hungry you will eat it. If you are not hungry you will say, "Well that doesn't mean anything to me". Are you hungry to find out a way of living, in daily life, without conflict?

Q: Yes.

Q: Go on.

K: I am pointing it out to you. So there is a way of living in which there is no confusion, when the mind is able to observe without direction, without motive, which is the movement of thought, just to observe. Observe the roof of this tent, the height, just to observe it. The colour of your dress, not say, "I like it, I don't like it, I wish I had it", just observe. In the same way if you can observe your whole psychological movement, then the thing itself changes radically. You don't have to practise anything, gurus, you can throw all that aside. Right sirs.

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 29TH JULY 1979

If I may I would like to, the speaker would like to talk over with you a question which perhaps might be of vital interest - perhaps. Why is it - this is a question mark, not the cause - why is it that two people are not able to think together? You understand the question? They think together when they are frightened. If two people are frightened they think about it together. Or when there is some kind of physical catastrophe, they forget their personal prejudices, judgements, hopes, their own problems, and face it together. And if there is some impending danger, they again come together in their thoughts, in their feelings. You must have noticed all this. Why is it when we have no catastrophes, physical dangers, or something threatening us, we are not able to come together and think the problem together? Is it that two people, if they like, or have great affection for each other, or love each other, then there is a possibility of thinking together? Isn't that so?

Can we this morning spend a little time on this question? Perhaps this will help us to understand the confusion and the misery of our daily life. Because we have not been able, so far, in all these discussions and talks, to meet actually together. Is it that we don't love each other? You know, this has been tried very often in various ways to bring people together, round a belief, round a person, round an ideal, round a concept. You must have noticed this, it is so. But each person translates the concepts, the ideals, the persons, the authority according to his own inclination. Therefore the person, the authority, the principle don't bring them together,

which you have seen again. Why is this? In what manner does this happen? You understand my question? Because I think if we can think together we can then investigate more deeply into our personal lives, into our confusion and face the world with all its monstrosities, with its horrendous degeneration, then perhaps we might investigate together how to bring about a good society, a good way of living. You have understood? Can we go into this?

Can we think together, first?

Q: Could be look at the differences between catastrophe, shared catastrophe and the shared belief? The differences between these two.

K: Could we go into catastrophes and belief. When there is a war we are all together, unless you are a conscientious objector, or a pacifist, then you have a terrible time, you are shot, or sent to prison, but the vast ninety nine person say, "Hurrah, let's all fight". You know all the rest of it. But a belief is much must subtle. You may believe in god, or in Jesus, or Christ, or whatever it is, but each one translates that belief in his own way, in his own pattern, according to his own experience. And so there is always a division. Even if you follow somebody whose authority you accept, again there is division between people. You have seen this all over the world.

So we are asking: is it possible to think together without authority, without a belief, without a crisis - the world is in a crisis anyhow - but putting all that aside, can we, you and the speaker, think together? What we mean by thinking together, meet at the same point, meet at the same level, with the same intensity, which is not possible if you hold on to some belief, if you hold on to your



own particular opinion, if you have certain experiences and say, "That's much better than anything else". So can we, this morning, somehow put aside our personal beliefs, experiences, judgements, points of view, and meet together?

Q: Can we be open enough?

K: No sir - yes. I wonder in what way you are using the word 'open'? Because that is rather a difficult word. I think I am open but I am really closed inside. So can you and I put aside our particular point of view, our particular opinion, our experience? I met the other day a man who said, "You will solve all these problems if you are a vegetarian" - you understand? All your problems will be solved. And you could not convince him. He was absolutely hooked up in it - to use a modern word. And most of us are like that, only it isn't vegetarianism, bananas, or something but our own deep conclusions which we have come to, for various reason. Can we let all that go, at least for this morning, set it aside and meet together? You understand my question? Can we do it?

Q: Let us try.

K: Not try, do it! When you try you can't do anything. I don't say, "I will try to climb the mountain", I climb the mountain. So can we, this morning, go into this question: is it possible without any pressure, without any kind of persuasion, without any reward or punishment, say, "Look, let's come together and think about it" - can we do it? Please! Because if we can then together we can investigate our own personal problems, our own personal lives, together. But if you withhold, and others examine, you are not part of it. Can we do this?

Which is, would it be possible to talk over together, together,

whether it is possible to bring about a good society. The intellectuals throughout the world have given up that idea, it is hopeless. I don't know if you are aware of it. Nobody talks about a good society any more. Right? They are taking about existentialism, new kinds of philosophy, go back to the bible, the new gods, and all the rest of it. Nobody, as far as one knows, is concerned with bringing about a good society in which we can live happily, without fear, without terror, without all the horrible things that are going on in the world. Can we do this, this morning? - not a good society in the future, then the future would be an ideal - right? Then we will discuss endlessly which is the better ideal. But whereas if we could investigate together whether human beings, you and the other, can we live a good life, not in the future, now? You understand my question? Please this is very important because around us morally, physically, intellectually there is disintegration. You must have observed this. And any serious person being concerned with all this, he must demand not only of himself but of others whether it is possible to lead a good life and therefore bring about a good society. You have understood?

Now let's begin.

Q: What means a good society?

K: You have already gone away. We will find out what is a good life if we are able to think together. Right? If I define or describe what is a good life, then you will disagree, and I will disagree, or somebody else will disagree, or say, "That is not good enough, we must add a little more to it". And we shall be wandering off. That's simple.

Q: Share your being and not your thinking.

K: To share your being, not your thinking.

Q: Could we, sir, look at the obstacles to leading a good life?

K: We will come to that sir. I wish I hadn't mentioned the good life, I am sorry! Or a good society. Let's leave that for the moment. Let's find out whether we can think together. Which is, the speaker is not persuading you to think in any particular direction, he is not stimulating you to think in a certain direction, or coercing you, influencing you, stimulating you, then we can't think together. Whereas if you and I see the necessity, the absolute necessity, of a group of people, or a set of people, thinking together. That is, thinking about something - you understand? Thinking about - god, what is good, what is bad, whether it is possible to create a good society, or not - thinking about is not thinking together. You see the difference? I wonder if you see this.

Thinking about involves opinions, evaluation, because you might think about it and others will say, "It is not quite like that", so there will be divergence of opinions and points of view, if you are thinking about something. But we are not thinking about something but thinking together. I wonder if you see the difference?

Q: We don't see the urgent necessity of this. The question is, why?

K: I know why. Because we are not interested. Sir, look at it carefully. Is this point clear? To think about something brings about divisions of opinion - right? If you think about god, think about it, then you will think your way, and I will think my way, and another will think his way - right? And we shall be tearing at each other with our own judgements, opinions, conclusions. But if

we could think together, not about something, but the see the necessity of thinking together. Is this difficult?

Q: Yes.

K: Am I putting it all right? Or would you like to put it differently?

Q: Put it differently.

K: Just a minute.

Q: Investigate together.

K: Before you investigate together you must think together.

Q: Thinking is really the barrier.

Q: (Inaudible).

K: Look here sir, if you and the speaker loved each other - loved in quotes - we would be thinking together, wouldn't we? No? What do you say?

Q: The problem is that we don't love each other.

K: Just a minute sir, please, let us consider this. I want, the speaker wants to think with you. He says, if I could think with you, the thinking is common. But if you and I were thinking together about something it is not common. You understand? This is clear, isn't it?

Q: This is clear. But is it possible to think without the object and the subject?

K: Our friend says, is it possible to think without the object and the subject. Which means can you think without those two? Of course you can. You are missing it. You see how difficult it is to be able to feel the common necessity of being together, to act together - right? Won't somebody help me?

Q: When you and I think together, it doesn't matter whose

thought it is, we both are enjoying - the thought comes first, it doesn't matter if it is my thought, or your thought - is that it?

K: Would you kindly learn, learn what it means to think together - right? Learn. We have discussed about listening, the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. And now we are going to learn together about the art of thinking together - right? Could we do that? At least learn, not object, not project. You don't know what it is to think together, so we are having a class in a school and the speaker happens to be the teacher. And he says, please you come here without knowing what it means, you are going to learn because you are curious, you want to find out what the speaker, the teacher has to say, so you say, "Please, I am prepared to learn" - right? Are you?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait, wait. Keep it to that, at that very, very simple level. If I happen to be a professor of biology and you didn't know anything about biology, you would come fresh, curious, perhaps bored, but you want to learn because if you learn you will pass exams, get a job and so on. So you are forced to listen - right? But here we are not forcing you, we are together trying to find out what it means to think together. And the speaker unfortunately is the professor, and you are the students. Are we in that relationship? Which is, the professor is not authoritarian, he wants to teach, and you are the students, about physics, mathematics, or whatever it is. So you don't know but you are going to learn. Right?

So let's start from that. You don't know, so you can't say, what do you mean by that, what do you mean by this, if so why, because you don't know biology - right? So you are prepared to listen -

right? So we are in that position, are we?

Q: Yes.

Q: Yes, please go on.

K: No, no, please. Don't assume it, don't pretend. Don't put on a mask. We are in that position. If we are in that position then the professor says, do you know anything about thinking? The western thinking, and the oriental thinking: the western thinking conditioned, pursuing technology, and the eastern thought doesn't know what it is pursuing - right? There is the western thinking and the eastern thinking. The world has been divided that way - right? You are learning. And he said that division is wrong, there is only thinking, which is neither east nor west. Thinking in the west has pursued a certain line. In the east, mainly in India, therefore spreading over Asia, it has pursued a different direction, but the source of the river is the same, taking two branches, which is, thinking - right? Is that clear? Right?

And you are western, and the speaker is neither eastern nor western. That is very important. He belongs neither to the west, nor to the east. So he is concerned only with the capacity and the energy and the vitality of thinking. Right? So he says, how is it, in what manner, does your thinking differ from the other's thinking? Even in the western world your thinking is apparently different from your fellow western being. You are following this - right?

Now he asks a question, which you must answer: how has this come? You understand? Let me put it differently. The western technology, western outlook, western culture, western philosophy, western religion, is based essentially on the Greek. They are the originators of the west - right? Democracy, analysis, science,

philosophy, the dialogues of Plato and so on and so on. Greece was the origin of the west - right? There is no question about it, you don't have to doubt this. I am a professor I know! I am glad we can laugh. And Greece has said, measurement is the beginning of technology - right? That is, thought is measurement - right? You are following this? If you don't understand this the professor will explain it. So thought has become extraordinarily important because on that all architecture, science, mathematics, the whole technological development has come from the idea of measurement. Without measurement you can't do anything - right? You can't build a bridge, you can't build a boat, submarine, and so on and so on. Right? You are taking notes!

And the east has said, measurement is necessary but through measurement you can't find the immeasurable - you are following all this? So they said, thought, though it is necessary, is bound by time, the past, the present, and the future, which is time, and that process of thinking will never find that which is inexhaustible, immeasurable, timeless - right?

So these are the two movements in the world - you are following all this? Or you are getting bored? Because you are going to have an examination at the end of it!

Q: Professor, as I am a student I say, tell me what you know.

K: I am telling you what I know.

Q: The teacher/pupil relationship is to ask, tell me what you know. It is very simple. Does it happen that you keep something back? Are there secrets, or are you as a person totally available? Are you keeping something back?

K: No, I am not. I am a professor of mathematics. I am not

keeping anything back.

Q: But we are not talking about that, about mathematics, but about life. If you are the professor, please tell me what you know.

K: I am telling you sir. I am telling you, sir.

Q: May I ask a question? Does it happen that you are keeping something to yourself, keeping it back?

K: Are you keeping something back?

Q: Does it happen? And are you totally available?

K: If I am not keeping anything back, am I available. For what?

Q: To give me secrets.

K: Sir, look, I have just told you.

Q: You are acting, you are not really giving answers.

K: I am not acting, I am not performing, I am not keeping any secrets.

Q: Never, or now?

K: Of course not, I said I have no secrets. It is not never, or now. I have no secrets.

Q: (Inaudible). Why don't you talk about the otherness?

K: The gentleman has read something which I wrote! And he wants me to talk about that instead of about thought. Perhaps we can talk about that at the end of the talk, at the end of this, which doesn't mean I am avoiding, which doesn't mean I am keeping it secret. You cannot possibly talk about the otherness, you cannot if you have read that book. If you haven't read it so much the better!

Q: Are you keeping something back?

K: Please sir, I have explained to you very carefully, I am not keeping anything back. I am approachable as you say, and so on. You see this is what happens.



Now, we have been distracted, purposely, perhaps rightly, but let's come back. So these two movements have taken place in the world. The western movement is gradually conquering the world, technology, measurement, precise thinking and so on and so on. And do our thoughts measure equally? You understand my question? No, you don't. The professor says, why is it, in what manner has this division between people taken place in their thinking? Is it education - you follow? Is it one group of people go from public school to college, to university and a good job, and therefore their thinking is different from the man who has not been educated so well, who labours, and there is the man who, educated, puts himself into the business world, and the man who is a scientist with technology and all that. Is that the origin of this division? You understand? You follow? The man who thinks entirely differently if he is educated to become a military, or the man who has been educated through a seminar to become a priest, his thinking is different from the businessman, from the scientists and so on and so on and so on. Is this the origin of this breaking up of thinking? You understand?

Q: You want to say that in this world every one of us has another kind of measurement?

K: Yes, partly. So I say is that the reason why you and the professor can't think together, because you are trained to think in one way, business, scientist, philosopher, or technician, and therefore we are all thinking differently. But the professor says, please, let us think together, not according to your way, or my way, or the scientist's way, but together.

Q: That would imply that we all have to be re-educated in

exactly the same way.

K: No. No, sir. Suppose the professor has been educated in mathematics, and you come along and say, let us think together. It doesn't mean I drop my mathematics, I put it aside and see if I can think with you. Thinking together does not mean uniformity - right?

Q: It does seem that professional differences do make it difficult for people to communicate but it is much more their deep attitudes to life that prevent people from thinking together.

K: Madam, when you have learnt all the professor has to say, at the end of the class, you can ask him questions. I mean if you want to learn something you have to be quiet. If you want to learn how to play the violin you have to follow the teacher, the violinist, put your finger there, there, practise. But you are not doing that.

So we started. Thinking together does not imply conformity - right? Thinking together does not mean that you subject your own selves, put aside and copy somebody - right? You understand, sirs, we are learning. Learning to find out how to think together, which doesn't mean that we lose our - whatever it is we lose. Right? Can we proceed from there?

So thinking together, the professor says, implies that you and the professor, who has studied Aristotle, all the dialogues of various people - I have not, fortunately - the professor has studied all this and he says, I will put aside my learning, all that I have acquired, and you also put aside your learning, and let's meet. That's all he is saying. Right? Can you do that?

Q: The problem is putting it aside.

K: All right. The problem is putting it aside.

Q: Could we possibly look at how we put it aside.

K: Yes. All right sir.

Q: Don't let us leave that point.

K: I won't leave that point. You are a student, I am a professor, I have a right to answer it. The question is in what manner do you put aside your particular way of thinking? But first you know your particular way of thinking - right? Do you? Don't you know your particular way of thinking? That you are a follower of somebody, that you believe this, that you think this is right, this is wrong, and this should be, my experience tells me it is so. So are you aware of this fact? If you are aware, what does that awareness of the fact mean? When you are aware of the fact that you have your own particular opinion, and you are aware of it, what do we mean by being aware of your opinion? You understand? This is simple. Is that awareness a judgement awareness - you understand? You follow what I say? Is that awareness of your prejudice, an awareness in which you are judging your personal opinion, or just being aware of it? Not saying it is right, wrong, should be, must not be, just yes I have prejudice, I know I have prejudice - right? That's all. Wait, wait. Are you in that position now? That you know you have prejudices? Right? Then why do you have these prejudices? Is it your family, your education, your desire for security in a belief, in a point of view - right? You are following all this? You are going to have an examination at the end!

So are you aware of it that way? So you know, aware, that you have prejudices.

Q: We are but most of our prejudices are unconscious.

K: I am making it conscious now. And one is helping each other

to become conscious of our thinking which has produced this prejudice. Right? So are you aware of these prejudices? And these prejudices are keeping us apart - right? Isn't that so?

Q: Yes.

K: Now these prejudices keeping us apart prevents our thinking together. Right? So can you see the necessity of thinking together, say, "All right, I won't have prejudices"? Because thinking together becomes all important, not your prejudices, therefore prejudices you put aside - right? Are you doing it?

Q: My prejudice is that I feel that you pretend. Can you help me out of it?

K: That I pretend?

Q: Can you help me out of it?

K: He has a prejudice, according to what I have understood, that I am pretending. I don't know what I am pretending about, but that is irrelevant. So he says, "I have a prejudice. Help me to see it is a prejudice and seeing the prejudice prevents thinking together, and thinking together is most important, therefore I will drop my prejudice" - you understand? The dropping of the prejudice is not important, what is much more important is thinking together - right? And you cannot think together if you have a prejudice.

Q: Can I express another possibility? Can we look closely at one point that you are saying? You say that thinking causes division. I think that only thinking can create again a unity. You don't agree with that I think because of your secret. I don't think you understand entirely your secret, which is love. You say if one has love, which a being like you has, then with this love that one has then one can think together. I think as a western audience we

cannot grasp this kind of love as you can. One has to discover that through thinking together. If he had this love, which you can have, I think it can only be an illusion.

K: As I understand it, I may be wrong, please correct it sir, that the speaker is able to love and therefore is able to think together. And the western mind, which doesn't know what love is, therefore it is impossible without that love to think together.

I said at the beginning there is only thinking, not western thinking and eastern thinking. Western thinking has devoted all its energy to technological, scientific business. And the eastern mind says, through thinking, measurement, you cannot come upon that state which is immeasurable. And they said the principle of that is Brahman, that is a Sanskrit word, you don't have to learn that.

So we have come to the point that as long as we do not love each other then thinking is not possible together - right? If I love you and you are full of prejudices, however much I may offer my open hand to you, you will reject it because you have your own importance, your own knowledge, your own conditioning and you say, "Sorry". That is what is preventing us. And if we don't meet there we cannot possibly create a good society. And the speaker says if we do not create a good society we are going to destroy ourselves, whether you are in the western technological world, you are going to destroy the world, if you have not this communication of love. That's all.

Now can you, after listening to all this, naturally put aside your prejudices, because thinking together is important? The greater puts aside the lesser, obviously. Can you do it? Does your interest lie in bringing about a good society, knowing the whole

intellectual, religious organizations, intellectual, philosophical, deny all this - you understand?

Q: If we want to bring about a good society we have to understand what you say. And I feel there is no understanding between you and I.

K: How can I help you to understand what I am saying? It is very simple if you listen.

Q: What I am trying to say, sir, is that unfortunately I am not listening. I am trying to work out why I am not listening to you.

K: Look, let me put it this way. The speaker wants to create a good society.

Q: So does the listener over here.

K: I want to create a good society and nobody will listen to me. What am I to do? Jump into a lake?

Q: I feel this as well, sir.

K: A good society is not some life in the future. It must be a good society now because I am living it here. I want to live peacefully, without danger, without terrorism, without being kidnapped, without being bombed.

Q: There seems to be a desire in that.

K: And I say to you as I want to create a good society now, will you join me?

Q: That's why we are here.

K: To join me, the speaker says, put aside your prejudices, your nationalities, your religions, your gurus, your this and that, and let us come together. And apparently you don't want to. That is the problem. Either - this is not an insult - either you are too old, or being young you are caught in something else, sex, drugs, your

own gurus, this or that. So you are not interested in creating a good society. Right?

Q: Don't you understand what you are saying. You are saying what we all feel, we want to create a good society. You are saying we can only create a good society if we think together. You are saying we can only think together if we have love. The only kind of love we can get in order to think together is the kind of love which most of humanity, particularly western humanity, has to spend ten, twenty, thirty years in the Mysteries. They had to die to get this love. Sure, you might have it but that doesn't help us. That is the point this man is making, and the point that this man is making. You must respect us enough to think that we are sincere.

K: I understand sir.

Q: I think examples are not very good. We all came here to learn a new language and I would like all of us to be like new born babies.

K: The gentleman says that the western world has to evolve, go through a number of years and die to their own prejudices and all the rest of it. That means the western world has to go through a great deal of evolution before it can come to this.

Q: We can only get a good society if we think together, that is true. And the only way we can think together is if we have love. I am saying that what I think you don't understand is what is your secret, is that you may have this love. But what I am saying is that western man...

Q: You don't have that love.

K: I understand sir. One moment. I understand. You are saying western man must be this, and this. And so you are saying you

represent the western man. Right? Are you the western man who represents the whole of the west?

Q: No, I am saying generally. Of course there are exceptions. There will always be exceptions.

K: Can we sir, if I may most respectfully point out, can you drop that conclusion?

Q: If you like.

K: It is not what I like, sir.

(A lot of people talking together).

K: Are we in parliament? Are we in a debating society? Please sir, would you mind sitting down.

Q: I am very serious. I want you to prove that you have love, right now.

(A lot of people talking together).

Q: Has everybody said what they wanted to say. I have said all I need to say. Let's listen to Krishnamurti now. I think I have learnt something from Krishnamurti and that is why I was able to stand up and express myself. And I think the fact that other people can do the same shows Krishnamurti has helped us to free ourselves.

K: I hope you are all having a lovely time! One of the questions that gentleman asked is that he thinks all my life is a pretence. Just a minute sir. You asked that question. I don't see how I can answer that question. I don't think I am pretending. So that is the end of my answer.

So let's come back. Please, let's stop parliamentarianism and let's talk over together in a friendly spirit, for god's sake. As we said, neither the east nor the west knows what love is. Don't say the west doesn't know it, the east knows it. Both are caught in this world.



Both have to live in this world. Both have to live on this earth, which is theirs, the earth is not west or east. Right? And the division has taken place for various reasons, which I have gone into, and can we meet without all these conclusions, that you are west, and east, that we must go through certain evolutionary processes, but know that we don't love and therefore we can't come together? And knowing that we don't love let's find out why, and if it is possible to love. It is only then you can create a good society; without that it is impossible. Various Greeks and others have postulated what a good society should be: justice, equality and so on and so on. All that is in the future. When you say what a good society should be, it means in the future - right? The very word 'should' implies time. And the speaker says that may be another illusion you are caught in. Whereas goodness born out of love can happen now. And from that a good society can be born. Instead of holding to that, going into that, we are dispersing our energies all the time - right? This is not impatience, or anger, or insults, we don't stick to this one thing.

So we have come to the point, can we think together because we love each other? That's all. Do you love anything, your children, your husband, your girl, your boy, your wife, do you love them? Or is it me always the first, and you the second? You understand? And where there is this division, me first and you second, it will never produce a good society. And therefore a good society can only come if you are good; which means you don't belong to any category of religions, of knowledge, of conclusions. You say, look, I want to become a good man. You don't. Please, you understand now? Will you do it?

We have had seven talks and this is the fifth discussion, and the last. If you observe, what have you learnt from all this - seven talks and five discussions? What is the treasure, or hot air, that you are going to carry out when you leave here? You understand? Have you found a jewel, an imperishable jewel so you can go off with it, or you are going away with a lot of words? You understand my question, sir? So the professor says at the end of the talks, "What have you learnt?" Have you learnt a lot words, east is east, and west is west, and all the rest of it? What we believe is better than what you say? So what have we learnt? Is there, out of all these talks and discussions and dialogues, that flame, the flame that lights the world - you understand? Lights our own life. Right sirs.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK DIALOGUE WITH STUDENTS AND STAFF 30TH MAY 1976**

K: What shall we talk about?

S: Could we talk about happiness?

K: Do you want to talk about it? Or something else?

S: Experience.

S: The self.

K: The self, the 'me', the ego.

S: We leave the school, what is one to do in life?

K: Good Lord!

S: Could we talk about order?

K: Order; what is one to do in life; happiness; the ego, the 'me', and experience. Could we put all those questions together into one question, and then expand it? What would be the question that would include all the questions? Happiness, order, the ego, the 'me', experience, what should one do in life?

S: The question that we have talked about in the last few weeks, what is right action, it seems to include all those.

S: Right action in relationship.

K: What is right action in relationship? Shall we take, what is right action in relationship and work all the rest through that? Would you be willing, you questioners?

What is right action in relationship? What do we mean by action, the doing; not having done, or will do, the past action, or the future action, but what is action? To do. It must be always in the present, mustn't it? Now what is the present? You understand my question? If there is action according to the past - we are

talking psychologically, is that understood, that is clear, isn't it, we are always talking psychologically. If there is psychological order inwardly then there is outward order. That's clear. So we are talking about psychological action, which is right, in relationship.

We say action is that which is taking place now. Right? One can say, "I have acted, I have done", that's in the past. Or "I will do something in the future", which is the past and the future, but not in the present. That's clear. That is, the past activity colours the present action, modifies it, somewhat transforms it and creates the future action. Right? Now in that movement of action, the past, modified through the present, creating the future, a movement of action, what is right in that action in relationship? You understand. Because unless you and I communicate verbally at least, and we are understanding each other, don't let's go any further.

So we are saying, there is an action which is a movement from the past, through the present, to the future. Right? Is there any other kind of action? We know this action, always in our life: the past, changing, controlling, shaping the present, and going on to the future. That's clear, isn't it? We all know that kind of action. Is that right action? That means, the past is always shaping the present and the future, always, changing the patterns, the style, the necessity, adjusting itself to environment, to pressures and so on and so on. The past moving through the present to the future, that movement of action we all know. Is that right action? You understand my question? What do you say?

S: ...coming in to the present and moving through to the future, don't the things that you have done in the past, wouldn't that damage all that you would do, will do?

K: Is that right action?

S: The past does the damage.

K: Yes, one does something in the past, whether right or wrong, and that passes, or goes through the present, and so modifies the future. So is that right action, we are asking? Because we are trying to find out what is right action, which is correct action, accurate action, in relationship. That's what we started out with that will include all the other questions.

S: What about saying if you tend to do actions now which will control your future then, as we have said, you are not living in the present.

K: So let's find out what it means to live, or to act in the present. You know this is an enormous question, you understand. It isn't just for amusement. This question has been asked by centuries of human beings, from the ancient Egyptians to the ancient Hindus and so on down to the modern age. So we are asking, what is right action in relationship, which is not modified, past. You understand? Be clear on this, don't agree with me, I may be wrong. You follow? So find out.

S: Well, when you are living in the present, would that mean doing any actions that you are doing - or let yourself be in a frame of mind that says, "All right, what I am doing now is for now".

K: Ah, but can you be free of the past?

S: No.

K: Then how can you say you are acting in the now?

S: If you see that the past is damaging, then you know, now is the time and present to say, "Right, I see the past is wrong and so now I am at present now".

K: That's right. That is, you say you have been hurt - let's take an example - you have been hurt in the past, by parents, by your friends, by your environment, psychologically deeply wounded in the past. And that past meets the present somewhat healed but goes on to the future. So can you be free of that hurt which has been given to you in the past?

S: It is a very difficult thing to do.

K: There is no action, no right action, is there?

S: You would be looking for the right action, or you should be anyway.

K: To find out right action the hurt which you have received in the past, it must be healed, cured, it must be wiped away. Can you do that?

S: This is where the difficulty seems to lie because how can I, who am the hurt, end it?

K: That's right. So one has to go into the question, who is it that is hurt? You follow? Please, this is very serious, all these questions, don't play with it. One has been hurt in the past, and that hurt acts in the present, and that present is somewhat changed, that wound is not completely healed, perhaps more hurt and you carry that into the future. Now we say, is that right action? You say that cannot be right action because it is still a movement of hurt. Right? Though somewhat modified, or exaggerated, or deeper, it is still the movement of hurt. A person who is hurt, what happens to such a person? He isolates himself, resists, feels frustrated, anger, violent - right? All this follows. So you say, seeing all that, you say that is not right action.

S: Sooner or later it is going to catch up with you.

K: That's right. Exactly.

S: And when it does I should think you would feel, well this is going to catch up with me, which is going to make things worse.

K: So how will you be free of the hurt that you had in the past? You have been hurt in the past, how will you be free of it? She says, isn't there a difficulty here: how am I to be free of the hurt? And is the hurt me? You understand my question? Be careful. Go slowly, go slowly. I understand. I'll explain. I have been hurt in the past - right? Now who is the 'I' that has been hurt? If I am not clear on that point, who is it that is going to free me? You understand, you get the point? Right? I have been hurt. You have said something to me which has hurt me, and I realize to find out right action I must be free of this hurt. Right? If not there is no right action. But I say to myself, who is it that is hurt? Right? And I say, "I am hurt". So who is the 'I' that is hurt? We are answering that question, the ego, me. Who is the 'me', the ego, that is hurt? Go slowly. Don't hurry.

S: You said that the image that is hurt.

K: I know what I said, but what do you say? Don't repeat what I said a few weeks ago, that would be just useless. What do you think? Because if you repeat what I say then I become the authority, don't I? Then you become the parrot, you are the follower, then you lose everything.

So who is the 'I' that is hurt? You say it is the image, the picture, the pattern, the shape which I have made that is hurt. Right? Are you clear? Be clear. I have built an image about myself through my parents and grandparents, through society, through school, college, university, and society helps me to bring about this image. Right?

S: You are the parent of that, aren't you?

K: Wait. So this picture has been built, and is the picture, the image different from me? Go slowly, watch it carefully in yourself. Who has built this picture, this image? You understand? I think I am a great man, or a fool, whatever I think. Now who has built this picture?

S: You have.

K: Who is you who have built it?

S: All of what society has put there.

K: Society, the name, the physical form, the shape of your head, the colour, the stature, the shortness, or the fatness, whatever it is. So the name, Mr So-and-so, the form; then psychologically, inwardly you have been told that you are somebody, or that you feel you are somebody. You are attached to this - a toy, a house, a wife, a husband, furniture, you are attached, that is you, isn't it? What you are attached to, you are that. Wait, go slow, go slow. Have you understood that? If I attached to this house, I am the house. Right? Wait, get one thing at a time, don't generalize and try to capture everything at once.

So I am the result of human struggle, pain, fear, sorrow, whether I live in India, here, or in Europe, or in America, wherever I live, I am the result of humanity - right - which is sorrow, struggle, pain, anxiety, fear, all kinds of psychological disturbances. Who has created this, which is the image I have - I am a great man, I am nobody, I must be somebody. You follow? Who has created all this?

S: Thought.

K: Are you sure? Or are you guessing?



S: I would still say it is still all those things.

K: All those but who has produced this strange mixture? A ratatouille! You know, ratatouille? Who has produced all this? You say, thought. You are quite sure? Don't back out of it. So you say, thought - thought being the thought of the past, all the generations which have thought. So you say, thought has created the picture, the image, and that image gets hurt. Right? Now I am asking you, is that image different from the 'me'? Or the image is me? You have understood my question? Now listen carefully, listen carefully. If the image is different from me then there is a division, isn't there, between the image and myself. Right? When there is a division what takes place?

S: Conflict.

K: Right. Muslim, Hindu, Arab, Jew, communist, socialist - you follow? You are British and somebody else is German. Wherever there is division there must be conflict. Right? So when the image is different from me then there is a conflict between me and the image. Right? Conflict which takes the form of saying, "I must control it", "I must alter it", "I must struggle with it", "I must suppress it". All that conflict goes on, doesn't it? Right? Have you understood this? So I am asking, is the image different from me?

S: I understand what you mean by picture, but I don't understand what you mean by 'me'.

K: Is the 'me' not the picture?

S: The 'me' is the picture, yes.

S: I think there is a lot of confusion that arises from even the way we use the language when you say, "I have built a picture".

K: I didn't say that.

S: But we tend to say, "I have an image".

K: There is a confusion, a semantic confusion that is, when we use words like 'I' and 'image', there is a difficulty. Now let's be clear. We know we have images, don't we, each one of us, about oneself. No? Right. Now I am asking you, is the image hurt? Who is hurt? Is the image hurt, or somebody who says, "I, different from the image, am hurt"? You understand my question?

Let's go slowly. You say you are hurt. Right? What is hurt, who is hurt?

S: My image.

K: Your image is hurt. You are sure?

S: All that you have made of yourself.

K: Yes. Now is that image different from the idea that there is a different 'I' from the image?

S: Well one likes to think that the 'I' is a permanent entity which is producing the images, and that the images can be changed.

K: One likes to think the 'I' is a permanent entity, which controls everything else, shapes. So I am asking, is that 'I' who thinks it is permanent, different from the hurt, from the picture which is hurt?

S: If you are the image, no.

K: Are you the image? Or are you different?

S: Both are the image.

K: So you are the image. The 'I' is the image. Be clear on this. Right? Wait.

S: I mean what is the 'I' besides the physical shape, I mean it is thought and thoughts are the image.

K: That's what I said. I said the 'I' is the name, the form, the

shape, the body, the biological structure, and then the psychological structure - I am good, I am not good, I am better than somebody else. So the 'I' is the image. The 'I' is not different from the image. You are clear on this?

S: Is it the 'I' that gets hurt?

K: The image gets hurt, which is the 'I'. Right?

S: Through the body, or the idea of the body?

K: The idea of the body, of course. I said the name and the form. Right? Sanskrit has got different names for it but I won't go into all that. The 'I' is the name, the form, the biological structure of the form, the psychological content. All that is the 'me'. And that 'me' is the image. So when you say something to me which is unpleasant and there is hurt, it is this whole entity which is the image that gets hurt. Right? Be clear on this because the next step is going to be rather difficult. Sure?

Then what is to take place? When the image is hurt, how is that hurt to disappear, if there is no 'I' who says, "I must get rid of it?" You understand what I am saying?

S: No.

K: Wait a minute. Go slowly. I am getting hot, are you getting hot too? It is rather exciting isn't it? Good! It is rather fun to look at it.

We said we are trying to find out what is right action in relationship. We took an example of hurt, if that hurt continues through the present, modified to the future, that movement of hurt cannot bring about right action. That's clear. Who is hurt? We said the hurt comes when there is the image. That image is the 'me', the 'me' is not different from the image. Before we separated the 'me'

from the image, and then the 'me' said, "I will make an effort to get rid of that hurt". Right? "I'll battle with it, I'll suppress it, I'll go to an analyst, I'll do anything to get rid of that hurt". But when we discover that the 'me', the 'I' is the same as the image then what takes place? You understand my question? Before you made an effort to get rid of it, the effort came from the 'me', who said, "I must get rid of it". Now what will you do? You understand the question?

Because before you made effort, the 'I' said, "I must get rid of it. I see in order to have right action I must get rid of hurt", and so it made an effort. But suddenly you realize the 'I' is the same as the image. Right? And where is effort then? You understand my question? If you don't understand stick to that question. I make an effort to learn a language, to learn about driving a car, mathematics and so on, I make an effort. And there that is a form of learning, I learn how to drive a car. Here I have always thought the 'I' is different from the picture, so the 'I' says to itself, "I will make a tremendous effort to get rid of the wound" - right. So it made effort - it suppressed it, it battled with it, it said, "I must get rid of it in order to have right action", and so on and so on. But suddenly someone comes along and says, "Don't be silly, the 'I' is the image". Right? Then what happens? You have taken away all effort from it. You understand?

S: The most difficult thing is that if you are doing it from image any effort that you put into it from your image will be only what you want to put in to it.

K: So where is your effort? I made effort before in trying to get rid of the image and the hurt. Now I find that I is the image, which

is a fact. Right? Which is so, which is 'what is', which is accurate. So what am I to do? What is there? Be careful! Before I made effort to get rid of the hurt; now I see how silly it is, then what am I to do with it? What action takes place?

S: If you see it's silly, why do anything?

K: What does that mean? Keep at it, keep at it, keep at it. Go slowly, go slowly.

S: It's silly.

K: That's it. If you see that it is silly...

S: If you can see that it is silly you just drop it.

K: Do you see it as silly? Or do you have an insight into the truth that the image and the 'I' are not separate? When you have an insight what takes place? There is no hurt, is there? You have got it?

S: What do you mean by an insight?

K: You know what it means to have insight - sight into. Right? Which means see what is in, what is reality, what is the fact, in which there is no illusion, but see actually what is. That is what it means to have an insight. To have an intelligent perception of 'what is'. I wasn't intelligent when I separated the 'I' and the image. Right? It is not being accurate. So I was caught in an illusion. When I see that it is an illusion I am intelligent to see the fact.

S: (Inaudible)

K: That's what I am coming to. Go slowly. I don't want to press it.

S: It is useless to say, "I see the image", because the 'I' is the image.

K: Let us start it again.

S: Perhaps we will have to change our language.

K: Change the language, all right we will change it.

S: Could we also go into why should one get rid of hurt.

K: Why should one get rid of hurt? Tell him. Will you answer him instead of me

S: It's because of what I said earlier that when anything from the past comes into your present it is going to create more conflict and problems and nothing else.

K: Quite right. So there it is. That if I am hurt - in my relationship with you I have been hurt, and that hurt goes on, though I say I am your friend, I love you, but that hurt goes on. Right? What does that hurt do between us? It separates us, doesn't it? Right? So there is conflict then between us two. I am more and more withdrawing from you, more and more frightened that you might hurt me, so I get more and more resisting, so conflict grows more and more. Right?

S: Why say, "I must get rid of it", what makes you?

K: I'll show it to you. One has to be free of hurt because unless you are free relationship between two people becomes a continuous conflict. That's obvious. No? Don't agree.

So, let's go back: before I made - I am using the word 'I' specially there - before I thought I was something different from the image, and so I made an effort to do something about the image which has been hurt. I suppressed it, I confessed to another that I have been hurt, I went to an analyst and talked about my hurt, and I controlled my hurt, I resisted it. All that is a struggle, a conflict, a battle between me, between the 'me' that says, "I must get rid of it" and the image. So you come along and tell me, "Look, it's all

wrong. Are you different from the image?" And you show me it is not. So I say, "By Jove, how true that is". When I say, "By Jove, how true that is", I have an insight into it, I have understood it. Right? Not, "I have understood", there is an understanding of the fact. So what happens then?

S: Is insight turned into memory?

K: No, insight is never memory.

S: No, but it might be if you say, "I have an insight" then...

K: Ah, insight is not, "I have an insight", it is an insight.

S: You might say there is an insight but then the image comes back up.

K: Just a minute. Have you understood this fact, that the image is you?

S: You tell us that I is different from the image.

K: I don't tell you. I don't tell you anything. I say to you right from the beginning, let us in all our discussions, in all our dialogues, say, "Don't accept anything from the speaker" - right? I am not your authority, I am not your guru, you are not my followers and so on and so on. I say, let's investigate together. Right? Now we have been spending nearly forty minutes investigating into this problem - the problem being, what is right action in relationship. The right action cannot take place in relationship when there is any kind of hurt. That hurt, who is hurt? You are investigating, we are not accepting what I am saying. Who is hurt? We said, the image. Is the image different from me? And we said, the image is created by thought and the 'me' is created by thought also. Am I going too fast?

S: Why do I think I am an image?

K: Aren't you the image? Have you got a name, a form, all the psychological structure, the content, when you say, "I must be better, I am not good, I must be taller, my hair is not right" - the whirlpool that is going on all the time. Isn't all that your image about yourself? And yourself, is that different from you who are looking at it?

Now look, you look at me, don't you, because unhappily I am sitting on a platform, you look at me. Right? Have you an image about me?

S: Yes.

K: Then you are looking at the image, aren't you, which you have built about me. Right? So you put a mask on me and are looking at the mask. Right?

S: That creates a lot of conflict.

K: Sir, so remove the mask and you will see me, if you can. Right? So if the image is the 'me' then what takes place?

S: To remove the mask...

K: That's an image, drop it, don't take it too seriously. You understand my question? Answer my question: if you are the image, what has happened? Is the hurt there? Is the conflict there between the 'I' and the image? What takes place? Before there was an illusion, that me is different from the image, but suddenly that illusion has gone, and only the fact remains. What is that that remains?

S: The real you.

K: What is the real you?

S: I'd say a real illusion.

K: What is the real you? You have suddenly introduced a new



word - the real you. This is a trick played by the ancient Hindus, which has been knocked on the head everlastingly. But we still carry on - not that you are a great Hinduist, or Buddhist, but this sense that there is something behind. So I am asking you what remains, what is there when you realize, or when you have an insight, when you really understand - to understand implies no illusion - when all that isn't there, what is there then?

S: (Inaudible)

K: Careful, careful. No you are missing something, go slowly.

S: There is a whole, one unit.

K: There is the whole. What do you mean by that? Do you mean there is sanity? Right? Which means there is no fragmentation. Right? Careful. Look what you are saying, observe it, don't just spin it out but watch it carefully. No fragmentation between the 'me' and the image, which are fragments, two fragments. So there is no fragmentation, therefore there is sanity. You are saying where there is sanity there is no fragmentation. So you are sane, therefore there is no insanity in you as a person. Yes. Wait. So I am asking you - don't let's accept the word 'whole' yet - I am asking you, what is there? You understand? We said the image and the 'me' is the name, the form and the psychological content of the image, all that is the 'me' and the image. Right? What is that? The name, the form, the content. Are they not just words? Are they not just memories? Are they not some things that you have remembered, past experiences? Is not all that the past?

S: I think that is all it is, because that is a fact.

K: So you are apart from your organic biological thing, what are you? Just a lot of words, memories?

S: It seems like it.

K: Not, 'seems like it', is it so? If it is so, if that is the truth, then how can words affect other words? You follow? You understand? So - you don't see it - therefore you are completely free, except biologically.

S: Physical things may hurt me but names will not.

K: Words will not.

S: If there is no I.

K: That's right, there is no I, therefore nothing can hurt you. Which doesn't mean you have become callous, indifferent, on the contrary you may become much more compassionate, tremendously affectionate. Right?

So what is right action then? If there is an image between you and me there is disorder in our relationship. Right? You talked about order, you wanted order. How can there be order in our relationship if we are constantly at battle with each other, because the images are fighting? Right? So there can only be order when there is no image. Right? And therefore when there is no image, in our relationship there is right action. You don't have to say, 'Well, what is right action', there is right action. You have understood it?

S: What is that which is doing the right action?

K: No, there is right action, not, "who is it that is doing right action".

S: What is doing the right action?

S: Are we just a bag of protoplasm?

K: I don't quite understand.

S: What is carrying out the action, the right action?

K: I get it! What do you think? Don't shrug your shoulders. You

understand this is a very important question. And we have gone into it very deeply, if you have gone with it, shared it together. We said, we are name, form and psychological content, you follow, all that. Memories, brain, I remember my name, I identify the name with the form, and the name and the form carry on to the psychological thing, and they are the content of all that. All that is me, the image. Now what is all that, apart from the biological structure and nature and activity, which has, if one observes carefully, its own intelligence, if you have gone into it. That is, we have destroyed the organic intelligence. We have destroyed it by drink, by giving in to taste, "I like, it tastes better, therefore I am used to that", so gradually we have destroyed the biological, instinctive, its own intelligence.

Now we are saying, psychologically we have destroyed the deeper intelligence. Let me go into it slowly, slowly. I am investigating. Don't accept what I am saying, right? We are investigating, we are sharing together. I am saying all that psychological content is the 'me' and the image. What is that content - memories, past experience, knowledge, words - the past. Now when there is the realization that the whole thing is put together by thought - thought being the response of the past, because we said thought - now let's stop there. What is thought? What do you think is thought?

S: It's what you said, it's all from the past.

K: What is thought?

S: A movement in time.

S: The actual brain trying to balance itself.

K: Now just a minute. I ask you what is your name, you answer

it very quickly, don't you? Why?

S: The memory responds.

K: Go slowly. I ask you, what is your name, you answer very quickly, don't you, why?

S: You are familiar with it.

K: She says, you are familiar with it, you have repeated it a hundred million times. So immediately you answer. Just a minute, go slow, go slow. I ask you, what is the distance between here and London - what takes place?

S: It takes longer.

K: What do you mean by longer?

S: It takes you a certain amount of time.

K: I know. What is happening in your mind?

S: You are searching in your memory.

K: Slowly. What is happening in your mind, in your brain?

S: Thinking it out.

K: Thinking, what does that mean?

S: You are searching out the right information.

K: Yes, thought is searching out information. Right? In a book, or trying to remember how many miles it is, or wait for somebody to tell you. Right? You follow this? So I ask you, what is the distance between here and London, and thought is immediately active, it says, "I have heard it, I have forgotten it, let me think for a minute. I don't know, but I will find out, I will ask somebody, I will look in that book." So thought is movement, searching in its own memory, or looking somewhere to find out. So thought is in action. Right? Are you sure?

Now I ask you something else. I ask you a question to which

you say, "I really don't know" - which means what? You are not searching, thought is not in movement, thought then says, "I don't know, I can't answer you". You see the difference? Familiarity and quick answer, then time interval when thought is searching, looking, asking, expecting, and thought says, when you ask a question which it really doesn't know, in any book, nobody can tell, it says, "I don't know". Thought stops there. You understand? See the difference. Quick response because you are familiar, time interval when thought is in operation, and a question which nobody can answer thought says, 'I don't know'. Thought is then blocked.

So what is thinking? I have said it to you, come on.

S: Thought is the response of memory.

K: Memory is what?

S: Symbols.

K: Symbols, pictures, information - right? Pictures. We said thought is the response of memory. What is memory?

S: Knowledge.

K: Knowledge, experience stored up in the brain. So the brain retains the experience, the knowledge, how many miles between here and London, and responds. Right? So you have found out something: that thought is a response or movement of memory. Right? Response of memory. When I learn how to drive a car it is the response of knowledge, which is stored up and I drive. So thought has created the image and because thought is a fragment it has created the 'me', thinking the two are different. Thought has created the image, and thought says, "The image is very transient, it is always changing, but there is a 'me' which is permanent." Thought has created both. Right? So when thought sees this, that it

has created both and therefore they are both the same, what happens?

S: Thought stops.

K: Thought is blocked, isn't it? It says, "I can't do anything." No? So what is there? You understand? Please understand this tremendously important thing in your life. For god's sake understand this. Get the principle of it, the truth of it, see the fact of it. Thought has created the image, thought has created the 'me', and thought says now, "I have created the two, battle". Right? And thought suddenly says, "By Jove, I see what I have done". Then what takes place?

S: You don't think about it.

K: There is no image at all. When thought stops, what is there? There is no illusion, there is no image, there is no me, therefore there is no hurt, and therefore out of that comes right action, which is intelligent, intelligence says, "This is right action". You understand this? Intelligence doesn't say it, intelligence is right action.

S: Don't you need thought for intelligence?

K: On the contrary. I have just shown it to you. Please listen carefully - listen, not to your opinions, not to your conclusions, not to what you have understood, just listen, find out. We said thought is the response of memory. Right? Thought has created the whole psychological structure, the 'me' and the image - the image that says, "I am good", "I am bad", "I am superior", etc., etc. And thought also has created the 'me', and says, "I am much more lasting, I will endure death", etc. So thought has created both. You come along and say, "Look at it carefully, thought has created both,

so they are both the same. There is no division between the 'I' and the image. There is no division between the observer and the observed, there is no division between the thinker and the thought, there is no division between the experiencer and the experience."

Sorry I am ramming all this into you.

So suddenly thought realizes how perfectly true this is. It is true, thought doesn't realize it, it is true. Right? The perception of the truth is intelligence, and that intelligence then says, 'Whatever I do is right action'. Because there is no image, there is no me, there is no psychological content, only intelligence operating. Do you get this?

S: If thought has stopped, or is blocked, then it is obvious that you don't use thought for your...

K: ...except to drive a car, to use a language, to do technical functions and so on. There is no psychological content. You understand this is a tremendous thing to discover for yourself. Therefore you can live a life without conflict, therefore live a life with tremendous compassion and all the rest of it.

S: I have the impression of using thought to discover all this.

K: No, we are using words to convey the meaning, which has thought has created. Look, I describe to you something. The description is the movement of thought. Right? The description is the movement of thought, but the description is not the described. The described is not thought. The tree is not thought, but I have described it. Get it?

So what is left is complete freedom from the image and me. You understand? This is what all the saints, the serious ones, and what all the great teachers have sought, so as to be in a state where

there is only intelligence operating, which is the intelligence of perception of truth. Have you understood all this? Have you got an insight into it? Not a verbal description, you understand?

S: Is that why we call it 'holiness'?

K: That is holy, that is intelligence is sacred - not the things created by the hand or by the mind, the statues, the temples, the churches, that's not holy, it is the product of thought. The architect who had an image as a design and put it down on paper, or form, in design and then built it, it is all thought. That's a reality, you follow? This building has been put together by the architect and it's a reality, it is so, it is there. But the 'I', the image is not there.

S: What is the difference between reality and the 'I'?

K: Look, the organism - are you the body?

S: Yes.

K: You are. What do you mean by that?

S: Two arms, two legs.

K: Yes, and the name, Jean-Michel, the form, the shape of the head, the shape of the eyes, the shape of the nose, the height and breadth - right? That's a reality. The organism is a reality, but the psychological thing which thought has created is not a reality.

Wait, wait, go slow.

S: (Inaudible)

K: Yes, the body, the organism, the biological structure is not the creation of thought.

S: No.

K: The tree is not the creation of thought. Right? Now thought has created the psychological structure. Right? That's also a reality. Wait. But it is an illusion.



S: Is the illusion in the fact that you don't realize it is created by thought?

K: Of course. Is not illusion created by thought, all illusions - I believe in perfect State, perfect government, the communists have the most perfect organized capacity, etc., etc., I believe. That's an illusion. But what they do is a reality. You have got it? I disagree with them, they send me to a mental hospital. The hospital and me in the hospital is a reality, but it is brought about by an illusion.

So we are going to find out - go slowly. That is, whatever thought has created, whatever, is a reality, though thought says, "I am Napoleon" it is an illusion, but it is a fact, I think so. But it is an illusion, you understand. But the tree is not an illusion, it is a fact, it is not created by thought. So intelligence is not created by thought.

S: That's what I was saying, if your thought stops how could it be.

K: Therefore it is intelligence that operates when there is a relationship which is not based on images. Right? Then that intelligence in relationship brings right action. Got it? You have understood a little bit of it? Hold on to the tail of the tiger, don't let it go, because you will see if you hold on you will enter into quite a different dimension. But if you let go it is like coming back to living with the beastly life of struggle and conflict and battle with each other. You understand? We had better stop.

# MADRAS 1ST PUBLIC TALK 7TH DECEMBER 1974

I wonder why you come to listen to me. Is it out of curiosity or you have nothing better to do? Or do you want to find out what the speaker has to say? If you want to find out what he has to say you have to listen. To listen is an art. The word `art' means to put everything in its right place, that's the real meaning of the word `art'. And if you are going to listen this evening to a discourse, and if one may suggest one has to listen not with your own opinions, your prejudices and your conclusions and ideas but rather listen neither agreeing or denying, disagreeing. To listen requires a certain form of communication between the speaker and yourself. Communication implies not only a verbal exchange but also to think together, actually think together and share together not ideas, not words but rather the thing that lies behind the word, to read between the lines, to have an insight which we both share. So listening is not only an art but a responsibility.

And if you are at all serious, not merely intellectually amused but serious in front of a declining and degenerating world, specially in this country then a quality of mind that demands to investigate, to explore, to examine, not merely the description, the verbal picture but rather to investigate together why this country is becoming daily more and more confused, more and more corrupt, a way of life that is becoming mechanical. And when we use the word `degeneracy' we mean what the dictionary says, an inferior state of mind which is not excellent. And together, if you will this evening, go into this problem because it is very serious why a

group of people, a community, living in this country, and this is happening all over the world, and we are not comparing India with the rest of the other countries, but merely taking the country as it is, which is the people as they are, which is yourself, and to find out why, what is the central core of this terrible decay, of this degeneracy, of this mechanical way of life. We have not only personal problems but also we have peripheral issues, like inflation, over- population, economic chaos and so on and so on, they are all peripheral issues. And a serious mind demands and must find an answer why there is this decline both religiously, and that's the first degeneration, there is no religion in this country at all. We are going to talk about it, so don't be shocked. There is a sense of totally unrelated to world events, each one is concerned with his own little problem, with his own survival, with his own security, with his own personal salvation. All this indicates a mind, a heart that is becoming more and more incapable of dealing with the problem as a whole. And we have to find an answer because there is so much suffering, incalculable misery, a despair of which one may not be aware, or conscious, but it is there. We are not exaggerating nor being pessimistic, but merely stating what is going on. Technologically there is extraordinary improvement, things are going so fast but human beings are not keeping up with that rapid growth in technology.

So seeing all this, wars, violence, corruption, a social structure that is totally immoral, division, conflict, suffering and the brutal violence that is spreading throughout the world, seeing all this, one wants to find out if one is at all really serious, not playing with words, not playing with ideas or speculating about the problem but

if one really earnestly enquires into it, which we are going to do, then that enquiry demands on your part an observation which is not prejudged, which is not prejudiced, which is not parochial, which is not Hindu or any other particular race or caste. So to investigate there must be freedom otherwise you cannot investigate. That's obvious. If I want to find out something my mind must be free to enquire, must not be caught in its own prejudices, in its own beliefs and conclusions. And that's the first requirement of any enquiry, of any examination. And I hope together, being free if that's at all possible, that is not being a Hindu with all your ugly tradition, your superstitions, and all the rest of it, and being free to look, to observe, to find out. And I hope we can do this together.

What is the reason of this decay? Not peripheral reasons, not reasons which are superficial, which any economist, socialist or philosopher invents or describes, but rather together face this question, why you in India, living in this country, not comparing India to Europe and America or Russia, this country why, what has happened? You know this is a question one asks after fifty years of coming to this country every winter, and seeing the decline every year. What is the reason, what has happened to the mind? As we said, please neither agree nor disagree but examine. Which is, examine not the words, the ideas, the speculative inferences but why this has happened. And where do you enquire? Do you enquire after some philosophical assertion, or do you enquire an idealistic formula, or do you enquire what you are, what you have become. Right? That's where the enquiry has to begin, otherwise it has no value, otherwise it becomes merely an amusing entertaining enquiry without any result. So to enquire you have to enquire

within yourself why human beings living in this country have allowed themselves to be what they are, what they have become - non-religious, though you may do puja three times a day, go to temples, follow innumerable gurus, read the Gita, Upanishads, those are all extraneous events, what other people have said. And by reading those books you think you are religious, by going to some guru and worshipping his nonsense, his systems, his meditation, you think you have become suddenly extraordinarily religious. Or somebody who does some miracle, and you think by attending those tricks you suddenly have found religion.

So if you observe yourself very seriously, are you religious? The word `religion' means according to the dictionary, not what you think religion should be, because your opinion of what you think religions should be may be just your own hope, your own wish, your own longing, your own prejudice and therefore it has no validity. Religion means gathering all your energy, both intellectual, physical, psychological, all your energy so that it is totally aware of all its activities, not fragmented but as a whole, a holistic activity. That's what religion means. Are you so religious?

And the next question is: thought plays an extraordinary part, thought has done most extraordinary things technologically, it has constructed the aeroplane, everything, thought has created that, the whole scientific field of knowledge, the whole world of medicine and so on and so on. Thought also has created wars, divided people. Please observe it for yourself, don't agree with me, the speaker has no value at all, he is not doing propaganda. Thought has divided people, thought has separated religions, thought has created the gods which you worship, the saviors, the gurus, the

masters, the whole field is the projection of thought, your ramas, sitas, and gurus, you know the whole world of that. So you have created your gods whom you worship. So you are worshipping yourself in a round about way. Are you observing all this? Are you aware that what the speaker is saying is a fact or non-fact? That thought, your thought, your daily thought, not your idealistic thought which is still part of thought, that thought has accumulated tremendous knowledge in one field and that knowledge is operating in that technological world and thought as knowledge is destroying the human beings. I'll explain as we go along.

Have you ever observed yourself, that you are functioning, thinking, acting according to knowledge. Knowledge means experience, accumulated memory, and you are acting, functioning, according to that memory, which has become mechanical. Right? You are following this? And as thought is fragmentary, thought is never whole, all action becomes fragmentary. So knowledge in one field, in one area is absolutely necessary and when mind merely functions on knowledge as most do, then it becomes mechanical and the decline begins. Right? Am I talking Greek? You understand the question? Knowledge to which you give such tremendous importance, is always in the past and part of that knowledge is tradition, and when you are acting, living in that area as you do then the mind must become mechanical. Right? That is, memory is experience and knowledge stored up in the brain and that knowledge is reacting all the time. You can observe it in yourself. And we say that one of the basic reasons for the decline of people in this country is that they are living in an area of mechanical knowledge. And therefore the mind must decline, the

mind must degenerate, when you are living according to the knowledge of others, the Gita, the Upanishads, you know, all the books that you read, you are living on the knowledge, or the experience, or the say-so of other people and therefore your life is second-hand. Right? Aren't you surprised, or you just sit there listening to all this? You understand what I am saying? I am not insulting you, I am just pointing out, you are second-hand people, or third-hand people. And when you discover that, not because the speaker tells you but you discover it for yourself, the truth of it, the fact of it, that you are living on knowledge, on tradition, which is a continuity of knowledge. And therefore a civilization, a culture, a people that live merely on knowledge must inevitably decline.

And to find out a way of living which is non-mechanical, which is not based on knowledge, is the regeneration. That is, in one area knowledge is essential, otherwise you can go home, otherwise you can't understand English, otherwise you can't recognize your wife or husband. Knowledge in that area is necessary. But when the mind merely lives, nourished by memory, by knowledge of others, specially, then the inevitable decline takes place. So is it possible, please do listen to this for two minutes, if you will - is it possible to live a life where the area of knowledge is sustained and to act in relationship, because life is relationship between you and another, in that relationship no continuity of knowledge from day to day? You understand my question? Because you see I am using the word 'knowledge' in the sense as accumulated experience in human relationship which becomes memory stored up in the brain and according to that memory responds. It's excellent in the field of technology but in the field of relationship between human beings

then it becomes a destructive and a mechanical thing, which prevents what one can call love. Right?

I wonder if you are following all this? Are we communicating with each other or not? I think you are used to going to meetings, aren't you, being lectured to, talked at. And here one is saying things which apparently you don't catch, apparently you haven't even thought about all this, you haven't even enquired. Do you understand my question? I am asking very seriously, why you as a human being living in this country are declining, degenerating, why your minds are not fresh, why there is no love at all. And that may be this mechanical activity of the brain, of the mind, of ideas, and the utter lack of what one can call deep affection, compassion. These two factors may be right through the world the essence of this decline. You understand?

Haven't you got a problem of this kind? Isn't it your problem? Or are you merely concerned with over population, inflation, and how to get on with your wife or your husband, get a better job, corruption, you know, all the superficial things, which dominate most people, and if you are enquiring you must go very much deeper, not merely find superficial answers to superficial issues. Aren't you concerned? You understand my questions, my problem? It is not mine, it is your problem, I am putting it to you for you to face and answer. How can human beings live on tradition, which is a mechanical process, on mere knowledge? Which makes the mind mechanical therefore it has no energy.

Leave that for the moment, and look at something else. Have you ever gone into the question of what love is? Or you don't even think about it? Have you gone into to find out that extraordinary



thing which one calls love, compassion. Is compassion knowledge? Is compassion the cultivation of thought? Is love a mere remembrance of certain incidents, knowledge? You understand my question? You have to answer this. So one asks: is there love in this country? Please, I am not saying it does exist or doesn't exist in Europe or America or Russia, I am asking you who live in this country non-comparatively. Or you have reduced love to sex, pleasure, or it has become duty, responsibility, a thing which is the outcome of a comfortable life, or something which you call devotion. You understand all my questions? Because it may be this factor, that in your heart there is no love, and you are living entirely within the field of knowledge.

Let's go into it a little more. You see when one observes what is going on in the world, the political division, the wars, the Arabs and the Jews and the Russians and the Chinese, and the Americans and the constant strain, and struggle and the brutality, the threat of war, starvation, all that, when you consider all that, not just your little problem, your problem is involved in all this but you have to take the whole thing, the whole thing, not just one fragment of it. Now when you look at all that non-personally, objectively, the chaos, the immense suffering not only personal but the collective suffering of man, what is your answer to this? For god's sake. What do you say? Retreat into some philosophical jargons and slogans? So if you are at all serious you have to find this out, whether human beings, that is you and I, whether we can bring about a total revolution in ourselves psychologically because when you change fundamentally you affect the whole consciousness of the world. You understand sirs? God! You understand this? Look: Lenin,

whether you agree with him or not agree with him, has affected the consciousness of the world. Right? Stalin has, Hitler has, and the priests have affected the consciousness of the world by their belief, by their saviors and all the rest of it. Every human being - please look at it for yourself, it's the truth, it's a fact - every human being when there is a fundamental change in himself affects the consciousness of the world because you are the world, the world is you, you are India, geographically as well as psychologically. And when you change not at the superficial level but fundamentally, radically, because you are the world, because the world is you, you affect the consciousness. That's a fact, isn't it? We don't seem to be communicating with each other at all. Haven't the inventors of Rama and Krishna affected your consciousness, everlasting songs about them? Of course it has affected your consciousness. And so if you as a human being transform yourself you affect the consciousness of the rest of the world. It seems so obvious.

And can knowledge transform man? Do you understand my question? Oh God! You have knowledge about so many things, you have read so much, you have philosophies galore, after all philosophy means the love of truth in daily life, not theories, not speculative concepts, it is the living, the love of truth in daily life, which means tremendous honesty. And the love of being honest. So can the human mind, your mind, transform itself through knowledge? Or knowledge has no place in the regeneration of man. Knowledge is mechanical, you can add and take away from knowledge, and when you live in that area as most people do - memory, experience, knowledge - if you live in that area the mind must inevitably become mechanical. That is, in your relationship,

in daily relationship between man and woman you function on knowledge, don't you? No? Don't you have an image of her and she has an image of that person, which is, essentially the image is knowledge, and you live in that relationship based on knowledge and therefore there is no freedom. Are we meeting at all? So I am asking you: what place has knowledge in the transformation of man and society? We are saying knowledge has no place because knowledge is mechanical, which I have explained. Then what is the element, what is the core, the root, which is not the product of thought and therefore a factor which is not knowledge? You understand my question? Please do. Look, sir: I want to transform myself because I see what I am, miserable, confused, ugly, brutal, avaricious, hateful, jealous, ambitious, cunning, deceitful, say one thing and do another, double talk, an idealist and that ideal has nothing to do with my daily life, I see all that, this contradiction, this conflict, this struggle from the moment I am born until I die. And I say to myself, how can I change all this? That requires not slackness, laziness, I must find out, not according to some philosopher, not according to the Gita, that doesn't interest me at all because that's rather a bore. I want to find out. What am I to do? Now put yourself in that position, please put yourself in that position and see, ask yourself seriously what are you to do. That is, can the knowledge that you have acquired either through self-knowing, understanding yourself, or the knowledge that you have acquired from others, the knowledge that you have gained through experience, whether this knowledge is going to transform you. You understand? Or a different energy, a different factor is necessary to bring about a transformation?

So we have put this question unconsciously perhaps, then we say, 'Yes, I cannot do it by myself, therefore I need a guru' and the guru is of my choice, who must please me, I don't go to a guru who tells me, 'Get to work'. And I escape into ideas, ideals and so on and never face this. Now since you are here, you are good enough to come this evening to listen, look at it: can your knowledge that you have acquired transform your envy? Take that one factor. Can you totally be free of it? That is, can your knowledge of what it is to be envious and the results of envy, and the cause of envy, you know all that because your minds are very good at analysing, most minds are if they are given certain opportunity, you have that knowledge and will that knowledge transform your envy? Please, look at it, go into it. What will end envy? You know what envy has done in the world, you know the cause of envy, which is pleasure, and so on - we won't go into the cause of it now for the time being. And all that knowledge, because knowledge is time and the mind that seeks cause of envy is caught in time, so I am asking will time solve it? You follow? I am putting the question differently.

And if you are serious and want to find out how to end totally, so that it never comes back again, this problem of envy, because our whole social and religious structure is based on envy, the hierarchical outlook, the one who knows, the one who doesn't know, all that is based essentially on envy, with all its competition, with all its ruthlessness and so on. Now after examining all that, not only verbally, descriptively, and you know that you are envious, can you end that envy through the information you have all about it? You understand my question? For god's sake say, yes, or no. Then what will end it? Determination? Now when you

determine to end envy there is a conflict, isn't there. So you may suppress it, you may overcome it, you may escape from it, but it is still there. So knowledge will not open the door so that you are free of envy.

Then the problem is: what will? Please ask yourself. Because envy, with jealousy, is hatred in a different form, and a world that lives on hate, a human being is nourished by hate cannot bring about a different world, a different culture, a different existence. So it is absolutely necessary - I am taking that as an example - to end envy. Now how is this done? You understand my question at least? May I go on? Right? At least some do.

Now how do you look at envy? Please watch yourself. You know you are envious, don't you, and how do you observe that envy? How do you see it? How do you know it? This is really a very important question. When you say, I am envious, is you who says, I am envious, different from envy? You are following this? Is the feeling of envy different from the observer of that feeling? You understand my question? If the observer is different from the feeling then there is a division therefore there is a conflict. Right? There is conflict. So wherever there is a division, Arab, Jew, Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist and non-Buddhist, Christian, non-Christian, wherever there is a division politically, inwardly, psychologically there must be conflict. That's a law, that's the truth. So when you observe envy, is the observer different from the observed? Or they are both the same, the observer is the observed? Do you understand? So when the observer is the observed conflict ceases, doesn't it? And what happens? When conflict ceases between the observer and the observed because the observer is the

observed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience and so on, when the observer is the observed, when the observer is the envy, therefore there is no division and therefore there is no conflict, therefore what has taken place? Do you want me to tell you? Or are you again becoming second-hand? You understand my question?

We live in conflict, we are nourished in conflict, and the conflict comes about when there is division. And I took the feeling which is called envy, and one sees the result, the effect and the cause of that envy, the effect in the world, the effect in oneself, the bitterness, the anger, the jealousy, you know the hatred that is born out of envy, the bitterness, and will knowledge resolve that envy? You may rationalize it and say, 'Yes, we need envy to live in this world otherwise I am destroyed', you know all the reasons, you give false reasons to enjoy your own envy. Now, then you ask, is the observer different from the observed. If he is different there must be conflict, suppression, rationalization, overcoming it and the battle begins, all that. But the fact is the observer is the observed, the observer is envy itself. Now when you realize that what has taken place? What has taken place when you have dissipated your energy in conflict, in suppression, in rationalization, in overcoming, what has happened to that energy when you are not doing that? You have all that energy collected, haven't you? And when you have that energy, complete energy which is not dissipated, then what takes place? You are still waiting for the second-hand mind? Good god! What takes place? Don't theorize, don't say, love. What actually takes place in you? You understand? Before you said you are aware that you are envy

and you say, how terrible, I must control it, I must suppress it, one must have envy otherwise one can't live in this world, which is rationalization, and you have done that all your life. And when you realize that the observer is not different from the observed, the observer is the envy, therefore what has happened?

Q: Transformation.

K: Oh, come off it, sir! You are just talking, has it disappeared in you? Second-hand mind in operation! You don't do it and that has been what has happened to this country, they talk and they invent ideas or repeat somebody else, they never go into it to find out. You observe yourself and you will find the answer, it is very simple. When you are not dissipating energy through suppression, overcoming and all the rest of it, you have that tremendous energy to deal with the fact. The fact is envy. You are that envy, envy is not separate from you, your consciousness is its content. I won't go into that now. Your consciousness is made up of its content, you are envy. And you say, 'All right, I am envy' and your whole mind if you are serious is giving all its energy to this question of envy. So what takes place?

Sirs, look what you are doing, you are going to repeat it after me, discuss it, reject it or accept it, or say, yes, somebody else has said the same thing and you think you have understood. That's the tragedy of this country, they have never gone into themselves, they have never found themselves in that reality of knowing what is actually going on. I'll show it to you. When the observer is the observed, that is, the envy is the observer, the 'me' who says, I am envy, that 'me' is envy, that's a fact, not knowing what to do we invent an outside agency, 'God will resolve this', an analyst will

resolve this, somebody else will do all the trip for us and that means you are accepting authority. In spiritual matters there is no authority, including your gurus, your Bhagavad Gita and your Upanishads, nothing. That makes you, if you rely on that, you are second-hand human beings, which you are. Now what takes place? I feel envy, that's a fact. How do I know that it is envy? Please follow this a little bit. How do I know that it is envy? Because I have previous memory of that feeling. So instinctively the previous experience recognizes envy, and that recognition strengthens the envy. Right? Do you understand what I am saying? That is your previous knowledge, your knowledge of envy recognizes the present envy, therefore it says, yes, I know all about it, and then it accepts it and goes on. Look, you see what the mind has done, when it recognizes that envy it is memory that is operating, which is knowledge and therefore it cannot deal with the present feeling with a past memory. It only strengthens that feeling.

So the problem then is, can the mind, can that feeling be observed without any recognition? You follow? Which means not bringing your previous knowledge into it. Therefore the previous knowledge is the observer. And so you create a division. Now when there is no division, when you see all this, you have abundance of energy. Then that fact of envy can be dealt with instantly, it's gone. It is only the lazy, inattentive mind that knows the cause, the effect and goes on. But the attentive mind, which means the mind that has seen the whole nature and the structure of envy and therefore has gathered that energy and can deal with that fact, the fact being the observer is the observed, the observer is envy, therefore there is no movement at all. Have you learnt it by



heart?

And when you realize this then the question arises: is there a way of living - please listen - is there a way of living daily life without a single conflict? Not as an idea, not as a slogan, not something you repeat and so on, but to find out for yourself a way of living in which there isn't a shadow of struggle, except in the technological field which you carry over into the psychological world. So I am asking you: in the realization that the observer is the observed, that is, the `me' that says, I am envy, that `me' is envy itself. Then there is no movement away from it, because you can't move away from it, you are it. Therefore you have all that energy, that energy dissipates the fact of envy. Have you understood? Have an insight into it, not my explanation of it.

So is conflict part of affection, part of love? We have to find an answer to this, you as a human being, individually as well as collectively - you are collective, you are not individual, sorry, individuality means a non- fragmented human being - you are the collective; now you have to find an answer how to live a life without a single conflict. And you will find it when you understand this whole problem of the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experience, because the experience is the experiencer. You understand this? Because after all you are seeking experience, aren't you? When you go to your guru, aren't you seeking experience? You want experience and how do you know that experience unless you recognize it? Therefore the experiencer is the experience. So the mind finds then there is no questing after experience.

So a mind that lives mechanically in the field of knowledge,

technologically, such a mind does not necessarily deteriorate; but a mind that lives in the field of psychological knowledge, the knowledge of experience, either your own or of another, the accumulated tradition or the tradition of a day, such a mind living in the field of its own particular knowledge brings about its own decay, which is what is happening all through the world, and especially in this country because you have never gone into yourself, and said, look, I have to find an answer to all these problems, not through books, and through teachers and through others. And this requires energy. And you have abundance of energy when you want to do something, you have plenty of energy to earn money, to go to the office day after day, but if you applied that same energy, that same intensity to go into yourself and find out how to live a life without a single shadow of conflict, then you will affect the whole consciousness of the world. Right, sirs.

## SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC DIALOGUE 6TH AUGUST, 1971

Shall we turn this morning's meeting into a young people's dialogue? Would you like that?

Audience: Yes.

K: Are the old people saying, yes, or the young people? Shall we do that? Right. It's up to you. And also, if I might point out, there are a lot of cameras about - you want to take photographs - I know, I know. We are serious people, we are not taking photographs, autographs, and all that nonsense, so please, I beg of you, don't take photographs of me at all. Take photographs of yourselves, or of each other, but not of me. I know people have been taking cinematograph, and although they have been asked not, they go on. So please, I beg of you, don't do it.

Q: Is there any difference between the young and the old people?

K: Oh lord; Is there any difference between the young and the old. I am afraid there is. We are older and they are younger. We are going and they are coming. And they may be like the rest of us when they grow up. So shall we make this morning's discussion or dialogue for the young people? If that is what is generally desired then what shall we talk over together?

Q: The sense of humour and laughter.

Q: How to avoid growing up in a hypocritical world.

Q: The conflict between the observer and the observed, does this lead to self-centred activity?

K: Does this awareness, does this watching, lead to self-centred

activity more and more, does it make one more self-centred. Is that the question sir?

Q: Action in daily life.

K: Action in daily life. Go on Sir, what is it you want?

Q: Sir, we discussed a couple of days ago the harmony between mind, the heart and the body. Most of your discussions have been concerned with the mind, in that quarter, so could you perhaps go a little deeper into the relationship of the heart, whatever that is, and the body.

Q: What does it mean that we are false?

K: Shall we begin by that question, what do you mean by harmony between the mind and the heart and the body? Shall we discuss that? That might be rather fun. There is your answer, harmony, laughter. And the gentleman said you have been talking, mostly, about the mind, and rather neglecting the heart and the body, the organism. So he says, please go into this whole question of harmony between the three. Is that right sir?

Sir, what do we mean by harmony? Balance, non-contradiction, not in opposition, not fragmented, all the three working simultaneously, easily without any friction, a sense of unity, not comparing, not directed, not controlled, but flowing easily, harmoniously, fully, deeply without any sense of distortion. Would you say that is somewhat what we mean by harmony - would you say that? In which the mind, the capacity to think, neurotically or sanely, objectively or subjectively, which doesn't pull in opposite directions from the heart, and the heart doesn't pull in opposite directions from the body and so on. So there is no contradiction, there is no tension, there is no sense of imbalance between the

three. Right? Do we see, understand verbally, what we mean by harmony? Do we agree to that? The definition, I am only defining, we are not saying what it is, or what it is not, we are just examining the word harmony.

Then are we harmonious? Taking the mind, the mind being the brain, thought, the intellect, with all the memory, experience stored up, and the heart - you know, that's a *façon de parler*, *vous savez?*, heart - not desiring one thing and suppressing it, suppressed by the mind, not being jealous, not envious, but quiet, you know that sense of richness, beauty, perfume, love, a sense of you know, heightened perception, and the body quiet, functioning easily, not having eaten too much or too little, not too much indulgence or too much restraint, eating the right kind of food so that all the stomach, the intestines and everything functions easily, with some fullness. Right? Do we live that way? Let us state the fact, actually what we are. For most of us there is no harmony, harmony in the sense that we have used that word, between the mind, the body and the heart, because most of us are torn apart. We over indulge, we eat the wrong kind of food, our body has been neglected and therefore it has lost its intelligence, and we smoke, we drink, take drugs - you follow - the whole of that, over active, over stimulated, sexually; and the heart never constant, never steady, pursuing emotional expressions, satisfying demands and so on, jealous, envious, comparative; and the mind living in the past - what a lovely day it was yesterday, what lovely memories I had when I was young - you know the whole of that. That is our life, isn't it? No? Is that the life of the older people, and is that the life of the younger people? Are the younger people different in that sense than the older

people? Are the younger people living a harmonious life? Or a life of laissez-allez, permissive, a life of revolt against the established order, and revolt in not revolution. Right?

So do we start ideologically, saying we must be harmonious, having the definition and making that into a formula, a concept, and then trying to live according to that? Or state facts as they are, that one does live rather a shoddy, unhealthy, contradictory, distorting life, sexually, and mentally incapable of consecutive thought, reason, capacity, that is a fact isn't it? Do we state facts as they are, as we are? Or do we pursue an ideal of what harmony is and try to imitate that? Go on sirs. If I have a concept of harmony - you understand what the word 'concept' means - to conceive a formula, to project an idea of what I should be, live a harmonious life, and the projection becomes the ideal; and according to that ideal projected by my desire to live an harmonious life, and trying to live according to that formula, concept, there is this constant imitation of what I should be, and therefore in that there is conflict, isn't there? Right? So, the very concept is disharmony. Right? Isn't that so? That is, I have an ideal that I must lead a kind of life, eat the right food, not drink, not whatever it is, after experimenting with myself, I must not, and I must have a loving heart, and I mustn't be jealous, I mustn't be envious, I mustn't be ambitious, I must be a vegetable. And I must not live in the past. You follow? All these are projections of what I should be. Right? Right? Do please. This is yours. And the ideals are fictitious, is not a reality, but what is a reality is 'what is'. Right? Can we start there?

Now my question is: how am I, who lives a life of disharmony, how am I to live a harmonious life? Not, how am I to copy a

harmonious life - you understand the difference? Are we clear on this? We are not discussing 'what should be', what kind of ideals we should have and live according to those ideals, that is the culture in which we have been brought up. And if you are really young, you are in revolution, not in revolt. Therefore seeing the falseness of ideals then you deal with 'what is'. Right? So reject - please bear in mind we are discussing this - we are rejecting the harmonious ideal of life but we are talking over together whether it is possible to live now a harmonious life. If you have an ideal you are trying to imitate that ideal, and where there is imitation, there is not only conformity, there is conflict, there is fear that you are not living up to your standard, so you feel inferior, so all the complexity of inferiority, from that inferiority all kinds of neurotic action. So when you understand really the falseness of ideals, then you see actually what you are. Right? Is that clear? Can we start from there? Or do you want to start with ideals? Please don't come back to ideals, you are finished with it, that is a game of the old people. Sorry old people!

So one lives a life in which there is no harmony, a life of contradiction, a life of hypocrisy, thinking one thing, doing another, saying something else - all those are indications of contradictions, imbalance, a life of no harmony. That is a fact. Now I want to find out how to change that fact, not how to become the ideal which I have projected - you see the difference? I am concerned with changing 'what is' - and is it possible to change a mind, a heart and the body which have acquired a great many habits - smoking, drinking, you know, habits. And when you are young the desire to follow the crowd, the young crowd - you know.

Shall we discuss that? Right? What do you say, shall we? I am not discussing it, you are sharing with me.

Q: The young is always conforming to the old crowd.

K: The young crowd conforms to the old crowd. The young generally conform. A group of long haired people, if I come there I feel rather lost because I have short hair, they have certain habits, certain ways of dressing, certain ways of walking, dirty - you know whatever they do, and if I don't fit in, I feel rather left out so out of fear, out of the desire for conformity, out of belonging, I identify myself with them, I grow long hair and all the rest of it.

Now these are all obvious facts. Now how am I, who lead a life of imbalance, not a balanced life, what am I to do? Shall we start from there? Right? Now shall I start with the body - listen to it carefully - with the body, with the organism or with the mind? The mind being the capacity to think, the capacity to understand, the capacity to be logical or illogical, the mind that says, I must, I must not, the mind that says, I must control my body - where shall we begin? With the body? Or with the mind?

Q: With the heart.

K: With the heart. Right. Shall we begin with the heart?

Q: Isn't there an intimate relationship between them all?

K: That's what I want to find out. You are saying there is an intimate relationship between them all. And to understand that intimate relationship between them all where shall I begin? You know, sir, consider this. The monks you may say, well they are silly people, and brush them aside, don't do that - examine it. The monks said let's begin by taking a vow of chastity, poverty, humility - which is the same all over the world, this applies in



India, in Japan, in Europe and so on. That is, they began with the outward thing. Right? The outward expression of their assertion that they are trying to live a life different from the rest of the world. You understand sir? In India a man who renounces the world puts on a loin cloth. Right? Or a robe and that shows that he doesn't belong to the herd, he is different. You understand all this? By putting on a robe, which generally goes with a monk, that very outward expression gives him a certain standing. Right? And wherever he goes in India, in India only, whether in the North, South, East or West, he is fed, looked after, that is the tradition. Because outwardly he has renounced the world: but inwardly he is full of - you follow? - poor chap, inwardly he is in battle. He daren't look at a woman and when he eats he must eat so much and no more. You follow? So he is in battle with himself all the time. So where do you begin? With the outward appearance of long hair, beard, dressing, or think any old thing, feel any old way, yield to sex if you like it and so on. Where shall we begin, with the heart, with the mind or the body? You decide.

Q: What is the relationship between social reform and unconditioning?

K: What is the connection, the relationship between social reform and unconditioning. Sir, please sir, we are discussing harmony for the moment, we'll come back to that question a little later.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Is there such a difference, or is there not an interrelationship between the mind, the heart and the body - inter-related - you cannot separate each one as though it is some kind of - you follow?

They are all interrelated, obviously. Psychosomatic. Soma means the body and psyche - it is a psychosomatic movement. Now to understand - please listen to this - to understand this whole structure, in which there is the mind, the brain, the heart, the whole structure, where shall we begin? Shall we begin with any - it is a whole thing - you follow? If I begin with the mind or with the heart - it is the same - no?

I'll put it differently. I see the interrelationship between the body, the heart and the mind.

Q: What is the difference between harmony and egotism?

K: Egotism is disharmony. No? If I am thinking about myself - how big I am, how small I am, what are my problems, I should be this way, I should sit that way, I must meditate, I must not meditate, there is no god, there is god - you follow - thinking about myself, my problems all day long, obviously that brings about a sense of isolation and therefore no relationship with another, and also it brings about an exaggeration of myself and therefore disharmony. That's fairly simple. The egotistic person is essentially a human being who has no harmony. Full stop. Don't let's waste time on that.

Now - you see sir this is really an important question. Do pay a little attention. Shall I begin by watching the body, what it should eat, why it eats, why it indulges - you follow - I yield to the taste of the tongue and eating more and more? Of shall I watch it, shall I watch this whole structure from an emotional standpoint because I am an emotional person, I love people, I have pleasure seeing people, I look at the mountains and say, how lovely they are. And also I look at my thoughts and say, how stupid these little thoughts

are. So knowing all are interrelated with each other, where is the central clue, central point from which to start understanding of the three - you have got it? Have I made it clear?

Q: Sir, would it be possible to examine this thing in such a way that it would happen now?

K: That's what I am doing sir. Just hold a minute.

Q: So that there is no time involved.

K: Of course - no time. Do listen sir. First listen to my question. I know your question sir, hold to your question but first listen to the speaker's question. Listen to it first. There are these three elements which compose the human being - the mind, the heart and the body, the whole of that. Is there a point, or a central point, which awakened, will deal with the three as a whole?

Q: Surely it is the mind.

K: You have understood my question?

Q: Sir if you are watching your body, your emotions, watching yourself...

K: Therefore what does that mean? This gentleman says, watch it. Watching the body, watching all the feelings one has, which is called heart and all that, love, jealousy and watching the operation of the mind - watching - right? That is, being watchful, being alert, being aware. If I can be aware, be aware of the operations of the mind, the operations of my feeling and how I eat, what I eat - aware - perhaps then I could understand each one. So the importance is watching - right - being aware of the mind with all its thoughts, its cunning, its motives, its deceptions, saying I won't take photographs of you but subtly taking photographs of me - you know - all the rest of it - watching. And also watching my feelings,

how easily I am hurt because I just can't get my way, I am hurt because I want to be a big man and you treat me like a little man - hurt. So watching. Watching how I eat, how quickly I eat, what kind of appetite I have - you follow, watch it. Now if that is the central thing - you understand - watching - then my next question is: how am I to watch? You follow? What is implied in watching? Go on sirs.

Q: Acceptance.

K: The gentleman says, acceptance. Is that watching? When I accept 'what is' - is that watching? No, don't say, no. Look at it. You are doing it with me, please do it with me.

Q: Sir isn't watching the problem?

K: That is what I am coming to. How do you watch? Because the manner of your watching teaches you everything. The manner of watching helps you to learn but if you don't know how to watch you can't learn. If I don't know the art of listening, I can't learn. So I must find out what it means to watch, what it means to observe, mustn't I?

Now the next question is: how do I observe my mind - please listen to it. How do I observe the mind? How do I observe the movement of my demands for happiness, pleasure - you follow - excitement? And how do I watch the body? So I must find out the art of watching. Now is the art of watching to be cultivated - please listen - cultivation implies time - doesn't it? I will watch today a little bit, tomorrow I will watch a little more and at the end of the year I shall be completely watching. That is, the cultivation of watching takes time - right - which means when you take time you are not watching. Right? When you say to yourself, look, at the end

of the year I will be very good at watching, in the meantime you are not watching - are you? So watching, observing, seeing, is not the result of cultivation, system or time. Right? Please, come on. Right? Be quite sure that watching doesn't imply any kind of time. So I must find out what it is that doesn't imply time. That is, when I watch myself - this is very complex, please - when I watch myself, which is the mind, the body, the heart, which is myself, how am I watching? Am I watching in order to change what I see? Right? Change, which means reject and keep some, saying to myself, this is good, this is bad, I'll throw away the bad and keep the good. So if I watch myself with the eyes of condemnation, judgement, evaluation, then I am watching myself with the eyes of the past. Right? You see the truth of that? That is, when I watch myself with a condemnatory attitude, then I am not watching, I am judging. If I am watching in order to overcome it, I am not watching. Right? So if you see the truth that in watching if there is any kind of judgment, any kind of evaluation, trying to overcome, escape, that prevents watching - if you see the truth of that immediately you will watch without any of that. Right?

So you want to do something without time - I am showing it to you.

Q: Sir, along with the evaluation, condemnation, does also recognition of what you see imply time?

K: Recognition. Look, he says, apart from condemning, judging, evaluating, what part does recognition play in it. I'll show you. I am angry. I have said I must not judge, I mustn't condemn - you follow - I see the truth of that therefore it has gone. I am no longer judging, evaluating, but there is the recognition of anger.

Right? Now what takes place there, when I recognize? I have named it, haven't I? Right? No? Come on, don't go to sleep please. I have recognized it, haven't I, as anger? That means I have been angry before many times, and that has left a mark on the brain, and that brain now says that is anger. Verbally it has stated it is anger. The very word anger has connotations, that is, don't be angry because that is part of our culture, part of our inheritance, we mustn't be angry. Or indulge in anger? You follow? Are you following all this? Yes sir?

Q: In the rejection of condemnation, evaluation there is no long hair or short hair.

K: All right. Of course, of course. You have got long hair. But in that recognition there is no judgement.

Q: Why not?

K: I can't help it. That's a tall tree. I don't mistake the tree for an elephant. But - just a minute, go into it. When I recognize that I am angry that is quite a different movement taking place. The very naming it is condemning it, because I have named it in order to fix it as anger, which generations have said, don't be angry.

Q: Then there is condemnation.

K: Therefore I am saying that. So is there an observation without judgement, evaluation, though I recognize it and not attach it to the past. It isn't as simple as all this.

So when you see that, the truth of that, then you are watching completely without any obsession. Now can you do that now? Don't say, no.

Q: There is a tenseness in the body when I am watching.

K: Now wait a minute. He said, when I am watching, the

questioner says, there is a tenseness in the body. Are you watching with your body? Are you watching with the eyes? Or are you watching, not with the eyes - you understand sir what I mean? How are you watching sir? Are you watching yourself with eyes closed? Or watching yourself with eyes open? You can do both, can't you? So what do you mean by watching? Go on sir.

Why should the body be in tension when you are watching? Which means either that you are watching with tension in your mind, and therefore the tension is transferred to the body. Or you are watching without any interference of the mind, just watching. When you are watching with an image, when you are watching yourself with the idea that there must be change then there is tension. Right? But if you are just watching. Look sir, suppose I have a habit of scratching myself or fiddling with my fingers - haven't you got habits like that, fiddling with your fingers, or doing something - can you watch it without wanting to change it, without wanting to stop it? Just watch it. Haven't you done it? Oh lord, you don't mean to say, please! Then you will see, if you watch it, there is no strain. But if you say, I must not fiddle with my fingers - right - I tighten up. But if I just watch it, in that there is no tension. That is simple enough. Let's go on.

So what is important is how I watch. That is really important. So watching - listen to this - has it anything to do with the mind, with the heart, or with the body? I am not saying it has, or it has not. We are enquiring. I am watching. Is watching a conclusion by the mind, I must watch, determination and therefore will. If there is will in operation there must be tension. Right? Oh lord!

Q: Isn't one of the problems of watching...

K: I am going to go into that. Sir, go slowly with me. So I am asking: what is watching? Is watching the result of determination therefore it is part of the mind - right - it says, I must watch because I must lead a harmonious life? That is, thought says to itself, I must be harmonious, therefore thought is watching. You are following? Is that clear? When thought is watching there is tension. Thought says, I must watch, I must sit still, I mustn't fiddle with my fingers. Then thought exercises its determination to watch and in that watching there is the operation of will, and where there is the operation of will there is resistance, and when there is resistance there is tension. Right? So I am asking: are you watching with the determination of thought? Right? Or, are you watching independent of thought? And therefore what does that independence of thought mean? Please sir let us go into it. You see, you can't sustain a long steady enquiry, you go to pieces in the middle of it. Just a minute sir. You see, I am saying, listen. You can't sustain sequential observation, step by step and sustain it. Because I see you give attention for a couple of seconds and gone! This requires watching. Not concentration but watching, in watching you are learning. I am doing that now. I say when I am watching if there is in that watching any operation of thought, that must inevitably result in tension, in contradiction, in resistance, because it is the determination of thought to achieve harmony, and therefore it says, I must. So I have learnt.

I am asking myself then what is watching, if it isn't thought, then what is this quality of watching in which there is no thought? Go on sirs. Is it the heart watching? Emotion, the desire, the feeling how beautiful it must be if I live a harmonious life, what a lovely



thing it will be - getting excited by the image of harmony, which is also resistance. So am I watching with any kind of resistance? You are following? And is that watching related to the mind, to the heart, or to the body? Or is it something outside of it? Wait, wait. I don't know. I am not saying it is, don't jump to it. I am asking, enquiring. When there is no resistance, no operation of will, no acceptance or denial, just watching, is that watching the exercise of thought? We said no, right? Are you quite sure? Oh lord! If it is the exercise of thought, then thought is watching. Right? If thought says, I am watching because I want to get somewhere, I must get rid of my imbalance, I must not be neurotic, thought is in operation because thought has been instructed by listening to this talk that it must live a harmonious life. And thought according to that instruction is trying to live because it wants to live a harmonious life, it doesn't matter what it means but it wants to. So thought is not watching. Right? Emotion isn't watching, obviously. If I say I love to watch - you follow - then it is lost. So then what is watching, what is the quality of watching? Do live with it for two minutes. Don't answer me please, just look at it. It is not thought, obviously, right? You are quite sure? The moment it is thought - thought is memory, the old - thought then says, I must, I must not, then in that there is contradiction and therefore that is not watching. We have been through that. Therefore watching is not the product of thought. Listen to it carefully. You have it if you go step by step. It is not emotional, aggressive assertion that I must watch. It is not getting enthusiastic about watching.

So what is watching? Now listen to this carefully. I'll repeat this. You will see it. It is not thought because thought has said, I'll

watch, in watching it has discovered it is operating from the past. Right? That it must achieve harmony because it has heard some person say, you must live a harmonious life, therefore it says, I must, it must be a marvellous state. So thought wants to live a life of harmony and thought cannot live a life of harmony because thought is the response of memory which is the past. Right? Harmony means living now. Right? So it is not thought. I have learnt that. The mind has learnt it is not thought. Therefore what is it? It is intelligence, isn't it? Right?

Now it is intelligence that is watching.

Q: This watching is impersonal.

K: Sir, don't bring in impersonal or personal. First see that when thought interferes there must be tension, there must be the operation of will, there must be resistance, there must be overcoming because thought can only function in terms of the past. Obviously sir. Right? Unless you see that, see the truth of that you will still be watching with thought.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right. Now. Sir look.

What is analysis? I am going back, you follow, a little bit. Analysis is observation, isn't it, a form of observation. Right? No? I watch and watching myself I say, I have been angry. Why have I been angry? The explanations. The cause, the justifications, all that is part of analysis, which is part of thought, isn't it? And analysis takes time. And at the end of it I say, that anger was justified or that anger was not justified, therefore I must be watchful next time, I will only get angry when it is justified - righteous anger and unrighteous anger! So look what is happening. Then thought is

awakened to anger and watching anger. Right? Then what takes place? The thought is the observer, isn't it? Then the observer is different from the thing which it observes, his anger. Right? In that observation there is contradiction and therefore conflict; therefore the observer says, I must get rid of anger. So in looking at thought, observing not saying, I must not use thought, I must use thought, in observing thought and all the activities of thought, out of that observation comes intelligence. This intelligence is the result of observation of the workings of thought.

So, now, that intelligence is watching. Right? Is watching the mind, watching the body, watching the heart. That intelligence says, don't eat that food - listen to this - because yesterday you had pain, give it up. And because intelligence is in operation you give it up instantly.

Q: That's memory sir.

K: No, wait, listen carefully. I said sir, intelligence is not thought. Intelligence comes into being in observing the operation of thought - Observing, not condemning it or accepting it, just watching thought. Right? How thought operates. You know, watch it yourself, you will see it. In that watching intelligence comes. Now that intelligence is watching. Right? And I eat the wrong things, when that intelligence is watching - listen to it - it's also aware of the causation which is the past. So intelligence doesn't neglect the cause, is aware of the cause and the result. Oh, you won't get it. But it is not memory, it is intelligence which perceives the whole movement of causation.

Q: Is watching the same as intelligence?

K: Watching. Yes that's right. Watching, if you have understood

the whole process of thought, is intelligence. Watching is intelligence if you understand the whole movement of thought.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Don't twist words.

Q: I just want to see.

K: I know sir. I am moving it away from it. Watching is intelligence. But mere watching is not intelligence. But watching the whole movements of the operations of thought - you understand - seeing how it works - haven't you done all this?

Q: It seems to me you need something more.

K: More than intelligence.

Q: Something more...

K: ...mysterious?

Q: No, no. Immensity.

K: Wait, wait, wait.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No sir. Let's begin slowly. Thought is measurable isn't it? Be clear. Thought is measurable. I can measure thought. My thought is better, wider, nobler - you follow - comparative. Is intelligence measurable?

Q: Yes.

Q: No.

K: Yes? Don't say yes and no. Let's find out. You see your mind is so conditioned you can't go through with it. I want to find out whether intelligence is limited, conditioned - born in India it is more intelligent than born in the West, or more intelligent because it was born in the West than in India, is intelligence personal, impersonal - you follow - all those are measurements. And that

measurement is thought. Thought is deciding whether it is personal or impersonal intelligence. Oh come on sir. Right?

Q: We don't know what intelligence is therefore...

K: No, therefore find out if you are watching with thought. Right? Don't bother about intelligence. You see that is another trick! Find out how you are watching: whether you are watching with thought. And most of us are watching with thought.

Q: Doesn't one have to be silent before there is intelligence?

K: The question is: hasn't thought to be silent when you are watching - right?

Q: Yes. Perhaps there must be silence before intelligence can operate.

K: Quite right, but the silence can only come when you understand the whole machinery of thought. Therefore when you understand the whole machinery of thought, thought becomes quiet and when it is quiet intelligence operates. That's all!

Q: Sir, when you use the word intelligence it has certain associations.

K: Wait sir. I understand. To you that word intelligence has certain associations. If I use the words, 'god is watching', you would object to that because you have other associations with that word.

Q: Well then, not quite.

K: Wait sir. I am going to expand a little more. If I say the higher self watching...

Q: ...atman.

K: There we are! Or if I was in India, the atman is watching then they would accept it. Therefore we are not associating

intelligence with any particular conditioning. You cannot associate intelligence with anything. If you do it is not intelligence. Ah, you've got it!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please don't be so categorical. Examine it, play with it, go into it.

Q: Sir, the mind looking at awareness, looking, seeing continuous flow or movement and then it seems to stop at a certain point. At that point the observer seems to come into being. Can intelligence come into being instead?

K: No sir. Certainly not. It is like saying, when you are aware of danger can you at the moment not be aware of it at all. You are walking down the street and you are aware at one moment that the bus is dangerous and the next moment you are not aware of it and you will be killed.

Q: Has intelligence a past and a future, or is it free of past and future?

K: Or is intelligence free of the past and the future. Please be careful. Does intelligence only function in the present, independent of the past and the future. Which means is intelligence out of time. That's right? Thought is in time. Right? Thought is in time, thought is time. And is intelligence time?

Look, may I go back to what we began with? I must stop in a minute or two because the tape cannot go on more than one hour and fifteen minutes. And I have nearly come to that.

We began by asking what is a harmonious life. We said we more or less defined it verbally, and what is described is not the described, the description is not the described, and we said we live

an unharmonious life. And that is a fact. And the ideal is out, that is gone, because I see the truth of the ideal. Now I am left with this, that I live a life which is not harmonious and I see why it is not. It is contradictory and so on and so on. Then I say who is watching all this? If thought is watching it is still the past watching the present, and so there is division between the past and the present. Then the past tries to overcome the present, therefore there is resistance against the present, therefore there is strain. And then what is watching? Is there a watching which is not the result of thought? Right?

Q: Is there awareness of the thinking process?

K: Awareness of the thinking process. Go slowly. The past, if thought is watching then there must be division, the past watching the present. Right? In that watching there is contradiction, therefore there is conflict and all the rest of it. So is there a watching - please listen - without the past thought coming into it? I see that there is such a watching and that watching is an awareness in which thought doesn't come into it at all.

Q: How do you know?

K: I am telling you. You can do it, not how do I know, do it.

Q: Are you telling me, or are you just stating facts?

K: I am just stating a fact.

Q: Are you?

K: How do I know. Look sir, how do I know. How do I know this exists. I am saying how do I know this exists?

Now here, I have explained for an hour and a quarter in discussion, the nature and structure of thought. Right? And when you watch the nature and the structure of thought, see where it is

important, where it is not important, see the truth of that - you follow - the truth of its operation and its non-operation, then there is a different kind of watching. That is all I am saying. That watching has no time. It is not based on time. It is not what I discover. If you apply your mind, your awareness you will discover it for yourself. Full stop.

Q: You are stating a fact or what is your fact?

K: Oh no, I am just stating a fact.



## **SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC DIALOGUE 9TH AUGUST 1971**

Q: Sir, I think most of us in this tent are completely and utterly out of touch with reality - we have too much money, we have too much food in our stomach, when we leave here we go back to a hot bath. What does this freedom mean compared to a man who can't have this. Here in this tent we don't want to find out what it is like.

K: Let me repeat that question. The gentleman says that we are well fed, we go off when we leave the tent, we go and have coffee and tea or smoke and we have got money. And what does freedom mean to us - and probably we are prisoners and we don't know it and so on. He wants to discuss that.

Q: Does love exist?

K: Does love exist between man and woman.

Q: This is a personal question only. As a psychologist I have to deal with a great many marriages which are entirely wrong and the children are not being cared for. Could we discuss what happens to these unfortunate marriages and their children.

K: We said the other day - we will come back to your question, sir - we would devote a whole morning to the question of education - not only education of our children but also the education of ourselves. Can we discuss that and include the two questions that have been put: what is the relationship between man and woman and love; and the children involved with marriages that go wrong, and the whole problem of freedom and fear, and therefore education - can we take that sir, can we discuss what is education, not only of the children but also of the grown-ups? May we? Do

you agree?

Q: Is there a difference between education and learning?

K: We will go into that - take the whole problem of what it means to learn and what it means to be taught, and the teacher relationship with the student, you know the whole problem, we will go into it. Do you all want to discuss this?

It is such a big question I don't quite know where to begin. I wonder what we want our children to be, or what is going to happen to children as they grow up. That's one problem. And what is the relationship between the parent and the child, and what is the relationship of the family to the community? What is the relationship of the community, the nationality to the rest of the world? And why do we have children at all? And also we have to go into this question of sex and so on, the whole problem.

I think we have to begin observing actually what is going on, the actual fact. We have children and we send them off to school as quickly as possible. We have our own private life independent of the children and we think we love our children and we have really very little relationship with our children. That's the actual fact - no? So one wonders, as one sees not only in India and the East but also in the West, why we educate children at all. Is it merely to acquire knowledge so that they can earn a livelihood and therefore conform to the pattern of society which the elder generation have established? You have to discuss this with me please. The elder generation is responsible for the total mess the world is in. Right? Not only the parents but the grandparents and the great-great-grandparents. And do we educate the children to conform to the pattern which the older generation have established. That's one

point.

And actually what is going on in the world - the parents have very little time with their children - they have their offices, their factories, and the mother and the father have to earn more because the society, the expansive society, buy more and more and more. So the parents have very little time with their children and so they are sent off to school as quickly as possible. These are all facts. And when they come home, the children, the parents are tired, and fortunately or unfortunately there is the television and the children are put in front of it and it's "For god's sake, don't bother me because I am tired." Right?

The children lead their own life and the parents lead their own life - their clubs, their factories, their books, their worries, their sexual life, their position, the office, in the factory, and so on and so on. Right? The parents are concerned with their own lives, their own miseries, their own positions, responsibilities, and the children are out of that. Haven't you noticed all this? And as the children grow older, as one observes in the West and in America, the children break away and revolt from the older generation, grow long hair, become dirty, wander around, permissive society, sex is a casual affair, not very important, drugs, marijuana, you know the whole permissive society, there they conform, they don't want to conform to the old pattern, but they have their own feeling of unity with the long haired ones. Right? So there is a wider and wider gap between the children and the parents.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: We are going to find out sir, we are going to go into this. First look at the whole picture, not what we should do. See what is

happening in the world. That's the whole picture in the West, more or less - wider, deeper division between the parents and the children. And the children have nobody to go to, to talk over things, and they talk over things amongst their own group, they experiment with sex, drugs, utterly confused, uncertain, unstable. That's what is happening in the West.

And in the East, India, the whole system used to be family, all the family lived together. The daughters went off to the husband's house and the boys remained with the parents, married but yet lived in the same house as their parents. For economic reasons that is breaking up. And so again though it is not so urgent as in the West, the mother remains at home with the children and the father goes out to earn money, comes back tired - you know, the whole business. But only the mother remains at home to look after the children. That is what is going on in the world.

Education, as we see it now, is to make children conform to the pattern established by the society, by the culture. That is, competitive, aggressive, ambitious, each one, parents and the children, out for themselves, selfish, arrogant, aggressive and frightened. And they resort, the children, the younger generation, to gurus, to mysticism - I won't call it that, mysticism is rather a good word - to occultism, to mysterious black magic, occult stuff, you know, Jesus loves us, you know, all that is going on. And strangely, in the East, in India, there is not this revolt against order, against the established order because of over population, there are five hundred and seventy million people and probably twelve million every year added to that. So the parents are concerned with their children, see that they have a good job, get married, get a job

and for god's sake don't get into mischief and then forget the children - just their grandmothers and mothers worry about them.

So looking at this whole picture: in the West there is the draft, conscription, and in India there is no conscription, because there is so much poverty, the poor, the uneducated, or so-called who joined the army, the officers and so on, that's a career. They are paid there, they are happier, they have food, clothing, shelter. So there is no conscription. So society, as it exists, encourages war, and all the horrors of it, violence, brutality, and the younger generation do not want war, they demonstrate, you know what is going on in the world. So when you look at this whole picture - not my picture, you understand, it is not my picture, it is your picture, it is there in front of you, when you look at all this, the revolt, the drugs, the permissive activities of sex and everything that's going on, one wonders how can all this be and why is it like this? Right? Are you interested in all this? You are parents, aren't you, some of you - I am so sorry, I am really. I have watched it in India, I have watched in America, in Europe, and if one is at all sensitive one has tears in one's eyes, at the appalling things that are going on.

So seeing all this, what is the purpose of education? Just to earn a livelihood, go to college, university, win a degree in some technological subject and forget the vast field of life in which you are not educated at all? Right? Is that education? One must have technological knowledge, otherwise you can't survive in this world as it is. You know in ancient India, and it still exists, if you leave the world and take the robe of a monk, a tradition has been established through thousands of years, that a monk who has renounced the world outwardly has to be fed, clothed, and in any

village, there are seven hundred thousand villages in India, any village however poor it is, will support this monk. These monks wander all over the country, and of course in the West it is not allowed, vagrancy.

So what is the purpose of living, what is it all about? When you meet students all over the world who have gone up to a certain point in university, say, "What is this, what am I doing? They are destroying me, stuffing me with a lot of knowledge and what is the point of it all?" and they walk out of the university.

So what is a parent to do and what are the children, the students, what are they to do? You understand the question? What are we to do? You have no answer, have you? There are parents who encourage their children to take drugs. Think of the horror of it.

Q: Think of the horror of prohibiting children to take drugs.

K: I am not at all sure.

Q: It could be better than...

K: Sir, the question of drugs, in India - I am not talking of better or worse, just looking at it - hashish - you know what that is, of course, part of all that, derived from hemp and all that, only certain types of ignorant people take it. It is tradition that you must not take it, and they don't take it, unless you are a little bit odd - only people who are ignorant, very little money, they generally indulge in all that kind of stuff. Now in the West...

Q: Sir, youth or not, hashish is no longer confined to the West.

K: Wait sir. Those who have money - very few drink whisky in India, fortunately, or beer, only the well-to-do because it is too expensive. Probably when whisky and beer and all the rest of it become cheaper they will all begin to drink. And the question is in

the West whether these drugs should be allowed or not. It is allowed to have tobacco, drink, why not also allow this. The scientists, the doctors have not examined as yet fully, though they have up to a point, that marijuana does affect the brain cells greatly. You understand? The brain cells toxically are infected by marijuana as well as LSD. They are discovering what tremendous damage it does to the brain. They will examine it much more, they will establish it and they will say it does damage it, like smoking cigarettes does harm to the lungs, that's obvious, and yet we go on smoking.

Q: Alcohol.

K: No, alcohol is a different matter. Wait sir, go slowly, go slowly. If you take a little of it - I don't take any of these things, so I am not advocating one or the other - if you take a little of it, it may help perhaps a little to stimulate, very little, sir. Don't object to this, look at it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Of course, of course, we know this. But to allow children at the age of 15, 14, 13, 12, 16 or 18 to take drugs, to buy them - you follow? See what happens, it gradually destroys their brain. Haven't you noticed that people who take drugs, and I have unfortunately, or fortunately have come into contact with a great many of them in the West, they can't reason, they are not responsible. I won't go into all that. Let the doctors go into it and then you will all accept it.

Q: Sir, may I ask you one thing. Even though I know in America drugs are illegal, it seems to me that the whole pattern of life is encouraging people to take drugs.

K: Of course, of course. So there is this whole miserable state - children, the students, the parents. Now what is education? Is it to prepare the children, the students, to conform to the pattern established by the old order; or is education meant to create a totally different kind of human being? Please, sir, answer.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Wait, sir, we are going to find out, don't state anything, you are not enquiring then.

Q: It is more in the sense of learning, not acquiring.

K: Wait, wait, madam. You refuse to go step by step, and we all jump ahead. So how can we, grown-up people and fairly advanced students, how can we change all this? You understand? What is our responsibility? You have no answer, have you? You would rather theorize about all this rather than really finding out what to do.

So what is education and what is learning? What is the acquisition of knowledge and freedom? What is learning, and can such a mind that is always learning, conform to any particular pattern of society? I am doing all the talking, I wish you would discuss this matter.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's right sir. Killing animals for food. Don't take one little thing, take the whole thing.

Q: And intolerance.

K: Of course, the intolerance.

Q: And violence.

K: Of course.

Q: It is my opinion that education as understood formally is entirely wrong. We have to bring up our children and let them have



the opportunity to be new human beings.

K: Sir, that's what I am saying. I am asking how, seeing things as they are now, the intolerance of the long-haired ones or the short-haired ones, the intolerance of the people who eat meat for the vegetarians, who don't eat meat, those who say vegetarianism is like a filthy creeping disease that is spreading all over the world, and so on and on and on. Seeing all this, the wars, the intolerance, the division between people, between the parents and children, the misery, the divorce - you follow sir, all that, don't just take one thing.

Q: We should abolish centralized authority.

K: Sir, all that is involved in this. You may abolish centralized authority but you have your own authority, over your wife, over your children, you have the authority of the guru. So we have to understand the problem totally, sir, not just one part of it, not one fragment of it. Our culture has broken up life into fragments and we look at one fragment and whine over that fragment and discard the rest, or be totally indifferent, or intolerant of the rest. So please consider the whole problem. Now what are we to do?

Q: Stop.

K: He says, just stop.

Q: We have to stop.

K: Wait a minute. Will you stop being intolerant, stop killing animals for your food, stop taking drugs, stop smoking? You see, you won't do it.

Q: If you are aware of what is going on.

K: You are aware of what is going on, not "if we can be aware". Why aren't you aware when the house is on fire?

Q: If you see fire you put it out.

K: Don't take up one thing sir, look at the whole problem. You think in terms of fragments, that's what we are trying to do, to prevent you from thinking in fragments. There is this whole problem, so complex, so divided, so contradictory, don't take one fragment and with that beat the rest of the fragments. Because you don't drink don't curse anybody who drinks. It all becomes too silly. So take the whole problem, and as human beings, concerned with their children, with society, with what is happening, what are you going to do? The gentleman suggested, stop. Will you stop? Stop sending your children to war?

Q: Try to resist propaganda.

K: But accept another propaganda.

Q: If I can see all the things that have conditioned me, I won't impose that on another.

K: That's all. So what are we to do, sir, how are you going to educate, teach, the new generation that will create a different society, not this thing. You see you don't answer.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, look, look: you want to create a new generation, a generation that will not think in fragments. Right? Like our society thinks in fragments, we want to create a generation that does not think in fragments, that looks at the whole of life, not just their job, their little family, their little sex, their little children, but the whole of life. Right? Now how can we do that? That is education, isn't it?

Q: Teach the reality of things.

K: Do you know it? You see, the vanity of the parents - teach them the reality. What do you know about reality, when you are

fragmented, when you are battling with your husband, or your wife, when you are seeking money, position, prestige, acting selfishly?

Q: I would eliminate the impact of society because, myself first. I can defy the impact.

K: Sir, do you do it, do you do it?

Q: Sir, as we are we cannot do it.

K: Yes, sir, you can do everything. We can't wait until we reach perfection.

Q: Once you start out, like myself, with perceptions but my body goes on in the same pattern.

K: That's what I am telling you, sir. Please go into this with me. Sir, first see there is this whole picture of life. We are responsible for it. Right? Each one of us is responsible for this awful mess in the world - in education, in every way, in our relationship with each other, with the misery, the suffering of it all, we are responsible. Now we are asking: how is it possible to educate the coming generation in a different way? Have I to wait - please listen to this - have I to wait until I am free of my conditioning, free of all my problems and become perfect and then teach the children? Or - please listen - or in the very act of teaching of the children I discover my own imperfections and correct them as I go along? Will you do that? No, you are all asleep.

Q: You need to know the actions of life, the essence of a human being.

K: Sir, we have to know the essence of life. Now who is going to tell you the essence of life?

Q: We can't ask a leader.

K: Therefore what will you do?

Q: Find out for ourselves.

K; That's what we are doing now.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, sir, I have been connected with several schools - two in India, one in the north and one in the south. I go there every year and spend about three weeks to a month talking to the students, to the teachers, practically every day discussing. The parents want their children to get a job, that's the only thing they are concerned with. See the problem of this. Overpopulation, and jobs are awfully difficult to get. And during these thirty, forty years that I have been talking to them, they all sit round me on the floor, we discuss for an hour, they say, "You are quite right sir, what you say is perfectly true, thank god you are leaving in a month's time and we can go back". Because the pressure of life is so strong, the tradition is so heavy, and they say, "Lovely to hear what you are saying, what you say is perfectly true, but..." We are connected with a school in California, that's gone. There is a school in England, we are trying to build it up. Now what is a teacher, what is a parent, what are you to do seeing all this?

Q: Sir, is it possible to allow, to create an environment where one can go beyond oneself?

K: Listen to that question. Is it possible to create an environment which will help you to go beyond yourself? All the religions have tried to do this with their monasteries. Right? The communist society, which worships the State, said, go beyond yourself, the State is more important. But the 'me' operates all the time - in the monk, in the commissar, in the politburo, in Mao,

everywhere. So we say, create the atmosphere. Now who is going to create it?

Q: Sir, hang on. I didn't say that. Remove the false relationship between the student and the teacher.

K: That's what we are trying to do, to remove that false relationship. Then what happens? Then the student who has been free to do what he likes says, "You have become authority" - if you correct him.

Q: Why do people have children at all?

K: Don't ask me.

Q: In spite of the problem, because you posed a question, one of the questions was why do people have children at all.

K: I asked that, sir, because I want to find out - the parents who have children, what responsibility they have towards the children. What responsibility have I if I have a child, a girl, a boy, what is my responsibility? Am I going to educate them to send to these monstrous schools - you follow - in which nobody is concerned about anybody else, they are only concerned with themselves, you know, all the rest of it. What is my responsibility?

Q: Sir, if you...

K: Sir, answer my question: what is my responsibility as a parent?

Q: Show them how to live.

K: Do you do that if you feel responsible? You know what responsibility means? I feel tremendously responsible sitting here talking to you, and I really mean it. And when I go to these schools, face them, you know crying, I'd do anything. I feel so tremendously passionate about all this.

So what is my responsibility towards a child whom I have begotten? And do I want him to fit into the society?

Q: Sir, if I see that dealing with my child, or friend, I play on their fears...

K: Sir, I am asking you, you are not answering my question.

Q: I don't do it. I don't make them dependent on me, I don't...

K: Sir, would you mind answering my question first.

Q: I teach them how to learn.

K: Not 'how'.

Q: We can't only be responsible for our own children.

K: Sir, begin with your children, that's good enough. If you love your children, you will expand the whole thing. I am asking a question, please hold a minute. You have children, either grown-up, married and put away, or you have children now, students, young people, what is your responsibility towards them? Wait, sir, please, give me two minutes, will you. What is your responsibility? Do you feel responsible? Not financially - of course, send them to school, give them food, clothes, I am not speaking of that responsibility, of that kind, but much more deeply. What is your responsibility towards them? Do you want them to be like you? Wait. Do you want them to conform to the society in which we have been living?

Q: No.

K: Wait, you know what it means? Do you want them to take drugs, do you want them to have sex at the age of thirteen, fourteen? Do you want them to become wandering people all over the earth - there are twenty thousand so-called hippies in India. I am asking what is your responsibility?

Q: Sir, isn't it possible that many of us are asking the question, what should our responsibility be, rather than being very honest in getting at the way it actually is. Most of us are very, very dishonest.

K: I am saying that, sir. I don't want to use the word 'dishonest'. I am saying what it is now, actually? If you can't face that you can't face anything else. You become dishonest.

Q: You have got to find out what responsibility is.

K: Sir, not what it is to be responsible, then you have the picture of what it is to be responsible, and try to conform to that picture, but actually do you feel responsible? You know what that word means? To your children.

Q: We don't want our children to grow up like us.

K: Please, madam, you are not answering my question. Please stick to my question. Do you feel responsible?

Q: I should try to...

K: Madam, that's not my question. Answer please my question. If you feel responsible for your children, how does that responsibility show?

Q: You let them make their own decisions.

K: They are doing it. Sir, you are not answering my question.

Q: I feel the responsibility when I am with my children, that responsibility is that I feel completely in despair when I am with them.

K: Be honest, for god's sake. Don't let us imagine.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sir, please. I would feel responsibility if I had a child, a son or daughter - thank god I haven't got either - if I had one I would

feel responsible. I would want to know what they are doing. I want to see how they walk, how they dress, how they talk, how they eat, what are they thinking about, what company they keep - you follow, I am responsible, I want to find out - not tell them, don't do this, do that, become this, become that, I want to see what is happening in their mind.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Please, I am asking one question, you are saying something else.

Q: We must listen to them.

K: We must, we should - everything is that you are not responsible. If you feel responsible then you are open, then you are watching, then you are listening, you are caring.

Q: But we are not like that. We don't see what we are.

K: No, I am sorry, you are not answering my question, you are saying, don't be like us.

Q: What about ourselves, sir.

K: No, I have asked you before, what do you say about this? You kept quiet. I am asking you - your question will be answered when you answer this question - do you feel responsible? If you feel responsible you will see that there is no war, you will not allow your children to be destroyed. For god's sake what human beings you are.

Q: Even though I feel responsible I can't do anything about it. Governments ask that your children be sent to schools.

K: Madam wait. Governments ask that your children be sent to schools, they form a gang, you know the whole thing begins. Right?



Q: The only thing to do, as far as I understand, is to be in right relationship with them.

K: Are you in right relationship with your husband, with your wife, with your children? Of course not. We said we must be, we should teach them, don't be like me.

Q: Sir, I think it is part of responsibility for the children to feel responsible too.

K: I know that, that is part of the game. The parents depend on their children, use them as toys and all the rest of it. Please, you are just avoiding the issue.

Q: If I had children I'd want to know where they come from.

Q: Sir, I would have thought that the parents themselves are responsible for their children, and that is a reflection on the parents.

K: The children are the embodiment of their parents. If that is so, even then I say to myself, if I have children, what is my responsibility? There is war, there is conscription, draft, children like to conform - long hair, short hair, worship Jesus revolution, Jesus freaks, they like to conform. That's what Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini did, conform, make the children - you know, all the rest of it, put on uniforms, march - that is part of the parents. Now seeing all this, all the picture, not just your picture, or my picture, all this picture in the world, what am I to do with my children? Yes sir?

Q: My responsibility is to be totally free of the world.

K: Seeing this whole picture, shall I cry for the rest of my life, get terribly depressed, in despair? I can't do it, it isn't in my blood to get depressed about this thing. So I say to myself, what is my

responsibility - there is war, there are drugs, in education there is no learning at all but merely cramming knowledge, which is necessary, and there is no learning about life, the beauty of life, the extraordinary thing that lies beyond thought and all the rest of it, what is my responsibility?

Q: If my mind is fragmented, conditioned, then it is not possible to do anything.

K: That is so sir. But I am asking you, you have children, what will you do with them?

Q: Love them.

K: You love them, you say. Do you love them? If you love them will there be war, will you send them to war? If you love them will you allow them to take drugs? Not 'allow' - you understand? See that they don't take drugs.

Q: Grow with your children.

Q: Our responsibility towards them is to show them that responsibility is in both directions.

Q: Sir, what do all these answers tell you about us?

K: They tell me very simply that you don't face facts.

Q: My responsibility is to talk the whole thing over with my children, to live with them.

K: Sir, just take a simple thing. There is war. There is conscription - in France, in England, not there, in America, conscription. Now what will you do as a parent?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Face it, sir, what will you do?

Q: We have to die psychologically to all this.

K: You are not dead, you have to. I am not interested in what

you are going to do. I am asking you what you will do now.

Q: Change myself.

K: You have been talking about changing yourself for the last forty years. Will you change?

Q: Don't tell us the answer. We should go away and try to find out.

K: I am going to show you. Take one fact: what am I to do with my child, boy, who is growing up, who is going to be eighteen, and so on - he is going to be conscripted, sent to war. What shall I do?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What am I to do? How am I to teach him, or help him to understand to extraordinary thing to kill somebody?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Are you doing that with your child? Are you doing that with your child? Will you do it with the child? Please see what it means sir: to show your child not to kill.

Q: But when they grow up they are doing the same thing to animals as they are to human beings. They see how animals treat each other, how we treat animals, and that is all instilled in them. Maybe it is impossible for us to change this - what can we do?

K: That's just it. I am asking.

Q: Can you tell us what to do, and what we shouldn't do?

K: Can you - please listen to the question - can you tell me what to do or what not to do?

Q: Obviously you can't tell us.

K: All right sir, I'll show it to you in a minute. When you stop yelling at me and giving me explanations, and not facing the facts. Here is a fact: I have got a child, I have got a son. I think I love

him. I want him to grow up to be a totally different being than this modern generation - what am I to do?

Q: Listen to him very carefully and go with him as far as he is willing to go.

K: But he is not going to listen to you because we have no relationship with him. I have been saying that.

Q: I have to have so much love that he will listen.

K: Sir, if you have no love then you are a lost soul, then why do you have children? Having children, what am I to do? You are not facing the problem. I have a child, a son, who is growing up. I want him to be a totally different kind of human. Just listen sir. I want him to be a totally different kind of man, not aggressive, not violent, not frightened, not conforming, living in a totally different dimension. I want him there, that's my love for him. Right? My love for him is not to teach him what he should do, but he should grow up to be a human being totally different from the rest of the gang. Right? Now how am I to do it?

Q: Sir...

K: Wait sir. You haven't even listened to what I have said. What am I to do? I see that the other children with whom he runs and plays, their parents are not concerned about this. See the difficulty sir. Their parents are not interested, so this boy, my son, goes and joins that group, and he begins to conform, he comes home already changed slightly. Haven't you noticed it? Day after day his face changes. No? Up to fourteen he is an angel, beyond that he becomes - you know what he becomes. So what am I to do? The government says, you must send him to school, educate him in the pattern. So what am I to do? How am I, who want him to be totally

different, different not in a reactionary sense, totally different, a revolution that is different, psychologically above all this stupid horror. And I see what is happening. So when he comes home I have to talk to him. Right? I say, look, you are conforming. Discuss with him, talk with him, but have I the time? I have been working in the office all day, being insulted, conforming, being bullied, you follow, and I come home tired. And the wife has her job, her career, because she loves careers, the Women's Lib - you know that. And she hates the house. So she comes home tired. And I have no time with the child, nor the mother. So the tendency is for the child to conform to the pattern set by the elder generation. And my desire, my love for him is destroyed because I can't do anything. Right?

So I say now, what am I to do? So I say, I will not go to clubs. Right? No bridge, I am going to spend my life looking after that boy, although I have to go and earn a livelihood. You won't do that because you want to go to clubs, you want to have your hair curled, you want to be fashionable, you want to be - you know all the monstrous things, and yet you say, "I am responsible". So you won't give up one thing and yet you say you love your children. No, sir. And if you loved your children do you think you would have wars?

Q: You must teach the child to learn about himself.

K: Are you learning about yourself? You may want to teach your child about himself, which means are you learning about yourself, how you dissipate your life, how you indulge in life, how you drink, gossip, waste energy.

Q: Sir, as I sit here I realize that I am not responsible and that

brings me to a tremendous stop.

K: That's right. First face the fact that you are not responsible. So if each one of us in this tent really did, do you know what we could do? If each one of us felt responsible we would form schools, we would sacrifice, we would sell our jewels, not sit comfortably back and say, "Oh, we must teach our children to be different" - you know all the things. So it is up to you sirs.

So all this shows that we don't feel responsible. And that's why the coming generation is like us, only with longer hair, equally unhappy, discontented, trying to identify themselves with something, or with themselves, saying, "I must be myself" - I don't know what that means. So they will be like us when they grow up - confused, unhappy, uncertain, tremendously caught up with their own misery, and their children will be like them. Socrates, I am told, in 500 BC complained about the children - how that they were rude, how they didn't behave, how they were concerned with themselves, with their looks, with their sex, and we are still doing exactly the same. Right?

So sirs, you have listened to the speaker for an hour, or more, do you feel responsible at the end of it? Don't answer me. You know to feel responsible means you have to change your whole way of life. Which means you are not concerned about yourself but about the child. You know love means that, love means the concern for another. You know when you plant a small tree you look after it, don't you, you water it, you protect it against the sun and the wind. And the child needs security. You don't give him security. You have no relationship with him. He becomes as confused as you are, and he does wild things, he becomes violent.

So can we, listening to something that is true, change our whole way of living and be totally concerned with the child?

## ROME PUBLIC TALK 31ST OCTOBER 1971

If I may I'll first talk a little and then perhaps you will be good enough to ask questions.

I wonder what you would like me to talk about, because we seem to have so many problems in the world, and also personally. Vast superficial, circumstantial changes are taking place. Technology has gone so rapidly ahead bringing about a great change in that field. And human beings throughout the world are caught in violence, in confusion, and a great deal of sorrow. One observes, looking at all this phenomenon in the world one realizes there must be a great revolution, not physical revolution of killing each other, destroying a particular system and setting up a new one, or destroying a particular way of thinking, but a revolution that is total, deeply psychological so that a human being is totally changed, not only in his way of thinking, but also in his actions. This is, I think, fairly obvious to any one who is observing or seeing or in contact with what is actually happening. There are wars, there are the division in religions, in superstition, and there are nationalistic, economic, social divisions and injustice. There is poverty, perhaps not so much in the western world but in the east, there is vast confusion, lack of food, the degradation of great poverty. So any person who is at all responsible, who is at all aware of what is happening in the world, must surely ask himself what he can do as a human being, not along a particular system of thought, or according to any belief, or to any nationalistic end because systems of thought have not brought about peace to man. Please do listen to all this seriously, if you will. Systems of belief,



ideals, have not brought man together, on the contrary they have divided people. Systems of ideological concepts in the east and in the west, whether it is communist ideology, or a Catholic ideology or a Christian ideology have not brought peace to man. On the contrary they have brought wars, conflict.

So if there is to be a fundamental revolution, as there must be, it doesn't lie along a particular system of thought, nor does it lie according to any particular formulation or concept. Because all our concepts and our particular points of view are conditioned by the culture in which we live, in which we have grown up. So the culture conditions thought, conditions our behaviour, and our culture whether in the east or in the west, has conditioned man, and he behaves according to a certain pattern. Now either of these two, a system of thought, or acting according to a particular conditioning, have not solved our problems. I think again that is very clear. The modern psychologists, what one has been told, observed and talked to, are concerned with man's behaviour, because man has become more violent, he lives in a permissive society, disregards totally the world as it is, the beauty of the world, and so he is polluting, destroying nature. So the most advanced psychologists are saying, man must be conditioned to behave - please follow this carefully - he must be conditioned through reward and not through punishment. The old religions with all their beliefs, dogmas, superstitions, have made man behave, or forced him to behave according to a pattern of punishment, fear. All religions, yours of this country, or in India, or in Asia, or in the West, are based on the cultivation and the perpetuation of fear. And their behaviour pattern is based on that, reward and

punishment. And so there are those who say that man, seeing what he is, his ugly nature, his brutality, his violence, his ambition, his competitive spirit attitude and action which is destroying the world, must be conditioned, shaped, totally so that he establishes a pattern of right behaviour. Which means again subtly establishing a pattern of fear, because he will behave, being conditioned, according to the pattern of reward and not punishment. But when man is seeking perpetually reward, behind it there is always the fear of not having. So the patterns are the same, the religious pattern, the cultural pattern and the psychological pattern established, or trying to be established by the psychologists. So that is our problem.

I hope we are communicating with each other. The word 'communication' means to understand each other, to share the problem with each other, to think together, not accepting or rejecting but to think together, and therefore share. The word 'communication' means that.

So that is our problem, how is man, who is so conditioned, logically and illogically, sanely in one direction and insanely in other directions, so conditioned by religions, by nationalism, by his environmental, economic conditions and so on, how is such a man, who is destroying the world, and there is no question about that, polluting the world, destroying the seas and the living things in the water, how is this man, that is you and I, we, how are we to change so that we behave totally differently, behave differently in our relationships? Please, that is the problem. So that we are no longer competitive, we are no longer pursuing our own particular little interests, our own stupid forms of so-called fulfilment. All of that is based on either fear or on the principle of pleasure. So how is a

man, we, to behave? Because the world is us, and we are the world. The world isn't something separate from us. We have created, brought about, the present condition in the world, we are responsible for it, with our separative religions, nationalism, wars and all the rest of the horrors that are going on in the world. We are the world, and the world is us. I think that is fairly obvious too, because the world is the culture in which we are born, and that culture shapes us. And having been shaped we act according to our conditioning.

So how is a man who feels responsible, who sees what is going on in the world, the misery, the actual misery, the suffering, the wars, the hatred, the violence - these are not just words, they are actual facts - how is he to change? You understand the problem? Do we see clearly, are we aware of our conditioning, and the results from that conditioning - all the absurdities that are going on in the name of religion, the circus, the utter meaninglessness of it all. Because that is not religion - god is not an idea. Though religions have tried brutally, violently, except perhaps one or two, Buddhism and another - not Christianity - they have tried to bring about a union, a feeling of brotherhood, together, but they have not succeeded, they have separated man more and more and more.

So one observes all this, as you must have observed also if you are at all aware, sensitive, enquiring, utterly serious, because it is only the serious man that lives, not the man who just amuses himself and does what he likes.

So our problem is, will thought bring about a deep psychological revolution? And that revolution is absolutely, urgently necessary. Will thought, on which the whole of the

western world, and partially in the east also, the whole culture is based on thought. And thought is measurable. And the social, economic, and psychological structure of the world in which we live is basically measurable because it is the product of thought, logical or illogical.

May I point out in this, a rather interesting problem, issue, which is: the west, all its culture, its religion, is the product of thought - thought is always measurable because thought is the response of memory, memory as knowledge within the brain, the cells, which retain memory. And the east said, measure is an illusion, and we can only find the immeasurable, that is god, whatever you like to call it, not through measurement. Please see the difference between the two: here in the west, the result of thought has produced an extraordinary world - technologically, you can go to the moon, live under the sea, have the most extraordinary machinery, health and so on and so on; in the east, the search for the immeasurable has neglected the whole physical, psychological world. But they employed thought also, so through thought they hope to find the immeasurable. You see the deception. I wonder if you are following all this.

Q: Not really.

K: Not really? All right, I'm glad.

Q: Not very much.

K: Wait a minute. Wait, wait. You see, sir, thought has done marvellous things, and thought can do still more marvellous things, but thought cannot bring about right relationship between human beings. I'm going to show it to you in a minute, have patience. What we are concerned with is human relationship, and therefore

in that relationship behaviour. This is a serious talk. One must give one's attention to a problem which is so serious because we are living in a world that has become so utterly mad. One's life has no meaning. The utter waste of one's life, spending years in offices, in factories, and all the circus that is going on in the name of religion, the wars, the things that are going on in this world between man and man, in this relationship. And until that relationship radically changes we shall never any peace, any happiness.

So as we were saying, thought has produced this culture, thought enclosing our feeling also, encased. And thought is very superficial, thought is based on knowledge, experience, which is the past - thought is the past. If you had no past, no knowledge, you couldn't think. You must have knowledge. If you had no knowledge you couldn't go home, you wouldn't know your name, where you live, nothing. So there must be this knowledge, more and more efficient, functioning, based on memory, experience, knowledge and so on. But that same thought destroys relationship. That is, relationship now, as it is, is based on the image which thought has put together in relationship. Isn't it? No? Are we meeting each other? Good. Not really. In our relationship, man, woman, boy, friend, whatever it is, in our relationship, knowledge becomes the image, the image put together by thought. It is so simple, let's get on with it. Between a man and a woman the relationship is based on the knowledge of each other. That knowledge is the past. If I am married, my image of my wife is based on all the things we have lived together, the nagging, you know, the domination, the sense of jealousy, insults - the image I have built about her and she has built about me. We both have

images of each other. And the relationship is between these two images, which is the idea, which is thought. And so these images separate people. Right? Images which I have as a Hindu - if I have images, which would be totally absurd in the modern world, or at any time - if I am conditioned in the culture of India, as a Brahmin or whatever it is, I carry that image; and you as a Catholic, Protestant, whatever it is, you have the image of that particular culture. So the division is between these two images. Right?

Q: How do you get rid of them?

K: Wait, wait. First see it, not how to remove them. First see the problem. How thought must function in one direction completely, efficiently, impersonally, and see at the same time how thought destroys relationship.

Thought is not love, love is not an image, or pleasure, sexual or otherwise. So how can thought, which is measurable, and therefore thought cannot ever find the immeasurable. Thought is time; time is division and movement; and through thought we want to establish a different form of behaviour, a different culture, a different way of living. You see the difficulty? We use thought logically, or illogically. It is totally illogical when we are nationalistic, when we have certain beliefs, that you believe in god and I don't believe in god, one is a communist, one is a socialist, a division created by thought, which divides man.

So our problem then is how to live together, and act together, living together means acting together, having tremendous knowledge of the world as it is, and using that knowledge most efficiently without the division of nationalities, beliefs, your god, my god, your idol and my idol, all that rubbish. To let that

knowledge function efficiently, and at the same time in our relationships to see how thought destroys relationship. You see the problem? Thought is necessary in one direction, completely and most effectively, and in relationship thought has no place at all. Now is this possible? Is this possible, that is, is it possible for knowledge of the world which we have acquired through centuries, through science, biology, archaeology, and mathematics, tremendous store of knowledge, which is the accumulation of thought in experience, using that knowledge to bring about a different world physically so that there is no nationalities, no divisions as the Muslim, the Hindu, their wars, their absurdities, their grotesque superstitions. So that physically, outwardly we live together differently, so that there is no division. Because the moment there is division there is conflict: if you are a Catholic and I am a Protestant there is division, and therefore there is conflict; if I am communist and you are something else, there is conflict. To see that, and to use thought so completely efficiently so that we can arrange a world in which human beings can live without wars, without hate, without division, without competition. And that is only possible when we understand how thought destroys relationship.

Now how can the mind prevent the formation of an image between two human beings? You are following this? You have an image about your wife and your friend, and she has an image about you and her friend - image, which has been built together by companionship, by various encounters, intimacy and all that. These images actually prevent relationship, don't they? If I have accumulated knowledge and images about you, and I am acting

according to that image, then there is no relationship between you and me. So how can the mind prevent the formation of images? How can the mind prevent the machinery which builds images? Right? We are following this? So that I am no longer a Hindu, no longer a Muslim, no longer having a division between myself and you. Now how is this possible? That's your problem too, isn't it. Right? How do you propose to prevent the machinery that builds images? Do please let's think about it together, otherwise you will just hear it and it will have no meaning. But if you apply your mind, your energy, your attention, that is, examine together, you can only examine together when the problem becomes really intense, otherwise you play with it, verbally or superficially. And this is an intense problem, and unless we understand this we are destroying the world.

So how do you answer this? Or you escape from it?

Q: Through meditation.

K: Wait, sir, I'll come to meditation. This is a problem, sir, if you understand this problem we can go further into it, what meditation is.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madam, listen, please do listen to this, we will answer all the questions a little later. Do please pursue this line of thought, give your attention to this, not meditation, whether Christ exists, or something or other, but go into this first. How am I, knowing thought must function efficiently in one direction, impersonally, nonsuperstitiously, not according to nationalities and all the rest of it, there it must function most extraordinarily; and I also see how thought destroys relationship. Now how am I to bring about



harmony - you understand? - functioning with complete objective action and also living a life in which there is no image-making at all?

First of all, is this possible? Wait, don't say, it is not possible. If you say that you block yourself; or if you say, it is possible, you block yourself also. But whereas if you begin to examine it, enquire into it, then you will find out the right answer. Now that's what we are doing, we are enquiring into it, which means the mind must be free to enquire. Right? Otherwise you can't enquire. If you are tethered to a particular belief, particular attitude of fear or pleasure, then you can't examine. So the mind to be able to examine must be completely free to enter into the examination. Look: I want to find out if there is god, I want to find out if there is, or if there is not. Which means, I must have no fear, I must put away all the thought, the structure of what the religions have said, be free to find out, not according to my pleasure or fear, but to find out if there is such a marvellous thing in life, something totally sacred, not invented by the mind. Which means I must put everything that man has invented aside, everything man has put together through thought, what god is or what god is not. That means I must stand completely alone to find out. In the same way, to find out how, to find out, to examine, the mind must be free. Therefore the mind must be free from fear. Right? Otherwise it can't examine. And also the mind must be free from this whole principle of pleasure because all our morality, all our social behaviour, everything, even the enquiry and the worship of what you call god is based on pleasure and fear.

So can the mind understand that pleasure is not love. And the

pursuit of pleasure, whether it is the noblest pleasure or the ordinary pleasure of sex, having possessions, you know, attachments, all the rest of it, the pleasure principle - when you pursue the pleasure principle you must at the same time have fear. The two go together. That's obvious, isn't it. Yes? So I don't have to go into that. So the two go together, pleasure and fear. And the mind must understand pleasure, which is entirely different from joy, from ecstasy, from delight, from the enjoyment of something beautiful. And that enjoyment is not pleasure. Pleasure is the pursuit of an enjoyment which is over. Right? I enjoyed the sunset, and thought says, 'I would like to repeat that sunset' - over and over and over again, sexually, in different ways. So pleasure is the product of thought. Please follow all this. And also the fear is the product of thought - fear of what might happen, fear of death, fear of losing, or repetition of physical pain and so on, which is always thought thinking about the past or the future. So thought cultivates pleasure and fear. And to enquire into this question, whether thought - enquire whether the mind can be free from image, not only the image between two people, but altogether the structure of image-making. To enquire in that there must be freedom from the pursuit of pleasure and fear. Right, is this clear? Oh, I don't know. It doesn't matter, I'll go on.

So the mind sees this problem, all of this problem, not just one side of it, the whole of it; to see is to be attentive, isn't it. If you are not completely attentive you can't see it. You may see one part of it, and neglect the other part, or you may see one particular interest that appeals to you. In attention there is no centre from which you are attending, there is only attention. Now when there is that

attention the image-making will never be formed. Right? If I am attending when you insult me, or flatter me, or dominate me, or this, or that, in that state of attention, because in that attention there is no centre as the 'me' which is attentive, there is only attention, in that state of attention there is no image-making at all. Right? Now what does this attention mean?

Now the gentleman asked, what is meditation. You see, meditation is not the control of thought. Right? Because when there is control of thought there is an observer who wants to control it. Right? There is a controller. So there is division between the controller and the controlled. In that division there is conflict. Because thought has created the controller who thinks he is different from the controlled, so the controller is the controlled. Right? So meditation is not the control of thought, but the understanding of the whole structure of thought - where it is important, where it is not important. So attention comes naturally and easily when you see the whole structure of living, your living, not somebody else's living. When you are totally aware of your activities, of your thoughts, of your behaviour, attentive, in which there is no effort to correct. I wonder if you see this. Because if you correct your behaviour, who is the corrector, who is the entity that says, this is good, this is not good, this must be changed, and that must not be changed? That observer is created by thought, isn't it. So thought divides itself as the observer and the observed. When I am angry at the moment of anger there is no observer, there is only a state of anger. A few second later the observer comes into being, says, 'I have been angry, I am so sorry, I should not have been angry', and all the rest of it. So thought divides. Right?

So a man who would live totally differently must understand the whole nature and structure of thought. Thought is measurement. And if we live only at that level, then our life is shallow, meaningless. You can go to the moon and kill each other, it has no meaning. Or go to the office everyday for the next forty years - just think of it! And that's our civilization, our culture, and we accept it. And if we are released from this activity everyday of going to the office, we die. All this has got to be changed radically. And to change it we must understand the whole structure of thought. Which is, to understand it, the structure of thought is yourself. And to observe yourself as part of the world; and if you observe as a Hindu, a Muslim, communist, socialist, or a Catholic, then you divide yourself. And in this division there is conflict. Whereas if you observe without the observer - you follow? - to observe without the observer, then there is a relationship in which there is love. Love is not pleasure. Love is not desire. It is something entirely different. And you can find it only when you understand the whole business of pleasure and fear.

Then there is this whole problem of the relationship between the measurable and immeasurable. Because we live now in the world of measurement, and that world of measurement has invented gods. Have you ever noticed how your belief, your gods, your saviours, have become your inner life, how they, the outer has become the inner. You understand? All right, I'll show it to you.

Suppose I was born as a Buddhist, or a Muslim, from childhood I have been told that there is god, or no god. The belief of god from outside has been put into me, and that belief has become a reality. You follow? And that reality is merely superficial, a result of

propaganda of two thousand years or ten thousand years, and I accept that as reality. Which is the reality imposed from the outside. And to find out reality I must reject this principle of from the outer to the inner. I don't know if you follow all this. So I must find out a relationship between the outer and the inner which is not the result of the propaganda. You get it?

And also there must be harmony between love, death and living. Because our living is a torture, our living now is conflict, to which we cling desperately. And inevitably there is death, which is the tomorrow. So there is thought, which has created this awful mess in which we live, and thought says, I cannot let this go because I don't know what will happen. So I accept, thought accepts the misery, the confusion, the wars, the hatred, that is called living. And within that pattern we change a little bit here and there, socially, you know all the tricks one plays. And inevitably there is death, and so there is fear. So we don't know how to live, and we don't know how to die. If we knew how to live, which is to live without conflict, and to live without conflict you must die everyday. And in that there is love. This is living.

So one must find harmony between the living, dying and what is love. Then in this, the quality of the mind is entirely different. Then it lives in a different dimension which is not measurement.

Right, now we can ask questions.

Q: Living brings about conflict.

K: Obviously.

Q: Can it be without fear?

K: Madame, you think living necessitates conflict?

Q: In a way, it must, conflict is there.

K: Must we? No, madame, that's what we have been saying.  
Conflict is there. Yes. And you accept conflict?

Q: Yes.

K: Therefore find out how to change it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: What are you saying, madame? Are you saying conflict is necessary?

Q: It is there.

K: It is there. That's what we have been saying all this morning.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I think both are the same, aren't they: if I have no fear I have no conflict.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look, madame, let me be clear. First of all, 'what is' is the fact. The fact is we live in conflict. Conflict in our relationship with the outer, and conflict with the inner. We are perpetually in conflict, both outwardly and inwardly. That's a fact. Because conflict implies division. Right? Division - I believe and you don't believe, my opinion and your opinion is different. So where there is division there must be conflict. Right? Now how can this division end? It can only end when the mind is aware of its conditioning as a Hindu, Buddhist, whatever it is. And to be free of the centre which is the accumulative factor of greed, envy and all the rest of it. So as long as there is a division there must be fear and conflict. That's what we have been saying all the morning. And is it possible to live without fear? Right?

Q: Sir, what is fear?

K: I am going to sir, we'll discuss it. What is fear?

Q: Do you support the World Federation and organizations?

K: Oh, do you support World Federation. Oh, madame. First we are answering the question what is fear. And we are going off on somebody asking do I support World Federation. Look: when I am afraid, I won't support anything, though I pretend to support. I pretend a great deal, I become dishonest, hypocrite when there is fear in me. I'll support world movements, all the outward things - that doesn't change man. What changes man is to live without fear. Now is it possible to live without fear? What is fear? Take facts as they are, not an idea, not a theory, not your opinion or my opinion - because I don't indulge in opinions, that is the most silly form of thinking. What is fear? First of all, what are we afraid of? Fear doesn't exist by itself, it is in relationship to something. I may be afraid of the dark, I may be afraid of what public opinion says, I may be afraid of losing my job, I may be afraid of my wife, husband, I am afraid of so many things - aren't you? I am not, I am saying, go into it.

So what is fear? Do you know you are afraid? Please, sir, go into it. You asked a question, what is fear.

Q: I'm not at this moment.

K: Do you know you are afraid, first of all. Not at this moment perhaps. Either you are afraid consciously, knowing what you are afraid of consciously, or you are afraid of things you don't know about - unconscious. So there are conscious fears and fears of which you are not acquainted with. Right? Hidden fears and open fears. Do we go into this? Please do it, not verbally accept anything, go into it.

There is the fear outwardly of physical pain: one has had

physical pain a week ago and you don't want it to happen again - the fear of happening again. Take a very simple example: there has been a fear of physical pain which happened a month ago, I don't want it repeated. Now at the moment of pain I act, don't I. There is some action. And when it is healed thought says, I mustn't repeat it again, it mustn't happen again. Right? Please listen to this - there has been an experience of pain which has left a mark on the brain as memory, and that memory says, don't let it happen again, I am frightened. So thought brings fear. Right? Superficially. There has been physical pain, and I don't want it repeated and I am frightened, because that incident of pain has left a mark, the memory, and the reaction of that memory is fear. Right, is that clear?

Psychologically, inwardly, one has hurt another, and you don't want that hurt repeated, therefore there is fear. Right? So thought is the means, or is the instrument of fear. Right? As thought is the instrument of pleasure. Of course, obviously. So thought is the instrument of pleasure, and thought is the instrument of pain, fear - consciously or unconsciously. Then there is the whole question of hidden fears, unconscious, deep rooted fears inherited through the environment, through culture, through the race, through family, you know, the stored up fears. Now how is one to be free of all that? If you are interested, if you are aware, if you want to go very deeply into it, because a mind that lives in fear cannot possibly look at life clearly, its life becomes distorted. All your religions are a distortion. So can the mind, the conscious mind examine the hidden, unconscious fears? You understand my question? Go on with me, please. If you are tired, let's stop. Can the conscious mind,



as it can examine conscious fears, can that conscious mind examine the unconscious, the unconscious, deep, secret fears? Can it?

Q: No.

K: Wait, don't say, no. You are too quick!

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madame, I have explained it just now. I want to go into this, please, let's go into this. Unconscious fears, now how are they to be exposed? You understand my questions? How are they to be exposed so that I can look at them, put them away, the mind can be free of them? Will dreams expose them?

Q: Yes.

K: Wait! I am asking a question madame, you can't say, yes. That has no meaning. Can a conscious mind expose the contents of the unconscious? Can it expose it through dreams? And what are dreams? Are not dreams the continuation in symbolic form, in a manner which needs interpretation, of your daily movement? Please think of it, look at it. I live a certain way, with my conflicts, with my anxieties, with my fears, guilt, ambition, competition, hatred, I live that way. And when the mind, the brain goes to sleep, that movement is still going on. And in that movement there are hints, warnings of a different movement. So dreams are the continuation in symbolic form of your daily life. That's obvious, isn't it? No. Look: the unconscious throws up hints, warnings, and you consciously, in the daily living consciously, you don't pay attention to it. And while you are asleep the brain is more or less quiet, more or less, not very quiet, more or less quiet, and these hints become the dreams also. So - please follow all this - so is it

possible not to dream at all? Is it possible to examine, or to observe the whole content of the unconscious? And how is this to be done? Consciousness is its content, isn't it? Is this becoming too difficult, too abstract? I'm afraid it is.

Your consciousness, your thinking, your consciousness, is the content of that consciousness. Right? You are attached to your property, to your husband, to your wife, to your children, to your job, you know, attached. You believe, and you don't believe, you believe in this and you know, opinions. But the content is your consciousness. And you are trying to observe that consciousness from the outside. Right? The outside is part of that consciousness, so the observer is the observed. Are you seeing this? Come on!

Q: It appears that you use the word thought in a different way.

K: Thought? I explained it, sir, just now. Thought is the response of memory, memory being experience, memory is the accumulation of knowledge. And thought is the response of that.

Q: Can't it be creative thought?

K: Wait, wait. Let's find out what that word 'creative' means, don't, that's a difficult word. Let's finish this, sir, we'll come back to that.

I am asking whether the mind, which is its content, can the content observe itself without an outside agency observing it? Can the mind become aware of its whole content without the division as the observer? You get it? You will see it can if you are completely attentive.

Q: Our attention is not a hundred per cent.

K: Therefore wait, wait, your attention is not a hundred per cent, why?

Q: Because...

K: No, do look at it sir, don't answer it immediately. Why is your mind not completely attentive? What does attention mean? Does attention mean concentration? No, obviously not. Wait, look at it sir. Attention, we are talking about the meaning of that word 'to attend'. Have you ever given your total attention to anything?

Q: I think so.

K: No, no, you have not. And when do you give total attention - do listen to this, please - when do you give total attention, complete attention? When you are threatened. Right? When there is tremendous danger your complete attention is there. And when there is no danger you slip off.

Q: What is living?

K: Madame, we just now went into that. We are discussing, we are trying to find out what it means to be attentive. You see, we are attentive only when we are frightened, when our particular form of pleasure is taken away, when we lose our money, our position, then we are caught. Now we are saying, be attentive without being caught. That means be interested to find out how to live totally differently. The way you are living is destroying the world, whether you are communists, Catholics, whatever it is, you are destroying the world. And if you want to live differently, to bring about a world that is entirely different, attend to that. Attend completely, give your complete attention to find out a way of living in which there is no conflict, no fear.

Q: How can we find this?

K: Sir, look, I'll show it to you. I'll show you. I am saying something now, and are you listening to it?

Q: No.

K: That gentleman says, no. Are you listening to what is being said? Wait a minute, sir. Are you listening? Examine the word 'listening', what does it mean, to listen? To listen is to be free from distraction. Right? From any kind of judgement, comparison, you are just listening. Are you listening that way?

Q: No.

K: No. Therefore you are not attentive. Therefore you are not interested. It isn't a vital problem to you. To find out a way of living which is entirely different. If you are interested you will listen with your heart, with your mind, with your body, everything. Then you will be passionate, you will be intense. But you are not, because you say, please we want to go on living the way we do, it's too much trouble, we are lazy, or we are frightened, we are this, we are that, and all the rest of it. So you go on. But the moment you are interested, passionate, if your next meal is not coming you are very anxious! You are comfortable bourgeois.

Q: Tell us how to do...

K: I am showing it to you, madame. Wait, wait. Tell us how. Now see what is implied in that question. Tell us how - what does that mean? Tell us a system of doing it. The moment you have a system you become mechanical. And you have reduced life into a mechanical process. That's why you have your gurus, your whole set-up of priests, they tell you what to do. And so you go on living a mechanical life. But whereas if you see it, if you yourself see the problem, see the danger of the way you are living, that very danger will make you act totally. There is no 'how'. For god's sake do realize it. The moment there is a 'how' there is a system, and the

practising of it day after day, repetition of some mantras, you know, all that tommy rot. That's not meditation. Meditation is something entirely different. Meditation must begin with the foundation of life, with behaviour. And behaviour means right relationship between man and man, not based on an image. If you have laid the foundation there, then begin. The laying the foundation is part of meditation. Then from there you can go. The mind can go infinitely, immeasurably. But there must be that foundation. And any flight from that foundation is an hypocrisy, is an escape, has no meaning. If you don't know how to behave, if you don't know how to love people, what's the good of your meditating, or running away into some transcendental nonsense?

So there it is.

Q: It is still a concept.

K: Oh, no, what is a concept. Madame, you are saying it is still a concept. Is it? The house is burning, is it a concept? When you have pain, is that a concept? When you are faced with danger, is it a concept? Concept only comes when you avoid the fact of 'what is'. When you are confronted with 'what is', there is no concept. You act, or you run away from it. Concepts exist only when you cannot understand the fact, the 'what is' and try to translate that 'what is' according to the background of your conditioning.

Q: But man has never done this.

K: Man has never done it, therefore is that not a good indication. Man has never stopped killing each other and therefore go on killing? Man has always been frightened, and therefore because he has always been frightened, therefore let it go on? Man has always been aggressive, therefore don't change. Man can't

change? I agree, madame, you are saying man has to be put into a condition then he will change. Who is going to create the condition? Man, isn't it, not some outside marvellous agency, man has to create the environment, that means you.

Q: Why does he going to create the right environment?

K: Why is he going to create the right environment - is that it? Are you asking me why he is going to create it? Because he is suffering, he is miserable, he is anxious, he is being destroyed.

Q: How does what you are advocating relate to what Jesus said?

K: Yes, sir I have we understood. What you advocate, attention, how does that relate to what Jesus said. Now wait a minute.

Q: Watch and pray.

K: Yes, watch and pray. Yes, sir, I understand all that.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: I understand sir, may I answer the question. What you advocate - first of all I am not advocating anything. Right? I am just pointing out for you to look at, or not to look at. Then what is the relationship of what you are saying, attention, to what Jesus said. You have an authority, the Bible, Jesus, the priest, you have authority. And I have no authority. I don't want authority. Because authority cripples enquiry. Find out, if I rely on the authority of my guru, on Jesus, or on my friend or wife, authority - wait sir, wait sir, wait sir, then I live a life of fear. You know the word 'authority', the meaning of that word, the author, the one who begins something. And if you merely imitate that which has begun then you are merely living a blind life. You may be living the most extraordinary effective life, but it is all within the conditioned life.

So if you would enquire into what is truth, what is beauty, what

it is really to live without conflict, the mind must be free from all fear of authority. Obviously.

Q: Can that be done through meditation?

K: Can that be done through meditation? What do you think we have been doing this whole morning? Isn't this part of meditation? Or meditation is something, you go apart and sit quietly, cross-legged and repeat some words, or get into some kind of fanciful stuff. This is meditation. What we have done this morning for me is meditation, because I'm finding out, enquiring, living, laying the foundation so that I will behave properly.

Q: For us Jesus has become an authority. Listening to you, are you not becoming an authority?

K: I understand. For us Jesus has become an authority. Here, listening to you, are you not becoming an authority also. Of course not, because I repudiate - follow this - because the moment you create the speaker into an authority then you are destroying truth.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Then you can pick up any book. You see, why do we need authority? Look at it that way. Why do we need authority? There is the authority of law. You understand? Because in Europe I have to keep to the right side of the road, in England the left side of the road. The authority is the left in England, the authority says, keep to the right in Europe. That is authority. There is the authority of governments. Right? Pay tax, you obey it. Now we are talking about psychological authority. Now why do you want authority, not that people have not created authority, but why do you want it? Because you are frightened, aren't you. You are frightened to go wrong, you like to follow, you like to imitate, you like to conform.

So authority is not there. When you have disorder in you, you create outer as well as inner authority. Right? When there is disorder in you, you inevitably create authority, outside. When there is confusion politically, somebody comes into being and he becomes the authority. You hope he will bring order and you give him authority. But inwardly when you are completely confused, disorderly, you create the authority of someone else whom you hope will give you order. That's so simple. So clear your disorder, then you will be free of all authority inwardly.

I think it is time.



## **BOMBAY 9TH SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION 29TH JANUARY, 1973 SILENCE AND DISORDER**

Questioner: I wonder whether we can talk about silence and how it is reached, or whether silence has many facets and forms. Whether there is only one silence which is absence of thought; or whether silence which arises through different experiences or different situations is different in nature, dimension and direction.

Krishnamurti: Where shall we start this? There are so many things.

Q: What is silence?

K: Are you saying, is there a right approach - right in the sense, we'll describe what 'right' is - to silence? And if there is, what is that first? You started off with that, didn't you?

Q: Yes.

K: And whether there are different varieties of silence, which means different methods by which to arrive at silence, and what is the nature of silence. So, shall we go in that order first? Is there a right approach to silence, - 'right', we'll put it in quotes. What do we mean by 'right'?

Q: Is there the one, or if all silences are of the same nature then there may be many approaches.

K: Yes, but I'm just asking what do we mean by 'right approach'?

Q: That is what I mean by right, the one.

K: The only one.

Q: The one, as against the hundred.

K: Yes, therefore what is the one? What is the true, natural,

reasonable, logical, and beyond the logic, what is that approach? Is that it?

Q: I don't know. I would say that when consciousness is not operating, then thought is not operating.

K: I would like to go into it.

Q: That is what is generally understood. We can define silence as the absence of thought.

K: I can go blank, you know, just without any thought, just looking at something and go blank. Is that silence?

Q: How do you know if it is true silence?

K: Let's begin by asking, is there a right approach to silence, and what is that 'right'? And are there many varieties of silences and is silence an absence of thought, which implies in that a great many things, such as 'I can go blank' - suddenly I'm thinking a great deal and I just stop and look at something, and go blank; daydream, vaguely daydream. That's why I would like to approach this question by asking, is there a true approach to silence? You started with that question, I think we ought to take that first, and go into the other things afterwards.

Q: You seem to be taking us to the true approach rather than the nature of true silence.

K: I think so. Because there are those people who have practised silence; controlling thought, mesmerizing themselves into silence, and control their chattering mind to such an extent that the mind becomes absolutely dull, stupid - and silent. So I want to start with the enquiry from this point of right approach. Otherwise we'll wander off. It seems more sane to find out is there a 'right' - again, 'right' is somehow not the word - is there a natural, sane, healthy

approach - sanity is healthy - is there a healthy, logical, objective, balanced approach to silence? Right? Could we proceed from that? What is the necessity of silence? I know from what people have told me - and I've talked a great deal about it too, not 'I' but one has talked about it a great deal - what is the necessity for silence?

Q: The necessity for silence is very easy to understand. People, in ordinary day living, have constantly chattering minds, constantly irritated minds, when it comes to a rest there is a feeling of being refreshed, the mind is refreshed, quite apart from anything else. So the silence in itself is important.

Q: And also, even in the ordinary sense, there's no seeing or listening, there is no seeing of colour, there's no seeing of things unless there is a certain quality of silence. That's in the ordinary sense.

Q: And it's true there is a whole tradition that silence is important, is necessary, and therefore in all these systems there is the watching of time ... (inaudible). These are all related.

K: Yes.

Q: It seems to make people make use of the state of silence. It is not an unhealthy state of silence. But there is a state of silence.

K: Suppose you don't know a thing about what other people have said, why you should be silent. Would you ask the question?

Q: Even at the level of the tranquillizer, you would ask the question.

K: So, you asked the question in order to tranquilize the mind. Right? Because the mind is chattering and it's wearisome and exhausting, so you say, is there a way of tranquilizing the mind without the drugs? We know the way of tranquilizing the mind

with drugs, but is there another way which will naturally, healthily, sanely, logically, bring about tranquillity to the mind? Right? How do you approach this? How would I, being weary, exhausted by the chattering of the mind, ask myself, can I, without the usage of drugs, quieten the mind? Is there a way of doing it? That's natural, I would ask that. Now, is there?

Q: There are many ways of doing it.

K: Ah, I don't know any way. You all say there are many ways. I come from a land, I don't read, except detective stories and historical books and so on. I come from a land where we don't know any of these things. Right? First hand, I'm talking about. So I say, now, can the mind do this? Can the mind, without effort, because effort implies disturbance of the mind, it doesn't bring about tranquillity, it brings about exhaustion and exhaustion is not tranquillity. It's like a business man, at the end of the day, exhausted, takes a drink, to be quiet, to calm his nerves, and so on. Conflict will not bring about tranquillity. Conflict will bring about exhaustion and the exhaustion may be translated as silence by those who are completely washed out at the end of the day, they say, 'At last, I can go into my meditation room and be quiet'. Right? So, is it possible to bring about tranquillity to the mind without conflict? I would put that question.

Q: Is it possible to bring about tranquility to the mind without conflict?

K: Without discipline, without distortion - all those are exhausting processes.

Q: Sir, this may sound absurd, but when I practice Pranayama there's no conflict in it, but there is silence; it doesn't exhaust you.

What is the nature of that silence?

K: There, you are breathing, getting more oxygen into your system, and the oxygen naturally helps you to be relaxed.

Q: So that is also a state of silence.

K: No, I am not talking of that. I want to find out. We'll discuss the state of silence afterwards. But I want to find out whether the mind can be tranquilized, become tranquil without any kind of effort, breathing, enforcement, control, direction.

Q: The mind asks such a question if it is possible to have tranquillity of the mind without any outside help?

K: No, no, I didn't say outside help. I said, without conflict - please listen, sir - without conflict, without direction, without enforcement, without control, practices of breathing, doing this and ... without any enforcement of any kind, which is, I can take a drug, a tranquillizer and make the mind very quiet. It is on the same level as Pranayama. And I can control the mind and force the mind; my mind can be controlled and I've brought about silence. It is on the same level as breathing, drugs. So I want to start from a point where the mind is agitated, chattering, exhausting itself by incessant friction of thought, and it says, is it possible to be really quiet, without any artificial means? Right? To me that is a central issue. That's how I would approach it if I went into this. I would discard any artificial ... I would consider, if I were investigating, I would consider artificial, control, drugs, breathing ...

Q: Watching the breath.

K: Watching the breath. Watching your toe, watching the light.

Q: Mantras.

K: Mantras. All those are artificial, which induce a peculiar

kind of silence. So I would not consider - when I say I, I will use the word 'I' for the moment, with the understanding that K is not emphasising himself. K would consider ...

Q: And would you include the silence induced by nature to this list?

K: Which is all part of it.

Q: Externally.

K: That's it. I would consider all those artificial enforcements in order to induce silence.

Q: Krishnaji, when you look at a mountain you get silent.

K: Ah, wait no. When you look at a mountain what takes place? By the greatness, by the beauty, by the grandeur of the mountain, that absorbs you and makes you silent. That is still artificial.

Q: But that is only nature.

K: Like a child, given a good toy, is absorbed by the toy and for the time being, till it breaks down, he is very quiet. I would consider all those, any form of inducement to silence, to bring about silence, is artificial - for K.

Q: Seeking silence is a motive.

K: I am saying the motive too, the motive is artificial.

Q: Sometimes the bringing about of silence is accidental.

K: I want to find out, sir, whether it is accidental or is there a natural way, without inducement, without motive, without direction, without etc., etc., etc?

Q: Looking at a mountain, though it is a non-duality experience, you then would say, it is not silence?

K: I wouldn't call it silence. Because the thing is so great, for the time being that greatness knocks ...

Q: The absence of the 'me' is there, but the absence of the 'me' is not at the conscious level, but you say is it there? How?

K: Is it there? Look, you see a marvellous picture, a marvellous sunset, an enormous chain of mountains, and it's like the toy with the child. That greatness knocks out the 'me' for the moment and the mind becomes silent. Experiment with it.

Q: Yes, but you say that is not silence.

K: I wouldn't call that silence, because the mountain, the sunset, the beauty of something means, for the moment, the 'me' is pushed aside. And the moment that's gone, I'm back to my chattering or whatever it is. So, I want to be clear that any artificial, a motive, a directional, seems to K that it's a distortion which will not bring about the depth of silence, in which is included practices, disciplines, controls, identification with the greater and thereby making myself quiet, and so on and so on and so on. Then I ask myself, what is the necessity of silence? If it has no motive, would I ask that question?

Q: It is the state of mind that keeps silent.

K: I am not describing the mind.

Q: Not in the sense that ...

K: No, sir, no, sorry. I said, any inducement, in any form, subtle or obvious, I would consider doesn't bring about the depth of great silence. I would consider it as all superficial. I may be wrong. We're enquiring.

Q: That state of mind is already ...(inaudible).

K: Maybe. I don't know. So, what is the natural, healthy approach to tranquillity? Right? What is the natural approach?

Q: But then approach is motivation.

K: No. What is the natural - I won't use that word, even - what is the natural state of tranquillity? How does one come upon it naturally? As we have already said, if I want to listen to what you are saying, my mind must be quiet. That's a natural thing. If I want to see something clearly, the mind mustn't be chattering. That's a natural thing. No? What?

Q: Is it natural or obvious?

K: It doesn't matter which word - natural or obvious. We have used those two words before. We'll use those two words again, natural, obvious. Right? Why do we make - silence is something tremendous ...

Q: In that is all poise, is all sanity.

K: So I would say, the basis for the depth of silence is poise, harmony, between the mind, the body and the heart - division for the moment - great harmony. The setting aside of any artificial methods, including control and all the rest of it. I would said that is the basis, the real basis is harmony.

Q: It doesn't solve anything.

K: Wait, wait. We haven't solved anything.

Q: We've agreed on the word, 'harmony'. What is that?

K: We'll come to that. Therefore I say, this is the basis for silence, for right silence.

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: The whole thing is, I know conflict, I don't know.

K: All right. Therefore don't talk about silence. Deal with conflict, not silence. If there is disharmony between the mind, heart and body, deal with that and not with silence. If you deal with silence being disharmonious, then it is artificial. This is so. Now I



am getting at it.

Q: I have an agitated mind.

K: So be concerned with the agitated mind, not with silence. Deal with 'what is', and not with 'what might be'. That comes logically, right. I'll stick to this.

Q: Are you asking, can the agitated mind deal with its own agitation?

K: That's a different question.

Q: She is saying that the agitated mind naturally asks the question, can there be silence.

K: Yes, so be concerned not with silence but why is it agitated?

Q: It can see the opposite state of mind.

K: Ah! That is then an opposite, a conflict, and the opposite has its roots within its own opposite and so on.

Q: Yes, the concept itself is part of the agitation.

K: So I would say, complete harmony is the foundation for the purity of silence.

Q: How does one move to the subjects of silence?

K: Let's go into that ... not into silence. We'll later on come to the question of the varieties of silence. So what is harmony? Right? Go on sirs.

Q: Harmony arises and comes again.

K: I want to find out, what is harmony? Between the mind, the body and the heart, a total sense of being whole, without fragmentation, without the over-development of the intellect, but the intellect operating clearly, objectively, sanely, and the heart, not sentimentally, gooey, emotionalism, outbreak of hysteria, but has a quality in it of affection, care, love, compassion, vitality, and

the body has its own intelligence and uninterfered by the intellect or by taste - all that. The feeling everything is operating, functioning beautifully, like marvellous machinery. Even though it's not physically well. This is important. Yes, sir? You were going to say something? No. Now is this possible?

Q: Is there a centre in that harmony?

K: In that harmony is there a centre? I don't know. We're going to find out. Can the mind, the brain, function efficiently without any friction, distortion, and so the mind, the intellect, the capacity to reason, the capacity to perceive, is sharp, clear? And when the centre is there it's not possible, obviously, because then the centre is translating everything according to its limitation. Am I reducing everybody to silence?

Q: Why does this division arise, between the mind, the body ...

K: Arise, because through our education, where emphasis is made on the cultivation of the intellect as memory and reason, as a function apart from living.

Q: That is the over-emphasis on the mind. Even without education, there can be an over-emphasis of emotions ...

K: Of course, that's what I'm saying.

Q: Yes, so ...

K: Man worships the intellect much more than the emotions. Doesn't he? And emotion is translated into devotion, into sentimentality, into all kinds of extravagance of expansions of emotionalism, hysteria and so on, and so on, and so on. We have done this all along. No?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's fairly simple, sir. Why does the brain, as the

repository of memory, why does it give such importance to knowledge? Technological, psychological, in relationship, why have human beings given such extraordinary importance to knowledge? I have an office, I've become an important bureaucrat, which is, I have knowledge about doing certain functions. And I become pompous, stupid, dull - why? Why do I give such importance to knowledge? Go on, sir.

Q: Is it the image?

K: No. It's very simple, security, obviously.

Q: To make oneself important.

K: Obviously. Knowledge gives you status. Don't you know bureaucrats, who are fairly high up, all they want is status.

Q: But that doesn't solve anything.

K: No, he asked that question. So, I must come back. Human beings have worshipped knowledge, knowledge is identified with the intellect. Right? The erudition, the scholar, the philosopher, the inventor, the scientist, are all concerned with knowledge. No? And they have created in the world marvellous things; going to the moon, new guns, submarines, Polaris - they have invented the most extraordinary things and the admiration, the sense of the marvel of knowledge, is overwhelming. And we say - we accept it. So, we have developed an inordinate admiration, almost verging on worship, for the intellect. All the sacred books and their interpretations, all that. Correct me, if I'm wrong. And in contrast to that there is a reaction which says, for goodness sake, let's be a bit more emotional about all this; let me have my feelings, I love being stupid, I love, you know. No? Devotion, hysteria, sentimentality, extravagance in expression. All that arises from

this. And the body is neglected. You see this.

Q: And therefore Yoga and all that.

K: And practise Yoga to get the body well, and so this division takes place, unnaturally. And now we have to bring about a natural harmony where the intellect functions like a marvellous watch, where the emotions and affections, care, love, compassion, all those are healthily functioning, and the body which has been so spoiled, which has been so mis-used, comes into its own intelligence. So there is that. Now, how do you do it?

Q: I need knowledge.

K: I know, I made that very clear, sir. Don't let me repeat it all over again. I need knowledge, to talk to you in English I need knowledge of English. I don't know any other language in India, so I have to use English; that's knowledge. I have to ride a bicycle; that's knowledge. I have to drive a car; that's knowledge. I have to drive a motor; that's knowledge.

Q: (Inaudible).

K: Yes, yes, yes. That's still within the field of knowledge.

Q: I am concerned with the problem because I have to solve it. I have to solve the problem with disease so I go to knowledge.

K: I say that sir. Knowledge is necessary. But when knowledge is misused by the centre as the 'me' who has got knowledge, and therefore I am superior to the man who has less knowledge, knowledge then I use as a status for myself. I am more important than the poor chap who has no knowledge. I am a bureaucrat, soaked in some stupidity and I ...

Q: If I may say so, we started this discussion with silence, and the various ways in which we arrive at silence. Without dealing

with the agitated mind, or the mind in conflict, he has pointed out that unless there is a harmony we cannot have the basis for even questioning or asking what is silence.

Q: Do you not make a distinction between knowledge and history and the new, the discovery of the new?

K: History? Of course, sir. Knowledge ...

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Sirs, when knowledge - just listen, sir - when knowledge interferes in the discovery of the new, there is no discovery of the new. There must be an interval between knowledge and the new, otherwise you are just carrying on the old.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That's all that we are saying, sir. I want to get back. Radhaji asked just now, why is there division between the mind, the heart and the body. We see that; why? Now we say, how is this division to naturally come into deep harmony, naturally? Now, how do you do it? Enforcement? You can't do it. Ideals? Ideal of harmony, therefore I must lessen my intellect, you follow? It becomes too silly. Right? So what shall I do? Go on.

Q: Can I will it, or does it have to come into being by itself?

K: What do you say?

Q: I think I can't will it.

K: So what will you do?

Q: Go into silence.

K: Don't you know, sir - I mean, not you particularly. One is aware of this division, isn't one? Intellect, emotion, and the body, there is this tremendous division between all of them. A gap. How is the mind to remove all this gap, and be a whole mechanism

functioning beautifully? What do the traditionalists say?

Q: Effort.

K: Effort.

Q: Only effort. Clench your teeth.

K: Clench your teeth and bite into it, is that it?

Q: You have used the word harmony.

K: Use another word.

Q: That's just it. We had silence and you said we won't touch it.

K: Ah! We won't touch it.

Q: Then we take the word 'harmony', we cannot touch the word 'harmony'.

K: Then what will you do? Why pursue silence?

Q: So we come back to the only one thing we can do - disharmony.

K: That's all. That's all I'm saying.

Q: There is this division.

K: Therefore I say, let's deal with disharmony and not with silence, so when there is the understanding of disharmony, from that may flow naturally silence.

Q: To know that you have ended disharmony totally.

Q: But we haven't come to that.

Q: This morning I told somebody, there is a Latin saying, 'I know what is right, but I don't follow it'.

K: Yes.

Q: There is a mechanism which seems to deny your statement that if you deal with disharmony, harmony is so.

K: Don't bring in something from Latin. Face the thing as is. Pupul says we started out with silence and we said, look it's no

good discussing silence until you find out if there is a natural way of coming to it. The artificial way is not - we have been through that - therefore we said, what is the natural way? The natural way is to find out if there is harmony, but we do not know anything about harmony because we are in a state of disorder. So let's deal with disorder, not with harmony, not with silence. With disorder.

Q: I wanted to say that according to our experience the disorder never yields. The disorder remains disorder.

K: We are going to find out, sir. Don't maintain it.

Q: No, I don't maintain it; that's my observation.

K: Your personal observation, of yourself?

Q: My observation of myself. I look and I look and observe and observe the disorder - and disorder looks at me. I look at the disorder and the disorder looks at me.

K: Therefore there is a duality, a contradiction in your observation as the observer, and the observed. A division. We can play with this endlessly. I am asking, sir. Please follow what we have so far discussed. We started out with silence, what is the nature of silence; are there different varieties of silence? Are there different approaches to silence? We also said, what is the beginning of silence, the approach to silence? We said, perhaps there may be a right way - 'right' in quotes. And we said, let's find out. Any artificial means to bring about silence is not silence. Any artificial means, we made that very clear, don't let's go back to that. If there is no artificial way then what is - is it possible to come upon silence naturally, without effort, without inducement, without direction, without artificial means? And in examining it, we said harmony. To that Pupul says, we don't know what this harmony is

but what we do know is disorder. So let us put aside everything else and consider disorder, not what silence is. Therefore, a mind that is disordered enquires after silence. Silence then becomes the means of bringing about order or escape from disorder. Silence then is imposed on disorder. As that gentleman said, impose it, or run away from disorder. We stop all that and say, why is there disorder? Is it possible to end disorder? Right?

Q: Disorder expresses itself.

K: I don't know anything about it. I wouldn't say that.

Q: I would say it is a matter of perception. Let's discuss it. Is there any other way it expresses itself?

K: What is disorder? What is disorder in me?

Q: Disorder in me is that when thought arises then I want something.

K: No, No, you are attributing a cause; you are looking for a cause. Give me two seconds. You want to find out what is the cause of disorder. Right?

Q: I don't.

K: No?

Q: I observe the nature of disorder; I don't look for the cause; I don't know the cause; I can never know the cause.

K: You observe disorder, right?

Q: I observe disorder.

K: One observes disorder in oneself, right?

Q: Yes. And I see that it is manifested as thought.

K: I don't know. I would like to go into that a little bit. I observe in myself disorder. Let's go into this very carefully because it's rather interesting. I observe myself in disorder. Why do I call what



I observe disorder?

Q: A disturbance is disorder.

K: I just want to go step by step. Please I'm not trying to stop you, Sonaliji, I just want to find out. Why do I call it disorder? Which means I already have an inclination about what order is.

Q: Of course.

K: So, I am comparing what I have experienced, or known as order and thereby call 'what is' disorder. I don't do that. I say, don't do that; don't compare. Just see what disorder is. Can I know, can the mind know disorder without comparing itself with order?

Q: It might not know it is.

K: Wait, sir, I haven't finished; give me two seconds. So, can my mind not compare? Comparison may be disorder - comparison itself may be the cause of disorder. Measurement may be disorder. And as long as I am comparing, there must be disorder. I am a bureaucrat and I am comparing myself to a higher bureaucrat; therefore that is disorder. I am comparing my disorder at the present moment with a whiff of order which I smelt, and comparing and therefore calling this disorder. So I see - I am just looking at it, be a little patient - so I see comparison is really important, not disorder. As long as my mind is comparing, measuring, there must be disorder. Right?

Q: Sir, I look at myself and I see there is disorder because every part of me is pulling in a different direction.

K: I've never felt I'm in disorder.

Q: But we're not talking about K.

K: Wait, I know. I've never felt I'm in disorder. Except rarely, occasionally, when something ... and why? I say to myself, why are

all these people talking about disorder? Do they really know disorder? Or you only know it through comparison?

Q: I know that I put it crudely but it is exactly the fact that when I don't get what I want, I call it disorder.

K: I don't call that disorder. That is - please, I want a Rolls Royce, I want to go to the moon, I can't get it but I don't call that disorder.

Q: There is no conscious comparison. You bring in words which I find very difficult. There is no conscious comparison of the mind itself which says, this is disorder and I want order.

K: No, I'm only asking how do you know disorder?

Q: Is it only a sense of uneasiness? It's very difficult.

Q: I see a sense of confusion. One thought against another thought.

Q: It is confusion. You will say the word confusion again is comparing.

K: No, contradiction.

Q: I don't any thing else but I know confusion.

K: We only know contradiction which is confusion. I stick to that. You said my mind is in a state of confusion because it is contradicting itself all the time. All right. Proceed from there.

Q: There is a real difficulty here. You see, you talked about silence, then harmony, then disorder. We are completely moving away - this way. Otherwise why aren't we with disorder? We leave a part in order.

Q: I'm not leaving a part in either harmony or silence. I observe my mind and I see disorder.

Q: Not only the mind but the disorder in the whole mechanism.

K: Yes, I overeat and then there is disorder.

Q: I see disorder in harmony - we are not talking of that.

K: You see disorder and then what? From there move.

Q: We are bound to ask. It is the nature of the mind to ask.

K: Ask.

Q: I ask. There must be a way of finding a way out of this.

K: Yes. Then what?

Q: And then I observe myself asking that question.

K: Yes.

Q: And then that, for the time being, comes to an end.

Q: (Inaudible)

Q: The question needs answering. Look, sir, I am not talking - these steps we can discover, we needn't come to it by these steps.

K: No, don't do it.

Q: But I thought it would be best to go step by step. There's an ending there. To someone else there may not be an ending, but to me there is an ending. I see that there is an ending. I say, what is the nature of this? Is this silence? Then I come back to it. Or is there an undercurrent still operating? You see, the need of different qualities and natures and dimensions of silence. The traditional outlook is the gap between two thoughts is silence.

K: But that's not silence, silence between two noises is not silence.

Q: That's what ...

K: Listen to that noise outside and there's a gap and you call that silence? I say that's nonsense. That's an absence of noise. Absence of noise is not silence.

Q: It's the ending of the perception of oneself in a state of

disturbance.

K: Pupul, you are not being clear. Sorry. I'm questioning, when you say disorder, what I am questioning is - I'm not at all sure that you know what disorder is. You call it tummy ache - I over ate - that is disorder, I over-indulge in emotional nonsense - that is disorder.

Q: I catch myself talking very loudly.

K: That is disorder. Now, so, what? Disorder; what is disorder? No, no - how do you know it is disorder? I overeat and I have a tummy ache - I don't call it disorder. I say, I over ate, I mustn't eat so much. Full stop.

Q: But I am in normal health, therefore when we ...

K: No, no. I don't go through all these processes. I overeat, I have pain, and I say to myself, I must be careful at the next meal.

Q: We moved from silence, to harmony and we found that it was impossible to go into the nature of harmony without going into disorder.

K: That's all. Keep to those three points.

Q: Why do you call it disorder?

Q: It's not necessarily a recognition of disorder, because when there is a conflict between the body, the mind ...

K: Therefore conflict you associate with disorder.

Q: No. The conflict makes one weary, as you say, and you instinctively feel there's something wrong with it.

K: So, what you're saying is, if I understand rightly, please correct me - conflict indicates disorder, right?

Q: Partly indicates disorder.

Q: Even when you don't name it there is conflict.

K: Conflict indicates disorder. Whether it is two thoughts, whether it is the body - conflict. What are we saying? Conflict is disorder.

Q: Indicates disorder.

K: No, - conflict is disorder. Not 'indicates'. You translate it as disorder.

Q: I don't understand the difference between it: you translate it as disorder and it is disorder. It is disorder and then it helps to translate it as disorder. What is the difference?

K: All right. I'm only saying conflict indicates disorder. So. Then what? From there, move. Move. You keep on going around in circles. Move.

Q: I said, there must be a way of being free of this.

K: Of what?

Q: Of conflict.

K: That's all.

Q: Of disorder.

K: That's the same thing. No, wait a minute. Silence, harmony, conflict. That's all. Not disorder. Conflict.

Q: You can take the word disorder and go through the same gymnastics with conflict, and come to the same question, 'what do I do about conflict?'

K: Wait. That's what we are concerned about. Please. Silence, harmony, conflict, right? Now, how am I to deal with conflict non-artificially? You know nothing, you are listening for the first time, therefore you have to go into it with me. Don't say 'how do I know it's for the first time?' - you don't know. Somebody comes along and says, look, look at this marvellous machinery and you look.

Q: I see this much, that I can't think of silence or harmony when I am in conflict. That much I see. It's clear sir.

K: So, is the mind capable of freeing itself from conflict? That is the only thing you can ask, right?

Q: Then you ask it.

K: I am asking. Is the mind capable of freeing itself from every kind of conflict? What is wrong with that question?

Q: It's the mind again which is asking.

Q: It is exactly the same question as can the mind be free from this conflict. I can't see the difference.

K: But I'm only saying - please, Pupulji - we have reduced it to conflict, right? Now I say, look, stick to that one thing, don't let's go round and round and round. Stick to that one thing, conflict, and see if the mind can be free of it. And don't go around saying, 'how'. Can the mind, knowing what conflict is, and what conflict does, end conflict? Surely that's a legitimate question? No? Why are you silent?

Q: Because you assume that the mind can be.

K: I don't. We are asking.

Q: If we look into this question of conflict, or rather, look into the aspect of it which is comparison, because there is no conflict without comparison.

K: Conflict is comparison, contradiction, imitation, and conformity, suppression, all that; put all that into that one word and accept the meaning of that word, as we've defined it, and said 'can the mind be free of conflict?'

Q: Of course it can be free of conflict, but the question which arises is 'what is the nature of that freedom from conflict?'

K: How do you know before you are free? That becomes theoretical.

Q: There is an ending of the state of conflict. For a while, at least.

K: Is there an ending completely of conflict?

Q: What we are asking is what is the nature of this ending and what do we mean by total ending?

K: That's what we're going to find out.

Q: There is no ending of conflict.

K: He says that.

Q: The universe ...

K: Don't include the universe. In the universe apparently every thing is moving in order - Hoyle! The expanding universe.

Q: I'm talking of the mental universe.

K: Then don't use the word 'universe'. Let's stick to our mind which seems to be endlessly in conflict. That's all. Don't bring in universe.

Q: The universe which I am.

K: Don't justify it for God's sake. We are trying to get on with the stuff. Now how is the mind to end conflict, naturally, because every other method, system, is a compulsive method, a directional method, a method of control, and therefore all that's out. Now, can the mind free itself from conflict. I say, yes; where are you at the end of it? I think mind can be completely, utterly without conflict.

Q: Forever.

K: Don't use that word, 'forever', because then you are introducing a word of time, and time is a factor of conflict.

Q: Can that mind be totally conflict?

K: Can the mind be in a state of total conflict?

Q: Just be conflict?

K: Obviously. What are you trying to say? I don't quite understand.

Q: I feel myself totally helpless in a situation. The fact is there is conflict.

K: Yes.

Q: And the fact is that any operation of the sense on that conflict ...

K: We have been through all that, don't bring it in.

Q: Seeing the nature of that, can the mind say, if it is conflict it is conflict.

K: I see what you are trying to say. Can the mind be aware of a state in which there is no conflict? Is that what you are trying to say?

Q: No.

K: Or, the mind can only know conflict. Do you know, is your mind totally aware of conflict? Or is it just words?

Q: You see ...

K: Stick to one thing. Simple. I'm being simple. Is my mind totally aware that it is in conflict? Or is there a part of the mind that says, I'm aware that I'm totally in conflict, or is there part of me watching conflict? Or is there part of me wishing to be free of conflict? Which means is there any fragment which says, 'I am not in conflict'? Or is there any fragment which separates itself from the totality of conflict? If there is a separate fragment, that's is all foolwery, then that fragment says, 'I must act, I must do, I must suppress, I must go beyond'. So is the mind - please, this is a



legitimate question - is the mind totally aware that there is only conflict? That is your question, right?

Q: You say that the mind measures itself and calls it conflict, but true conflict is ...

K: Yes sir. that's what we are saying. Is your mind totally aware that there is nothing but conflict? Or is there a fragment which kicks away a little path and says, 'yes I know I am aware of conflict'. I am not in conflict, but I know'? So, is conflict a fragment, or total? I will keep to the same word, only put a different word for the time being - is there total darkness or a slight light somewhere?

Q: If that light were not there, could we be aware of it?

K: I don't know anything about it. I'm asking you. Don't ask me that question. When there is a fragmentation of the mind, that very fragmentation is conflict. Therefore, the mind, is it ever aware - just listen - ever aware that it is total conflict? And Pupul says, 'yes'.

Q: You are getting into words.

K: No No. I'm not trying to trick you.

Q: I refuse to move away.

K: I have not moved away.

Q: Therefore, I don't know anything about total conflict.

K: Therefore, you only know partial conflict.

Q: Quite, whether partial or ...

K: No, that is important.

Q: The fact is, the conflict which it is. And I say, can there be a refusal to move away.

K: I'm not moving away; I haven't moved away. I haven't really

moved away from silence, harmony, or conflict. I think it is an important question, because ...

Q: The very awareness of the mind indicates that there is a fragment.

K: That's all. Therefore, you say partially I am in conflict, therefore you are never with conflict.

Q: Total conflict cannot know itself, unless there is something else to know it.

K: We're going to go into that, a little bit.

Q: I am not making myself clear. Conflict is not necessary, why do ...

K: When the room is full of furniture - forgive this wrong example, a better example you may think of - when the room is full of furniture there is no space to move. I would consider that utter confusion - you follow? Wait, I am not finished. Is my mind so totally full of this confusion, so that it has no movement away from this, if it is so completely full of confusion, conflict and full of this furniture in the room, then what takes place? That's what I want to get at, not a partial this and a partial that and ... When the steam is full it must do something - explode. And I do not think we look at this confusion so totally; this conflict so totally.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Could I use a word, sorrow? May I? There is no moving away from sorrow. When you move away from sorrow, then it is just, you know, escape from it, or suppressing it - I won't go into all that. Can one be full of sorrow - not, 'can one'. Is there such a thing as being full of sorrow? Is there such a thing as being completely happy? When you are so aware that you are completely

happy, it is no longer happy. In the same way when you are so completely full of this thing called confusion, sorrow, conflict, it is no longer there. It's only there when there is division. That's all.

Q: Then it seems to be a hopeless problem, because there is always this ...

K: That's why, remain with the truth of the thing, not with the conclusion of the thing. The truth of the thing is, until the mind is complete with something it cannot but create conflict. If I love you and there is attachment in it, it is contradiction and therefore no love. So I say, remain with the fact of that thing, don't introduce ... Is the mind totally aware, full of this sorrow, this confusion, this conflict? I won't move away 'till that is so.

Q: One peculiarity about your approach. When you draw a picture there is always a clear black outline, the colours don't match. In reality there are no outlines, there are only colours merging into each other.

K: This, to me, is very clear. This to me is very clear.

Q: That very clarity is ...

K: This to me is very clear. If the heart is full of love, and there is no part of envy in it, the problem is finished. It is only when there is a part that is jealous then the whole problem arises.

Q: Love is full of jealousies.

K: Ah. Therefore remain with it. Remain with that 'full' of envy, be envious. Feel it.

Q: Then its total nature undergoes change.

K: Tremendous change.

Q: No division.

K: It's when you say I'm envious and I must not be, somewhere

in the dark corner, the education restraint, and then something goes wrong. But to say, yes, I am envious, and don't move from that.

Moving is rationalising, suppressing, just remain with that feeling.

Q: The rationalist says, without repentance, no salvation.

K: I don't repent. I don't want to be saved.

Q: What is the difference between you being fully aware of the conflict and repenting the conflict?

K: Oh, oh, oh! Repentance means there is a repenter. An entity who repents, who regrets. I must stop.

Q: Feeling it fully.

K: No, don't feel it. If you are jealous, then you are just jealous.

Q: Then that is not perception.

K: That is perception.

Q: That can break down.

K: Oh, no, sir. That can break down only when you are trying to suppress it, go beyond it, rationalise it, and all the rest of it. But it's so simple.

Q: When you are in a mess are you not sorry for yourself?

K: Good God, no. That is the after-thought; 'I wish I wasn't in a mess'. When you are in a mess, be in a mess; see it, don't move away from it.

Q: That is only the after-thought. The very idea of not moving away is the after-thought.

K: I'm saying that. You're repeating.

Q: Time is merciless.

K: This is merciless. All the rest is playing tricks. When there is sorrow, be completely with it.

Q: There is no time in the now. In the now there is no

moment ...

K: I don't know what you are talking about. I'm talking about sorrow, not time. My son is dead; look at the beggar there; I am full of sorrow. I don't have to invent sorrow, there it is, right in front of my nose. I'm in it. I won't move an inch from it.

Q: An action takes place.

K: Sir, when you are with something, action has taken place. I don't have to do something. A total action has taken place, which is the ending of that sorrow.

Q: How can we have tranquillity when the beggar is there?

K: Tranquillity is the ending of sorrow.

Q: Is it the acceptance of sorrow?

K: No. It's the same then as the worshipping of sorrow.

Q: No, no.

K: Of course it is.

Q: No, no. You accept sorrow as a ...

K: Ah, worshipping sorrow is also a form of accepting sorrow.

Q: No, you have no business to introduce words like that.

K: Why should I accept it?

Q: I accept my crippled child without worshipping it.

K: No, why should I accept it? It is like that, because ...

Acceptance implies an accepter.

Q: Anything implies an operator. Anything implies an operator.

Q: If there is sorrow one is full of violence.

K: Be with violence.

Q: Won't there be a destruction with that violence?

K: No, that means you are moving away from the fact. When you are violent, be completely with it, which means not doing

something violently is a moving away from violence. You've got it? Because you have moved away. Suppressing violence is also moving away, or trying to overcome violence, it is still moving away.

Q: You mean mentally be violent.

K: The state of violence you know it, you don't have to be.

Q: A distinction can be made, not being violent, but be with violence.

K: Be with, yes. That's what .. live with it, be with it, not be violent. Of course, we are violent, we don't have to be with it.

## **AUSTRALIAN INTERVIEW WITH MR SAUNDERS SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA 20TH NOVEMBER 1970**

Mr Saunders: Our problem then is, as I see it, is that we are bound, weighed down by belief, by knowledge. And is it possible for a mind to be free from yesterday and from the beliefs that have been acquired through the beliefs of yesterday? Is it possible for me, as an individual, and you, as an individual, to live in this society and yet be free from the beliefs in which we have been brought up? Is it possible for the mind to be free from all that knowledge, all that authority? Krishnamurti, are you saying that it is wrong to believe in what you have found to be true?

Krishnamurti: Sir, surely, is belief necessary at all? Why do we have beliefs? Probably because mostly you believe in something because you don't actually see 'what is'. If you saw actually 'what is', 'what is' in the sense what is actually going on, both outwardly, in the outward phenomenon, and inwardly, then what is the necessity for a belief at all? You don't believe the sun is rising. It is there, and you have seen it. Therefore the whole problem of belief seems to me so utterly erroneous, it has no place with a person who is actually observing the whole structure and the nature of thinking, living, suffering, the agony of existence, the sorrow, and all the rest of it. Belief appears as a means of escape from the reality of 'what is'.

So to understand actually 'what is' one has to be rid of all these extraneous beliefs and fears, and hopes, and be able to look actually, not theoretically, not abstractly, but actually look at what

is taking place in the world outside, with all the racial conflicts, with wars, the division between religions - the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Muslim, all the divisions have created such havoc in the world. And by observing all that one sees how this has come about because in oneself one is conditioned by society, by the culture one lives in. If you live in India you become a Hindu or Muslim, or if you live in Europe you are a Catholic or a Protestant. It's the environment that conditions, the culture that shapes the mind, the culture being the knowledge, the tradition, the various beliefs. And surely a mind that is conditioned as a Communist, as a Catholic, or as a Hindu, what you will, surely is incapable of being free to observe: to observe the extraordinary complex structure of society; and also the still more complex, the psychological structure of oneself. Because oneself is the world. We have created the world, and the world is me and you, we cannot separate the two. And so to understand the world one has to understand oneself. To change the social structure, which obviously needs colossal change, one has to change oneself because one is part of this society. So the change must begin with the human being, not with the outward structure. Because the human being is confused, the human being is conditioned, he believes and therefore there is a contradiction in himself and therefore he is really deeply confused. And if he wants to change the social structure, the change from confusion only breeds more confusion. Whereas if he could bring about clarity within himself and from that clarity act, then such an action is really a deep psychological revolution. That revolution is absolutely necessary.

S: This means, doesn't it, a completely different view of



education, for after all education is implanting beliefs.

K: Obviously. Education now, as it is, is really a cultivation of a corner of a vast field. We are concerned with that little corner, which is technological knowledge, condition the mind with knowledge, with information, and neglecting the whole field. And therefore there is an imbalance: technologically one has gone very far, and psychologically one is very, very primitive, one is still at the stage of tribal conflict, with their beliefs, with their gods, with their separate nationalities and armies and all the rest of it, which is really a continuation of the tribal existence. And apparently we don't see in education that it is immensely important to cultivate, to understand the whole field, not just one corner of it.

S: The other thing about this, Krishnamurti, is how can an individual, who is part of the system, get outside the system in order to observe it and himself?

K: You know, sir, the word 'individuality', the individual, means indivisible, an entity who is in himself indivisible, which means non-contradictory in himself. But the individual human being is contradictory in himself, he is not an individual; he is broken up, he is fragmented in himself. And so being contradictory, being divided in himself, his activity, his social structure, his morality is obviously fragmentary, contradictory, therefore he becomes a hypocrite. So the problem is not how to change the individual, but can the human being, who is part of this vast structure, which he himself has created, can that human being radically, psychologically change? Not the society. The society is the relationship between individuals. And can the human mind which is so conditioned after so many centuries, can it uncondition itself

completely, be free from being a Catholic, a Hindu, a communist, a socialist and see that he is part of this human structure, part of the world, not the Catholic world or the communist world.

S: Well, if he can, how can he?

K: That's the problem: how can he see? First of all, one has to be aware of what is going on both outwardly and inwardly, aware - not theoretically, not intellectually, or aware according to some philosopher, or psychologist. Then he is aware according to their ideas, to their conditioning, whereas to be aware of what he is actually - his problems, his miseries, his sufferings, his extraordinary sense of brutality, violence, to be aware of all that. And from that awareness comes clarity, and that means he must be tremendously interested in life, not in some awful absurd theory, whether it be the theory of the Catholics or the Hindus.

S: Well then how do you get people to be aware in your sense?

K: I don't think you can get people - if they are interested, they will be. But if you force them to be interested through propaganda, then the propaganda becomes all important, not the people. After all, all religions have been that, they are instruments of propaganda. Christianity, with their belief, with their saviours, with their virgin - and all the rest of it, their saints, is the result of two thousand years of propaganda, dinning into people every belief - believe, believe, you are saved, you are this, you are that. The other day when I was in Rome, I speak Italian and so on, the priest was absolutely mesmerizing the people by repeating, repeating, repeating, going on for a whole half an hour, naturally the people were mesmerized into belief. So all that has to be set aside. Which means facing the fear, fear to stand alone, fear to discard all this

absurdity, all this circus, if I may use the word, that has become religion. So to discard all that implies a man must be aware and so become very sensitive, very alert and therefore intelligent. It is that intelligence that is going to change society, not throwing a bomb at it. The response to a challenge, as violence, is a most primitive form of response.

Therefore the question really is whether the human mind as it is, living in this world, with wars, with the economic inequalities, with the immorality of society, and society is immoral, whether he can be totally good. Good in the sense, good, be free of violence, free of aggression, and violence is a form, is an outward expression of fear. I don't know if you have noticed that when whole cities are crowded, as they are now, overpopulated, the lack of space makes people violent. The very lack of survival is making everything violent. So I think one has to really go into all this, not as an idea, not as a belief, but one has to search, understand all this in oneself, one must have tremendous passion to find out all this, because self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom, you can't buy it in a book, or from another.

S: In your travels round the world, Krishnamurti, have you found that the younger generation have got this kind of thirst for awareness and self-knowledge?

K: I think from what one has observed, both in America and in Europe and India, this sense of revolt, which most young people have, is a revolt because what has society to offer them, actually, except go into business, or join the army, or go to the moon, or where you will, but actually what has society, the culture to offer them? Nothing, if you look at it. And therefore the more intelligent,

the more sensitive, the more alert, they say, 'This is all wrong'. We must change the very fabric of education, and the vested interests won't have it, the vested interest says, 'We must go slow', you know, the good old business, and therefore there is this conflict. Because, after all the human mind does seek more than bread and butter. It wants something beyond all this, which has meaning, which has significance, which has depth and passion and interest. But just when society, the culture says, you are going to become a business man, or a professor, or become a soldier, then... Therefore the revolt all through the world, they may not express it in so many ways, in such depth, but there are indications of that, but unfortunately they want to change society by throwing bombs and violence, and any physical revolution, as one has observed, must lead inevitably to dictatorship, either of the few, or of the bureaucracy.

So this psychological revolution, of which we are talking about is the most important. That will bring about a change in the world.

S: You have been rather critical of religions, you yourself must have a religious view of life. Would you tell me your own particular outlook on religion.

K: I mean, what is religion, actually what is religion? First of all, to find out what is religion we must negate what it is not. I don't know if you? What it is not, then it is. It's like what is not love - love is not hate, love is not jealousy, love is not ambition, love is not violence - so when you negate all that the other is, which is compassion. In the same way, if you negate what is not religion, then you will find out what is true religion. That is, what is the truly religious mind. First of all, therefore, belief is not

religion, and the authority which the churches, the organized religions assume is not religion. In that there is all the sense of obedience, conformity, acceptance, the hierarchical approach to life, the division between the Protestant, the Catholic, the Hindu, the Muslim and all that, that's not religion. So when you negate all that, which means you are no longer a Hindu, no longer a Catholic, no longer belonging to any sectarian outlook, then your mind then questions, asks, what is then truly religion. This is not, with their rituals, with their masters, with their saviours, that is not religion. Therefore when the mind discards that intelligently, because it has seen it is not, then what is religion? Religion is - not what I think - but religion is this sense of comprehension of the totality of existence in which there is no division between you and me.

Then if there is that quality of goodness, which is virtue, real virtue, not this phoney virtue of society, real virtue, then the mind can go beyond and find out true meditation through deep quiet silence. You can find out if there is such a thing as reality. And therefore a religious mind is a mind that is constantly aware, sensitive, attentive so that it goes beyond itself, into a dimension where there is no time at all.

S: What you are saying, Krishnamurti, seems to me, that man has no need of any power outside of himself.

K: Obviously not, sir. The power of the outside agency is self created. I can't live properly in this world and I hope somebody outside is going to help me. But I have created as a human being, the social structure, the misery, the confusion, the enormous suffering. We have created this. Unless we change it, an outside agency is not going to change it, either the communist outside

agency, the polit bureau, or the Hindu centre, or the Catholic centre. So one has to have the clarity to observe all this.

S: What do you make of death?

K: Sir, that is an immense question. Again, you see we have made life into a hideous thing, living. Life has become a battle, which is an obvious fact, constant fight, fight, fight. And we have divorced that living from death. We separate death as something horrible, something to be frightened of, and to us this living which is misery, we accept. If we didn't accept this existence as misery, then life and death are the same movement. Like love, death and living are all one. One must totally die to find what love is. And to go into this question of what is death, what lies beyond death, whether there is reincarnation, whether there is resurrection, you follow, all that, becomes rather meaningless if you don't know how to live. If the human being knows how to live in this world without conflict then death has quite a different meaning.

To understand death really one has to go into the question of what is it that dies. The physical organism obviously is going to end, because we have misused it, we have really destroyed the intelligence of the organism itself, and to us death is something to be avoided, and as it exists we believe, we believe in something beyond. There is something beyond far greater than any of our belief, there is something tremendously great which the mind cannot possibly grasp, a mind which is in such chaos, which is in such contradiction.

S: Krishnamurti, way back in 1929, that's forty odd years ago now, you dissolved the Order of the Star of the East, I'd like to read the words, some of the words that you said at that time. You said, 'I

maintain that truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect. I do not want followers', you said, 'I mean this. If there are only five people who will listen, who will live, who have their faces turned towards eternity, it will be sufficient. Of what use is it to have thousands who do not understand, who are fully embalmed in prejudice, who do not want the new, who would rather translate the new to suit their own sterile, stagnant selves.' You said, 'I desire those who seek to understand me to be free, not to follow me, not to make out of me a cage which will become a religion, a sect, but rather they should be free from all fears; from the fear of religion, from the fear of salvation, from the fear of spirituality, from the fear of love, from the fear of death, from the fear of life itself.' Well, forty one years later how would you summarize your aims?

K: I think that is true. I mean human beings, whether they live in India, or America, or in the West, are really unhappy beings. They are frustrated, they feel life has very little meaning, the more intellectual you are, you say, it has no meaning at all. And therefore they begin to invent meanings. Whereas if you really understood oneself - oneself is so conditioned, oneself is so small, petty, bourgeois, then out of that understanding flowers goodness.

S: And so you are not setting yourself up as a great teacher?

K: No, no, sir. On the contrary. I say, be your own teacher, be your own light, don't look to somebody else.

S: And where do you find truth?

K: Only when a mind is completely - not only a mind - a life that is completely harmonious, not contradictory. It is only such a mind which is religious that can find truth, which can observe

truth. Truth isn't something abstract, it is there.



## **AT BROCKWOOD PARK, 1975 (FILM INTERSPERSED WITH MUSIC)**

Life is really very beautiful. It is not this ugly thing that we have made of it. And you can appreciate its richness, its depth, its extraordinary loveliness only when you revolt against everything, against organized religions, against tradition, against the present rotten society, so that you, as a human being, find out for yourself what is truth, not to imitate it but to discover.

It is a tragedy, I think, that man lives in constant conflict with himself and with the world. This conflict expresses itself in so many different ways - the conflict between two human beings, the conflict between ideals, the conflict between two beliefs, the conflict between two gods and gurus. This constant conflict which man has lived in is very destructive, it is not creative at all. Quite the contrary. It is a wastage of energy. And man apparently, you, have never been able to solve this problem at all. Conflict in relationship is really between two images - the image you have built about another, and the images he has built about you. So in relationship conflict is essentially between these two images. And can one live a life without this image - the image, the symbol, the conclusion, that you may have drawn from your experience. And I think it is possible, really it is possible to live without a single conflict. And that is possible only when you have no image about yourself - image as being great, or inferior, or something noble, or ignoble and so on, not to have a single image about yourself or about another.

Have you ever wondered why it is that as people grow older

they seem to lose all joy of life. Why do so many of us as we grow into so-called maturity become dull, insensitive, to joy, to beauty, to the open skies and the marvellous earth?

You can cultivate pleasure, you can pursue it, you can subtly, consciously or unconsciously, maintain this pursuit, but pleasure is entirely different from joy. You cannot invite joy, you may experience a period of joy, and cultivate the memory of that experience and turn it into pleasure, but it is no longer joy. Joy cannot be invited, as you can invite pleasure. So the memory of joy remains, and the cultivation of that memory gradually becomes pleasure and prevents the joy coming in. So one has to be very much aware of these two, that joy cannot possibly be invited at any time, consciously or unconsciously. But pleasure in different forms can be pursued, sustained and nourished. So when this is very clear, the difference of the two, then joy becomes a natural event, and it happens quite often, when the whole principle of pleasure is understood.

Yesterday evening I saw a boat going up the river at full sail, driven by the west wind, it was a large boat, heavily laden with firewood for the town. The sun was setting and this wood against the sky was astonishingly beautiful, the boatman was just guiding it, there was no effort for the wind was doing all the work. Similarly, if each one of us would understand the problem of struggle and conflict then I think we would be able to live effortlessly, happily, with a smile on our face.

Our life, our everyday life is based on two principles: fear and pleasure, reward and punishment. From this arises this constant struggle. From this also arises the whole question of behaviour

because our behaviour, that is conduct, how we treat others and treat ourselves, the manner of our speech, the activities of our daily life, are based on these two principles. And as long as these two principles, which is, fear and pleasure, reward and punishment, there must be not only contradiction in ourselves, and therefore in our actions, but also in our relationship with each other. And struggle and effort, to become something, to achieve something - psychologically we are speaking - becomes one of our major problems of life. I don't know if you have noticed how every human being right throughout the world, it doesn't matter where you go, whether you go in the Far East, Near East, or in the West, man is caught in this web, in this trap of endless struggle, struggle not only to live securely, physically, but also psychologically, the battle that goes on within oneself, which is most destructive. I do not know if you have noticed this in yourself, how your life, your daily life, is based on this extraordinary principle of fear and pleasure, and therefore one is trying to dominate the other, and from this arises this endless conflict. Is it possible to live a life without this constant battle, without this constant struggle, inwardly as well as outwardly?

To really understand this you have to see what your life is first. That it is a struggle, that it is terribly frustrated, painful. Be aware of that, be conscious of it. Then don't escape from it, don't run away from what you see, don't try to explain it, don't try to rationalize it, but stay with what actually is, that you are struggling, there is battle going on inside yourself, to be different, or to become different and so on. Just watch that. And in that watching, in that awareness you will find that by the very act of that attention

the struggle comes to an end.

Silence has many qualities, there is the silence between two noises, the silence between two notes, and the widening silence in the interval between two thoughts. There is that peculiar quiet, pervading silence that comes of an evening in the country. There is the silence in a house when everybody has gone to sleep and its peculiar emphasis when you wake up in the middle of the night and listen to an owl hooting in the valley. And there is that silence before the owl's mate answers. There is the silence of an old deserted house, and the silence of a mountain. The silence between two human beings when they have seen the same thing, felt the same thing and acted. The meditative mind contains all these varieties, changes and movements of silence. This silence of the mind is the true religious mind, and the silence of the gods is the silence of the earth. And strangely that morning it had come through the window like some perfume, and with it came a sense, a feeling of the absolute. As you looked out of the window the distance between all things disappeared, and your eyes opened with the dawn and saw everything anew.

Love like most human issues is a very complex problem. I think we should approach it simply and look rather deeply into this question. Love isn't pleasure, nor desire, nor is it the romantic, fanciful affair. And we have made it either idealistic or a sexual affair. And I think when you go into it rather deeply you will find that when pleasure is identified with love it becomes very personal, and therefore it causes a great deal of harm. It brings about hurt, jealousy, anxiety, and pain. And in the pursuit of pleasure there is always fear. And where there is fear naturally there cannot be love.

And you are really destroying the world by your pursuit of pleasure, by your constant demand for the fulfilment of your own particular desires. And so you are limiting the extraordinary width and depth of love. And when you see this it naturally comes about, that is when you are not pursuing pleasure sexually, or ideologically, or make it into something romantic, as divine and human, then that quality which one may call love comes into being. I feel that is the only solution for this miserable confused, conflicting world.

That is one of the most extraordinary things in the world: man has never been able to resolve this question of death, he has never learnt about it. He has run away from it, or worshipped it from a distance, or frightened about it, we have never gone into it. We have never said, let's find out, let's learn what it means to live and what it means to die. We know what it means to live, a routine, as it is now, a great deal of suffering, a great deal of pain, and great boredom of life which demands the search for entertainment - night clubs, drink, drugs, and every form of amusement exploited. We never learn what it is to live without conflict, without struggle, without pain. And one must learn it, and it is part of our existence, as we must also learn what it means to die, because we are so frightened of death. Nobody talks about it, nobody says to you, find out what it means to live a life in which death and life are not separate, they go together, like love and life go together, like love and death go together. They are all together, they can never be divorced, put aside, broken away from each other, as we have done. So to learn about death, not believe in something after death, as the whole of Asia does, or believe in some resurrective

processes and so on, but actually without any fear, without seeking comfort, learn what it means to live and what it means to die. And then you will find that life isn't merely a mechanical process in relationship but life is something immeasurable.

Philosophy means the love of truth, not according to some theory, or speculative concepts, or imagination, but to lead in daily life a truthful life. That truth is not according to some system, some guru, some pattern that traditionally has been established, but in the understanding of oneself, not according to some psychologist, or analyst, but understanding yourself in daily life, to see what you are, exactly, without any distortion, without any despair, or regret, just to see in your daily relationship what you are. What you are is the truth. Now that truth is denied when you follow somebody - follow a guru, follow a priest, follow a traditional concept of heaven or hell, or saviour and all the rest of it. Those are all the products of one's own thoughts, therefore one has to be free from this spiritual authority - if one may use that word 'spiritual'. Authority destroys, destroys not only truth but your understanding of truth. So don't follow anybody with regard to your understanding what truth is. Don't follow what the speaker is saying either; but what the speaker is saying is merely, to observe yourself, to understand yourself as you are. Therefore 'what is', is to be understood and gone beyond. And that is the whole problem of existence. That is, to understand our relationship with each other, however intimate, however distant, and in the understanding of that relationship comes the reality of one's own existence.